Law
J
11
.R5

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 24, 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 of Thursday, May 23, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

THE LATE SENATOR CUTTING—EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter of appreciation from Mrs. Olivia M. Cutting, mother of the late Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

MAY 22, 1935.

The Honorable EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALSEY: On behalf of my family and myself I thank you for sending me the resolution passed by the United States Senate in regard to the death of my son, Bronson Cutting.

With deep appreciation of this tribute to him, I am,

Yours sincerely,

OLIVIA M. CUTTING.
(Mrs. W. Bayard Cutting).

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

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to 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. Ninety-two Senators having 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 agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6114) to amend section 128 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3019) to amend sections 1, 3, and 15 of "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2311. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 6085. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the filling, grading, and paving of streets and sidewalks, the construction and improvement of sewers, and construction of necessary bridges and viaducts in connection with the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $35,000; and

H. R. 6723. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to construct a public-school building and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $30,000; and to authorize said town to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on the editorial page of the Washington Times of the 24th day of May the following, among other things, appears:

> It won't be long before RUSH D. HOLT, Senator-elect from West Virginia, achieves his thirtieth birthday.
>
> On June 19 this man whom West Virginians elected but who has never been sworn in will attain the age prescribed by the Constitution for Senators. * * *
>
> At the present time one question that is being debated is how the other Senator from West Virginia will line up.

Mr. President, the statement contained in the last sentence is utterly preposterous and equally untrue. Practically every Member of the Senate knows that ever since the Congress convened last January I have unconditionally, uncompromisingly, and enthusiastically advocated the seating of Mr. HOLT at the earliest possible moment. I have ventured to express or indicate my desire in this matter to many of the distinguished Members of this body, including Senators ROBINSON, GEORGE, CONNALLY, COSTIGAN, BLACK, WHEELER, MCKELLAR, GUFFEY, NORRIS, BORAH, SHIPSTEAD, BAILEY, KING, and several others whose names I do not at the moment recall.

This newspaper article further says:

> Some say that he (the other Senator from West Virginia) wants HOLT seated so that the youngster will not seek his seat in 1936.

As just indicated, I, of course, want Mr. HOLT seated, but certainly not for the reason assigned in the article from which I have just read. Our journalistic friend further says:

> Others say that NEELY is not overly fond of the young man because of his policies on legislation.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

The "others" who have thus said must be direct descendants of Ananias, for nothing ever uttered by the great past master of falsification was more destitute of a scintilla of truth, or a scintilla of foundation than the statement that I am not "fond" of Senator HOLT. The naked, unblushing fact of the matter is that Senator HOLT and I have been devoted friends for many years. In the Senator's recent campaign in West Virginia I worked as industriously and as faithfully for his election as I ever worked for my own.

The people of West Virginia approved Senator HOLT's candidacy by an overwhelming majority. He is preeminently qualified to render his State great service on the floor of the Senate. There are not, to my knowledge, more than five West Virginia Democrats who control their own votes who do not sincerely desire that he be awarded his seat in this body on his thirtieth birthday. The sentiment of the Democracy of West Virginia in this matter is, in my opinion, shared by more than 90 percent of the Republicans of the State.

For the information of the disappointed, discouraged, and unforgiving few who would maliciously rob Mr. HOLT of the fruits of the magnificent victory which he won at the polls, I state upon the record that I am confident this young statesman will be made a Member of the Senate on or about the 19th day of June by an almost unanimous vote.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS CARRIED IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN SHIPS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 111—calling for certain information regarding imports of agricultural products, and cotton and wheat production and consumption—tables showing the value of agricultural imports, from January 1, 1934, to March 1, 1935, on American and foreign vessels classified by countries of exportation and by customs districts, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Corporation and expenditures for the month of April 1935, also including statements of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by a mass meeting of the United States Bondholders Association of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a Government conservator on each separate bond issue, who would take the place of each self-appointed "bondholders protective committee", which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for an investigation of charges filed by the Women's Committee of Louisiana relative to the qualifications 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 a telegram (dated May 23, 1935) from Margaret G. Fawcett, formerly chief head aide, Army Medical Corps, New York City, N. Y., stating "Please sustain the President's veto. Feel our veterans will regret in the future having been the cause of jeopardizing the country's finances", which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a memorial from Mrs. Dora L. Edwards, of Sanford, N. C., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 2796) to provide for the control and elimination of public-utility holding companies operating or marketing securities in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, to regulate the transmission and sale of electric energy in interstate commerce, to amend the Federal Water Power Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY—PETITION

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD and appropriately referred a petition of some several hundred members of Everett Local No. 183 of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers. It is a petition addressed to the Senate, and I ask that the text of the petition be printed in the RECORD without the signatures.

There being no objection, the petition without the signatures attached was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Our Honorable President and the Senate of the United States:

In recognition of the importance of the pulp and paper industry to the people of the State of Washington and the United States and that due to the importation of newsprint and pulp from Canada, Sweden, and Finland with lower living and wage conditions, which has caused a reduction in prices paid for similar products manufactured in our country, we, the undersigned citizens and employees of Everett and vicinity, respectfully petition that you use the powers granted you under the N. R. A. to stop this importation detrimental to our labor and business.

This petition is sponsored by Everett Local No. 183 of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McGILL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1607) to amend section 109 of the Criminal Code so as to except officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve not on active duty from certain of its provisions, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 686) thereon.

Mr. GERRY, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1973) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, to authorize the payment of a per diem in connection with naval aerial surveys and flight checking of aviation charts, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 687) thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1974) to authorize the transfer of officers of the Construction Corps of the Navy to the line of the Navy for aeronautical engineering duty only, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 688) thereon.

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1977) to amend the act approved February 15, 1929, entitled "An act to permit certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for the purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank", reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 689) thereon.

Mr. DIETERICH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1604) to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 690) thereon.

Mr. TRAMMELL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1975. A bill to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy, and officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps, to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered (Rept. No. 691);

S. 1976. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927,

and for other purposes", approved April 15, 1926, so as to equalize the allowances for quarters and subsistence of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps (Rept. No. 692);

S. 2230. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a suitable site at Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii, for a rear range light (Rept. No. 693); and

S. 2460. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924, entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 694).

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1045) for the relief of A. Cyril Crilley, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 695) thereon.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon;

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Dunham (Rept. No. 696); and

S. 1640. A bill for the relief of Dan Meehan (Rept. No. 697).

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1833) for the relief of W. L. Horn, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 708) thereon.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1960) for the relief of the Florida National Bank & Trust Co., a national banking corporation, as successor trustee for the estate of Phillip Ullendorff, deceased, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 698) thereon.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2520) for the relief of T. D. Randall & Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 699) thereon.

Mr. COOLIDGE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1064) for the relief of Albert Gonzales, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 700) thereon.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 928) for the relief of Rene Hooge, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 701) thereon.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2373. A bill for the relief of Harry Jarrette (Rept. No. 702); and

S. 2374. A bill for the relief of Elliott H. Tasso and Emma Tasso (Rept. No. 703).

Mr. BAILEY also, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1980. A bill for the relief of Lewis Worthy and Dennis O. Penn (Rept. No. 704);

S. 2168. A bill for the relief of the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania (Rept. No. 705);

S. 2590. A bill for the relief of James E. McDonald (Rept. No. 706); and

H. R. 3073. A bill for the relief of William E. Smith (Rept. No. 707).

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1793) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California", approved May 18, 1928 (43 Stat. L. 602), reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 709) thereon.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2257. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty", to include officers assigned to duty at submarine training tanks and diving units, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 710); and

A bill (S. 2378) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States a bequest of certain personal property of the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass. (Rept. No. 711).

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7873) to give the consent and approval of Congress to the extension of the terms and provisions of the present Rio Grande compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on February 12, 1929, and heretofore approved by act of Congress dated June 17, 1930 (Public, No. 370, 71st Cong., 46 Stat. 767), reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 712) thereon.

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2253) to make better provision for the government of the military and naval forces of the United States by the suppression of attempts to incite the members thereof to disobedience, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 714) thereon.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2582) to develop a strong American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid national defense, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 713) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2646. A bill to change the name of the German Orphan Asylum Association of the District of Columbia to the German Orphan Home of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 716); and

H. R. 5711. A bill to provide pensions for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor (Rept. No. 718).

Mr. COPELAND also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2259) to amend sections 966 and 971 of chapter 22 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 720) thereon.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2591. A bill for the relief of Lyman C. Drake (Rept. No. 715); and

H. R. 4708. A bill for the relief of E. F. Droop & Sons Co. (Rept. No. 717).

Mr. KING also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2738) to authorize the use of park property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their national jamboree, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 719) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 2892) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2893) granting a pension to Amanda Boyd; and

A bill (S. 2894) for the relief of William H. Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2895) to amend Private Act No. 5, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to convey certain land in the county of Los Angeles, State of California"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2896) to require the furnishing of heat in living quarters in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 2897) for the relief of Lt. Robert A. J. English, United States Navy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2898) for the relief of John A. Bass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 2899) to provide for increasing the limit of cost for the construction and equipment of an annex to the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 2900) granting a pension to certain Indians on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

A bill (S. 2901) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Bartlett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BONE:

A bill (S. 2902) to amend section 201 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1928; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2903) for the protection and control of the blue crab (Callinectes sapidus) in any State or Territory, and authorizing the Department of Commerce to define the seasons and regulate the manner and conditions under which they may be taken or destroyed; to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3019) to amend sections 1, 3, and 15 of "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. GIBSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6732) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF AIR MAIL SERVICE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6511) to amend the air mail laws and to authorize the extension of the Air Mail Service, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ACCEPTANCE OF MEDALS, ETC., FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1975) authorizing certain officers of the United States Navy and officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DUTY ON COFFEE IMPORTED INTO PUERTO RICO—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday, after the vote on the passage of the bonus bill over the veto of the President of the United States, I gave notice under the rule of my intention at a later time to move to suspend the rules for the purpose of offering an amendment to the naval appropriation bill making mandatory the payment of the bonus but vesting in the President discretion as to whether the adjusted-service certificates should be paid in whole or in part by the issuance of currency, by the sale of bonds, or by transferring funds from the $4,800,000,000 heretofore appropriated for relief and work relief.

It seemed to me, and still seems to me, that the naval appropriation bill was a peculiarly appropriate bill to which to add legislation for the payment of the bonus. That bill, which is now pending before the Senate, provides for the most stupendous peace-time appropriations in the history of the world in preparation for another war. It therefore seemed to me entirely appropriate, entirely proper and fitting, that the same act dishing out public funds with such abandon and such lavishness in preparation for another war should contain an appropriation for paying the bill for the last war.

Moreover, Mr. President, this bill contains, in the most lavish style, appropriations to enable the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. and other shipbuilding companies to pay out enormous bonuses, running into millions of dollars, to Mr. Grace and other executives of the shipbuilding industry. It seemed to me not unfitting that the same bill should also contain a slight bonus to the men who fought and won the war.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Has the Senator offered the soldiers' bonus as an amendment to the naval bill or as a substitute for it?

Mr. CLARK. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I should prefer to offer it as a substitute; but in view of the provisions of the naval appropriation bill, it seemed to me it was not at all inappropriate or unfitting to offer as an amendment the provision for the payment of the bonus to the men who served in the last war and who won the last war.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in view of the way the soldiers have been treated, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri how he figures that this country ever will be able to get another army to fight a war anywhere.

Mr. CLARK. We got the army in the last war by drafting them. I presume that is the intention of the militarists of this country as to the next war.

I do not desire to detain the Senate. My purpose in rising was to say that, in spite of the fact that this seemed to me to be an entirely appropriate bill on which to offer the amendment for the payment of the soldiers' bonus, I have no desire to fight moot battles at the expense of the holders of the adjusted-service certificates, and have no desire to cause votes in the Senate except when I have sound reasons to believe the votes may be successful for the payment of the bonus. Consultations with some of my colleagues over the night have convinced me that on this bill the motion to suspend the rules and make in order the amendment I have proposed could not be successful. Some Members who are in sympathy with the payment of the bonus are intensely in favor of the naval appropriation bill, and do not desire that issue to be complicated with any other. Other Senators who are in sympathy with the purposes of my amendment are opposed to the naval appropriation bill, and would not desire to vote for it even with the bonus amendment attached to it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I simply desire to give notice that I shall not press the motion to suspend the rules of which I gave notice yesterday, but shall probably at an appropriate time offer that amendment to another bill.

SAVE THE N. R. A.—ADDRESS BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and illuminating

radio speech delivered by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, on the 20th instant, with reference to the N. R. A.

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

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I secured consent to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by General Johnson. At that time I did not have an estimate from the Public Printer, as required under the rules, for the address will occupy about half a page more than is permitted without an estimate.

I now have secured the estimate, and I renew my request for the printing of the speech in the RECORD.

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

N. R. A. never gave me anything but grief. I have no official, personal, or political interest. But I have a citizen's interest and some knowledge of it from the beginning. It is a duty to speak at this crisis in its life. I thank the National Broadcasting Co. for letting me do so.

The neck of N. R. A. is on the chopping block. Its life expires on June 16 unless Congress extends it. The House wants to do this, but the Senate is determined to give it only 9 months with changes which disembowel the law and leave nothing but uncertainty of its meaning.

Make no mistake about it. What the Senate proposes is not to extend N. R. A. It is to kill it.

A rule of general commercial conduct such as N. R. A., which has only 9 months to live after vast changes in its structure, and with death at the end, is nothing on which business can plan or act. The effect of the Senate bill would plunge all business into blank uncertainty.

It is business uncertainty everywhere which is holding up recovery. Nobody dares plan 3 months on the future. Our whole economic machine is on a hand-to-mouth basis. The Senate proposal is just one more barrier to prosperity. It can't possibly do good. It can do nothing but harm because its effect will be utterly to demoralize N. R. A., which is now practically motionless anyway.

It would be far better to kill N. R. A. now. That would at least remove uncertainty. To leave it in barely tolerated existence—a nightmare "life-in-death" still threaded through the whole fabric of business would be deadly. Yet to kill it outright might produce the worst business set-back since 1932.

There is more than appears on the surface of this Senate cup of cold poison. There is a strong gamble that the Supreme Court decision in the Sick Chicken case may hold parts of the present law unconstitutional. If a new act were now framed to avoid the bad parts of the old, it might be consistent with the Court's decision and N. R. A. could yet live on. But if, by the short Senate lease on life, N. R. A. is pinned down to the faults of the old law, the Court decision may give the whole statute what Pancho Villa used to give the wounded and call it the "mercy shot"—a bullet through the brain.

The Senate enemies of N. R. A. are very determined. They want nothing less than its burial under 6 feet of earth to paraphrase HUEY LONG—face downward, so that the more it scratches the closer it gets to what they call its home.

The troubles of N. R. A. happened because it was new and complex and trod on too many big and powerful toes. It came at a time when Congress was too much engrossed with other things to follow it. It was never very well understood or properly defended in Congress itself and it is not well understood there now.

When you husk N. R. A. down to its essentials there are only two:

(1) That people shall not compete in commerce and manufacture by cutting wages below a minimum or by other abuses, such as sweatshops and child labor, and that employers agree to bargain with elected representatives of their workers, if workers so elect.

(2) That they shall not compete by the old monopolist method of driving a competitor out by selling at cutthroat prices until they are rid of him—the methods by which great chain-store, mail-order, and department operators were practically wiping small business out of existence before N. R. A.—or by other methods thought by a majority in any industry and by the President to be unfair.

Now, that is all there is to the general principle of N. R. A. Stated in that way, I doubt if out of 100 people in any group you could get 5 to condemn it.

It goes straight to great evils. It intends to prevent the exploitation of the weak and helpless. It was designed to create new employment and raise the purchasing power of workers to the benefit of business throughout the country.

Those principles appealed to the imagination of the people, and N. R. A. went over with a great bang. The President went on the air and invited all employers to agree with him to put the labor provisions into effect voluntarily. Within 60 days 96 percent of all employers had made this pledge to the President; 2,785,000 new jobs were created then and there. Pay rolls were increased by $3,000,000,000.

It reached its high point early in September of 1933. Then it began to sag, and it has sagged ever since. Why? Its enemies say it was because it encouraged monopoly, oppressed small enterprise, regimented business, and that it has retarded recovery by increasing prices faster than wages.

Now, here in the Senate is a major policy of this administration accused at the bar of public opinion and on trial for its very life. It is as grave a crisis as we have had; for if N. R. A. goes down, a large part of the new deal goes down with it.

Monopoly; oppression of small enterprise; raising prices faster than wages; regimentation. These are the charges. If they are true N. R. A. ought to die. If they are not true, the people of this country ought to demand an honorable acquittal.

I must, with great deliberation, say that those are not the real reasons for opposition to N. R. A.; that not one single one of those charges is true; that the exact reverse of each of them is true.

Since I propose to prove this I dare to add that the fountainheads of these false charges are interests who want to kill N. R. A. for reasons which they dare not state, because they are selfish, unworthy, and unpopular reasons; because the stench of them would drive them out of court and these more fragrant, if artificial, buds have been sold to the Senate in their stead.

It is one of the cleverest pieces of propaganda of our time.

The charge of monopoly comes from monopolists, that of oppression from oppressors, that of regimentation from industrial martinets, and that of prices higher than wages—is not true.

They don't want N. R. A. killed because it helps monopoly but because it checked monopoly; not because it hurts the little fellow, but because it saved the little fellow from their rapacity; not because it regiments, but because it interfered with their control of every industry; not because it reduces real wages, but because it increases them.

I do not mean to say that all opponents to N. R. A. advance one rosy reason to hide another saffron one. Many have fallen for the sloganeers in one of the most effective of ballyhoo campaigns on record.

I want to record here a challenge to N. R. A. enemies which I have made several times before—thus far without a taker.

Show me a good case of claimed oppression of a little fellow that does not reduce to somebody's unwillingness to pay code wages for code hours. With a few slight exceptions, the claim is—every time—that an employer is oppressed because he can't hire help for sweatshop wages.

Minimum-code wages happen to be from $10.50 to $14 a week, except in large cities where they were as high as $15—from $40 to $60 a month for adult human labor. That is getting close to the sweatshop. The whole idea was that, if everybody pays the same wages—big fellow and little fellow—it is an equal burden to all, a special advantage to none, and that there is nothing there to hurt the little fellow.

Husked out to its ugly facts, the complaint of oppression is that N. R. A. won't let a man operate a sweatshop. That does not make pretty reading and it is no good as a political slogan, so what we hear is not that "N. R. A. prohibits sweatshop wages", but N. R. A. oppresses the little fellow by monopolistic practices, and then not one word of what the monopolistic practice is, not one word, because there is not one word to say.

I have sought cases of other oppression and I have yet to find one. I say again to this radio audience "Look into your own experience and see if you can find such an oppression, and if not, look into your hearts and say what you think of this kind of an attack on N. R. A."

Now, I have been free to admit mistakes of N. R. A. There are regional differences in wage rates due to lower living costs or less efficient work, that were not scientifically worked out.

A lot of N. R. A. unpopularity was due to its failure to deal realistically with the economic fact that wage scales for Negro labor are lower than for white labor, North and South.

These situations must be recognized frankly. The only cure lies in scientific differentials favoring the South and other areas, but with a zoning restriction preventing products of such labor rates from lowering established wage rates in other areas. But even this—the most serious charge against N. R. A.—does not support the claim that N. R. A. hurt the little fellow in business.

Turning from reasons to recorded facts, they show the charge to be a cynical paradox. N. R. A. has done more to maintain, preserve, and restore the little fellow in business than anything that has happened in this country in 20 years.

These critics say that they want to go back to the Federal Trade Commission and the antitrust acts as they were before N. R. A., in order to save the little fellow. From the World War straight through the boom of 1929 to N. R. A., the little fellows were being literally wiped out of existence by chains, mail-order houses, big buyers, and constant bigger and better mergers.

Before the antitrust acts it is doubtful whether the 200 largest corporations controlled a very big share of corporate wealth. At the end of 1929 they controlled 49.2 percent of it, and in 1931 55 percent of it. In industry alone, three-tenths of 1 percent of the number of corporations control 90 percent of the industrial corporate wealth. Even in 1928 and 1929 few little fellows were making money. From 1923 to 1928 over 45 percent of corporations were operating in the red. In 1904, million-dollar producers turned out 38 percent of our output. In 1929 they made 69 percent of it. That process of concentration and elimination of little fellows went on right up to the enactment of N. I. R. A.

While this vast concentration and slaughter of little fellows was going on employment was also being wiped out. The output per worker in all industries increased 83 percent in the first

quarter of this century while population increased 54 percent and industrial employment only 35 percent.

After the crash of 1929 the process speeded up—wage cutting, extension of hours, and a vast destruction of small competitors by any cutthroat method that could be invented and applied. Commercial failures reached an all-time peak. Weekly earnings dropped from $25.76 to $16.11 between May 1929 and February 1933.

In 1914 there was about 1 business enterprise to every 390 people. In 1929 there was 1 to every 900 people.

Those are shocking figures. They show something more than oppression. They show elimination. Throughout prosperity from 1923 to the 1929 peak the number of small business failures was rising rapidly.

With the advent of N. R. A. the destruction of little fellows was abruptly halted. Failures dropped from a monthly moving average of 2,065 in February 1933 to 834 in February 1935—the lowest point in recent history, the lowest point since dependable figures became available—about half what they were in the years of our great prosperity, 1928 and 1929.

You can't get away from those figures. They give the lie direct to the first and second charges against N. R. A. N. R. A. has not oppressed the little fellow. It has saved him. It has not encouraged monopoly. It has checked monopoly, and it is the only force that has ever done so in recent years.

To little fellows I do not need to labor this point. It was done by checking the instruments by which monopoly was working their destruction—the loss leader, high-pressure fake advertising, putting on the heat by bulldozing buying methods, followed by cutthroat pricing on lines vital to their existence—and all the other methods of modern economic murder.

Specifically, N. R. A. saved the retail tire industry, the independent moving-picture houses, the retail book industry in large cities, and in greater or less degree tobacconists, independent druggists, grocers, dry goods, notion stores, and many others.

There were more retailers in business at the end of 1933 than in 1929, in spite of the tremendous mortality of the depression. My mail is flooded with appeals from little fellows for me to try to save N. R. A., but I have yet to see any such suggestion by a monopolist. On the contrary, the biggest monopolists in this country, are leading the attack.

I have heard plenty of little-fellow kicks about annoyances in the codes, but most every little fellow within the sound of my voices knows that for the first time in years he is in the black, and that with business in general still prostrate and millions of people out of employment. Also he has at last some little sense of security—that he is not going to wake up tomorrow to find himself bludgeoned out of existence by the irresistible power of some large and ruthless competitor.

It is the natural monopolies—not the little-fellow independents—who don't want N. R. A. Why should they want it? They don't get anything out of it but burdens. Where are the telephone and telegraph companies, the press services, the utilities under N. R. A.? Generally, they have not pressed for codes. Some of them never had codes. The same thing is true of dominated industries like packers and the can and tobacco companies.

Of the whole idea about N. R. A. oppressing small enterprise and promoting monopoly, it is not merely untrue—it is the exact reverse of true.

The next charge against N. R. A. is that, by raising prices (through increased costs) faster than it has raised wages, it has lessened consumption and hence production and hence employment and hence retarded recovery.

There is a very prevalent idea—that if you keep wages down it will keep costs down, which will increase consumption, make employment and recovery.

If that is right, March 1932 (when all wages and costs and prices were at depression lows) must have been an economic paradise. Industry had cut costs as never before and nearly all of it came out of the wages of labor. The purchasing power of factory labor was at the lowest point it has ever reached in the twentieth century. For the first time, I think, in our history, wages went down to the depths nearly as fast as prices.

N. R. A. did something that was never done before. It pushed labor wages upward nearly as fast as prices notwithstanding the 1933 speculative boom. But when a man goes further and says that prices went up faster and destroyed the purchasing power of wages, he is departing from the truth. All figures that I know show the exact reverse of that.

It may be true as is sometimes said that total national income has not gone up as fast as total prices, thus reducing real wealth, and real income for 1934 as compared with 1933. But the part of N. R. A. in that is all to its credit because the real wages—the real purchasing power of labor—has increased at least 30 percent.

Other factors raising price have had much more effect. We deliberately devalued the dollar, expecting to raise all prices to the 1926 level. We reduced acreage and taxed processing of agricultural products and we laid on layers of taxes. We sought inflation up every alley to raise prices and, of course, all that has had its effect. It may be that the total effect was to reduce total consuming power. But N. R. A. did the reverse of reducing the consuming power of workers.

Suppose N. R. A. had not increased the wages of labor and put 3,000,000 workers on pay rolls—what would have happened to workers with all these other forces increasing prices? Obviously they would have suffered cruelly as they always have suffered during period of price inflation and obviously their reduced consuming power would have reduced consumption and employment and retarded recovery.

This is the least defensible charge against N. R. A. N. R. A. increased hourly wages of labor from an average 42 to an average 56. It decreased hours per week from an average of about 42 to an average of about 37. As I have said, it employed about 3,000,000 people which is more than all the billions spent by the Government has done and it did it with no great expense or increase in taxation. It increased the purchasing power of pay rolls from 83 percent of the 1914 figure to 112 percent.

Runaway prices have not been caused by N. R. A. Taking the Bureau of Labor statistics, figures which show fluctuations in prices by groups of farm products, foods, other commodities, and all commodities separately the group "other commodities" is the one which is affected by N. R. A. codes. It was on a higher level than other prices in March 1933, it rose somewhat in the early part of 1933 but—from the effective date of N. R. A.—it leveled off at about 77 percent of the 1926 level and there it has remained in the greatest stability shown for many years, while the three other groups gyrated sharply upward and finally crossed it. Prices in codified industries have increased much less than in uncodified industries. All this is conclusive evidence that N. R. A. itself has not tended to increase prices in the group it affects, but on the contrary to stabilize and maintain them.

These figures take into account the rapid rise in non-N. R. A. prices. In other words, N. R. A. carried the purchasing and consuming power of those whom it affected straight upward in spite of a rapidly increasing price level in other groups and it did not contribute to any increase itself. The general average of N. R. A. prices increased before N. R. A. came into being.

There remains the accusation that N. R. A. regiments American business—whatever they may mean. I take it to mean that some people have been obliged to do what they did not want to do—principally to pay living wages and refrain from further economic assassination of small competition.

Perhaps so—but how have they been prevented from doing this? The codes are not statutes. They are agreements on what the overwhelming majority of each industry, with the President's concurrence, say they regard as plain decency. Don't forget that 95 percent of all industry came voluntarily forward by individual agreement and accepted the essential provisions of N. R. A. on the invitation of the President.

There is not one imposed code in the whole category. If there was compulsion, it was only the compulsion of conscience and public opinion—and if it be said "that was compulsion enough", the answer is that there are several large industries with no codes at all.

I have never been able to see how anybody can spell regimentation out of that. After codification—after agreement, some court actions have been brought against people who failed to live up to their agreement and the standard of decency in their industries. That is as near as N. R. A. ever came to compulsion.

Now we have considered here the plain question of the guilt or innocence of N. R. A.—accused and on trial for its life on four charges:

1. Monopoly.
2. Oppression.
3. Retarding recovery.
4. Regimenting industry.

These charges are proved to be not true; the exact reverse of each is proved to be true. There is no room for dispute about the figures, and every set of figures that I have seen shows exactly the same result.

N. R. A. never had a real trial on any of these charges. Before the Senate Finance Committee a procession of complainants appeared. With few exceptions they were witnesses for the prosecution. They produced no such ultimate facts as have been produced here. There were only a few witnesses for the defense. I had the record of those hearings carefully digested, and in my opinion on the four main charges there is not a shred of respectable evidence in that whole record. There are ex parte statements and notoriously fragmentary and contradictory stories, never tested by cross-examination, never refuted by evidence, and there is some stuff in there that is nothing less than shameful—a man who paid some of his workers less than a penitentiary pays prisoners, complaining of his oppression as a little fellow, because he was taken to task for it by N. R. A.

N. R. A. has been betrayed by ballyhoo, pilloried by politics, and slaughtered by slogans.

This never could have occurred if those whom N. R. A. was conceived to protect knew exactly what is about to happen to it and to them.

The principal, if not the only forthright argument against N. R. A. is that if you can cast the codes aside, you can get prices down by lengthening hours of work and lowering wages—that is the essence of this whole attack. That affects far more than just the 3,000,000 people to whom N. R. A. gave jobs. It strikes at some 20,000,000 who work for wages and salaries in industries under N. R. A. Your day off, your longer leisure, your increased rates per hour are all threatened if this Nation goes back to a policy of more goods produced by fewer people at lower wages.

I am making no estimate or prophecy, but it is reasonable to suppose that if N. R. A. must be sacrificed in order to undo what

N. R. A. has done, then at least 3,000,000 jobs and $3,000,000,000 in wages are at least in a danger zone.

Why not? It is merely a restoration of the condition which existed before N. R. A. It is the aim and object of those who have sought to engineer the destruction of N. R. A. I don't know that such things will happen, but I know they happened before N. R. A.—shop girls working for $3 per week, 14 hours a day; women bending in gloomy garret sweatshops to buy food; children working 8 hours a day for 10 cents an hour; men laboring all daylight hours in steaming lumber swamps for 7 cents an hour. If you don't see these things return it won't be because there is any force or influence in government to stop them.

It is not only workers who are threatened. There is not an informed small mine operator or merchant, manufacturer, filling-station proprietor, or moving-picture exhibitor who does not know what was happening to him before N. R. A. and what is likely to begin to happen to him again the moment N. R. A. is gone.

The textile industry is almost sure to go into a nose dive. Bituminous-coal mining will find little to prevent its falling back to where it was in 1932. The flood of petroleum that has the midcontinent area on the ropes may rob that district of its short-lived recovery.

Now, I doubt if there is anything that can be done about this in Washington. This ballyhooed psychology has had its effect in the Senate. Whatever is done about it must be done back home.

I know how N. R. A. was put into effect. It was done on an almost unanimous demand of the people. The Old Guard wanted N. R. A. then no more than it wants N. R. A. now. But fifteen or twenty million workers on none or starvation wages and their families wanted it. Small merchants and manufacturers wanted it.

But above and beyond all this, the women of this country wanted it. Housewives who have somehow to make small wages feed large families—mothers who want their children in schools and not in factories—wives who had kept up too long a brave family front on little or nothing—they wanted N. R. A. They made their wants known and they got what they wanted. As long as they kept on wanting N. R. A. it flourished like the green bay tree. When they stopped fighting for it, it sickened and has almost died.

They alone can save it.

I don't believe in our modern push-button government by cut-rate telegrams to Congressmen. But it is a literal fact that N. R. A. is being killed because many Senators think that most of their people don't want it—that it is a political hot poker. There isn't a small business man in this country, there isn't a worker for wages or salary, there isn't a wife or family of any of these, who is not going to be badly hurt by what is sure to happen soon in this city to N. R. A. if it is not promptly proved to Senators that a vast majority of their constituents want them to give N. R. A. at least a fair trial for its life by the President's plan for an outright extension of his modified N. R. A. for a period of at least 2 years.

There is not a business association of little fellows which should not make their appeal by petition giving facts and not threats. There is not a woman's club or workers' union, there is not an individual who works for wages, or depends on the wages of others, who does not have a vital stake in making his individual interest and experience known by a temperate and moderate recitation of the fact of his own case.

WHEAT PROGRAM OF THE A. A. A.—ADDRESS BY SENATOR M'GILL

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very interesting speech delivered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. MCGILL] over the Columbia Broadcasting System Tuesday, May 21, at 10:15 p. m. His subject was the "Wheat Program of the A. A. A."

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

The referendum at which the wheat farmers of America will by their votes determine their course following the year 1935 is of such major importance it would seem appropriate that I should devote the time allotted to me on this broadcast to a discussion of their problem.

Before entering upon a discussion of the national wheat referendum which will be held this coming Saturday, the 25th of the present month; that is, a vote by the wheat farmers of the Nation on the question of whether they themselves desire to continue the control of their own wheat production—before going into the subject itself, permit me to say there is a thought which comes to me most impressively at this time as I contemplate the millions of American homes over whose rooftops these radio waves are now flashing through the night, and I would like to tell you what that thought is. It is this: For the few minutes I shall occupy, my position is that of one speaking from the Capital City at Washington to the wheat farmers of America, and that this is a one-way conversation reaching throughout the Nation on a subject vital to the welfare of many thousands of our best citizens. These radio waves are blanketing every American wheat field under the stars tonight and are flashing over the kitchens of every wheat farmer from Texas and Kansas to the Dakotas and from Walla Walla, Wash., to Washington, D. C. I repeat, this is a one-way conversation; that is, I merely occupy the position as a representative of one of the great agricultural States of the Union speaking in his official capacity in behalf of the farm program of this administration from the Capital City in Washington to the farmers of America. On this coming Saturday, May 25, the conversation will be resumed. On that day, through the referendum—the vote which will be taken among the wheat farmers of America—those same wheat farmers to whom I am talking tonight will talk to the officials of their Government. It will be a case of the other end of the farm program—the farm end—talking to Washington.

This, it occurs to me, is highly significant of the way in which this farm program has at all times since its inception been working. On the one hand, here in Washington are the representatives of the farmers in the Congress and in the Department of Agriculture and in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Cooperating with those here in Washington and to accomplish the same ends, are the farmers, the wheat growers themselves, and their own committeemen in their county associations throughout the wheat-growing regions of the United States. There are some 10,000 of these farmer committeemen actively functioning in the local administration of the wheat program. Tonight we are talking to the wheat farmers and on next Saturday the wheat farmers of America will talk to us. They will then record their opinion through the National Wheat Referendum which will be taken at that time. Every farmer who grows wheat whether he is a contract signer or not is eligible to vote. Polling places will be established in all wheat-growing communities and the farmers will simply be asked to vote "yes" or "no" on the question of whether they favor continuing the wheat-control program.

A national hook-up radio talk is significant of the way we do things today. It is not possible for me or any other Government official to talk to one group over a national radio hook-up and make a certain set of promises to that particular group. This broadcast reaches all groups, farmers and consumers alike. It reaches the laborers and the men who are interested in business and industry. This is as it should be because the farm program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, including the wheat program, affects the economic well-being of all these groups. All are interested. No doubt the wheat farmer himself knows more about the wheat program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration than other groups and for that reason I will talk first to the consumers.

To the consumers who are listening to this broadcast—and we are all consumers of wheat—let me point out three important things: First, the price of wheat is still below the parity price level; that is, the same amount of wheat will not buy for the farmer as much in other commodities as it would purchase during the parity period preceding the World War. Second, you will probably be relieved to know that there continues to exist more than a normal supply of wheat on hand, notwithstanding the yield from the last two wheat crops has been far less than would have been ordinarily anticipated. The July carry-over this year will be around 150,000,000 bushels, which is more than the normal carry-over, more than the average carry-over during the past 20 years. Third, the cost of foods to the American family is still below the level of other commodities which go to make up the cost of living. During the 15 years since 1920 food prices have been proportionately lower than other items which go to make up the cost of living. It is true, consumers are paying more for their food than they did a few years ago, but the same consumers should remember that for years they were being furnished their food at a price which did not allow the farmer the cost of production. Food prices have been extremely low as compared to the prices of other commodities we have had to buy. The increase in food prices has not been large, generally speaking, and in order that there may be an economic equality in this country it is necessary that they reach a point more nearly on a comparative level with the prices of other commodities.

HISTORY OF WHEAT

I should like on this occasion to tell you something of the history of wheat during the past 20 years. It is a story which has been told before, but will bear repeating. The story of wheat is phrased in figures and it is framed in facts and is one of human hopes and human homes. It relates to the wheat farmer who was urged by his Government at a time of stress to plant more and more acres to wheat until following the war the production of wheat became so abnormal and out of proportion to the markets' demand that the price fell far below the cost of production. Through cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration the wheat farmer has now partially recovered his position in the economic equation. In fact, he is on his way to complete recovery, and in my judgment his ultimate recovery is dependent upon the results of the referendum to be held this coming Saturday.

Twenty years ago, just before the war, a dollar's worth of wheat would buy a full round dollar's worth of other commodities. When a bushel of wheat will again buy the same in goods as it did 20 years ago, then wheat will again have reached what is called a parity price. That is the purpose and scope of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. During the parity period, 20 years ago, we were a debtor Nation. We had always owed money to Europe. Consequently Europe had always imported goods from us. For example, Europe bought our wheat. We exported from one-fourth to one-third of our entire crop each year and produced according to the then-existing demand. When the war came we began to farm as we had never farmed before. Millions of acres of land was plowed which had never been plowed before. Out went the grass pasture. In went the cultivated crops. The temporary stimulus was entirely sound while it lasted. At the conclusion of the war, European

farmers went back to the plow and by the year 1930 their wheat production was above their pre-war rate. European countries had become the debtor nations now, and decided to grow more and buy less. We had changed from the position of a debtor nation to a creditor nation. In fact, we had suddenly become the greatest creditor nation know to modern history. As such, we should have, in my judgment, adjusted our tariffs to permit a greater degree of international trade. However, we attempted to act like a debtor nation while we were in fact a creditor nation. The tariffs which we maintained for industry of course restricted imports from other countries and at the same time cost us our exports. Hence the American farmer lost his export market for wheat. Our wheat exports dropped from the two to three hundred million bushel level, which we had enjoyed, down to aproximately 32,000,000 bushels for the year ending June 1933. This was less than we had exported during any year since 1868—and our wheat exports dropped to even a lower level the following year.

There are some who criticize the processing tax, which is the farmer's tariff, because they contend it has reduced our exports. Let those who criticize this farmer's tariff and its effect, if any, on exports, compare the processing tax with the industrial tariff which reduced our wheat exports from one-fourth of our annual crop to the lowest point since 1868 and which similarly has destroyed our export market for other agricultural commodities. If it is the loss of export markets which causes our trouble, let us face the realities of the situation and recognize the mountain instead of the molehill.

Those who try to confuse the issue by stating wheat will be consumed if the price is low are embarrassed when you remind them that in the year when the wheat prices were the lowest in our history we were compelled to store unsold the largest carry-over in our history—a carry-over of approximately 390,000,000 bushels—which was about three times our normal or average carry-over. Regardless of the price, our national consumption of wheat for food varies hardly at all from year to year. In 1932–33 it is true there were those who needed bread. It is true there were those who were hungry. Our bread lines had never been longer. This was not due, however, to an insufficient quantity of wheat—we had never had more on hand. It was not because the price was too high—the price had never been lower. Those who try to confuse the issue by saying that production control deprives some of our people of food are dodging two important facts: First, we had our longest bread lines when we had the largest supply of wheat and the cheapest price. Second, our July carry-over this year will be a little above normal. In other words, we have on hand at this time more than a normal supply of wheat.

Two years ago we witnessed the adoption by the National Congress of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and with it appeared the possibility of belated justice to the farmers who had for years fed the Nation below the cost of production. Some of you who are listening to me know that the plan provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has worked—unfortunately, however, many do not know. With reference to wheat as well as to other basic agricultural commodities the object of the plan is to raise the price to the parity level so that a wheat farmer can, with a wagonload of wheat, buy as much of other goods as he could during the balanced period before the war. The plan has worked, as many of you know, remarkably well. Nearly 800,000 wheat farmers have voluntarily cooperated in the plan. At the outset, in the summer of 1933, the price of wheat increased for various reasons. The 1933 wheat crop, because of drought, was about only two-thirds as large as the 1932 crop, but it brought nearly twice as much money to the wheat farmers. The 1934 crop was less than the 1933 crop but brought almost exactly twice as much money to the wheat farmers as did the 1932 crop. On the other hand, the cost of bread to the ultimate consumer has not increased so as materially to affect the cost of living. I know that many of our most sincere citizens who, while they wish prosperity for the farmer, deplore the millions of dollars of wheat checks and cotton checks; that is, the Government checks to the farmers called "benefit and rental payments", and which are made to the farmers through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in return for their cooperation in the control programs. There are altogether too many of these sincere individuals who have the feeling that this money comes out of general funds of the Federal Treasury and is an additional burden on the Federal Government. I believe it is only fair that the Nation should know that these farm programs, the crop-control programs, are, and have been, and will continue to be financially self-sustaining.

The triple A pays its own way as it goes. An examination of the budget division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration discloses there had been paid to farmers to March 31, 1935, in the crop-control program, rental or benefit payments, in addition to the substantial increase in market prices for their commodities, the total sum of $678,416,926.45 and that to the same date the processing tax collected had amounted to the total sum of $772,963,077. The farmers, therefore, may well be proud, and some of the skeptics may be relieved to know that the adjustment program of the triple A is and has been self-sustaining—it pays its own way. For example, when a miller buys wheat he pays the regular market price for it which the farmer receives, and in addition to that the miller pays 30 cents per bushel processing tax, which is collected by the Government, and from this processing tax the farmer receives his rental or benefit payment. These payments are simply one part of the farmer's income for his product. He gets one portion of his pay for the crop when he delivers his product to market. He gets the other portion of it later in the form of his rental or benefit payment. It is in no sense a dole—it is simply a part of an earned income to farmers for their production.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Before concluding I desire to explode one particular bogey which some of the unscrupulous opponents of this successful agricultural program have brought forward in a frantic effort to frighten the public. I refer to the stories which perhaps all of you have read, with reference to agricultural imports which are supposed to be flooding our country today. Let us examine the facts a moment to demonstrate how far these groups have gone in an effort to find something with which to attack the program.

In terms of wheat, our imports of agricultural products do sound impressive, of course. I have observed these figures quoted in pounds instead of in terms of bushels. This is done no doubt by reason of the fact that one can in that way get into the millions more quickly. Remember this fact, however: We have always imported wheat. We require certain kinds of wheat we do not produce in the United States except in limited quantities—required for special uses and we have always imported such wheat. As disclosed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the total imports of our competitive agricultural products, including grains, during the 8-month period ending March 1, 1935, were 25 percent less—not more—but 25 percent less than the average imports of such commodities for the same months of any year during the past 10 years. The drought damage to our wheat crop last year was approximately 300,000,000 bushels. We imported 9½ million bushels of wheat during the 8-month period ending March 1. Our corn imports were about seven-tenths of 1 percent of the estimated drought loss. Imports of beef during 1934 were less than the 10-year average. Imports of hog products for 1934 were eighteen one-thousandths of 1 percent of our pork products and twenty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the exports of pork products last year. It will be observed therefore that our agricultural imports have been very unimportant except as a medium of propaganda.

CONCLUSION

To the wheat farmers of America I would like to make these suggestions: Remember now your condition 2 years ago. The price of wheat then was far below the actual cost of production. You were buried beneath the largest surplus of wheat in the history of the United States. As individuals you were helpless to do anything because you had no assurance that whatever you yourself might do your neighbor would cooperate. You have been voluntarily cooperating with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration during the past 2 years. The price of your wheat has not only doubled but is nearly three times what it was at the inception of the program. The price you are now receiving for this commodity, together with your benefit or rental payment, is approaching toward parity or a fair price. The surplus of this commodity has been reduced to nearly normal. You are no longer helpless with reference to your own situation, because you have the assurance that the wheat farmers throughout America will cooperate with you. Without the Agricultural Adjustment program our basic industry, agriculture, would have continued in a state of ruin. Do you wish to continue this program? This is the question which you will be asked to answer on Saturday, May 25, as wheat farmers. You on that day will have the opportunity to express in this referendum your opinion. The program must and will be, if carried on, a voluntary cooperative program on your part. Your vote in no way binds you and in no way affects the contract between the farmers and the Agricultural Adjustment Administrator but is merely an evidence of your sympathies and an expression of your opinion. Your Government merely wants to know whether the wheat producers of America are favorably impressed with the idea of managed control.

The surplus has been reduced, the price has materially increased—facts no one can dispute. Remember, however, the potential surplus may be regarded as still here. The acres which produced the surplus are with us. Inspired by higher prices, what will your neighbors and the wheat growers generally do, if you abandon the control provided by the medium of the adjustment program? It isn't so much a question of what one might do as a wheat farmer. It is a question of what all will do. You can retain control of production as it has been carried on for the past 2 years for the first time in history, or you can abandon it and rebuild the price-depressing surplus. My purpose in discussing with you tonight the issues involved in this referendum is not to tell you to vote either this way or that way, but to focus attention upon the opportunity which is yours this week—the opportunity of expressing your wishes with reference to the program.

The referendum next Saturday has been arranged so that each of you may speak to Washington. I have discussed this matter tonight due to my feeling that, as a representative of one of the great agricultural States of the Union in the Senate of the United States, it is my official duty, the opportunity having been afforded, to call your attention to the importance of the national referendum of the wheat farmers. It is important not only to the farmers themselves but to every other citizen of the land. The various phases of agriculture constitute the basic industry of this Nation, and unless those engaged in agriculture shall prosper, normal conditions cannot exist. When agriculture prospers and the farmers have been restored to their normal purchasing powers, our economic problems will largely have been solved.

ITALY'S PART IN THE WORLD WAR—ADDRESS BY COLONEL HUME

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, today being the twentieth anniversary of the entry of Italy into the World War on behalf of the Allies, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Col. Edgar Erskine Hume to the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States in New York City on January 16, 1935, dealing with the part Italy played in the World War.

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

Of the parts played by the several nations in the World War, none is so little appreciated in this country as that of Italy. Italy's part has often been forgotten, but more often misstated or underrated. I cannot claim to be an authority on this subject, but at least I had an unusual opportunity to know what Italy accomplished and suffered. I was in that country when she entered the war, 20 years ago, and I was again there with the American troops sent to that front, and witnessed the final Italian victory in 1918. I am the only officer of the Regular Army today, on active duty, who served with our troops in the Italian war zone.

When the World War began, Italy was a member of the Triple Alliance, the other members of which were Germany and Austria-Hungary. The terms of this pact were secret, but we now know that there were two important provisions either of which rendered it unnecessary for Italy to join the other two powers in the war of 1914. First the Central Powers were not fighting a defensive war, and secondly Great Britain was on the other side.

Public opinion in Italy, as in the United States, was divided. Both sides had their friends. But, again, as in the United States, the great mass of the people sided with the Entente. Austria was Italy's hereditary enemy. There were still living many old soldiers who had fought against Austria in Italy's wars of unity and of independence. A part of the territory occupied by Italians was in the dual monarchy, still unredeemed. On the other side were Great Britain, Italy's old friend, and the French, kinsfolk of the Italians. In 1871 Italy's national hero, Giuseppe Garibaldi, had fought with the French against the Prussians.

The Popolo d'Italia, the newspaper of a then almost unknown man, one Benito Mussolini, constantly urged Italy to take this step and free her sons still held by the dual monarchy. Gabriele d'Annunzio also advocated this step. Thus they thought that the Allies might win. Let their critics remember this service.

On the Austrian side there had for years been an unconcealed contempt for the Italians. Gen. Conrad von Hötzendorff, who was to lead the Empire's troops against Italy, had long been advocating a "protective war" against Italy, and striking them before they were themselves ready to strike. Italians were pictured as a lot of brigands and cowards.

Italy's entrance into the World War was a voluntary act. Her soil, unlike that of France or Belgium, had not been invaded. The Allies, by the pact of London, guaranteed that the Italian areas of the dual monarchy were to be released to Italy.

But even before this Italy had done the Allies a good deed, and one which, though then appreciated, was to have far greater effects than at first were apparent. Italy announced her neutrality at the outbreak of the war. But it was for the Allies a benevolent neutrality, for Italian troops were withdrawn from the French frontier, so that France need not keep troops here to guard this line of 240 kilometers. Thus was France able to transfer quickly General d'Amade's six divisions, 200,000 troops, to the north to oppose the German advance, troops which arrived in time to participate in the Battle of the Marne. On the other hand, Austria, sensing the feeling of the Italian people, was forced to keep her Italian border well manned, and troops were there immobilized which otherwise would have been sent against the Russians.

Italy was the most powerful European nation not in the war, and could have thrown the balance of power in either direction that she liked—a fact all too well recognized by both sides. Italy had the only large fleet not in the war. It alone could have established a crushing superiority in the Mediterranean for either side. When we remember that Britain's communications with Australia and New Zealand lay through this zone, the importance of Italy's position is evident.

The treaty of 1866 between Austria and Italy had been carefully drawn and established a frontier that was wholly favorable to Austria for the greater part of its 600 kilometers length. The border instead of being at the top of the Alps was well down on the Italian side. This was well fortified and the Austrians could descend quickly onto the plains of Italy, just as they had done in previous wars. The frontier was in the shape of a great letter "S."

Italy declared war on the Austro-Hungarian monarchy on May 24, 1915, 9 months after the outbreak of the World War. The World War in Italy is considered as one of the campaigns for Italian independence and unity.

At the moment of her declaration of war Italy was in a fairly good position as to men, for her extra classes had been called owing to the continued difficulties in north Africa following the Libyan War. She had 28,000 officers and 843,000 men, many of whom were still in training. But she was deficient in matériel, woefully so as to artillery, particularly heavy artillery.

In Italy the war was one of attrition from the start. It is most difficult to have a clear mental picture of the war on the Italian front as a single effort because of the nature of the terrain. The war was broken up into many small sectors cut off from each other so that the general lines tend to be blurred except in the great battles like that of Vittorio Veneto.

When Italy came into the war it was at a dark moment for the Allied cause. The war on the western front had, as stated, become stabile. On the eastern front the Germans had won the great battles of Tannenberg, the Masurian Lakes, and Lemberg. The Germans had just introduced toxic gas at Ypres, with results that surpassed even their fondest hopes, and the demoralizing effect of this agent was everywhere. The Serbs were caught in a vise, for Bulgaria menaced them on the flank. The British expedition to the Dardanelles had failed. In Greece a pro-German king was in power. Rumania was not to enter the war for another year. The outlook was far from encouraging.

In her war plans Italy had two missions. First, to hold the line of the Trentino to the north, where there were no important objectives, and, second, to push to the east and concentrate their operations on the Isonzo. The Italian war was conducted at areas averaging 3,000 feet above the sea level, a large part of it 6,000, and a part some 9,000 in elevation. Campaigning in the mountains on the edges of steep precipices, where a false step meant death, amid snow and ice, is so different from anything that our troops experienced in France that few of you can have any idea of it.

The Italian engineers, one of the most brilliant groups in any army, did their work well. They constructed magnificent roads; cut deep galleries and whole underground chambers in the solid rock. They built in many places the efficient teleferica or cable railway by which munitions and even men were transported. The medical service evacuated wounded by this means in many localities.

In Italy's first year at war there were four battles on the Isonzo. There were to be 12 of these Isonzo battles before the war ended. Italy, with varying success, pushed hard against the Austrians, and, though the objective Gorizia was not at first gained, 25 of Austria's best divisions and large masses of heavy artillery, of which the Austrians were well supplied, were held, which otherwise would have been available for use on other fronts where they might have turned the scale in favor of the Central Powers.

With the coming of winter, the sufferings of the soldiers increased. Italy's shortage of munitions included clothing. Her soldiers were cold. The Italian Alpini, the famous Alpine troops, on skis, raided the enemy lines across the snow fields. There were the usual counterattacks. But no important operations took place until January 14 on the Isonzo front.

The end of 1915 found the Central Powers uniformly successful. The Allies had not won any successes in their six major offensives. The Germans marched steadily into Russia and held their lines on the western front.

The Battle of Asiago, or Austrian offensive against the Italians in the Trentino, was the most important enemy activity of the year. The Italians managed to stop it unaided. Gen. Conrad von Hötzendorff, the Austrian commander, was severely criticized for having depleted the Russian front in order to put into effect his pet Trentino scheme. It was this Austrian drive on the Trentino, together with the German drive on Verdun, that upset the plans of the Allies. The terrain in the Trentino is appallingly difficult. The most inaccessible regions of the Vosges in France, the Carpathians or the Balkans, do not compare with it for steep valleys, precipices, and chasms. The effect of artillery was terrible because the heavy projectiles striking against the rocky mountain sides dislodged great masses of stone which would fall on those below. The Austrians pushed through to within 18 miles of Vicenza. But the advance over such difficult ground destroyed the momentum of the drive and as the Italian wings held, the Austrians gained no decisive results.

In March 1916 the fifth Battle of the Isonzo was fought. It was indecisive because General Cadorna had to suspend his operations in order to send all the troops he could spare to the Trentino to meet the Austrian offensive.

The sixth Battle of the Isonzo was the Italian attack against Gorizia, an objective long sought. The Italian morale was high owing to their success in stopping the Austrian advance in the Trentino. Gorizia was captured and its gain greatly improved the Italian position. But its moral effect was yet more important. The country felt that at last their arms had gained a signal success and secured a fairly large piece of enemy territory. The Italian losses, however, had been heavier than those of the enemy—74,000 Italians killed and wounded as against 61,000 Austrians. But the Italians had captured more prisoners, though the Austrians had been able to save their guns.

On August 29, 1916, Germany declared war on Italy, and in September, October, and November there were three more battles on the Isonzo. General Cadorna was carrying out his idea of exploiting his successes and conforming to the general plan of the Allies of offensives on all fronts. Italy made definite gains, but at a cost of 69,000 killed and wounded to 52,000 of the Austrians. Their successes were costly.

At the beginning of 1917 the Allies had, for the first time, a more or less concerted plan. Offensives were to be launched simultaneously, so that Germany could not strengthen any front unless by weakening another. On their side the Germans had new tactics—infiltration. A short, heavy bombardment, not far to the rear, and then a break through of division after division, the troops having been carefully hidden so as to effect a surprise. Ludendorff's objective was to crush Italy first, then France and Britain before American troops could reach Europe. The unrestricted submarine warfare of the Germans was put into effect.

In May and June 1917 the Italians fought another battle, the tenth, on the Isonzo, and in August and September the eleventh

(the Battle of the Bainsizza). While important tactical advantages were gained, the cost was enormous. The Austrians were being worn down, however, and a stiffening of German troops was demanded and received. If only French and British troops had been sent to Italy at this time!

It was the addition of the German troops that helped to bring about the Italian defeat of Caporetto, the twelfth and last battle of the Isonzo. But there were many other causes of this defeat, of which so much has been said that one sometimes forgets the final Italian victory. Too many men in Italy were being employed in nonmilitary duties, and often at high wages. Yet these very men were the chief grumblers. It is a lesson that we may well remember in this country. Pernicious and cunning German propaganda was everywhere present. Peace, it whispered, could be had for the asking. Food was short. The old Italian troops had been wiped out and the new were less fitted for the struggle.

The French Army had a moral crisis just as did the Italian, and mutiny was present. But fortunately for France no great enemy offensive came at that moment.

The Austrians advanced on October 24, 1917, a dark day for Italy. They moved forward, carrying position after position, and crossed the Isonzo, attacked the reserve lines and struck the Italian Fourth Corps in reverse. The Italians could not hold. No army can stand under such circumstances. It was just as "Stonewall" Jackson's march around the front of Joe Hooker's army at Chancellorsville brought about the precipitate retreat of Howard's Twelfth Corps. General Cadorna was unable to stem the tide, and on the 27th ordered a withdrawal. It was only when the Piave River was reached that the Italians held. General Cadorna was replaced by General Diaz.

Now was seen one of the anomalies of war. The defeat did not cause a break-down of Italy as the Central Powers had expected. The nation's courage was aroused. The effect of Caporetto in the World War was like that of Bull Run in our war between the States. The defeat was a sort of victory in disguise.

The news of Caporetto had brought Italy Allied aid. Five British and 5 French divisions were promised, and 3 of the former and 2 of the latter actually came to Italy. Those who would belittle Italy's arms must not overlook that Italy unaided had stemmed the tide of the Austro-German advance on the Piave before a single soldier of the Entente reached Italy; Italy's wonderful recovery after Caporetto gave the British and French time to march 90 miles to the Montello unmolested by the enemy. Twenty-nine Italian divisions had stopped 55 of the enemy.

But the end of 1917 found the Allied cause in its most dismal state. Russia had been completely wiped out as an ally. All the enemy troops released from the eastern front were now available for other fronts. All of the Austro-Hungarian Army were sent to Italy. The Americans had not yet reached Europe in significant numbers. Franco-British offensive on the western front had failed.

The year 1918 saw two great battles in Italy. In June the Austrian offensive, called the "Radetzky Offensive", began. This we call the "Battle of the Piave." The Austrians advanced in two sections. Both failed. After Field Marshal Boroevitch had crossed the Piave, that river, swollen by torrential rains, rose so quickly that he could not get back, and the Italian artillery did the rest. Here ended the Austrian hope of gaining peace by victory. The battle cost them 25,000 prisoners, 100 guns, and 150,000 casualties.

In the autumn came Italy's mighty effort, the Battle of Vittorio Veneto, one of the most misunderstood of all battles. The battle began on October 24, 1918—exactly 1 year after the defeat of Caporetto—with a blow on Mount Grappa, between the Brenta and Piave Rivers, with the object of cutting the Austrian Army in two and separating the forces in the Trentino from those on the left bank of the Piave. Then followed the second phase. The forces along the Piave from the Montello to the sea were to be attacked, concentrating on the junction between the Austrian Sixth Army and the Isonzo Armée. It was a classical maneuver, driving a wedge through so as to split the enemy, and then crushing the two broken limbs separately. The battle was entirely successful and Austria was brought to her knees.

The consequences of the battle were the annihilation of the Austro-Hungarian Army. The number of prisoners taken is uncertain but General Gathorne-Hardy, the British Chief of Staff, says that at least one-third of the Austrian infantry and practically the whole of their artillery were in the hands of the Italians at the finish.

Vittorio Veneto was one of the most important battles ever fought. It was the greatest decisive victory of the World War, and in point of numbers of men engaged on both sides—almost 2,000,000—the largest battle of all history. It was essentially an Italian victory, for more than 90 percent of those engaged on the side of the Allies were Italians.

It is perhaps worth while to mention in this connection that at no time were there as many troops of the Allies in Italy as there were Italians on other fronts, including the French. The presence of an Italian Army Corps in France was always an act of defiance to Austria. The foreign troops in Italy consisted of 3 British, 2 French, and 1 Czechoslovak divisions, 1 American regiment, and 3 companies of Rumanian volunteers. Besides the one American regiment of infantry, the Three Hundred and Thirty-Second, with the Three Hundred and Thirty-First Field Hospital attached, there were in Italy only the following other American organizations: Base Hospital 102 (expanded by additional Italian personnel to a hospital center), 15 sections of the Army Ambulance Service and varying number of aviators in Italy chiefly for instruction. Mayor LaGuardia was one of these aviators.

Italy's losses were very great. The Battle of Vittorio Veneto cost her more than 35,000 dead. The proportion of her dead to her population was 1: 5—greater than the percentage of British dead to her population (white only). Of the Fourth Army seven divisions alone lost 20,000. But at the Armistice she held half a million Austrian prisoners. Of a population of 34,000,000 Italy mobilized 5,000,000. She lost in all about half a million killed and more than a million wounded, about half of whom were permanently disabled.

By the outcome of the war Italy secured the watershed of the Alps as her natural frontier. And at last Italy was rendenta, and the dreams of the Italian patriots of half a century before, of Mazzini, Cavour, and Garibaldi, had come true. It is idle to speculate as to who "won the war." No one nation can claim that honor. But with Italy, as with America, it may be truthfully said that if she had remained neutral the war would have lasted much longer and possibly not have been won by the Allies in the end after all.

DUST STORM—EDITORIAL IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post on May 25, 1935, entitled "Dust Storm."

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

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Philadelphia, May 25, 1935]

DUST STORM

All through the early spring dust storms were blowing over the West, blotting out the sun, blinding the people, and penetrating as far east as Washington. From the Capitol itself there came a counterblast, blanketing the country, through which the people groped blindly. From time to time there was a rift in the dark cloud of doubt, through which the sun shone briefly, only to be blotted out again by a new dust storm.

In the case of our physical dust storms the "new dealers" realized that the one sure way to stop them was a return of semiarid areas to something more nearly approaching their former condition, when a strong covering of grass held down the soil. But for the clouds of doubt that are blowing over the country from Washington they have no cure except the plowing up of more doubtful territory, until at last they are groping through the dust of their own plans and policies. No doubt the "new dealers" are trying to break more ground with the best of intentions, but nothing is more to be feared than the excesses of good intentions.

The experiment of plowing up and raising wheat on semiarid land has proved to be a gamble in which the grower, if by chance he raises an occasional bumper crop, gets the profits and the public gets the dust. The new-deal experiments are also a gamble—a gamble with the future and safety of the whole country, from which we have gained little except doubt; and the dust that they are raising in increasing volume is rapidly smothering such good as some of their plans may contain. We suggest that those experiments that go against the hard-learned lessons of the past and sound economics be put down in grass. It is just such sound policies that President Roosevelt stood for in his pre-election campaign and what the country voted for. Take the President's Pittsburgh speech, delivered on October 19, 1932, and consider these excerpts from it:

"Now, the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

"If, in some cases, it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms.

"But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

"For over 2 years our Federal Government has experienced unprecedented deficits in spite of increased taxes. * * *

"This simply means that one-third—33⅓ percent—of the entire income of our people must go for the luxury of being governed.

"That is an impossible economic condition. Quite apart from every man's own tax assessment, that burden is a brake on any return to normal business activity.

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and, hence, in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

"Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or (as now) in broad cessation of employment.

"There is not an unemployed man, there is not a struggling farmer, whose interest in this subject is not direct and vital. * * *

"Our Federal extravagance and improvidence bear a double evil; first, our people and our business cannot carry its excessive burdens of taxation; second, our credit structure is impaired by the unorthodox Federal financing made necessary by the unprecedented magnitude of these deficits.

"Instead of financing the billion-dollar deficit of 1931 in the regular way, our Government simply absorbed that much of the lending capacity of banks, and by so much impaired the credit available for business. * * *

"Commercial credit has continuously contracted and is contracting now. Most of this new Government-created credit has been taken to finance the Government's continuing deficits.

"The truth is that our banks are financing these stupendous deficits and that the burden is absorbing their resources.

"All this is highly undesirable and wholly unnecessary. It arises from one cause only, and that is the unbalanced Budget and the continued failure of this administration to take effective steps to balance it. If that Budget had been fully and honestly balanced in 1930, as it could have been, some of the 1931 collapse would have been avoided. Even if it had been balanced in 1931, as it could have been, much of the extreme dip in 1932 would have been obviated. * * *

"Would it not be infinitely better to clear this whole subject of obscurity—to present the facts squarely to the Congress and the people of the United States and secure the one sound foundation of permanent economic recovery—a complete and honest balance of the Federal Budget?

"In all earnestness I leave the answer to your common sense and judgment.

"The other bad effect of this fiscal mismanagement is not at all technical. It is the burden of high cost on the backs of all our people.

"I can state the condition best by quoting one paragraph from a document published a week ago and signed by both Alfred E. Smith and Calvin Coolidge:

"'All the costs of local, State, and National Governments must be reduced without fear and without favor. Unless the people, through unified action, arise and take charge of their Government, they will find that their Government has taken charge of them. Independence and liberty will be gone and the general public will find itself in a condition of servitude to an aggregation of organized and selfish minorities.'

"Every word of that warning is true, and the first and most important and necessitous step in balancing our Federal Budget is to reduce expense. * * *

"Now, ever since the days of Thomas Jefferson that has been the exact reverse of the Democratic concept—which is to permit Washington to take from the States nothing more than is necessary to keep abreast of the march of our changing economic situation.

"In the latter philosophy and not in the philosophy of Mr. Hoover (which I think is responsible for so much of our trouble) I shall approach the problem of carrying out the plain precept of our party which is to reduce the cost of the current Federal Government operations by 25 percent.

"Of course, that means a complete realinement of the unprecedented bureaucracy that has assembled in Washington in the past 4 years. * * *

"Now, I am going to disclose to you a definite personal conclusion which I adopted the day after I was nominated in Chicago. Here it is: Before any man enters my Cabinet he must give me a twofold pledge of—

"1. Absolute loyalty to the Democratic platform and especially to its economy plank.

"2. Complete cooperation with me, looking to economy and reorganization in his department.

"I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues of this campaign. In my opinion it is the most direct and effective contribution that government can make to business. * * *

"In accordance with this fundamental policy, it is equally necessary to eliminate from Federal Budget making during the emergency all new items, except such as relate to direct relief of unemployment. * * *

"I have sought to make two things clear: First, that we can make savings by reorganization of existing departments, by eliminating functions, by abolishing many of the innumerable boards and commissions which over a long period of years have grown up as excrescences on the regular system. These savings can properly be made to total many hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

"Secondly, I hope that it will not be necessary to increase the present scale of taxes, and I call definite attention to the fact as soon as the Democratic platform pledge is enacted into legislation modifying the Volstead Act, a source of new revenue amounting to several hundred millions of dollars a year will be made available toward the balancing of the Budget.

"The above two categorical statements are aimed at a definite balancing of the Budget.

"At the same time, if starvation and dire need on the part of any of our citizens make necessary the appropriation of additional funds which would keep the Budget out of balance, I shall not hesitate to tell the American people the full truth and recommend to them the expenditure of this additional amount. * * *

"I am as certain as mortal man can be certain of anything in the future that from the moment that we set our hands openly and frankly and courageously to this problem, we shall have reached the end of our long, hard downward road and shall have started on the upward trail.

"We shall have built for economic recovery a firm footing, on a path broad, true, and straight."

In his message of March 10, 1933, to the Congress the President said:

"For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

"For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was $462,000,000.

"For the fiscal year 1932 it was $2,472,000,000.

"For the fiscal year 1933 it will probably exceed $1,200,000,000.

"For the fiscal year 1934, based on the appropriation bills passed by the last Congress and the estimated revenues, the deficit will probably exceed $1,000,000,000 unless immediate action is taken.

"Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of $5,000,000,000.

"With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order, and for many reasons no effective action has been taken to restore it to order.

"Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rest the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It, therefore, becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it.

"Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose financial policy. We must avoid this danger.

"It is too late for a leisurely approach to this problem. We must not wait to act several months hence. The emergency is accentuated by the necessity of meeting great refunding operations this spring.

"We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of the Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy."

There is a law of first things first, and these principles that the President enunciated are not only first things but they are fundamental in any sound program of recovery. To these promises he added another—that he would promptly discard any experiment that, on trial, did not prove practicable. With these pledges he took office. An overwhelming majority of the people was behind him. That a steadily increasing number of those who do not get their opinions ready-made over the radio and from new-deal handouts are beginning to doubt and fear is due to a failure on the part of the administration to keep these pledges, and to the President's apparent unwillingness to discard those experiments that have proved themselves a detriment to the well-being of the country.

Haste, waste, and classroom experiment have failed. Caution, thrift, and experience will succeed. There is a tide of natural forces that is trying to break through the barriers of papa-and-mamma bureaucratic government. Here and there it is succeeding, but new legislation to bulwark the barriers is before the Congress.

There must be nothing partisan in the stand of the opposition. These questions are far above partisanship or politics. If a coalition government of Republicans and Democrats is necessary to pull the country out, let us have it, but so far the only thing approaching a coalition of the parties has been a rather shameful rush for the pie counter. If the President will discard his failing and failed experiments, preserving only what is demonstrably good in them, and build anew on the foundation of his campaign pledges, we should all get behind him, but let's have an end to this silly talk that we should support his every move, regardless of our honest convictions. If a balanced Budget, a sound fiscal policy and relief relieved of waste and politics call for even heavier taxation, we should accept the burden cheerfully, but let us have an end to discretionary pools of billions of tax money. Business of the lawless and predatory type, though it was and is in the minority, must give up that license which once masqueraded under the name of liberty, but let us have an end to the surrender of our rightful liberties to regimentation, paternalism, and socialism.

There will always be dust storms as long as we prepare the soil for them with nostrums and panaceas and believe that wheat will grow in the desert that we have made.

FARMERS' VISIT TO WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, on Wednesday a week ago, the day after the President had made a speech to the farmers who congregated in Washington, I submitted a short resolution (S. Res. 139), reading as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he 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 by 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 be it further

Resolved, 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.

The resolution was rather hastily drawn, and, although I did not request unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, I had supposed there would be no serious objection to its adoption. It seemed to me there was nothing unusual about it in that it merely asked an official of the Government to furnish to the Senate such information as

he had with respect to a subject which was of great importance to the public generally.

Much to my surprise, after I had made a few remarks with respect to the resolution, Senators on the other side of the aisle described it as suggesting, among other things, that the men who came to Washington had been brought here at Government expense, that the Secretary of Agriculture under the resolution might be assumed to be guilty of embezzlement, and that altogether it was improper, constituting a reflection upon the farmers who came and on the Secretary of Agriculture. A mere reading of the resolution itself does not permit any reasonable person to draw any such conclusion, and the remarks made across the aisle with respect to the resolution were in large part wholly unjustified.

There is perhaps no Senator on either side of the Chamber who is not interested in the farmers of the Nation. There is probably no man who does not fully appreciate how important it is to the Nation to have that particular class enjoy a prosperous condition. I submit that the gathering in Washington of some 4,500 farmers in the middle of May, which is about the busiest time a farmer has upon his farm, is an unusual occurrence, one that never before happened, and one which might reasonably attract the attention, to say nothing of the suspicion, of any reasonable-minded man.

Another thing in connection with it that attracted my attention was the fact that there were pending in this body, as well as in the other House, amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. There had been for days and weeks much complaint from those who have to pay the processing tax. It seemed to me that the natural conclusion to reach was that these farmers had come here for two purposes, one to impress upon the President of the United States their appreciation of his attitude with respect to these measures and the other to impress upon the Congress what the farmers thought with respect to the amendments pending in the Congress.

That they had a right to come, nobody questions; that they had a right to come at one particular time, nobody doubts; that is the great privilege accorded to every citizen and every group of citizens in this land; but to be greeted at the White House by the President of the United States and to be addressed as they were addressed, in intemperate language, was indeed an unusual occurrence and established a precedent which, to my mind, means great danger ahead for our country.

Just about the time this happened we saw that the same kind of forces, interested in the N. R. A., were sending out the alarm to those interested in an extension of that act. We saw by their literature and by their press releases that they had been urged to appear at Washington during this very week, 8 days from the time the farmers appeared. Except for the fact that complaints have been made as to what had been done with respect to the farmers, I am by no means certain they would not have been greeted in the same way, if not by the President himself, then by that other great personage who seems to be more interested than any other citizen of the country in extending the N. R. A.

If it be true that these groups may come to impress upon the Congress what they think and may be greeted by the President of the United States when he concurs with what they want done, then I ask how much further the movement may go? I inquire what would have happened if there had appeared 2 or 3 days ago in Washington a group of 4,500 men representing the veterans, and they had contacted the administration or officers of the administration, and had been asked to greet the President? Does anybody think the President would have greeted them on the White House lawn and addressed them as he addressed the joint session 2 days ago?

If this be a practical way of running this Democratic Government, if the 5,000,000 investors who are interested in the holding-company bill now pending before this body should send their delegates to Washington and should select a group of 4,500 of their number to represent them, and they should go to the White House, I inquire whether is it unreasonable to expect that they would be met upon the White House grounds and would have delivered to them the kind of message that was delivered to this particular group of farmers.

If we are going that far, I inquire whether the Congress is bound to take note this morning of what appears on the front page of every newspaper, a note of warning issued by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to the effect that unless the N. R. A. shall be extended for 2 years, there will be strikes forthcoming in the big manufacturing concerns all over this land of ours? In other words, in the coming of this delegation of farmers, greeted as they were by the President of the United States, has there not started, been inaugurated in America, a new kind of movement which makes the minority more powerful and more dangerous than it has ever previously been?

To my mind, regardless of what the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] may think of it, and regardless of how lightly he may have treated my remarks here about a week ago, I believe it is a serious matter for America, and it is a serious matter for American institutions.

I hesitate somewhat to take the time of the Senate to do what I am about to do, and I should not do it except for my sincere belief that what has been done and what may be done, because of the precedent set, makes a real danger for America.

I should like to comment for a few moments upon the objection which was made to this resolution coming from the other side. It will take me a little while to do so; and, following that, I propose to read into the RECORD the evidence which has been piling into my office ever since I made the few remarks following the submission of my resolution to the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Texas insisted that I could obtain the desired information by calling the Secretary of Agriculture, and thereby save the time of the Senate. Both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] insisted that my sole purpose was to get the headlines in the newspapers. Unlike them, I had no such purpose in mind; but, fortunately for me, and, in my judgment, fortunately for the country, the remarks I made and the charges I made did receive some public attention. The effect has been to flood my office with complaints against the A. A. A. The effect has been to show that many of the suspicions set forth in my resolution were thoroughly justified, and have been proven to be justified by the letters I have received.

In addition to that, I followed the suggestion made by the Senator from Texas and wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. The letter, in addition to what the resolution itself contained, included some 16 questions. The letter was delivered to the Secretary of Agriculture on Friday last. When I gave notice yesterday that I should speak upon this subject today I supposed the Secretary was about to ignore my letter, because I had not heard from him at all. At quarter past 11 today, he called me on the telephone and said he was sending a reply to me and wished to know if I had any objection to his making it public. I said, "Certainly not; and I hope I shall have time to read it before I address the Senate this morning."

I have the letter here; and I shall read portions, if not all, of it. Before doing so, however, I wish to comment upon some of the suggestions made by Senators on the other side.

On the day on which I submitted the resolution, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] said:

> 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.

Mr. President, while I was not certain that some of this money did not come directly from the Federal Government—

for in these days, when the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to collect money and spend it as he sees fit, when the Secretary has the right to levy a tax and spend it as he pleases, I was by no means certain that some of that money had not been appropriated for this purpose—in the resolution I merely inquired as to the fact; and the mere making of the inquiry is what stirred the hearts and souls of my friends on the other side. As to that, however, I have much proof to the effect that the Federal Government's money indirectly did go to pay the expenses of the men who came to Washington. More than that, Mr. President, and what is perhaps worse than taking it from the Federal Treasury, the money was taken from the poor farmers themselves, who were made to believe that that was the only way they had of protecting themselves.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] observed:

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.

The reading of these letters will convince the Senator from Kentucky that it is not a fact.

Then the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] remarked:

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.

Then he went on to say that 700 farmers came from Texas; and I have evidence to show that it cost $100 for each farmer, or that it cost a total of $70,000 to send this delegation from Texas here.

Further along the Senator from Texas said:

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.

* * * * * * *

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.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas knew at that time that I was making no attack upon the farmers. He was trying to throw a smoke screen around the resolution by making people believe that its adoption would constitute a reflection upon the farmers, when there was nothing in the resolution to indicate any such purpose.

The Senator from Texas further said:

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—

Let me say, with respect to that matter, that, however much I disagree with the Secretary of Agriculture on that which he is doing, I never even thought, and never heard anybody else suggest, that this great man was dishonest, and I had no intention of so intimating; and a reading of the resolution will not convince any reasonable man that there was any intimation of that nature in it.

Further along the Senator from Texas said:

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. 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."

I beg Senators to listen to the evidence which I shall produce, and see whether or not they think that statement in the morning paper, quoted by the Senator from Texas, is correct.

Before doing so, however, I call attention to the press conference held by Mr. Davis on April 24, 1935, when he was asked this question:

Can you tell us, off the record, whether the processing tax on cotton will be lifted or there will be a substitute for it?

Mr. DAVIS. I will say, off the record, I don't think so, and I will say, on the record, that I believe in a month you will hear a great deal less about lifting the processing tax from commodities than now.

Why?

Mr. DAVIS. Because I think they will be in here from the country.

Further along the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] suggested that the Senator from Texas had already covered what was in his mind. That was the statement with respect to my "effort to get the headlines", upon which I have already commented. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said:

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.

And then:

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.

Further along, I inquired:

Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas admit that these farmers came here as guests of the Government?

Then he "jumped all over me" for suggesting such a thing, although he himself had just made the statement. Then he continued:

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.

Two or three days later, on May 21, the Senator from Texas again referred to the matter in a colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], in which he again explained it, and stated:

It originated, as every farmer knows, and as the Senator would know if he talked to any farmer from Louisiana, among the farmers themselves. One of the leaders of the movement was a man by the name of C. H. Day, from my State. The farmers paid their own way; they made up the money in each community. There was left in my office a list showing by the different counties where farmers contributed 50 cents, 20 cents, 25 cents, and the names of the donors. In that way the farmers paid their way to Washington. The movement was not incited by the President. The Department of Agriculture has repeatedly issued statements through the press, statements which have gone undenied, that they did not incite the trip, but that it was generated among the farmers themselves. There was a large delegation here from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I merely desire to say to the Senator from Texas that all Texans do not agree with him. I propose to read him a letter, if he has not read it himself, addressed to

him from Amarillo, Tex., dated May 16, a copy of which was sent to me. This letter is not read for the purpose of proving what I have suggested in the resolution. It is read for the sole purpose of showing that the Senator from Texas does not know the feeling of all the citizens of his State. The letter is directed to "Senator TOM CONNALLY", and the writer starts by saying:

I do not see it any other way but that the Federal Government took public funds and paid the expenses of 4,000 farmers for a "sky-lark" vacation to Washington to see the "Great White Chief", as the Indians would say.

Bear in mind that this is not my language. I would not read it except for the fact that it was addressed to the Senator from Texas; and, in view of the fact that he has made these statements about the outrages about to be committed, I think it is justified. I read further from the letter:

These men, I will bet my last dollar, every one of them have been, as Senator HASTINGS said, paid public money for not working, under the A. A. A. scheme of setting up state socialism by outright bribery of the electorate.

Now, you may think you are right, but bear this in mind: There are tens of thousands of men of character and integrity in Texas who think you are dead wrong, and that the whole policy of Roosevelt's farm schemes and other pet fanatical hobbies are running this Nation straight to chaos or dictatorship. All because a policy of positive dishonesty is being followed in setting up one class of people as better than another, or entitled to something that God's natural laws denied them.

As Al Smith was quoted in the press a few days ago, "$4,800,000,000 is a h— of a lot of money to have to spend for reelection", so many of us think things are pretty rotten when such a thing is necessary. All your talk about the "submerged" classes and "down-trodden" farmers is all hooey and does not get through the skins of honest men.

I have always been an admirer of you as a statesman, and I believe that you, being a man of highest character, would openly oppose most of these new-deal schemes of a set of wobblies, pinks, semireds, fuzzies, and flannel-mouthed shanty and almost Bolshevists if you really knew the true feeling of the people. I have never found a man of any success, integrity, and of a well-balanced mentality who would defend what has been done either privately or publicly. Whenever you find a man that is a little "screwy" and "off center" on religion, politics, economics, or what not, there you will find a Roosevelt supporter, unless he is an outright failure on the dole, selling his vote and support like it were a sack of potatoes or cabbage. Now, I do not write this in bitterness, but as my sincere belief, and observation after meeting hundreds of business men and others. The business people are working trying to carry the load of these monstrosities of the new socialism, and for that reason you seldom hear from any but the "gimme" crowd of selfish interests, among whom is the organized farm-relief racket.

Then a note attached to the letter to me says:

All sensible farmers, even if they get the A. A. A. allotments, would not favor such a manifestly inspired piece of propaganda as these "vacation" trips of loafing for these birds. Your attack should be given wide publicity.

Please get the names of the farmers and check the record for the size of their checks for loafing. It would be good reading.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator please give the name of the correspondent?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes. Has not the Senator read this letter?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I have not.

Mr. HASTINGS. I hope the Senator received a copy of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope so, too.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is from Frank Robinett, Amarillo, Tex.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the letterhead on which he writes show what his business is?

Mr. HASTINGS. He may be a member of the chamber of commerce; I am not certain about that. "Merchandise broker."

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; he is an Amarillo agriculturalist.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not know about that. I do not say that I agree with all he says. I only quote the letter to show that all people living in Texas do not agree with what the Senator from Texas said about this matter.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very happy that they do not. All the people in Delaware of course agree with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not think so, although Delaware would be much better off if they did. [Laughter.]

I may make this observation now with respect to the Senator's request that I give him the name. I have here some 50 letters, and I do not propose to give any names, and I do not propose to give them because many of these correspondents have urged me not to give the names for the reason that they are afraid they will be punished if they express their honest opinions. But I say this much to the Senator from Texas, or to any other Senator, who desires to examine these letters; I will show the original letters, all of these original letters, to any person, in confidence, in order that I may show definitely that I am reading them to the Senate correctly.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon for having already invaded the secrecy of his correspondence, but I wanted the name of this correspondent so that I could look up his letter and find it in my files. I will be very frank with the Senator. If he does not release the names, I assure him now that I, for one, shall not turn loose the Ogpu on them.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am sure the Senator would not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not loose all these Government agencies and hound them to their death. I love my people, and I will not do that with regard to correspondents from Texas. I will not call them into the Federal court for writing to the Senator from Delaware. I will not blackguard them before the Nation and undertake to cover them with obloquy and shame because they have been in secret communication with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am sure of that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is below my level.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is right; but I will say to the Senator that what I have read so far was a communication directed to him, and I am a little surprised that he has not seen it. I suppose he has faithful clerks in his office, who concluded that it might worry him a little, and they thought they would withhold that letter from him.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to thank the Senator from Delaware for his consideration and kindness. Unfortunately for the Senator from Texas, he represents a State of about 6,000,000 people, and he has only the same number of clerks to answer 6,000,000 people the Senator from Delaware has to answer the people of one congressional district. So the Senator from Texas is not able instantaneously to see every letter which comes into his office. But I will see this letter and will examine it. That is why I asked the Senator for the information.

Mr. HASTINGS. The letter is about a week old. I will give its date. I received it on Monday morning, and it is dated May 16.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has announced that he is going to read a letter or letters into the RECORD, but he is not going to give the names of the correspondents.

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think it is really fair to the Senate and to the country to "mess up" the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a lot of letters from soreheads who do not agree with something that has happened, and not let

the Senate know anything about who the writers are, and their background, or what their profession is, or what their grievances may be?

Mr. HASTINGS. I promise the Senator that I will not "mess up" the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Do not worry about that.

I desire now to read a letter from Dallas, Tex.—the Senator from Texas knows where that is [laughter]—and I wish to read the introduction to the letter. This man says:

By way of introduction, I am a native Texan.

If he had been born in Delaware of course I would not have dared read the letter under the circumstances. [Laughter.]

By way of introduction, I am a native Texan, born in a tenant house, son of a cotton tenant, where I lived for 14 years. I know the lot of the Southern tenant, I know cotton. I have grown it, ginned it, and marketed it for years. I have been opposed to the present program since its inception. Therefore, I am one of the "liars" spoken of in the recent tirade of Mr. Roosevelt.

I have been a life-long Democrat and am still one, but I know that the Republican Party comes much nearer representing the democratic principles of government than the present conglomeration of "brain trusters", foreigners, and would-be dictators now in power at Washington. They are drunk on the taxpayers' money, they are on a wild ride to destruction. If this "spree" is not halted then the country is lost.

I want to give you some of the low-down on the present situation. I am attaching hereto a statement of facts—you can verify this in any way you care to. The names of the county and community committeemen, as listed herewith, are taken from the list published in the Dallas Morning News, a leading paper of the South. The names of the so-called "dirt farmers" listed as delegates to Washington were taken from the Dallas News of Saturday, May 11, 1935.

You will notice that all delegates on the "farm special"—should have been the "political special", as all those birds are interested in is to hold their jobs and draw their pay—with the exception of four are either county or community committeemen, and all are on the pay roll. I cannot get the facts on the four, they may also be on the pay roll.

I am sure this holds good for other counties. I have visited some of them since last week and find the same thing exists in all.

The C. H. Day, who was supposed to be the "dirt farmer" instigator of the trip, is very close to the Extension Service A. & M. College. You will see from the news report from the Dallas News, May 7, 1935, dated at College Station, where a meeting of the various county committeemen was being held, that C. H. Day, V. C. Marshall, and J. R. McCreary, were appointed by the Extension Service. These men are all on the pay roll and are puppets of the A. A. A.

The man who has charge of rural rehabilitation in Robertson County informs me that McCreary is chairman of the county committee, and that he rented all his land that the Government would take to the A. A. A. and placed all his tenants on the relief rolls.

Such crimes that are being committed in the name of farm relief will stench the nostrils of the dead. Of course all rental money from the big farms finds its way into the pocket of the big farmer while he "whoops up" the program and the poor tenant starves on the relief roll.

I now read the Statement of Facts——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARRAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the letterhead indicate the business of the gentleman who wrote that letter?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will show it to the Senator, if he wants to see it, and he may comment on it as he pleases.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The cotton program, both rental and Bankhead Control Law, has been administered by two committees—

I beg the Senators to bear this in mind, because this is important—

one known as the "county committee", the other as the "community committee." Naturally the selection of these committeemen has been under the direct control of the county agricultural agent, who, through his knowledge of the farmers in each community, has been able to dictate the selection of such committeemen, while at the same time he has led the farmers to believe that they selected them.

COUNTY COMMITTEES

County committees are composed of three men; they are absolute dictators—they can reject or accept the recommendations of the local committees as to base production, Bankhead exemptions to be granted, or make other decisions that may cost the individual farmer much money—

Bear this in mind—

All farmers live in constant fear of the disfavor of some committeemen. The farmer does everything possible to keep in the good graces of these committees, while under his breath his "cussing is almost audible."

Knowing this situation, it is easy to determine how money was raised for the "Washington trip." All county committeemen and local committeemen are on the Federal pay roll. All have allowed themselves liberal production allowances and Bankhead exemptions. All are Federal employees, knowing that if the program is changed they will lose their job and easy money, plus the loss of their political club now held over the heads of all.

The money for the trip was raised in various ways: In some sections merchants were gouged for donations. In others local farmers were asked for donations; in one instance acreage signers were asked for so much per capita. In every instance the farmer approached was afraid to have the wrath of the would-be delegate poured upon him in the way of a "loss in tax-free" cotton. So it was easy to raise the money for the trip.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Naturally community committees do not have as much political power as the county committee; however, most recommendations of the community committees are followed by the county committee. Community committeemen do not draw regular salaries, but they draw so much per day and so much expense money. But their jobs also carry a "big stick" over the farmers of the community. They are Federal employees. They dominate the community gatherings, hand out propaganda sent them by A. A. A., call all critics "liars" and "thieves", and otherwise act as local "yes" men for the Washington A. A. A. group, who are contented to let the South go to hell in order to perpetuate themselves in their present positions.

The greatest need confronting the United States at this time is a full investigation, not of this "hurrah trip" but of the entire workings of A. A. A. Never was such rotten politics played, or such injustices foisted upon a free people as has been the case under the present system. Community feuds, gossips, and selfishness has been the guiding motive behind all, practically all unfair decisions, allotments, or rentals.

Countless thousands, in fact millions, are praying for a complete investigation of the entire cotton program.

Below is listed the names of the Dallas County committeemen, Federal employees, if you please, and the Dallas County community committeemen, also Federal employees. Opposite this list are the names of those making the trip to Washington as "dirt farmers" to ballyhoo the A. A. A. One can draw his own conclusion as to why the trip was made, and as to where the money came from.

Mr. President, in that list there are 20 delegates from Dallas County. Eighty percent of them have been checked, and 80 percent of them, or 16, are either county committeemen, county agents, or community committeemen, all drawing pay out of the A. A. A. fund, except the county committeeman, who is drawing it out of some other Federal fund.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Just as a matter of information, from what fund would the county committeeman draw compensation? The Senator stated they were drawing pay as county committeemen. Are they county employees?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will reply to the Senator. The letter I am reading states that the county committeemen and the community committeemen are drawing pay from the Federal Government. I have had my office check with the Agricultural Department to get a report with respect to this.

I hope the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will not distract the attention of the Senator from South Carolina while I answer his question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that I came to this place in order to be in direct line with the Senator while he was addressing the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Senator.

I was advised by the Department of Agriculture that the county committeemen and the community committeemen were paid from three to five dollars a day. They were paid out of the funds which had been allotted to the farmers in the particular county. For instance, in the case of wheat, where the farmer gets 29 cents, at a certain time he gets 20 cents of it paid to him and nothing deducted, but before he gets the other 9 cents the pay for his county committee and his community committee for each day is taken out, and

their expenses are taken out, and the farmer gets the balance.

Mr. Wallace, in his reply to my letter, said that he has no control over the county agent, although he does have to approve his appointment. The county agent is under the Extension Service. The other people, the county committeemen and the community committeemen, are selected by the farmers and paid by the farmers. I have told the Senator what the Department of Agriculture of his own administration has told me; and while it is not literally true that the men I referred to are on the Government pay roll in that they get checks from Washington, it is true that they are being paid by the Federal Government.

While I am on that point, I will state that the Secretary of Agriculture said in his letter that he has no control over the county agent, that he is not a Federal employee, that he is under the Extension Service; but I have in my records the notices sent out by the county agents to those who had signed a contract with the Government and were getting money from the Government, and also I have the postmarked free envelop sent out by a county agent in which he enclosed a franked envelop for reply, and a letter in which the contractor was requested to contribute 25 cents, 50 cents, or any amount he wanted, in order to pay the expenses of this crowd to Washington.

In Dallas County, from which 20 delegates came to Washington, 80 percent, or 16 out of the 20, are being paid by county funds; and, of course, Mr. President, being paid by Federal funds, having their jobs under the Federal Government, they had every reason in the world to collect money in any way they could from the farmers who are under their control and in their grip, compelling them, as these letters show, to contribute in order that they might have as good a contract for the next year as they had for this particular year.

Let us see whether or not that condition applies only to Dallas County. I was particularly anxious to know, and I made some inquiry about Falls County, the home county of the Senator from Texas; and that county goes Dallas County a little better, because while Dallas County, so far as our checking shows, indicated that only 80 percent of the delegates were employees of the Government, in the case of Falls County, the county of the junior Senator from Texas, the check showed 100 percent. In that county there was selected one county agent, one member of the county committee, and two community committeemen.

In Ellis County the check shows 100 percent.

In Lamar County it is again 100 percent.

In Kaufman County the check shows 100 percent.

From Wilbarger County the delegate was a county committeeman member; that man is not an employee, but he was employed in the county agent's office last season. I do not know whether or not he is still there.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I will yield in just a moment. Mr. A. M. Bourland, who comes from Wilbarger County, is a member of the State committee on full-time pay of the A. A. A. He is the man who made the cotton talk while in Washington as representing all the cotton farmers.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not hear all the statement about my own county. Would the Senator mind repeating it?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think I said that in the case of the Senator's own county the check showed 100 percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many were here from that county?

Mr. HASTINGS. Four.

Mr. CONNALLY. And that was all?

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator's county was 100 percent in that all the delegates drew money from the Federal Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. In what way?

Mr. HASTINGS. One of them was county committeeman, two of them were community committeemen, and one of them was county agent; and the community committeeman and the county committeeman draw pay—a per diem for their expenses—and they take it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, I get the information from the Agricultural Department. That is between the Senator from Texas and the Agricultural Department. The Senator is close to them, and he must work that out to suit himself; but that is where I got my information.

Mr. President, that is all I know directly about Texas; but let me just read a letter from Roby, Tex., which I presume the Senator will admit is in his State. The letter is as follows:

> I notice in the daily press where there is some controversy between you and Secretary Wallace as to who promoted the recent pilgrimage of some 3,000 farmers, or their representatives, to Washington. I have a faint recollection some time back of seeing in the daily papers where Mr. Wallace was thinking of turning the farmers loose on the Congress due to some Members being in opposition to certain amendments which he wished. This, I think, he has tried to do. As to who paid the expenses of these men to Washington I am not able to say. This county sent two men to the meeting in Washington, and I feel like the Federal Government paid part of their expenses. At least the local county agent used Government stationery, clerks, stenographers, and United States franked envelops.
>
> There are some 1,500 to 2,000 contract signers in this county, and I am of the opinion each one received a letter like the one I am enclosing. If each person receiving one of these letters answered it, which they did not do, the Post Office Department lost 6 cents on each person, or some $90 in all. I do not know if this procedure was followed in other counties. It appears that not many of the farmers responded with the 25 cents, for a subscription was passed among the merchants of the town and the county. Some of the merchants contributed although against the farm program. Otherwise they would have been boycotted by certain farmers.
>
> Two men attended the Washington Convention from this county. Both of these men are on the county cotton committee and in the pay of the Federal Government. It appears to me as though any time the Department of Agriculture wished to get any information relative to the wishes of the farmers they invariably contact local men who are in some manner on the pay roll of the Department of Agriculture. To be sure, those who went to Washington want the farm program continued. It means dollars to them because they are in the pay.
>
> I have two farms and each has signed a cotton contract, partly because I was practically forced to do so, and then I wished to be fair and assist if there was any good to be gotten from the farm program. These contracts expire this year, and never again will I sign one.
>
> I have always voted the Democratic ticket, but have promised myself that hereafter I will vote the Republican ticket in national elections.
>
> To me the new deal and socialism are synonymous terms.

Mr. President, enclosed in that letter is a franked envelop bearing the inscription:

> United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service, Division of Cooperative Extension, Washington, D. C. Official business.
>
> Penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, $300.

In it is a like envelop with the same inscription printed on it self-addressed to "T. H. Roensch, county agent, Roby, Tex."

In connection, Mr. President, with that——

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I did not understand who wrote that letter and to whom it was written.

Mr. HASTINGS. It was written from Roby, Tex., and signed M. P. Wilson.

Mr. KING. Did it come from the Agricultural Department here in Washington?

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator means the letter which I have read?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. No. I will read the letter which was signed by the county agent and enclosed in the letter which I have read.

Mr. KING. I do not ask for the letter to be read, but I was wondering from whom it came and to whom it was addressed.

Mr. HASTINGS. The letter which I am about to read came from T. H. Roensch, county agent. It did not come from Washington.

Mr. KING. But it was sent in a franked envelop?

Mr. HASTINGS. It was sent in a franked envelop.

The letter from the county agent is under the heading:

Cooperative Extension Work in Agricultural and Home Economics, State of Texas, Extension Service, County Agent Work, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and United States Department of Agriculture Cooperating.

Mr. President, here is one letter which throws some light on how this voluntary, spontaneous meeting started:

ROBY, TEX., *May 3, 1935.*

DEAR FARMER: Very important.

I am asking that each contract signer—

A contract signer is a man who has made a contract with the Government to reduce the amount of cotton produced by him on condition that he receives in payment a certain sum, and so on—

I am asking that each contract signer donate 25 cents or more to help pay the expenses of the representatives from Fisher County. This amount won't be missed by the individual and will certainly go a long ways to protect your future agricultural program.

* * * * * * *

This is the farmer's first call to arms—

Note that—

This is the farmer's first call to arms!

During the past 3 years the National Government has made its first real attempt to place agriculture on an equal footing with industry. This is being done through benefits and parity payments to farmers on the products they produce to offset the high protective tariff industry has enjoyed for more than 40 years.

Special interests are fighting the whole program by attempting to kill the processing taxes and by preventing the passage of a group of A. A. A. amendments designed to improve and strengthen the program.

Over $88,000,000 has been paid to Texas farmers as rental and benefit payments in the past 2 years. All of these funds, as well as the funds for the $630,000,000 that has been paid farmers in the United States, have come from the processing taxes. The abolishment of these taxes means the destruction of the Agricultural Adjustment program.

Up to now the farmer has been content to receive the benefit payment and enjoy the improvement in his condition, and has said nothing. This condition can no longer continue without the positive support of all farmers, and we must go in a body to Washington and express personally our appreciation for all that has been done by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and insist that no radical change be made that would destroy the effectiveness of the program.

Representative farmers from every State in the Union will assemble in Washington on May 14 and 15, to express our gratitude of what has been done.

The State advisory cotton committee urges that farmers from every county in Texas send representatives, and that in addition to the representatives sent by farmers as a whole, that as many farmers who are cooperating in the program and feel that they can pay their own expenses be urged to go.

Does that mean that this was a voluntary movement? Does it mean that the farmer who received that letter from the county agent, who is responsible for naming the county committee, who is responsible for naming the community committee, had a free choice? Does it mean that he dared hesitate to contribute to this fund?

In connection with these letters being sent out at Government expense in envelops bearing the inscription "Official Business", I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the cost of penalty matter handled by the Post Office for branches of the Government other than the Post Office Department has increased from $8,169,170 in 1929 to $9,151,809 in 1932, and to $23,094,882 in 1934. The expense has grown in that manner because of this kind of propaganda that is coming out of Washington.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator quoted figures showing the increase in franked mail. Was that to what he referred?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; franked mail.

Mr. CONNALLY. How much does the campaign committee under the direction of the Senator from Delaware send out?

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator mean that question seriously?

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean in the campaign how many franked speeches and other communications went out?

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator mean under my frank?

Mr. CONNALLY. That were sent out by the Senator's committee?

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not send out anything franked, so far as I know.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not attacking the Senator's committee. The practice is not without the pale; it has always been done. The Senator knows that in campaign years a great deal of franked mail in the form of speeches which Senators or Members of the House have delivered is sent out through the mails under frank. The Senator knows that, does he not?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; but I do not know that that accounts for an increase of $15,000,000 in the cost of such matter between 1929 and 1934. So far as I know, there was no increase in 1934 over any other year in the respect to which the Senator refers. That item has always been included in the Post Office Department reports; it was included in the 1929 reports; and the suggestion is not an intelligent one, I submit.

Mr. CONNALLY. The reports for 1929 were not for a campaign year.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am confident I have the figures for a campaign year here. Let the Senator look at them himself and see if he thinks there is any sense in the suggestion he has made.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. STEIWER. I am in some degree familiar with the figures which the Senator is using. The figure $23,000,000 plus was the figure disclosed in the last report of the Postmaster General. It is indicated in the report that it is so-called "penalty mail." "Penalty mail", as generally understood, is the means resorted to to distribute mail matter from the executive departments. I think there is a distinction between penalty mail and franked mail. The Senator's mail and the type of mail to which the Senator from Texas referred are franked mail. The envelop bears on its exterior the facsimile of the signature of the Senator or Representative in Congress who deposits the mail with the Government. This is not franked mail referred to in the reports of Mr. Farley; it is free use or penalty mail; and I am of the impression, which I will verify if I get an opportunity, that all of it is mail sent out by the executive departments, and the increase from $8,000,000 to $23,000,000 between the 5 years to which the Senator referred is an increase that does not include anything at all connected with the Congress or the Members of Congress.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Senator for his observation. I knew there was a great increase; I just took a moment to find out what the increase was; and it seemed to me that this propaganda was largely responsible for it.

Mr. President, I leave Texas for a moment and go to Oklahoma. Here is a letter from Idabel, Okla., dated May 18, 1935:

I notice that a lot is being said about the farmers' trek to Washington, and that you have raised some question about this on the Senate floor. I charge that the idea originated in Washington and was passed down the line of A. A. A. officials until it reached the party in charge of adjustments in the various counties.

In this county C. W. Van Hyning, acting county agent in charge of cotton adjustments, called a meeting at the county courthouse and sent invitations to all those in charge of the administration of the A. A. A. and a few selected farmers who hold nice rental contracts with Mr. Wallace. The invitations were mailed out on Government postcards requiring no postage, and on which there was none. Here is an abstract of the cards used, one of which I have in front of me:

"United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service, Division of Cooperative Extension, Washington, D. C. Official business. Penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, $300."

At the meeting there were about 25 men and not over 30 present, almost all of whom are employed to administer the A. A. A. The chairman and first speaker was H. R. Hedger, county cotton committeeman. Other speakers on the program were C. W. Van Hyning, in charge of cotton adjustment in this county; T. J. Barnes, lawyer and third largest landowner in the county, and who holds contracts with Mr. Wallace, on which the land contracted has a very high base acreage estimate; R. C. Blocker, defeated candidate in the last election; and E. M. Kilgore, farmer and contract holder with Mr. Wallace. Mr. Kilgore took issue with the other gentlemen and

voted against their proposals. A finance committee was appointed and secured donations from business and professional men by telling them the farmers had a meeting and decided to send a representative to Washington, as other counties were doing, to present their views to Mr. Roosevelt. Also, this is the influence behind the farmer vote on the Bankhead bill. It seems to me Mr. Wallace wishes to be not only dictator of the South but also general manager of Congress. I am against giving this man any more power and for taking away part of that which he has.

I hold in my hand a letter from Oakwood, Tex., enclosing a card, the face of which reads as follows:

United States Department of Agriculture. Extension Service. Division of Cooperative Extension. Washington, D. C. Official business. Penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, $300.

The card is addressed to Mr. Murphy Haley, Oakwood, Tex. On the reverse side it reads:

Cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics. United States Department of Agriculture and State land-grant colleges cooperating.

MEETING AT CENTERVILLE

DEAR SIR: This is an emergency call to all committeemen and others who are interested in a continuation of A. A. A. programs with their cash benefit payments to farmers to meet with me at Centerville Friday afternoon, May 3, at 2:30 p. m.

These programs are in imminent danger, and farmers are being called upon in every cotton-growing county this week to act in defense of the adjustment program.

This is important; come and bring a few good men with you.

Yours very truly,

EDMUND SINGLETON, *County Agent.*

This letter is sent to me by the secretary of the Oakwood public schools at Oakwood, Tex., and reads:

I want to personally congratulate you upon the stand you took in the Senate in regard to the bunch of supposed-to-be cotton farmers that have recently visited Washington.

Notice from daily papers that Wallace and Davis say that they did not know or have anything to do with this visit. As to that, I can't say. However, from press reports this delegation had a committee go to Washington to make arrangements for this visit some 3 weeks before.

The meetings in my county were called by the county agent in his capacity as such, and the only ones to be notified were what are known as "local committeemen." Leon County produces about 10,000 bales of cotton each year, and I would say that there are around 2,000 cotton contracts in the county. There were only 24 present at the meeting in which the two delegates were selected, so you can see that it was a select affair.

The enclosed card is one of the notices that was used in the Leon County selection.

Sorry indeed to have to admit that the great State of Texas has a Senator that puts administration ideas ahead of his people. Much luck to you.

Inclosed with the letter is a newspaper clipping dated Longview, and reading in part:

Sponsored by the Texas Cotton Advisory Committee, a group of cotton farmers elected by producers to represent them in planning and administering cotton adjustment programs, the delegation will arrive in Washington Tuesday.

C. H. Day, of Plainview, and C. H. Matthews, of Eagle Lake, are mentioned.

Mr. President, I have one other county agent letter here which was printed in a newspaper. Here is what was said in the newspaper item:

County Agent Ross B. Jenkins' statement to the Review concerning the proposed trip and the benefits to be derived therefrom appears hereunder:

"May 12 is the second aniversary of the A. A. A. and is the birthday of the greatest piece of legislation ever enacted for the farmer."

I read from the President's address to the farmers:

I am glad to welcome you to the National Capital. We can think of this occasion as a kind of suprise birthday party for it was just 2 years and 2 days ago that the Agricultural Adjustment Act became a law.

No connection between the two, perhaps, but they both had the same idea!

Further along in the letter it was stated:

Texas is going to send a special train to Washington on May 12 composed of farmers—

Note this:

And the administration wants a farmer or more from each county to be on that train.

The administration wants a farmer or more from each county to be on that train!

Then he goes on to tell the purposes of the trip. The letter enclosing this newspaper clipping is from Cross Plains, Tex. He begins, as most of these men do, by saying:

In the beginning, I wish to state that I am a Democrat, but I believe in Democratic principles, not communism.

I noticed the Fort Worth Star-Telegram's version of the argument in the Senate between yourself and my Senator, Mr. TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; also the remarks of THOMAS L. BLANTON, Congressman from my district. Hence I am handing you herewith a clipping from our local paper. I think that this shows clearly who promoted this farmers-going-to-Washington idea, and to whom they made their appeal for funds. They are about as representative of the farming class in this country as the K. K. K.'s were of the law-abiding citizens when the K. K. K.'s were at their best.

Mr. Ross B. Jenkins is at this time a powerful factor in this county account of the A. A. A.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY and Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON were so highly incensed about your remarks that I thought you might appreciate this clipping from their home State and district.

From Brownwood, Tex., came the following letter, dated May 16, 1935:

I note in the morning press the fact that you have introduced a resolution demanding an investigation of the source of funds used in transporting the triple A boosters to Washington.

For what the information might be worth to you, I would advise the two representatives from this county, as I am reliably informed, were furnished the sum of $75 each, which amount was raised by subscription from the farmers of the county.

After much advertising and ballyhoo, they managed to get about 75 farmers together in a mass meeting out of a total of about 6,000 in the county.

Government employees were the prime movers and instigators of the proposition, as I have been informed. In fact, one of the representatives from this county is an employee of the new deal, and the other is an ex.

I am sure the farmers of this country are not really in sympathy with this foolishness but have been intimidated into it for fear of something worse being handed them.

I have always been a Democrat; but if what we now have is Democracy, may the good Lord deliver this Government from it.

From St. Augustine, Fla., comes a letter enclosing a newspaper clipping reading in part:

Prior to the mass meeting of farmers the county board of commissioners appropriated $100 to defray a portion of the expenses of Brooks County farmers to Washington.

The letter reads:

The enclosed clipping from the Jacksonville Times Union of May 15 is additional evidence of the truth of your charge that the farmer gathering in Washington was financed from public funds.

Brooks County, of which Quitman is the county seat, is receiving Government aid for the needy, and yet the county officials appropriate money to send farmers to Washington. The affair was evidently sponsored by politicians.

I hope the A. A. A. will be checked before it does further damage. Allow me to assure you that many farmers appreciate your efforts.

I read another letter:

BALLINGER, TEX., *May 16, 1935.*

I notice from the Associated Press today an investigation was started by you regarding the farmers who came to Washington under the auspices of the A. A. A.

Every county agent who is on the Federal pay roll called a meeting of the farmers, and advertised same through the local papers, to meet at the courthouse and send delegates to Washington to uphold the A. A. A. Their instructions came out of Washington, so they could make a concentrated drive on Washington. The farmers that were favorable to the A. A. A. were hand-picked by the county agents to be at the meetings.

Runnels County sent three men appointed by the county agent, Mr. T. J. McCaughan, who is secretary of the Runnels County Agricultural Committee, and has been on the Federal pay roll for 2 years, and still is; and Mr. C. L. Cook, of Winters, and Mr. Ray, of Miles, who are the other two county committeemen, who receive pay for their work.

Trusting you will defeat the licensing power of the Secretary of Agriculture and all amendments to the A. A. A.

Attached to that is an account of the meeting:

The chairman of the Runnels County Community Agricultural Councils this week received a letter from T. J. McCaughn, secretary of the Runnels County Council, asking each to hold a meeting as soon as possible and raise $7.50 to help defray the expense of a Runnels County delegate to go to Washington, D. C., for a meeting on May 14 and 15. Every county in Texas as well as in all cotton-growing States is being asked to send at least one representative and as many farmers as possible to work for the passage of a group of A. A. A. amendments designed to improve and strengthen the

agricultural program. The great assembly of farmers will also oppose certain lobbies which are fighting the program.

Mr. McCaughn opens his letter to the councils of this county with the expression of "this is the farmers' first call to arms." He further says:

"During the past 3 years the National Government has made its first real attempt to place agriculture on an equal footing with industry. This is being done through benefits and parity payments to farmers on the products they produce to offset the high protective tariff industry has enjoyed for more than 50 years."

In speaking of the special benefits to the people of this county the letter points out:

"Over one and a half million dollars has been paid to Runnels County farmers as rental and benefits payments in the past 2 years. All of these funds, as well as the funds for the $630,000,000 that has been paid farmers in the United States, have come from the processing taxes. Abolishment of these taxes means the destruction of the agricultural adjustment program."

I read another letter from Texas:

FORT WORTH, TEX., *May 16, 1935.*

Note with interest the criticisms yesterday with reference to your resolution to investigate the "farmers' convention" held this week in Washington.

Thinking that it might be of interest to you to know the personnel of the farmers from this (Tarrant) county, I am enclosing you marked copies of Star-Telegram, Sunday, May 12, and both Star-Telegram and Press of this date.

You will note that the six farmers who represented this county are all members of the staff of the county agricultural agent.

All of them, except the county agent, are, or have been, farmers in this county, but most of them, if not all of them, have been engaged principally in shaping the attitude of the farmers in the matter of the A. A. A. contracts.

I understand that a collection was taken up to defray their expenses for the trip.

So far as the six accredited representatives of this county are concerned, it does not appear to me to be a delegation capable of representing the unbiased opinion of the farmers as a whole, but was a delegation arranged to see that the "program" was continued.

Just wonder if the delegations from other points were made up in the same manner.

Here is another letter from Texas:

PUTNAM, TEX., *May 17, 1935.*

Have just been reading your resolution calling for an investigation of the 4,000 farmers who have just been in Washington, in which you state that you think they are either paid directly or indirectly for this trip to Washington and came there as Government employees.

Am mailing you a copy of the Baird Star, a local paper in Callahan County, with an article on the front page marked with blue pencil. All of the names shown as intending to go are Government employees in the Cotton Production Control set-up. I do not know whether they are employed by the month or how they are employed, but they are on what is known as the "cotton committee." In Taylor County, immediately west of us, the same thing applies.

These county agents who are jointly employed by the Federal Government and the county are the men who are putting out this propaganda, and are doing it under their franking privileges of the Federal Government.

Thought I would send this to you as things of this kind will show to the general public that this propaganda is being paid for, either directly or indirectly, with Federal Government funds.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I feel constrained to express my disapproval of the course pursued by those persons to whom reference is made by the writers of the letters presented to the Senate by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. It appears from these letters—and I have received information of a similar character—that it was planned by some individuals to organize a movement for the purpose of influencing, if not intimidating, the Congress of the United States.

Citizens of the United States have the right to present their views to their representatives in Congress and to petition Congress with respect to matters within the jurisdiction and authority of the legislative department of the Government; but, in my opinion, a different situation is presented when movements are organized for the purpose of exercising improper influence upon Congress.

Undoubtedly, as I have indicated, the Members of Congress are glad to receive suggestions concerning legislation, but there is a wide difference between the submission of the views of individuals to the Congress of the United States in an orderly and proper manner and the organization of movements of the character indicated in the letters which have been read. It would appear as though some of our citizens are being lead to believe that Congress is amenable to pressure or coercive movements, and that in order to secure legislation there must be mass movements and powerful organizations, representatives of which must move upon Washington and make their presence known to the Members of the two branches of Congress.

Only a few days ago we experienced a situation somewhat different from that which is being discussed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], but which had for its purpose the exercise of pressure, if not coercion, upon Congress to secure the passage of a bill in which certain interests were greatly interested. A number of business groups who claimed to have been benefited by certain provisions in the N. R. A., provisions which, I may say in passing, permitted monopolistic control in certain industrial and business activities, conceived the plan of bringing to Washington several thousand persons for the purpose of bringing influence upon the Members of Congress to enact legislation which they believed to be to their financial benefit.

In my opinion, the plan was utterly indefensible and the mass movement clearly designed to secure legislation by improper and wholly indefensible methods.

The morning papers report that a Nation-wide strike is to be called unless certain legislation shall be enacted. In my opinion, sound and wise legislation cannot result from an atmosphere surcharged with fear or anger or any form of pressure or intimidation. Legislation should be the product of deliberation and an understanding and appreciation of all the questions and problems involved—the evils to be corrected and the remedies to be secured. I am told that other movements may be expected, and a friend of mine suggested that perhaps we would soon be visited by a powerful delegation of "boondogglers" for the purpose of securing appropriations from one of the Federal agencies, if not legislation from Congress.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the American people will not approve of plans to secure legislation by improper or selfish methods or legislating, nor will they approve of any attempt from any source to improperly influence or coerce Congress in the discharge of the heavy responsibilities resting upon it.

In other countries and in other days legislative bodies have been subjected to threats and intimidation, and in some cases to coercion by military organizations. It would be a sad day for this or any country if legislation were enacted under the whip of organizations influenced by selfish and sinister purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. I do not have the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Utah spoke on the basis of the letters which have been read. Does the Senator accept everything that is in these letters, the writers of many of which do not purport to know the facts, but who report all sorts of hearsay and things of that kind?

Mr. KING. I stated that I based my remarks on the letters submitted by the Senator from Delaware and upon information that had been brought to my attention.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Utah was here while the farmers were in Washington. Let me ask the Senator whether any one of those farmers approached him in any spirit of intimidation or threat, or anything of the kind.

Mr. KING. I will say that none of the persons referred to and none of the ex-service men approached me. Perhaps they knew my views respecting the matters to which they were giving their attention.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I have not heard of any Senator who has been threatened or coerced, and I do not think even the Senator from Delaware has intimated that any farmer threatened him, or approached him, or sandbagged him, or waylaid him, or coerced him, or anything of the kind.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Texas approve of the utilization of the frank of the Government for sending letters of the character referred to?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas does not approve the violation of the franking privilege for any purpose. I am unaware of the fact that it has been violated except as the Senator from Delaware has set forth today. Those were all local drop-letters, however, and I do not suppose they added anything to the cost of maintaining the Postal Service. The result may have been to make a few rural carriers carry a few more letters than they ordinarily would have carried. There may have been a technical violation of law, but I am sure no great breach of the law has been committed.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wish to thank the Senator from Utah for his observations.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. SCHALL. I do not want to let the occasion pass without stating that I think the State of Utah, and indeed the Nation as a whole, should be especially proud and grateful for the courageous words just uttered by the Democratic senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I desire to read a telegram from Galveston, Tex., which came to me almost the next day after the introduction of my resolution:

Referring press reports, farmers' march on Washington, heartily commend you for taking stand that delegation not representative cotton farmers. Farmers Galveston County supposedly represented by J. C. Yeary, who is county agent and employed by Department of Agriculture. Contrary what Senator CONNALLY stated yesterday, we firmly believe that 80 percent of delegation consists of county agents and extension workers of Department of Agriculture and also that trip being financed with assistance Government funds. This propaganda typical of so-called "farmers' meetings" held in the South to support A. A. A., which were mostly dominated by county agents and extension directors.

Of course, that particular telegram is one of the few instances in which there is no definite proof that the sender's estimate of 80 percent is correct; but I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that in most of the communications I have read the names are given, and their particular positions are given.

Another telegram, from Houston, Tex., reads:

We commend your action demanding investigation sponsorship farmer meeting. Our opinion it was arranged by A. A. A. officials to vindicate their short-sighted policies in eyes of Nation. Believe poll of delegates will reflect staggering majority of county agents, extension directors, who are employees Department of Agriculture. Vast number real farmers and employees cotton industry who are aware permanent injury to agriculture and national economy A. A. A. program is inflicting were financially unable to attend or uninvited to make trip. This should be brought forcefully to attention Congress.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. That telegram reads like one from Mr. R. P. Lordan, of Houston. He is the head of an organization of cotton brokers and salesmen that is fighting the A. A. A. bitterly and probably spending more money in propaganda than was spent on the whole Harris County delegation trip to Washington. That is from Mr. Lordan, is it not?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought it sounded like his sentiments.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am very glad the Senator has been able to find an answer to one of the many communications I have read.

The letter I am now about to read is from Mr. Lordan, on the letterhead of the Cotton Industries Employees' Association. I do not know what that is. I got the impression that it was an employees' association.

Mr. CONNALLY. For the information of the Senator, I will state that it is an association of employees who are interested in buying and selling cotton, and who are anxious to have a large volume so that they can do a big business.

Mr. HASTINGS. Are these the workers in the mills down there?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; they are cotton brokers and salesmen in big cotton offices, tremendous cotton offices. They do not work in mills. They are employees of large wholesale cotton agents, like Anderson, Clayton, and other concerns of that character.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. They hold white-collar jobs.

Mr. HASTINGS. I will read the letter to the Senator, anyway, and let him answer it in any way he pleases.

This will confirm our telegram of even date commending you on your action in regard to questioning the sponsorship of the recent meeting of "farmers" in Washington, to whom the A. A. A. played host.

There has never been any doubt in the minds of this association as to whose auspices this meeting was responsible. We believe that the move was planned with "malice and aforethought" by the A. A. A. in a vain effort to vindicate their policies in the eyes of the Nation.

Even the highly paid publicity experts who dish out the "black sheets" were unable to veil the suspicion of an arranged meeting, for the many voluntary and emphatic denials of the "farmers" and the Department were indicative of the fact that their consciences hurt just a wee bit.

Both Mr. Roosevelt and the Secretary evidently felt the need of a "pat on the back", in view of the continued bombardment of criticism from all sides directed against the A. A. A. Mr. Roosevelt was even inspired by the praise to "speak his mind", and his statement to the effect that the "high and mighty were guilty of lying" gives evidence of his testiness to constructive criticism.

There can no longer exist any doubt as to the fact that he wants the present program as a permanent policy. Heretofore he has had Congress believe that it was merely a temporary expedient in a period of emergency. As a permanent policy it will wreck the South.

In view of the fact that both Texas Senators have shown an inclination to ride the "pork barrel" for the administration, we must look to leaders like yourself and colleagues to throw the light of publicity on the insidious propaganda of the Department of Agriculture through its county agents, who seem to have come to a point where they are believing their own "black sheet" releases.

Senator, please permit us to point out to you that literally hundreds of thousands of farmers, employees of industries engaged in the handling of the cotton crop are bitterly opposed to the program of scarcity and artificial prices. The "farmers" in Washington do not represent the majority.

The economic and social welfare of Texas depends on the free production and free movement of cotton at natural price levels into the markets of the world.

The present A. A. A. program is building up a theory of artificial prices resulting in the accumulation of huge surpluses, destruction of our foreign markets, and unemployment and increased relief rolls in this State.

Our association, which is composed of over 100,000 employees working for firms engaged in the distributive system for the handling of the crop, are becoming desperate at seeing our lifelong positions taken from us. Ports like Galveston face commercial strangulation. Something must be done.

We organized in October 1934, and for several months followed a false illusion—that the President did not know what the A. A. A. program was doing in the South. On March 13, 1935, I had the opportunity of talking with President Roosevelt in his executive offices for 38 minutes, and it was then apparent that he did know but was not much concerned. His recent address to the farmers leaves little doubt of this.

We must look to Congress for action in this matter, and over 100,000 of our members are open-minded politically and will vote economically rather than sectionally from now on.

If we can serve you in this matter please do not hesitate to call on us.

Now I read a letter from Midway, Ala.:

I am enclosing a clipping that explains itself. You are absolutely correct. * * *

Finally the day before they were to start or were supposed to start Nunn came out to his house, which is about 20 miles from the county agent's home, and told him that "I cannot get anyone to go and represent Bullock County so you just must go and your way will be paid. I will take you to Auburn in my car and there you will be presented with a ticket free of charge and return, and when you return to Auburn I will be there to meet you in my car and bring you back home.

Now, Auburn is where the great head is, the Extension Service; when they want a thing they send word to the county agents and tell them what to do.

At least that is the way it seems.

Most of these great meetings of farmers, that you hear of are not farmers at all but county agents and Extension Service agents whose jobs depend on what they can put over.

I want you to protect me in this matter and if there is anything that I can do to help let me know but do not give my name away as I might have to suffer the consequences, not bodily, but these people have everything by the tail and a down-hill pull, and you dare not cross them and then ask for an allotment or rental or anything.

The man who went to Washington was H. B. Thompkins, of Fitzpatrick, Ala., and the county agent is Mr. Nunn.

Now I read a letter from Conway, Ark.:

Do not call that bunch that went to Washington farmers. They were county agents, county committeemen, Extension agents. These agents, I understand, collected money from the signers of Government contract (of course, under compulsion) to help finance this escapade.

He signs himself "Jeffersonian Democrat." He pins to this a letter written from Ashdown, Ark., which reads as follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE GAZETTE:

Well, I notice where the big boys have gone to Washington in the interest of the cotton growers of the South. I would like to have the personnel of that bunch. I will bet a dollar against a thin dime that there wasn't a man in the bunch that did not own less than 200 acres of land. If so, he was representing some big land owner. Of course, I don't blame the big farmer for being in favor of a continuation of the A. A. A., for it is playing into the hands of the big landowner. The little farmer is the one it is hurting. I asked a man the other day how many acres of cotton he had this year. He said he had 300 acres. This man only had three in his family. I met another farmer that had four in his family, and I asked him how much cotton he was allowed to plant. He said 10 acres. This 10-acre man told me that he didn't see how he could live and pay any debts with 10 acres of cotton. So I want to know how you expect to bring back prosperity in the South when you take the only cash crop away from the small farmer. I mean the share-cropper and the renter. Cotton is the only thing that he can raise to get any money out of. We can't grow wheat, oats, or corn as a cash crop.

So let the North raise the corn, wheat, and oats, and let the South raise the cotton; and when the North has grain to sell, buy it from them and quit shipping it in from South America, and the same way about other commodities. Don't buy from other countries as long as our people have it to sell.

I will tell you why the big landowner is in favor of the A. A. A. He rents all his surplus land to the Government, and then he has the other worked with 50-cents-a-day labor. You don't see very many share-croppers now. Why? Because the land the share-cropper used to work is rented to the Government. I can show you 50 farmers in this little burg who had farmed all their lives and made a living and never asked anybody for a penny are now on relief. Why? Because the big landowner has rented the land they worked to the Government. You can't blame the landowner, for when he rents his land to the Government and gets his money in his pockets his troubles are over.

As long as this system lasts, just that long we are to have thousands of people drifting around over the country on the relief, for they can't help it. You have taken the only occupation they know away from them. There is nothing else for them to do but get on relief and stay there.

The note is:

This is the sentiment of 80 percent of the farmers.

Next is a letter from Eatonton, Ga., Putnam County:

I have just noted that you are requesting an investigation into the source of expenses of the so-called "farmers' pilgrimage" to Washington in behalf of the A. A. A. program.

I have before me a mimeographed pamphlet on the cotton processing tax in Georgia used in the "mass meetings" held preliminary to the Washington trip. On the back of this pamphlet, in pencil impressions transferred through the original sheet upon which the writing was done, is a schedule of some of the assessments placed upon "farmers who aided in the administration of the program" and others in this county to finance the trip.

This schedule is as follows:

10 "committeemen" (named), $3 each	$30.00
3 committeemen, 50 cents each	1.50
3 committeemen, $1 each	3.00
1 county agent (Putnam)	1.00
1 individual	1.00
Total	36.50

The "individual" above is a State legislator from this county. He was named as one of the "delegates" to Washington. The other "delegate" drew the largest cotton rentals paid by the Government in this county last year.

The above is not the entire list, but is all I have. I know of others not on this list, but do not know the total.

One of the "committeemen" was told not to pay them anything, as he was not present at the meeting, but he stated to me that he had been working for them and did not know what else to do.

Next is from Millwood, Ga., written by a preacher, as follows:

I noticed in the Savannah Morning News on yesterday your questions thus, "Who paid the bill?" referring to the farmers' march on Washington. And today I notice that the reply was that the farmers themselves paid it. I wish to inform you this is untrue in the case from my county, Ware.

Mr. I. W. Cavender was the representative from Ware, whom I know well, being a member of my church, of which I am the present pastor. He is a fine fellow, but is constantly on the Government pay roll as a writer of cotton contracts, etc.

Now, who paid the bill? Court happened to be in session when the big fellows was getting up rallies for this march, so it was laid before the grand jury, and they recommended that $25 be paid by the county, and the ordinary handed over to Mr. Cavender the $25 to help pay expenses of the trip, and Mr. Cavender solicited funds from friends to finish out the expenses. I know of only two directly that contributed to the trip. One was Mr. W. Fe. Wasden, who gave me this information in a casual conversation, he being also one of my members and who is engaged in running a public truck line and has headquarters in the city of Waycross. The other one that gave to the expense of the trip by personal request is Mr. B. E. Bennett, of Millwood, who is a naval-store operator. Now, as I said, Mr. Cavender is a fine fellow and a two-horse farmer of Millwood section, and I am glad he had the pleasure of making the trip to Washington, but I am of the opinion that in reality he was not a representative of the majority of the farmers of this section but of the big business men of the city of Waycross, Ga.

The following letter is from Calhoun, Ga.:

We notice in the press that you have introduced a resolution seeking an investigation of the national meeting of the farmers in Washington and feel that you will be interested to know how the representatives from this county were chosen.

The county farm demonstrator, who draws a part of his salary from the National Government, called the meeting by inserting in the Calhoun Times a notice the week previous to the week of calling the meeting, and he also attended this meeting and took a part in the proceedings, and after the farmers who did attend the meeting had voted down the resolution to continue the cotton-acreage program, this same county agent requested those who had voted in favor of the resolution to remain, as is set forth fully in copy of the Calhoun Times, which is herewith enclosed for your information, and fully explained how the representatives from this county were chosen.

This meeting was also advocated and attended by the farmers who have been serving on the local and county committees in allocating the amount of acreage that each farmer shall plant to cotton, and constituted the majority of the 54 farmers who voted to continue the cotton-control program.

We would like to know, if you ever find out, how 4,000 farmers decided to meet in Washington on the same day, if they were not directed by some central figure at Washington. We were reared on the farm and operate farms at this time, and we have never been able to get our tenants to agree on the same thing at the same time, and it is rather strange that 4,000 farmers all agreed to sponsor the same program and sent a large delegation to Washington on the same day. We notice in the daily press of Georgia, and some of the other States, that meetings similar to the one held at Calhoun were called for the same week, which is another peculiar coincidence for a bunch of southern farmers to experience. This new deal is most marvelous if it has changed the mental make-up of our farmers so that they, without any suggestion from any person, all come to one mind as evidenced by this march on Washington.

I now read a letter from Iowa:

In reading my morning paper I see that you, together with some other Senators, are contesting the sincerity of the farmers that called at the White House with regard to the extension of the A. A. A. I heartily agree with you, and does it occur to you that most of the fellows that made the trip might be fellows that are on the corn-hog committees in their districts and are on a salary?

I know that is true from this territory. It meant their jobs. And every one of the committee are well-to-do farmers that don't need the salary at all. I feel sure that if an investigation was made that most of them are of this type.

I'll bet that if a square vote could be taken in this territory there would be 80 percent against the extension.

If the check-up can be made of the attendance of this meeting I believe it will substantiate my claims.

Next I read a communication from the Polk County Farm Bureau, by its president, to its members:

DEAR SIR: At a special meeting of the Polk County Farm Bureau board of directors it was decided by a large majority that it would be advisable to send a representative of the Polk County farmers to Washington with a group of farmers that were gathering there from all parts of the United States to endorse the A. A. A. program, and urge their representatives to aggressively support the A. A. A. amendments.

The past president of the Polk County Farm Bureau, James D. Ledlie, of Bloomfield Township, was the farmer who was chosen to make the trip to Washington in behalf of the Polk County Farm Bureau. The farm bureau board members realized the precarious position of the A. A. A. amendments. The board realizes that there is a very grave possibility that the A. A. A. amendments may not be passed, and if they do not, the future of the A. A. A. program is very doubtful.

The farm bureau board urges that you write to your Senator and your Congressman and urge them to support these amendments. See your neighbors and get them to do the same. It is imperative that we act at once or otherwise all of the ground we have gained may be lost.

I urge that you assume the responsibility of seeing that your Senator and Representative are informed as to your wishes relative to the A. A. A. program.

I read a letter from Collins, Miss.:

I am enclosing a clipping from the local paper which is sufficient proof that the idea of delegations going to Washington originated with the Government employees.

The donation list which I enclose gives S. W. Pierce, chairman of the reduction committee, as the first signer; then follows with S. J. Dedeaux, county agent, and E. D. Clarke, of the Cotton Control Office, and about a dozen of the office employees. After that comes a miscellaneous list of merchants, professional men, etc., and two dirt farmers. I am acquainted with them all, having been secretary of the local cooperative association for several years, and know what I am talking about. Incidentally, I was not invited to the meeting, since it is known that my views and those of many other farmers here differ materially from those of the A. A. A. crowd.

Covington County delegation got off to Washington last week, and consisted of S. W. Pierce, cotton buyer and local politician, who, it is rumored, is seeking a job as custodian of the post-office building at Jackson; W. J. Warren, ex-sheriff and present office holder of some kind under the Federal Government; and a Mr. Rawls, merchant, of Mount Olive. I was told today that Mr. Warren would likely land a good job with the R. F. C. I couldn't learn if Mr. Rawls is seeking a job. At any rate he is not a farmer.

You will note that the county board made a donation of $100 for the trip. I have heard a good deal of adverse criticism of this in the past few days and no doubt something will be heard about it later.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to secure an investigation of this march on Washington by the politicians in the guise of farmers, and hope that my little information will be of assistance to you.

In that connection, with respect to the contribution, I read from the Richland Beacon-News, Rayville, La., Saturday, May 18, 1935, which prints the official proceedings of the Richland Parish School Board, Rayville, La., as follows:

The resolution was adopted.

Messrs. M. L. Bell, W. T. Jones, E. P. Norman appeared before the board and requested that if the board considered it wise, that representatives be selected from the board to attend the cotton-growers mass meeting in Washington, D. C., for the purpose of strengthening the cotton farmers' request for the continuation of the present cotton program, and especially the processing tax on cotton.

The following resolution was made by Mr. Colvin and seconded by Mr. Rhymes:

"Be it resolved by the Richland Parish School Board of the parish of Richland, La., in lawful session convened, on this 8th day of May 1935, That the president of this board, and two other members to be named by him, be selected as delegates to represent the board at the cotton-growers mass meeting at Washington, D. C.; be it further

"Resolved, etc., That the board allow each delegate $75 for expenses. The president then named the two additional members, Messrs. Neal McEacharn and R. R. Rhymes."

The roll was called and resulted as follows—

All voted "aye"—

and the resolution was adopted.

Now follows this:

The superintendent explained that teachers had not been paid their last month's salary, neither had scrip been issued to teachers for the reason that he had the promise of assistance from the F. E. R. A. and that application for such assistance was now being considered, and probably would be accepted within a week or 10 days. He further stated that the F. E. R. A. would not allow more than $60 per month to any teacher, and that he proposed to issue scrip for the difference between the teacher's regular salary and the amount paid by the F. E. R. A., if in conformity with the wishes of the board.

Mr. President, Senators will observe from that statement that here is a school board whose teachers are being paid by the F. E. R. A., and who have passed a resolution contributing $75 for each of three persons coming to Washington to impress themselves upon the President.

I now read a letter coming from Church Hill, Miss.:

I have read an Associated Press account of your remark in the Senate concerning the recent meeting of cotton farmers at Washington. I have no knowledge that Government money was used for transportation of any of these farmers. I do know that in this county the movement did not originate with the farmers, but with the county agent, who is paid in part by the Federal Government. I am a farmer. One night last week a young man drove up to my house and solicited a contribution for sending a delegate to the mass meeting at Washington. He carried a letter from the county agent urging farmers to give for this purpose, and stating—as I think, untruly—that there was an effort to damage the cotton farmer by abolishing the processing tax. This young man (Mr. Hugh Harris) said he had been working very hard the whole day. Whether he was paid by the county agent or not, I do not now. As you are aware, few farmers would decline a request from this official, who controls their loans and allotments.

I am glad you expressed indignation at the President's insulting remarks. I have been telling my neighbors that American cotton mills were already at a disadvantage with respect to labor costs, that the added handicap of a 4½ percent processing tax removed hope of their competing in world cloth markets, that it may even permit Japan to take away part of their domestic market for goods—

And so forth.

I now read a letter from Pawnee City, Nebr., as follows:

We have been interested in following your procedure in the Senate relative to the "march" of the farmers on Washington to lobby for continuance of the A. A. A., and thought you might be interested in the enclosed tear sheet from our issue of the 9th, giving an account of the meeting held here at which a representative from this section of Nebraska was chosen. All farmers who attended the meeting at which this representative was selected were members of county corn-hog and wheat association committees having charge of the two projects in the four southeastern Nebraska counties.

As to the source of funds for expense of the delegate, we were told by one of our Pawnee County men who attended the meeting that the delegate's expenses would be paid from the fund set aside by the corn-hog and wheat associations here for "administrative expense."

To our knowledge, the 6,000 contract signers of these four counties had nothing to do with selecting the delegate to represent the counties, nor did they know the meeting was to be held at which the delegate from here was selected.

This information may be interesting to you, and we are sending it for what it is worth. We might add that we hear nothing here from the honest-to-God farmers about wanting to keep the processing tax because it is their "tariff." Practically every farmer we talk to is firm in the belief that the hog market would be higher with the processing tax removed.

I read the following letter from North Carolina:

I have read with interest news items concerning your resolution demanding that the Agriculture Department produce data to show whether the "farmers' march on Washington" was subsidized by the A. A. A.

An investigation would probably reveal that a considerable portion of these marchers were local county committeemen working in connection with the various crop reduction boards. These delegations were organized by the county agents, and, while their expenses were not paid directly, I am certain it was done indirectly by allowing these committeemen a few days' extra work, which they used in going to Washington.

There is a tremendous misuse and wastage in connection with the expenditure of Government funds, which is obvious to and resented by all sound business people. This letter is written with the thought that it might assist in a small way your fight to at least curtail these abuses.

I now read a mimeographed copy of a letter written to the Honorable T. P. GORE on May 13 from Altus, Okla., as follows:

The present pilgrimage to Washington of so-called "farmers' representatives" is nothing but A. A. A. propaganda. I sincerely hope that you Senators and also the Representatives are not misled by it. I suggest two pertinent questions to ask each delegate:

How many farmers attended the meeting to appoint you?

Where did you get your expense money?

The delegates from Jackson County, Messrs. Crow, Walker, and McAskill, are all three landowners and at present constitute the county committee, thus drawing some pay from A. A. A. The expenses of their trip are being paid partly by an assessment, amounting to a "squeeze" on every employee at the county agent's office, and partly by funds solicited from the town merchants, who for business reasons did not feel that they could refuse. The balance is being paid by the three delegates themselves. As far as I can find out, only two farmers had contributed until noon Saturday.

There was no meeting of any kind held here by the farmers to appoint these men. In fact, the whole thing was done so quietly and so quickly at the county agent's office that only a very few people in this community knew anything at all about it.

Yours very truly,

JOHN ELLETT.

I read a telegram from Oklahoma, as follows:

Three farmers' representatives from this district are on Government pay roll interested in continuance of A. A. A. program in order to hold job. Expenses partly paid by assessment of clerks in county offices. Not 3 percent of the farmers represented at meeting that elected them.

The following telegram is from Memphis, Tenn.:

From newspapers notice you charge expenses recent delegation cotton farmers paid by Government. I have no information on this, but the facts are that the rankest discrimination prevails in the administration of the Bankhead Act. This march on Washington was pure and unadulterated bunk, the ballyhoo of local

politicians and the favored few to perpetuate their control of present very unjust situation in a manner to acquire and retain supporters and secure improper personal advantages and profits. A proper investigation will show that those visiting Washington are far more favored in their allowances and allotments than their neighbors, many of whom are afraid to complain for fear of further punishment. These are the facts and you need not hesitate to charge them. Access to individual contracts and analyses of actual conditions will remove every doubt. Gross favoritism prevails. What we need is a cotton-consumption program, not one of reduction. If the money that has been and is now in prospect of being spent on this program had been used to educate and induce our own people to a more general constant and extensive use of cotton and its various products, we would in all probability now have in our own land a sufficient and permanent market. There is little doubt that America can and will when properly informed and urged consume her entire cotton production profitably. Investigate this situation, and you will really get somewhere. You may rest assured you will find the the facts as represented. A producer of cotton.

W. C. RODGERS.

The following letter comes from Milwaukee, Wis., under date of May 18, 1935:

I notice in a news item you had brought up the question as to whether the A. A. A. had paid the expenses of the farm delegation to Washington. I enclose a clipping from the Milwaukee Journal of May 17 mentioning this same matter. If you get in touch with Mr. Mallon, you might get enough interesting facts to enable you to stir up the A. A. A.'s and at the same time show up the "new dealers."

The clipping enclosed is an article by Mr. Paul Mallon, which appeared in many newspapers. In the course of the article Mr. Mallon says:

It was built mainly upon the county-control committee in each county and the township committees in most townships. These committees are made up of farmers for purposes of the A. A. A. program. County agents usually are secretaries of the control committees. The A. A. A. may quibble with you, if you say the county agents are paid by the Government, but it is fair to say part of their remuneration comes from the Federal Government.

The following letter comes from Commerce, Tex.:

For your information will state that the delegates from this county are all on the pay roll of the A. A. A. Department, and that one of them, and probably all the others, are not farmers, never have been, and not even interested in farming to the slightest extent. I have been reliably informed that the expense of these so-called "representatives" were solicited from smaller fry on the A. A. A. pay roll.

I have a letter addressed to the Observer, which I presume is the Raleigh News and Observer, which was sent to me from Lincolnton, N. C. The letter to the newspaper is from Hoffman, which I presume is in North Carolina, and reads as follows:

To the OBSERVER:

Recently a hosiery manufacturer said to me: "I thought the farmers were well pleased with the A. A. A. and Bankhead bill. Didn't they vote overwhelmingly for it?" Probably, President Roosevelt thought the same until "certain persons in the seats of the mighty", as well as some who do not occupy such high seats began to inform him of the truth.

Who voted in the famous Democratic plebiscite for cotton control? I'll tell you. These same 4,500 farmers who went to Washington and their black share-croppers and day laborers—50-cents-a-dayers—who can neither read nor write. These are they who voted in that famous referendum. Perhaps two-thirds of all voters were of the dark variety, who had, or their ancestors, never cast a ballot. A large percent of them are working for 50 cents a day for these same cotton farmers who went to Washington to tell the President how much they have profited by the Bankhead bill. Another large percent are those poor, ignorant devils, who, whether cotton is high or low come out at the end of the year in debt to these same farmers who have profited also by the Bankhead bill.

Now how did these gentlemen farmers profit so by the Bankhead bill? Senator BAILEY figured in an article published in the Saturday Evening Post that they could not have profited materially by the Bankhead bill, when considered in its relation to devaluation and the rise in prices.

Here is the truth. These same gentlemen belong to the political rings in the Southern counties and States. Their acres and poundage have not been cut. The small farmers, those outside of the pale of the graces of these Democratic county rings, have suffered their share of acreage and poundage reduction—yes, and not only their own, but also reduction that rightfully belonged to these same gentlemen who told the President how much they have profited by the cotton-control policy, but, mark you, not how they did it.

These cotton gentlemen, like Senator Huey, believe in "sharing the wealth." But, mark you, they have a different idea about it. They believe in sharing the wealth of their poorer neighbors, those neighbors not protected and favored by the county ring. Yea, they believe in sharing their neighbors' acres and poundage.

ALBERT M. SNIDER.

HOFFMAN.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. SCHALL. It may be of interest right here to refer to how they secured the advertisement that went out in the newspapers and over the radio and by every other means of communication which they control today that 90 percent of the cotton farmers were for the Bankhead bill. The testimony before the House committee disclosed that letters were sent to a select few whom they knew were for it. I think the number was 43,000, though I am not sure as to that. At any rate, out of the 43,000 there came back twenty-two or twenty-three thousand replies, of which number 90 percent were for the Bankhead law. When the computation is made according to the number of cotton farmers in the country it means that about one-third of 1 percent of the cotton farmers are for it. Yet the advertisement went out from one end of the country to the other, through the agency of the Agricultural Department, that 90 percent of the cotton farmers were in favor of that law.

That is only a sample of the propaganda which is continually being sent out through the country. It is only a sample of the complete censorship that the administration holds over what goes to the people. It is even impossible to get out to the country words said on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that the Senator from Delaware is doing a great service to the country by disclosing what he is setting forth here today, and that it ought to be followed up by a full investigation.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Senator for his observations. I should like to say that I have purposely eliminated very many letters which have come to me during the past week which touched that particular subject. That not being the matter in which I was particularly interested, I have eliminated them in order that I might have the time to present the important things which I wanted to place in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I read now from the Arkansas Gazette of May 16, a letter written by Skag Jones, of Pine Bluff., Ark.:

I see in the papers reports of thousands of "dirt farmers" are pouring into Washington City to give the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, a glad handshake and pledge him their unstinted support. More especially do they give their hearty approval to the A. A. A. I may not know just what a "dirt farmer" is, but I never thought that a bunch of high-hatted planters, bankers, lawyers, and politicians could qualify as 100-percent "dirt farmers" until I read the names of those that are converging on Washington from southeast Arkansas.

It is unfortunate that Norman Thomas recently reported some rather uncomplimentary conditions that existed on the plantations in northeast Arkansas, but it is still more unfortunate that the reports were in a large measure true, judging from conditions in southeast Arkansas.

There is not, so far as I know, one single tiller of the soil in the southeast Arkansas delegation that are now in Washington whooping up the A. A. A. Senator JOE T. ROBINSON, Senator HATTIE CARAWAY, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, our Congressman from this district, nor even Mr. Roosevelt, should he have occasion, will not have to wear gloves when they shake hands with our boys on account of the callouses in their palms produced by holding plow or hoe handles while trailing up and down the long rows of cotton under a blistering June sun for 14 hours for the magnificent sum of 50 cents per day.

The A. A. A. is a real bonus for the planters. But I have not been able to see where it amounts to very much for the small farmer, tenant, and share-cropper—more especially to those that have been kicked out and not permitted to have any crop. As to the planters and landlords, it has enabled them to rent the Government land, at excessive prices, that was cleared by slave labor long before the first shell burst over Fort Sumter.

With a steady stream of checks pouring in to them from the United States Treasury and their competitors forced out of the game, it would not be natural for them to oppose the A. A. A. If there were 350 special trains loaded with small farmers, tenants, and share-croppers sent to Washington, our good President would have an opportunity to hear the other side of the question, but unfortunately they have not the cash sufficient to charter the trains.

Our delegation will tell our Senators and Congressmen how to vote now. Next year they will be telling the small farmers, tenants, and share-croppers how to vote, and the cycle will have been completed.

That clipping was sent to me by an attorney at Hope, Ark., who wrote the following letter:

I see from the papers where you attacked the "farmers' march on Washington." Let me state that the people who made the trip were not really the farmers who do the farming, but the big landowners and bankers who have been the sole beneficiaries of the A. A. A. program in the Cotton Belt. The little farmer has been bled to death for their benefit.

If you in Congress would only send down South and get the records of the county agents (they are lord and master of the complete workings) you would be indeed astounded at the revelation. I know whereof I speak, as I have had some real experience with them and could furnish you with hundreds of affidavits of the injustices that have been practiced by them. Get the Hempstead County Record and you will find where the big landowner—one man controls the entire situation in this county in the A. A. A., the Farm Credit Administration, the relief office, the Federal land bank, the Emergency Crop Loan Office, the E. R. A.—and all of these offices work hand in hand to crush, intimidate, and control the little man politically and otherwise. I have never seen the situation so desperate.

Hundreds and thousands of acres of land have been rented to the Government by these "overlords" at exorbitant prices. Cotton land supposedly taken out of cultivation is not cotton land, but old worn-out land. The good cotton land is still being cultivated, I understand by E. R. A. labor. Hundreds of tenants are thrown off and forced to open up new land.

The county agent refuses to give cotton contracts. No contracts, no loans by the emergency crop loan office. Therefore hundreds of new clients are thrown on Federal relief. There is nothing else for them to do, as they cannot stand by and see their families starve. No factories or other means of work are available here in the South. The cotton-exemption certificates have been bountifully distributed to these wealthy men who do not do one lick of real work, and the poor man is not given enough certificates even to pay the money he borrowed to make his crop, much less have one penny to get by the winter on. I have seen men come in the emergency crop loan office and beg to hold back "just enough to buy a sack of flour"; his acreage and lint cut all out of proportion. If it were possible for some of you from the East to come in person and see the real situation here in the South, you would find the east Arkansas situation was not exaggerated, and is not confined to east Arkansas. It is the true situation of most of the cotton section of the State. I was from Tennessee, and I was really surprised at the condition when I first came to this State some 18 years ago. I could not realize that such servitude existed in the United States, for servitude it is.

We are looking to you in Congress to straighten out the situation, as those in charge are deaf to all appeals for relief, and in most cases the letters of complaint are only forwarded to those against whom complaint is made, and added venom is cast out in the local programs in an effort to prevent further criticism.

I trust you will get your investigation through, and please do not stop at the Secretary of Agriculture's report, but go into some of the records of the county units. There is where the real "rot" lies.

From El Dorado, Kans., came the following letter:

The gentleman that represented the Butler County farmers at the A. A. A. meeting recently in Washington was Ralph Gfeller. Mr. Gfeller is president of the Butler County Farm Bureau. He is local president of the wheat production control committee, and as such travels around handing out the farmers' checks to them, and I know and you know that he gets paid for the same.

Our Butler County Farm Bureau agent used to be a Republican, but he is now turned to a Democrat, and can say no good of anything that ever happened under Republicans—and all because he is getting his own nest feathered so well with all the "brain trusters" schemes.

I am sure you are exactly right about the way the farmers' trips to Washington were financed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will not mind a mild protest on my part, because of the charge that a member of the Democratic Party became a member of it for revenue only. [Laughter.]

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not intend it to be so. I am not at all responsible for these letters, but since they came voluntarily to me I am quite certain they are pretty nearly accurate.

From New Mexico came the following letter:

I see in the papers about the farm pilgrimage to Washington; also the charges that the Government is indirectly financing such a pilgrimage. I cannot say for other places, but I can give the general facts as to Curry County, N. Mex. I am told it is the same in other counties.

Claude Gamble, Democratic county chairman, is chairman, with a large salary, of the county wheat-allotment board. Mr. Edwards, vice chairman of the Democratic Party, is chairman of the corn-hog allotment committee, with a large salary. Mr. Gamble is the chairman of the recently created soil-erosion board on a salary. According to the papers here, Gamble's trip to Washington was financed out of the wheat-allotment fund. According to the papers here, Mr. Edwards has attended several purely political meetings on corn and hog assessment money.

The wheat and hog and corn committee is composed of the Democratic precinct committeemen. All get a rake-off when expenses are to be put out for a purely political nature.

These committeemen assess a fee on each producer. These committeemen can and do spend it on all kinds of junkets, rallies, and purely political meetings.

Get this point: Creed Webb kicked about such trips on the members' money. His wheat-allotment money never came after that, his hog and corn money stopped, and when the Government was taking over poor cows, they slighted him.

The following letter is from Gordo, Ala.:

MAY 20, 1935.

I notice in the papers that you have introduced a resolution in the Senate to investigate where the money came from to defray the expense of the so-called "farmers' march" on Washington, for which I want to congratulate you and bid you Godspeed in the investigation.

As for this section of the country being represented by farmers, it is all a farce. From this county (Pickens County, Ala.) the county farm agent, a lawyer, and a former banker represented the county; and, in my opinion, a very small percentage of the actual farmers made this trip. In fact, I doubt very seriously if any actual farmers made the trip from the fact that there are very few farmers that are financially able to make such trips, for I am a farmer myself and know whereof I speak.

It is hoped that these few facts may be of some assistance to you in your investigation and that you can carry out the investigation to the very limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point, may the Chair be permitted to ask the able Senator from Delaware if he correctly understood that the eminent Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] intimated that one of the letters disclosed that the writer, being the chairman of the Democratic committee, thereby became qualified to be the head of a hog service? [Laughter.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Is that a parliamentary inquiry the Chair is making of the Senator from Delaware?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is asking whether the able Senator from Maryland meant to indicate that the letter contained such or whether it was his conclusion from the letter.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland for the purpose of replying to the inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the Chair ought to take that matter under advisement and hand down a ruling at the earliest opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To avoid further embarrassment to the Chair, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HASTINGS. From Canadian, Tex., I read a copy of a letter written to the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, Kansas City, Mo.:

There has been much to-do in the papers all over the land since the "dirt farmers" went to Washington. There have been charges and countercharges galore. The charge that the farmers were led into this trip by outsiders is true in Texas, I know, and I have grave suspicions as to how it was done in other States also. The charge that the farmers did not finance their trip is also true in part, I am sure. In our county the county commissioners voted to pay the expenses of one delegate. At the request of a farmer? No. At the request of the county agent? Yes. Where do you suppose the county agents get their instructions? From the farmers? No. Everybody knows that the Extension Service is carried on through instructions from those higher up in politics in these days of the new deal. If any county agent should doubt this statement, let him refuse to carry out instructions and see how long his job will last.

In our county, after the commissioners voted to pay expenses for one delegate, we decided to send two, because the delegate who was elected was a lawyer and not a satisfactory delegate to most farmers; so we elected another one and agreed to make up his expense money by popular subscription, and then elected a banker for the delegate. So we sent a lawyer and a banker. The banker is, however, the president of the wheat-production-control association.

I will venture to say that perhaps in 90 percent of the counties the "dirt farmers" sent would compare favorably with ours.

As to who started, aided, and pushed the movement in Texas, will say that it was representatives of the Extension Service. I will also say that they did a good job, too. Why, I never saw such teamwork that they showed in this movement, and in the move "to educate the farmer to vote intelligently" (?) in the referendum vote on the wheat-control program. Talk about it! Why, George E. Farrell himself came to Amarillo, and every man from State head of Extension Service, district organizers, and down to the most remote county agent is working his head off in the task of getting these ignorant farmers to vote for continuance of the program. Do they think the farmer is so ignorant that he is not to be trusted to decide a vital question affecting himself as this one does without political help? If they are not trying to influence the farmer, what are they working so hard for?

Maybe our President will call me a liar, too, but just tell him I would be glad of a chance to prove every statement I make. I can do it, and there is not a doubt in my mind that our President knows I can. Then if that be so, it seems to me that it is indeed a serious state of affairs. I'll bet many an expense account goes in to Washington including expense money for a "dirt farmer" delegate, but will not show that it is for that purpose.

You may wonder where I got that "dirt farmer" phrase. Well, I got it out of Extension Service advertising promoting the movement. I got a suspicion I can prove that, too. I happen to be a director and treasurer in a wheat-production-control association, and know how the Extension Service is acting to promote things in politics. I am quitting at the end of June, when the year is up, voting against the program, and do not intend to sign another Government contract. Why? Because I believe that to continue will get the American farmer to depending on politicians and the Government, instead of depending on God and agriculture.

I cannot commend our Government or anyone else who destroys livestock and the products of the soil fit for human food when we have many, many people who need the things they are destroying, and destroying it only in an effort to raise prices. What a sin! Does any sane person think God will overlook such actions?

In the President's speech before the "dirt farmers" he made this statement:

"It is high time for us to repeat on every occasion that we have not wastefully destroyed food in any form."

Yes; I think it will have to be repeated on every occasion to get people to believe it who either saw or know thousands of cattle fit for human food were shot down and left to decompose, either saw or know that thousands of pigs fit for human food were destroyed and left to rot also, who saw thousands of acres of cotton that was mature plowed under, who saw thousands of acres of wheat plowed under last year to comply with the wheat contract.

All these things happened; and if anyone says they did not, even if he is the President of this great land, then it seems to me someone else may be charged with the same thing that our President stooped low enough to charge others with in his speech to the "dirt farmers" who gathered in Washington.

You may use this letter in any honorable way you see fit, either over my signature or not.

I repeat, that letter was directed to the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, Kansas City, Mo., and was signed by James I. Payton, "a farmer who really farms dirt." Then, as a footnote to the copy sent to me, he says:

Am sending you a copy of this letter to show you that some farmers know that your charges were not without foundation.

The letter I next read is from St. Joe, Ark.:

MAY 21, 1935.

I note that our Senator ROBINSON is indignant that insinuations should be made that the "farmers'" excursion to Washington last week was not a spontaneous testimonial of the farmers themselves.

All the evidence here is that the move in Arkansas was promoted and sustained by employees of the various A. A. A. set-ups.

The only delegate from this county, James A. Hudspeth, holds a $100-a-month job in the set-ups in the county agent's office here.

Two weeks ago a notice was printed in local papers that farmers were demanding an extension of A. A. A. The man who signed the notice as president of the meeting is a school teacher receiving E. R. A. wages. His son has a fat job in the A. A. A. set-up here. Three others signed the notice in the papers. One has a job since A. A. A.'s initiation here doing fieldwork. Another is a preacher on the rehabilitation or direct-relief rolls of E. R. A. The third has children enjoying good jobs in the E. R. A. and A. A. A. set-ups.

So far as I know, no farmers' organization here has endorsed A. A. A. or was identified with this move.

Carbon-copy press stuff was furnished to country weeklies throughout Arkansas representing the move to be a "swarming of farmers from the Southwest to defend the farmers' A. A. A. program." This press stuff was furnished by employees of A. A. A. set-ups.

There are only two newspapers published in this—Searcy County. You will notice that the "news" report in both is identical, although these two newspapers are published in different offices, and have nothing in common. Similar press stuff was used all over Arkansas.

Here we all realize that the Washington "swarming" was a swarming of A. A. A. employees to Washington to defend their jobs.

(Signed) WILL RICE,
President Searcy County Independent Farmers' Association.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHIPSTEAD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I desire to read an editorial from the Fairbury Journal of Fairbury, Nebr., dated Friday, May 17, under the heading "Takes Trip to Washington."

TAKES TRIP TO WASHINGTON

Senator Frank Wells was one of a large number of farmers who trekked to Washington, D. C., starting last Saturday to influence Congress to continue the A. A. A. Senator Wells represented Jefferson and Saline Counties, a farmer in Saline County being selected as alternate.

The selection was made largely by telephone as Mr. Wells was in Lincoln, the senate being still in session. The Wheat Control Association sent him $50 for expense money, the understanding being that committeemen would be assessed $1 each in the two counties to make up this amount.

The party which Senator Wells traveled with started from Lincoln early Saturday morning in a touring bus, expecting to make Chicago in time to go into camp—hotel—that night. The next day they planned to make Pittsburgh and the following day arrive in Washington, being there on Tuesday when a demonstration was put on.

This ballyhoo precedes an election to be held soon wherein wheat farmers are to vote whether they shall continue the wheat-control program period or not.

In that connection I read a letter from Lyons, Kans., to this effect:

After reading the morning papers I judge you would like to know about the "bonus march of the farmers" and who paid the freight!

All I know, of course, is what happened in this locality.

The delegates from this (Rice) county are F. J. Habiger, who is a member of the local "draft board" on the wheat allotment, and Orville Evans, who is in some official position in the corn-hog deal. Habiger and two others constitute the county board for the wheat program and Evans and others the corn-hog board.

I am informed, upon good authority, that the expenses of Habiger were paid to the farmers cooperative elevators of the locality; for Evans, by the farm bureaus of three counties.

Perhaps the article in Who's Who in America (1932–33), under the name of Loris Everett Webb, of Dodge City, Kans., recent candidate for Member of Congress from the Seventh District of Kansas against the Boy Scout who was reelected from Garden City, will throw some light on the matter, since Mr. Webb was recently furnished a "lame duck" crutch by the present administration in the way of a nice position—ostensibly to investigate the matter of wheat imports from Canada, I believe.

Habiger is president of a farmers' cooperative elevator organization. It is not impossible that both Mr. Evans and Mr. Habiger are interested in preserving their jobs.

In this connection I am also reliably informed that a so-called "election" will be held on May 25, to vote on the A. A. A. program. I am also informed that meetings have been and are being held at various places over this county at which the producers are being told that delegates have been sent to Washington to lobby for a law that will require all elevators and other purchasers of wheat (under a licensing system) to deduct the amount of the processing tax from the price per bushel of all wheat bought from nonsigners of allotment contracts.

Thus, in an indirect way, or perhaps direct, wheat producers are being scared into voting for the A. A. A. set-up and put in a position of approving the amendments to the A. A. A. through fear they will not be able to sell their wheat at the fair market

price and will be discriminated against. Much the same talk was heard when the first program was launched.

The word of the men who have been putting out these threats is being made good by this march upon Washington.

You might also note Wheat Leaflet No. 2, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, put out by the Department—with particular reference to question 5 and its answer.

For a moment I desire to refer to that. This is in the form of questions and answers distributed to farmers, and I call particular attention to question 5. This is put out by the A. A. A.:

What other methods besides the voluntary production adjustment program might be attempted to bring about the necessary adjustment in seeding?

In other words, what is going to happen to you unless you agree to what the A. A. A. recommends? Here is the answer.

1. Compulsory control.

So that in this pamphlet which comes from the Department of Agriculture the farmer is asked the question:

What other methods besides the voluntary production-adjustment program might be attempted to bring about the necessary adjustment in seeding?

The first part of the answer is, "Compulsory control."

2. Purchase of submarginal lands, which would require a period of years.

3. Persuasive methods without adjustment payments, which methods were tried by the Federal Farm Board.

4. Remove all restrictions and let 30- to 40-cent wheat squeeze out enough farmers to make the necessary adjustment in acreage.

In other words, with all the questions, 19 in number, which are asked in this paper, but one answer is left to the farmer, "Unless you agree with this program the only other plan is compulsory control, or purchase of submarginal land, which will take a period of years, persuasive methods, which have shown that they are not effective, or removal of all restrictions, and letting 30- to 40-cent wheat squeeze out enough farmers to make the necessary adjustment in acreage."

Did anybody ever see an honest-to-God inquiry and an honest-to-God suggestion to the farmer in the form of a vote, when it is followed by a paper like that, which undertakes to prove to him conclusively, "Accept what we offer you or your condition is bound to be very much more serious than it is under the present plan"? It is an outrageous effort to force the farmer to put himself in a position to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to say that the great body of wheat farmers agree to this program. If they do agree to it, it is because of the compulsory attitude on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture and those working with him.

I read a telegram from Clyde, Kans., directed to me:

Honest-to-God farmers will not be represented by contemptible job-seeking farm-bureau bums. Let's kill A. A. A. forever. Am ex-service man and farmer. Never accepted A. A. A. grafty dole. Give farmer fair prices and his share of export trade, and let him take care of himself.

Here is a letter from Helena, Ark., which encloses a news item headed—

Will list donors to farmers' trip.

In that news article it is said:

The list will be sent to Congress, and Senator JOE T. ROBINSON has promised to see that it is read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, members of the delegation said.

The letter to me is as follows:

Note the enclosed clipping from the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., May 18, 1935.

Say, old top, you know and I know that no man or men, company, interest, or organization give or contribute a darn thing without a monetary return to them, and are the dear dumb people so dumb that they do not know this?

Are the farmers to be paid with store-bought representation for their interest by interests who will profit by such crop restrictions and manipulations to and for everything at the sacrifice of the farmer?

Senator, you may or you may not be hearing from me in the future.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. In the group which visited Washington last week, of which visit the Senator has complained so long and so frequently, there were some 300 citizens of the State of Arkansas. Practically every one of them is personally known to me, and I believe also to my colleague. They are representative of farmers in every portion of the State, high-class citizens, and not one of whom received one cent in any form of contribution from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Most of them personally paid their own expenses. A number of them received contributions from their friends and neighbors. It is very difficult for me to understand why the Senator from Delaware regards the visit of those citizens, those farmers, to the National Capital as dangerous to our public institutions.

I have a letter which will be presented for the RECORD by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] from the head of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, showing that not only was the visit unsolicited on the part of the Department of Agriculture or its agencies, but the representatives of the Department advised against the expenditure of any departmental funds, advised that there existed no right to expend such funds for the purposes stated, and even suggested that the Department did not recommend the coming of the delegation.

The Capitol is thronged constantly with professional lobbyists who are paid to stand about the halls, to visit the offices of Senators and Representatives, and to urge the enactment or defeat of legislation; and it is somewhat mysterious to me that the Senator from Delaware should find it dangerous to the Government, dangerous to the liberties of the people, for four or five thousand farmers to visit their National Capital and in a courteous manner present their views to their Representatives in the National Congress.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I now read a letter from a man who describes himself as "the poorest man in the South", from Crawfordsville, Ark., as follows:

First, I would like to say I can read and partly understand, but for the lack of education I cannot explain to you as I would like to just how myself and some of my neighbors feel about this miserable A. A. A., and its processing tax.

I am a farmer, I mean a real dirt farmer. I have a wife and 6 boys and 1 girl. And we all know the feel of the plow and hoe handle. We know no other way of earning our livelihood, and always have done very well until now. And before God and man we are staring starvation in the face today. But I do hope I will outlive the three A.'s for my boys' sake. I want to thank you with all my heart for the stand you have taken against the A. A. A. and the processing tax. I do know we little farmers, share-croppers, and farmer laborers cannot bear out what has been placed upon us by Henry Wallace. I will not vote for no such men as the present administration, and I am a born Democrat, but it certainly looks very much like I am going to starve with a very bad feeling in my heart toward my old party. I am also an ex-soldier, but I won't mention how I feel about the bonus question, for I guess you know how all soldiers feel about that. The three A.'s is enough to turn any poor devil like myself against the whole world. God pity the man who can't see the graft in the processing tax, and the poor people who have to bear the burden. We little fellows can read the papers enough to understand we are getting a dirty deal instead of the new deal. It is a new deal all right, but a new dirty deal.

I will sure be glad when the day comes when we can cast our votes in a way to right the wrong that has been placed upon us, for I do feel like a change in the administration will also change this miserable two-thirds to three-fourths starvation that we are facing today.

I see in the papers where some 4,500 farmers went to Washington to uphold the A. A. A. I will say this: If there was one real dirt farmer in that whole bunch, I will eat up hell raw by the acre. They were the county committees, big landowners, and men who are getting fat salaries through the three A's. They are interested in farming in one way, and that is to graft everything the little dirt farmer can make and all they can off of our Government. That is the "dirt" farmer that so easily fooled some of the flatheads of our country. We can only hope you good Senators will continue your vigorous fight for our rights. We will certainly stand by you.

Yours very truly,

FRANK G. PHILGAW,
Crawfordsville, Ark.
(The poorest man in the South.)

Mr. President, I now read a letter from Chula, Ga., dated May 18, a letter from a farmer, in which he says:

I read in the Atlanta Journal that you are offering a resolution in the Senate in Washington to investigate the expenses of the

farmers coming to Washington to endorse the A. A. A., or the President's agricultural program. Just for your information, I am sending you one of the cotton contracts which I have, which will explain why I don't like the A. A. A. You will notice on the contract where I am given a 10-acre base with 7 acres to plant, and 3 acres that the Government pays rent on at the rate of $7.50 per acre. They allow me to make 225 pounds of lint per acre, which amounts to 1,575 pounds of lint on 7 acres. The Government collects on that 1,575 pounds of cotton 4.2 cents per pound, or about $86—

It does not collect it from this man, but collects it from the processor—

I receive back in rentals $22.50 and a little check they call "parity", which last year amounted to $5.88. I don't know just how much "parity" will be this time. However, that leaves a balance of around $60 that the Government collects out of my little three bales of cotton. I have asked the Government agents here to explain to me where it went to, and they have not done so.

In other words, this man complains that the use of 3 acres has been taken away from him, he has been given $22.50, and is permitted to produce 1,575 pounds of cotton, upon which some processor pays to the Federal Government $86; but he complains that there has been paid to him only $22.50, plus $5.88, making a difference of about $60 in this one instance, and he would like to have somebody explain to him why he has not received the $60 which, under the processing tax, was supposed to have been collected for him.

Then when I criticize Mr. Roosevelt, our President says I am lying. Mr. Talmadge, our Governor, when he read a part of the platform which Mr. Roosevelt was elected on here was nice enough not to say lying, but we can draw our own conclusions.

Now, Mr. HASTINGS, in regard to the expenses of the people that went from Tift County, Ga., to this farmers' meeting, one of them, a Mr. Joe Paulk, is a member of the county board of control, whose name appears on the enclosed contract; and I am sure was retained on the Government pay roll while he was in Washington. I think his expenses might have been paid by some of the larger farmers who received large benefits from the A. A. A. Such as some I will mention Mr. E. P. Bowen, who is president of the Bank of Tifton, who controls some 200 plows in Tift County, Ga., most if not all farmed by tenant farmers or share-croppers.

We will say that Mr. Bowen gets a contract similar to the one enclosed on each of the 200 plows would be around $45,000 that Mr. Bowen would put into his pocket where there are 200 share-croppers that don't get a penny. Mr. Bowen's land is only worth, according to the custom of the country here, $4 an acre, yet he gets $7.50 for a part of it and still gets half of the crop that the tenant makes on the same land. While the tenant farmers take the reduction in acreage, the Government collects processing taxes on his cotton, he also pays increased prices for everything that he buys and all he gets back from the Government is half of the little parity. I could mention several other cases like Mr. Bowen, but it will take too much of your time. I also wish to state that the meetings were called and presided over by these same county agents and committeemen, and the resolutions that were carried to Washington by them were drawn in the office by these same men a week in advance of the meetings what we farmers were going to do. Endorsing the A. A. A., and I don't blame such men as Mr. Bowen and others in that class for favoring it, neither do I blame these men who are drawing a good salary out of the Government to favor it. If they will put me on the pay roll, I will favor it also. But I would like to inform Mr. Roosevelt that I wouldn't lie not even to get to be President of these United States.

Now, Mr. HASTINGS, you can use this letter and contract any way you see fit, also use my name if you like.

I am, sincerely yours,

W. B. LEVERETT, *Chula, Ga.*

I now read a letter coming from New Iberia, La.:

At a meeting that was held at New Iberia, La., county seat of Iberia Parish, by the farmers, which was called by Congressman MONTET, he made a political speech and praised Roosevelt and A. A. A. control. He asked for volunteers to go to Washington and help the A. A. A. get more power and control.

There were only three volunteers, one a railroad representative, another under the employment of the A. A. A. and has his daughter and son-in-law working in that office. The other party is not a farmer.

All through Congressman MONTET's speech he praised and spoke in favor of A. A. A. control program. The audience was not at all enthused; in fact, they are all afraid of it, but they do not express their views as they are intimidated by no-crop finances or fear of greater crop-reduction allotment. It is a fact that some rice farmers are being cut 25 percent of their 5-year average and others are being cut as high as 46 percent of their 5-year average.

We all are in hopes that you good Senators will have enough support to defeat these radical bills that the A. A. A. is trying to put through.

I have been a successful farmer for 35 years, even though I have gone through several depressions. The fight was not as great as Henry A. Wallace and the A. A. A. is trying to put on us.

I read an extract from a letter coming from Dadeville, Ala., as follows:

And in regard to the A. A. A. so-called "farm help-nothing outfit", the delegation who invaded Washington pretending it was to help the poor farmers from this section were men who are and have been receiving a good salary from the Government. They called a farm meeting, and not over 10 or 12 men from this section went, and donated the money to pay expenses of this lollypop sucker to come to Washington to ask for more lollypop laws.

The following letter came from Fairview, Okla.:

I am enclosing a clipping from a local daily that will give you some information that you may be able to use. In the first place, that delegation didn't represent the majority of farmers and wasn't planned by the farmers or with their knowledge. I don't think 10 percent of the farmers of this county knew a thing about it and not many more yet.

Milo Reno said it was the bird-dog gang that went to Washington (bird dog is a natural setter, you know), or the swivel-chair farmers. He is mistaken, however. That bunch was real farmers, all right, but each delegate was hand-picked by the county agent or some of that crowd. I am one of the community cotton committeemen. The county agent drove to my farm on Friday—they started to Washington on Sunday—and asked what I thought of the plan, but mostly to get me to donate 1 day's work as committeeman to expenses of delegates. I told him I didn't like to pay for something I thought would do more harm than good, and would give Congress and the President the idea we were 100 percent for the A. A. A. He said that wasn't the intention. They would only ask for the processing tax to be retained until we could get the farm program adjusted satisfactorily, as he wasn't satisfied as it was and knew not very many farmers were. You know what happened; they turned out to be a lot of rubber stamps led by picked and instructed leaders that were more interested in a free trip to the Capital than they were in the triple A. I feel we farmers have been double-crossed. It has gone all over the United States the farmers are 100 percent back of the farm program when nothing is further from the truth. There are only two classes satisfied—one is the bird-dog bunch who draw a steady salary for doing very little, and the wheat bottom or corn hog who draw benefit payments up in the thousands. There is one man in our county (there may be many more), vice president of a bank, owns several business buildings, has several farms, struck oil on one farm this spring, was offered $50,000 for it and turned it down, is reported to be worth $100,000. I am confident he draws benefit payment on hogs, wheat, and cotton. Don't know how much, but possibly more than any man in the county, and there are hundreds who receive up in the thousands, while lots of poor people can't sell even one bale of cotton, so have to go on the relief roll, and the pauper on the street is taxed on the bread he eats and the overalls and shirt he wears to pay those farm hogs. That may be the "new deal", but it lacks a thousand miles of being a square deal.

I think if you press your resolution, you will find those delegates were financed mostly by those drawing a salary under the A. A. A. set-up. They have been nervous for some time. They were all voluntary so far as I know, but it came indirectly out of the processing-tax fund. Our local chamber of commerce took care of the balance if there wasn't enough donations.

There might be some excuse for a processing tax if it was distributed so as to raise the buying power of the majority of farmers; but thousands to some and nothing to others puts the farmers as a whole in a worse condition than they were and will finally collapse by its own unfairness.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. THOMPSON,
Chester Star Route.

Mr. President, on May 17, following the suggestion made by the Senator from Texas, I concluded to write a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which I enclosed a copy of my resolution and propounded 16 questions. In the last paragraph of that letter I said:

My dear Mr. Secretary, I hope you will not consider these questions as impertinent. From my point of view, they touch very directly the public interest. I am asking them in good faith. I realize, of course, that you may ignore them if you like, but Senator CONNALLY tried to make the Senate and the country believe that I might get this information from you in this way.

I should be glad to have your reply as soon as you can find it convenient.

When I suggested to the Senate yesterday that I would address the Senate upon this subject this morning I had not received the reply from the Secretary of Agriculture and only received it 10 or 15 minutes before I began my address.

I will not take the time of the Senate to read my letter and the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture, but, if the Senate will permit me, I should like to have consent to print as part of my remarks the letter in full which I directed to the Secretary and his reply in full; but, without the exhibits, which I have not read, and which some other Senator may

put in the RECORD, if he cares to do so. I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the letters to which I have referred.

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

(See exhibits A and B at the conclusion of Mr. HASTINGS' remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, so far as I have been able to consider it, I am inclined to think that the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture is frank, and I have no doubt that he gives me all the information he has. My recollection is that in the letter he promises to give me such other information as may come to him.

I have, however, accomplished the principal object I had in view by offering the resolution in the Senate, having it printed in the public press, and having received the replies which I have read into the RECORD.

I still insist that it is important; I still insist that we ought to adopt the resolution; though if a majority does not want it done they will undoubtedly see that it is not adopted.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] that every farmer in the Nation has a right to come to Washington when he wants to do so; that he has a right not only to see his own Senator, but a right to see every other Senator who is willing to talk to him. He has the right to solicit funds to pay his way here. He has the right to stay here at the expense of those who are willing to send him here for any legitimate purpose. No one questions those rights. They are American rights which attach to the American farmer, the American laborer, the American manufacturer, and every other person who is interested in legislation. I am not complaining about anything of that kind. I am not complaining about the farmer being interested in legislation for himself.

What I am complaining about is the employees of the A. A. A. using their power to coerce farmers to agree to send delegates and pay their way here—for what purpose? For the purpose of putting on a show, for the purpose of giving the President of the United States an opportunity to tell them how much he has done for them; and, at the same time, for another purpose, namely, to impress upon the Congress that we dare not do something which is against the will of a group which voluntarily comes here under such circumstances. That is the matter about which I am complaining. It is unfair; it is undemocratic. The most undemocratic feature of it was the President of the United States welcoming them with open arms and making to them a speech which they could take back home, and which, to my mind, under all the circumstances, was not fair to American citizens anywhere.

It is that to which I object. It is that precedent which, if followed in the future, will make trouble for the country in more ways than one. There can be no doubt about it. Does anyone think that, unless the President had agreed that the A. A. A. processing tax should be continued, he would have welcomed these farmers under any such conditions? No, no!

I should not be surprised if within a week we do not have the soldiers of the Nation marching upon Washington and, with their representatives, calling upon the President of the United States to go out upon the back porch of the White House and greet them on the White House lawn. I should not be surprised if we do not have coming here the representatives of 5,000,000 people who are opposed to the holding company bill, and those representatives going to the President and saying to him, "You have given the farmers a chance. You have told them what you did for them. You have given the representatives of the N. R. A. a chance, perhaps, to hear what you have to say to them. Knowing that, we beg of you to let us present our case to you and let us see if we cannot have some influence upon you and upon the Congress by coming to Washington in this great group."

It is said sarcastically that the Senator from Delaware did not inquire about who paid the expenses of the United States Chamber of Commerce. How ridiculous it is to make such a suggestion. The United States Chamber of Commerce meets in Washington annually and is composed of people who are selected to come here. It is not an unusual thing. They were not greeted at the White House. No; they were not even given the privilege of hearing the President at all on that occasion, although it had been in the past the practice of the President to speak to them, but not on this occasion. Why? Because the President of the United States knew the United States Chamber of Commerce was going to adopt a resolution condemning some of the things the administration had done. He cannot go any place where anybody is to condemn him. He wants to be surrounded by a crowd who will praise and applaud what he does. He knew the farmers would do that. There were many in that group who were representatives of the A. A. A. and who were on the pay roll, that pay roll being provided by the poor farmers who were afraid not to send the man the county agent selected.

That is the miserable situation about which I complain. The correspondence shows that the county agent selects the county committee and the community committee, although he makes the farmer believe that the farmer himself does it. He selects the community committeemen and they have the farmer's life right in their hands. The letters which I have read from farmers beg me not to disclose the identity of the writers, because they know that if their identity should be disclosed they would have the county agent and the community committeeman standing over them and denying them their right to aid when they are almost starving to death.

No; the Senator from Arkansas sees no reason why the Senator from Delaware should complain if these people want to come to Washington to be heard. He said there are paid lobbyists who come right into our very offices, so why should not the farmer be permitted to come here and have his say?

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made fun of me after I had finished my speech the other day. I give way to him now to let him answer this correspondence which I have read into the RECORD. I am sure if he sticks to the facts he will have much difficulty getting that job done.

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1935.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I enclose herewith a copy of a resolution, introduced by me in the Senate on May 15, requesting that you furnish to the Senate certain information, touching the gathering of some three or four thousand farmers in the city of Washington in the early part of this week.

The resolution is still pending in the Senate. On the day I introduced it Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, made certain observations with respect to it. He complained because I had introduced the resolution instead of calling you by telephone and asking you personally to furnish me with the desired information. I was following the long-established precedent when I introduced the resolution. Both Senator CONNALLY and Senator LEWIS thought that the resolution was a reflection upon you, Senator CONNALLY going so far as to suggest that there was intimation in it that you had approved of an improper use of Federal money. I think you will agree with me that a careful reading of the resolution will show that there is no such suggestion contained in it.

The gathering of so large a number of persons, all of whom claimed to be farmers, in Washington at one time is something that had never happened before. The fact that they came in the middle of May, about the busiest time for the real farmer, also adds to the unusual event.

There has been much complaint in various parts of the country with respect to the processing tax, which is levied by your Department for the benefit of the farmer. This is done under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. A large sum of money has been collected and distributed; the amount not being far short of a billion dollars. Legislation is pending in the Congress to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and both you and the President have been urged to do something that will relieve persons paying such tax.

On Tuesday last, while these farmers were here, they congregated on the White House grounds and were addressed by the President, and the language used by the President in describing those who had criticized the farm program was, to my mind, intemperate, to say the least.

I recite the above facts to show that I think the public generally were justified in reaching the conclusion that these things did not happen by chance, and that there must have been some directing head that brought this many farmers from several States to Washington at one time.

In the resolution, which I introduced, I accused nobody of anything. I sought information and I am addressing this letter

to you to see whether you are willing to give me the information sought in this resolution without further effort on my part.

I am therefore propounding the following questions to you:

1. What was your first knowledge of the contemplated trip of these farmers to Washington, and if you passed the information to the President, when was that done?

If you did not personally know about it, who was it in your Department who did have sufficient knowledge of it to pass the information to the President, and what day did such person notify the President?

2. Do you or does anybody in your Department know how many county agents were present; and, if so, will you give me their names and the counties from which they came?

3. Do you or does anybody in your Department know how many crop-control officials there were in this group?

Can you give the names of such persons and from where they came?

4. Were there any other agriculture officials or employees in this group; and, if so, what were their positions, and how many were there?

5. Do you know who instructed Mr. Foster, of the A. A. A., to check up on the delegation?

Do you know who instructed Mr. Foster to take charge of the tenth floor of the Raleigh Hotel that was reserved for the accommodations of some of the group?

Do you know how many women employed by the A. A. A. were delegated to assist Mr. Foster at the Raleigh Hotel?

6. I assume it will not be denied that the county agents and the crop-control officials had much to do with the sending of this delegation to Washington. Do you know who in your Department approved of any such activities on the part of such officials?

7. Is it not a fact that such county agents and crop-control officials had the approval of officials in your Department when they issued calls for meetings, at which delegates were selected to come to Washington at this particular time?

8. Did anybody in your Department arrange in advance for hotel accommodations for the stay of these farmers in Washington?

9. Did anybody in your Department have anything to do with the arrangement for the rental of Constitution Hall, such as assurance that the person hiring the hall was good for the payment of the rent?

10. Is it not a fact that the county agents or the crop-control officials issued the credentials necessary before a person could be admitted to the Constitution Hall meeting?

11. Was there a registered list of the delegates who attended the meetings, and does this list show the States represented, and does this list show how many of them were county agents, extension directors, crop-control officials, or other employees of the Department of Agriculture or any other Government agency?

12. Do you know whether this delegation came to Washington for the purpose of influencing the Congress in legislation now pending before it, pertaining to farmers?

13. Do you know whether this delegation came to Washington for the purpose of impressing upon the Congress the importance of maintaining the processing tax?

14. Do you know whether any of the group of farmers that came to Washington were persons who had not received money from the Federal Government under the crop-control program?

15. Do you know whether any, and if any, how many, farmers paid their own expenses on this trip; and if they did not pay their own expenses, who did pay them?

16. If there were farmers who paid their own expenses to make this trip to Washington, do you not think that they had been imposed upon by county agents, or other officials who made them believe that such a trip was necessary to protect their own interests?

Lastly, do you agree that it is a proper course to pursue to encourage groups of people, interested in legislation, to appear in Washington where the Congress is considering legislation affecting them and have them greeted by the President on the White House grounds?

My dear Mr. Secretary, I hope you will not consider these questions as impertinent. From my point of view, they touch very directly the public interest. I am asking them in good faith. I realize, of course, that you may ignore them if you like, but Senator CONNALLY tried to make the Senate and the country believe that I might get this information from you in this way.

I should be glad to have your reply as soon as you can find it convenient.

With highest regards, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

DANIEL O. HASTINGS.

EXHIBIT B

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 24, 1935.

Hon. DANIEL O. HASTINGS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HASTINGS: This is in reply to your letter of May 17 in which you ask a series of questions concerning the gathering of farmers in Washington on May 14. Several days have been required to assemble the information, because some of it was not in our possession when your letter reached the Department.

A good many of your inquiries were covered in a letter from Chester C. Davis, Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON. In that letter, which was dated May 16, Mr. Davis correctly stated the Department's attitude toward the farmers' meeting. Mr. Davis said:

"The attitude of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is and has been that the right of the farmers to come to Washington was not open to question and that this right is the right of petition established in the Constitution for all American citizens without discrimination.

"The Adjustment Administration therefore has considered it to be wholly and exclusively the right and responsibility of the farmers themselves to decide and act without being influenced. This right and this responsibility have been respected by the Adjustment Administration and its personnel.

"The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has not sponsored nor financed, nor permitted its agents to sponsor, nor permitted county production control association funds to be used to finance the farmers' visit to Washington. On the other hand, the Adjustment Administration has never denied the right of farmers to visit their Capital, has not attempted to discourage them from doing so, and upon their arrival in Washington welcomed them and rendered to them assistance requested by them when we could give it."

A copy of Mr. Davis' letter to Senator ROBINSON is attached hereto.

In view of published accusations that the farmers' meeting was "bought and paid for" by the Government, and in view of similar statement which have been made, the Department of Agriculture instituted inquiries and is pleased to supply you with the results.

The implication of some of these accusations is that the Federal Government sponsored the farmers' visit to Washington through the State extension organizations and their county agents. This apparently arises from a misunderstanding of the relationship between the United States Department of Agriculture and the county agents. The county agents are not directly responsible to Washington, but to the State directors of extension, who are employed by the State colleges of agriculture and whose appointment is subject to approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Funds for operating the State extension organizations are supplied partly by the States and partly by the Federal Government. The State director of extension, while he coordinates the work of his staff with the United States Department of Agriculture, is primarily an officer of the State college of agriculture. The county agents are appointed by the State directors of extension, usually with the approval of local groups, and they are paid in part from county or local funds and in part from State and Federal funds. Thus the county agents, while they operate to some extent under instructions from their State director of extension, are primarily responsive to the wishes and needs of the farmers of their own county.

We telegraphed State extension directors in States sending delegates of farmers. We inquired whether: (1) State extension funds were used to finance the trip, (2) whether the State extension officers participated in organizing farmers, or whether instructions were given to county agents to participate, (3) whether county agents called meetings of farmers to organize the trip, and (4) to advise us as to the number of county agents who accompanied the farmers to Washington.

All State extension directors answering to date have replied that no extension funds were used to finance farmers, farmer committeemen, or county agents in making the trip, but that the farmers raised the money among themselves or from contributions by local business men and other friends in their communities. No extension director has reported that his office gave instructions to county agents to promote the visit. As indicated above, the county agents regard themselves as servants of the farmers in the counties, and apparently in many instances were urged by the farmers to make the trip at the farmers' expense. But in spite of that situation, out of more than 1,300 county agents in the country, the 30 States reporting thus far indicate that there were less than 100 county agents from these States in the crowd of about 4,500 farmers who came here. The total of less than 100 does not, however, include county agents from Texas, which sent one of the largest delegations of farmers, and a few other States which have not yet reported. The reports are still coming in and will be sent to you later. The Department of Agriculture, having no direct supervision over the county agents, did not and could not forbid these county agents to make the trip to Washington.

I have received many letters from farmers protesting against accusations that their way to Washington was paid by the Government. From one Texas county—Anderson County—I received a list of about 200 individual donations ranging from 10 cents to $6 made by farmers and farmers' wives. They raised $149.44. Six farmers came from this county. One paid all his own expenses. The others accepted the $149.44, used it so far as it would reach, and then paid the rest out of their own pockets.

I have received another similar list from Claiborne County, Miss. This shows 86 donations, ranging from 5 cents to $5, and totaling $94.35. This money was used to pay part of the expenses of two delegates from that county.

Copies of these two lists and a number of letters from farmers who participated in the meeting are attached.

After the farmers got here Mr. Davis and I did what we could to welcome them and help them. Their leader, Mr. Clifford H. Day, a farmer of Plainview, Tex., appealed to us for help. He and his associates knew very little about the city. They did not know how so many farmers could be accommodated, and we placed them in touch with the Washington Board of Trade, which cooperated splendidly in helping arrange facilities. It developed that many

more farmers were coming from several States than Mr. Day had expected. It was suddenly disclosed that the Federal Auditorium, in the Labor-Interstate Commerce Building, which had been engaged for Mr. Day through efforts of the Texas delegation in Congress, would not be large enough to hold the crowd. In the emergency the Department then did what it could to help the farmers find a larger hall. With our assistance, Constitution Hall was engaged by the farmers committee. While Administrator Davis and I were on the platform there Tuesday forenoon, the farmers' chairman announced that a collection would be taken up at the door to pay for the use of the building. In the afternoon the farmers' chairman announced that the funds collected at the door were insufficient and hats were passed by the farmers in attendance to get the balance. A subordinate employee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration from Alabama, I have since been told, assisted his farmer friends by personally sharing responsibility with the farmers for the rent of the hall, and later advanced the $250 needed for the afternoon session, being reimbursed from the funds collected by the farmers.

The answers to your detailed questions follow:

Question no. 1: What was your first knowledge of the contemplated trip of these farmers to Washington, and if you passed the information to the President, when was that done? If you did not personally know about it, who was it in your Department who did have sufficient knowledge of it to pass the information to the President, and what day did such person notify the President?

My first knowledge of the contemplated trip came to me in a newspaper story from Texas. I believe this was published by the Associated Press about April 17. I did not inform the President about this for the reason that the information was not direct, and was somewhat indefinite. It did not forecast any such general gathering as finally took place. At some later date Edward O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, telephoned me that some farmers were coming from Alabama, his home State. He requested that I get an appointment for them with the President. I communicated with the White House, and was informed that the President would be glad to receive an Alabama delegation.

The Department still did not have any authentic and direct information that a general meeting of farmers was being arranged.

On May 11, between trains at Monroe, La., I heard from the Missouri Pacific station agent that other farmers were going to Washington. That was my first knowledge that Louisiana farmers were planning to visit the Capital.

I met Representative JOHN H. SANDLIN, of Louisiana, at Alexandria. Representative SANDLIN then suggested to me that if a large delegation of farmers came to Washington they would be greatly disappointed if they did not see the President. After talking with Mr. SANDLIN I telegraphed Secretary Marvin McIntyre at the White House, requesting an appointment for May 13. We intended at our meeting with the President on May 13 to ask him to meet the farmers. After I returned from Louisiana several Members of both Houses of Congress, including members of the Texas congressional delegation, either communicated directly with the President or asked Administrator Davis and myself to request the President to meet the farmers and speak to them. At noon on Monday, May 13, I asked the President if he would meet the farmers, and he agreed if they would go to the White House.

Question no. 2: Do you or does anybody in your Department know how many county agents were present; and if so, will you give me their names and the counties from which they came?

Through Dr. C. W. Warburton, Director of Extension Work, the Department has requested complete information as to the number and identity of county agents attending the farmers' meeting. Attached hereto are copies of the telegram requesting this information and of the replies. These telegrams report less than 100 county agents as being in the crowd of farmer visitors.

Question no. 3: Do you or does anybody in your Department know how many crop-control officials there were in this group? Can you give the names of such persons and from where they came?

The "crop-control officials" to whom you refer evidently are community and county committeemen of the production-control associations. These are not Government officials, but are farmers elected by farmers and their compensation for per diem work is fixed by the farmers. They are responsible to their own farmer constituents and, except for routine matters of auditing and the like, we do not attempt to keep track of their activities. We do not have any list of county or community committeemen who attended the meeting. The telegram from the assistant director of extension of Missouri states that Charles E. Rohde, a member of the State allotment board charged with enforcement of the Bankhead Act in Missouri, was in the group. He did not come at Federal expense.

Question no. 4: Were there any other agricultural officials or employees in this group, and if so, what were their positions, and how many were there?

The county and community committeemen referred to in the answer to question 3 are in no sense Federal employees.

At the request of Mr. Day, Administrator Chester C. Davis and myself both addressed the farmers. Administrator Davis introduced a dozen or more of the staff of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to the meeting Tuesday afternoon. In Washington on official business at the time of the meeting and perhaps present at some of the sessions, as indicated by the attached telegrams, were several State extension officials.

Instructions were issued to employees of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration that no travel authorization would be issued at Government expense for anyone to attend the farmers' meeting and that Federal funds and funds of the county production control associations were not be used to finance attendance or any other expenses in connection with the meeting. This is shown in detail in the correspondence which Administrator Davis sent to Senator ROBINSON May 16. The fact that extension funds were not used by county agents or State extension services to finance the meeting is reiterated over and over in the attached telegrams from the State extension directors.

Question no. 5: Do you know who instructed Mr. Foster, of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, to check up on the delegation? Do you know who instructed Mr. Foster to take charge of the tenth floor of the Raleigh Hotel that was reserved for the accomodation of some of the group? Do you know how many women, employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, were delegated to assist Mr. Foster at the Raleigh Hotel?

We do not know of any "Mr. Foster" connected with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration who had anything to do with reserving accommodations or in any other way assisting the farmers in making their arrangements at the Raleigh Hotel. It is possible that you have in mind one of the railroad agents or some hotel employee.

At the request of Mr. Clifford H. Day, cotton farmer of Plainview, Tex., chairman of the farmers' arrangements committee, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration did do what it could to help the farmers make their arrangements. Mr. Frank Brown, assistant to Mr. Davis, was assigned to aid Mr. Day. Two stenographers were kept on duty most of the time. The stenographers worked only for short periods when they could be absent from the office without interfering with their duties, so that in all 10 girls supplied clerical assistance at one time or another.

Question no. 6: I assume it will not be denied that the county agents and the crop-control officials had much to do with the sending of this delegation to Washington. Do you know who in your Department approved of any such activities on the part of such officials?

All our information shows that the farmers' meeting in Washington was sponsored and financed by the farmers themselves and their neighbors. The production-control committeemen are, as I have pointed out, farmers who are chosen by farmers. I do not regard it as the Department's function to tell the farmers whether they should or should not visit their Capital. For that reason, no census has been made or will be made to determine what or how many officials in the Department of Agriculture approved or disapproved of what the farmers did.

As for the county agents, since the Department of Agriculture does not give them orders as to how they shall spend their time, there was no occasion to approve or disapprove their coming to Washington, provided they did not come at Government expense.

Question no. 7: Is it not a fact that such county agents and crop-control officials had the approval of officials of your Department when they issued calls for meetings, at which delegates were selected to come to Washington at this particular time?

No; this is not a fact. The Department neither approved nor disapproved of meetings called by county agents or local committeemen for the purpose of discussing a trip to Washington. The attached telegrams indicate that in only two States reporting did any county agents call any such meetings, and in these instances their action was taken at the request of their farmer constituents, and not with the approval of Department of Agriculture officials. As for "crop-control officials", I have repeatedly pointed out, and I point out again, that production-association committeemen are farmers, chosen by farmers.

Question no. 8: Did anybody in your Department arrange in advance for hotel accommodations for the stay of these farmers in Washington?

Arrangements were made through the Washington Board of Trade, room 204, Star Building, to serve as a clearing house for hotel and rooming-house accommodations for the visiting farmers. We assisted Mr. Day in getting the Board of Trade to make these arrangements.

In one instance, a representative of the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture did make a hotel reservation for the South Dakota farmers. This was in response to a telegraphic request from Extension Director Eberle, of South Dakota, who was not a member of his State delegation. I assume that some of the farmers who were coming to Washington requested Director Eberle to send this telegram, and it was done as a courtesy to them.

Question no. 9: Did anybody in your Department have anything to do with the arrangement for the rental of Constitution Hall, such as assurance that the person hiring the hall was good for the payment of the rent?

An explanation of the part played by Department of Agriculture employees in arranging for a hall is contained in the introductory portion of this letter.

Question no. 10: Is it not a fact that the county agents, or the crop-control officials, issued the credentials necessary before a person could be admitted to the Constitution Hall meeting?

Your inquiries as to the methods of identification used as a precaution to guard against entrance by outsiders who might create a disturbance should be addressed to Mr. Clifford H. Day, Plainview, Tex.

Question no. 11: Was there a registered list of the delegates who attended the meetings, and does this list show the States represented, and does this list show how many of them were county agents, extension directors, crop-control officials, or other employees of the Department of Agriculture, or any other Government agency?

There was not, so far as I know, any registered list of delegates. For the identity of county agents who were in the crowd of approximately 4,500 farmers see the attached list of telegrams.

Question no. 12: Do you know whether this delegation came to Washington for the purpose of influencing the Congress in legislation now pending before it, pertaining to farmers?

C. H. Matthews, secretary of the Texas advisory committee, and in charge of arrangements for the Texas delegation, in a statement issued on the train bound for Washington defined the purpose of the farmers in coming to Washington as follows:

"The specific and definite purpose (of the visit) is to appropriately express appreciation collectively to Congress and the administration for the recognition given to agriculture by means of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and its programs. In doing this we give encouragement and support to Congress and the administration in their resistance to the gigantic organized effort on the part of processors and handlers of farm commodities to disrupt the adjustment programs by destroying or interfering with any of the processing taxes."

Question no. 13: Do you know whether this delegation came to Washington for the purpose of impressing upon the Congress the importance of maintaining the processing tax?

See the foregoing statement by Mr. Matthews.

Question no. 14: Do you know whether any of the group of farmers that came to Washington were persons who had not received money from the Federal Government under the crop-control program?

I think all of the farmers in the meeting had been benefited, either directly or indirectly, by operations made possible by Congress under the Adjustment Act. I doubt whether you could find any farmers in the United States who are not better off because of these operations.

I believe that since more than 3,000,000 farmers are signers of production-adjustment contracts with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and since thousands of other farmers are benefiting from marketing agreements and licenses, it is reasonable to suppose that virtually the entire gathering was composed of farmers participating in the adjustment program. Many farmers told me personally that this was the main point of their meeting here. They wished to thank the Government for what had been done directly to help them through the adjustment program.

Question no. 15: Do you know whether any, and if any, how many, farmers paid their own expenses on this trip; and if they did not pay their own expenses, who did pay them?

To the best of my knowledge and belief all of the expenses of the trip to and from Washington and the meeting here were paid by the farmers or business men and other friends in their local communities. I have been informed by the farmers themselves, by many letters and by responses to official inquiries, that the farmers who were financially able paid their own way and those who were not were financed by collections taken up in the community.

Question no. 16: If there were farmers who paid their own expenses to make this trip to Washington, do you not think that they had been imposed upon by county agents or other officials who made them believe that such a trip was necessary to protect their own interests?

As you know, efforts were being made by strong and directly interested processor groups to abolish the processing taxes, which, to my mind, may properly be called "the farmer's tariff." As you also know, these processor groups for many years have maintained strong lobbies in Washington. To my mind, there is nothing reprehensible in farmers making their voices heard in their Capital along with that of the processor lobbies.

If the farmers believed it was necessary to make a trip to Washington to protect their interests, it was not because they were imposed upon by Government officials, but because of their knowledge that their production-adjustment program had been placed in jeopardy by the forces I have just described.

Final question (not numbered): Lastly, do you agree that it is a proper course to pursue to encourage groups of people interested in legislation to appear in Washington, where the Congress is considering legislation affecting them, and have them greeted by the President on the White House grounds?

If you refer to encouragement of such groups by executive departments of the Government, I agree that it is not a proper course. The action taken by Administrator Davis prior to the gathering, as described in his letter to Senator ROBINSON, shows that this particular group was neither encouraged nor discouraged by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

If you refer to encouragement by others, then I wish to point out that for many years groups of various kinds have been appearing in Washington with a view to influencing legislation. Surely the farmers have that same right. And surely they should not be censored for meeting on the White House grounds, in the open, where all could see them, rather than bringing their influence to bear in secret places.

As for the propriety of the President's greeting to the farmers, my personal view is that I see no reason why he should not receive a group which had come to express its appreciation of his efforts to help them attain economic justice.

The information in this letter necessarily is limited to what we have been able to find out through facilities of the Department of Agriculture. If you wish additional details, I would refer you to Mr. Day and to the various railroad officials who, I am informed, played a prominent part in helping with the arrangements.

The attached enclosures are in the following order:

(1) Administrator Davis' letter to Senator ROBINSON.

(2) Two lists of farmers and others donating toward delegates' expenses.

(3) Copy of the telegram from Dr. C. W. Warburton to State extension directors.

(4) Copies of replies thus far received.

(5) Letters protesting against the accusations that the Government sponsored or financed the farmers' visit to Washington.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary*.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Delaware will not depart. I notice that he is about to leave the Chamber. I have been here more than 3 hours listening to him.

Mr. HASTINGS. I appreciate that, but I have to get a bite to eat. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been here listening to the Senator from Delaware 3 hours and have not had anything to eat.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator from Texas has my sympathy. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], after great preparation, announced in the open Senate yesterday that he would address the Senate today, and invited the junior Senator from Texas to be present.

I am delighted to see that the Senator from Delaware now has returned to the Chamber. The Senator from Delaware spent almost 3½ hours of the Senate's time in denouncing the representatives of the farmers who came to Washington some 10 days ago; and after detaining the Senate for that length of time he left the Chamber hastily to consume some of the farmers' products down in the restaurant. I am glad the farmers were able in that way at least to contribute to the physical comfort of the Senator from Delaware, even if they do arouse a great disturbance in his mental processes.

Mr. President, some years ago there swept over the country a great rage of marathon dancers, marathon dance contests, in which the participants would seek to outdure competitors by dancing all night or all day. Then there followed a rage of marathon tree sitters, individuals who would climb up trees and see who could sit in the trees the longest. We had other kinds of marathon contests; but I believe the Senator from Delaware will justly go down in senatorial history as the marathon letter reader of all time. He spent nearly the entire 3½ hours of the Senate's time in reading letters from all parts of the Union, not pertinent to the issue which he raised here, but making a general assault upon the agricultural policies of the administration, and upon the administration itself.

All of us knew, when the Senator originally made his assault, that the farmers simply furnished the occasion for it. What the Senator from Delaware was interested in was making an attack on the administration and on the President of the United States. So, after putting nearly everybody to sleep with his letters for 3½ hours, in an impassioned burst of oratory at the conclusion of his reading of his voluminous correspondence, he then burst forth in a great explosion of candor, and said that his complaint was not because the farmers came to Washington. He was glad to have the farmers come to Washington. His complaint was not that they collected money among their neighbors and friends to pay their way here; but his complaint was that they came here and went over to the White House, and gave the President of the United States an opportunity to make a speech to them, and tell them what the administration's policies as to agriculture had been and would be.

That is the essence—the boiled-down essence, the sublimated extract—of the Senator's complaint. He is angry because the President received the farmers. I desire to say to the Senator from Delaware that I know the audience with the President was obtained only after the farmers themselves, through several agencies, asked for the privilege of visiting the White House.

Then the Senator complains and asks, "Why were not the members of the chamber of commerce received at the White House?" I dare say that the chamber of commerce

would have been received at the White House if they had asked to be received. That is one great thing about the present administration: It is democratic. It receives the representatives of chambers of commerce just as it receives the farmer. It receives them all on the same basis of equality, as citizens of a republic, citizens of a democracy. It now requires no title of industrial nobility to see the President of the United States. It requires, under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, no embossed or engraved coat of arms of finance or of monopoly to gain an audience at the White House. So the Senator from Delaware grieves, he is disturbed, because the President received the farmers who came to Washington.

Mr. President, what is the issue here? The Senator from Delaware originally raised the issue that the Department of Agriculture had financed the trip of the farmers to Washington. A few days ago the junior Senator from Texas told the Senator from Delaware that if he would call up the Secretary of Agriculture he would find out the truth. The Senator from Delaware now admits on the floor of the Senate that he has a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture. He is satisfied that the Secretary did not finance the trip. He is now satisfied that the Secretary did not instigate the trip, that he did not undertake to initiate it, that he did not stimulate it; so the Senator has changed his whole front of attack. His complaint now is at the whole A. A. A. program. His charge now is against the whole agricultural policies of the administration; and what does he do? He reads letters from all over the country!

The Senator from Delaware disclaimed that his purpose the other day was to obtain publicity. Whether he desired it or not, the receipt of these letters proves that the Senator's outburst here a few days ago against the visit of the farmers did receive wide publicity.

Mr. President, in this Chamber it is not so much what is said, but it is the authority that says it; it is the source whence it comes that secures publicity and gives significance to the utterances of those who make these deliverances. So the Senator from Delaware, who is the Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, speaks here not only in his individual capacity, but he speaks with all the authority and all the prestige and all the influence that goes with the exalted station of Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. So we are presented here today with the situation that the Senator from Delaware, representing his party, is attacking all along the front all the agricultural policies of the present administration.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Is not the Senator a little too harsh upon the Senator from Delaware? Does he not realize that the Senator from Delaware has to collect campaign funds for the next election, and that what he is now doing is laying the foundation for that activity?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that, according to the Senator from Delaware, it is wrong, it is an outrage, for a farmer to pass around the hat among his own neighbors and collect 25 cents, 50 cents, or a dollar here and there with which to pay the legitimate expense of a delegate to Washington; but I dare say, in the view of the Senator from Delaware, it is no crime to pass around a silk hat just before the senatorial elections in the fall—not among the friends and neighbors of a candidate but among powerful groups, powerful interests, who will not themselves come to Washington but who will come here through their paid emissaries, through their lobbyists, to haunt the doors of Congress and its committee rooms, asking for special favors for themselves, or asking that equality be denied to other groups or other industries.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 4 of a minority report filed by the Senator from Delaware with reference to the public-utility bill he said:

> There is nothing in the new bill to indicate that serious attention was paid to the real objections made by the utility companies.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from Montana mean to say that the utility companies have had delegates attending the sessions of his committee or hanging around Washington?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that not only have they had their lobbyists here, not only did they appear before the committee, or were given ample opportunity to appear before the committee, but, in addition to that, they have had lobbyists here calling upon every Senator in his office, and, in addition to that, they have carried on a campaign by advertising and by letters and in every other manner, and before I get through with the discussion of the holding-company bill I will show what some of their activities have been. The Senator from Delaware is complaining because of the fact that we did not adopt all of the suggestions made by the utility lobbyists when they were in Washington.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why should the Senator from Montana complain at that? Why does the Senator from Montana complain at the conduct of the Senator from Delaware in wanting the committee to yield to the people who came here, and who have a right to come here, he says, and petition the Congress? To do what? To petition the Congress to continue their opportunities for exploiting the public through the sale of stocks and bonds in violation of blue-sky regulations. That is legitimate! That is right! They have the right of petition. But the farmers—"What are you doing here in Washington?"

The Senator from Delaware says this is spring planting time, when the farmers ought to be out in the fields working between the plow handles. But spring, and summer, and autumn, and winter are all open seasons for the paid emissaries of the special groups and interests to come to Washington. He raises no inhibition of season or of time as to those who represent his own economic views.

I thank the Senator from Montana. I read the minority views on the Public Utility Act of 1935:

> Minority views expressed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]:
>
> There is nothing in the new bill—

Speaking of the utility bill, I suppose.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. He says:

> There is nothing in the new bill to indicate that serious attention was paid to the real objections made by the utility companies.

Why should not serious and real attention be paid to the utility companies? The utility companies neither live as humans, nor breathe, nor think, nor die. A utility company never stayed at home in the spring to plow between the plow handles. They do, it is true, contribute to campaign funds along about October and November. Usually they are "shaken down" by somebody for campaign contributions. But that is no crime! They are business men. They are prominent citizens. Many of them live in Delaware. But what right has a poor farmer down in Arkansas—I believe one of the Senator's correspondents signed himself "The poorest man in the South"—to come to Washington, when he ought to be out in the field plowing, so that the Senator from Delaware could procure a more luscious meal, after exhausting himself for 3 hours physically, and exhausting the rest of us in the Senate Chamber mentally? [Laughter.]

I shall not dwell longer on the utility holding companies. They are one thing; the farmers are another thing.

Mr. President, I am not going to spend much time answering the Senator from Delaware, but I do want to correct one or two misstatements. The Senator from Delaware stated that the county agents are all paid by the Federal Government. That is partly true, and it is partly untrue. The Federal Government makes an appropriation for the Agricultural Extension Service—and if I am in error, I hope the

senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, will correct me. That fund is allocated to the various States through the Extension Service. Before a county agent can be employed, the State and the county must contribute funds to the employment of the county agent, which is merely supplemented by the Federal appropriation. The choice of the county agents is not in the Federal Government at all. The choice of these agents is in the respective counties which select them, with the approval, I presume, of the Extension Service.

Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware also stated—and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong—that the county agents select all of the county agricultural committees. That is not true. The fact is that the county agricultural committees are selected by the farmers themselves.

The Senator from Delaware said that the county committees were paid by the Federal Government. The county committees were paid out of the A. A. A. funds from three to four dollars a day for a very short period while they were actually engaged in adjusting the acreage contracts of the farmers in their counties. They were paid no expenses. All of their expenses had to be paid out of the three or four dollars per diem which was allotted to them, and my information is that in many cases their expenses were greater than their per diem compensation.

Those are the facts as furnished to me by the Department of Agriculture. If I am in error, I hope the Senator from South Carolina will correct me.

Mr. President, I am not responsible for all the hearsay or all the neighborhood gossip or all of the rumor reflected in the letters which the Senator from Delaware has read in the Senate. Any Senator who has a voluminous correspondence knows that if he believed and took for granted as being true everything that is contained in the correspondence that comes to his desk he would be in a mental fog 24 hours out of the day. Many of these letters do not purport to state the facts. They state what the writers believe. They say, "It is my opinion" so-and-so. "It is my belief" so-and-so. I am rather astounded that a shrewd lawyer like the Senator from Delaware, a man who has honored the bench in his State, who ought to know the value of testimony, the materiality of testimony, the unworthiness of hearsay testimony, the flimsy foundation of rumor and gossip, should stand here in the Senate and, on his responsibility as a Senator, fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with such a hodge-podge as was furnished by the letters he read here.

The real issue in this case and the only issue is: Did the Department of Agriculture furnish the money and incite this trip to Washington?

The Senator from Delaware has practically admitted that his first charge was untrue. I hold in my hand a letter—and I have many of them, but I shall not weary the Senate with them—from a place in my State, Burlington, Tex. It gives a list. I suppose there are more than a hundred names of farmers in that community who contributed money to pay the way of their delegates to Washington. I am going to ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD. I will read only a few names.

This letter was written on the 16th of May. It was prompted by the Senator from Delaware. All the letters that were written in response to the outburst of the Senator from Delaware were not written to the Senator.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator's correspondent show he made a request for a contribution?

Mr. CONNALLY. This one does not.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the letter show that?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it does not. I will read a portion of it.

Mr. HASTINGS. The important point is, did the man who made the request for the contribution have some sort of control over the farmer which put the farmer in a position where he felt compelled to contribute or to be punished afterward?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course not.

Mr. HASTINGS. "Of course not." That is easy to say, but difficult to prove.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. HASTINGS. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator evidently is unacquainted with farming. He does not know much about farming. We do not live under a feudalistic system in our State—either an industrial feudalism or an agricultural feudalism. Who in the county would have the power to go to the farmer and coerce him into contributing 50 cents toward the payment of another farmer's expenses here to Washington?

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it true or is it not true that the county committee have control over the contract which they will make with the particular farmer? Does the Senator know whether or not that is true?

Mr. CONNALLY. The county committee does have a good deal of authority, of course, with regard to the acreage and things of that kind; but an appeal from its action is provided.

Mr. HASTINGS. To whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. To the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HASTINGS. In Washington?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. To whom ought it to be made? I suppose the Senator from Delaware would expect the appeal to be made to the Department of the Interior, or to the Navy Department, or to the War Department.

Mr. HASTINGS. No. Does the Senator from Texas really think a farmer planting 10 acres of cotton in Texas can, from a practical point of view, appeal to Washington if a county agent treats him improperly?

Mr. CONNALLY. If he has an active Representative or Senator, there is no reason why he should not. I have taken up with the Department of Agriculture many small insignificant claims. They are not beneath the notice of the Senator from Texas, whatever the practice may be in Delaware.

Mr. HASTINGS. They are not beneath the notice of the Senator from Delaware. However, is it therefore admitted that in order to get justice from the Agricultural Department a farmer must go to his Senator or to his Representative?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no; not at all! Some of the appeals probably ought to have been rejected. Action in other cases may have been due to errors. Let me just read two or three lines from a letter.

Mr. HASTINGS. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not read all of this letter. The writer says, in part:

> We, the undersigned farmers, ginners, and merchants of the Meeks, Cyclone, Zabcikville, Seaton, Stringtown, and Ratibor communities—

Not cities, not villages—just little communities. This letter comes from the county adjoining that in which I live. I know this section. I will say, however, that I had no communication with those who sent the letter. I did not write them; I did not telegraph them; I never asked them to send me any information about the matter.

> We * * * * have donated money to send our representative to Washington to thank the Government for what it has done for the farmer and what it will do for the coming year. The other thousands of representatives were paid in a similar way by their respective communities that they represent. Some of the representatives paid their own expenses, and we feel that by sending the names of the donators we can help our Senator clear some of this rumor.
>
> J. D. Roper, $1.
> W. M. Chudej, 50 cents.
> J. W. Merek, 50 cents.
> Ed. Sell, 50 cents.
> E. E. James, $1.

The concluding part of that page, consisting of three columns, and also half of the next page, contain the names and amounts. One of the donations was 10 cents:

> John Hejl, 10 cents.

Of course, the Senator from Delaware, no doubt, will sneer and no doubt will poke fun and scorn and ridicule at a farmer contributing 10 cents to help pay the expenses of a delegate to Washington; but, Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Delaware that the gratitude and the appreciation of the farmers of America for the enactment of the farm program under the present administration have been so great

and so universal, as I have found among the farming people of my State, and as other Senators with whom I have discussed the question have found among the farmers of their States—that it is not remarkable to me, at least, that they should contribute from their scant resources these insignificant, these humble sums in order to send their representatives to Washington so as to let the Government, and the country as well, know that they have gained benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and that they are grateful to the Government for its action.

The farmers did not come here threatening anyone. The Senator from Delaware says he expects an army here next week threatening somebody. This army of farmers, four or five thousand from all parts of the country, did not come to Washington with guns in their hands. They did not come to Washington with clubs in their hands. They came with hands knotty and gnarled, perhaps, by toil out in the fields, to thank the Government for putting into effect the agricultural program.

The other day the Senator from Delaware said the Agricultural Department had been paying farmers to do nothing. I hope he did not mean that. I know the Senator from Delaware never farmed. I can see, from his smooth features and his velvet-like hands, that he never touched the plow handle. I can tell from his well-groomed appearance that he never knew what it was to rise with the coming of the sun and toil out under a broiling sun until eventide had come. Ah, the Senator from Delaware does not understand the trials and the hardships which come to the farmer. I am not surprised that he, sitting yonder in Wilmington, looking out through crystal panes on the crowded city, where the munitions makers roll by in their Rolls-Royce automobiles, while an army of their emissaries marches forth to Washington when we have the naval bill pending before us, to assault the doors of the Treasury—I am not much surprised that one with such an environment, grown and cultured like an orchid in a hothouse [laughter in the galleries], should feel no response of sympathy to the horny-handed farmer who has the temerity to leave his fields in the springtime and come to Washington to thank a great and generous Government.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation for the RECORD?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to hear from the Senator.

Mr. HASTINGS. I should like the Senator to know a fact of which I am very proud, namely, that I spent the first 18 years of my life on a farm, and performed actual farm work, and I am satisfied I know very much more about farming than does the Senator from Texas. In addition to that, I spent the first money I earned to buy a farm, and I own two farms, tenanted by two good Democrats, who have never taken a dime from the Federal Government, and who admit they have one of the best landlords in the State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not astonished by the Senator's statement. Most lands are owned by the Republicans, and most of the work on those lands is done by the Democrats. [Laughter.]

I congratulate the Senator from Delaware. The first 18 years of his life he lived on a farm. As soon as he came to the age of intellectual maturity he left the farm. He did not buy a farm until some time after he left the farm of his boyhood. After he had gone out into more remunerative occupations or professions he was then able to accumulate enough funds to go back and, for political purposes, acquire a farm in order that he might be tied back to the soil; but not since he was 18 years of age has he ever done any work on the farm. He farmed a farm until he was 18, and since that time he has farmed the farmer. [Laughter.]

I am glad to know the background of the Senator. There is all the more reason why one who has that kind of a background, who was raised on a farm until he was 18 years of age, should not now desert the farmer and hurl scorn and ridicule at him because he desires to come to Washington.

The Senator from Delaware adverted to the county contracts. The Department of Agriculture advised me that the county agent had nothing to do with the contracts. If a farmer protests a contract, the appeal is automatically transmitted to an appeal board. That is required by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter addressed to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] under date of May 16, 1935, from Chester C. Davis, the Agricultural Adjustment Administrator. I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD the letter to which I referred a moment ago containing the list of contributors and the amounts of their contribution; and another list of similar character, of contributors, with the amounts of their contributions, from Anderson County, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONEY in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits A, B, and C.)

Mr. CONNALLY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter sent to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] by the Secretary of Agriculture. Did the Senator from Delaware have the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HASTINGS. I did.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I withdraw the request. I desired to have the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have here other material which I may at a later date request to have printed in the RECORD, because it substantiates all that has been said by the Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, Mr. Davis, in the letters to the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Delaware.

The Senator from Delaware made some complaint that the chamber of commerce, which came here recently, was not received at the White House. It would have been received at the White House, no doubt, had it asked to be received; but the chamber of commerce came here not in the spirit of cooperation with the administration and the President, but in a spirit of hostility. Its members came here to attack, and that is the reason why its visit was so pleasing to the Senator from Delaware. If the army of farmers had come to Washington not to express their appreciation, but to protest against the administration's policies, the Senator from Delaware never would have raised his voice in this Chamber, but would perhaps be applauding on the sidelines.

The Senator from Delaware said it is ridiculous to compare the visit of the chamber of commerce to condemn with the visit of the farmers to approve. Of course, it is ridiculous, because the chamber of commerce meets here every year, he said, and because they meet here every year he makes no complaint; but because the farmers come here once in a lifetime the Senator from Delaware is outraged.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. HASTINGS. What has the Senator to say with reference to the two letters I read showing that in two instances—one in particular—money was raised for one delegate and a lawyer was picked who was not satisfactory? Then they raised money for another delegate and a banker was chosen. That happened in two instances, but one of them was in Texas. What does the Senator say of such delegates as a representative farming group?

Mr. CONNALLY. All the information I have about that is the letter which the Senator from Delaware read. I did not hear all the letters, though I tried to listen patiently. If a banker is a farmer I see no reason why he should not come to Washington in connection with the farm program, just the same as a man who is a farmer and is not a banker. If a man owns an interest in a bank, that is no reason to me why he ought to be ostracized. I am not one who is prejudiced against a man because he is a banker. Why should he not be interested? How can the banks survive, how can the industries in the city of Wilmington, Del., survive, how can the far-flung commerce and industry of the United States survive, unless agriculture, the foundation of all our

prosperity and advancement, survives and prospers? Forsooth, if a banker is willing for the moment, we will say, to sacrifice his own selfish interests, and is willing to come to Washington to advance an agricultural program, why should he be pointed to with scorn because he does not happen to be an actual dirt farmer out on the farm?

Mr. President, we welcome any man in favor of the advancement of agriculture, whether he be a dirt farmer, a banker, a financier, or a Senator from Delaware. We welcome all of them. There is nothing inconsistent with one of those delegates having been a banker. I am surprised that the Senator from Delaware should throw odium on a man simply because he happens to be a banker.

Mr. President, what is the trouble with the situation? There is a large element in America which wants to get rid of the processing tax. There was a drive made on Washington not long ago from New England. I have no prejudice against New England because it is New England. I am an American. I love every portion of this Republic. I claim to be an inheritor of the glories not alone of those who landed in Virginia and settled the Old Dominion, but of those who landed in Massachusetts. I claim a right to the glories of the fathers of the country no matter where they live. My direct ancestor was a soldier in the Revolutionary Army. I am not referring to New England in any narrow or provincial or prejudiced fashion.

But delegates came here from New England, from Georgia, from North Carolina, representing the milling interests, demanding that the Government remove the processing tax and go back to the old system under which the farmer operated. Was there any complaint from the Senator from Delaware when those emissaries of the milling interests wanted the processing tax removed? I did not hear his clarion voice ring out in this Chamber demanding to know who paid the expenses of the milling interests who wanted to have the processing tax repealed. The Senator from Delaware reserved his thunders, held his fire, marshaled his heavy artillery for the little band of farmers who came, not to demand favors, but to thank a great and generous government.

Why was it desired to have processing tax repealed? We were told that unless we removed the processing tax Japan would flood our markets. Then it was shown that Japan exported to the United States less than 1 percent, less than one-hundredth part, of the cotton production of the United States. Prosperity under a successful farm program depends upon the retention of the processing tax. It is the only way in which the farmer can get back some of the bounty which he has been paying throughout the years to the specially protected and favored industrial interests of America.

The fight on the A. A. A., the fight on the farmers coming to Washington, the insinuation, the accusation, the suspicion about them coming here and who influenced them to come, and the charges about the measly, pitiful little sums which were collected to pay their expenses, all have their origin in the movement to do away with the processing tax and to turn agriculture back into the ruin and chaos through which it staggered for the 12 years preceding the present administration. There, and there alone, is the source of this attack.

I happen to know that some of the letters which were read by the Senator from Delaware were written by interests who are opposed to the A. A. A., because they claim it interferes with their former privileges and their former business opportunities.

Mr. President, I shall consume no more of the time of the Senate. It has been proven beyond any question of doubt that the Department of Agriculture did not finance the farmers' trip to Washington. It has been demonstrated that the expenses were paid by local collections and local assessments. Now, the Senator from Delaware, when driven from these two positions, falls back on a general attack on the whole farm program. That was his objective in the beginning. That was the design of all his strategy and all his grand tactics. They had for a final objective the destruction of the farm program and an attack on the President of the United States.

The other matters were incidental. The other things were only excuses for the Senator being able to consume so much of the time of the Senate and so much space in the newspapers. Tomorrow he will get the headlines. We will not get any headlines. Great headlines will appear in the papers tomorrow, "Senator from Delaware! Senator from Delaware! Senator HASTINGS launches attack on Agricultural Administration! Senator from Delaware reads letters from farmers!"

Those are the most welcome letters from farmers that the Senator from Delaware ever received. He was glad to receive that kind of letters from the farmers.

Mr. President, I am not entirely without hope for the Senator from Delaware. I trust he will not further harden his heart. I hope he will remember that on his own side of the aisle there is a Member from Kansas, a State which raises wheat. I wish to remind him that under the former program, the price of wheat was 38 cents a bushel at Chicago and 23 cents a bushel on the farm in Kansas. I wish to remind him, in the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], that the same farmers in Kansas, instead of getting 23 cents a bushel for their wheat on the farm, are now getting 75 cents a bushel for their wheat. I wish to remind the Senator from Delaware that sitting beside him is the beloved and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who comes from a State which raises great numbers of cattle, a State which produces wheat and other agricultural products, and that under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration every one of those commodities has reached heights two and three times the prices which prevailed under the policies of the Senator from Delaware. I remind him that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] comes from another Commonwealth where the prices of agricultural products have been lifted, and the farmers who toil in the sugar-beet fields and in other fields of that State are receiving more for their products than they received in other days.

So I might go on down the line, and call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] and the Senators from other States in the West. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not be so blind in his zeal, that he will not be so stubborn in his prejudice, that he will not continue to be so inexorable in his hostility to the administration and to President Roosevelt, as to arraign and aline all of his forces to beat down agricultural prices to their former levels and to deliver the farmer from the degree of prosperity to which he has succeeded to the miserable and unfortunate condition to which he was driven prior to 1933.

EXHIBIT A

MAY 16, 1935.

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ROBINSON: This is in response to your request for information concerning the truth of charges made in Congress and in certain newspapers that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration organized and financed or otherwise sponsored the meeting of farmers in Washington May 14.

The attitude of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is and has been that the right of the farmers to come to Washington was not open to question and that this right is the right of petition established in the Constitution for all American citizens without discrimination.

The Adjustment Administration therefore has considered it to be wholly and exclusively the right and responsibility of the farmers themselves to decide and act without being influenced. This right and this responsibility have been respected by the Adjustment Administration and its personnel.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has not sponsored nor financed, nor permitted its agents to sponsor, nor permitted county production control association funds to be used to finance, the farmers' visit to Washington. On the other hand, the Adjustment Administration has never denied the right of farmers to visit their Capital, has not attempted to discourage them from doing so, and upon their arrival in Washington welcomed them, and rendered to them assistance requested by them when we could give it.

Reference has been made in the Senate to correspondence in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration relating to the farmers' meeting. Several weeks ago I had information of the meeting from the newspapers, first publishing reports from Texas, and

later I heard of it from farmers and by correspondence from field personnel.

On April 27, J. V. Cain, agricultural agent of Elwood, Nebr., wrote, and the letter was answered May 7, through the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. A copy of the letter and the reply follow:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF NEBRASKA

ELWOOD, NEBR., *April 27, 1935.*

Secretary WALLACE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please send to me what information you have available regarding the proposed farmers' meeting to be held in Washington soon. Be assured we will do all we can to make the program a success.

Very truly yours,

J. V. CAIN, *Agricultural Agent.*

—

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1935.

J. V. CAIN,
Agricultural Agent, Elwood, Nebr.

DEAR MR. CAIN: In response to your letter of April 27 to Secretary Wallace, I wish to advise that we have no information concerning the farmers' meeting to be held soon in Washington. There have been newspaper accounts of a group of Texas farmers who propose to come to Washington for the purpose of conferring with various agencies of the Government, but this meeting is not under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture or any of its agencies. It is our understanding that this movement was a spontaneous development out in the country, and our information as to the plans is limited to the newspaper accounts which have come to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

MILO PERKINS,
Assistant to Secretary.

On May 3, C. H. Day, chairman of the farmers' committee on arrangements, wrote to me, telling me that several hundred farmers were planning to visit Washington. The letter was received by the administration May 6. Another letter, written May 4 and received May 7, invited myself and administration heads to participate in the farmers' program.

I replied on May 10, thanking Mr. Day for his courtesy, saying it was my understanding that the farmers would pay their own expenses and pointed out that organized movements of farmers to Washington should not be stimulated by Government officials nor financed by county control association funds.

This correspondence follows:

PLAINVIEW, TEX., *May 3, 1935.*

Mr. CHESTER DAVIS,
Director Agricultural Adjustment Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: Please find enclosed a copy of a letter which has been addressed to the Texas Members of Congress, May 1, and a letter of this date to Hon. MARVIN JONES, Chairman of the Agricultural Committee. This is for your information.

To date we have received communications from the following States, indicating the number of farmers that will attend from these States: Arkansas, 160; Louisiana, 2 trainloads; Alabama, 100; Georgia, 200; South Carolina, 250; North Carolina, 250; Texas, 280.

Favorable reports have been received from the leaders in Minnesota, Kansas, Oklahoma, California, Idaho, Wyoming, Arizona, Virginia, New Mexico, Kentucky, Maryland, and Iowa. It appears that the program recently planned will be carried out without material change.

I have a wire from Senator CONNALLY stating that the Labor Building has been obtained for Tuesday, May 14, from 10 a. m. to 1 p. m.

Thanking you for your cooperation, I am,

Yours very truly,

C. H. DAY,
Chairman Committee on Arrangements.

—

PLAINVIEW, TEX., *May 4, 1935.*

Mr. CHESTER DAVIS,
Director Agriculture Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I have been sending to your office carbon copies of letters to Senators and Representatives and perhaps others for your general information in regard to the farmers' program in Washington.

Please consider this letter an invitation to yourself and your Department heads for active participation in the program in Washington.

Thanking you for your cooperation, I am,

Yours very truly,

C. H. DAY,
Chairman Committee on Arrangements.

—

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1935.

Mr. C. H. DAY,
Plainview, Tex.

DEAR MR. DAY: I have your letter of May 3 and its enclosures with reference to the proposed coming to Washington of a large delegation of producers from the Southern and Middle Western States. I note that you are planning a meeting for a discussion of the agricultural situation, and to obtain suggestions on the basis of which further plans for meeting the situation may be developed on a sound and logical basis. We shall be glad, of course, to cooperate in supplying any facts or information which may be helpful in your discussions.

As I understand it, the coming of this delegation to Washington is a spontaneous movement on the part of producers desiring to express their views on the agricultural situation and the progress which is being made in meeting it. It is my understanding, also, that the expedition is being personally financed by producers.

In this connection I hope you will pardon my expressing concern that there should be no cases where county production control associations undertake to finance the expenses of a representative on this trip. Probably this caution is unnecessary, but I think you realize that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration's policy is that organized movements of farmers to come to Washington should not be stimulated by Government officials nor be financed by county control associations. As a precaution, I have instructed our field representatives to be alert in preventing any violation of this policy.

I wish to express my appreciation of your courtesy in advising us of your plans, and wish to assure you that we shall be glad to be of service to you if desired upon your arrival in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS, *Administrator.*

On May 8, with my approval and at my direction, George E. Farrell, director of the grains division, sent the following telegram to directors of extension in wheat States:

MAY 8, 1935.

Mr. H. UMBERGER,
Extension Director, Manhattan, Kans.:

I am advised that farmer groups are planning trip to Washington to confer with Congress on adjustment programs. Advise all county wheat production control associations that no wheat association funds may be used either directly or indirectly to defray travel or other expenses for this purpose.

GEORGE E. FARRELL, *Grain Division.*

A similar blanket telegram was sent on the same date to corn-hog section field men by Claude R. Wickard, chief of the corn and hogs section. This telegram follows:

MAY 8, 1935.

Mr. RALPH N. MOYER,
Care A. J. Surratt, 226 Federal Building,
Springfield, Ill.

Mr. R. E. STRASSHEIM,
Care A. J. Surratt, 226 Federal Building,
Springfield, Ill.

Mr. R. M. EVANS EVANS,
Chairman Iowa Corn Hog Committee,
310 United States Court House, Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. ARDEN MCKEE,
Care of H. Umberger, Director of
Extension Col. of Agriculture, Manhattan, Kans.

Mr. J. J. REED,
Care A. E. Anderson, 1105 State House, Lincoln, Nebr.

Agricultural Adjustment Administration does not wish its representatives to take part in organized movements to encourage farmers to come to Washington. Agricultural Adjustment Administration funds or county control association funds cannot be used for that purpose. Will appreciate your cooperation in observing this policy.

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Chief Corn and Hogs Section,
Division of Livestock and Feed Grains.

—

On May 9 C. H. Alvord, assistant director of the division of cotton, telegraphed to D. F. Trent, director of extension, Stillwater, Okla., in response to a request for a letter of authorization to accompany a group of two cars of cotton producers:

MAY 9, 1935.

D. F. TRENT,
Director of Extension, Stillwater, Okla.:

Your telegram this date. No authorization for travel will be issued to any department employee connection with cotton producers meeting here next week.

C. H. ALVORD,
Assistant Director Division of Cotton.

—

Telegrams were sent by Reuben Brigham on May 9 to five regional informational representatives. The text of this telegram follows:

MAY 9, 1935.

The following statement is being sent to all field representatives. Agricultural Adjustment Administration does not wish its representatives to take part in organized movements to encourage farmers to come to Washington. Agricultural Adjustment Administration funds or county control association funds cannot be used for that purpose. Will appreciate your cooperation in observing this policy.

REUBEN BRIGHAM.

I believe that the foregoing correspondence, which includes all relevant communications, omitting duplications and letters having little direct bearing on the farmers' meeting, will be sufficient

to show that the farmers came to Washington of their own volition and paid their own way here.

I wish to reiterate, the farmers have as much right to express themselves, and if they want to, to come to their Capital to do it, as other people.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS, *Administrator.*

EXHIBIT B

BURLINGTON, TEX., *May 16, 1935.*

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Senator of Texas:

In reply to the statement brought out by the newspapers that the G. O. P. is accusing our Government of paying the expense of sending the farmer representatives to Washington, we, the undersigned farmers, ginners, and merchants of the Meeks, Cyclone, Zabcikville, Seaton, Stringtown, and Ratibor communities, have donated money to send our representatives to Washington to thank the Government for what it has done for the farmer and what it will do for the coming year. The other thousands of representatives were paid in a similar way by their respective communities that they represent. Some of the representatives paid their own expense, and we feel that by sending the names of the donators we can help our Senator clear some of this rumor.

J. D. Roper	$1.00
W. M. Chudej	.50
J. W. Marek	.50
Ed Sell	.50
E. E. James	1.00
A. J. Klecka	.50
Paul Wychopen	.75
Frank Marek	.50
Robert Matheson	.50
Sil Bartek	.50
Paul Wychopen, Jr	.50
C. W. Bedrich	.30
J. P. Bell	.25
Anton Gerza	.25
Albert Pagel	.25
Adolph Schiller	.50
L. C. Schiller	.25
Emmitt James	.50
W. J. Baletka	1.00
Frank Pagach	.25
Frank Spanhel	.35
Henry Zabcik	.50
Geo. Jurcak	.50
F. J. Klecka	.25
A. L. Laferney	.25
J. B. Schiller	.30
J. F. Salac	.25
Lee Schneider	.25
Oscar Bedrick	.25
O. J. Sebesta	1.00
Ben Zabcik	.50
Joe Zucha	.25
Frank Bresch	.50
Frank Bedrich	.50
F. J. Bedrich, Jr	.50
Ernest Goeke	.25
Martin Zabcik	.50
Steve Polzel	.25
Edw. Hesse	.25
Lee Casey	.25
M. R. Krummnow	.50
F. E. Hejl	.25
F. E. Hejl, Jr	.25
H. M. Jakubik	2.00
Joe Chlapek	.30
J. A. Talasek	.50
R. J. Hanacek	.25
Joe Grygar	.30
Frank Bigon	.40
Frank Tyroch	.25
John Brenek	.25
Emil Motl	.25
Steve Rusnak	.25
John Machalek	.50
Joe Chudej	.25
John Grygar	.25
Jerry Bavovec	.25
Jon Maruna	.50
Joe Vanicek	.50
A. J. Sodek	.25
Joe Machalek	.25
Joe Chlaupka	.25
O. H. Juren	.50
Vallie Maruna	.25
Mrs. Joe Mukalas	.75
Joe Schiller	.50
Ed Doskocil	.35
Erwin Pimpler	.25
Lee Hoelscher	.10
A. Kohut	.25
J. M. Bartek	.35
J. V. Kohut	.50
Verny Kessler	$0.50
W. F. Mikeska	.10
Joe Mikeska	.20
Hoelscher Bros	1.00
W. L. Gent	.25
Hugo Greene	.50
E. W. Schiller	.25
Joe Kohut	.25
H. H. Schmidt	.25
Louis Posvar	.10
A. F. Gaistman	.25
Lee Greene	.25
Gus Schneider	.50
Joe Zavodny	.55
J. E. Wentrchek	.25
Joe Psencik	.20
Paul Goldman	.10
E. R. Schiller	.20
E. J. Zavodny	.20
Frank Lesikar	.50
A. P. Engbreck	.25
Joe Milander	.25
Lee Doskocil	.35
E. A. Bruggman	.50
L. R. Engbrock	.50
Ladis Salac	.35
W. O. Marburger	.25
E. G. Swll	.50
W. D. Bull	.50
J. L. Marek	.50
E. J. Marek	.50
Alois Schneider	.25
A. J. Schneider	.50
Edmund Kosel	.35
Franklin Green	.25
J. V. Wentrchek	.25
Tom Luksa	.25
J. R. Pitrucha	.35
F. H. Psencik	.25
Rosie Placek	.25
Joe V. Macek	.25
J. W. Marek, Jr	.25
Steve Janacek	.35
J. T. Stepan	.50
Jim Ruzicka	.10
Wiley Mangum	.25
M. G. Stepan	.15
Jerry Beran	.15
Charles Tomasek	.25
H. A. Meadows	.25
L. O. Donhafer	.25
C. L. Shook	.25
J. C. Bartek	.20
Ed Bartek	.25
Tom Adamek	.25
Joe F. Vitek	.25
John R. Schiller	.25
John Hejl	.10
M. C. Zabcik	.25
Emil Vasek	.25
W. J. Salac	.25
Adolf Millian	.25
F. J. Zabcik	.50
L. B. Griffin	.25
J. J. Barek	.25
Ernest Junek	.25
Emil Feytasek	.10
Louis Schiller	.25
M. L. Hawkins	.25
John Bedrick	.25
M. J. Stepam	.50
F. J. A. Marek	.50
Frank Adamek	.25
Rogers community	11.50
Stringtown community	7.00
Red Ranger community	4.00
Farmers, Inc	20.00

The above are the names of the individuals and different communities that have donated money to send our representative, Mr. W. J. Baletka, to Washington.

Recopied from the original record by—

W. M. CHUDEJ,
Committeeman, Burlington, Tex., Route 1.

EXHIBIT C

LIST OF DONATIONS GIVEN BY FARMERS TO HELP PAY THE EXPENSES OF THE FOLLOWING FARMER DELEGATES TO WASHINGTON FROM ANDERSON COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. J. F. Gray, a farmer from the Slocum community, paid his entire expenses out of his own pocket.

J. S. Carroll, route 2, Palestine, Tex.
T. A. Carroll, Tennessee Colony, Tex.
S. D. Watkins, route 1, Percilla, Tex.
J. E. Mills, box 25, Slocum, Tex.
Joe E. Edmindson, route 1, Palestine, Tex.

The above-named five men accepted the donation as listed and then paid the balance of their expenses out of their own pockets.

Carroll, George B	$1.00
Avant, M. E	1.00
Campbell, C. H	1.00
Steel, G. A	1.00
Eubanks, J. K	1.00
Carroll, T. A	1.00
Woolverton, Mrs. B. J	1.00
Hudson, W. M	1.00
Hudson, H. L	1.00
Gore, F. M	1.00
Cross, E. M	1.00
Massey, E. H	1.00
Massey, H. L	.50
Holmes, C. E	1.00
Ward, E. E	1.00
Gore, O. B	1.00
Pugh, J. A	.50
Ingram, S. A	1.00
Johnson, R. H	1.00
Henderson, H. O	1.00
Tillman, Mildred	1.00
Edmondson, Joe E	2.00
Speegle, Dr. A. A	1.00
Carrol, J. S	1.00
Rogers, Earl	1.00
Rogers, Fred	1.00
Rogers, S. C	.50
Rogers, C. W	.50
Lade, Will	.50
Lade, Walter	.50
Elrod, C. M	.50
Elrod, T. C	.25
Roper, A. E	.25
Freeman, R. J	.25
Taylor, J. C	.25
Rogers, J. C	.25
Langston, J. W	.25
Hassell, Robert	.50
Killion, H. D	1.00
Derden, M. J	1.00
Turrentine, J. F	1.00
Sellers, T. J	.50
Godley, J. L	.25
Turrentine, F. E	.50
Hoxie, W. M	1.00
Watkins, S. D	6.00
Sloan, Henry	.50
Braly, J. W	.50
Smith, J. R	1.00
Cook, J. P	1.00
Valentine, C. T	.50
Brown, T. J	.50
Reagan, John	1.00
Hail, W. D	1.00
Herrington, F. A	2.00
Coleman, S. F	3.00
James, W. B	1.00
Murphey, H. C	1.00
Conaway, John	1.00
Strong, Mrs. C. E	1.00
Chambers, Clarence	2.00
Brede, J. A	1.00
Edmondson, M. P	1.00
Fish, Eugene	1.00
Scott, J. S	1.00
Boyd, J. L	1.00
Huffman, M. E	1.40
Poole, H	1.35
Huffman, B. M	.25
Wilkinson, R. A	1.00
Hyett, J. C	1.00
Ward, W. H	.25
Berry, Clay	.25
Herrington, W. L	.25
Herrington, Mrs. V	.25
Lucas, Mack	.25
Wilbanks, Martin	.25
Sammans, Eli	.10
Berry, Amos	.10
Herrington, J. B	.10
Parrish, M. G	.25
Davis, C. D	1.00
Jones, Major	.25
Walters, H. A	.50
Farrish, W. H	.50
Lasiter, Lee	.25
Hassell, J. E	.50
Langston, A. C	.25
Worley, C. E	.25
Dotson, R. L	.50
Worley, J. L	.50
Worley, E. T	.09
Knox, E. C	.50
Lasiter, Harley	.25
Lasiter, Lude	.25
Lasiter, Seldon	.25
Langston, A. M	$0.25
Lasiter, Allen	.25
Teel, E. W	.25
Hassell, Alex	.25
Killion, A. C	.25
Swanson, H. C	.25
Gibson, R. L	1.00
Hassell, A. J	.25
Burke, R. O	.50
Lasiter, T. W	1.00
Huddleston, R. S	.50
Wortham, W. L	.25
Melton, R. T	.25
Langston, H. C	.25
Clark, Harry	1.00
Moore, Judge Jim	1.00
Mills, J. E	3.00
Fitzgerald, Mrs. H. H	1.00
Fitzgerald, H. N	1.00
Williams, J. W	.50
Kale, J. L	.50
Jenkins, R. E	.05
Williams, G. H	.50
Price, Mrs. Minnie W	1.00
Milner, T. O	1.00
Taylor, Cora	.25
Warren, G. T	.05
Reagan, Dave	.50
Woodard, J. C	.50
Ward, G. W	.25
Sanders, E. A	.25
Taylor, Alpheus	.10
Johnson, Pervy	.25
Huddleston, Cliff	.75
Vannoy, Tom	.25
White, Marion	.25
White, Dave	.25
Barnhart, M. A	.50
Cook, Simmons	.50
Richardson, Clyde	.50
Austin, Bruce	1.00
Johnson, Marshall	1.00
Brooks, Bailey	.50
Johnson, Poyner	1.00
Austin, M. B	1.00
Dr. Scarborough & Sons	1.00
Miller, Jack	.50
Millier, Hill	.50
Miller, Hugh	.50
Miller, Mrs. S. T	.50
Royall, Tucker	5.00
Angly, J. E	1.00
Hufsmith, C. L	1.00
Bowers, Willie	1.00
Cretsinger, E. E	1.00
Jennings, C. M	1.00
Bridges, S. E	.50
Lumpkin, Champ	.25
Pinson, Simon	.25
Phillips, Frank	.25
Williamson, W. C	.50
Conaway, R. L	.50
Flanagan, W. B	.50
Schmidt, Herman	1.00
Wilson, J. J	.25
Robinson, C	.25
Dial, G. W	.25
Sutton, Gay	1.00
Ramsey, Jesse	.50
Price, Abel	1.00
Fitzgerald, W. G	1.00
Ward, J. H	1.00
Williams, F. C	.35
Price, Asa	.25
Price, S. N	.65
Price, R. V	1.00
Price, Carroll	.25
Milner, J. B	1.00
Tomkins, Reed	.25
Holmes, J. E	.50
Hutcherson, J. D	.30
Holmes, P. C	.50
Biggan, J. J	1.00
Howard, J. B	.50
Todd, W. T	1.00
Elrod, H. C	.50
Petri, C. P	3.25
Schmidt, George	.50
McCain, E. T	.50
Edwards, Rufo	.10
Schwitter, Frank	.25
Handorf, Mayor	1.00
Butler, Wade	.25
Murrell Variety	.25
Crist, W. L	.25
Gee, J. N	1.00
Thomas, O. C	1.00
(?)	.25

Morris, F. R	$1.00
Morris, Homer	1.00
Kleins, E. F	1.00
Evans, J. R	.25
Sawyer, Ralph	.10
O'Connell, Tim	.25
Wolens, Jack	.50
Gardner, B. H	.25
Hamilton, W. M	1.00
Phillips, P. K	.35
Eppner, Frank	.50
Kolstad, P. A	.50
Wilson, S. A	.25
Henry, T. E	.50
Gee, H. A	1.00
Total	149.44

DONATIONS TOWARD PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF DELEGATES W. W. NOBLE AND T. W. HERRINGTON, OF CLAIBORNE COUNTY, MISS., TO WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 12, 1935

Name and address of donor:	*Amount*
J. L. Rice, Lorman, Miss	$2.50
Jim Currie, Barlow, Miss	1.00
Wash Burrell, Pattison, Miss	.50
D. E. McCaa, Jr., Willows, Miss	1.00
C. L. Nelson, Willows, Miss	1.00
J. G. Harmon, Willows, Miss	1.00
Jas. Brown, Willows, Miss	.25
R. D. Lawrence, Carlisle, Miss	1.00
Henry Galloway, Carlisle, Miss	1.00
E. D. Jones, Jr., Carlisle, Miss	.50
E. D. Jones, Sr., Carlisle, Miss	1.00
L. B. Wooley, Hermanville, Miss	1.00
J. L. Walters, Hermanville, Miss	.50
A. McC. Byrnes, Jr., Carlisle, Miss	1.00
C. A. Gordon, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
J. V. Gage, Port Gibson, Miss	4.00
Herman Marx, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
Est. B. H. Magruder, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
Mrs. G. F. Disharoon, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
G. L. Disharoon, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
Est. T. B. Magruder, Port Gibson, Miss	1.00
J. D. Sistrunk, Utica, Miss	2.00
J. M. Crawford, Utica, Miss	1.00
S. B. Hutchins, Utica, Miss	1.00
Dr. M. J. Luster, Clarksdale, Miss	2.00
G. Lum McCay, Utica, Miss	3.00
W. H. Clark, Utica, Miss	.50
S. H. White, Utica, Miss	.50
J. H. Sanders, route 2, Utica, Miss	1.00
A. B. Crawford, Utica, Miss	1.00
Fred G. Peyton, Utica, Miss	2.00
F. A. Peyton, Utica, Miss	1.00
Morgan Hutchins, Utica, Miss	1.00
E. V. Hutchins, Utica, Miss	1.00
H. B. Tinsley, Willows, Miss	1.00
R. E. Templeton, Utica, Miss	2.00
S. H. Hill, Utica, Miss	1.00
J. G. Hill, Hankinson, Miss	1.00
F. F. Powell, Hankinson, Miss	1.00
Chas. Frazier, Willows, Miss	1.00
Jackson Powell, Willows, Miss	.50
Bryant Brown, Willows, Miss	.50
W. L. Henderson, Willows, Miss	.50
Arch Carter, Willows, Miss	.50
Ruben Barnes, Willows, Miss	.25
Hence Steed, Jr., Willows, Miss	.50
John Caldwell, Willows, Miss	.50
Raymond Harrod, Hankinson, Miss	.50
Oscar Barnes, Willows, Miss	.25
S. P. Sorrels, Peyton, Miss	.25
T. H. McFatter, Pattison, Miss	1.00
J. B. Manis, Pattison, Miss	.25
I. R. Price, Pattison, Miss	1.00
Vernon Y. Jones, Pattison, Miss	.25
C. C. Greer, Pattison, Miss	.10
E. M. Jordan, Pattison, Miss	2.00
W. D. Irby, Pattison, Miss	.10
Emmet Griffin, Pattison, Miss	.50
Wm. Wood, Pattison, Miss	.05
Luther Mason, Pattison, Miss	.50
W. C. Wilkerson, Pattison, Miss	1.00
Eliza and Priscilla Brady, Pattison, Miss	5.00
D. B. Irby, Pattison, Miss	.30
Willie Weaver, Tillman, Miss	.25
A. J. Hannis, Pattison, Miss	.25
W. T. Hannis, Pattison, Miss	.25
Wm. Smith, Pattison, Miss	1.00
F. E. Herring, Pattison, Miss	.50
Lewis Carmichael, Pattison, Miss	.50
W. H. Rogers, Pattison, Miss	.50
Lee Bouie, Peyton, Miss	.25
J. P. Collins, Peyton, Miss	.50
B. F. Newman, Pattison, Miss	.30
J. Mack Jones, Pattison, Miss	.50
W. H. Harrell, Peyton, Miss	.50
Sylvan Cohn, Lorman, Miss	2.00

Name and address of donor—Continued.	*Amount*
C. S. Harris, Port Gibson, Miss	$1.00
S. P. Headley, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
Samuel Weil, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
C. R. Irving, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
J. A. Callender, Port Gibson, Miss	1.00
W. C. Billingslea, Russum, Miss	1.00
J. P. Russum, Russum, Miss	1.00
D. M. Dowdell, Port Gibson, Miss	2.00
L. Briscoe Allen, Port Gibson, Miss	2.50
Russell L. Fox, Pattison, Miss	2.00
Total donations	94.35

REGULATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall not discuss very long the question of whether or not the expenses of the farmers who came here to Washington were paid by the Department of Agriculture or by anybody else. I do know, however, that the farmers who came from my own State paid their own way, and their expenses were not paid by anybody connected with the Department of Agriculture.

I am glad to see the Senator from Delaware defending the wheat farmers of Montana. I know they will be happy to learn that they have in the Senate of the United States such a distinguished defender.

I desire at this time, however, to call attention to a so-called "minority report", which was filed by the Senator from Delaware on the so-called "public utility bill"; and then I wish to call attention to an advertisement which was published by the Associated Gas & Electric Co., one of the worst offenders in the United States of America, a concern which has been engaged in legalized thievery to a greater extent than almost any other corporation in this country, with the exception of the Insull corporations. I should like to have the Members of the Senate read the advertisement of the Associated Gas & Electric Co., and then read the minority report filed by the Senator from Delaware, and they will see the parallel.

The heading of the advertisement of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. is:

RAILROADING UTILITIES TO DESTRUCTION

The report of the Senator from Delaware says, in substance, that the bill was railroaded through the committee; and the report, as printed in the New York Herald Tribune, says:

Minority report invites defeat. Railroading of utility company measure hit by Senator HASTINGS.

Then I call attention to the advertisement printed by the Associated Gas & Electric Co. They say:

The committee did not take very seriously this matter of destroying the investments of millions of American citizens.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In what newspaper was that advertisement carried?

Mr. WHEELER. It was carried in the Philadelphia Bulletin of Friday, May 17, 1935.

Mr. BARKLEY. I happened to notice the same advertisement in my home-town newspaper, which I received yesterday; the object, of course, being so obvious that it does not even need to be called to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly. As a matter of fact, when the utilities thought the bill was coming up this week in the Senate, I am reliably informed that they spent $60,000 in advertising throughout the country, and in their advertisements urged their stockholders to send in telegrams, and that in some instances they made house-to-house canvasses.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield further, I have not read the advertisement he has in his hand, but if it is the same one which appeared in my home-town newspaper, there is not a single truthful sentence in it from beginning to end.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly; and there is not a word of truth in this advertisement; yet let me call attention to the fact that language used in the minority report is of the same purport and is almost the same language as that used in this advertisement.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator find in the minority views anything which is not true?

Mr. WHEELER. Absolutely.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then the Senator and I disagree. What particular part is it?

Mr. WHEELER. I will call the Senator's attention to it in a little while.

Let me say to the Senator that the whole implication from his report is that the bill was railroaded through the committee. There is not a word of truth in that statement. The fact is that the bill was given more consideration in the committee than almost anything else.

The Senator's report starts out by saying:

On February 6, 1935, S. 1725 was introduced by Senator WHEELER. The bill was commonly known as "the public utility holding company bill." About that same time a similar bill, if not identical, was introduced in the House.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee began hearings on the bill on the 19th of February and continued the said hearings until the 15th of April, a period of nearly 2 months.

That is correct. I had planned to start hearings at the same time; but the Public Utility Committee came and asked me, as Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, not to hold hearings at the same time the House was holding them. In order to accommodate the Public Utility Committee—their own committee—I postponed the hearings until after the House had finished its hearings.

The House committee held hearings for 2 months. The utilities came there and piled up testimony of the same kind, repetition after repetition. When their committee came to see me I said to them in unmistakable terms that the same procedure could not take place before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. Why? Because their purpose was first to hold hearings for 2 months in the House of Representatives, and then come over before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee and adopt the same identical tactics before that committee. If the Senator from Delaware does not know it, he is about the only member of the committee who does not know it. I knew exactly what they intended to do; namely, to stall and stall and keep stalling until the expiration of the present session, so that there should not be an opportunity to vote upon the bill at this session of the Congress.

I said to the committee of public-utility representatives, "We will give the proponents of the bill 1 week's time, and we will give you 1 week's time." They came to me with a list of witnesses, and we started in at 10 o'clock in the morning, and we held hearings not only all the forenoon but all the afternoon. The members of the committee sat there, and the Senator from Delaware did not often honor us with his presence. We sat there from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon, listening to the witnesses. Finally, when the proponents of the bill had concluded their testimony, on Friday, I think it was, we offered to sit on the following day, but the public-utility men came to the committee and said they did not care to start on Saturday, that they preferred to start on Monday, and said they could finish in 1 week's time. We gave them not only the time we agreed upon, but we gave them more than that time; and we heard them not only in the mornings, as I said originally we would, but we sat every afternoon, sometimes starting in at 1 o'clock and running until 5 or 6 o'clock in the evening.

The Senator was not there; but I was there, and other members of the committee stayed there faithfully. We heard every objection that was offered; and not only did we hear the objections of the members of the State commissions and their attorneys, but, as a matter of fact, we adopted many of the amendments which were suggested by the State commissions.

The Senator would give the impression that we paid no attention to their objections. Of course we did not kill the bill, which was what they wanted done. There was nothing else wanted except an outright killing of the bill and all of its provisions, regulatory and otherwise.

They first said, "If you will just take out one provision, it will be all right", and if we took that out they would want every other provision taken out. We took out the provision making common carriers of public utilities. We took out of the bill the provision making them apply for certificates of convenience and necessity. Yet they say we paid no attention to their objections.

Those were two of the principal objections which they had to title II of the bill, and those provisions were eliminated because the members of the committee agreed that those two provisions ought to be eliminated. We adopted not one, not two, but we adopted hundreds of suggestions that were made by the public-utility operating companies of the United States.

Of course, the Associated Gas complained that they did not get an opportunity to be heard. Why were they not heard? I will tell the Senator, if he does not know, why they were not heard. I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say to the Senator why they were not heard. It was because of the fact that their own associates, the committee that was representing them, did not want them to be heard. They did not want the Associated Gas & Electric Co. to be heard.

The holding companies and the electric-utility companies selected a committee and allotted the time. I said to them, "You fix the time, and we will hear whomever you propose." Did they want the Associated Gas & Electric heard? Not at all, because the Associated Gas & Electric Co., they knew, had carried on such an illicit business that they did not want them to appear before the committee. Did they want some of the rest of them to appear? Not at all. Yet the Senator has the temerity to report that the bill was railroaded through the committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator a plain question, to point out to the Senate wherein there was any error in the minority views, and if he can convince us that there is error in it, I will stand corrected.

Mr. WHEELER. I am coming to that.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have told the facts, and I told nothing but the facts, so far as I knew them.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well. The Senator said there was no popular demand. The Senator points out that there is no popular demand for this bill; does he not?

Mr. HASTINGS. I say that there is nothing appearing in the testimony to show that there is any popular demand. If I am mistaken in that, I should like to have the Senator call my attention to the testimony.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call attention to the advertisement of the Associated Gas again:

Citizens must fight for their rights——

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is that in the record?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am reading from the advertisement.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am asking whether there is in the record anything that shows that there is a public demand for this bill? That was my allegation, that there was no public demand, and I want to know whether or not I am correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well. But the Senator put that in, and referred repeatedly to the fact that the men from the department were the only ones who testified.

I will answer the Senator's question, but I want to call attention to the language of the Associated Gas advertisement and the language used in the views of the minority filed by the Senator from Delaware.

I read now from the advertisement of the Associated Gas & Electric Co.:

Citizens must fight for their rights. There has been no popular demand for this wholesale destruction of the property of American citizens.

Wholesale destruction! Wholesale destruction of the property of American citizens! Who was it who destroyed the property and took the money from the widows and orphans who are so indispensable to the arguments of the

opponents of the bill? It was the Associated Gas & Electric Co., where they have one holding company piled upon another, where they went out and took the common stock of operating companies, put them in a holding company, and issued bonds upon that common stock, and then piled another holding company upon that, and issued bonds upon the common stock of that holding company. Then they had another holding company, and they issued bonds upon the common stock of that holding company, and they sold them to the indispensable widows and orphans of this country, and now they are calling for aid upon those widows and orphans whom they have robbed, for it cannot be said to be anything else but robbery.

They talk about the destruction of property rights in the United States of America. They had nine different holding companies one upon top of the other.

I do not know where the Senator got the language used in the minority views, but it runs almost parallel with the language of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. advertisement published all over this country.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, does the Senator intimate that I drafted the report from that advertisement?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am saying that the language used by the Senator in his report is similar to the language used in the advertisement, and it is passing strange that the language of the advertisement of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. should be almost the same as the language used by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HASTINGS. May I say to the Senator—and I say to him as a Senator—that I never saw the advertisement; I had no suggestion with respect to the minority report; it was all prepared by me myself, and I ask him with respect to the majority report whether he can say as much?

Mr. WHEELER. What was that?

Mr. HASTINGS. I say that the minority report, which I signed, was prepared solely by myself, without ever seeing the advertisement to which the Senator refers, for I never heard of it before; and I ask the Senator whether he can say as much with respect to the majority report, which was sent to the Printer 2 days before the bill was laid before the Senate committee.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator made the statement that the report was sent to the Printer 2 days before.

Mr. HASTINGS. I say so in the minority report.

Mr. WHEELER. I mean that the Senator says so there. As a matter of fact, we asked for a galley proof 2 days before the bill was finally printed. We asked the Printer to make a galley proof of it, and I know some newspaper man got hold of it, and I assume he ran to the Senator, thinking he had found out something the Senator ought to know. The truth about the matter is that when the report was drawn up under my direction by the men who had drafted the bill and who worked with the committee and the committee clerks together, we sent the draft of the report down to the Printer and asked for a galley proof.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that the consideration of the bill was completed in detail by the committee on Friday.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Every section had been gone over in detail, and every amendment had been agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Rather than have the bill introduced under its original number, with a large number of amendments, the committee authorized the chairman to introduce a new bill containing the amendments to which the committee had agreed; and the clerks of the committee and the drafting service of the Senate were instructed to and did draw the new bill incorporating the amendments which had been agreed to by the committee. The following day, after the bill had been completed in the committee by the committee itself, the draft of the report, the galley-sheet proof of the report, was sent to the Printer.

Is that not the fact?

Mr. WHEELER. That is the fact. Let me say further that we finished the report and went over the bill line for line and word for word; and then, when we finished it, I think, upon the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], it was moved and seconded that I introduce a new bill containing the amendments, as the Senator has outlined, and that we vote upon it on the following Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. But for that there would have been no further meeting of the committee, because the amendments had been agreed to, and the committee would have reported the bill on Friday or Saturday with the amendments to which the committee had agreed. However, in order that we might formally report the new, clean bill without setting out separately the amendments which had been agreed to, we adjourned until Monday, and on that day reported out the bill which we had been over in detail, sentence by sentence and line by line, for more than a week before that time.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. He is entirely correct.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. My understanding from the Senator from Kentucky is that the committee completed going over the bill on Friday, and the report was in the hands of the Printer on Saturday. I should like to know how the 60-page report was completed between that time and the time it was sent to the Printer on Saturday.

Mr. WHEELER. Because both the clerks in the committee and the men who had drafted the bill worked upon the report together.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it or is it not true that the men who drafted the bill also drafted the 60-page report?

Mr. WHEELER. That is not entirely true. They worked upon the report.

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not say it was true. I asked the question.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator asked me the question if they prepared the report.

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I say they worked upon the report in conjunction with the clerks in my office, and with my own suggestions; and I went over it with them, and suggested to them what I wanted to put in the report. These men worked until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, trying to get out the report; and after they had brought me one draft I sent it back, and suggested to them that we put in the report practically every change that had been made in the bill. The report had to be taken back again and gone over, and many changes were made in it after the first suggested draft came out.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Kentucky realize the great difficulties placed in the way of the members of the committee who could not possibly stay there all the time? Here we had a bill presented to the Senate in February, 2 months ago. It was considered, and many changes were made in it. Instead of having the bill brought back to the Senate with those changes clearly shown in it, there was presented to the committee in executive session an entirely new bill; and it is admitted by everyone there that no person had an opportunity to examine that bill before it was presented to the Senate to be voted upon.

I did not say this was railroading the bill through, but I stated the facts; and I challenge anyone to show me that any statement made in the minority report is not a fact. It may be true that there are some erroneous statements in the minority report, but if there are, I shall be glad to correct them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The new bill was a completed bill which had been worked out by the committee. What the Senator wanted us to do when we met on Monday to report the bill to which we had already agreed was to go over it page by page and section by section.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator from Kentucky was there, and he knows the request I made. The request I made was

that we be not asked to vote on the bill until we had had at least 1 or 2 days to read it. I did not even suggest that the committee go over it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator wanted the committee to go over the bill in detail.

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, no! The Senator from Kentucky must know, and I think the chairman will bear me out in that statement, that I never made such a suggestion. Not having been able to attend all the meetings of the Interstate Commerce Committee, because the Finance Committee was meeting every day during the executive sessions, I insisted that as a member of the committee I had a right to examine the bill before I was called upon to vote upon it. I did not even suggest that it be gone over in the committee meeting.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that he had an opportunity to go over the bill, because all there was in the new bill was the text of the old bill with the exact amendments which had been adopted to it; and the Senator had the old bill with all the amendments which had been adopted to it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Was it in printed form?

Mr. WHEELER. No; it was not in printed form.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does not the Senator admit that it was necessary for members of the committee to be there and to make their own corrections in the bill if they were to have before them the sort of a bill that they could look at and see what changes were made?

Mr. WHEELER. Not with reference to all the changes. It was necessary with reference to a few minor ones, but not with reference to the principal ones.

The Senator said he desired to have me point out where there was an error. He said, in his report:

> There is almost complete displacement of State jurisdiction over electrical utilities.

I suggest to him that that is not correct. As a matter of fact, we have not done anything of the kind; and that is an incorrect statement. Not only is it an incorrect statement but the whole report is filled with statements which would lead to the idea that there was something wrong about the action of the committee. I desire to say to the Senator, so far as I am concerned, that the utility people themselves, after the hearing was over, stated to me that they had had a fair hearing; they were only sorry we did not agree with them in their suggestion that the entire bill should be defeated.

I am not going to take up any more of the Senate's time. I expect to discuss the bill at length when it comes up for consideration; but I do not want the impression to go out among the Members of the Senate that I, as Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, or a majority of the members of the committee present there, did not give every single member of the committee a fair opportunity to be heard. I submit to the Senator from Delaware that he cannot get Members on his own side to agree with him upon what he has stated in the report on that subject.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, yesterday an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was agreed to, reading:

> No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available to pay a contractor upon any contract entered into under authority of this act unless, at the time of filing his bid, he shall also file the estimates upon which such bid was based.

I desire to move a reconsideration of the vote by which that amendment was adopted, in order to amend the amendment by inserting, after the word "contract", the words "for a naval vessel", so that the amendment will read:

> No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available to pay a contractor upon any contract for a naval vessel entered into under authority of this act unless, at the time of filing his bid, he shall also file the estimates upon which such bid was based.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was adopted? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, yesterday and on preceding days, members of the Munitions Committee individually offered amendments which were intended to afford some check for the Government and for the Navy against practices to which shipbuilders have resorted in the more recent years of naval construction. Those amendments had as their purpose stopping the sale of national-defense designs to other countries, and building barriers against continued collusion. They had as their further purpose making our American dollars buy more of national defense and stopping the plunder of Federal funds in the name of national defense.

A point of order was raised against virtually each and every one of the amendments. It would be useless to offer further amendments having as their purpose like goals. It had been my purpose to offer two amendments, one dealing with the establishment of a larger designing department in the Navy, which would leave the Navy wholly independent of private shipbuilding yards for their designing, and a second amendment affording further checks to the Government on shipbuilding prices and safeguards against collusion, which has been practiced.

There is little use of offering these amendments. However, I am going to request that the two amendments as prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

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

> On page 52 insert, after the first complete paragraph, the following paragraph:
>
> "That none of the appropriations provided by this act or by later acts shall be available for compensation, whether as part of the contract price for construction of a vessel or otherwise, to any private shipyard for plans and designs for vessels, and that of the appropriations contained in this act under the head of 'Increase of the Navy', there shall be available such sums as the Secretary of the Navy may from time to time determine to be necessary for the establishment of a section of design and planning which shall prepare the plans and designs for all vessels hereafter constructed by or for the United States, the salaries of the permanent and temporary personnel of such section not to be subject to the limitations of existing acts of Congress, and for the engagement of other technical services, and the employment of other personnel in the Navy Department and in the field, the purchase of drafting and other supplies."
>
> On page 50, line 8, after the word "*Provided*", insert the following: "That no vessel the commencement of which is authorized by this act or by later acts shall be built in any private shipyard unless such private shipyard shall, (1) except in the case of an aircraft carrier, have given a bond, in the amount of the contract for such vessel, that such vessel shall be completed and delivered to the Navy Department within 30 months from the date of such contract; (2) the Navy Department shall have prepared, prior to the advertising for any bid therefor, estimates of the cost of construction in each of the navy yards of such vessel; (3) such private shipyard shall have agreed to build such vessel for an amount not greater than the Navy Department's estimate of cost of construction of such vessel in the lowest navy yards, plus (a) $500,000 in the case of a cruiser, (b) $1,000,000 in the case of an aircraft carrier, and (c) $200,000 in the case of a destroyer; (4) in the contract for such vessel, except in the case of a fixed-price contract, such private shipyard shall have agreed (a) to pay to the Treasury all profit in excess of 5 percent of the total amount of the contract covering such vessel, such amount to become the property of the United States, and (b) to insert a like clause in all subcontracts in excess of $10,000 made by such private shipyard in performance of such contract; and (5) such private shipyard shall have agreed that all books, records, memoranda, documents, correspondence, and papers of such shipyard and of its subsidiaries and affiliates shall be subject to examination, during the usual hours of business, by representatives of the Comptroller General and/or of the Navy Department; in this clause (5) the word 'subsidiary' means any person, corporation, trust, or business unit over whom or over which such private shipyard has actual or legal control, whether by stock ownership, contractual relation, or otherwise; and the term 'affiliate' means any person, corporation, trust, or business unit who or which has actual or legal control over such private shipyard, whether by stock ownership, contractual relation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation made by this act or later acts shall

be expended under any contract with any private shipyard unless the bid of such private shipyard, upon the basis of which such contract was entered into, has been certified to by the Comptroller General, after consideration by him of (1) the Navy Department's estimates of cost of construction in the navy yards of the vessel covered by such bid, (2) estimates and reports prepared by the Navy Department and by the Comptroller General of the costs of construction in navy yards and in private shipyards of similar vessels, (3) previous bids made by private shipyards for similar vessels, and (4) the likelihood of changing costs of construction during the period of construction contemplated by such bid, as (a) fair, reasonable, and not excessive in amount, and (b) being lower than any bid that could be anticipated upon a readvertisement for bids: *Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation made by this act or later acts shall be expended under any contract with any private shipyard unless the Comptroller General shall, prior to each payment under such contract, certify that such shipyard has complied with all applicable provisions of this act and of the act of March 27, 1934 (Public, No. 135, 73d Cong.) relating to repayment of profits, insofar as previous contracts of such shipyard with the United States, or any agency thereof, are concerned, and as a basis for such certification the Comptroller General shall cause to be made at least ample examinations of the books and records of such shipyard relating to costs of construction of the vessel or vessels built by such shipyard pursuant to such previous contracts and such actual examination of such books and records as is made shall be recited in said certificate, and *Provided further,*"

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, it is evident that there is need for consolidation of these amendments into one legislative bill. The accomplishment of that will be the immediate purpose of the Munitions Investigating Committee. I sincerely hope for the cooperation of the entire Senate and its committees in accomplishing expeditious consideration of that character of legislation when it shall be offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. NYE. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	King	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	La Follette	Russell
Bankhead	Couzens	Lonergan	Schall
Barbour	Dickinson	McGill	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Dieterich	McKellar	Sheppard
Bilbo	Donahey	McNary	Shipstead
Black	Duffy	Maloney	Smith
Brown	Fletcher	Metcalf	Steiwer
Bulkley	Frazier	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gerry	Moore	Trammell
Byrd	Gibson	Murphy	Truman
Byrnes	Glass	Murray	Tydings
Capper	Gore	Neely	Vandenberg
Caraway	Guffey	Norris	Walsh
Carey	Hale	Nye	Wheeler
Chavez	Hatch	O'Mahoney	White
Clark	Hayden	Overton	
Connally	Johnson	Pittman	
Coolidge	Keyes	Radcliffe	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate on this matter, but it seems to me, in the case of a bill of this unprecedented magnitude, appropriating practically almost half a billion dollars for purposes of naval construction, that a demand for the yeas and nays is not unreasonable. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the vote is taken upon this measure I desire to state that, except for the lateness of the hour and the eagerness of the Senate to recess or adjourn, I should carry out the purpose which I had in mind to speak at some length upon the bill and cognate questions. I shall take advantage of the opportunity, however, on Monday to address the Senate upon the bill, even though it shall have passed in the meantime, and upon such questions as are relevant to a proper discussion of the question.

I am opposed to the bill and shall vote against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I therefore feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer my pair with him to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. My colleague [Mr. LOGAN] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am not authorized to announce how my colleague would vote if present.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BACHMAN], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. POPE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily detained from the Senate on departmental business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is detained from the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—55

Adams	Coolidge	Hayden	Robinson
Austin	Copeland	Johnson	Russell
Bankhead	Couzens	Keyes	Schall
Barbour	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Dieterich	McKellar	Sheppard
Bilbo	Duffy	McNary	Smith
Brown	Fletcher	Maloney	Steiwer
Bulkley	Gerry	Metcalf	Trammell
Byrd	Gibson	Minton	Truman
Byrnes	Glass	Moore	Tydings
Caraway	Gore	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Carey	Guffey	Overton	Walsh
Chavez	Hale	Pittman	White
Connally	Hatch	Radcliffe	

NAYS—18

Black	Donahey	Murphy	Shipstead
Bulow	Frazier	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Capper	King	Neely	Wheeler
Clark	La Follette	Norris	
Costigan	McGill	Nye	

NOT VOTING—22

Ashurst	Davis	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Bachman	George	McAdoo	Townsend
Bailey	Harrison	McCarran	Van Nuys
Bone	Hastings	Norbeck	Wagner
Borah	Lewis	Pope	
Burke	Logan	Reynolds	

So the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BYRNES, Mr. COPELAND, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. HALE, and Mr. KEYES conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1807, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1807) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

Mr. SMITH. I offer as an amendment to or substitute for the bill, House bill 8052.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and be considered pending.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what was the request made by the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SMITH. I asked that Senate bill 1807 be taken up, and then I offered as an amendment or as a substitute the House bill on the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the parliamentary situation to be as follows:

Upon motion of the Senator from South Carolina, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of Senate bill 1807. The Senator from South Carolina then offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which amendment is pending.

REGULATION OF TRAFFIC IN FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Senate bill 5, the food and drugs bill. I am about to ask unanimous consent that the amendments which have been agreed upon by the various persons interested in the bill may now be adopted, without any view to passing the bill tonight, but in order that it may be printed, so that at an opportune time those who are interested in the bill may study it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that, without displacing the pending unfinished business, the Senate take up a certain bill and agree to the amendments referred to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, first it will be necessary temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business, which is the bill dealing with the A. A. A. amendments, and then to proceed with the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is simply putting the request of the Senator from New York.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator from New York whether he would not accomplish all he is now seeking to accomplish if he would have the amendments printed and placed upon the desks of Senators so that we might consider them? Then, I would have no objection to having the bill taken up in the regular order following the so-called "triple A amendment bill." In fact, I should prefer that it precede the triple A bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from New York to present a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is it the desire of the Senator from New York to have the Senate act upon all the amendments, or is the request simply to have them printed in the bill?

Mr. COPELAND. It is my desire to have the amendments acted upon so that the bill may be reprinted as amended.

Mr. McNARY. That raises the question as to whether we shall adopt the proposed amendments without consideration.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the Senate would adopt them without much consideration, because they must appeal so strongly to the judgment of Senators. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, seriously, as Senators know, there has been much controversy about this bill, and I am very happy to say that after conferences with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and others, we appear to be in full agreement as to what amendments should be adopted.

I believe that it would facilitate action if we could do as I am now proposing, namely, have the amendments acted upon by the Senate. Then I will not press the measure, but will ask that the bill as amended be printed so that there may be further consideration if it is so desired. I submit my request for unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, that the Senate agree to the amendments referred to by the Senator from New York, and that the bill be printed as amended.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator modified his request so that his request, as I now understand it, is that the bill be printed with the amendments.

Mr. COPELAND. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator did not make that request. The Chair was particular to understand the request.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I hope that we may dispose of the amendments, and then that the bill may be printed so that it may be given further thought by Members of the Senate who might desire to have other amendments offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. The idea of the Senator from New York is not to the effect that the less we consider the amendments the more apt we will be to adopt them? [Laughter.]

Mr. COPELAND. I know the Senator from Kentucky is very much interested in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sympathetic with the Senator's proposal.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am going to suggest to the Senator from New York, in an earnest desire to be of assistance to him, that he have his bill printed with the amendments so that Senators may have the opportunity of examining the bill if they wish to do so, and that on another occasion, in a very short time, so far as my wish is concerned, he call up the bill for action.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if that is the best I can do, that is what I have to take. [Laughter.]

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was just about to remark that I should be very happy to cooperate with the Senator from New York in the preparation of the bill, but this is an unusual procedure, a practice which has never been heretofore recognized, and if the request is pressed, I shall have to object to it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator does not object to the request I presented?

Mr. McNARY. No; I suggested a moment ago that the proper course would be to obtain unanimous consent to have the amendments printed in the new bill, and then we may consider it later.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he suggested printing the amendments in the bill in italics so that it can be determined just what they are?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; my suggestion to the Senator from New York was that the bill be printed with the amendments, and they should be printed in italics.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, it is well known in the Senate which amendments are controversial. There was one amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to which I objected so seriously that I stated that I would rather have the bill die than to have the amendment adopted. The amendment provided that no article could be taken off the market except one particular sample of it, no matter whether it affected health or not. That amendment has been changed so that now it provides that unless health is involved there shall be only one seizure. That is entirely agreeable to me. There are other amendments with which I think every Senator who is really interested in debating the bill will be satisfied. There is much discontent because this bill has not been acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator permit the Chair to make a suggestion?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator would secure unanimous consent to offer an amendment to his bill which would include all the amendments so that there would be only one amendment proposed to the bill, it would obviate the necessity of considering all the amendments when the bill was brought before the Senate.

Mr. COPELAND. I think that is a very good suggestion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the status of the bill is that it has been considered by the Senate, and the Senate has adopted certain amendments. A print of the bill was made showing the amendments adopted by the Senate up to a certain date. A few other amendments have been agreed upon since that time. My suggestion is to print the bill showing the amendments adopted by the Senate in italics and showing in bold-face type the amendments which have not been adopted by the Senate but which have been agreed upon by the several Senators in conference. That will give Senators exactly the information they need.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is willing to present any request the Senator from New York may make.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I think the suggestion made by the Chair is a very wise one, and if I may have unanimous consent to present a blanket amendment to include all the various changes which are now proposed, then I assume that request may be agreeable to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent, the pending business having been temporarily laid aside, that he may offer an amendment to the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is a new practice. I understand there are a number of amendments to be placed in one big amendment upon which we would have one vote covering very many different changes in the bill. That is illogical, and I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I will have to have a few hours further study of the bill. May I have unanimous consent to pass the bill to the clerk after the amendments have been worked out?

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

INVITATION TO PRESS CLUB OUTING

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask leave to present a notice with the request that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The National Press Club extends a cordial invitation to Members of the United States Senate to join in the "Anchors Aweigh" party to be held at the Marine Base, Quantico, Va., on Saturday, May 25. Our chartered steamer, *The City of Washington*, leaves the Wilson dock at 1 o'clock. Dinner will be served at Quantico; there will be a 7-inning baseball game between the congressional team and a press gallery team, and the "Devil Dogs", 1,200 strong, will give an exhibition drill, with 26 airplanes participating.

There will be three boxing bouts.

The boat will return to Washington in the evening, docking about 11 o'clock. Tickets for the event may be obtained at the office of Sergeant at Arms Jurney.

The National Press Club will be happy to have Senators join in the festivities.

MARK FOOTE,
President National Press Club.

PAYMENT TO CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA FOR LAND

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, on May 13 last the Senate passed the bill (S. 1492) to compensate the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for lands set aside by treaties for their future homes and later patented to the State of Minnesota under the Swamp Land Act.

On the same day the House passed House bill 2046, a bill identical with the Senate bill, and it was transmitted to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2046.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Vice President laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 2046) to compensate the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for lands set aside by treaties for their future homes and later patented to the State of Minnesota under the Swamp Land Act, which was read twice by its title.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $223,162.62, said amount to be credited to the trust fund of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota arising under the provisions of section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889, in full payment for 178,530.10 acres of land embraced within reservations established by the treaties of March 11, 1863 (12 Stat. 1249), May 7, 1864 (13 Stat. 693), and March 19, 1867 (16 Stat. 719), for the future homes of said Indians, and later patented to the State of Minnesota under the provisions of the amendatory Swamp Land Act of March 12, 1860, without compensation to said Indians.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to determine just and proper compensation to the respective attorneys representing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota in the prosecution of their claims against the United States for the services rendered in the prosecution of said claim, said compensation to be based upon the nature, extent, character, and value of said services, and to pay such amounts, if any, as he may find said attorneys to be entitled to receive out of the trust funds standing to the credit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. 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 VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations (and also withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; also the nominations of several general officers for appointment in the National Guard of the United States, and the nomination of Brig. Gen. Frank Thomas Hines, Reserve, for reappointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army under the provisions of law.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination in order on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William P. McDermitt to be United States marshal, district of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert L. Culbertson, of Illinois, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Norman Armour, of New Jersey, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Canada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Balda J. McMillan to be postmaster of Hughes Springs, Tex., be withdrawn from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters on the calendar, with the exception of that of Balda J. McMillan, be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations, with the exception noted, are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 27, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

John C. Mahoney, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge, district of Rhode Island, vice Ira Lloyd Letts, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Giles Kavanagh, of Michigan, to be collector of Internal Revenue for the district of Michigan, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Martin R. Bradley, of Hermansville, Mich., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich., to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Norman Armour to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Canada.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William P. McDermitt to be United States marshal, district of New Jersey.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Albert L. Culbertson to be member Mississippi River Commission.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Linnie N. Smith, McNary.

ILLINOIS

Raymond R. Staubus, Cissna Park.
Charles W. Sampson, Greenup.
Wilber J. Strange, Le Roy.
Forest Vernon McNabney, Menard.
Dorsey Berry Anderson, National Stock Yards.
Roy S. Preston, Pekin.
Parke Burnham, Ullin.

IOWA

Isaac Hoeven, Sioux Center.

KENTUCKY

Newton Sullivan, Burlington.
Claud Brown, Henderson.
Ernest Meek, Paintsville.
J. Wise Higgins, Salyersville.
Joe C. Cantrell, Wheelwright.

MAINE

Eber J. Johnson, Poland.
Velorus T. Shaw, Prouts Neck.

MASSACHUSETTS

Carl E. Brown, Lunenburg.

MICHIGAN

Carl V. Moody, Copemish.
Vedah W. Halterman, De Witt.
John S. Courtney, Marquette.
Michael A. Mahar, Vermontville.

MINNESOTA

Clifford A. Hedquist, Argyle.
John H. Beutner, Buffalo.
Mary E. Gilbert, Carlton.
Clifford W. McDonald, Claremont.
Clifford Bergland, Clearbrook.
Harold J. Peck, Deer River.
Ove H. Voigt, Dent.
Lester A. Helweg, Fulda.
Ferdie A. Brown, Grygla.
Marian E. Boettcher, Hackensack.
Alfred H. Smith, Heron Lake.
C. Violet Thyren, Kelliher.
Lloyd O. Sundeen, Kerkhoven.
Herman Olberding, Lismore.
Byron B. Maddy, McGregor.
H. Mermond Olsen, Marine on St. Croix.
Patrick J. Malone, Montgomery.
Ernest S. Mariette, Oak Terrace.
Casper W. Lotterer, Perham.
John L. Suel, Robbinsdale.
Edwin G. Doyle, Rosemount.
Wallace Oscar Merrill, Silver Lake.
Lloyd A. Hakes, Stewart.
Edwin O. Stennes, Strandquist.
Andrew C. Peterson, Waubun.
Julia B. Anderson, Zumbrota.

MISSISSIPPI

Louise A. Stephenson, Flora.
Grace M. Williams, Silver Creek.

NEW MEXICO

Roy L. Cook, Albuquerque.
Frances I. Burch, Alamogordo.
Virginia B. Jameson, Estancia.
James H. Odle, Farmington.
Higinio M. Vigil, Wagon Mound.

NORTH DAKOTA

Winfield S. Hooper, Fargo.
Peter L. Freund, Hope.
Harry E. Brady, Jud.
John D. Leadon, Taylor.

TENNESSEE

Jere Gardenhire, Carthage.
Joseph E. McCracken, Cumberland City.
Walter W. Ryburn, Erwin.
Mary E. Watkins, Goodlettsville.
Coy M. Seal, Sneedville.
Roev D. Shoulders, Westmoreland.

TEXAS

Arthur K. Tyson, Calvert.
Walter L. Pickett, Hereford.
Walter B. Wilson, McKinney.

WEST VIRGINIA

Roscoe Cook, Lorado.

WISCONSIN

John T. Murphy, Delavan.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

William Gerig, of Arkansas, for appointment as a member of the Mississippi River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a 'Mississippi River Commission' for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes, near its mouth, to its headwaters", vice Charles H. West, deceased, which was sent to the Senate on May 20, 1935.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite God, the Eternal One, Thou hast spoken and Thy wonderful manifestations give witness to the oneness in divine government. We praise Thee that Thy fatherly goodness hangs like a rainbow above the life of man. We thank Thee that in this ageless world of ours we have the innocence and charm of childhood, the hopes and dreams of youthhood, the power and fervor of middle life, and the treasures of the ripened years. We rejoice that all shall be one in the brightness of the heavenly glories. Wherever right and wrong, truth and error are in deadly conflict, O let human progress roll on over all prejudices, bringing its everlasting triumphs. Identify us with all movements that bring us into the very richest religious experience. Endue us with incredible zeal that will work for the supremacy of those institutions that conform to the rights, happiness, and peace of our fellow men. In the name of the Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1384) entitled "An act 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."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISBURSEMENT OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5225) to provide relief for disbursing officers of the Army in certain cases be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the address of our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] I may be allowed to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] has 15 minutes, following the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I ask for 5 minutes following the address of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, following the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that, following the address of the gentleman from Texas, he may address the House for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we to get to the Consent Calendar today?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter for the House to determine.

Mr. TRUAX. As I recall, 50 minutes of time has been granted now preceding the consideration of the bills on the calendar, and I think this is entirely unfair.

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

There was no objection.

THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection?

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, few industries more directly or more vitally affect every American family than the petroleum industry. Aside from food and shelter, no other factor enters so intimately into the life of the people, as well as into their industrial or financial affairs, as do the products of this industry. The second in importance to the country, according to repeated statements made by Secretary of the Interior Ickes, its stabilization is a matter of the foremost consequence.

Through the assistance furnished to this industry by Congress by the passage of special legislation, such as the excise taxes on foreign petroleum product, the Connally hot-oil bill, and the adoption of the oil code under the National Industrial Recovery Act, this industry has made tremendous contributions to the restoration of employment and prosperity. The annual pay roll of the industry today is approximately $1,569,000,000, which is practically equal to the pay roll in 1929. As evidence that this industry is doing its part in meeting the administration's reemployment program, the oil industry has given new employment to 217,200 persons in the past 2 years, according to the American Petroleum Institute.

The same authority also states that the taxes paid by this industry in levies made upon its properties, products, and operations amount to $1,250,000 a year.

The petroleum industry, Mr. Speaker, has been enabled to make this tremendous contribution toward the return of prosperity because of the steps taken toward the elimination of excessive production of petroleum, bringing supply into a closer balance with demand than had been the case before the adoption of the petroleum code made this possible. Through that control of production and this attempt at balance, crude petroleum which had been selling as low as 10 cents a barrel of 42 gallons has now been selling around $1 a barrel.

This increase in the price received by the producer has not resulted in any increase in the prices paid by the consumer of petroleum products. Possibly not another industry would show such an increase in the cost of its primary raw material without any increase in the price of the finished product delivered to the consumer. When crude petroleum was selling at 10 cents a barrel or at 25 cents a barrel, or at any figure below a dollar a barrel, many of the smaller interests in the industry were forced into bankruptcy and their products absorbed by larger and better financed groups. The present price paid for this product, while it does not cover the production costs in all fields, nevertheless, has enabled the industry to continue its employment program and has wiped out the red ink on the

ledgers of uncounted numbers of those in the industry. The differential between the production cost of foreign petroleum and of domestic petroleum, according to the latest figures which have been compiled by the United States Tariff Commission, is $1.03 per barrel. It is quite evidently impossible for domestic petroleum to compete with the foreign product which has so great an advantage, due largely to the fact that the American product must pay American wage scales and must also pay a vast number of local, State, and Federal taxes, from which the foreign product is free. Furthermore, in many cases the foreign product is produced by peon labor or else by the forced labor of the Soviet.

As the price of American petroleum has risen, the market in this country has become increasingly desirable to those firms owning large oil fields in other countries. Thus far the only thing which has prevented the American petroleum industry from being demoralized by a tremendous flood of cheap foreign oil has been the excise taxes in the present revenue act, and also the limitation on imports which have kept those imports, approximately, within the average amount imported during the last 6 months of 1932.

Mr. Speaker, the oil excise taxes on foreign petroleum products expire in June. At the same time, the present Petroleum Code, which contains a section on the limitation of imports, also expires. Unless this Congress shall take action prior to that expiration date the gains made by this industry during the past 20 months may all be swept away, its successful reemployment program replaced by the forced discharge of hundreds of thousands of workers who are now receiving high wages, and by the reduction in the salaries and wages paid those who would be retained by this industry. This would constitute one of the most staggering blows which could be struck at any program for recovery of American prosperity. Furthermore, the most important oil reserves of the Nation are those which are reached by the stripper wells or the wells of settled production. These wells produce their oil by pumping, in contrast to those wells in any fields which have flush production, which does not require expensive labor in pumping operations. Should cheap foreign oil be admitted without restraint and without a compensating duty, it could take possession of such a large portion of our domestic market that the American oil producer would find it utterly impossible to compete.

The first effect of this would be the forced abandonment of the stripper wells. Many of these wells when once closed down could not be reopened because of the entry of water. An oil well is not like a coal mine or any other form of mineral development. It must be continuously produced or else its reopening after a long shut-down may show that it has been destroyed by water or else its producing possibilities have been greatly decreased.

Oil is one of the most vital elements in our national defense. It is probably second only to man power. Without large supplies of oil we would be tremendously handicapped should a war with any major power break out. The abandonment of the stripper wells of the Nation because of the uncontrolled admission of cheap, foreign oil would multiply all our problems of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, because of its important place in our economic life, it is imperative that we should continue to maintain the oil reserves of the Nation. There are nearly 25,000,000 automobiles in operation. Many of these are not used for pleasure solely but play a very significant part in our industrial life. They are primary methods of transportation today. Without them the farmer would find his present difficulties greatly intensified; the business man would face unnecessary handicaps. Congestion in cities would increase if this mobile form of transportation was diminished. A volume might be written about the effect upon our national, our social, and our financial life if a large portion of the Nation's petroleum supplies were abandoned as would inevitably result if the free admission of foreign oil made it economically impossible to continue to operate the wells touching the largest portion of our national reserves. The additional cost of American petroleum as compared with foreign petroleum is due entirely to two factors: The higher wages paid in this country and the heavy tax burdens carried by this industry and its products. The taxes paid, it has been estimated, have been between 4 and 5 percent of the earnings of the industry which, according to the American Petroleum Institute, have averaged 1.66 percent during the past 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of this heavy and increasing burden of taxation, the industry has not increased to the consumer the price of its product but has continuously decreased that price. The consumer has not realized this decrease since additional taxes have usually replaced the price cut in the product made by the industry.

The petroleum excise taxes produced last year a revenue of about $7,800,000. This sum may not seem large when compared with expenditures which we are called upon to approve. It is an important item, however, in our revenue program. The actual values of this tax, however, cannot be computed merely from the payments made at our ports of entry. The Federal Government receives more income through the support given to the domestic petroleum industry through these taxes than it does from the taxes themselves. Elimination of these taxes through the admission of cheap foreign oil would not alone deprive the National Treasury of the $7,000,000 it received in 1934 but would also deprive it of many, many millions of dollars additional which it has been receiving from the various forms of taxation levied upon this industry. This ignores the enormous revenues which are received by cities, towns, counties, and States from taxes on oil properties or upon oil products.

Mr. Speaker, a measure introduced in the House by Congressman MORGAN SANDERS, of Texas, to continue these taxes beyond their present expiration date in June of the current year would increase some of these taxes. The present tax upon crude petroleum and fuel and gas oil is one-half cent a gallon or 21 cents a barrel. At a previous session of Congress, it was proposed to increase these taxes to 42 cents a barrel. That effort did not succeed at the time although no convincing arguments against the value or the necessity of this increase were advanced. Since the foreign product has an advantage of $1.03 over the American product, it is quite evident that a tax of 42 cents per barrel would not be great enough to constitute an embargo. It would, however, reduce the margin of profit which would tempt the importers of foreign oil to take possession of our domestic market.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move the 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. 83]

Allen	Dickstein	Hennings	Perkins
Andrew, Mass.	Dietrich	Higgins, Conn.	Pettengill
Arends	Disney	Holmes	Peyser
Bankhead	Doutrich	Igoe	Rayburn
Biermann	Doxey	Kennedy, Md.	Richardson
Brennan	Duncan	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sanders, La.
Brooks	Dunn, Miss.	Kleberg	Scott
Brown, Mich.	Eaton	Kocialkowski	Scrugham
Buck	Eckert	Lamneck	Sears
Buckley, N.Y.	Ellenbogen	Lanham	Shannon
Bulwinkle	Frey	Lee, Okla.	Somers, N. Y.
Caldwell	Fulmer	Lewis, Md.	Steagall
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	McCormack	Stewart
Carden	Gasque	McGrath	Taylor, Tenn.
Casey	Gassaway	McGroarty	Thomas
Celler	Gildea	McLeod	Tinkham
Clark, Idaho	Gingery	Maas	Umstead
Cochran	Goldsborough	Marcantonio	Underwood
Connery	Gray, Pa.	May	Wadsworth
Cooley	Greenway	Meeks	Walter
Cooper, Ohio	Griswold	Moritz	Wearin
Corning	Hancock, N. C.	O'Connell	White
Crosby	Harlan	O'Day	Wigglesworth
Daly	Hart	Oliver	Wilcox
Dear	Harter	O'Malley	Withrow
Delaney	Hartley	Owen	Wolfenden

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TURNER). Three hundred and twenty-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

JOSEF PILSUDSKI, THE FATHER OF THE POLISH REPUBLIC

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Joseph Pilsudski, the father of the Polish Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the memorial address delivered by me before the Polish Club of Washington on Saturday evening, May 18, 1935:

I am indeed pleased to have the privilege to address you this evening on the life of Marshal Josef Pilsudski, of Poland. At the invitation of the Ambassador of Poland, Stanislaus Patek, I was present this morning, together with Mrs. Roosevelt, the Ambassadors and dignitaries representing the various nations here in our Capital, and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, to observe the memorial services in honor of Marshal Josef Pilsudski, of Poland.

Marshal Pilsudski is to Poland what George Washington is to our country. He is truly the Father of Poland. He was a statesman possessing tremendous powers but never abused them. He was not a despot, he was not a conqueror, he was not a ruthless warrior fighting for the sake of conquest; he was like General Washington—a man who loved his country and his people and fought bravely for freedom and liberty.

Although it is difficult to say that the birth of any nation should be regarded as the work of one individual, yet so powerful was the personality of Marshal Josef Pilsudski that not only the creation of the Polish Republic but its domestic and foreign policies bear the stamp of his individuality.

It was largely due to his foresight and genius that Europe was saved from another bloody war which may have embroiled the whole world. Only history will reveal the significance and far-reaching effects of this man's deeds.

Marshal Josef Pilsudski, the "Father of the Polish Republic", was laid at rest today in Poland's national sanctuary in the Wawel Cathedral at Kracow. The whole Polish Republic is in deep sorrow. Even here in the United States of America memorial services have been held in most of our principal cities in honor of this great unselfish patriot and lover of freedom and liberty.

I was deeply impressed with the eulogy delivered by Rev. John J. Rolbiecki, associate professor of philosophy at the Catholic University of this city. With your kind permission, I shall read it to you—I think it is a masterpiece. There is not much that I can add to this beautiful eulogy.

"EULOGY DELIVERED BY REV. JOHN J. ROLBIECKI, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, AT THE SOLEMN PONTIFICAL REQUIEM MASS CELEBRATED FOR THE LATE MARSHAL JOSEF PILSUDSKI, OF POLAND, BY HIS EXCELLENCY, THE MOST REV. JAMES H. RYAN, BISHOP OF MODRA AND RECTOR OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, IN THE NATIONAL SHRINE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION ON THE CAMPUS OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA AT WASHINGTON, D. C., AT 11 O'CLOCK A. M., SATURDAY, MAY 18

"Over every nation He set a ruler." (Ecclesiasticus, c. 17, v. 14.)

"On last Sunday night, May 12, the angel of death came to the Belvedere Palace in Warsaw and claimed as his own Poland's soldier and statesman, Josef Pilsudski. The sorrow in the hearts of the people of Poland found its echoes in the tolling of thousands of church bells announcing that the great old patriot and leader had passed from the scene of his earthly labors. There are good reasons why the people of Poland should grieve, there is cause for deep sorrow in the thought that the strong heart and brave spirit of Pilsudski will no more direct the destinies of Poland, and in the reflection that by his death the reborn Poland has lost a man who in the truest sense of the word may be considered its liberator and its father. The grief of the people of Poland is felt with equal poignancy wherever, throughout the world, people of Polish birth are to be found, and wherever there are men whose hearts are warmed by the thought of personal sacrifice and suffering for the sake of a nation's freedom. It is eminently fitting that in this city, the Capital of a great Nation united to Poland by so many ties of race, and by the spiritual bond of a common aspiration for human liberty and advancement, there should be an expression of sorrow for the death of Josef Pilsudski, there should be a manifestation of sympathy for the members of his family, his friends, and fellow countrymen. Today throughout the world the official representatives of Poland will join with their people at home in mourning the death of a great leader, and, in order that the people of the United States may share in the mourning, this illustrious gathering is assembled here at this time.

"We stand beside the bier of a great man who deserves a place beside the most illustrious of the leaders of the world. It is, perhaps, no exaggeration to say that in the Poland of today there is nobody who could challenge his preeminence in the political life of his country, and nobody who could be considered his rival in the deep and enduring affection of his people. But Pilsudski was more than a national figure. His position in the world was not merely that of a man who had guided his people from subjection to freedom, and who had found a lasting place in their affection and their gratitude. He was among that small group of men to whom, in the destinies of Providence, the peace of the world, and the future of civilization, seem to have been committed. He rose to be ruler over his people at the most critical period in modern history, and on him as much as on any man of his time was placed the heavy burden of rescuing civilization from the spiritual and political ruin into which it had been cast during 4 years of world-wide struggle and slaughter. The people of Poland and other peoples of the world have reason for joy in the thought that their burden was placed on the strong and competent shoulders of Josef Pilsudski. The responsibility which was placed on him he accepted as a sacred trust not only for Poland but for humanity, and if Poland and the world have profited by his efforts and his career, it is because he was faithful and unswerving in his loyalty to high principles, and because his life was simple in its loyalty to his country and its devotion to duty and fidelity to God. He was a revolutionary, not because he desired to tear down, but because he sought to build up. He was a professional soldier who had no ambition for personal glory, but who did have the iron-willed purpose to use his gifts as an educator and administrator in the service of Poland.

"The Poland to which Pilsudski dedicated his life was a Poland torn and dismembered by a century and a half of oppression; a Poland which was one only in the determination of its people for independence and unity. Time after time the people of Poland sought for freedom through the desperate measures of war and revolution. Defeat did not crush the spirit of independence; and, when the last great struggle came, all the longings and aspirations of a great and proud people were embodied in the person and the aims of the man whose memory we now honor. From his earliest years Pilsudski devoted his life to the emancipation of Poland, and every phase of the last great struggle was merely an expression of his purpose and his ambitions.

"In a sense the life of Pilsudski may be taken as a symbol of Poland's struggle for liberty. If Poland suffered persecution, humiliation, and bondage, Pilsudski had to bear torture, exile, and imprisonment. Poland was threatened with the loss of national life, and Pilsudski was time after time exposed to death because he would make Poland free. When his country was drawn into the Great War, he had the vision and the determination which enabled him to make and to execute plans which led Poland out of the carnage and destruction into the realization of its hopes for independence.

"War was declared on the 1st of August 1914. Only 5 days later, on August 6, Pilsudski led his legions across the Austrian border into Russia. These legions constituted the nucleus of the future army of Poland, which he formed, developed, and led to victory. It should be remembered that Poland's wars did not end in 1918, but were continued on her own territory until the peace of Riga in 1921.

"Pilsudski's services did not end with the war. The work of unification and reorganization in Poland, divided as it was by subjection to three different administrative systems, demanded qualities of statesmanship as great as the military skill by which the marshal had made Poland the ruler of her own destinies. The devastated regions had to be rebuilt, a unified efficient government had to be set up at home, and normal and friendly relations had to be established with the nations of the world. Pilsudski was equal to the task, and not the least of his claims to greatness is the manner in which he forgot old animosities in his desire to establish amicable relations with neighboring states by signing treaties of nonaggression with them. He hoped that the new Poland would commence its life without enemies and that it would be received into the comity of nations as a great force for peace and progress. His love for peace brought his country into close relations with the great democracies of western Europe and with the United States. He never wished to lose the old friends of Poland while establishing good relations with Poland's neighbors. All those agreements were not merely measures of political or international expediency, but an expression of the marshal's convictions as a statesman and a Christian.

"Though Pilsudski's hopes and ambitions were centered in Poland, it can never be said that he desired Poland's advantage at the cost or humiliation of others. Among European statesmen none had a closer and more real knowledge of war than Pilsudski, and none was more convinced of its futility as a means to settle the rivalries and animosities of states.

"Pilsudski's memory will be cherished by patriots everywhere; he will be honored by those who deplore the horrors of war and who love the spirit and the ways of peace. Much will be written about him now, and in years to come great statues will be raised to him, but his real monument is the new Poland. If Poland is united, if it has definite national aims and a strong national spirit, these are but concrete and actual expressions of the mind and soul of Pilsudski. He had a clear conception in life of what he would like Poland to be. Pilsudski met with opposition. He brushed it aside, because in pursuing the course he had worked out he believed he was aiding his people in achieving the ends they all hoped for. Even those who felt the marshal's heavy hand never questioned the loftiness of his aims, the sincerity of his intentions, or his inherent honesty, probity, and integrity. All, irrespective of their political tenets or personal views, esteemed and respected him. Even his coup d'état of 1926 is regarded by thinking Poles as a blessing—a fortunate escape from a serious impasse, a timely removal of a deadly threat to the stability of the body politic. After years of titanic exertions he succeeded in bringing about far-reaching constitutional reforms which have

greatly strengthened the government and which will for all time promote the welfare of the Polish people. Pilsudski was preeminent as a statesman because his principal concern was the safety of the commonwealth. Salus Reipublicae suprema lex esto! He commanded the unwavering and unswerving loyalty of one of the most modern, most efficient, and above all most enthusiastic military machines in Europe. He had the army in the palm of his hand. He could have trampled on human rights, he could have laughed at the pretensions of the citizens, he could have ruthlessly crushed all opposition. Such methods would have been foreign to his spirit. He preferred to argue with his countrymen; they were his people, and he knew that if they were to enjoy the blessings of liberty they should learn the lesson of subordination, they should submit to discipline, and they should advance step by step. He acted toward them not as a dictator but as a father. Few men who possessed so much power as he did would have acted with so much moderation toward those who opposed him. To him might be addressed the words of the angel which we read in the second verse of the second chapter of the Apocalypse: 'I know thy works and thy labor and thy patience.'

"His labors have not been in vain. The old marshal sleeps the sleep of the just, but his ideals remain, his constructive program will be followed out by his faithful coworkers and disciples, whose principal concern will be to continue on the path indicated by Poland's national hero. Those who have witnessed the birth of Pilsudski's peace plans will endeavor to bring them to a successful conclusion, for they can make certain Poland's further internal development, and assure her an honorable place in the family of nations, a place worthy of his great people.

"On this day the body of Josef Pilsudski is being laid to rest in Wawel Cathedral in Krakow, the ancient capital of Poland. There his tomb will be placed among those of Poland's greatest and most illustrious dead, the tombs of Poland's immortals, her mighty kings and heroes. His glory will not be told in the inscription which will be placed on his tomb; it will be revealed in the spectacle of an entire nation united in sorrow at his grave. As the greatest Pole and the first chief of state he receives honors reserved for heads of states. He goes to that grave with the sound of muffled drums and tolling bells, but long after these sounds will be forgotten his memory will live in the grateful and sorrowing hearts of his countrymen. Former enemies as well as friends surround his bier, where animosities vanish, ill-feeling is swept away, and grievances pass into oblivion. To the wreaths of odorous flowers the Polish nation adds garlands of prayers, which rise on the blue clouds of incense to the throne of the King of Kings and the Lord of Hosts, and we, with many millions throughout the world, join our prayers to theirs: May he rest in peace."

To our own land, beginning with the Pilgrim Fathers, thousands of honest, God-fearing, and liberty-loving people have come to find refuge from European persecution, intolerance, and despotism. The Americans have a deep, inherent love for freedom, tolerance, and liberty. We revere and respect not only the memory of our own heroes, the men who have upheld those principles which we cherish in this our native land; but it is also natural for us to respect and honor men who uphold these principles in whatever part of the world it may be. Every nation has some such sterling characters—men who sacrifice their all in the interest of humanity—France had them, Germany, Italy, England, Ireland, the South American countries—every nation has been blessed at some time or other with these noble men. We have had our George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and others—the Republic of Poland has had Marshal Josef Pilsudski.

It has been a pleasure to address you this evening, and I appreciate greatly this opportunity to appear before you.

HYDRO IN TROUBLE

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in reply to a New York Sun editorial entitled "Hydro in Trouble", which was put in the RECORD by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following in reply to an editorial of the New York Sun, entitled "Hydro in Trouble", which was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, April 22, 1935, pages 6145–6146, by my worthy colleague the Honorable JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., of New York.

Upon reading this editorial of the Sun, I wrote to the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission at Toronto, and the secretary of that body, the Honorable W. W. Pope, made an extended personal reply and sent me copies of the last annual report of the commission and other official literature. I also consulted Dr. Carl D. Thompson, secretary of the Public Ownership League of America, who has been in constant personal touch with the Ontario system since its inception more than 25 years ago. From these official and authoritative sources and from personal knowledge of the situation Dr. Thompson has prepared for me the following statement:

THE FACTS ABOUT HYDRO

The editorial writer of the New York Sun is quite right in referring to the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission as the world's largest and most outstanding example of successful municipal ownership in the electric field. It has been that for over a quarter of a century and continues to be so right down to date.

The cause of municipal ownership has not received any setback, nor has political management broken its wonderful record. The last annual report of the Ontario Hydroelectric Commission, being for the twenty-sixth year, ending October 31, 1933, shows the magnitude and growing success of this great project. The facts are as follows:

1. There are now 757 communities—cities, towns, villages, and rural sections—served by the commission. This is the largest number ever served, being a considerable increase over the preceding year.

2. There is now invested in this system a greater amount of capital than ever before, reaching a total for the year of $394,661,542.

3. The system is steadily reducing its indebtedness. The percentage of debt to the total assets has steadily declined from the beginning; and this is true in the last year or two, as before. In 1913 the total percentage of debt to the total assets was 88 percent. From that point it has steadily declined until in 1933 it was only 39.5 percent.

4. There were more surplus earnings accumulated by the system last year than ever before and they have now reached a total of $129,170,080. The net increase in the total of commission and municipal reserves for 1933 was $6,399,976 over that of the previous year, thus showing a steady increase in this respect down to date.

5. The net earnings for depreciation showed a slight decrease in 1932 and 1933, due to depression conditions, which reduced the sale of power in that section as everywhere else. But it is interesting to note that since April 1933 the trend in the sale of power has been steadily upward and that by the end of the fiscal year, October 31, 1933, the ground lost during the first part of the year had been regained and the year closed with a net increase, so that while there is still a slight operating loss, that is already being regained. Furthermore, it has been the policy of the Commission for many years to set aside in a reserve fund for obsolescence and contingencies additional sums "designed to care for possible lean years that might come in the future." As a result of this policy, the Commission has been able to more than cover the temporary deficiencies due to the depression during the last 2 years.

6. And, finally, it is interesting to note that all of the above achievements have been made with the lowest rates now in existence on the continent, if not in the world, and that these rates, "except in a very few cases, have been maintained at their low levels or have been made even lower during the period of depression."

THE POWER TRUST MAKES THE "TROUBLE"

Some "trouble" there has been, but it was slight and of very short duration. And therein lies another notable achievement of this really wonderful and inspiring project—when "trouble" does arise the Ontario Hydro "shoots" it promptly. We in our country subsidize our "troubles" and help them to multiply.

And it is interesting to note what the "trouble" is that Ontario has had and what its source. It is the same trouble and comes from exactly the same source as all of our utility troubles here in this country; namely, the interference of the private power company influences.

In Ontario the private power interests have, from the very beginning and constantly fought, by every means and method known to them, this public power system. Failing in their direct attacks, they have resorted in recent years to the more subtle and invidious methods with which we are familiar here in this country.

What the power companies have tried to do in Ontario is to lure the public project away from a policy of developing its own generating plants and get them to buy their current wholesale from existing private plants. It is interesting and instructive to note that this is one of the methods that the power companies use everywhere. By very plausible arguments they seek to prevail upon municipal and public plants not to expend money in developing their own generating systems, but to buy the current of them.

Every municipally owned light and power system in the United States has had this kind of "trouble." Our own Federal Government is having the same kind of "trouble" with the private power interests. First, by open opposition and antagonism, then by false and misleading propaganda, and, finally by court proceedings in the form of injunctions, etc., they make us "trouble." And finally, failing in every other method, their last resort is always to seek to worm their own representatives either into the political positions of control or into the manipulation of the project from within and thus seek to destroy it.

In Ontario the "trouble" arose when the private power companies succeeded some years ago in luring the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission's officials into contracts for the purchase of power from them—the private power companies—which has proven to be burdensome. For example, in November 1929, after it was evident, due to the beginning of the depression, that the demand for power would very likely decrease rapidly, the power

companies managed to get the Hydro officials to make a contract for 250,000 horsepower to be purchased from the Quebec Power Corporations. In February 1930 another company managed to negotiate another contract for 96,000 horsepower in spite of the fact that by that time the collapse of business enterprise was well known. And still later, in December 1930, a third contract was made, with a third company, for 125,000 more horsepower.

These contracts, in view of the oncoming depression and the resulting decrease in the demand for power, loaded upon the commission an unnecessary and, of course, a disastrous burden. And this is the "trouble" that the Ontario system has had.

But please note how quickly and how effectively the Ontario people have met this situation. There has come about a complete change in the administration of the Province, and the new administration has very swiftly met this situation, found the contracts actually illegal and are having them canceled. Thus, before the "trouble" has developed into any serious proportions, the public project has met, overcome, and is swiftly removing it entirely.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE "DEBT"

The New York Sun in its editorial claims that the Ontario system has added hundreds of millions of dollars to the public debt of Ontario, which it claims compares very unfavorably to the situation in New York State and in Quebec under private ownership.

Yes, the "debt" of the Hydro system has increased. But it is not a debt in the ordinary sense in which we use that word. It is an investment, and a mighty good one at that. It is an investment that pays the people of that Province big dividends. It reduces rates. It pays itself off out of earnings. It amortizes itself. It gives the public an ever-increasing equity in the property, so that in about 30 years the whole $280,000,000 property will be paid for and belong to the people of Ontario, entirely free of debt. That is a very different kind of "debt" from the kind carried by the private power companies. Their debt is enormously overcapitalized, is forever increasing and is never paid off. So that under the companies' indebtedness our people are paying for the properties in excessive rates every 20 years or so, and never own them and never derive any revenue from them.

THE FACTS ABOUT RATES

The Sun editorial says that the enemies of Hydro "offer to demonstrate that its rates for service are, on the average, higher than those of Quebec." Perhaps they "offer" to do so, but their demonstration is woefully lacking.

First of all, any student who is familiar with rate structures knows perfectly well that the comparison of rates, on the average, is absolutely false and misleading. A private company may sell the greater proportion of its current for industrial purposes at very low rates and a very small portion of its current for domestic service at high rates; whereas a municipal or public project may reverse the arrangement, selling the larger part of its product for domestic service at comparatively high rates and a very small proportion for industrial and power purposes at low rates. Thus, the "average" rate may be lower under private than under public ownership and operation. But it has been demonstrated by every study of the matter that has been made that for every type or kind of service the rates under municipal or public ownership are very much lower than under private.

This method of comparing rates under municipal and private ownership, on the basis of the average, is one of the favored and deceptive tricks of the apologists of the private power interests.

As a matter of fact, as stated by Secretary Pope, of the Hydro-electric Commission, verified by the New York Power Authority, by studies made by Professor Mosher in his works; by T. D. Bouchard, secretary of the Union of Municipalities of Quebec and speaker of the Provincial Legislature of that Province; and other eminent authorities; and admitted by Mr. Carlisle, president of the Niagara-Hudson Power Corporation, the average domestic rate in New York State is 4½ cents per kilowatt-hour, whereas the Ontario rate is approximately 1¾ cents per kilowatt-hour (1.77 cents, to be exact). Also, in Quebec the average domestic rate is 2½ cents per kilowatt-hour, as against 1¾ cents in Ontario.

So the rates are not lower in Quebec and in New York than in Ontario. Exactly the opposite is true.

From all of which it is perfectly apparent, when one gets down to the actual facts in the matter, that the criticism of the Ontario system, offered by the editorial in the New York Sun, is without foundation. Whatever trouble there has been has arisen not from the failure of the principle of municipal or public ownership, but from the interference by private power interests in their efforts to drive a sharp bargain with the public project and thereby to weaken and, if possible, destroy it. And the strength of the public project is further apparent in the swiftness with which the trouble has been met and removed. Meanwhile, the charges that the debt has increased, that rates have been raised, etc., prove also to be without foundation.

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB OUTING

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has leave to address the House for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if it is not taken out of my time, I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota 3 minutes.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I trust that no able-bodied Member of this body will disregard the invitation he received a few days ago to attend the National Press Club outing tomorrow. I hope a substantial group will be in attendance. The congressional contingent will be headed by the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, and at least two Governors from adjoining States will be included. There will be a congressional baseball game which will vie with the National Press Club for at least 5 innings. There will be a series of amateur boxing bouts that will tickle the fancy of the most ardent sportsman.

There will be food that will delight the appetite, and everything will be furnished except liquid refreshments, and those can be had on the boat going down and return. It promises to be a fine day, and I hope we have a fine turnout.

The congressional ball team line-up for the game will be Messrs. KELLY, BOLAND, RICHARDS, HARTLEY, MEAD, MCCORMACK, MCMILLAN, ALLEN, SHANLEY, GRANFIELD, LAMBERTSON, RAMSPECK, CONNERY, WITHROW, NICHOLS, MERRITT, CALDWELL, LEE, STARNES, HOBBS, and KLEBERG.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman tell the House what time the boat leaves and what particular wharf?

Mr. KVALE. The boat leaves the wharf at the foot of Seventh Street at 1 o'clock tomorrow. The Navy Band will be in attendance and function as usual on the way down and on the way back will entertain the party as a German band. The time for returning should be not later than 10 o'clock.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to address the House at this time on the subject of "A Billion-dollar Overcharge for Electric Lights and Power." Since I am to speak on the same subject tonight over a Nation-wide radiobroadcast, I would have withdrawn my request to address the House at this time, were it not for the fact that Congress is being literally bombarded by the Power Trust in their desperate attempts to prevent the passage of legislation now pending before the House and Senate. Their representatives are invading the committee rooms, "buttonholing" Congressmen and Senators, deliberately misrepresenting facts, and using every possible pressure to control the actions of Congress. It is the most diabolical lobby, the most powerful and the most far-reaching, that has ever attempted to influence legislation, in all the history of this Government.

They are using the mails, the press, and the radio. On the front page of the New York Times this morning, the Consolidated Gas System, one of the powerful companies operating in the State of New York, comes out with a fanfare of trumpets announcing reductions in light and power rates in New York City, that are so ridiculous that I cannot refrain from calling attention to them at this time.

We need not deceive ourselves; we are at war with one of the most powerful and dangerous influences this country has ever known. Suppose war were declared upon our country by some invidious foe and he should demand at our hands a tribute of $1,000,000,000 a year. We would not hesitate; the American people would rise as one man and drive that enemy forever from our shores. Yet, we find ourselves grappling with an adversary within our gates that is actually levying tribute upon the helpless people you and I are supposed to represent, that amounts to $1,000,000,000 a year. Not just $1,000,000,000, mind you, but $1,000,000,000 every year that rolls round. That adversary is the Power Trust—one of the greatest menaces of our day and generation. It has developed one of the

greatest rackets of all times. Like a huge octopus, it spreads its gigantic form over the entire country, winding its loathsome feelers about every capitol—not only every State capitol, but around this National Capitol as well.

In fact, it has become a super-government that has exercised more power in recent years than the Federal Government itself. It has influenced Presidents, controlled Governors, dominated legislators, frightened Congressmen, intimidated Senators, and corrupted courts.

It is reaching its greedy tentacles into every factory, every business establishment, and into every home. It is literally reaching into every light bulb and exacting tribute from everyone who uses electric lights and power. Your constituents are the victims; they pay the bills. They pay this tribute every month and sometimes twice a month, and if the Power Trust can have its way, they will pay it as long as they live, and their children and grandchildren will continue to pay it throughout all time to come.

This war to which I refer is not of our own choosing. I see from the papers this morning that the power interests, parading under the guise of protecting utility investors, announce that they have declared war. They are using their victims on whom they have unloaded their worthless watered stocks as shock troops, to bear the brunt of battle and also to pay the cost.

When these innocent investors finally wake up to what the Power Trust has done to them, and come to understand what their rights and their remedies are, they will give that combination all the war they want without their having to declare war on Congress and on the country.

We are not attempting to destroy anybody's property. Wherever it has become necessary to buy any of the property of a power company the Government has paid what that property was actually worth. The T. V. A. has done the same thing.

The Wheeler-Rayburn bill will not destroy the property of anyone, but it will help to protect innocent investors in the years to come. It will really enhance the actual value of stocks in legitimate operating companies by relieving them of the burdens of maintaining useless and expensive holding companies. The stocks in a corporation are simply worth the value of whatever property that corporation owns, and mere speculative revenues or gambling prospects are not to be considered as a part of its assets.

The power interests have attempted to base rates, not upon the cost of production and distribution, but upon the helpless consumers' ability to pay, and they have issued these watered stocks against their right or their ability to plunder the unprotected users of electric lights and power. In other words, they have issued preferred stocks against their right to hold you and your children in perpetual economic bondage, and have sold these watered stocks out to innocent investors—invariably under the most flagrant of false pretenses.

Now, when their scheme is exposed, and they are threatened with even-handed justice, in order to escape the wrath of their deluded purchasers, they come with feigned indignity and affected bravo, and pretend to declare war.

Since the Power Trust has declared this war, you and I have no election. As Patrick Henry once said, "If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest."

So far as I am concerned, I accept the challenge. I have enlisted for the duration of the conflict. This must be a fight to the finish between the American people on the one hand and the Power Trust on the other.

We are fighting to get light and power rates reduced to what they should be in every State in the Union. I want to show you what that would mean in dollars and cents to your people who have to pay the bills. I am not guessing at these figures; they have been carefully prepared from data collected through the power survey of the Federal Power Commission. They are substantially correct.

If these rates, throughout the whole country, were reduced to the T. V. A. rates, the domestic consumers would save $320,880,000 a year; the commercial consumers would save $279,300,000 a year; and the industrial consumers would save $193,689,000 a year.

All told, they would save $793,869,000 a year, on the basis of present consumption. That is about $200,000,000 more than the value of our entire cotton crop for 1934.

But the power interests tell you that the T. V. A. rates are too low. My answer is that they are too high, and that they will be reduced as the years go by.

Now, let us take the Tacoma, Wash., rates. At Tacoma they have a publicly owned plant, worth between twenty and thirty millions of dollars, which they are paying for entirely from earnings from the electric energy sold. Their rates are even lower, as a whole, than the T. V. A. rates.

Let us see what the people of the United States who use electric lights and power would save in a year if they all paid the Tacoma rates. The residential consumers would save $286,416,000 a year; the commercial consumers would save $241,428,000 a year; the industrial consumers would save $270,954,000 a year. All told, they would save $798,798,000 a year, even on the basis of the present consumption. That is $250,000,000 more than the value of the entire wheat crop of the United States for the year 1934.

Just think of the American people being overcharged every year for electric lights and power, $250,000,000 more than the value of the entire wheat crop of the United States; and yet millions of our people, especially in the smaller towns and in the rural districts, are denied the use of any electric energy at all.

The average monthly domestic consumption of electricity throughout the United States is about 50 kilowatt-hours a month. In Tacoma it is 117 kilowatt-hours a month. At Tupelo, Miss., under the T. V. A. rates, it is 103 kilowatt-hours a month. So the chances are that if the American people were given lights and power at the Tacoma rates, or at the T. V. A. rates, they would more than double their domestic and probably their commercial, if not their industrial consumption, which would run this saving far above the billion-dollar mark.

Now, let us take the Canadian rates and compare what we are paying in the United States with the rates paid in Winnipeg and Ontario, Canada, and see what the difference would be. If we paid the same rates throughout the United States that are paid in Winnipeg, our domestic consumers would save $385,980,000 a year; our commercial consumers would save $357,900,000, and our industrial consumers would save $142,000,000 a year, or a total saving, even on the present consumption, of $885,880,000 a year.

While the average domestic consumption in the United States is only about 50 kilowatt-hours a month, the average domestic consumption in Winnipeg, Canada, is a little more than 375 kilowatt-hours a month. Their low rates in Winnipeg enable those people to use adequate lights, operate their radios, water pumps, electric irons, electric churns, electric refrigerators, electric ranges, and electric radiators with which to heat their homes. I am informed that some of them are even building dwelling houses without any fireplaces or chimneys at all, depending entirely upon electric energy for their heat.

If the electric light and power rates throughout the United States were reduced to the Ontario rates, the 20,000,000 residential consumers in this country would save $390,516,000 a year; the commercial consumers would save $321,084,000 a year; the industrial consumers would save $267,955,000 a year. All told, they would save $979,555,000 a year on the basis of their present consumption.

But in Ontario the average domestic consumption is 155 kilowatt-hours a month, or about three times the average monthly consumption in the United States. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that if the American people were given the same electric light and power rates enjoyed by the citizens of Ontario, probably our domestic and commercial, if not our industrial, consumption would more than double, and would not only run this savings of $979,555,000 even above the billion-dollar mark but would undoubtedly run it to nearer the $2,000,000,000 mark. In other words, if the American people were given lights and power at the Ontario rates, it

would really mean to them a savings of anywhere from $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a year.

Now, let us see what these overcharges are costing the people of your State. I have before me figures which have been carefully compiled from data collected by the Federal Power Commission through its rate survey which gives us this information.

We know the amount of electricity used in each State, and how much of it is used by domestic, commercial, and industrial consumers. We know what the people are paying for it under the present rates and what they would pay for it under the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, the Winnipeg rates, or the Ontario rates.

I shall take them by States and show how much these overcharges are costing the people of the various States in every section of the country. Read them carefully and tell me how the people of your State can continue to stagger under this burden.

MAINE

We will take first the State of Maine. If the people of that State were supplied with electric light and power at the T. V. A. rates, the domestic consumers would save $2,141,000 a year; the commercial consumers would save $1,501,000 a year; and the industrial consumers would save $1,445,000 a year—making a total of $5,087,000 a year the people of the State of Maine would save on their light and power bills every year, even on the basis of their present consumption, if they were supplied electric energy at the T. V. A. rates.

If the people of Maine were furnished electric energy at the Tacoma rates, the domestic consumers would save $1,910,000 a year; the commercial consumers would save $1,298,000 a year; and the industrial consumers would save $2,021,000 a year—making a tctal of $5,229,000 a year the people of Maine would save in 1 year under the Tacoma rates.

Under the Ontario rates domestic consumers would save $2,604,000, the commercial consumers would save $1,726,660, and the industrial consumers would save $1,999,000, making a total of $6,329,660 the people of Maine would save in a year under the Ontario rates.

Under the Winnipeg rates the domestic consumers of Maine would save $2,574,000 a year, the commercial consumers would save $1,924,000 a year, and the industrial consumers would save $1,060,000 a year, making a total of $5,558,000 the people of Maine would save a year under the Winnipeg rates.

No wonder the Power Trust is opposed to the development of the great "Quoddy" project in the State of Maine. They know it would relieve the people of that State from a part, at least, of this terrific burden.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The domestic consumers of New Hampshire, under the T. V. A. rates, would save $1,490,000 a year; the commercial consumers would save $1,187,000 a year and the industrial consumers would save $766,000 a year, or a total of $3,443,000.

Under the Tacoma rates the domestic consumers would save $1,330,000 a year, the commercial consumers $1,053,000, and the industrial consumers $1,076,000, or a total of $3459,000.

Under the Ontario rates the domestic consumers of New Hampshire would save $1,814,000 a year, the commercial consumers would save $1,135,040, and the industrial consumers would save $1,064,000, or a total of $4,013,040.

Under the Winnipeg rates the domestic consumers in New Hampshire would save $1,793,000 a year, the commercial consumers would save $1,464,000 a year, the industrial consumers would save $564,000 a year, making a total annual saving of $3,821,000.

VERMONT AND RHODE ISLAND

The people in the two small States of Vermont and Rhode Island together used 481,171,873 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $17,300,221.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $9,078,221, a saving of $8,222,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $8,933,221, or a saving of $8,367,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $7,096,867, or a saving of $10,203,354 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $8,223,221, or a saving of $9,077,000 a year.

MASSACHUSETTS

The people in the State of Massachusetts used 1,993,560,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $75,499,187.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $38,315,000, a saving of $37,184,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $37,942,187, a saving of $37,557,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $30,112,730, a saving of $45,386,457 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $34,415,187, a saving of $41,084,000 a year.

CONNECTICUT

The people in the State of Connecticut used 811,158,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $30,123,083.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $15,672,083, a saving of $14,451,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $15,726,086, a saving of $14,397,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $12,352,492, a saving of $17,770,594 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $13,973,086, a saving of $16,150,000 a year.

NEW YORK

The people of the State of New York used 8,295,012,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $255,454,676.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $129,755,676, a saving of $125,699,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $127,836,676, a saving of $127,618,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $101,306,539, a saving of $154,148,137 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $116,781,676, a saving of $138,673,000 a year.

No wonder the Power Trust is opposing the development of the St. Lawrence project, which would give to the people of the State of New York and adjoining States lights and power at reasonable rates, and save them from having to pay this enormous overcharge.

NEW JERSEY

The people of the State of New Jersey used 1,839,677,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $76,487,173.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $37,364,173, a saving of $39,123,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $36,924,173, a saving of $39,563,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $29,724,156, a saving of $46,763,017 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $32,379,173, a saving of $44,108,000 a year.

PENNSYLVANIA

The people of the State of Pennsylvania used 5,591,808,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $152,567,854.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $81,398,854, a saving of $71,169,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $77,660,854, a saving of $74,907,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $63,313,688, a saving of $89,254,166 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $76,518,854, a saving of $76,048,000 a year.

In the State of Pennsylvania, in addition to this enormous overcharge imposed upon the consumers of electric energy, the utilities have been powerful enough in years past to

exempt their real-estate holdings from taxation by statute, through their control of the State legislature.

Today they own $100,000,000 worth of real estate in Pennsylvania that is escaping all taxes—State, county, and municipal. That burden is passed on to the unprotected people of Pennsylvania, although these utilities own large office buildings, space in which is rented to the public, thus bringing them additional revenues, while they escape the burden of taxation which the small business man and the home owners have to pay.

OHIO

The people of the State of Ohio used 3,418,060,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $98,215,219.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $51,372,219, a saving of $46,843,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $50,686,219, a saving of $47,529,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $40,198,328, a saving of $58,016,891 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $46,376,219, a saving of $51,839,000 a year.

Ohio is a great wheat-growing State, producing around 35,000,000 bushels a year. Yet if every grain of wheat grown in Ohio last year were sold at the highest price on today's market it would lack from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 bringing enough money to pay this overcharge in the State of Ohio alone.

INDIANA

The people of the State of Indiana used 1,209,459,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $39,861,716.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $20,677,716, a saving of $19,184,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $20,672,716, a saving of $19,189,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $16,219,967, a saving of $23,641,749 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $18,351,716, a saving of $21,510,000 a year.

ILLINOIS

The people of the State of Illinois used 3,918,305,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $122,506,776.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $64,032,776, a saving of $58,474,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $63,245,776, a saving of $59,261,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $50,002,211, a saving of $72,504,565 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $57,192,776, a saving of $65,314,000 a year.

MICHIGAN

The people of the State of Michigan used 2,589,125,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $69,958,547.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $35,933,547, a saving of $34,025,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $36,190,547, a saving of $33,768,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $28,235,230, a saving of $41,723,317 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $31,451,547, a saving of $38,507,000 a year.

WISCONSIN

The people of the State of Wisconsin used 1,188,207,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $37,026,068.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $19,133,068, a saving of $17,893,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $19,239,068, a saving of $17,787,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $15,025,274, a saving of $22,000,794 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $16,852,068, a saving of $20,174,000 a year.

MINNESOTA

The people of the State of Minnesota used 891,683,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $29,895,355.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $15,435,355, a saving of $14,460,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $15,984,355, a saving of $13,911,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $12,133,336, a saving of $17,762,019 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $13,508,355, a saving of $16,387,000 a year.

IOWA

The people of the State of Iowa used 672,600,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $25,258,621.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $12,778,621, a saving of $12,480,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $13,450,621, a saving of $11,808,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $10,115,975, a saving of $15,142,646 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $10,624,621, a saving of $14,634,000 a year.

MISSOURI

The people of the State of Missouri used 1,416,997,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $42,521,922.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $21,453,922, a saving of $21,068,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $22,272,922, a saving of $20,249,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $16,952,246, a saving of $25,569,676 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $18,020,922, a saving of $24,501,000 a year.

NORTH DAKOTA

The people of the State of North Dakota used 70,816,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $4,354,173.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $2,170,173, a saving of $2,184,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $2,494,173, a saving of $1,860,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $1,724,702, a saving of $2,629,471 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $1,756,173, a saving of $2,598,000 a year.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The people of the State of South Dakota used 88,336,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $5,001,302.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $2,521,302, a saving of $2,480,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $2,656,302, a saving of $2,345,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $1,996,863, a saving of $3,004,439 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $2,087,302, a saving of $2,914,000 a year.

NEBRASKA

The people of the State of Nebraska used 383,685,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $13,799,571.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $6,643,571, a saving of $7,156,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $7,029,517, a saving of $6,770,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $5,500,587, a saving of $8,298,984 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $5,429,571, a saving of $8,370,000 a year.

KANSAS

The people of the State of Kansas used 583,507,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $18,835,232.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $9,661,-232, a saving of $9,174,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $9,881,-232, a saving of $8,954,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $7,609,-114, a saving of $11,226,118 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $8,-337,232, a saving of $10,498,000 a year.

DELAWARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, AND WEST VIRGINIA

The people of the State of Delaware, the District of Columbia, the States of Maryland and West Virginia, together used 2,119,605,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $52,659,441.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $27,789,-441, a saving of $24,870,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $27,-897,441, a saving of $24,762,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $21,674,-366, a saving of $30,985,075 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $25,-635,441, a saving of $27,024,000 a year.

VIRGINIA

The people of the State of Virginia used 735,802,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $20,049,222.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $10,-449,222, a saving of $9,600,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $10,351,222, a saving of $9,698,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $8,189,768, a saving of $11,859,454 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $9,379,222, a saving of $10,670,000 a year.

NORTH CAROLINA

The people of the State of North Carolina used 1,239,-893,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $23,396,108.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $12,754,108, a saving of $10,642,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $11,743,108, a saving of $11,653,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $9,858,206, a saving of $13,537,902 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $12,481,108, a saving of $10,915,000 a year.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The people of the State of South Carolina used 736,552,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $12,407,190.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $6,840,190, a saving of $5,567,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $6,-115,190, a saving of $6,292,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $5,-250,539, a saving of $7,156,651 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $6,831,190, a saving of $5,576,000 a year.

GEORGIA

The people of the State of Georgia used 876,614,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $20,194,417.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $10,-528,417, a saving of $9,666,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $10,-294,417, a saving of $9,900,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $8,229,248, a saving of $11,965,169 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $9,550,417, a saving of $10,644,000 a year.

FLORIDA

The people of the State of Florida used 404,425,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $18,206,511.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $9,065,511, a saving of $9,141,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $9,741,-511, a saving of $8,465,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $7,206,-617, a saving of $10,999,894 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $7,289,-511, a saving of $10,917,000 a year.

KENTUCKY

The people of the State of Kentucky used 712,619,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $17,303,256.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $9,076,-256, a saving of $8,227,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $8,905,-256, a saving of $8,398,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $7,094,-794, a saving of $10,208,322 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $8,-246,256, a saving of $9,057,000 a year.

TENNESSEE

The people of the State of Tennessee used 946,883,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $20,764,172.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $10,-912,172, a saving of $9,852,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $10,-563,172, a saving of $10,201,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $8,512,517, a saving of $12,251,655 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $10,034,172, a saving of $10,730,000 a year.

ALABAMA

The people of the State of Alabama used 634,292,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $12,978,651.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $6,815,651, a saving of $6,163,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $6,634,651, a saving of $6,344,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $5,322,608, a saving of $7,656,043 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $6,236,651, a saving of $6,742,000 a year.

MISSISSIPPI

The people of the State of Mississippi used 324,590,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $8,386,241.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $4,405,241, a saving of $3,981,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $4,269,-241, a saving of $4,117,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $3,438,-882, a saving of $4,947,359 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $4,049,241, a saving of $4,337,000 a year.

ARKANSAS

The people of the State of Arkansas used 255,988,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $8,667,560.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $4,510,-560, a saving of $4,157,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $4,456,-560, a saving of $4,211,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $3,532,-381, a saving of $5,135,179 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $4,052,560, a saving of $4,615,000 a year.

LOUISIANA

The people of the State of Louisiana used 557,718,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $15,460,717.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $8,059,717, a saving of $7,401,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $7,983,717, a saving of $7,477,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $6,312,264, a saving of $9,148,453 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $7,233,717, a saving of $8,227,000 a year.

OKLAHOMA

The people of the State of Oklahoma used 551,388,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $18,305,275.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $9,666,275, a saving of $8,639,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $9,359,275, a saving of $8,946,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $7,538,678, a saving of $10,766,597 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $8,918,275, a saving of $9,387,000 a year.

TEXAS

The people of the State of Texas used 1,683,558,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $51,403,516.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $26,491,516, a saving of $24,912,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $26,481,516, a saving of $24,922,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $20,789,117, a saving of $30,614,399 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $23,394,516, a saving of $28,009,000 a year.

MONTANA AND UTAH

The people of the States of Montana and Utah together used 536,139,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $13,630,783.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $7,084,783, a saving of $6,546,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $7,041,783, a saving of $6,589,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $5,550,944, a saving of $8,079,839 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $6,327,783, a saving of $7,303,000 a year.

IDAHO

The people of the State of Idaho used 292,135,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $5,750,348.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $2,989,348, a saving of $2,761,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $2,961,348, a saving of $2,789,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $2,342,323, a saving of $3,408,025 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $2,678,348, a saving of $3,072,000 a year.

WYOMING

The people of the State of Wyoming used 79,225,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $2,745,869.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $1,427,869, a saving of $1,318,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $1,422,869, a saving of $1,323,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $1,119,126, a saving of $1,626,743 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $1,272,869, a saving of $1,473,000 a year.

COLORADO

The people of the State of Colorado used 441,982,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $13,339,906.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $6,934,906, a saving of $6,405,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $6,878,906, a saving of $6,461,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $5,432,769, a saving of $7,907,137 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $6,203,906, a saving of $7,136,000 a year.

ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

The people of the States of Arizona and New Mexico used 264,057,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $8,929,686.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $4,642,686, a saving of $4,287,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $4,585,686, a saving of $4,344,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $3,635,904, a saving of $5,293,782 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $4,168,686, a saving of $4,761,000 a year.

NEVADA

The people of the State of Nevada used 94,760,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $2,154,764.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $1,120,764, a saving of $1,034,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $1,108,764, a saving of $1,046,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $897,430, a saving of $1,257,334 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $1,004,764, a saving of $1,150,000 a year.

WASHINGTON

The people of the State of Washington used 1,576,070,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $24,615,571.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $12,427,571, a saving of $12,188,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates, the cost would have been $12,954,571, a saving of $11,661,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been $9,825,735, a saving of $14,789,836 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates, the cost would have been $10,406,571, a saving of $14,209,000 a year.

OREGON

The people of the State of Oregon used 637,926,000 kilowatt hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $13,833,329.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $6,904,329, a saving of $6,929,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $7,323,329, a saving of $6,510,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $5,478,029, a saving of $8,355,300 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $5,630,329, a saving of $8,203,000 a year.

CALIFORNIA

The people of the State of California used 4,325,505,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year, for which they paid the sum of $107,606,211.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $54,103,211, a saving of $53,503,000 a year.

Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $56,659,211, a saving of $50,947,000 a year.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $42,816,608, a saving of $64,789,603 a year.

Under the Winnipeg rates the cost would have been $44,957,211, a saving of $62,649,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask any Member of this House, I ask any Member of the Senate, I ask any intelligent patriotic citi-

zen, if it is just, if it is fair, if it is honest for the already overburdened American people in the various States to have to carry this enormous load throughout their lives and pass it on down to their children, in order to gratify the cupidity of this gigantic octopus known as the "Power Trust"?

You have no doubt heard and read many vicious attacks on the Tennessee Valley Authority. Do you know why? Have you ever stopped to think what crime the T. V. A. has committed to inspire these attacks? It has simply shown the American people what electric lights and power should cost, and the example it has set is forcing down light and power rates all over the land to the benefit of you ultimate consumers. The example set by the T. V. A., together with the publicity given through the Federal Power Commission's rate survey, has already saved our people more than $100,000,000 a year.

I want to answer at this point some of the arguments the Power Trust is using against municipally owned plants. They tell you that municipal plants pay no taxes, and that their average rates for all classes of service are higher than the rates of privately owned utilities.

Mr. FLETCHER. The gentleman said "They say that they do not pay any taxes." Did the New York Times, which the gentleman quoted a moment ago, make that statement?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no. The Power Trust puts out that statement.

I called attention a moment ago to an article appearing on the front page of the New York Times this morning showing a reduction which the power interest has announced in that city, and in which they quote the following table to show how the residential consumers will be affected by this change in the rates, if and when they go into effect:

Monthly	Bill at present rates	Bill at new rates	Reduction in bill
0 to 10 kilowatt-hours	$1.00	$1.00	
15 kilowatt-hours	1.30	1.25	$0.05
25 kilowatt-hours	1.80	1.75	.05
35 kilowatt-hours	2.30	2.25	.05
50 kilowatt-hours	3.05	2.95	.10
60 kilowatt-hours	3.55	3.35	.20
70 kilowatt-hours	4.05	3.75	.30
90 kilowatt-hours	5.05	4.50	.55
100 kilowatt-hours	5.55	4.80	.75
150 kilowatt-hours	8.05	6.05	2.00
200 kilowatt-hours	10.55	7.05	3.50
300 kilowatt-hours	15.55	9.05	6.50
500 kilowatt-hours	25.55	13.05	12.50

This announcement was made in order to block the attempt on the part of the mayor and the citizens of New York to construct a municipal plant.

The average monthly consumption of domestic users of electricity in New York City is 35 kilowatt-hours a month. You will note from this table that the average consumer in the city of New York under this change "voluntarily" made by this beneficent institution, in order to stop the row in New York over a municipal plant, amounts to a saving to the average consumer of the enormous amount of 5 cents a month.

No wonder such a voluntary demonstration of magnanimity on the part of the Power Trust was given a conspicuous display on the front page of the New York Times, a great daily newspaper that publishes "All the news that's fit to print."

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, yielding a concession of 5 cents a month to stop this row over a municipal plant. It is one of the most outstanding acts of unselfish generosity ever known since the monkey ate up the cheese to keep the cats from quarreling over it.

Now let us compare these new rates which the people of New York are to enjoy with the T. V. A. rates. You will note that under these new rates 25 kilowatt-hours a month will cost a residential consumer in New York City $1.75. In Tupelo, Miss., under the T. V. A. rates, 25 kilowatt-hours a month costs 75 cents; 35 kilowatt-hours a month under these "reduced" New York rates will cost $2.25; in Tupelo, under the T. V. A. rates, 35 kilowatt-hours a month costs $1.05. Fifty kilowatt-hours a month under these "reduced" New York rates will cost $2.95; in Tupelo, $1.50 a month. Sixty kilowatt-hours a month in New York, $3.35 a month; in Tupelo, $1.70 a month. Seventy kilowatt-hours a month in New York, $3.75; in Tupelo, $1.90. Ninety kilowatt-hours in New York, $4.50; in Tupelo, $2.30. One hundred kilowatt-hours a month in New York, $4.80; in Tupelo, $2.50. One hundred and fifty kilowatt-hours a month in New York, $6.05; in Tupelo, $3.50. Two hundred kilowatt-hours a month in New York, $7.05; in Tupelo, $4.50. Three hundred kilowatt-hours in New York, $9.05; in Tupelo, $5.50. Five hundred kilowatt-hours a month in New York, $13.05; in Tupelo, $6.90.

And, as I said before, the T. V. A. rates are higher on the whole, than the Tacoma rates, or the Winnipeg, or the Ontario rates.

Now, let us make some more comparisons. We will take Birmingham, Ala., one of the hotbeds of the Power Trust. Let us compare the domestic rates in Birmingham, which is supplied by a private company, with the rates charged by the public plant at Tacoma, Wash. Although the Birmingham rates have been forced downward by the psychological effect of the T. V. A., and the publicity to which I referred, their rates are still so high as to make the following comparison between Birmingham and Tacoma, Wash., a complete answer to the power interests' contention against publicly owned plants.

In Birmingham, 25 kilowatt-hours a month costs a householder $1.55; in Tacoma it costs $1.13. In Birmingham, 40 kilowatt-hours a month costs $2.30; in Tacoma $1.80. In Birmingham, 250 kilowatt-hours a month costs $7.80; in Tacoma $3.90. In Birmingham 500 kilowatt-hours a month costs $12.55, while in Tacoma it costs $6.40.

Yet, with a gross revenue of $1,940,994, the Tacoma plant paid $145,575 in taxes last year; gave to the city of Tacoma $200,545 worth of free service, set aside for depreciation $400,053; paid interest on its indebtedness to the amount of $435,322, and still made a net profit of $508,190; and at the same time gave the people of Tacoma the lowest light and power rates in the United States.

Let us take some more examples and compare rates of these private companies with the rates charged by publicly owned plants. I see before me here the rates of the public plant at Jacksonville, Fla., and the rates charged by the private power company in Miami, Fla.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I compliment the gentleman on his masterful presentation of this subject. I was interested in the remarks which the gentleman made that the decreasing of rates would increase consumption. I think the House would be interested to know that an economist paid by the power interests, who came before our committee to fight the Wheeler-Rayburn bill, testified that during the depression years, because of decreased rates, the power business increased by leaps and bounds. In other words, the decreased rate, as the gentleman suggested, causes increasing consumption because the people are better able to pay the rates and make greater use of God's great gift and aid to mankind—electrical energy.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Montana is correct.

Now, remember that Jacksonville is following a different policy from that pursued by Tacoma and the T. V. A., in that Jacksonville is maintaining its high rate structure in order to turn revenues into the city treasury and reduce taxes. In Jacksonville, where they have a municipally owned plant, 25 kilowatt-hours a month costs a domestic consumer $1.75; in Miami, which is supplied by a private company, it costs $2.76; 40 kilowatt-hours a month in Jacksonville costs $2.80; in Miami, $4.18. In Jacksonville 250 kilowatt-hours a month costs $7.95; in Miami, $10.40. In Jacksonville 500 kilowatt-hours a month costs $12.95; and in Miami, $15.40.

Yet with a gross revenue of $2,671,659, Jacksonville paid operating expenses amounting to $793,249 last year; paid taxes in the amount of $34,794; and then turned into the city treasury cash to the amount of $1,777,657. Jacksonville

could reduce her rates to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, or the Canadian rates and still operate at a profit.

I have before me a volume of figures which show the advantages of publicly owned plants, but I will not take the time to read them all. I will just take this one more. I note that some fellow from Massachusetts has been attacking me through the New York Times because of my attitude on the power question. Let us see on what grounds he has to complain.

If anyone will take the time to study the report made by the Federal Power Commission on electric light and power rates in Massachusetts, he will realize that if there are any people anywhere who need relief from exorbitant light and power rates, they are the people in the State of Massachusetts, especially in the smaller towns and in the rural districts. The rates in Boston are a little more reasonable. So let us compare them with the rates of the publicly owned plant in Los Angeles, Calif.

In Boston, where light and power is supplied by a private power company, 25 kilowatt-hours a month costs a householder $1.75; in Los Angeles, $1.20. In Boston, 40 kilowatt-hours a month costs $2.50; in Los Angeles, $1.81. In Boston, 150 kilowatt-hours costs $6.80; in Los Angeles, $4.58. In Boston, 500 kilowatt-hours a month costs $12.80; while in Los Angeles, $8.81.

Last year the public plant in Los Angeles, with a gross operating revenue of $14,300,019, paid its operating expenses amounting to $7,020,919, paid taxes amounting to $1,296,570, as well as free service amounting to $1,079,463, set aside $2,086,890 for depreciation, paid interest on its indebtedness to the amount of $1,528,385, and still had a net income of $3,670,091.

Yet the Power Trust would have you believe that these public plants pay no taxes, contribute nothing, charge higher rates than the private companies, and are operated at a loss.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Los Angeles must bring her power over transmission lines a considerable distance, and the distributing system is one of the most expensive in America, because of the great area over which it must operate.

Mr. RANKIN. And still supplies electric energy at these rates.

The Power Trust attempts to block every movement we make to give the American people relief from exorbitant light and power rates. They have opposed the T. V. A. from the beginning. They have opposed the construction of the Quoddy project, the St. Lawrence project, the Boulder Dam, Peck, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and all other public power projects, on the flimsy pretext that there is no market for the power—telling the American people that we have a surplus of power now.

If we reduce rates all over the United States to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, or the Canadian rates, and make electricity available to everyone at rates based upon the cost of production and distribution so as to enable them to enjoy a liberal use of electric lights, operate their fans, refrigerators, electric pumps, radios, electric ranges, and other necessary appliances, and heat their homes with it, if necessary, as well as operate their business establishments, and their industrial plants, then they will consume more power than all of these new projects and all existing plants can produce.

It is a significant fact that lower rates bring higher consumption. When the T. V. A. rates first went into effect at Tupelo, the average domestic consumption was 42 kilowatt-hours a month. In 10 months it had increased to 103. The number of electric refrigerators increased from 195 to 559, the number of electric ranges from 15 to 150, and the commercial consumption of electric energy more than doubled.

The same thing has happened in all the other communities served with T. V. A. power. In the city of Amory, Miss., during the first 6 months their T. V. A. rates were in effect, the number of electric refrigerators increased from 40 to 345.

Give the American people reasonable rates, based upon the actual cost of production and distribution, and there will be no surplus of power; they will consume many times our present supply. That will not only lighten the burdens of the domestic consumers and enable them to use sufficient electrical appliances to enrich their homes and relieve them of their drudgery, but it will also stimulate industry, relieve the merchants and other commercial consumers, aid agriculture by taking light and hope to the distressed farmers of America, and will make our country a brighter, a richer, and a better place in which to live—not only today and tomorrow, but for all time to come. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is severely criticized for many of the things that are done here. It is my pleasure to call attention to a particular project that the Congress has authorized, which is to commence operation tomorrow, for which we ought to get a large volume of credit that will equalize much of the criticism to which we have been subjected.

Mr. Speaker, the event which will occur tomorrow is a most important event, concerning the new method in the handling and treatment of narcotic addicts, the dedication of the first United States narcotic farm at Lexington, Ky.

The Congress should receive great credit for this forward step. At the second session of the Seventieth Congress I introduced a resolution providing for an investigation of Federal prisons. Up to that time, for 40 years, these prisons had not been investigated by a congressional committee.

This committee, of which Mr. COOPER of Ohio was chairman, and on which Mr. TABER, of New York, served, and on which I also had the honor of serving, visited and inspected all Federal prisons in the United States.

We found in some of the prisons that no segregation had been made of the narcotic addicts, with the result that many inmates of the prisons for the first time were initiated into the use of habit-forming drugs, with the result that in some instances they had become confirmed addicts before their sentences expired.

The committee reported to the Congress recommending the erection of new Federal penitentiaries and the establishment of Federal farms for the treatment of narcotic addicts.

The institution at Lexington is designed primarily for the care of the more intractable type of person, largely the prisoner group. However, it will also be possible for addicts to be voluntarily committed even though they are unable to pay for their treatment. This class will be kept separate and distinct from the prisoner class.

Arrangements have been completed by the Public Health Service, under Surg. Gen. Hugh S. Cummings, to transfer to the new institution some 300 addict prisoners from the Federal prison system. The new farm has 1,000 beds and is for men only, although it is contemplated that facilities will be developed for women addicts in the near future.

A great many persons have been interested, and many have taken part in the evolution of the narcotic farm at Lexington, Ky., and in bringing it to its present state of completion. The Public Health Service of the Federal Government is doing a wonderful and magnificent work under the leadership of Dr. Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General.

The problem of institutional treatment for drug addiction, however, must take into account not only the precipitating and underlying causes of addiction but the diverse motives or reasons for seeking treatment, the incidence of intercurrent diseases and defects in such a group, the great differences in the types of personalities involved, and the need for protecting the institution community against the weaknesses and cupidity of its component individuals.

The most important or underlying causes of addiction are related to the inherent constitutional make-up of the individual. The so-called "nervously unstable person", is more prone to embrace the habitual use of narcotics than one

with a stable constitution. Experience with persons addicted to the use of such drugs has proved this.

Now, of course, you do not realize the great handicap that narcotic addiction is to any man or woman. A man or woman can be addicted, for instance, to the use of alcohol, but at some particular time they can pull themselves together, stop using it, and start life all over again, but with narcotic addiction it is different. After 2 or 3 weeks' use, no matter how strong-minded or how strong-willed you are, without medical help and assistance you are unable to get yourself off the addiction. Congress realized that. Congress realized that there is no condition in which a man is placed that is comparable with that of opium addiction, where food, shelter, raiment, and all those things by which men live are cheerfully abandoned in order that the addict may secure his favorite drug. Those who are addicted to the use of opium or its derivatives constitute the ultimate market for smuggled or contraband drugs. They are a menace to the local supply of such drugs originally destined for medical and scientific use.

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

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman from New York deserves the thanks of the Nation for the work he has done for these narcotic addicts. I want to thank him especially, because through the work he has done has come about the construction of a sanitarium for the treatment of narcotic addicts in my State, near Fort Worth, Tex., and it means a great deal to the people who are afflicted with this terrible habit. I want to make this public expression of my appreciation of his efforts.

Mr. BOYLAN. I thank the gentleman.

The addict usually commences early, most of them before they reach the age of 25 or 30 years. These young persons represent a period of life where there exists the greatest urge to accept hazards, and when, coupled with a desire for their favorite drug, the possibilities become even greater for their taking extraordinary chances that violate the customary standards of safety.

The immediate important causes of addition to narcotic drugs are related to the previous use of such drugs in medical treatment; in self-treatment for the relief of pain; recourse to drugs during emotional stress; to overcome the effect of drunkenness; and to indulgence for the sake of experience, curiosity, or the thrill they expect to get from it. Also through the influence of association with others who are addicted to the use of such drugs is the more frequent or prominent immediate cause of addiction. The removal of those addicts from the American communities is therefore a step in the direction of preventing further addiction.

The second subsequent change in Federal policy toward this so-called "addiction problem" occurred when, as I told you, the Seventieth Congress adopted a resolution for the investigation of Federal prisons. That went so far as to lead to the establishment of a narcotic farm for addicts about 5 miles out of the city of Lexington, Ky. We also have provided for a farm a short distance from the city of Fort Worth, Tex. This, however, is but in the making. The point that I immediately wanted to call to your attention was the opening of the farm at Lexington, Ky., which will take place tomorrow, May 25.

There on a beautiful tract of land, consisting of about 1,100 acres, we have erected a series of buildings, with every hospital facility, in order to start the Federal Government for the first time in a proper scientific study of the causes of addiction and to give proper treatment to the inmates who will be confined in that hospital.

In addition to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to commit addicts to the farm, there is also a provision in the law which was passed providing for voluntary commitments. Everything will be done there to try to bring the addicts back to a full sense of their individual responsibility and to return them to the community in such physical condition that they will be able to carry on.

There will be a dairy farm; there will be a truck farm; there will be poultry and hog raising; teaching landscaping; there will also be athletics, both indoor and outdoor. There will be a carpenter and machine shops, a clothing shop to make clothing just for the inmates. In other words, all these activities will be used to endeavor to make the institution as self-sustaining as possible, and yet provide employment for the inmates.

I might say that at Fort Worth, Tex., we have purchased about 1,500 acres, where a similar narcotic farm will be established. The control and management and discipline to be maintained for the safe-keeping of the individuals and the protection of the community will be done in a humane and understanding manner. Experiments are to be carried on to determine the best methods of treatment, and research in this field, and the results disseminated to the medical profession and to the general public, to the end that States may make provision for establishing and for helping to solve the problem of drug addiction.

The functions of these institutions make them assume the character of treatment and research centers, of educational and rehabilitation centers with certain custodial features superimposed. I might say at the present time we have no place for treatment of female addicts in the United States. In a bowl of the Blue Ridge Mountains, a beautiful setting at Alderson, W. Va., we have established a prison for women. This is on the cottage plan and it is one of the most modern and up-to-date prisons in the United States. I had the pleasure of visiting it, spending a few days there, and inspecting all its facilities. At that particular place they have a small hospital for the treatment of any female addict who may be confined in that institution. It is the plan of the Surgeon General, however, with your support and help, to take a part of the grounds of the farm at Lexington, Ky., and there erect a separate institution for female addicts; and I am hopeful that by the next session we will have this plan before us. I bespeak for it your favorable consideration.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, has given a very interesting dissertation on drug addicts. May I ask him, if they consider drug addiction a disease, why call the institution a prison?

Mr. BOYLAN. We do not call it a prison. We call it a narcotic farm.

Mr. SIROVICH. I thought the gentleman did call it a prison.

Mr. BOYLAN. No. We call it a farm. We realize that drug addiction is a disease and not a crime.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 6 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FIESINGER. Has the gentleman any figures showing how many of these people who are released after being cured go back again to the drug habit?

Mr. BOYLAN. We have no figures on that, because this is but the beginning. It is an experiment. From my knowledge of drug addiction, however, through studies in New York City, many return, just like a man who is addicted to alcoholism returns; but sometimes he wakes up and pulls himself together and gets on his feet again. With the help of medical attention we are hopeful the same thing can be done in the case of drug addicts. I have shown the peculiarity. The difference between alcoholic addicts and drug addicts is that a drug addict cannot pull himself together without medical treatment. He has to get medical treatment first.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We are all very much interested in what the gentleman has had to say. In the early part of his address he stated that before drug addicts were segre-

gated in the Federal prisons those who were not addicted to the use of drugs often contracted the habit of drug use from those prisoners who did use it.

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think we would be interested to know how prisoners in the United States prisons secure drugs with which to satisfy their craving.

Mr. BOYLAN. I will answer the gentleman. It seems impossible, not only in United States prisons, but in all of the prisons of the country, whether State or Federal, to keep out illicit traffic in drugs. One of the greatest troubles that wardens have is to discover and break up this drug traffic within the prison. Anyone who is familiar with the operation of prisons knows that condition exists, although everything is done to try to break it up and prevent its further operation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is due entirely to the smuggling of the drugs into the prison? The drug addicts then secure the drug by the smuggling process exclusively?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; through underground methods; not through the proper medical channels in the prison.

Mr. KRAMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield to my California colleague.

Mr. KRAMER. The State of California has built a sanitarium at Spardo, Calif., for the treatment of addicts. It has been very successful in its operation.

Mr. BOYLAN. I am pleased that your State has taken up this important matter. It is a splendid way to help many unfortunate addicts.

Previously in my remarks I stated that many of these drug addicts got their start through receiving drugs in medical treatment. Others took it as a self-treatment for the relief of pain. Others had recourse to the drugs in times of great emotional stress, others to overcome the effect of drinking, others for the sake of the experience, the thrill somebody told them they would get from the taking of it, and others through the influence and association of those accustomed to the use of drugs.

The authorization and establishment of facilities for the confinement and treatment of persons addicted to habit-forming drugs is a form of specialization that bears a direct relationship to policies respecting enforcement of the so-called "antinarcotic laws" and to the protection of American communities. It bears relationship also to problems in penal and correctional institutions, to the uses of narcotic drugs in medical practice, to research and quest for more accurate and fundamental knowledge concerning the nature of drug addiction and related phenomena, and to the instinctive demand ever present in the American people that the sick and afflicted shall be set in the way of strength and hope.

At this time I want to take the occasion to congratulate the Congress for the splendid advanced, humane work they have taken up and brought to a head through the establishment of these narcotic farms.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the Congress has accomplished splendid work. In the past, unfortunately, drug addicts have been treated more as criminals; they have been treated as inmates of penal institutions and with a harshness and severity that killed any ambition they might have had for a reforming of their lives.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress should compliment themselves and feel they have done a real service to humanity. It is not a question of political or partisan advantage; it is just a question of doing something for humanity, lending a helping hand to a struggling brother, that to my mind gives a great satisfaction and a greater thrill than any other possible service can give, and that is helping someone who is afflicted and in need and giving them the chance and the opportunity to commence again a new life full of faith, hope, and promise. [Applause.]

USE OF MAILS FOR PROCUREMENT OF DIVORCES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8180) to prohibit the use of mails for the solicitation of the procurement of divorces in foreign countries, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of many strong statements having been made lately as to the attitude of New England in textile matters, I have been requested by the chamber of commerce of my city to express their views at this particular time, that we may be relieved of charges that have been made. Several of the speakers have stated that New England is making a drive for cheap cotton. We think we can prove to you that this is not so at all. Therefore, in order that I may be temperate in my remarks and reflect the views of my own section, I wish to speak a little out of the ordinary and read most carefully and as forcefully as I can the views of my particular section in seeking a solution of the problem which confronts the cotton-textile industry. I am speaking in behalf of my city of New Bedford, Mass., as represented by its own most effective chamber of commerce.

This city has been textile-minded for over 50 years. It now has approximately 1,800,000 cotton spindles in place, with some 18,000 wage earners still employed in the industry.

In the year 1919 we had 35,000 wage earners in our cotton mills; in 1921 we had 32,000; and in 1929, 29,000. Since 1925, 12 mills, employing some 15,000 people, have been liquidated or removed from this city. Machinery sold from our liquidated plants has, in most cases, been installed in lower-wage sections of the United States. Some machinery has been junked and some has been sent abroad, but, in general, the larger portion has been disposed of as outlined in the foregoing statement.

Mills in this city are comparatively modern. Some are among the newest and most efficiently equipped in the United States. Every type and kind of cotton, from tire yarns and fabrics to the highest-count yarns, bandage cloths, duck and sail cloths, and the highest types of lawns and silk and rayon mixtures are spun or woven in our mills. This city also makes rayon yarns and weaves considerable silk goods.

The manufacture of textiles is the city's principal occupation and support.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. No; I would prefer to not yield until I get through with this statement. However, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman is reading a recital about the wage differential. Is it not a fact for the gentleman to state that the so-called "North-South wage differential" is a code regulation; that it was passed unanimously by the Textile Code Authority upon which sit the leading New England textile manufacturers; is that not correct?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may I at this point ask permission to revise and extend my remarks so that I may suffer interruptions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman very kindly yielded to me.

Mr. GIFFORD. In reply to the gentleman, further on in these remarks I speak of code no. 1, and our willingness and pleasure in agreeing to the minimum scale of $1, and a little later on I shall explain that this is perfectly satisfactory, but it is with respect to our expectation as to other wage levels that we have met bitter disappointment.

It is the considered opinion of this community, its workers, and its mill management that, while many factors contribute to the present condition of the industry, the one which most affects our particular situation is that of wage inequalities within the industry.

The skill of our employees is recognized. Our management is conceded to be at least as able as any in the busi-

ness. Yet our mills have been compelled to liquidate, while those in lower wage sections have been able to continue in business. This situation has been brought home to us again during the past few weeks. One of the largest and most efficient of our local mills lost a large Government order to a mill in a lower wage section of the United States.

I have the executive's letter here at hand, but to use his very expressive language might be thought out of order.

The Uxbridge Worsted Co., of Uxbridge, Mass., announced the purchase of a plant in Georgia. The Davol Mills, of Fall River, Mass., announced the liquidation of two mills employing 700 workers.

The industry quickly showed progress, both social and economic. The increased replacement cost of its stock in process and finished goods in warehouses became of greater value. This increased the credit position of the corporations engaged in the textile business. Fear on the part of the workers was changed to hope and confidence in the future. Retail sales in textile communities jumped as purchasing power was increased and confidence restored.

Other sections of the country showed signs of improving conditions, but not as quickly. This resulted in manufacfactured goods going into warehouses in increasing quantities. Where mills could not stand the capital losses involved in shutdowns, goods were dumped into the national market, which was not ready to absorb them, even though the industry manufactures what is universally considered as "the world's raiment."

I should like to interject here in relation to the processing tax, which I shall approach in a moment, that we could not sell the cotton goods to the country at such advanced prices. The tobacco processing tax seems to be successful. We are cheerful consumers of tobacco, but the many cost increases added to the cotton industry made the price of cotton goods so high that extreme trade resistance resulted. This is why we stress so much the last burden imposed, which was the processing tax; but by no means do we object or want to buy of the farmer cheap cotton. All we want is to buy at a price that will meet with sales and overcome this trade resistance.

Within its code authority the industry has made several moves to establish control of its so-called "overproduction." It is interesting to note in this respect that while mills in New England continue to liquidate, mills in low-wage sections are constantly adding equipment. (See Textile Bulletin, February this year.) The question of overproduction is much involved not only in its productive sense but in the sense of underconsumption caused by the economic conditions of our agricultural and industrial workers throughout the Nation. We in New Bedford believe that the country as a whole is in need of much additional clothing and other textiles.

There has been comment that, perhaps, the textile industry is not mindful of the problems of the rest of the United States.

No city in the industry can show a more conscientious attempt than ours to live up to the principles concerned with the operations of the textile code.

This division of the Board of Commerce has worked whole-heartedly with representatives of labor and with management. We are proud of our community's N. R. A. record and confident that Washington headquarters will bear this out.

REVIEW OF GENERAL PROBLEMS

The importance of the textile industry cannot be overestimated. It is the industry which the President honored in his first recovery-program address; the industry which reacted to his program immediately by agreeing to an economic new deal under the title of code no. 1 of the National Recovery Act. This code became the keystone of the arch which supported, and which still supports, the economic and social existence of all the other major industries of the United States and the millions of working men and women who depend upon these industries for their livelihood.

The industry whole-heartedly laid out its program under the principles of the new deal. It eliminated child labor; it shortened hours of work; it increased wages; it established minimum wages; and, as previously mentioned, it became the foundation stone for all the innumerable industrial codes.

We have not received from those we represent a single request to protest against any soundly and fairly written bill designed to help either the credit structure of the rest of the United States or the social and economic conditions of the working men and women in the industrial or agricultural sections of the United States.

The increased costs of raw materials and the increased labor and overhead costs due to our social program have eliminated our products from world markets, since, obviously, we cannot compete in foreign markets with countries having low cost raw materials and low wage standards. We in New England realize that our market is now almost entirely confined to the United States. Obviously, if the farmers and other workers in other parts of the United States are unable to buy our goods, we cannot manufacture them.

I may say here to the gentleman from North Carolina, when he stated in that forceful way of his that the farmer did not want to go on the dole, in his answer to the plan offered by Senator GEORGE that this processing tax should be met from the $4,800,000,000 fund. I am exceedingly sorry the gentleman made that particular statement, although I know he meant it. Perhaps the farmer would seem to be on a dole if it were taken from that particular fund, but he takes it from a fund harder to get by far than that. But this remark of the gentleman from North Carolina, I am sure, must have had due weight with his constituents. I appreciated the force of it and it is hard to debate it.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I will reiterate that I am absolutely opposed to the processing tax being paid from the relief fund, and I ask the gentleman, coming as he does from New England, is he in favor of paying all of these processing taxes to the farmers out of the $4,000,000,000 relief fund?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I frankly confess that under present conditions I would vote to have it done that way. It is far better, I think, it should be spent in that way than in the ways I believe the money is going to be spent. However, I do recognize the full force of the gentleman's argument and the way he feels about it, that perhaps it would appear like a dole to his constituents.

Mr. WARREN. That is all it would be, of course.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why is not this processing tax paid from general levies? I do not want the pork processing tax paid only by those who buy pork, "even though we are getting our pigs now from China." I think the processing tax should be met from general taxation and not by a sales tax imposed on a few commodities; and when the gentleman recited that the processing tax on overalls amounted to only 8 cents, and so little on other things, he forgot to say anything about what we did to the gold dollar, and he forgot to say anything about the N. R. A. expenses, whereby cotton goods, as a whole, cost the consumer twice as much, including even overalls, as they did before.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman knows that ever since I discussed that proposition he has been checking and rechecking my figures and not one of them has ever been challenged on the floor.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman that I have not challenged his figures. I am simply asking him to consider the other elements which a little later on I shall refer to in the course of my remarks.

We mention these things because there are at present controversies over the processing tax which the Department of Agriculture feels is necessary to its cotton program. No statements made by New Englanders on these textile matters make any objection to assisting the cotton farmer. The statements have, however, gone deeply into the effect of the present application of the taxes designed to assist the

cotton farmer. The New England presentation has not recommended the elimination of assistance to the cotton farmer; it has objected to the present method of collecting a tax which amounts to as much as 28 percent of the total wages on a fairly high-count gingham, and to 121 percent of the total labor cost in no. 8's single southern carded yarns. I would ask the gentleman to check those figures.

It is evident that such a tax is practically confiscatory, since a major industry in a world depression could hardly hope to receive 28 percent more than its labor costs, and certainly not 121 percent at any time. The figures submitted are quoted from an analysis of Frederick Moore, Textile Cost Authority of Charlotte, N. C., in a recent issue of the New York Daily News Record, an established textile daily newspaper.

We believe that in asking the administration to consider some way of broadening the base of this tax, the textile manufacturer, either North or South, is on reasonable grounds.

There is another complaint of the textile industry—and of many other industries within the United States—a complaint involving a friendly nation which we were the first to assist in its own new deal.

The same skill; in fact, one might call it the same artistry by which old Japan was able to produce its equisite textiles; the same capacity for infinite detail, which we call genius; that now threatens our textile and other industries.

Some may grossly misjudge the ability of these people. Their achievements in the arts, literature, poetry, philosophy, and horticulture should convince nonindustrial skeptics of their abilities. Their desires are simple. The Asiatic can become ascetic over self-denial. He can express pride over his lack of luxuries. He is, therefore, satisfied with low wages, where we are unhappy.

It is this combination of energy, adaptability, and low wages which is grievously affecting our textile business. Their goods, offered at prices far below any possible competitive hope on the part of our American workmen, have affected not only the coarse goods sections of our industry but the fine goods sections as well.

The State Department has suggested that, since Japan purchases $1.65 of our products and sells us but $1 worth, we must consider this question in a national way. Our answer is that the whole recovery program is based on jobs, not on dollars; and Japan is selling us 3 to 4 days' labor while buying from us but one-half day's labor. Japan buys from us for one reason only: Because she cannot buy our commodities at lower prices elsewhere.

It is inconceivable that while our American fellow citizens walk the streets in idleness, such a flow of goods should be allowed into our country. We are told that these questions can be settled around a table. This may be so. But at present the world is in a depression; and it is engaged in a bitter trade war.

Our American director of Mitsui, in testimony before the Tariff Commission recently, said that Japan's only solution for overpopulation is to develop her industries to absorb surplus labor. "The success or failure of her industrial activities charts the parting of the ways for Japan—either life or death", he declared. "Naturally she will plan and fight to the utmost of her power and ability on this point; there is no other path of life for her." We cannot smile that off any more than we can give up our Navy.

No nation will honor us when our farms and factories are gone; no nation will even respect us.

We in New England feel that there is only one way for a high-wage nation to do business with others, and that is to buy from others what we need and do not produce ourselves—silk, tea, coffee, mahogany, rubber, and so forth—others to buy from us what they need and do not produce.

To those who would buy foreign shoes, textiles, electrical goods, silverware, toys, marmalades, or wines, and cheeses, we say: "Buy them if you wish, but pay more for them or buy American goods." These things strike home with us when we are spending years of effort and billions of dollars on the question of what shall be done with the unemployed workmen of the United States.

The mills in New England, among their complaints, enumerate another and, to our mind, the most important matter concerning this industry operating under code no. 1; and this is wage differences within the industry.

It is peculiar that we in America should recognize sectional differences where working men and women are concerned. It would seem that any such recognition would ipso facto indicate that we are not the "United" States, but 48 brutally competitive countries within our national borders, with workers in one section who cannot protect themselves against the low wages of another section or police their borders against the introduction of low-wage goods which jeopardize their standards of living.

It would seem that we should at least be able, as an American Commonwealth, particularly now that we have so many agencies within our governmental departments interested in the establishment of social justice, to find a way to protect the high-wage employer and his high-standard working men and women against the low-wage employer and his less fortunate working men and women.

We are told that the recognition of sectional differences in the textile industry is occasioned by the maintenance of mill villages in some sections. We, in Massachusetts, have had mill villages; some of them genuinely beautiful; built with all the modern conveniences and laid out in landscaped parks. Our people did not like them. They were not happy in them. They sensed a social and economic control of the plant owners through the 24 hours of the day. They felt the watchful eye of their employers in their every movement. The loss of their jobs in a particular mill meant the loss of their homes.

This aspect of the mill situation became so vital a factor in our political and social situation that we finally adopted the system of paying wages in cash in weekly envelops to the employee; enabling him to buy his weekly necessities and rent a home of his own choosing.

We even assisted him, so far as his thriftiness enabled us, to purchase his own home and face his neighbors and fellow citizens as an American workman should. We did not force him to spend his life in open admission that he controlled neither the product of his hands and mind, nor the roof over his head. Much good can be said on both sides of the village question, but we cannot believe a manufacturer should be allowed to directly deduct village costs from the workers' envelops.

We ask your very earnest consideration of this vital principle of American life.

(The time of Mr. GIFFORD having expired, by unanimous consent he was given 6 minutes more.)

CONCLUSION

Mr. GIFFORD. The various arguments discussed affect all of the industry. All branches admit they are operating at present under losses. One claims it is because of Japanese competition; and presents a fair case. Another says it is because of overproduction, or, as stated previously, underconsumption; and presents a fair case. Another says it is because of the processing tax; and presents a fair case. An analysis of these differences by governmental departments should be helpful and might well be undertaken by a commission, since these questions are controversial.

On the matter of wage inequalities, however, we believe your committee should determine, now that the high-wage worker in any section of the industry must be protected against the loss of his job or the lowering of his living standards because of wage differences allowed in a national code.

It is our opinion that the elimination of wage inequalities will go further toward quickly correcting overproduction than a Government agency, which may be compelled to fight its way through the constitutional courts.

On the other hand, if you continue to allow the low-wage employer to take what business is available, then the high-wage employer must lower his wages or go out of business. Far too many New England mills have chosen the latter course.

Any one of a great number of commodities which we have come to believe are American necessities cannot be sold to low-paid workers. In the economic life of a low-paid worker, such commodities as refrigerators, automobiles, radios, dentist services, and so forth, are not necessities but luxuries beyond his power to purchase.

An equalization of wages throughout the industry would result in the establishment of higher standards of living in what are now low-wage sections an increase in purchasing power, which would result in greater consumption of our agricultural products as well as other commodities made by workers in other industries. Surely the thousands of operatives in low-wage sections would appreciate and be happy to spend such higher wages.

The New England communities ask no advantage for themselves. They ask that wages in low-wage sections be increased to the standards of New England, in order that all American business shall not go to the low-wage employer.

Textile operatives who now work 3 days a week are finding themselves not as well off as E. R. A. workers, who receive $12 per week for 3 days' work calling for a small expenditure of effort. We fear this will develop Americans into politically well-educated unfortunates who will, by their very numbers alone, demand politically more than we shall be able to give them.

There is, of necessity, an increase in community farms throughout the textile areas of New England. This must eventually reduce sales of California canned goods, since housewives of the unemployed will can their own; Florida oranges will not be purchased, since unemployed textile operatives will grow tomatoes and other substitutes; Maine and Idaho potatoes will be replaced by locally grown potatoes; Texas onions will not be purchased for the same reasons; and certainly less cotton, wheat, corn, dairy, and other agricultural products will be sold. Nor can equal amounts of such goods be sold to low-wage employees in other sections of the United States.

In other words, unless the textile operative of New England is kept at the job which enables him to keep busy during the day, and which pays sufficiently well to allow him to purchase the products of other industrial and agricultural centers, he will pull down with him the American industrial and farmers' markets. If the textile communities of New England are not heeded, they will of necessity, by lack of purchasing power, pull down with them the transportation systems, community-tax funds, municipal and State finances, and all the institutions dependent upon them. New England now pays to the Federal Government for relief purposes proportionately more than any other section of its size in the Union. In return, it receives less proportionately for relief purposes from the Federal Government than any other section in the Union. Reverse this statement and you must affect the rest of the United States. Reverse this situation and you will ruin New England—ruin 9,000,000 people and you can have no recovery.

A single industry, the textile industry, is asking that we make certain cardinal policy decisions. We believe that the decisions are far beyond the question of the textile industry alone. We believe that the question is a national issue. We believe that if the National Recovery Act, the new deal, if you will, is unable to protect the wage earners of the United States against low-wage competition, either abroad or within our own borders, then our working people will lose faith in a new and hopeful future.

If the New England textile industry loses in this struggle, American standards of living must suffer. Other industries are awaiting our treatment of code no. 1. If negative action on our part establishes a Government policy toward lower wages, we may expect national adjustments both in plant relocation and wages which must seriously affect recovery.

In the final analysis it was the American workingman's desire to carve an empire, to work for a living, which has made America. If wealth is but labor stored up, if labor is the fountain of all prosperity, then these men who come before us in the name of honest toil and fair wages bespeak the beginning and the only honorable end for our country. [Applause.]

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert a lecture by George Henry Payne, Federal Communications Commissioner. I did not have the estimate from the Printer at that time, but I now have it, and I renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following lecture by George Henry Payne, Federal Communications Commissioner, at the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, May 14, 1935:

Not infrequently I have been made aware that in some quarters there is misunderstanding as to the scope and power of the Federal Communications Commission. Therefore, it might not be inappropriate to say at the beginning that this Commission touches the lives and interests of possibly 85 percent of the 120 millions of people in this country. An accurate tabulation of the people in this country who are directly and personally in touch with the telephone, telegraph, and radio is perhaps not possible, but it is a safe assumption that almost every adult member of our population is affected by some form of communication either directly or indirectly. The figures back of this assumption are not without interest.

In the first place there are in this country 16,889,000 telephones and 86,800,000 miles of telephone wire, serving approximately 12,500,000 business subscribers and 10,000,000 resident subscribers.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co.'s report for the year 1932, gives the number of telephone conversations in the United States during that year as 25,500,000,000. The latest statistics from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. indicate that the number of telephone conversations in the United States for the year 1934 was approximately 26,791,000,000. In the rest of the world there were only approximately, in each of the same years, 16,000,000,000 of such conversations. Through its power to regulate rates and trade practices, the Federal Communications Commission is a direct agent of the people in the matter of the telephone.

As to telegraph communications in this country approximately 148,000,000 (1932 figures) messages were sent over, approximately, 2,260,000 miles of wire. In the rest of the world there were sent approximately 218,000,000 telegraph messages in the year 1932. The radio telegraph companies sent somewhat over 5,000,000 messages during the same period. In order to grasp the significance of these figures, we should recall that there are in the United States 46,160 post offices, and that the 1930 United States Census Report shows that we have only 16,598 incorporated cities, towns, and villages. Not only has the Federal Communications Commission the right of regulating rates, but the companies themselves assert that only the Commission, by the merger which it has already advocated, can save these companies from chaos.

In the broadcasting field the Federal Communications Commission has been given even greater power by the law, which permits it to grant licenses and revoke them and to regulate broadcasting generally, without any power of censorship, however. The size of the audience in this field can be estimated by the fact that there are installed in this country approximately 20,000,000 receiving sets.

HOW THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT DEVELOPED

These figures give us a picture of the activities of the industries, of the inventions and corporations over which the Communications Commission has the power of regulation. It may be appropriate now to say how this Commission came into existence as a division of the Government.

The bill creating the Federal Communications Commission was passed on June 19, 1934. It provided for a Commission of seven members, charged with the responsibility of regulation and supervision of the telephone, the telegraph, both wire and wireless, and the broadcasting industry.

There were a great many people, and there are a great many people, to whom the reasons for the bill were not and are not obvious, and I have heard—not once, but several times—people declare that it was simply another one of those new-deal brainstorms, born of an uncontrollable desire to interfere in other people's business.

In the first place, it is well to recall that from the very beginning of the telegraph in this country the Government has taken an interest in this industry.

A resolution passed by the House of Representatives on February 3, 1837, declared "That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to report to the House of Representatives at its next session upon the propriety of establishing a system of telegraph for the United States." In accordance with this resolution Levi Woodbury, Secretary of the Treasury, investigated the matter and submitted a report to the Speaker of the House, stating that a telegraph system "would be useful to commerce as well as to the Government."

On February 21, 1838, in one of the rooms of the Committee on Commerce, Morse demonstrated his invention to President Van Buren and his Cabinet over a coil of wire representing a circuit of 10 miles. Congress did nothing in the matter for 5 years; but on December 30, 1842, Congressman C. G. Ferris, of New York, submitted a bill to Congress "to test the practicability of establishing a system of electromagnetic telegraph by the United States." The bill, which carried an appropriation of $30,000, was passed early in 1843.

The first telegraph line was built by Morse with the help of the Government between Washington and Baltimore, and the first message over the completed line containing the historic words, "What hath God wrought?" was sent over it on May 24, 1844.

In the early days of the telegraph Morse offered to sell the telegraph to the Government for $100,000. Upon the recommendation of the Postmaster General the offer was not accepted. Twenty-five years later, when the Government contemplated buying the existing telegraph lines, it was discovered that the value of the property was $50,000,000.

New telegraph lines were soon built to the principal cities of the United States and also in the Eastern Hemisphere, until in the year 1894 there were about 900,000 miles of line in the world, of which about 200,000 miles were in use in the United States. At that time the Western Union Telegraph Co., our largest carrier, maintained about 21,000 offices and sent over 58,000,000 messages.

The telegraph business could not have grown to its present proportions without substantial legislative aid by the Government. The act of July 24, 1866, among other provisions, provided:

"Any telegraph company organized under the laws of any State shall have the right to construct, maintain, and operate lines of telegraph through and over any portion of the public domain of the United States, over and along any of the military or post roads of the United States which have been or may hereafter be declared such by law, and over, under, or across the navigable streams or waters of the United States; but such lines of telegraph shall be so constructed and maintained as not to obstruct the navigation of such streams and waters, or interfere with the ordinary travel on such military or post roads.

"* * * shall have the right to take and use from the public lands through which its lines of telegraph may pass, the necessary stone, timber, and other materials for its posts, piers, stations, and other needful uses in the construction, maintenance, and operation of its lines of telegraph, and may preempt and use such portion of the unoccupied public lands subject to preemption through which their lines of telegraph may be located as may be necessary for their stations, not exceeding 40 acres for each station; but such stations shall not be within 15 miles of each other.

"Telegrams between the several departments of the Government and their officers and agents, in their transmission over the lines of any telegraph company to which has been given the right-of-way, timber, or station lands from the public domain shall have priority over all other business, at such rates as the Postmaster General shall annually fix; and no part of any appropriation for the several departments of the Government shall be paid to any company which neglects or refuses to transmit such telegrams in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"* * * The United States may, for postal, military, or other purposes, purchase all the telegraph lines, property, and effects of any or all companies acting under the provisions of sections 1 to 6 of this title, at an appraised value, to be ascertained by 5 competent disinterested persons, 2 of whom shall be selected by the Postmaster General of the United States, 2 by the company interested, and 1 by the 4 so previously selected."

The development of the cable paralleled that of the land telegraph. The first experiments in submarine telegraphy were made about 1839. Morse established the first cable circuit between Castle Garden and Governors Island, N. Y., in the year 1842, and the first trans-Atlantic cable was laid from Ireland to Newfoundland in 1857. This trans-Atlantic cable, however, was a failure and it was not until 1866 that success was achieved. Such rapid progress followed that by 1895 there was combined telegraph and cable service practically to any part of the world.

In general, before 1914, the idea of the Government was to help the telegraph in its development; since that time the controlling idea has been the regulation of the whole communications industry.

No regulative Federal legislation concerning the telephone and telegraph companies appears on the statute books until the legislation of June 18, 1910 (36 Stat. 544, 545), classifying the telephone, the cable and telegraph companies, wire and wireless, as public-service agencies and giving the Interstate Commerce Commission control of these carriers. This Commission was not given authority to initiate rates but was charged with the duty of investigating complaints as to rates and practices that may have been filed with it and of determining whether or not the rates or practices complained of were reasonable.

From 1910 to 1934 practically no attempt was made by the Commission to regulate rates.

A few interesting cases were decided by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but none that effected any significant changes in the rates and practices of the carriers.

When radio came along the Government first took cognizance of the new invention or art by passing a law in 1911, making it illegal for any ocean-going steamer carrying more than 50 persons to leave any port of the United States unless it was equipped with efficient radio apparatus in charge of a skilled operator, said apparatus to be capable of sending and receiving messages at least 100 miles.

The following year the first attempt at the regulation of radio was made when an act was passed prohibiting the operation of any apparatus for radio communication without a license granted by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. Six years later, when we were in the World War, the President was authorized during time of war to take over not only the radio but the telegraph and telephone and the marine cable system or any part thereof and operate them under a provision for compensation for the time used. The next step was the advocacy of a Federal Communications Commission by President Roosevelt in February 1934, and the compliance with his request in June of the same year.

Having traced briefly how the Communications Commission came into existence, it seems reasonable that, before embarking on a discussion of the work it undertook and on an analysis of what it has to do, we break this narrative to consider some of the fundamentals back of this new venture in government.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS

It was, I think, George Bernard Shaw, who said it was a characteristic of the modern drama that ideas were taken up in the theater only after they had become worn out and familiar in all the other arts, including the art of politics. However true this may be with regard to an art about which Mr. Shaw ought to be able to speak with authority, it is a fact that legislators, though frequently claiming to be pioneers, are seldom in the van of civilization and really bring up the rear guard, and are only putting in effect legally what the people have already decided to be a necessity. I realize that there are conservative gentlemen who will comment that the tendency of legislators to be over-cautious and slow is a characteristic sadly lacking in the legislative attitude in our National Capital at the present time.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that the legislator cannot precede the inventor; but it is an interesting comment on our own day, particularly in this matter of communications, that the legislator is trying to keep abreast of the inventor, and in the field of electrical communications has become his associate, and, strange as it may seem, is in some quarters even regarded as his friend.

The human race began its climb upward as it learned to communicate, first, one individual with another, and later, one group with another. The trails of the most primitive peoples originating in the hunt for and the provision of food began the arteries of primitive commerce, the precursors of our great roads and railroads. Even before 2000 B. C., in Europe long land routes led from the Danish Peninsula down the Elbe and through Europe to Rome or to Italy.

In looking back over the development of human communications, I think we should keep in mind a passage that John Morley once described as lines "among the most pregnant, as they were among the most original, in the history of literature, and reveal in an outline, standing clear against the light, a thought which revolutionized old methods of viewing and describing the course of human affairs, and contained the germs of a new and most fruitful philosophy of society."

The lines so delightfully characterized were those of the great financial genius of France, Turgot.

"The succession of men," said Turgot in the famous discourse read at the Sorbonne in 1750, when he was 23 years of age, "offers from age to age a spectacle of continual variations. Reason, freedom, the passions, are incessantly producing new events. All epochs are fastened together by a sequence of causes and effects, linking the condition of the world to all the conditions that have gone before it. The gradually multiplied signs of speech and writing, giving men an instrument for making sure of the continued possession of their ideas, as well as of imparting them to others, have formed out of the knowledge of each individual a common treasure, which generation transmits to generation, as an inheritance, constantly augmented by the discoveries of each age; and the human race, observed from its first beginning, seems in the eyes of the philosopher to be one vast whole, which, like each individual in it, has its infancy and its growth."

Nothing that has been said or written since is more lofty in its conception of the destiny of the human race and nothing has emphasized more forcibly the fact that we progress by the law of change, not because change in itself is a sign of progress, but because of the additional knowledge that comes through change.

"The progress of the human mind", says Morley, "means to Turgot the progress of knowledge. Its history is the history of the growth and spread of science and the arts. Its advance is increased enlightenment of the understanding. From Adam and Eve down to Louis XIV, the record of progress is the chronicle of the ever-increasing additions to the sum of what men know and the accuracy and fullness with which they know."

I think that we will better envisage our situation today not only in communications but in other governmental activities and handle our problems with more perspicacity and intelligence if we have Turgot's thought before us.

WORK OF THE TELEGRAPH DIVISION

Returning now to the subject in hand, the work of the Communications Commission, when it came into existence in 1934, on the hottest July 11 that I have ever known, was divided into three sections: Telegraph, telephone, and broadcast.

It was my privilege to be assigned to the telegraph division.

The duties of the Commission, through the Telegraph Division, are as follows:

1. To regulate in the public interest the rates, practices, classifications, etc., of the telegraph companies, wire and radio.

2. To keep itself informed of all new construction, extensions, improvements, retirements, or other changes in the condition,

quantity, use, and classification of the property of common carriers. No carrier may undertake the construction of any new lines, or the extension of any existing lines, without authority of the Commission.

3. To examine the transactions of common carriers relative to the furnishing of equipment, supplies, research, services, finances, credit, or personnel, which may affect the charges or services rendered or to be rendered in wire or radio communication.

4. To investigate the methods by which and the extent to which wire telephone companies are furnishing wire telegraph service, and wire telegraph companies are furnishing wire telephone service, and to report its findings to Congress.

5. To examine all contracts of common carriers subject to the act which prevent the other party thereto from dealing with another common carrier, and to report its findings to Congress. (This has already been done.)

6. To make an annual report to Congress, furnishing such information and data as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the regulation of interstate and foreign wire and radio communication, etc. To make a special report not later than February 1, 1935, recommending such amendments to the act as seemed desirable in the public interest. (This has been done.)

When Congress assembled we made our first report, or, rather, recommendations, on three of these imposed tasks. One dealt with the question of franks, over which the Commission had the power of regulation. This situation was not dissimilar to that which had grown up in the railroad field, where the issuance of franks or passes had resulted in the setting up of a privileged class transported free of charge, and, in this case, sending their communications free.

Our investigations and hearings developed considerable most interesting and illuminating material and were at times not without touches of adolescent humor. At one of the informal hearings an important officer of a large corporation was open-minded enough to tell us he had found that franks were quite effective in "greasing the wheels." I demurred to this characterization as one not in accord with modern enlightened business policies and subject to considerable misunderstanding and abuse on the part of that large portion of the public which was denied the privilege of being "greased." I recalled, informally, days when, as a youngster, I had seen the lobbyist representatives of large railways in State capitols passing out railroad franks or passes to the legislators—on the same theory of "greasing the wheels", with the result that not the wheels alone were "greased" but that many of the laws passed by "greasy" legislators were fairly "greasy" themselves, when they came out.

The question of exclusive contracts enjoyed by the telegraph companies was taken up at a number of public hearings held by the Telegraph Division of the Commission, at which representatives of all the interested carriers testified.

The Commission's findings were as follows:

If the telegraph companies are not merged, "it should be against public policy for one carrier by contract to be able to exclude a competing carrier from places to which the public has general access. * * *" In the opinion of the Commission, most, if not all, of the existing contracts are illegal.

The Commission also expressed the fear that telegraph companies might be tempted to set a high valuation upon the exclusive contracts held by them and to use such valuation for rate-making purposes.

The Commission accordingly on January 21, 1935, recommended to Congress that the telegraph companies be prevented by law from entering into or operating under exclusive contracts.

The most important of the recommendations of the Telegraph Division has met with a rather sad fate. I refer to the merger or consolidation of the telegraph lines, on which subject we held extensive hearings, gathered much information, formulated our suggestions, and sent them to Congress, where they rest in committee unnoticed and unsung.

THE BRITISH CONTROL OF CABLES

Before leaving the subject we might point out that early in the development of rapid communications Great Britain saw and appreciated the enormous advantages which she would reap for her commerce and for the defense of her far-flung possessions by control of a world-wide communications net. This period being, of course, prior to the advent of radio, Great Britain set out to control the cables of the world. That she has succeeded in doing so is apparent from this chart.

She owns 170,032 nautical miles of cable, which is about as much as all the rest of the nations of the world own together. We are her nearest competitor, owning only about one-half this mileage. Of the three trans-Pacific cables, one is listed as American-owned, but 50 percent of the stock is British owned and 25 percent Danish. The other two cables are British owned. The Western Union Telegraph Co. leases five of our trans-Atlantic cables from a British concern and every trans-Atlantic cable owned or operated by a United States company touches British soil at either Nova Scotia or Newfoundland before leaving North America.

The companies which make up the cable system of Imperial & International Communications, Ltd. (the British communication company), are the Eastern Telegraph Co., the Eastern Extension Australasia & China Telegraph Co., the Eastern & South African Telegraph Co., the Western Telegraph Co., the Anglo-American Telegraph Co., the African Direct Telegraph Co., the Europe and Azores Telegraph Co., the West African Telegraph Co., and the West Coast of America Telegraph Co.

You can see that practically all important points of Europe, Africa, the East and West Indies, North and South America, and Asia, except Japan, are touched by British systems.

The preponderant cable mileage of Great Britain and her connections to smaller cable companies throughout the world enabled her, by means of controlling rates, to direct and control the flow of world communications over British cables. She was able to give her own commercial firms the earliest news of the markets of the world. She was enabled to control world opinion by subsidizing British press and propaganda over her own cables while charging much higher tolls for foreign press. It has been testified in public hearings that all code messages of foreign cable companies in London were required by law to be turned over to the British Government after a certain short period of time.

Her world-wide cable net was of inestimable value to her naval and military forces in their operations to protect British possessions or to aid penetration into additional areas in competition with other nations.

On the board of directors of this company sit officials of the British Government and the dominions. The Government is, therefore, in a position to control directly the policies and to support fully the interests of the companies concerned, either by subsidies or by governmental acts. By means of this powerful, Government-supported, world-wide organization, Great Britain was able for many years to control the policies, practices, and rates of the communications of the world until the advent of radio. This new medium now threatens British control of world communications.

In the competition for dominion over the still uncivilized parts of the world, it must have been obvious to Great Britain, as it is now to us, that messages relative to troop movements, projected plans and supplies necessary to support them, passing over the cables of a competing nation would be certainly read by that nation and acted upon to the detriment of Great Britain. Likewise, it is obvious that information relative to ship movements, naval orders, diplomatic exchanges, trade information, etc., all are susceptible of interruption, delay, and disclosure when traveling over the cables of foreign competitive nations, but were safe and could be used only to the advantage of Great Britain when sent over her own cables and on cables which touch British territory or connect with British cables.

THE TELEPHONE DIVISION

The important work of the telephone division is yet to be done by carrying on the broadest possible investigation.

The demand for a telephone investigation has been made at various times, but never more emphatically than by Walter M. W. Splawn in his letter of submittal to Congress of the preliminary report on communications companies, after an exhaustive study of the communications industry. He therein stated his belief that the first duty of "the new Communications Commission or Board might be an intensive study of communications companies—among other things, their accounts, records, and memoranda; their methods of handling depreciation; their operating expenses; contracts for service with a view to determining whether the contracts are in the interest of the operating companies or the stockholders of the service companies; to what extent communications companies contribute to campaign expenses or otherwise participate in political activities. An exploration of possible economies might be made as is being made in the railroad field under title I of the Emergency Transportation Act of 1933. It must be borne in mind that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. system has assets estimated at $5,000,000,000 and that the gross telephone revenue of the system in the year 1932 was $989,722,645; that is to say, that this one system in the field of communication has assets to about one-fifth of all the railroads and that the average per capita contribution to its telephone service in 1932 was $7.93. The average per capita contribution to telephone service in 1932 for all companies was $8.41. The magnificent plant that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. system owns has, in the main, been paid for by the users of the service. * * *

"The American people are entitled to know if they are being overcharged for this service though they may be satisfied with the quality of the service. How much more should it cost to place a long-distance call from Washington to San Francisco than from Washington to Baltimore? If 20 cents be a reasonable charge for such a service from Washington to Baltimore may it not be possible to place the call with any exchange in any American city at approximately the same cost?

"* * * Telephone business is a monopoly—it is supposed to be regulated. Thus far regulation, particularly by the Federal Government, has been nominal largely because Congress has not made appropriations sufficient to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to give effect to existing statutes."

In the very able address of Dr. Jewett, vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., on April 22, 1935, there is stated the position, quite fairly and dispassionately, of those who oppose governmental ownership and control, pointing out that electrical communication "is essentially and most largely an American thing—possibly our greatest and most unique contribution in the field of applied science. Certainly both telegraphy and telephony as arts had their beginnings in the United States, and whatever may be argued about the history of telegraphy, there can be no question as to telephony. Born in America, it has always been and is now the leader and model for other countries." Going into the reasons for this, Dr. Jewett describes "a lack of

tradition and settled modes of life" as having had something to do with it, but states the fact that for 50 years it was free to grow and develop "essentially untrammeled by a too narrow and detailed dominance of political government" as a major influence. Elsewhere, he says it has been subjected to all the restraints "which seem to be a necessary concomitant of such government. In a developing art based on a rapidly growing fundamental science it is fatal to progress and to the fullest fruiting for society to begin setting rigid standards, rules, and regulations before you know what it is you are trying to standardize, rule, and regulate, and before that art has reached the quiet courses of mature life."

In connection with this statement it might be pointed out that governmental action was required in order that telephony, or rather, the Bell System, should enjoy the monopoly that it does, and that while it is generally admitted that we have the best telephone system in the world, the statements that Dr. Jewett made, and similar generalizations, fall to the ground when we apply them to the accomplishments of telegraphy in this country and compare such accomplishments with those of foreign countries where the telegraph is government owned and controlled. In the field of radio, both as to communications and broadcasting, it must be evident to anyone who is at all familiar with its history, that if there had not been Government regulation there would have been little progress and unending chaos.

In addition we should remember that in the entire world outside of the United States, there are only about 6 privately owned telegraph systems, and about 20 privately owned telephone systems in approximately the same number of countries.

THE PROBLEMS OF RADIO

I have left for the last the radio, that division of the activities of the Federal Communications Commission in which, while its problems are no more urgent, the public is most keenly and actively interested. In addition it is the division about which everyone has some opinion and will be the subject of the liveliest discussions.

You all know the history of radio. If you do not, I cannot understand how you have escaped it. The modesty and the reticence of the scientists and inventors of this great development have been in inverse ratio to the self-glorification and self-assertion of those in charge of its commercial exploitation. The art of ballyhoo has never been carried quite so far in this country. There has grown up considerable resentment against the character of the programs and the indifference to cultural standards, but these are perhaps the natural sequence to the rapid development and confusing conditions of the industry and the art.

In his letter of submittal of the preliminary report on communication companies, dated April 18, 1935, Mr. Walter M. W. Splawn called attention to the fact that the people who had most at stake "in gaining early control of the radio industry were those engaged in rendering competitive forms of communications service and those producing materials and appliances essential to the application of the radio art. In this connection the occasionally published prediction heard from research workers to the effect that radio transmission of electrical energy to be consumed in the production of light and mechanical power does not appear too fanciful for at least passing mention as a possible additional reason for concern over radio developments by the aforementioned class of manufacturing interests."

During the early days of radio laissez faire was the prevailing principle. The few known channels were used and abused by anyone who could provide the facilities for transmitting messages over the air. Waves and power were used at will no matter how prejudicial to the operations of other stations. Interference was so common that little practical use could be made of this great new invention. The public interest required that immediate action be taken to regulate operations over the air.

As the radio waves do not respect State lines, the obligation to regulate and control obviously devolved upon the Federal Government. Such control came in due time because the industry and the people demanded it.

The Government went about the business of control hesitatingly, as is natural in the case of any experimental legislation, particularly as the industry was new and novel.

The first radio bill was approved by the President on June 24, 1910. It dealt entirely with the safety of persons at sea, and provided that from July 1, 1911, ocean-going vessels under certain conditions were required to be equipped with the necessary apparatus for radio communication in charge of a person qualified to use it.

On July 23, 1912, the President approved an act "to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers." By this act the provisions of the former act were extended and made more stringent in order to provide greater safety to life at sea.

The first real regulative act was approved August 3, 1912. This act practically put all commercial radio under the control of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, authorizing him to license stations and, under certain conditions, to revoke any license that had been issued. In this act, for the first time, an attempt was made to attack the problem of interference in the air.

A public resolution (H. J. Res. 309), approved July 16, 1918, empowered the President to assume control of the telegraph, telephone, marine cable, and radio in time of war.

Several resolutions were subsequently passed authorizing the participation in international conferences to consider questions concerning international communications, the operation of government-owned radio stations, and covering other matters pertaining to radio.

On February 27, 1927, the Radio Act of 1927, became law. This act for the first time put the regulation of radio into the hands of an independent commission consisting of five members. The next step was the Communications Act of 1934 creating a Federal Communications Commission consisting of seven members, authorized to regulate the electrical communication facilities; that is the telephone, the telegraph, and radio.

THE RADIO SPECTRUM

The services to which radio has been put may be best understood in relation to the complete radio activity by a glance at the spectrum.

The chart of the radio spectrum shows the distribution of frequencies by means of blocks of various colors. This so-called "spectrum" does not actually exist in nature and has been contrived as an aid to the mind. The spectrum shows the various radio frequencies that have been assigned by the Federal Communications Commission for different uses, such as broadcast, fixed point-to-point (which includes the radiotelegraph and the radiotelephone), aviation, Government, amateur, police, television, etc. Assignments of these frequencies have been made so far for 25 different services. The frequencies are limited in number and assignments are largely prompted and controlled by scientific and practical necessity.

Radio waves are identified and distinguished by the frequency with which they vibrate; hence, the term "frequency", which is so often used in radio matters. Frequencies are measured in kilocycles and the waves themselves in meters. Not all frequencies are available for use for all types of service. For example, for broadcasting purposes only the frequencies from 550 kilocycles to 1,500 kilocycles have been allocated in this country.

The number of channels—that is, frequencies—that can be used without interference is more limited than it would seem at first, owing to the fact that frequencies, in order to be useful, must be spaced or separated from each other sometimes by 10, 25, and in some cases as much as 100 kilocycles, depending on the frequency used. As the entire number of frequencies assigned, for instance, in broadcasting, runs from 550 to 1,500 kilocycles, after due allowance is made for the necessary separations, the channels left for actual use are very few in number. At the present time, in the entire broadcast band there are only 96 channels, of which 6 have been reserved for the exclusive use of Canada.

Of the 25 services for which frequencies have been assigned by the Federal Communications Commission, the following may be specifically mentioned as among the most important and interesting. Fixed service—includes the radiotelegraph and the radiotelephone. Numerous frequencies, both high and low, are assigned to this service and are indicated in the spectrum by the color brown, which appears in spots in a number of places. Eight companies in this country are authorized to engage in the commercial radiotelegraph business between the United States and foreign nations, and communications by this method may be had, either directly or through foreign companies, with almost every nation of the world. Although insufficient frequencies are as yet available for the use of domestic radiotelegraph service, this service is being used at the present time more extensively than ever.

The multiple address radiotelegraph service is an interesting development. It is employed largely for the transmission of information destined for use by newspapers. The messages are automatically recorded by printer instruments located in various places in the United States.

Radio is extensively used for foreign telephone and telegraph communications, and the volume of this kind of traffic is constantly increasing, causing a definite loss to the cable companies and creating a problem in the field of cable communication which will have to be met in the near future.

Maritime mobile service includes radiotelegraph and radiotelephone communication between ships at sea and between ships and the shore. Frequencies above 1,500 kilocycles and below 550 kilocycles are assigned to this service. A number of large vessels are now equipped with apparatus for the reception and the transmission of telephone messages as well as telegraph messages by radio. A passenger on a ship thus equipped may lift his telephone and transmit a message to practically any telephone user in this country or in Europe at any time during his voyage.

The great *Titanic* disaster, in which hundreds of lives were lost because of the inability to communicate with other ships, prompted the London Safety of Life at Sea Conference in 1914.

Aviation: Radio is used extensively in aviation. A great deal of the increased safety and efficiency in aviation may be attributed to the use of radio. Airplanes may now be in continual contact with the ground for the reception and the transmission of information essential to their safety.

Police: The use of radio for the transmission of orders by police departments to policemen operating automobiles which patrol the streets and the roads is now familiar to all of us. Metropolitan police departments could hardly function properly without this service. What this particular service means to the average citizen is obvious.

THE AMATEUR CONTRIBUTES

Amateur: One of the most interesting of the radio services is the amateur service. Approximately 47,000 amateur stations are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. The amateurs are constantly experimenting in frequencies otherwise unassigned, are in communication with similar stations in all parts of the world and are assembling a volume of data that may be of the greatest use in the further development of radio. In the

time of a serious emergency, such as an earthquake, when the commercial services are overburdened with traffic, the amateur stations are of great help. Expeditions to distant points have been able to keep in touch with the civilized world by means of these stations.

According to the records of the Commission, amateur radio operators in this country between the years 1919 and 1933 furnished emergency communication service on 33 different occasions when the wire lines were rendered useless by storm, earthquake, or flood.

On March 12, 1923, wire communication was destroyed by storm in the upper Mississippi Valley and amateur station 9ZN, of Chicago, organized a relay service with the help of other amateur stations, which handled much of the communication business of the Chicago & Great Western Railroad.

The Florida hurricane, occurring in 1926, did much damage in Miami and other cities in Florida. Wire service was completely suspended for several days. During this period two amateur radio stations rendered invaluable help in saving life and property. During a second hurricane in Florida, occurring in 1928, an amateur station located at West Palm Beach maintained the sole contact with the outside world for 3 days.

The California earthquake occurred on March 10, 1933. Many amateur radio stations in the earthquake area and elsewhere established communications for the purpose of relief and for other purposes.

In many of the cases on record, quick relief through the help of the Red Cross or by other means would have been quite impossible without the help of the amateur stations.

The broadcast band with its 96 channels (including the 6 assigned to Canada) is the one in which the public has the greatest and possibly the most direct interest. It is also the one concerning which there is the greatest political activity, if we may so dignify the pulling and hauling, the diplomatic, and the rough approaches to guide public opinion and direct legislation and regulation.

This political activity of broadcasters is a regrettable fact. It would be unfair to place the entire responsibility for the situation on them, for in the early days of chaos possibly it seemed to them the only way of obtaining what they considered their rights. One nevertheless cannot help feeling that the energy that has been put into politics, if devoted to the cultural aspects of the art, would have led to much better programs.

In the year that the present Commission has been in existence there has been a decided improvement, I sincerely believe; although someone has said that, even now, you cannot come out of an office in the Communications Commission without stepping on one or two broadcast lawyers.

The present Commission is cognizant of this intolerable condition and from time to time has taken steps to put relations with this arm of the Government on a higher plane.

It was a man famous in his day, John J. Ingalls, of Kansas, who made the pungent observation that "purity in politics is an irridescent dream." If that is so, it has always been so, but it is also true that the bright pages of the past are those where some dreamer has put his visions into action.

Anyone who believes in a democratic form of government cannot help but welcome gladly the addition of radio to methods of informing the people of the country on their Government and on public questions. Only a week ago there was an extraordinary evidence of its power when members of the Senate were deluged with 50,000 telegrams in 1 day as a result of a speech delivered the night before by Father Coughlin. I do not believe that any harm will come to the American Republic or the American people by the discussion of public questions and whether we are in sympathy or not with the ideas of the person who has the power to express himself with clarity over the radio, we must admit that in our form of Government the greater the number of people that are informed and stirred to take an interest in public questions, the safer are the foundations on which this Government is laid.

It is when we come to the cultural aspects of the radio programs that we find the sharpest differences among those in control of broadcasting and those who believe that it should be improved.

BROADCASTING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

To appreciate the situation in our own country it is necessary to survey broadcasting as it is carried on by other governments. In Great Britain, advertising is absolutely prohibited, as it is in Japan. As a matter of fact, advertising over the radio is absolutely unknown in any foreign country except to a very limited extent in France and Spain.

The original British Broadcasting Corporation, organized in 1922 and 1923, made an endeavor to establish an educational foundation by arranging for a series of discussions by the curators and official lecturers of the various national art galleries and museums. A further development was the appointment of a director of education, and in 1928, the appointment of a central council to broadcast adult education. This central council was enlarged later by the addition of five regional similar organizing committees. The subjects discussed are correlated to a central theme in the fields of economics, literature, art, science, politics, religion, and ethics. Teaching of languages was later added and given a prominent place.

Educational broadcasting in Italy is developing rapidly. Talks are given on a large variety of subjects, including agriculture. The broadcasts on agricultural subjects are arranged by a special organization known as "Ente Radio Rurale."

The French Government stations have, during the past 10 years, broadcast lessons and courses given at the Sorbonne and other institutions.

The Japanese broadcasting organization cooperates with the Government and various institutions in the planning of educational programs. Serious efforts are being made to enhance the cause of education by other methods also.

In the Soviet Union systematic talks on a large number of serious subjects are given and the matter of education by radio is treated very seriously. In that country an effort to train leaders for listening groups is being made.

In Germany the report for 1932 shows that 7,792 of the radio talks were instructive, 4,735 informative, 2,363 scientific, 1,059 political, and 3,287 merely entertaining.

As broadcasting is under Government control in most of the foreign countries, the presentation of ideas over the radio opposed to those held by the party in power is practically unknown. Highly controversial subjects of any kind are not permitted on the air. Such speeches as those of Senator Long or Father Coughlin would probably cause a great deal of commotion in almost any country but ours. In foreign countries education by radio in many instances is one of the functions of the minister of propaganda and public information. Radio-receiving sets are maintained in schools, public buildings, and along important thoroughfares, making it possible to reach the public with ease.

On the other hand, radio in foreign countries is used extensively for the purpose of inculcating the ideas and ideals of the party in power, thus leaving the door open to pernicious abuses—a condition that is quite impossible at the present time in this country.

The abuse of the radio, particularly in Germany, for propaganda purposes is well known. The wisdom of our Congress, therefore, in obligating broadcasting stations to allot equal facilities to opposing candidates for political office is apparent.

The fundamental difference between broadcasting in other countries and in America is that here there is free political discussion, the advantage of which we shall all admit, I believe. The second difference is one on which we cannot be so self-congratulatory. The cultural aspects of radio here are made secondary to its commercial aspects. We must freely admit that in this country the commercial broadcasting has given us the best musical programs in the world. While this fact is so, and while the commercial broadcasters are able to contend that their advertising programs enable them to give high-grade musical programs, this country will be very reluctant to have the broadcasting industry taken over as a national activity of the Government. It has been said that the philosophy underlying the program in Great Britain, for instance, seems to be "give the public what it should have", while in the United States the underlying thought is, "give the public what it wants."

Unfortunately, those who decide on what the public wants are in the main interested in the money-making side of radio and have little sense, comparatively, of the obligation that the Government owes to the people in the matter of the regulation of a public utility. As President Sproul pointed out in discussing the experience of the University of California:

"It may be true, as the broadcasters assert, that people are satisfied with what they are getting, but that does not prove hat they would not like something better. The public has been taught to want what it is getting. It has received 12 years of concentrated instruction from an expert corps of teachers."[1]

A radio broadcast station is operated by the Ohio State University, which is supported by State tax funds. The Ohio State University has accomplished more than any other institution in radio broadcasting. Twelve persons are employed at the station. Its work includes the broadcasting of class-room lectures, musical and literary programs, football games, talks on problems of interest to the rural population of Ohio, etc.

The regular audience of this station is believed to be in excess of 90,000, principally composed of rural population.

The University of Wisconsin, a State institution, maintains a broadcast station where good work has been done. Stations are also maintained by the Universities of Illinois, Kansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, and by other similar State institutions.

Good work within limits has been done by all these stations, but every one of them is a low-power station and none can compare with any of the better foreign stations in range, organization, or significant work.

One of the dangers of the present program system is its tendency to crush individuality and individual expression and to extend the dead level of dullness.

I realize that possibly I may seem a pathetic object when I refuse to listen to the man who wants to relate to me in minute detail all that had been said the previous night by "Amos 'n' Andy" and "Madam Queen", but I, too, see something pathetic in the fact that an appetite for more intelligent things is being destroyed by the foisting of programs on millions of defenseless citizens with a capacity for a better grade of humor and more intelligent ideas. It is hardly necessary in this country, or in any civilized country, to point out the value of individuality, but the resistance of individuals to the lower grade of entertainment is bound to be weakened where an entire nation is being fed from a few broadcasting centers under the direction of a group intent on catering to the

[1] Radio: An Instrument of Culture or an Agent of Confusion, by Robert G. Sproul, president University of California, in Radio and Education, 1934. Chicago, 1935.

more unintelligent rather than to the more intelligent, simply because the unintelligent are the more numerous.

One of the problems confronting the American people, and therefore the Communications Commission, is that of the control of the large broadcasting chains and the character of the programs that are given, not only on these chains but by the independent operators.

With regard to the latter condition there have been some very frank statements made, not the least direct being that of Senator WHEELER when the confirmation of the communications commissioners was before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate. The chairman of that committee, Senator WHEELER, went into many phases of the work of the Commission and did not hesitate to discuss abuses of the past and the present with refreshing disregard for the personal feelings of some of the large figures in the radio industry.

As Senator WHEELER said, "more and more, as you pick up your radio now, you find some fellow who is selling boots and shoes or clothes and giving prices, and it seems to me that the programs over all stations have materially deteriorated in the last 2 years. * * * I do not think you ought to censor, for instance, as much as they do some talks that go over the radio, but it is getting to the point where they are just making some of the programs that come over the various stations nothing but advertising schemes and they are selling shoes and old clothes and everything else, like a pawn shop."

I realize that for the first 5 years of radio, from 1920 to 1925, when there was no advertising, the programs were, with few exceptions, far below, in character and merit, the best that we have now. Great credit should be given to those who provided the opera of the Metropolitan of New York, the symphony concerts, and similar entertainment to radio listeners. But all of these instances of fine broadcasting simply go to show that the public will accept and patronize the better type of entertainment.

To understand how serious is the problem and what shall be the character of broadcasting, it is necessary to realize that, as has been said, broadcasting constitutes "the cheapest, speediest, and most ubiquitous mode of communication achieved by man", and it is also necessary to keep in mind that the development of broadcasting was left primarily to the patent owners and the equipment manufacturers.

As the president of the National Broadcasting Co. has stated, very frankly, this company was established "as an indirect sales-promotion agency for the radio-manufacturing industry."

Naturally with such a beginning the character of the program offered was purely commercial, and if really fine things have crept in, it has been largely as a sop to Cerberus, and only because there has been growing, and growing rapidly, a demand that the cultural aspects of radio should be given more consideration.

CONCLUSION

In speaking to the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University I should like to make, in conclusion, one or two observations on the general attitude of business men toward our Government, which may have no value at all, and yet, on the other hand, may be suggestive to some of you. I would not here or on this occasion assume to preach any particular philosophy, but I do say without fear of its propriety being challenged that it would be more helpful to business men and to the country at large if they were to devote more thought to their Government when no emergency exists and not only when they are driven into consideration of government because of the urgency of their own business problems.

Whether a man approach this subject from the attitude of the conservative or the progressive, Republican or Democrat, is of little importance compared to the willingness of approaching it with tolerance. I have quoted John Morley once and I should like to quote him again, this time from his essay "On Compromise." In this connection let me confess that many a time when I have been in doubt as to my own political conclusions I have found an hour or two spent with this great character and this stimulating essay a most clarifying influence.

Morley says:

"* * * it is well to remember the very obvious truth that opinions are at least an extremely important part of character. As it is sometimes put, what we think has a prodigiously close connection with what we are. The consciousness of having reflected seriously and conclusively on important questions, whether social or spiritual, augments dignity while it does not lessen humility. In this sense, taking thought can and does add a cubit to our stature. Opinions which we may not feel bound or even permitted to press on other people, are not the less forces for being latent. They shape ideals, and it is ideals that inspire conduct. They do this, though from afar, and though he who possesses them may not presume to take the world into his confidence. Finally, unless a man follows out ideas to their full conclusion without fear what the conclusion may be, whether he thinks it expedient to make his thought and its goal fully known or not, it is impossible that he should acquire a commanding grasp of principles. And a commanding grasp of principles, whether they are public or not, is at the very root of coherency of character."

A few years ago while travelling to Bermuda, a member of your faculty pressed on me the necessity of reading a book, which has been a continuous delight to me ever since. I refer to F. S. Oliver's "Endless Adventure."

"The Endless Adventure", said this writer in his opening paragraph, "is the endless adventure of governing men."

The endless adventure of governing men! What pages of tragedy in the past might have been left forever unwritten, what happiness and light might be spread among untold millions if that endless adventure were carried on with unflinching devotion to unselfish ideals!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

NO GROUP LEGISLATION SHOULD BE FORCED BY THREATS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, no honest legislator should ever be compelled to do anything. No selfish group should ever attempt to force Congress to comply with its demands. Legislation coerced by threats is dangerous to the people.

As a true, sincere friend of all labor, organized and unorganized, I feel that our country is seriously alarmed over threats broadcast in this morning's press. The Washington Herald, under the scarry headlines on its front page—Green Sounds A. F. L. General Strike Threat, and the subheadlines, Labor to Lay Down Tools Unless Congress Grants Its Basic Demands, Says Leader—prints the following:

NEW YORK, May 23 (U. S.).—Labor stands ready to tie up the Nation's industry by throwing down its tools in a general strike if Congress fails to grant its basic demands. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, warned today.

Addressing a mass meeting of 25,000 workers that crammed every available inch of Madison Square Garden, Mr. Green listed labor's demands as 2-year extension of the N. R. A., passage of the Wagner labor disputes bill and inauguration of a 30-hour week.

CROWD ROARS APPROVAL

The crowd roared its approval as the labor leader threatened:

"If Congress fails us, labor has its economic strength.

"If it comes to the point, we can mobilize our complete strength and refuse to work until we get our rights!"

And when the applause had thundered away, he added grimly: "That is no idle threat! I mean just what I say!"

In addition, he told the audience, labor must be ready to mobilize its political strength to defeat unfriendly Congressmen when they run for reelection.

CITES PARKER CASE

Labor, he said, had been able to block the confirmation of Judge Parker as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Of the Senators who defied labor and voted to confirm Mr. Parker, not one ever went back to the Senate, he asserted.

And on page 10 of this morning's Herald, under large headlines "Strikers Carry Fight Here", is a posed picture of three smiling young ladies picketing our United States Department of Justice, carrying a large banner attacking Gen. Homer Cummings, Attorney General of the United States, stating that their strike has been on since May 13, and that "the Wagner bill would not have made them suffer", and that "Attorney General Cummings refuses to prosecute", and printing underneath their picture the following:

Picket Department of Justice: Strikers at the plant of the Colt Firearms Co., in Hartford, carried their fight to the Capital in their attempt to focus national attention on their grievances. Some of the strikers from the Connecticut city are pictured as they carried their banner in front of the Department of Justice Building.

This posed photograph of these three well-clad, well-groomed, smiling picketing young ladies is shown to have been taken by Underwood & Underwood, the leading photographers of Washington.

OTHER PAPERS CONFIRM PRESIDENT GREEN'S THREAT

I would hesitate to quote anything from the Washington Herald as authentic, were it not for the fact that practically the same news report of said threats is found in today's leading daily newspapers of the East; and, by permission of the House, I will quote in my remarks excerpts from the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Philadelphia Record, and the Philadephia Inquirer, which was established in 1829, all asserting that such threats were made.

ARE PRESIDENT GREEN'S DEMANDS REASONABLE?

He demands that Congress must extend the N. R. A. 2 more years, must pass the Wagner labor bill, and must pass the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill. When extending my remarks, I will quote excerpts from the above bills to show that they will be harmful to the best interests of the whole people of the United States, and will quote other excerpts regarding measures that such threats have forced through Congress in past years which time has proven not to have been beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, for our distinguished friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WOOD], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the other distinguished spokesmen and leaders for organized labor in the House, we all have a high respect, and regard, and a real affection for all of them. They are all able, efficient, sincere representatives of the people, and through their effective fights here have accomplished much for organized labor on this floor, but I cannot believe that they or any other Member of this Congress will subscribe to or endorse the kind of threat that appears in today's press.

What is to become of Congress if we are to be influenced by such threats? Our oath does not require us to faithfully and impartially represent only the three-million-odd members of the American Federation of Labor. Our oath requires us to represent all of the people—the 125,000,000 people of the United States.

With reference to Mr. Green's first demand, that Congress must extend the N. R. A. for 2 more years, the United States Senate has had extensive hearings on that subject, and there has been extensive debate on it in the Senate for a long time, and many distinguished and able Senators were opposed to extending the N. R. A. at all, but by way of compromise they reached a settlement on the controversy, and passed their bill recently extending the N. R. A. until April 1, 1936. Are they by threats to be forced to change their position? Is fear to enter their hearts? Are they to be dominated and controlled by the reminder that organized labor prevented the Senate from confirming Judge Parker on the Supreme Court?

Are United States Senators to be scared with the reminder that organized labor prevented all of the Senators who voted for confirmation of Judge Parker from being reelected? Are Senators to be dominated and controlled by threats of future opposition unless they change their votes and extend the N. R. A. for 2 more years? Have we come to this?

Mr. Green's second demand is that Congress must pass the Wagner labor bill, or there will be a general strike, and Congressmen voting against it will be defeated. There are some provisions in it that no business man would endorse. There are provisions in the Wagner bill that would ruin and put out of business many businesses in the United States, that would wreck many small businesses, and are against the best interests of all of the people in the United States.

And the same thing is true respecting the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill. It would stifle business. It would ruin many businesses. Yet if Congress does not pass it, we are threatened with a general strike and with defeat for reelection.

Is Mr. Green to frighten Congress by such unreasonable threats? Has it come to pass that our beloved Federation of Labor, with less than 4,000,000 members, can control the Congress of the United States?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to put in the excerpts that I referred to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, so that there will not be any question about the authenticity of the press reports regarding the threat of President Green that unless Congress extended the N. R. A. for 2 years, and passed the Wagner bill, and the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill, he would cause a general strike, and defeat for reelection all Senators and Congressmen voting against the said program of the American Federation of Labor, I quote the following excerpts from today's reputable newspapers:

ASSOCIATED PRESS REPORT

The Baltimore Sun carried the report of President Green's speech made by the Associated Press, and under the big headlines on its front page, "General Strike Threat If N. R. A. 2-Year Extension Is Rejected", and the subhead lines "William Green Addresses 50,000 in New York", I quote the following:

[From the Baltimore Sun]

By the Associated Press

NEW YORK, May 23.—A Nation-wide general strike was threatened tonight by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, unless Congress extends the N. R. A. for 2 years and passes the Wagner labor-disputes bill and the Black-Connery 30-hour-a-week bill.

Addressing nearly 50,000 members of the Federation, gathered inside and outside Madison Square Garden in a mass demonstration, Green also threatened political retaliation against Members of Congress.

"We will refuse to work and will mobilize our entire economic strength until we get our rights," he said as the vast crowd roared its approval.

"That is no idle statement. I mean just what I say. Furthermore, the workers can mobilize our political strength and order those men who deny us to stay at home when they stand for reelection."

Twenty-three thousand of the workers crowded into the Garden itself; the others thronged in the streets outside, taxing the efforts of several hundred policemen.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer (established 1829)]

NEW YORK, May 23.—Nation-wide general strike was threatened tonight by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, unless Congress extends the N. R. A. for 2 years and passes the Wagner labor-disputes bill and the Black-Connery 30-hour-a-week bill.

Addressing nearly 50,000 members of the Federation, gathered inside and outside Madison Square Garden in a mass demonstration, Green also threatened political retaliation against Members of Congress.

"We will refuse to work and will mobilize our entire economic strength until we get our rights", he said as the vast crowd roared its approval.

NO IDLE STATEMENT

"That is no idle statement. I mean just what I say. Furthermore, the workers can mobilize our political strength and order those men who deny us to stay at home when they stand for reelection."

Twenty-three thousand of the workers crowded into the Garden itself, the others thronged in the streets outside, taxing the efforts of several hundred policemen.

From the Philadelphia Record, which, under the big headlines, "Green Makes Threat of United States General Strike", had the subheads, "A. F. of L. Chief Warns of Action if Congress Ignores Demands", and "50,000 Cheer", and "N. R. A. Extension, Wagner Bill, and 30-Hour Week Urged", I quote the following:

[From the Philadelphia Record]

NEW YORK, May 23.—A Nation-wide general strike was threatened tonight by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, if Congress refuses to approve pending legislation demanded by labor.

Green sounded his warning before 50,000 trade unionists, gathered inside and outside Madison Square Garden in a mass demonstration.

He urged specifically extension of the N. R. A. for 2 years and passage of the Wagner disputes bill and the Black-Connery 30-hour-a-week bill.

NO IDLE THREAT

Threatening political retaliation against members of Congress, he declared:

"We will refuse to work and will mobilize our entire economic strength until we get our rights."

The vast crowd roared its approval.

"And that is no idle statement", he continued. "I mean just what I say. The workers can mobilize our political strength and order those men who deny us to stay at home when they stand for reelection."

Who will say, Mr. Speaker, that the New York Times is not reliable. In big headlines "Cheer Green in Threat of Strike", and subheadlines of "A. F. of L. Chief Warns Labor Will Fight to Force Congress to Adopt Bill of Rights", I quote the following:

[From the New York Times]

Organized labor stands ready to mobilize all its economic strength to force the adoption by Congress of what it considers to be its "Bill of Rights", William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, declared yesterday afternoon at a huge rally in Madison Square Garden called by the trade-unions of the city.

"That is no idle statement. I mean just what I say. Furthermore, the workers can mobilize their political strength and compel those men in Congress who deny us our rights to remain at home when they stand for reelection."

More than 250,000 workers in the needle trades quit their work shortly after 2 p. m. in support of the legislative demands of the American Federation of Labor as voiced at the Garden meeting. Many thousands marched to the Garden in mass formation.

More than 500 policemen under command of Deputy Chief Inspector David J. McAuliffe were on duty inside the Garden and in the adjacent streets.

Mr. Green also denounced those Democrats in the Senate who voted against a 2-year extension of the N. R. A. and warned that Members of the House and Senate who will not support the President and the demands of the American Federation of Labor would be sent into political retirement. As part of this warning he cited the example of Judge Parker, of North Carolina, who failed of confirmation in the Senate when appointed to the United States Sureme Court, and the defeat by labor of Senators who voted for Judge Parker.

"We will not be diverted from our purpose," Mr. Green shouted. "Labor still possesses its economic strength. That can be utilized in an emergency. The workers can also mobilize their political strength and order those men who willfully defy the President to remain at home when they stand for reelection."

He urged all union men to send telegrams to the Members of Congress demanding passage of the Wagner bill and the 30-hour work bill.

"The battle is on", he declared. "It is really on. It is terrific. It is up to every one of you to do your duty."

N. R. A. BENEFITS ORGANIZED LABOR

N. R. A. has been a bonanza for organized labor. It has greatly benefited the less than 4,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor. But no one will deny that other Americans everywhere have suffered by its drastic codes. It has not hurt big business so much but it has hurt little businesses everywhere. It has caused many sacrifices to be made everywhere. Hence, if Congress should decide that April 1, 1936 is long enough to extend the N. R. A., President William Green and his American Federation of Labor should not think of calling a general strike, after all Congress has done for them. They should be too patriotic.

THE WAGNER-CONNERY BILL

The Wagner bill S. 1958, passed the United States Senate on May 16, 1935, and from it, I quote some provisions:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created in the Department of Labor a board, to be known as the "National Labor Relations Board" * * *.

SEC. 4. (a) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board shall appoint, without regard for the provisions of the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, an executive secretary, and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and shall appoint such other employees with regard to existing laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be from time to time appropriated for by Congress. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Board, appear for and represent the Board in any case in court.

(c) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia, incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

SEC. 5. The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 7. Employees shall have the 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.

SEC. 8. It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

(1) To interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

(2) To dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it: *Provided*, That subject to rules and regulations made and published by the Board pursuant to section 6 (a), an employer shall not be prohibited from permitting employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of time or pay.

(3) 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. * * *

(4) To discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this act.

(5) To refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a).

PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

SEC. 10. (a) The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in sec. 8) affecting commerce. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise.

(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Board granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business, or in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside.

(1) The Board, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. Any member of the Board shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation or in question, before the Board, its member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or investigation. Any member of the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing. * * *

(3) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; * * *.

SEC. 12. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Board or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

ENORMOUS EXPENSES TO BE PAID BY PEOPLE

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that all of the expenses of this Board, with salaries of $10,000 and all traveling expenses paid and its attorneys and horde of employees, are to be paid by all of the people of the United States.

With every one of the millions of members of labor being given the right to a separate appeal in case they feel aggrieved, our courts everywhere will be cluttered with new suits, and all of this enormous expense is to be borne by all of the people of the United States.

MEN SUMMONED TO FAR-DISTANT TRIBUNALS

Business men from every part of the United States will be summoned by this Board, from the Department of Labor, to hearings far distant from their homes; and they will have to bring their books, private correspondence, and all of their business papers; will have to hire expensive attorneys to represent them; and pay not only their own expenses, but the expenses of their attorneys and witnesses to attend hearings and court trials. And if they inadvertently make some mistake they will be fined $5,000 and imprisoned for 1 year.

WILL CLOSE UP MANY BUSINESSES

Instead of causing capital to invest in new businesses we will find that business houses will close up and go out of business in every part of the United States. Interference with business has done more than anything else to bring about this depression. Business men do not want arrogant, overfed, walking delegates to dictate to them how they shall run every detail of their business. They are not going to stand for it. They will close up and get out of business. And when they do there will be millions of employees out of jobs, and with no chance to get a job.

THE TAIL CANNOT WAG THE DOG

The 125,000,000 people of the United States are not going to be held up and forced to make sacrifices just to pamper and grant special treatment and privileges to the less than 4,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor.

THE ADAMSON ACT

It will be remembered that during the first term of President Wilson the railroad brotherhoods, through a like threat of strike and of tying up all of the railroads in the United States, passed the Adamson Act, which was the beginning of bad times ultimately for all railroad employees.

SPECIAL ESCH-CUMMINGS PROVISIONS

Then, again in 1919, the railroad brotherhoods again threatened a Nation-wide railroad strike, and forced Congress to grant them special privileges in the Esch-Cummings Act, after Director General McAdoo had granted them a raise in salary of $754,000,000, and then they forced another raise of $67,000,000 out of Director General Hines, and at that time I predicted that eventually it would be hurtful not only to the whole people of the United States who would have to foot the bill through increased freight and passenger tariffs, but that it would put many railroads out of business, and lay off and put out of jobs thousands of splendid railroad employees all over the United States. And that is just what happened.

STARTED THE DEPRESSION

It was just such coerced laws, brought about through threats upon Congress, that have been largely instrumental in bringing about this continued depression. And it will never end until organized labor takes its throttle-hold off of the neck of this Government.

NO INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT CAN EXIST

There must not be any invisible government within greater and more powerful than the Government of the United States itself. The United States Government must be and remain supreme unless we end in chaos.

THE IMPOSSIBLE 30-HOUR-WEEK BILL

Now, let me quote a few paragraphs from the Black-Connery bill:

That no article or commodity shall be shipped, transported, or delivered in interstate or foreign commerce, which was produced or manufactured in any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment situated in the United States, in which any person, except officers, executives, and superintendents, and their personal and immediate clerical assistants, was employed more than 5 days in any week or more than 6 hours in any day: * * *

SEC. 5. On and after the date this act takes effect it shall be unlawful for any employer subject to any of the provisions of this act to reduce, directly or indirectly, the daily, weekly, or monthly wage rate in effect on such date * * *

SEC. 6. Any person who violates any of the provisions of this act, or who fails to comply with any of its requirements, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $200 or be imprisoned for not more than 3 months, or both.

This bill also will close up thousands of business houses in every part of the United States. After men receive for 5 days' work of 6 hours per day the same pay they formerly received for a full week's work, they will find employment for their idle hours, and make double pay, or else they will eventually become lazy, shiftless, and of no account.

Idleness does not produce happiness. The man who is busy is the happy man. The man who does an honest day's work is the happy man. The man who does his best is the happy man. The man who produces his maximum is the happy man.

IDLENESS IS THE DEVIL'S WORKSHOP

If we pass a law that will induce men to work just a part of their time, idleness will inevitably follow. I have been a worker all of my life. I have gotten happiness out of it. I would be miserable if I did not keep busy. Should we Members of Congress work just 6 hours per day for 5 days only each week? Why not? Why should we work 10, 12, 14, or 16 hours per day? Why should farmers work 10, 12, 14, or 16 hours per day? Why should domestic servants work 10, 12, 14, or 16 hours per day? Why should all of the above be discriminated against? Why should they not have the same privileges that this bill grants to members of organized labor?

NATION-WIDE STRIKE AND DEFEAT OUR ALTERNATIVE

But unless we Members of Congress pass all three of the above measures, Mr. Green threatens that he will precipitate a general strike, and that he will defeat us for reelection, and put us out of Congress. I would rather get out of Congress, Mr. Speaker, than to be such a servile, helpless worm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because I was absent when the payment in cash of the adjusted-service certificates to World War veterans was being considered in the House 2 months ago. At that time, as you all know, the Patman bill was passed by a few votes over the so-called "Vinson bill." When we voted on the veto message 2 days ago there was no debate or discussion in the House. A number of years ago I voted to override the veto of President Harding, which was sustained in the Senate.

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

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. I just want to correct the gentleman's statement.

Mr. FISH. I do not yield, and there is no statement to correct. Later on I voted to override the veto of President Coolidge, when the present adjusted-service certificate bill was enacted into law. I voted to sustain the President on the veto day before yesterday only because I am opposed to any printing-press method of paying the bonus, no matter in what degree it may be. I am not criticizing my colleagues for voting that way. It may be that it would not bring about inflation. Certainly it is a dangerous principle to invoke, but if it did bring about ruinous inflation, I, for one, would not have to apologize a year or two hence. Printing-press money, once started, is apt to bring economic disaster to the American people, as it has wherever it has been extensively tried, and particularly to the wage earners. There is no more reason to start the printing presses to pay the veterans than to pay for the Army and Navy, salaries of Members of Congress, or even to liquidate the national debt. It is just playing with fire.

I am making this statement because I believe in the immediate cash payment of the bonus before the Congress adjourns, whether it is through the funds appropriated for public works or the Vinson bill or any other bill, as long as it is not an inflationary measure, providing for printing-press money. I am not a prophet, and I have no way of knowing what the Senate proposes to do, or what other Members of Congress propose to do, but I believe it is a relief measure, as most veterans are in debt and in need, and that the ex-service men are right in being apprehensive, if it is not paid now, that in a few years from now the adjusted-service certificates may be paid on the basis of a third of the present value of the dollar, and it may be on the basis of 20 cents on the dollar or less.

The administration by reducing the value of the dollar to 59 cents has already violated the contract made with the veterans in 1925. When the President says that there is no difference between the able-bodied veterans who served at a dollar a day and those employed at home during the war at $10 a day and upward, of course I differ with him. That issue was settled by the Congress 10 years ago. We could not adjust the full compensation, but we passed the adjusted-service certificate bill, and that settled the matter forever. The President goes out of his way to deliberately rebuke and pillory the World War veterans and particularly those who served on the battlefields of France at the risk of their lives. I do not agree with the President's contention that the terms of the contract entered into with the World War veterans must be exacted to the last pound of flesh without modification or change. The President went into great detail regarding the original reason, purpose, and value of the certificates. It is apparent the only contract that the new-deal repudiation administration holds sacred and insists on keeping is that with the veterans.

I am introducing the following resolution, which will go to the Ways and Means Committee, and probably will not be acted on, but at the end of 30 days I propose to file a petition at the desk and ask that the committee be discharged from further consideration and the resolution be reported to the House for action before adjournment of Congress.

House Joint Resolution

Whereas billions of dollars have been doled out of the Treasury of the United States to various groups in the country; and

Whereas the World War veterans are in debt and in need; and

Whereas the veterans are apprehensive that, due to the unstable dollar and indications of inflation, the obligation due them may be paid in further depreciated currency; and

Whereas the new-deal administration has repudiated most of its contracts, obligations, and pledges but insists on singling out the agreement made with the veterans for payment of the adjusted-service certificates as sacred and unchangeable like the laws of the Medes and the Persians; and

Whereas one billion dollars have been allocated out of the public-works fund to Rexford Guy Tugwell to undertake further unsound and socialistic experiments and to put the Government into further competition with private industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the adjusted-service certificates shall be paid as a relief measure on or before July 1, 1935, in cash, out of funds heretofore appropriated by the Congress for public works, amounting to $4,000,000,000, and unexpended funds of approximately $1,000,000,000 carried over from the last Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That payment be made in accordance with the provisions of the so-called "Vinson bill" sponsored by the American Legion and reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

[Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I am going to object to any further requests after this one.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Oh, let me have just 1 minute.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I shall not object to 1 minute for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] about what appeared in the newspapers this morning, Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning in hearings being conducted on the extension of the N. R. A. I am sure that if the gentleman from Texas and others will read his testimony delivered this morning, they will find that what appears in the newspapers has been fully clarified along the lines we would expect from such a constructive mind as that of President Green of the American Federation of Labor. Naturally, reading the newspaper account of his remarks would have a disturbing effect, as it did upon myself, and my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], interrogated Mr. Green, as did the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULLER] and myself. We asked him several questions, and I think his answers clarified the situation completely.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Green has promised to submit the speech that he made at Madison Square Garden yesterday afternoon and make it a part of the hearings held before the committee this morning.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not deny that Mr. Green made the statement that he would call a general strike?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do deny that. He says he did not make that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. The metropolitan press this morning, not only the Herald, but the other daily papers, make the statement that he did.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think they made that statement. The press, as I noticed it, said it was short of a general strike.

Mr. BLANTON. Did he deny that he said they must mobilize to keep Congressmen from being elected who voted against these measures?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Green did not say anything of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. Did he say that Judge Parker was not confirmed by the Senate and that every Senator who voted for the confirmation of him failed to come back?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to pass on what Mr. Green said or did not say.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, we cannot believe much that we see in Hearst's Washington Herald, but when all of the reputable morning newspapers carried practically the identical statement——

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want the gentleman to put into my time any criticism of a newspaper or anybody else.

Mr. BLANTON. It could not have been wrong in all these particulars.

Mr. McCORMACK. I like to go along the line of not criticizing, but expressing my own views, and if I have a difference with anyone, to express my differences impersonally.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. With reference to the remark made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], that Mr. Green intends to make his speech a part of the record before the Ways and Means Committee, it appears in the press that the remarks that are being referred to now in relation to the strike were not in the printed speech. I do not know whether Mr. Green brought that out before the committee or not. I assume that Mr. Green intends to print all he said in New York.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I cannot answer that. All I know is that Mr. Green appeared before the committee in connection with the N. R. A. bill, and he was asked certain questions; and Mr. Green's answers absolutely satisfied me as to what his state of mind was—a state of mind which I was satisfied he was possessed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object to ask a question——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will, if necessary, object himself to such a reservation of objection as that. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 minutes, as I want to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] as amended, that he may proceed for 2 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that the press reports indicate that in lieu of his prepared speech, Mr. Green made this speech at Madison Square Garden, which the press reports him to have made; he put his prepared speech down and made his speech and altogether about 50,000 people heard him?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to enter into any controversy whether the press quoted him correctly or not. All I am stating is that Mr. Green's position, expressed before the Committee on Ways and Means, is consistent with what I thought it would be. When I read the papers this morning I felt that either he extemporaneously expressed his thoughts incorrectly or that he was misquoted, quite honestly, by those who were present. In any event, Mr. Green has clarified his situation before the Committee on Ways and Means, which is the important thing, after all. His position is absolutely consistent with the man as I know him, a man who has always conducted himself constructively, particularly during this depression; a man who has evidenced real leadership. I say that impersonally, not to flatter the gentleman, because personally he does not mean anything to me one way or the other, although I have the greatest respect for him. I look the cold facts in the face. If the American Federation of Labor were not following constructive leadership we would have been in trouble long ago. Two

years ago, when some farmers threatening a strike tried to have the American Federation of Labor join with them, the American Federation of Labor refused to do so. Just visualize what would have happened if, instead of that kind of constructive leadership, we had had at that time a leadership of "strike, strike, strike." Instead of trying to resist and trying to prevent strikes and to arbitrate, and using the strike as a last recourse, if the American Federation of Labor had a leadership of engaging in constant strikes, we would have had a chaotic condition in this country during the time of this depression. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts have 1 additional minute in order to answer a question.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire for further time.

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

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] had asked unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute. I do not object to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] that he adddress the House for 2 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as saying that I am for the N. I. R. A. to be extended for 10 years if it will benefit the men and women who have to labor for a livelihood. I shall also support the Wagner-Connery Disputes Act and the 5-day, 6-hour bill. I have received letters from people informing me that if I supported the Rayburn utility and holding company bill they would do their utmost to prevent me from being returned to Congress. The officials of the utility companies and holding companies are responsible for those letters of intimidation. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Rayburn bill and every other bill that is going to benefit mankind, regardless of what will happen to me politically in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] has expired.

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

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not recognize any reservation of objection to a request for time to address the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] that he be permitted to address the House for 2 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of entering into any dispute relative to the merits or demerits of the testimony of any man appearing before a committee or any man making any address to any audience.

I wish, however, to say, in supplementing what my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said, that I have heard Mr. William Green on several occasions speak before committees. I have heard him deliver addresses. While each of us is entitled to his viewpoint as to whether or not we agree with the views of some other person, I never have contacted a man who seemed to me to be more sincere in the position he assumes, or more fair in the manner in which he states his views. I think any man who has had any contact with Mr. Green before a committee would be justified in this representation, whether he agrees or disagrees with Mr. Green's viewpoint.

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

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Green stated that he thought the reporter's notes would be available, which led me to believe that he spoke extemporaneously. When a man speaks extemporaneously he cannot weigh his words as carefully as he would otherwise.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say to my friend the gentleman from Minnesota that I think Mr. Green has had sufficient experience in addressing audiences that he will stand by what he says, whether it is on paper or extemporaneous.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

REPATRIATION OF NATIVE-BORN WOMEN

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 4354, to repatriate native-born women who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLANE objected.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no woman born in the United States, who has been living in the United States or under its jurisdiction for at least 3 years immediately preceding the date of this act, shall be deemed to have lost her United States citizenship solely by reason of her marriage, prior to September 22, 1922, to an alien: *Provided*, That the benefits of this act shall not apply to any woman who subsequent to her marriage has personally made an oath of allegiance which would invalidate her citizenship of the United States.

SEC. 2. The benefits granted under section 1 of this act may be shown to have accrued by an appropriate certificate which the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization is hereby authorized to issue to any woman who applies for such a certificate by her own affidavit setting forth facts that entitle her to the benefits, together with the affidavits of two disinterested persons who are personally able to certify the facts in support of the application.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, is hereby authorized to prescribe and prepare appropriate forms to administer this act.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEARHART: Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof substitute the following language:

"That hereafter a woman, being a native-born citizen, who has or is believed to have lost her United States citizenship solely by reason of her marriage prior to September 22, 1922, to an alien, and who has not acquired any other nationality by an affirmative act, shall be deemed to be a citizen of the United States to the same extent as though her marriage to said alien had taken place on or after September 22, 1922: *Provided, however*, That no such woman shall have or claim any rights as a citizen of the United States until she shall have duly taken the oath of allegiance as prescribed in section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 596; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 381) at any place within or under the jurisdiction of the United States before either a court of record of general jurisdiction or a United States commissioner or, outside of the jurisdiction of the United States, before a secretary of embassy or legation or a consular officer as prescribed in section 1750 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 22, sec. 131); and such officer before whom such oath of allegiance shall be taken shall make entry thereof in the records of his office or in the minutes of the court, as the case may be, and shall deliver to such person taking such oath, upon demand, a certified copy of the proceedings had, including a copy of the oath administered, under the seal of his office or of such court, at a cost not exceeding one dollar ($1), which shall be evidence of the facts stated therein before any court of record or judicial tribunal and in any department of the United States."

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is merely one in clarification.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill and the amendment is to extend to American-born women who have lost their citizenship by virtue of their marriage to foreigners prior to September 22, 1922, the same privilege which is enjoyed

by American-born women who have married aliens subsequent to that date.

It will be remembered that by the ancient law of nations a woman, as a consequence of her marriage to an alien, lost the citizenship of her nativity and acquired that of her husband. This is an ancient rule of law. No person now living gave any consent to the enactment of that law; and our American women of today, in line with their character, their training, and their patriotism, have long since objected to it. In response to their wishes the Congress of the United States in 1922 changed the law insofar as it affected women who married aliens after September 22, 1922. Marriages contracted since 1922 no longer affect the citizen-status of native-born American women.

Twelve years have elapsed since the enactment of that corrective law and there has not been during the time intervening a single objection to allowing American women to retain their American citizenship after marriage to aliens. Since there has been no objection to granting this privilege to American women who married after September 22, 1922, it is believed it is now time to extend the same privilege to those who married before that date. That is the situation in a nutshell.

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

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Has the gentleman submitted his amendment to the committee; is it a committee amendment?

Mr. GEARHART. It has been accepted by the committee, by the author of the bill, and by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. O'DAY].

Mr. ZIONCHECK. It was a matter of compromise, was it not?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; in a sense. But my amendment was readily agreed to by all interested parties as soon as I pointed out the reasons therefor, together with the defects in the reported bill.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. There is only one objection to this bill now, and three objections are required to prevent its consideration. Is it not a little presumptuous on the gentleman's part to ask the House to pass an amendment that entirely changes the bill without an opportunity to study the amendment?

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman is in error; it does not change the bill; it merely extends it to all women who married prior to September 22, 1922, instead of confining it to that small group who have resided in the United States during 1932, 1933, and 1934.

I go further and add a precautionary feature. My amendment will require all women who would avail themselves of the benefits of the law to take an oath of allegiance and to set forth affirmatively that they have done nothing in the years gone by which would be inconsistent with the retention of American citizenship.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman's amendment is merely a clarifying amendment, and if the part of the bill he wants to clarify is the period of time before 1922, why not offer an amendment to strike out the words "3 years preceding the date of enactment" and insert in lieu thereof 10, 20, or some other figure, instead of changing the entire language of the bill?

Mr. GEARHART. My reason for putting in the requirement that they should take the oath of allegiance is easily understood. I have to take the oath of allegiance almost every day in one way or another, and certainly no American woman who wants to regain her American citizenship would object to taking a simple oath of allegiance to this country. If she is not willing to take the oath, she ought not have citizenship. Certainly not with my consent.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The language the gentleman puts in by way of amendment has not been studied by the committee, and I am not able to understand it by just listening to a reading of it at this time. I, for one, am going to vote against the amendment for that reason; not because I am opposed to the gentleman's purpose, but because I am opposed to making such a drastic change as to strike out the enacting clause and substitute an entirely different bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I may say that those gentlemen, Members of this House, who scrutinize most closely all bills having to do with citizenship, to whose attention this amendment has been called, have all agreed to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Speaker, my objection, may I announce at the start, is only pro forma, but I rise at this time to make an explanation. This bill has been before the House on many occasions and has been on the Consent Calendar, and I have objected to its consideration. I have asked to pass it over. I have stated repeatedly that I did not think this bill was necessary. But out of respect for the committee and on account of the efforts of the gentleman from California and others, I am reluctant to interpose my own personal opinion. It is for that reason I did not object today.

Mr. Speaker, here is what I think should be done with this bill, and I speak for myself only. This refers to some very complicated sections of the law. No one, I care not how smart he is or how well versed he is on immigration and naturalization matters, can take this amendment, or the bill either, and fit it into the law just by discussion here on the floor. At one time I thought we should have the whole matter recommitted to the committee, but the gentleman from California has consulted with the committee chairman and the author of the bill, and they are satisfied with his amendment. The offices of the Secretary of State and Secretary of Labor are very much interested in these sections. They have experts there who can fit these provisions together.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we may pass this bill today, not because I am for it or because I am receding from my position at all, but there may be two, three, or a dozen women who need the benefit of this bill. I understand there are some women who find themselves in foreign countries and whose property in this country is being placed in jeopardy because of failure to clarify this section. If that is the case, I for one would withdraw my objection and let the matter then go to the Senate. The State Department and the Labor Department with their experts may come before the Senate committee and fit these things together and then perhaps we will have something that will do justice to everybody and be a proper and worthy piece of legislation. I do not want to go on record as advocating the passage of the bill on its merits, but in order to be more than fair I am receding from my former position enough to allow this bill to proceed on its way to the Senate where it might be rewritten.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ZIONCHECK. May I ask the gentleman if he is in favor of the passage of the bill as it is printed here and allow the corrections or perfections to be made in the Senate or in conference between the Senate and House later on?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is my theory now. I do not want to go on record as being in favor of the bill, because I have stated repeatedly I do not think it is necessary. But why should my own personal opinion keep a bill from passing if a committee of the House has passed upon this matter? The representation is made to me by the gentleman from California that there are some worthy women who might find their property in jeopardy because of failure to clarify this law.

Mr. LESINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LESINSKI. I happen to be a member of that committee, and I do not know anything about this amendment.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TRUAX. Does the gentleman think we ought to amend the laws to provide protection to million-dollar prin-

cesses, like Barbara Hutton, who might lose their citizenship when they marry foreigners?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like the gentleman to know that I have fought against those things long before he became a Member of this House. Several years ago a law was passed for the benefit of one of those princesses who was not deserving. Together with Judge Box, of Texas, I put up a memorable fight against that bill. I have stood up against all laws of that kind, and have been responsible for keeping this bill from passing on several occasions.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McFARLANE. Why should we approve some measure when we are not sure of the measure we are approving? Does not the gentleman think we better pass it over and have the measure studied rather carefully to see what we are doing?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If the gentleman can do that by unanimous consent, yes; but it is too late now.

Mr. McFARLANE. We can vote down the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman offers a preferential motion. The gentleman from Texas moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McFARLANE and Mr. GEARHART) there were—ayes 52, noes 12.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 142, nays 148, and not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—142

Allen	Doxey	Larrabee	Rankin
Arends	Driver	Lea, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Arnold	Edmiston	Lloyd	Rich
Ashbrook	Eicher	Lord	Romjue
Bacon	Ekwall	Lucas	Sanders, Tex.
Barden	Engel	Luckey	Schaefer
Beam	Fernandez	McClellan	Short
Binderup	Fiesinger	McFarlane	Smith, Wash.
Blanton	Focht	McGehee	South
Buckler, Minn.	Ford, Miss.	McKeough	Spence
Burch	Fuller	McLean	Starnes
Burdick	Gearhart	McReynolds	Steagall
Burnham	Gifford	Mahon	Sutphin
Carlson	Gilchrist	Maloney	Taber
Carmichael	Guyer	Mapes	Tarver
Carter	Gwynne	Marshall	Taylor, Colo.
Cartwright	Haines	Mason	Taylor, S. C.
Christianson	Hancock, N. Y.	Massingale	Terry
Church	Hess	May	Thomason
Clark, N. C.	Hill, Knute	Meeks	Thompson
Colden	Hill, Samuel B.	Michener	Thurston
Cole, N. Y.	Hoeppel	Millard	Treadway
Collins	Hoffman	Miller	Turner
Cooley	Hollister	Mitchell, Tenn.	Turpin
Cooper, Tenn.	Hope	Mott	Vinson, Ky.
Costello	Houston	Murdock	Walter
Cravens	Jenkins, Ohio	Nelson	Warren
Crawford	Johnson, Okla.	O'Neal	Welch
Darrow	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Werner
Deen	Jones	Parsons	Whelchel
DeRouen	Kelly	Patman	Williams
Disney	Kimball	Peterson, Ga.	Wolcott
Ditter	Kinzer	Pierce	Wolverton
Dobbins	Knutson	Polk	Woodrum
Dondero	Kocialkowski	Rabaut	
Doughton	Lambeth	Ramspeck	

NAYS—148

Amlie	Beiter	Bland	Brewster
Andresen	Bell	Bloom	Brown, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Berlin	Boileau	Brunner
Ayers	Biermann	Boland	Buckbee
Bacharach	Blackney	Boylan	Cannon, Mo.
Carpenter	Greenway	McLaughlin	Sadowski
Casey	Greever	Martin, Mass.	Sanders, La.
Castellow	Gregory	Maverick	Sandlin
Cavicchia	Hart	Mead	Sauthoff
Chapman	Healey	Merritt, N. Y.	Schneider
Citron	Higgins, Mass.	Mitchell, Ill.	Schulte
Cox	Hildebrandt	Monaghan	Secrest
Crosser, Ohio	Hill, Ala.	Montague	Shanley
Cullen	Hobbs	Moran	Sirovich
Cummings	Hook	Norton	Sisson
Darden	Huddleston	O'Connor	Smith, Conn.
Dear	Hull	Owen	Smith, W. Va.
Dempsey	Imhoff	Palmisano	Stack
Dingell	Jacobsen	Patterson	Stubbs
Dockweiler	Jenckes, Ind.	Patton	Sweeney
Dorsey	Kee	Pearson	Thom
Driscoll	Keller	Peterson, Fla.	Tinkham
Duffey, Ohio	Kenney	Pittenger	Tolan
Duffy, N. Y.	Kleberg	Quinn	Tonry
Dunn, Pa.	Kloeb	Ramsay	Truax
Eagle	Kniffin	Randolph	Utterback
Ellenbogen	Kopplemann	Ransley	Vinson, Ga.
Evans	Kramer	Reed, Ill.	Wallgren
Ferguson	Kvale	Reilly	Wearin
Fitzpatrick	Lemke	Richards	Weaver
Fletcher	Lesinski	Robertson	Whittington
Gehrmann	Lewis, Colo.	Robsion, Ky.	Wilson, La.
Gillette	Lewis, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Wolfenden
Goodwin	Ludlow	Rogers, N. H.	Woodruff
Granfield	Lundeen	Rogers, Okla.	Young
Gray, Ind.	McAndrews	Russell	Zimmerman
Gray, Pa.	McCormack	Ryan	Zioncheck

NOT VOTING—141

Adair	Dietrich	Holmes	Plumley
Andrew, Mass.	Dirksen	Igoe	Powers
Bankhead	Doutrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Rayburn
Boehne	Drewry	Kahn	Reece
Bolton	Duncan	Kennedy, Md.	Richardson
Brennan	Dunn, Miss.	Kennedy, N. Y.	Robinson, Utah
Brooks	Eaton	Kerr	Rudd
Brown, Mich.	Eckert	Lambertson	Sabath
Buchanan	Englebright	Lamneck	Schuetz
Buck	Faddis	Lanham	Scott
Buckley, N. Y.	Farley	Lee, Okla.	Scrugham
Bulwinkle	Fenerty	Lehlbach	Sears
Caldwell	Fish	McGrath	Seger
Cannon, Wis.	Flannagan	McGroarty	Shannon
Carden	Ford, Calif.	McLeod	Smith, Va.
Cary	Frey	McMillan	Snell
Celler	Fulmer	McSwain	Snyder
Chandler	Gambrill	Maas	Somers, N. Y.
Claiborne	Gasque	Mansfield	Stefan
Clark, Idaho	Gassaway	Marcantonio	Stewart
Cochran	Gavagan	Martin, Colo.	Sullivan
Coffee	Gildea	Merritt, Conn.	Sumners, Tex.
Cole, Md.	Gingery	Montet	Taylor, Tenn.
Colmer	Goldsborough	Moritz	Thomas
Connery	Green	Nichols	Tobey
Cooper, Ohio	Greenwood	O'Brien	Umstead
Corning	Griswold	O'Connell	Underwood
Crosby	Halleck	O'Day	Wadsworth
Cross, Tex.	Hamlin	O'Leary	West
Crowe	Hancock, N. C.	Oliver	White
Crowther	Harlan	O'Malley	Wigglesworth
Culkin	Harter	Perkins	Wilcox
Daly	Hartley	Pettengill	Wilson, Pa.
Delaney	Hennings	Peyser	Withrow
Dickstein	Higgins, Conn.	Pfeifer	Wood
Dies			

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs until further notice:

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Connery with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Reece.
Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Martin of Colorado with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Engelbright.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Cross of Texas with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. West with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Eckert.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Rudd.
Mr. Dietrich with Mr. O'Malley.
Mr. Crowe with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Daly with Mr. Lamneck.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Adair.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Moritz with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McGroarty.
Mr. Caldwell with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Carden.
Mr. Cary with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. O'Connell with Mr. Chandler.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Gassaway with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Gambrill.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Green with Mr. Hennings.
Mr. Young with Mr. White.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Harlan.
Mr. Gildea with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. Umstead with Mr. Kennedy of Maryland.
Mr. Igoe with Mr. Hancock of North Carolina.

Mr. SCHULTE, Mr. BLAND, Mr. DUFFY of New York, Mr. WOODRUM, Mr. DRISCOLL, and Mr. GRAY of Indiana changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BLANTON changed his vote from "present" to "aye."

Mr. PEARSON changed his vote from "present" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN RIVERS IN TILLAMOOK COUNTY, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4077, authorizing a preliminary examination of the Nehalem, Miami, Kilchis, Wilson, Trask, and Tillamook Rivers, in Tillamook County, Oreg., with a view to the controlling of floods.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill and the similar bills, Calendar Nos. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55, be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the bills on the calendar numbered from 49 to 55, inclusive, be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5917, to appoint an additional circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request.

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

Mr. McFARLANE and Mr. TRUAX objected.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, an additional circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit.

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.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE ORDINANCE OF 1787 AND THE SETTLEMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY

The Clerk called the next resolution, House Joint Resolution 208, to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of the Northwest Territory.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I have an amendment to offer which has been agreed to by the author of the bill, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. ZIONCHECK and Mr. JENKINS of Ohio reserved the right to object.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the amendment is.

Mr. TRUAX. Let the clerk read it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. No; I should like to know what the amendment is.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection. I am not against the bill, I am for it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the famous ordinance known as the "Ordinance of 1787", adopted by the Federal Congress for the government of the territory now embracing the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota, and then known as the "Northwest Territory", was so far-reaching in its effects, making such a complete change in the method of governing new communities formed by colonization, that it will always rank as one of the greatest civil documents of all time; and

Whereas the settlement of, and establishment of government in, the Northwest Territory in 1788 marked the beginning of the resistless march of the people of the United States from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas the adoption of the Ordinance of 1787 followed by the settlement of the Northwest Territory under the system of government provided by such ordinance vitally shaped and determined the pattern of development of our Nation, its ideals, its Constitution, and its government; and

Whereas there is an indicative analogy between the national problems of 150 years ago and those of the present day, making the study of the accomplishments of those early days of value to our people today; and

Whereas the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of these two great focal events in American history occurs in 1937 and 1938: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Northwest Territory Celebration Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of 17 commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States; 2 Members of the Senate, 1 from each of the two major parties, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; 2 Members of the House of Representatives, 1 from each of the two major parties, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; the regent of the State chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution of each of the 6 States formed from the Northwest Territory, namely, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; and 6 individuals from private life, to be appointed by the President of the United States. The commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of the Northwest Territory. In the preparation of such plan, the Commission shall cooperate, insofar as is possible, with the several States and particularly with the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and shall take such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of plans prepared by State commissions, by agencies appointed by the Governors of the several States, and by representative civic organizations.

SEC. 3. (a) Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Commission is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of a director and such other employees as are necessary in the execution of its functions.

(b) The Commission may make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of Government and elsewhere, for office supplies, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary in the execution of the functions of the Commission. All expenditures of the Commission, including necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses (not in excess of $5 per day) incurred by the commissioners while absent from their places of residence upon the business of the Commission, and by the employees of the Commission while away from their designated posts of duty upon the business of the Commission, shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist within 180 days after the date of the expiration of the celebration.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 15, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

On page 3, line 20, after the word "compensation", insert in parentheses "not to exceed $5,000 per annum."

On page 3, beginning in line 24, strike out all of lines 24 and 25 and lines 1, 2, and 3, on page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the words "as are necessary to carry out the intent and purposes of this resolution."

On page 4, line 5, after the word "including", insert the word "all."

On page 4, line 6, after the word "expenses", strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

On page 4, line 14, after the word "within", strike out the words "one hundred and eighty days" and insert in lieu thereof the words "six months."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRUAX: On page 4, after the word "commissioners", in line 7, insert "*Provided*, That $10,000 of the $75,000 herein authorized shall be expended in connection with the 1937 Ohio State Fair, Columbus, Ohio, for the purpose of producing, staging, and presenting an historical pageant depicting the establishment and settlement of the Northwest Territory in an appropriate manner, to be determined by the Northwest Territory Celebration Commission, cooperating with the director of agriculture of Ohio and the State Board of Agriculture of Ohio."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. My opposition is pro forma only.

I am not opposed to the amendment, but I want to inquire whether this amendment is satisfactory to the author of the bill.

Mr. SECREST. This amendment is satisfactory. I think everyone is familiar with the fact that the Federal Government apportions so much to each State, and the States are passing bills of their own with reference to this matter, and if this amount which would come to Ohio is to be devoted to this purpose, it will be all right, and we can use part of the Ohio fund for some other purpose.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The bill provides for $75,000 to be used in the observance of the opening up of the Northwest Territory through the famous Ordinance of 1787, in which six or seven States will participate.

Mr. SECREST. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And this $10,000 is to be used at the State Fair at Columbus, Ohio, to provide a great educational and historical pageant in which all the States will participate, and this is agreeable to all the parties concerned?

Mr. SECREST. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to ask the gentleman does this authorize $10,000 to pay the expenses of the Ohio State fair?

Mr. SECREST. No; it is for the purpose of a pageant in connection with the Ohio State fair.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the purpose of this bill is to celebrate or commemorate the adoption of the Ordinance of 1787, in which several States are very much interested. With the understanding that the whole sum is to be expended for the general celebration by States involved, none of the other States that were within the Northwest Territory have seen fit to isolate any part of the fund. I do not know why the State of Ohio has asked that a certain portion be set aside for a particular celebration in that State. If that is done Michigan and Indiana and other States might be expected to advance some reason why they should have an allocation.

Mr. SECREST. That would be satisfactory as far as I am concerned.

Mr. TRUAX. My colleague has explained the fact that each State is appropriating a definite amount of money to cooperate in this celebration. The State of Ohio has authorized $25,000 in addition to the State's share in the Federal appropriation.

Now, the Ohio State fair is one of the leading fairs of the country, and it was thought that by taking this pageant in connection with this fair that it would be brought sharply to the attention of 300,000 people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I presume that under the provisions of the act, the Commission has authority to provide for the distribution of the $100,000. In order to protect the integrity of that act, I am going to oppose this amendment to the best of my ability, because I do not want to create a situation whereby other States that participate in this great celebration will be embarrassed by the fact a certain amount of money has been set aside for a particular State.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in the main. It was the intention of the author of the bill and those having charge to make this a celebration between the States. There has been some minor objection to the bill from the beginning. In order to satisfy the particular Member who is objecting, it was thought best to placate him if the same could be done without doing violence to the purpose of the bill. This is one reason for the change that would call for a portion to be set aside for this pageant. It is my understanding that the State legislature is to appropriate much more money than any other State.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I fully appreciate that. I was not a party to the compromise. I took the bill as it was presented to us, and I did not object, because I thought it was meritorious.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Washington is not getting a dime out of this, and I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to defeat the purposes of this bill by having a certain definite sum allocated to any State. I hope the States of Ohio and Michigan and Illinois and Indiana, and the other States which were part of the Northwest Territory, can get together under this commission and arrange for the celebration without having a commission say that it has to give Ohio $10,000 or Michigan $10,000, and for that reason I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. This is one of the bills with which the House is not generally familiar. All I know about it I have heard from the floor. I have not read all the bill, but I have read enough of the bill to know that it sets up another commission. It provides for a celebration and the spending of $100,000 of the people's money in setting up a commission and celebrating a historic event at this time when, in my judgment, we could far better economize. To defeat the bill in no way reflects upon the merit of the occurrence to be celebrated. We might do ourselves honor by celebrating many historic events, but does the financial condition of the country and States warrant any but necessary expenditures at this time?

Establishing of bureaus and commissions seems to be the popular pastime of Congress in recent months. This is just one more, and I am against it.

Section 3 provides:

Without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Commission is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the compensation (not to exceed $5,000 per annum) of a director and such other employees as may be necessary in the execution of its functions.

The country is not asking for more commissions or more bureaus to be established outside of the civil service, where jobs may be created. I tell you, gentlemen, it is all wrong. Every bureau has a small beginning. I come from that section of the country which would participate in this celebration, but I believe I state the sentiment of 95 percent of our people when I say that we are opposed to new commissions.

The time is coming when the American people must become tax-conscious. We have to pay for these things. We can spend easily, but we cannot escape responsibility, because this is a celebration affecting one particular part of our country. When the country becomes tax-conscious we will stop this spending. Why not do it now before the tax load is too great? We are on the way, and economy now is the only thing that will prevent ruinous currency expansion or repudiation. I am surprised at the objector; the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], is not interested in the taxpayers' money at this time. I come from the same State that he does. This may affect us, but let us not be sectional.

Mr. LESINSKI. I have not said anything at all.

Mr. MICHENER. And it is time the gentleman did. He objects to other people's bills. He should stand up and show his colors.

Mr. LESINSKI. I shall object to every bill. How does the gentleman like that?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the parliamentary situation is this: There is no opposition to the immediate consideration of the bill. Certain committee amendments have been agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. One amendment is now pending, which provides for $10,000 to be allocated to the State of Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Personally I would be glad to have the author of that amendment withdraw it and then the parliamentary situation would be that the bill is up for passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know whether amendments will be offered. An amendment has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX].

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] says that he favors economy. I wish he would stay on this floor at all times when this Consent Calendar is being considered. I wish he would stay here when we are considering the Private Calendar. Then he himself could help to save the Government millions of dollars.

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

Mr. TRUAX. I refuse to yield now.

Mr. MICHENER. For a correction.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is opposed to this bill. Let me read to him what the Governor of his own State has to say about this project:

> The history of Michigan and of the Northwest Territory is forever closely linked. It seems to me that this proposal comes at a particularly appropriate time, for it ties in with the celebration of Michigan's centennial. That celebration will close in 1937. If the North Territory plan goes through, it will have the happy effect of emphasizing to the rest of the United States how much is owing to Michigan for the leadership she provided in the early years.

I quote that from a statement by Governor Fitzgerald at Lansing, Mich., on May 4, 1935.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. Not now. The gentleman from Michigan objects to my amendment. He is opposed to centralizing power in any commission. So I take it my amendment is offered for that very purpose, to safeguard this governmental expenditure so that we may assure the taxpayers of this country that they are not asked to stomach a commission or bureau with no knowledge whatsoever of this project, with no experience to guide them, but instead of that, we propose to take $10,000 of this $75,000 appropriation and have it expended by this Commission to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, the Vice President, and the President of the United States; that this Commission so appointed and duly qualified, shall cooperate with the Ohio State Board of Agriculture, a nonpartisan, nonpolitical board, and shall cooperate with the director of agriculture, appointed by the Governor of Ohio; so that we could be assured and assure those interested therein that at least $10,000 of this money will be expended properly, wisely, and sanely, and by those who have had years of experience in such matters.

I know it is all well and good for a Member to get up here and say, "I am for economy; I am opposed to the further extension of bureaucracy and bureaucrats", as I am, but here is a project that has received the approval of many hundreds of people interested, not only in Ohio but in six States, and they approve this amendment.

I ask for its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I do this for the purpose of getting information only. Did I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] to state that this amendment providing that Ohio shall be given $10,000 was agreed to in order to obtain withdrawal of the objection of the other gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] to the consideration of the bill? Am I correct?

Mr. TRUAX. The gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not asking the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX].

Mr. TRUAX. I am telling the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am sorry to have to admit the gentleman is about correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood an amendment was pending, upon which we would vote, and that the amendment would not be adopted by unanimous consent. Otherwise I would object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment is pending. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last four words.

When Michigan's rights are being questioned on this floor you may take it from me that she will always have those who raise their voices in her defense. If this resolution applies to five States, as I read from the joint resolution that it does, I see no reason why $10,000 of the sum should be assigned to any individual State listed therein. Accordingly I would ask the Members of this House to pass the resolution in its present form and take no cognizance of the request of the gentleman from Ohio. It appears unfair to me that special recognition should be given any one of the individual States. I feel that the Members of the House will agree in this respect.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SECREST: Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "seventeen" and insert "fourteen."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what is the purpose of that amendment?

Mr. SECREST. That is to correct a typographical error.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SECREST: Page 4, line 18, strike out "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

I do this to get information. How many of the States affected here have made State appropriations?

Mr. SECREST. The State of Ohio has passed a bill, and it has been signed by the Governor, appropriating $25,000. Governor Fitzgerald, of Michigan, sent a special message to the legislature recommending $15,000, and issued a statement to the press, which is reprinted in the Detroit Free Press, saying there would be no doubt about Michigan's participation. Governor Horner, of Illinois, recommended to the legislature an appropriation of $25,000. The Governor of Indiana, although the legislature had adjourned, made an arrangement with some of the leaders in both parties that an amount should be appropriated or used and taken from some other fund. I do not know the exact arrangement, but I think every State will participate.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, the State of Illinois today is having trouble to get money to feed its starving people. As a matter of fact, in the State of Michigan we are having trouble to get money to run the Government, because the taxes are so high and the bottoms of the taxpayers' pockets have been reached. The State of Ohio, it seems, is the only State in the Union which has as yet appropriated this money. I thank God that Ohio has sufficient money and the taxpayers are willing to appropriate money for this purpose.

So far as Michigan is concerned, I am sure that the legislature of the State has not, in these stringent times, appropriated additional money for this purpose, and it is my belief that they will not. Coming from Michigan, I am going to oppose the bill and think that I am representing a large proportion of the taxpayers of my State in taking this stand. I hope the whole thing will be voted down.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman from Ohio a while ago suggested that the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan had taken some action. With the gentleman's permission I would ask the gentleman from Ohio if he knows what, if anything, the State of Wisconsin has done.

Mr. SECREST. I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. SECREST. I wish to point out to the gentleman that this celebration is to take place in 1937, and I am sure we hope that at that time conditions will be somewhat different from what they are now.

Mr. MICHENER. Let us live within our means and not upon our prospects. That has been our trouble in the past. We spend when it is easy to spend; we spend whenever we get the notion, when the urge is upon us; but we think too little of the pay day. If this Congress is subject to one criticism above all others it is that we are spending, just as the gentleman suggests, without thinking of the pay day that ultimately must come.

The amount involved here is not very great. It is true that the Commissioners are to receive no salaries. At the same time they are to receive all expenses and subsistence while engaged in their duties as commissioners. I have heretofore stated that a director and such help as the commission thinks advisable are to be compensated, and all out of the Federal Treasury. You may say this is "kitchen economy", because we are dealing with $100,000 rather than $100,000,000. The time is not far distant when we must begin to practice "kitchen economy." Of course, it is difficult to vote against these appropriations, especially when they affect our respective localities. I am fully mindful of what the Ordinance of 1787 means. It is always well to celebrate occasions of this kind. We cannot, however, financially do the things we would like to do always, and my thought is that our people are more interested in recovery and regaining our normal economic status than they are in celebrating any ordinance or birthday.

Of course, there is always some argument to show that an expenditure is economically sound. In Michigan we have a large tourist trade, as has been suggested. But I do not believe that this commission will be of any value whatever in bringing tourists to Michigan this year.

Again, whenever the Federal Government appropriates sums like this we throw out bait to the State government. The State then ofttimes feels that it is getting something for nothing, and the State legislature makes appropriation out of the State taxpayers' money. The result is that the State taxpayer only contributes a small part in the Federal appropriation, yet they must have an additional tax in the State because of the appropriation.

This bill does not provide for any specific celebration. This commission will have its headquarters in Washington and will furnish literature and advice to those communities desiring to celebrate. Be it understood that this money which we are appropriating is to be expended largely in the headquarters of the commission.

I know that this bill will pass this body, and I ask the Members to keep track of just what happens after the commission is set up and how the money is expended. I shall be greatly surprised if additional appropriations are not to be asked for in connection with this project. All these things have small beginnings. The George Washington celebration had a small beginning but was a real project, and is still functioning. If we get together all the history in connection with the current celebration, this will cost money. And if you believe that such effort will not be made, then I believe you are mistaken. In short, there is just one way to economize, and that is to stop creating new bureaus, commissions, and offices. The people cannot have everything they want under present economic conditions. Let us devote our efforts to getting back on the track rather than creating more debts.

The work of this commission will be advisory only. No specified celebration in Michigan, as in any other of the States, is provided for. This is not an exposition. We are setting up a board to tell us that we may celebrate if we desire, and that convenience is to cost $100,000.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, the idea for this celebration originated in the minds of a group of citizens in Marietta, Ohio, citizens who are justly proud of the fact that their city was the first to be settled in the vast territory of the old Northwest. Here was the cornerstone of westward expansion. Here began the real growth of the Nation. Here was planted the outpost from which flew the American flag that had but recently led these same men in the long struggle for independence. The citizens of Marietta hope with all justice that the eyes of this Nation shall gaze upon their many historic shrines and the beautiful city that has now replaced the humble cabins of the city's founders.

Representing in Congress this historical city, I introduced this resolution providing for the celebration of the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of the Northwest Territory. No document in American history, except the Constitution itself, has done more to establish our democratic form of government and guarantee the preservation of those ideals upon which this Nation was founded and developed to its present greatness.

The President of the United States, realizing the importance of this ordinance in the growth of the Nation, immediately gave his hearty endorsement to this resolution. I wish at this point to read his public statement.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 20, 1935.

Hon. GEORGE WHITE, *Chairman,*
Marietta, Ohio.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I most heartily endorse the proposal that the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Ordinance of 1787 and of the settlement of the Northwest be celebrated by the joint observance of the Federal Government and of the various States concerned.

Rich in the possession of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution, those documents which established and gave form to our National Government, we, as a people, have perhaps been less informed with respect to that third great charter—the Northwest Ordinance. I trust that this forthcoming anniversary will be seized as the opportune occasion to instill in American minds and hearts the cherished appreciation of the rank and honor that is the rightful due of the "Great Ordinance."

The principles therein embodied served as the highway, broad and safe, over which poured the westward march of our civilization. As the Constitution provided the Federal frame, so the "Great Ordinance" provided for the States to be born of your region, not only the basis of civil government, but a perpetual security of elemental rights. On this plan was the United States built; on the plan of this ordinance we have, State by State, filled in the geographic frame of our domain; and from it we have had no occasion to depart.

I hope to see the most helpful cooperation, both on the part of the Federal Government and your historic States, in the commemoration of an event so full of meaning both to our past development and to the principles of freedom and progress for which we must ever stand.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Republican Governor of Michigan gave his wholehearted endorsement to this project and recommended to the legislature of Michigan an appropriation sufficient to insure participation of his State in this great celebration.

It has always been my great pleasure and fortune to count among my loyal friends thousands who are members of the Republican Party. I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation and thanks to one who is a member of this Congress, Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS. He has faithfully supported my efforts in behalf of this resolution. I want, also, to thank the members of the Ohio delegation, both Democratic and Republican, every one of whom signed a petition heartily endorsing this resolution.

I have letters of endorsement from every State Historical Society in the six States formed from the Northwest Territory. The legislature of Ohio has appropriated $25,000 as Ohio's contribution. The bill making this appropriation received every vote in the State senate regardless of political affiliation. The vote of the State representatives was 97 to 7.

I have a vast number of editorials and articles collected from newspapers in every section of the six States interested in this celebration. I shall not take the time of the House in reading these but without exception they are unanimous in praise of this resolution and the celebration for which it provides.

As a former teacher of American history, I can see the effect this celebration will have in developing character, understanding, and love of country in the hearts and minds of more than 3,000,000 children who daily attend the schools in these six great States.

The stories of our national heroes and the ideals for which they gave every ounce of their strength and even their lives have inspired you to greater effort in behalf of your constituents, just as they have inspired me. Out of this great celebration, I hope will grow in the minds of boys and girls a love of independence, a strength of character, and a desire to serve faithfully and honestly this Nation and its citizens. For those of us who are older, I hope it will serve to renew our faith and to stimulate our efforts to protect from communism and radicalism every principle embodied in this great civil document passed by another Congress in the year of 1787. Let us glance briefly at the history of this ordinance and the principles embodied in it.

For many years seven of the Original Thirteen States had made claim to all of the Northwest Territory between the Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi River. Many disputes arose concerning those claims, and in 1780 the State of New York ceded her rights in this territory to the United States. The other States soon adopted the same policy.

Naturally the question came before Congress as to what should be done with these newly acquired national lands, the first to come into the possession of the Federal Government. The question was debated for several years, although final disposition was not made of the matter until 1787. The Congress of the United States in that year held sessions in New York City. At the same time the Constitution was being drafted at a convention in Philadelphia. The eyes of the people were focused on the constitutional body. This permitted the Congress to deliberate in a manner almost wholly free from selfish State interests and petty jealousies.

Already a considerable number of individuals had entered the Territory for exploratory purposes. A great group of Revolutionary soldiers whose personal fortunes had been lost in the war made ready to enter the western lands as soon as a satisfactory government might be authorized by Congress. The Congress had found itself unable to pay the wages of many of these soldiers except in money which was depreciated to approximately 12 cents on the dollar. The soldiers urged that lands in the Northwest Territory be sold them, and that they be permitted to pay the purchase price with the depreciated currency by giving it to the Government at its face value.

Not only were the veterans anxious to enter into the Territory but many Members of Congress felt that the country must be settled to protect it from Great Britain and Spain, neither country of which had truly recognized the territory as belonging to the United States.

Washington, in his farewell orders to his soldiers, had cheered them with these words:

The extensive and fertile region to the west will yield a most happy asylum to those who, fond of domestic enjoyment, are seeking for personal independence.

As early as 1783, 285 officers of the Continental Army had petitioned Congress "to mark out a tract of land in the West as a colony of the United States, in time to be admitted as one of the Confederated States of America." This petition was really the foundation of the "Ohio Company of Association" organized in the "Bunch of Grapes" in Boston, March 3, 1786. The directors of this company sent Gen. S. H. Parsons, of Middleton, Conn., to negotiate the purchase of a tract of land from Congress. Parsons presented his memorial, which was referred to the committee, and returned home. His place was shortly taken by Dr. Cutler, of Ipswich, Mass., to whom goes much of the credit for securing the action of Congress in formulating a policy for the government of the Northwest Territory.

On July 13 the Ordinance of 1787 was passed by Congress. Next to the Constitution itself, which was finally finished a few weeks later, this ordinance stands out as the greatest civil document in American history. It not only formed the basis of government for the Northwest Territory, but for each succeeding territory that was acquired by the United States. It provided for a governor, legislative, and judiciary systems, and further established certain principles and rights which were to be forever guaranteed to the people. Among these was the declaration that "no person who demeans himself in a proper and orderly manner shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or religious sentiments in the said territory." It guaranteed to the inhabitants the writ of habeas corpus, trial by jury, proportionate representation in the legislature, and the privilege of common law.

Another article contains words that set forth a philosophy which alone is the chief cornerstone upon which democratic government rests. This article says:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

To give full support to that part of the ordinance, it was provided that lot no. 16 in every township was to be dedicated to the support of public schools. The funds derived from the sale of these original school lands form the bulk of the public-school endowments of the five great States wholly formed from the old Northwest Territory.

Not only did this ordinance furnish the basis of government for all new lands acquired by the United States but the wisdom of its provisions encouraged the settlement of this new land by men of courage and self-reliance. The principles enunciated in the Ordinance of 1787, together with the qualities of character possessed by the early settlers, might be presented with excellent effect on the morale of the Nation.

Every effort has been made by local, State, and National Governments to administer to the physical needs of our people, and no one will say that I have not given my full time and strength during this time when the needs of our people are so great. Nevertheless, it is just as essential that we encourage and preserve the moral and spiritual life of

the Nation as it moves through the dark hours of bitter experience and depression.

If communism is to be fought from our shores, we must forever keep alight the fires of patriotism in the hearts of our children. Every cent of this appropriation should be wisely spent for the purposes of increasing our appreciation and knowledge of those men and those events which made the growth of our Nation possible.

Good government and the principles of good government should be made the ambition of every boy and girl and every adult in any democracy. The elements of courage, faith, self-reliance, and spiritual responsibility for ourselves and those who believe in us should be lifted from the hearts of the Nation's heroes of the past and transplanted in the very souls of the youth and men of today.

Those sacred milestones in our march to self-government and national power should be properly marked as the shrines for generations yet to come. If these ends are ever kept in mind, this celebration will repay the Nation many times by giving us for tomorrow's battles greater inspiration, better character, and nobler government. Such addition to our intangible wealth must certainly appeal to farmer, laborer, and merchant alike.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, in view of the fact they are quarreling about money.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIONCHECK to the amendment offered by Mr. SECREST: Strike out "$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is one that deserves dignified consideration. I fear that the gentleman from Michigan does not fully understand what it purports to do. It is a bill that does not need to excite or incite anybody's prejudice. Rather it should incite his patriotism. Its purpose is to commemorate one of the greatest events in American history, an event next only to the Declaration of Independence. It is to commemorate the Ordinance of 1787 which stands out as one of the leading accomplishments, political and legislative, of the parliamentary governments of the world. It opened up the great Northwest Territory to settlement. Its preamble carried the greatest guaranty for liberty of action and freedom of conscience to that time ever pronounced. It laid down the principle that religion, morality, and education were necessary to good government and that they should forever be encouraged.

The bill comes to us from probably the most conservative committee of the House, the Committee on the Library, which is always mindful of those things which will tend to spread and intensify Americanism. They favor this bill. They will be sorely disappointed if it is set aside, especially for anything but a good statesmanlike reason.

The question involved is not that of the expenditure of money but of commemorating one of the greatest events in American history. Not to commemorate this great event fittingly would be a blot on the escutcheon of our great country. Under the bill as drawn about $15,000 will go to each of the great States that were carved out of the Northwest Territory. The Northwest Territory ranks next to the Thirteen Colonies in the importance of contributions to the greatness and glory of our Republic.

We want to celebrate this anniversary in a fitting way and I appeal to my colleagues to lay prejudice aside. If Michigan has not yet made her appropriation, we hope and believe she will. Ohio has done nobly. We have already appropriated $25,000. We want this movement to be a great success and we want Michigan with us. We want Wisconsin with us, too. The first settlers came into Ohio in 1788. At Marietta in 1788 a small group of New Englanders who had formed themselves into an organization that they called the "Ohio Co." made the first white settlement in that whole new world and within a dozen years many thriving communities had been settled. From that time on for 100 years the people streamed into the western country. And what kind of people were they? Not the tramp or the bum, but God's finest people. The American pioneer—man and woman—have never been excelled. This movement kept up and people streamed into Ohio from the South, and from the East. From Connecticut, New York, Maine they came; and from Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia—why, bless your life, the cream of the earth came into the Ohio Valley. Washington told them of the glories of that land beyond the Ohio River—the beautiful river. They settled up so fast that in 1803 Ohio became a State. The same class of people came to Michigan and to Indiana and to all the other States. Why, certainly we ought to celebrate this great event with dignity. [Applause.]

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It is a pleasure to yield to one of the most distinguished men in America, a former Governor of the great State of Virginia, Mr. MONTAGUE. [Applause.]

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the gentleman's observation. I wonder if the great subject about which this commemoration is to take place recalls to the minds of any who wrote the Ordinance of 1787?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; Jefferson.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. EKWALL. As I understand the purport of the gentleman's argument, he wants the people to come across again; am I right?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. We want this great Government never to fail to do its patriotic duty. The State of Ohio contributes liberally. We contribute more in proportion than we ask from the Government, and we do not ask for ourselves. We want to help the American people realize what religion, morality, and education will do toward establishing a nation.

Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman from Washington withdraw his amendment?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I offered my amendment to the amendment was that the Members from the States interested were quarreling about the amount.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], I do not agree with him that the expenditure by the Federal Government of $100,000 to celebrate this great event is a waste of public money. May I remind the House that in the State of Michigan, next to the automobile industry, the tourist trade is the next largest industry. You people who have come up from the South, out from the East and the West, and down from the North, to see us have made this possible. The State of Michigan has on frequent occasions in years gone by—and we hope it will do the same thing again—appropriated at least $100,000 to two associations organized for the express purpose of selling Michigan to our friends outside the State.

I am sure if they have not already done so, the Governor and the Legislature of the State of Michigan will appropriate their proportionate amount to match this money to carry on this celebration. Fifteen thousand dollars is only too small an amount to be appropriated by any State for a celebration which means millions and millions of dollars to the State, looking at it from the commercial standpoint. It will bring to the Middle West money which has been denied us under other bills, which is needed so much out there for the rehabilitation of one of the richest sections of the United States.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that when this proposition was first made President Roosevelt suggested $200,000?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I did not know that.

Mr. KELLER. That is true, and that ought to have been the amount specified here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MICHENER) there were—ayes 80, noes 12.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays 35, not voting 177, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—219

Amlie	Duncan	Lea, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.
Arnold	Dunn, Pa.	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Ashbrook	Eagle	Lesinski	Rogers, N. H.
Ayers	Eckert	Lewis, Colo.	Rogers, Okla.
Barden	Ellenbogen	Lord	Romjue
Beam	Engel	Luckey	Ryan
Beiter	Englebright	Lundeen	Sadowski
Biermann	Evans	McClellan	Sanders, La.
Blackney	Farley	McCormack	Sanders, Tex.
Blanton	Fernandez	McFarlane	Sandlin
Bloom	Fiesinger	McGehee	Schaefer
Boileau	Fletcher	McLaughlin	Schulte
Boland	Focht	McLean	Secrest
Boylan	Ford, Calif.	McReynolds	Shanley
Brewster	Gearhart	McSwain	Sisson
Brown, Ga.	Gehrmann	Mahon	Smith, Conn.
Buckbee	Gifford	Maloney	Smith, Va.
Buckler, Minn.	Gillette	Mapes	Smith, Wash.
Burdick	Goodwin	Marshall	Smith, W. Va.
Burnham	Granfield	Martin, Colo.	South
Cannon, Mo.	Gray, Ind.	Martin, Mass.	Spence
Carlson	Gray, Pa.	Mason	Starnes
Carmichael	Greenway	Massingale	Stubbs
Cartwright	Greever	Maverick	Sutphin
Castellow	Gregory	Meeks	Sweeney
Cavicchia	Guyer	Merritt, N. Y.	Tarver
Chapman	Haines	Miller	Taylor, Colo.
Citron	Hancock, N. Y.	Mitchell, Ill.	Terry
Claiborne	Healey	Monaghan	Thom
Clark, N. C.	Hess	Moran	Thomason
Coffee	Hildebrandt	Mott	Tinkham
Colden	Hill, Knute	Murdock	Tolan
Cooley	Hill, Samuel B.	Nelson	Tonry
Cooper, Tenn.	Hoeppel	Norton	Truax
Costello	Hook	O'Connor	Turpin
Cox	Hull	O'Neal	Utterback
Cravens	Imhoff	Owen	Vinson, Ga.
Crawford	Jacobsen	Parsons	Vinson, Ky.
Cross, Tex.	Jenckes, Ind.	Patman	Wallgren
Crosser, Ohio	Jenkins, Ohio	Patton	Walter
Crowe	Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Fla.	Warren
Cummings	Johnson, Tex.	Peterson, Ga.	Wearin
Darrow	Jones	Pierce	Weaver
Dear	Kahn	Pittenger	Welch
Deen	Kee	Polk	Werner
Dempsey	Keller	Powers	Whelchel
DeRouen	Kenney	Quinn	White
Dockweiler	Kerr	Rabaut	Whittington
Dondero	Kimball	Ramspeck	Williams
Dorsey	Kloeb	Rankin	Wilson, La.
Doxey	Kniffin	Ransley	Wolcott
Driscoll	Kocialkowski	Reed, Ill.	Wood
Driver	Kvale	Reilly	Zimmerman
Duffey, Ohio	Lambeth	Richards	Zioncheck
Duffy, N. Y.	Larrabee	Robertson	

NAYS—35

Andresen	Ekwall	Houston	Rich
Bacon	Ford, Miss.	Huddleston	Sauthoff
Binderup	Gilchrist	Ludlow	Short
Carpenter	Gwynne	Michener	Taber
Christianson	Halleck	Millard	Taylor, S. C.
Church	Hill, Ala.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Thurston
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Montague	Treadway
Dobbins	Hoffman	Patterson	Turner
Eicher	Hope	Pearson	

NOT VOTING—177

Adair	Dies	Kennedy, Md.	Rayburn
Allen	Dietrich	Kennedy, N. Y.	Reece
Andrew, Mass.	Dingell	Kinzer	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews, N.Y.	Dirksen	Kleberg	Richardson
Arends	Disney	Knutson	Robinson, Utah
Bacharach	Ditter	Kopplemann	Rudd
Bankhead	Doughton	Kramer	Russell
Bell	Doutrich	Lambertson	Sabath
Berlin	Drewry	Lamneck	Schneider
Bland	Dunn, Miss.	Lanham	Schuetz
Boehne	Eaton	Lee, Okla.	Scott
Bolton	Edmiston	Lehlbach	Scrugham
Brennan	Faddis	Lewis, Md.	Sears
Brooks	Fenerty	Lloyd	Seger
Brown, Mich.	Ferguson	Lucas	Shannon
Brunner	Fish	McAndrews	Sirovich
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	McGrath	Snell
Buck	Flannagan	McGroarty	Snyder
Buckley, N. Y.	Frey	McKeough	Somers, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Fuller	McLeod	Stack
Burch	Fulmer	McMillan	Steagall
Caldwell	Gambrill	Maas	Stefan
Cannon, Wis.	Gasque	Mansfield	Stewart
Carden	Gassaway	Marcantonio	Sullivan
Carter	Gavagan	May	Sumners, Tex.
Cary	Gildea	Mead	Taylor, Tenn.
Casey	Gingery	Merritt, Conn.	Thomas
Celler	Goldsborough	Montet	Thompson
Chandler	Green	Moritz	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Greenwood	Nichols	Umstead
Cochran	Griswold	O'Brien	Underwood
Cole, Md.	Hamlin	O'Connell	Wadsworth
Collins	Hancock, N. C.	O'Day	West
Colmer	Harlan	O'Leary	Wigglesworth
Connery	Hart	Oliver	Wilcox
Cooper, Ohio	Harter	O'Malley	Wilson, Pa.
Corning	Hartley	Palmisano	Withrow
Crosby	Hennings	Parks	Wolfenden
Crowther	Higgins, Conn.	Perkins	Wolverton
Culkin	Higgins, Mass.	Pettengill	Woodruff
Cullen	Hollister	Peyser	Woodrum
Daly	Holmes	Pfeifer	Young
Darden	Igoe	Plumley	
Delaney	Johnson, W. Va.	Ramsay	
Dickstein	Kelly	Randolph	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Arends.
Mr. McAndrews with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Brunner with Mr. Allen.
Mr. May with Mr. Schneider.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Rudd.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. McKeough.
Mr. Stack with Mr. Young.
Mr. Lloyd with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Russell.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Gingery.
Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Palmisano.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Peyser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHITE SWAN SCHOOL DISTRICT 88, WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4297, to provide funds for cooperation with White Swan School District No. 88, Yakima County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children of the Yakima Reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1535) may be substituted for the House bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of cooperating with White Swan School District No. 88, Yakima County, Wash., for extension and improvement of public-school buildings: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any moneys so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all Indian children of the district on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 4297) was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD, POPLAR, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5207, for expenditure of funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Poplar, Mont., in the construction or improvement of public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 1528 for the House bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $25,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the public-school board of district no. 9, town of Poplar, Mont.: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so authorized shall be subject to the express conditions that the school maintained by the said school district in the said building shall be available to all Indian children of Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district and that accommodations in said enlarged building to the extent of one-half its capacity shall be available for Indian children from the Fort Peck Reservation: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5207) was laid on the table.

SCHOOL BOARD, BROCKTON, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5209, to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Brockton, Mont., in the extension of the public-school building at that place to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1526 may be substituted for the House bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $40,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the public-school board of district no. 55, town of Brockton, and county of Roosevelt, Mont., for the extension and betterment of the public-school building at Brockton, Mont.: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the express conditions that the school maintained by the said school district in the said building shall be available to all Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district, and that accommodations in said enlarged building to the extent of one-half its capacity shall be available for Indian children from the Fort Peck Reservation: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5209) was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 17–H, BIG HORN COUNTY, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5210, to provide funds for cooperation with school district no. 17–H, Big Horn County, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings, to be available to Indian children.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $158,000 for the purpose of cooperating with School District No. 17–H, Big Horn County, Mont., for the extension and improvement of public-school buildings at Hardin and at Crow Agency: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any moneys so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all Indian children of the school district on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of the school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditure shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL, FRAZER, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5212, to authorize appropriations for the completion of the public high school at Frazer, Mont.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1530 may be substituted for the House bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 for the completion of the public high school at Frazer, Mont., and for necessary equipment in connection therewith for manual, laboratory, and other lines of training.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5212) was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 27, BIG HORN COUNTY, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5213, to provide funds for cooperation with school district no. 27, Big Horn County, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings to be available to Indian children.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object for the purpose of asking a question. I do not expect to object. The 15 bills we are now considering provide for the construction of school buildings to take care of Indian children, and, as I understand it, without the appropriations being made as provided in these bills, it would cost a considerably larger sum of money to take care of them otherwise, would it not?

Mr. AYERS. The statement from the Indian Bureau is that it would cost about three times as much.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $80,000 for the purpose of cooperating with School District No. 27, Big Horn County, Mont., for the extension and improvement of public-school buildings: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all Indian children of the school district on the same

terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

PUBLIC-SCHOOL BOARD AT WOLF POINT, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5214, to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Wolf Point, Mont., in the construction or improvement of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar bill (S. 1523) be substituted for the House bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the public-school board of district no. 45, town of Wolf Point, county of Roosevelt, Mont., for construction, extension, and betterment of the public high-school building at Wolf Point, Mont.: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so authorized shall be subject to the express conditions that the school maintained by the said district in the said building shall be available to all Indian children of Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district, and that accommodations in said enlarged building to the extent of one-half its capacity shall be available for Indian children from the Fort Peck Reservation: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5214) was laid on the table.

HARLEM SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12, BLAINE COUNTY, MONT.

The clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5216, to provide funds for cooperation with Harlem School District No. 12, Blaine County, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings and equipment to be available for Indian children.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 for the purpose of cooperating with Harlem School District No. 12, Blaine County, Mont., for equipment, extension, and improvements of public high-school buildings at Harlem, Mont.: *Provided*, That the expenditures of any moneys so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all the Indian children of the district on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28, LAKE AND MISSOULA COUNTIES, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5500, to provide funds for cooperation with joint school district no. 28, Lake and Missoula Counties, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings to be available to Indian children of the Flathead Indian Reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill for the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill (S. 1525), as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000 for the purpose of cooperating with joint school district no. 28, Lake and Missoula Counties, Mont., for the extension and improvement of public-school buildings, namely, at Arlee in the sum of $40,000, at Roman in the sum of $30,000, and at St. Ignatius in the sum of $30,000: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all Indian children of the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont., on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5500) was laid on the table.

SCHOOL BOARD AT MEDICINE LAKE, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6315, to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Medicine Lake, Mont., in construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the village of Medicine Lake, Sheridan County, Mont.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the public-school board of district no. 7, Sheridan County, Mont., for the construction, extension, and betterment of a public-school building at Medicine Lake, Mont.: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the express conditions that the school maintained by the said school district in the said building shall be available to all Indian children of the village of Medicine Lake, Sheridan County, Mont., on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *And provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARYSVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 325, SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASH.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3999, to provide funds for cooperation with Marysville School District No. 325, Snohomish County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill (S. 1533) for the House bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $38,000 for the purpose of cooperating with Marysville School District, No. 325, Snohomish County, Wash., for extension and improvements of school buildings: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any moneys so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all the Indian children of the district on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 3999) was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23, POLSON, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5499) to provide funds for cooperation with school district no. 23, Polson, Mont., in the improvement and extension of school buildings to be available to both Indian and white children.

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill S. 1524 be substituted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $40,000 for the purpose of cooperating with school district no. 23, Polson, Mont., in the improvement and extension of public-school buildings: *Provided*, That the schools

maintained by the district shall be available to both Indian and white children without discrimination, except that tuition may be paid for Indian children attending in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PUBLIC-SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN GLACIER COUNTY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5215) to provide funds for cooperation with public-school districts in Glacier County, Mont., in the improvement and extension of school buildings to be available to both Indian and white children.

There being no objection, the bill S. 1522 was substituted, and the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, of which $60,000 is to be used for the purpose of cooperating with school district no. 9 in Glacier County, Mont., in the improvement and extension of high-school buildings, and $40,000 to be used in the improvement and extension of school buildings in other public-school districts in said Glacier County: *Provided*, That said schools shall be available to both white and Indian children without discrimination, except that tuition may be paid for Indian children attending in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PUBLIC-SCHOOL BUILDING, ROUND VALLEY RESERVATION, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1395) to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Covelo, Calif., in the construction of public-school buildings to be available to Indian children of the Round Valley Reservation, Calif.

There being no objection, the bill S. 1536 was substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the Round Valley Union High School District Board of School Trustees, town of Covelo, and county of Mendocino, Calif., for construction of a new public high-school plant at Covelo, Calif.: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the express conditions that the school maintained by the said school district in the said building shall be available to all Indian children on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN WHO SERVED IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS BEYOND THE PERIOD OF THEIR ENLISTMENT

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 2024, for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Reserving the right to object, this bill proposes to refund transportation to these officers, and goes back 37 years. It will affect about 10,000 Spanish War veterans. The Committee on Pensions has just reported favorably a bill known as the "Smith bill", which will affect favorably 250,000 Spanish War veterans and require an annual appropriation by the Federal Government of around $50,000,000.

We are very hopeful that this bill will be enacted into law and signed by the President. Pending the consideration of that legislation, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does not this bill cover an entirely different subject matter? The bill the gentleman alludes to is a pension bill, and this is for reimbursing the American soldier who served in the Philippines who did not receive his travel pay, while others received theirs.

Mr. TRUAX. That is true, but the point I make is this. If we pass this bill now, requiring the additional expenditure of $5,000,000 or more, I believe it will prejudice this other bill becoming a law, because it is a question as to the additional expenditures involved in each year, if this bill becomes a law. Therefore I think that we should benefit the greater number of soldiers, 250,000, as against the 10,000, first.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should not prejudice the interest of particular soldiers affected by this bill, by waiting until the other bill comes before us for consideration.

Mr. TRUAX. May I say to the gentleman that the majority of the Spanish-American War veterans are for the pension bill first, and then they hope that this bill will be given consideration next.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. Yes.

Mrs. KAHN. This claim is a claim due these soldiers. They did not get their travel pay because of a technicality. These men were in the Philippines. The men who were mustered out were given their travel pay. These men who stayed in the Philippines were not, owing to the fact that they should have been mustered out and sworn in again. It was negligence or an oversight. These men stayed in the Philippines and continued doing their duty there. This has nothing to do with pensions, it has nothing to do with the other bill. These men continued in the Philippines, doing their duty there at the request of their Government, but because of the technicality of mustering them out one minute and swearing them in the next they have been deprived of their travel pay. It is something that we have owed these men for years. It is a just and fair claim. I do not see why it should wait for another bill that affects an entirely different class and is something given to them for an entirely different reason.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from California that I concur in what she has said, but there are also other debts and moral obligations to all of our soldiers, one of which is the payment of the bonus at the present time.

Mrs. KAHN. I voted for the bonus but that has nothing to do with this.

Mr. TRUAX. I believe that we should take care of 250,000 veterans first instead of first taking care of only 10,000.

Mrs. KAHN. Why not take care of 10,000 first and then take care of the rest later?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the payment of a direct obligation on the part of the United States to the veterans who remained in the Philippines. I definitely recall that as an inducement to reenlistment, those who stayed behind and reenlisted were promised that they would receive as a bonus for staying in the Philippines for another enlistment their travel pay. This bill provides for the payment of that obligation and I hope the gentleman from Ohio will not object.

Mr. TRUAX. I am not objecting. I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice so that we can know more about the status of this pending pension measure.

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

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INDIAN CHILDREN IN QUEETS, JEFFERSON COUNTY, WASH.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Calendar No. 113, H. R. 6651, to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Queets, Wash., in the construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children in the village of Queets, Jefferson County, Wash. It is another one of those school bills, but is out of order on the calendar. I ask this, so that they may be considered together.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to consider Calendar No. 113 at the present time. Is there objection?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1414) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? This bill requires three objectors.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I object. This is a bill creating another additional judge for the eastern district of Virginia. I know of Federal district judges in our State who are doing more work than some of the judges in other parts of the country, and we are more in need of a district judge down there. Under the circumstances I object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen reserve their objections?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my objection.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour in the day I fear that any explanation I might make would not change the views of these gentlemen.

Mr. McFARLANE. I will be very glad to ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, if it would convenience the gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate that very much.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7057, to provide for the appointment of 2 additional judges for the southern district of New York and 1 additional judge for the eastern district of New York.

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

Mr. TRUAX, Mr. McFARLANE, and Mr. GRANFIELD objected.

CLAIMS OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2049, to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims", approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 555).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLANE, Mr. BACON, and Mr. TRUAX objected.

COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE OF ACKIA, MISS.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3003, to provide for the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, Miss., and the establishment of the Ackia Battleground National Monument, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the author of this bill voluntarily reduced the amount from $25,000 to $15,000. With that understanding as to the amendment, I will have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a national commission to be known as the "Ackia Battle Memorial Commission" and which shall be composed of five commissioners to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, one member to represent the Chickasaw Indians and one the French-speaking people of the United States, be, and is hereby, authorized and established to investigate and recommend to said Secretary what lands should be acquired and administered as a national monument to be known as the "Ackia Battleground National Monument", and to prepare plans and programs for the commemoration in May 1936 of the two hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia.

SEC. 2. That the commissioners shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their actual or necessary traveling expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to acquire, by purchase or by condemnation and/or accept by donation in behalf of the United States, such lands, easements, and buildings as may be recommended by the said Ackia Battle Memorial Commission, and when title satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior shall have been vested in the United States such area or areas shall be, upon proclamation of the President, established, dedicated, and set apart as a public monument for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the "Ackia Battleground National Monument": *Provided*, That such area or areas shall include, at least, the site of the Battle of Ackia and the Indian village.

SEC. 4. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to conduct the memorial celebration, erect a memorial to the Chickasaw people, meet the expenses of the commission, and to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. The administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid national monument shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIONCHECK: On page 2, line 25, strike out "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,000."

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 was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR SIOUX INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6771, to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 484).

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

Mr. BACON, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. TRUAX objected.

Mr. WERNER. Will the gentlemen reserve their objections?

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures wishes to go into this bill in more detail. At his request I am going to object. It is not personal with me, but he is entitled to look into it more closely. If the gentleman wishes to have it passed over, I will agree to that.

Mr. WERNER. I would rather have the gentleman do that, but this bill merely provides for the payment of sums of money which were ordered audited by the Interior Department in the Seventy-first Congress.

Mr. BACON. As I stated, the Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures desires a little more time to look into this question further. He is necessarily absent on account of illness.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Calendar No. 102 has exactly the same status. The author of that bill is now very busy in a session of the Committee on Ways and Means. In all fairness to him, I suggest that the gentleman from New York make the same request with respect to that bill.

Mr. BACON. But there were three objections to that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that this bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

PUNISHMENT FOR ROBBING CUSTODIANS OF GOVERNMENT MONEYS OR PROPERTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5360, providing for punishment for the crime of robbing or attempting to rob custodians of Government moneys or property.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be advisable to recommit this bill to the committee?

Mr. LUCKEY. The committee is working on that now.

Mr. DOBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DOBBINS. I do not believe that the recommittal of this bill would accomplish anything. It was rather thoroughly considered. It did not merely receive perfunctory consideration. I think the language to which objection was made the previous day when this bill was considered, while it may be unusual language, it has been in the statute a great many years. Since the objection was made the other day I have taken up the matter with the legal adviser and with the inspection force of the Post Office Department. They feel it would be extremely dangerous to change the language of the statute as it is now. As to new language being incorporated in the act, I see no objection to changing it in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] at the last hearing of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I stated at that time that I thought it was a very poorly drafted bill, and I had hoped the committee would redraft it and report it out. I do not insist upon my amendment so far as the penalty is concerned. I think it is a very bad way to leave legislation, making it mandatory upon a judge to give a particular sentence, and no more and no less.

If the committee want it that way, however, I have no objection. I think, however, for the purpose of safeguarding the integrity of our work here the language on page 1 should be amended.

Mr. DOBBINS. The amendment the gentleman from Michigan has in mind is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Otherwise I have no objection to the bill.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. TRUAX. I ask the gentleman why we should pass any law placing a penalty of 25 years' imprisonment on someone who attacks a postal employee? Why should we not make it apply also to the criminal, to the burglar who enters a person's home? For instance, we have a law that makes life imprisonment mandatory for anyone who burglarizes a bank.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Replying to the gentleman from Ohio, I doubt whether the Federal Government would have jurisdiction to enact legislation making it a felony to enter a person's home for the purpose of committing burglary or any other offense. This bill is confined to assaults on Federal law-enforcement officers. For that reason, I have no objection to it. I do not want to see them federalize all the criminal laws of the States, and this bill does not do it; it merely amends existing law with respect to assault with intent to commit robbery.

Mr. TRUAX. Does not the gentleman believe such a law would be a good thing to protect the homes of our citizens?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It might be a good law, but I do not think it would be advisable for the Federal Government to pass such a law unless an interstate queston was involved; and I understand the Congress already has passed legislation making it a Federal offense for a fugitive from justice to cross a State line. I think that is as far as we should go.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request that the bill may be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. With the understanding that my amendment will be incorporated in the bill I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TRUAX. Yes.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio objects to the 25-year penalty provided in this bill. The penalty clause is not new legislation. If this bill is not passed, the statute will still contain the mandatory 25-year penalty.

The only purpose of the pending bill is to extend the protection of the present law to property of the United States in the custody of its postal officials, the same as it now extends that protection to mail matter in the custody of postal officials. Aside from that, it makes no change in the law. It just includes property of the United States in addition to mail matter which is protected; and let me say there are many custodians of postal stations who have a great amount of money in their custody but little mail; for instance, in those substations where money orders are sold. If a bandit attacks those employees seeking that money, there is no way to prosecute the bandit under the present law, but if he is merely after a postal card or a letter he can be prosecuted.

I think this makes a salutary change in the law. It is advocated by the Post Office Department and it seems to me there ought to be no objection to it.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I think we ought to have some salutary laws that will protect the Government and its property from the Wall Street bandits.

Mr. DOBBINS. That might be proposed, Mr. Speaker, by way of an amendment and considered on its own merits.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman offer that as an amendment?

Mr. DOBBINS. I will keep still while the gentleman from Ohio offers it.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer that amendment at the next session, and, therefore, I object.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2756, authorizing the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska to bring suit in the United States Court of Claims, and conferring jurisdiction upon said court to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment upon any and all claims which said Indians may have, or claim to have, against the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill requires three objections. Is there objection to its consideration?

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of this act the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska shall be defined to be all those Indians of the whole or mixed blood of the Tlingit and Haida Tribes who were residing in Russian America, now called the Territory of Alaska, on March 30, 1867, in the region known and described as "southeastern Alaska", lying east of the one hundred and forty-first meridian, and their descendants of the whole or mixed blood now living in the Territory of Alaska, or in the United States, or elsewhere.

SEC. 2. All claims of whatever nature, legal or equitable, which the said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska may have, or claim to have, against the United States, for lands or other tribal, community, or individual property rights, taken from them by the United States without compensation therefor, or for the failure or refusal of the United States to compensate them for said lands or other tribal community, or individual property rights, claimed to be owned by said Indians, and which the United States appropriated to its own uses and purposes without the

consent of said Indians, at the time of the purchase of the said Russian America, now Alaska, from Russia, or at any time since that date and prior to the passage and approval of this act, shall be submitted to the said Court of Claims by said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska for the settlement and determination of the equitable and just value thereof, and the amount equitably and justly due to said Indians from the United States therefor; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon said Court of Claims to hear the evidence in support of such claims and to render judgment and decree thereon; to dismiss said claim or claims if found to be inequitable and unjust, and to render judgment or decree thereon in favor of said Indians and against the United States for such sum as said court shall find to be equitable and just for the reasonable value of their said property, if any was so taken by the United States without the consent of the said Indians and without compensation therefor; that from the decision of the Court of Claims in any suit or suits prosecuted under the authority of this act an appeal may be taken by either party, as in other cases, to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the claim or claims of said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska may be presented and prosecuted separately or jointly in one or more suits, by petition setting out the facts briefly upon which they base their demands for relief and judgment or decree; the petition may be amended when necessary more fully or specifically to set forth their said claim or claims, and said suit or suits shall be filed in said Court of Claims within 5 years after the date of the passage of this act; such suit or suits shall make the said Indians parties plaintiff and the United States party defendant, and the final judgment of decree shall conclude and forever settle the claim or claims so presented; the Court of Claims shall have full authority by proper orders and process to bring in and make parties to such suit or suits any and all persons deemed by it necessary or proper to the final determination of the matters in controversy; such petition or petitions may be verified by any attorney or attorneys employed by said Indians, which verification may be upon information and belief as to the facts alleged; a true copy of the written contract or contracts by which such attorney or attorneys are employed by said Indians to represent them in such suit or suits shall be filed in said Court of Claims, and a copy served upon the Attorney General of the United States, with the filing or service of the original petition or petitions, as their authority by the said attorney or attorneys to so appear in said suit or suits for said Indians and to prosecute their said claim or claims in said Court of Claims.

SEC. 4. That if any claim or claims shall be submitted to said court it shall hear and settle the equitable and just rights therein, notwithstanding lapse of time, or statutes of limitations, or the fact that the said claim or claims have not been presented to any other tribunal, or the fact that said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska may have been made citizens of the United States by the act of Congress of June 2, 1924 (43 Stat. L. 253), or by any other law of the United States, or the fact that the said Indians, or any of them, either individually or collectively, prior to the passage and approval of this act, may have severed their tribal relations with the said Tlingit and Haida Indians. Any payment which may have been made by the United States or moneys heretofore or hereafter expended to date of award for the benefit of the said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, made under specific appropriations for the support, education, health, and civilization of said Indians, including purchase of lands, shall not be pleaded as an estoppel but may be pleaded by way of set-off.

SEC. 5. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof, from the files and records of the United States, or the Territory of Alaska, and Russian documents and similar records, and historical data and books prepared by American or other standard historians or authors, relating to the subject matter in controversy in said suit or suits, may be used in evidence by either party, and the departments of the United States Government shall give the attorneys for both parties access to such papers, correspondence, and documents, and furnish such certified copies thereof as may be necessary in the premises free of cost.

SEC. 6. That upon filing the petition or petitions of the said Alaska Indians in the Court of Claims, and when the issues are formed by the pleading, the Court of Claims shall appoint a commissioner or commissioners under the provisions of the act of February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. L. 964), who shall have the aid of a stenographer to take the testimony to be used in the investigation of such claims. In addition to the present powers of such commissioner to take such testimony, he is hereby authorized to take the testimony of said Alaska Indians and their witnesses at such place or places in Alaska as are most convenient for said Indians and their witnesses; that the said Alaska Indians shall produce their witnesses in Alaska at such times and places as said commissioner shall direct, at their own expense, but the expenses of said commissioner and stenographer shall be paid by the United States out of the funds provided for such purposes in the said act of February 24, 1925, and no costs shall be assessed against the said Alaska Indian in said suit or suits at any time.

SEC. 7. That for the purpose of determining who are Tlingit or Haida Indians of Alaska and entitled to receive from the United States an equal share of any judgment or appropriation made to pay said claim or claims, in case judgment or decree and appropriation shall finally be made in their favor by the Court of Claims and Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, shall cause a roll to be made of such Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska as he finds from the evidence are entitled to share equally in said compensation claimed for said property so described in said petition or petitions in said suit or suits. Any person claiming to be entitled to receive an equal share of said amount so found in favor of said Indians, if any, may make application in writing to the Secretary of the Interior for enrollment as one of the said Indians defined in section 1 of this act, within 2 years from the date of this act, and his or her right thereto, as a descendant of any such Indian or Indians, may be based upon proof of his or her ancestors' residence in Alaska on March 30, 1867, and it shall not be necessary to establish a marriage except according to the custom of said Indians; such findings and enrollment by the Secretary of the Interior shall be accepted as prima facie proof of the right of such Indian to share equally with all other said Indians on said roll in the distribution of said fund, if any, is adjudged due to said Indians in said suit or suits.

SEC. 8. The amount of any judgment obtained in favor of said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska shall be paid to them in three equal annual installments, the first of which shall become due and payable on the approval of the act of Congress making the first appropriation for paying the same, and the other two installments shall be paid in 1 and 2 years following the first payments, with interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of judgment until paid; said payments shall be made to said Indians by the Secretary of the Interior, per capita, in equal shares, to all those Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska whose names shall appear upon the roll so made by the Secretary of the Interior as hereinabove authorized; in case the name of any other Tlingit or Haida Indian of Alaska, as defined in section 1 of this act, shall be added to the roll after any payment has been made, he or she shall be paid his or her equal share, and the Secretary of the Interior shall be authorized to readjust the fund so that every such authorized Indian shall finally receive an equal share with all others.

SEC. 9. That upon the final determination of any suit or suits instituted under this act, if there is judgment for the plaintiff Indians, the Court of Claims shall inquire into the agreement or contract which said Indians have made with their attorneys for compensation for their services in said suit or suits, and if said Court of Claims shall find that such services have been faithfully performed by said attorneys, it shall make a finding to that effect and adjudge that said attorneys' compensation shall be paid as agreed upon in said contract out of the first appropriation made for the payment of the sum found due to said Indians, but in no case to exceed 10 percent of the amount of the total recovery, and said sum so found to be due to said attorneys shall be paid in full out of the sums so found due to said Indians, at the time of the first payment to the said Indians, and the remainder of said total sum due to said Indians shall be paid to them as provided in section 8 of this act.

SEC. 10. A copy of the petition and other pleadings and briefs in said suit or suits brought under this act shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States, and he, or some attorney from the Department of Justice to be designated by him, is hereby directed to appear and defend the interests of the United States in such case or cases.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike the word "were" line 6, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "are"; strike the words "On March 30, 1867" in line 7, page 1.

On page 2, line 2, after the word "meridian", change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the section to the end of line 4.

On page 2, line 8, insert the word "or" after the word "tribal"; strike out the comma after the word "community" and strike out the words "or individual".

On page 2, line 11, insert the word "or" after the word "tribal"; strike out the comma after "community".

On page 2, line 12, strike out the words "or individual."

On page 2, line 22, strike out the word "of" after the word "Court."

On page 2, line 23, strike out the word "claims" before the words "to hear."

On page 2, line 23, strike out the words "the evidence in support of."

On page 2, line 24, strike out the semicolon after the word "thereon" and strike out the words "to dismiss said claim." Line 25, page 2, and line 1, page 3, should be stricken out, and in line 2, page 3, strike out the words "against the United States."

Page 3, lines 12 and 14, after the word "petition", insert the words "or petitions."

Page 3, line 13, strike out the word "briefly."

Page 3, line 17, strike the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seven."

Page 3, line 24, strike out the word "persons" and insert the word "parties."

Page 4, lines 7, 8, and 9, strike out the words "and a copy served upon the Attorney General of the United States with a filing or service of the original petition or petitions."

In section 4, page 4, line 22, strike out the words "either individually or."

In section 5, page 5, line 16, after the word "documents", insert "as are in the files", and in lines 16, 17, and 18, strike out the words "and furnish such certified copies thereof as may be necessary in the premises free of cost."

Section 6, page 5, strike out lines 19 and 20 and the words "the issues are formed by the pleadings" in line 21.

Page 5, line 22, after the word "appoint", insert the words "at the proper time."

Page 5, line 24, before the word "who", insert the words "and acts supplemental thereto."

Page 6, lines 11 and 12, strike out "no cost shall be assessed against the said Alaska Indians in said suit or suits at any time" and insert the words "said supplemental acts."

Strike all of sections 7 and 8 from pages 6, 7, and 8 and insert in lieu thereof revised sections as follows:

"SEC. 7. That Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska who are entitled to share in any judgment or appropriation made to pay said claim or claims shall consist of all persons of Tlingit or Haida blood, living in or belonging to any local community of these tribes in the territory described in section 1 of this act. Each tribal community shall prepare a roll of its tribal membership, which roll shall be submitted to a Tlingit and Haida central council for its approval. The said central council shall prepare a combined roll of all communities and submit it to the Secretary of the Interior for approval. Approval of the roll by the said Secretary of the Interior shall operate as final proof of the right of such Indian communities to share in the benefits of this act as set forth in section 8.

"SEC. 8. The amount of any judgment in favor of said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, after payment of attorneys' fees, shall be apportioned to the different Tlingit and Haida communities listed in the roll provided for in section 7 in direct proportion to the number of names on each roll, and shall become an asset thereof, and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of each community, and such funds shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum, and shall be expended from time to time upon requisition by the said communities by and with advice and consent of the Secretary of the Interior, and under regulations as he may prescribe for the future economic security and stability of said Indian groups, through the acquisition or creation of productive economic instruments and resources of public benefit to such Indian communities: *Provided, however,* That the interest on such funds may be used for beneficial purposes such as the relief of distress, emergency relief, and health: *Provided, further,* That none of the funds above indicated or the interest thereon shall ever be used for per capita payments."

Page 8, section 9, line 18, strike out the word "first"; in lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "at the time of the first payment to the said Indians"; line 24, strike out the words "paid to them" and insert the word "expended."

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.

INDIAN BUFFALO HUNT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5263, to purchase and erect in the city of Washington the group of statuary known as the "Indian Buffalo Hunt."

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SCHOOL BOARD, QUEETS, WASH.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6651, to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Queets, Wash., in the construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the village of Queets, Jefferson County, Wash.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1534) may be substituted for the House bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the public-school board of district no. 20, Jefferson County, Wash., for the construction, extension, and betterment of a public-school building at Queets, Wash.: *Provided,* That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the express conditions that the school maintained by the said school district in the said building shall be available to all Indian children of the village of Queets and Jefferson County, Wash., on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further,* That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

A similar bill (H. R. 6651) was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE REFERENCE BUREAU

The Clerk called the next resolution, House Joint Resolution 156, to make available to Congress the services and data of the Interstate Reference Bureau.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the resolution because it is not accompanied by a report in conformity with subsection 2 of rule XVIII. The report reads:

The Committee on the Library, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 156, do respectfully report the same with the recommendation that it do pass.

I realize, of course, that the sufficiency of the report is not a question for the Chair. It is always a question for the House, under the precedents of the House. My point of order goes not alone to the sufficiency of the report, but to the fact that the report is not in keeping with the spirit of the rule. The recommendation of the committee does not constitute a report in substantial compliance with the rule. I say this for the reason that the rule undoubtedly was adopted so that the House might be informed on the merits of each bill.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, may I say that we have enough objectors over here to stop this resolution. I for one will object to the resolution, and I understand there are two more objections over here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor at the present time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule was to provide that the House be informed at least in substance on the merits of each bill.

I do not know what the American Legislators' Association is, and I do not know what the Interstate Reference Bureau is, and I do not know what is meant by the language of the bill where it states that the sum of $40,000 is to be hereafter annually expended by the American Legislators' Association for the maintenance of the said Interstate Reference Bureau. I do not know what jurisdiction this Congress has over the American Legislators' Association that would warrant our enacting legislation compelling them to raise that amount of money, or which would permit us to appropriate that money for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore renew my point of order that the recommendation of the committee does not constitute a report in compliance with the provisions of subdivision 2 of rule XVIII.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

This point was raised in 1884 when a bill which provided for the issuance of circulating notes to national-banking associations was called up for consideration. The point of order was made that the report accompanying the bill, containing nothing further than a recommendation for its passage, was not a sufficient compliance with the rule. The Chair understands the same point has been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] against the report on this bill, which reads as follows:

The Committee on the Library, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 156, do respectfully report the same with the recommendation that it do pass.

In ruling upon the point of order in 1884—and the decision may be found in Hinds' Precedents, volume II, section 1339—Speaker Carlisle said:

The Chair can only say what has been frequently said before upon similar points—that it is not within the province of the Chair to decide upon the sufficiency of a report made by a committee of the House. All that the rule requires is that a report shall be submitted in writing, without specifying the nature of the report, and if that provision of the rule is complied with, the Chair must entertain the report.

The argument of the gentleman from Iowa—

Said Speaker Carlisle—

may be a very proper one to address to the House itself upon a motion to recommit the bill for a report containing further and more specific information; but the gentleman will see at once that if the Chair should undertake to decide such questions the reception of all reports would depend upon the judgment of the Chair as to whether they were full or sufficiently explanatory of the measure to which they referred. So that point of order must be overruled.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McFARLANE, Mr. TRUAX, and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

H. C. BRENNER REALTY & FINANCE CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1855, to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing H. C. Brenner Realty & Finance Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Street, St. Louis, Mo.", approved February 13, 1931.

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

Mr. McFARLANE, Mr. TRUAX, and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN AND PHILIPPINE LABOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7348, to protect American and Philippine labor and to preserve an essential industry, and for other purposes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, by request of the Chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice. It is my understanding that the chairman is obtaining a rule from the Rules Committee to bring this bill before the House for consideration.

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

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT BROWNVILLE, NEBR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7081, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Brownville, Nebr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved February 26, 1929, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved June 10, 1930, March 4, 1933, and June 12, 1934, to be built by the Brownville Bridge Co. across the Missouri River, at or near Brownville, Nebr., are hereby further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 12, 1935.

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

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.

BRIDGE ACROSS WABASH RIVER NEAR MEROM, SULLIVAN COUNTY, IND.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7083, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at or near Merom, Sullivan County, Ind.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, the author of the bill asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice. The gentleman is absent at the moment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio submit that request?

Mr. TRUAX. I make the request, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC-BUILDING PROJECTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 97, to require contractors on public-building projects to name their subcontractors, materialmen, and supply men, and for other purposes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the next resolution, House Joint Resolution 27, providing for the extension of cooperative work of the Geological Survey to Puerto Rico.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request that the joint resolution be passed over.

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

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of law authorizing the making of topographic and geological surveys and conducting investigations relating to mineral and water resources by the United States Geological Survey in various portions of the United States be, and the same are hereby, extended to authorize such surveys and investigations in Puerto Rico.

The 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.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SABINE RIVER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6987, authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River at or near a point where Louisiana Highway No. 7 meets Texas Highway No. 87.

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

Be it enactced, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas be, and are hereby, authorized to construct; maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Sabine River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near a point where Louisiana Highway No. 7 meets Texas Highway No. 87, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF COMMISSION

The Clerk called the next resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 88, to abolish the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission and transfer its functions to the Secretary of the Interior.

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

Resolved, etc., That the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission, created by joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of Porto Rica", approved December 21, 1928, is hereby abolished and all of the functions of the said Commission, together with its employees, records, supplies, equipment, and property of every kind, and unexpended balances of appropriations, are hereby transferred to the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, to be administered under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That personnel now temporarily assigned to the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission from the War Department and from the Department of Agriculture shall, without in any way affecting their permanent status in such Departments, continue to serve in their present capacity, but under supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, until June 30, 1935, unless sooner relieved by the Secretary of the Interior, and that the length of such service shall not be continued

beyond June 30, 1935, except by special agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of the other Departments concerned.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "Rica" and insert "Rico."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS FOR UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6800, authorizing the construction of buildings for the United States High Commissioner to the government of the commonwealth of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ASSIGNMENT OF LINE OFFICERS OF THE NAVY FOR AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6204, to authorize the assignment of officers of the line of the Navy for aeronautical engineering duty only, and for other purposes.

The bill was passed over.

AMENDING SECTION 12 OF THE ACT APPROVED MAY 18, 1920

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6629) to amend section 12 of the act approved May 18, 1920 (41 Stat. 604; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 896), as amended.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the language of this bill was incorporated in the corporation bill, I ask that this bill be stricken from the calendar and laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL RESERVE AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The Clerk called the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 5731, to amend in certain particulars the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve, as amended, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Naval Affairs Committee has provided for a full investigation, I ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE U. S. S. "OLYMPIA"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7220) to provide for the use of the U. S. S. *Olympia* as a memorial to the men and women who served the United States in the War with Spain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I object.

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

Mr. TRUAX. I object.

AMENDING SECTION 1383 OF THE REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 4767, to amend section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Every officer of the Supply Corps of the United States Navy shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, give good and sufficient bond to the United States, to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy and in such sum as the Secretary of the Navy may direct, faithfully to account for all public funds and property which he may receive: *Provided*, That such requirement may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be waived in the case of officers of the Supply Corps who are not accountable for public funds or public property."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "to read as follows" and insert "by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and by adding the following:".

Page 1, strike out lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2 to the colon.

On page 2, line 4, after the word "of", insert the word "such", and in lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "of the Supply Corps."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1212) to amend section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the House bill (H. R. 4767), as amended, just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to take up for consideration the bill S. 1212, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the House bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1383. Every officer of the Supply Corps of the United States Navy shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, give good and sufficient bond to the United States, to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy and in such sum as the Secretary may direct, faithfully to account for all public funds and property which he may receive. The Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, waive the requirements of this section in the case of officers of the Supply Corps who are not accountable for public funds or public property."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and by adding the following:

"'*Provided*, That such requirement may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be waived in the case of such officers who are not accountable for public funds or public property.'"

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which the House bill was passed will be vacated and the bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

ASSIGNMENT OF NAVAL OFFICERS FOR AERONAUTICAL AVIATION DUTY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 142, H. R. 6204, to authorize the assignment of officers of the line of the Navy for aeronautical engineering duty only, and for other purposes. The gentleman from Texas has stated that he will withdraw his objection to the favorable consideration of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers of the line of the Navy, upon application, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, may be designated for the performance of aeronautical engineering duty only. The President of the United States is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer and appoint officers of the Construction Corps of the Navy who are applicants to the corresponding rank and grade in the line of the Navy for the performance of aeronautical engineering duty only. Each officer of the Construction Corps so transferred and appointed shall have the lineal position and precedence in the line which he would have held had he remained in the line or had his original appointment been in the line except that no officer shall have his existing relative rank, precedence, or seniority in the Construction Corps altered by such transfer. Any officer of the Construction Corps so transferred and appointed and any line officer designated for the performance of aeronautical engineering duty only shall be carried as an additional number in the grade

in which he is serving and to which he may hereafter be promoted, and, except as otherwise provided in this act, the performance of duty, succession to command, selection for promotion, examination for promotion, promotion, and retirement of such officers shall be governed by the provisions of existing law and of laws hereafter enacted relating to line officers assigned to engineering duty only.

The bill 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.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 13 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I reserve the right to object. On what subject?

Mr. MONAGHAN. I am going to talk on the power of the Supreme Court to void acts of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL BUILDING, SHANNON COUNTY, S. DAK.

Mr. WERNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1537) to provide funds for cooperation with the School Board of Shannon County, S. Dak., in the construction of a consolidated high-school building to be available to both white and Indian children.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $125,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the Public School Board of Shannon County, S. Dak., for the construction and equipment of a consolidated public high-school building at Pine Ridge, S. Dak.: *Provided*, That said school shall be conducted for both white and Indian children without discrimination, and that practical training for vocations and home economics be provided, and that the cost of education of white children shall be defrayed by the State and local public-school authorities, in accordance with such agreement or agreements as may be made between the Secretary of the Interior and State or local officials, and any and all sums of money obtained by reason of such agreement or agreements shall be available for reexpenditure for support and maintenance of said school.

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

AMENDMENT TO WHEELER-HOWARD BILL

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call attention of the House to the bill (H. R. 7781) to define the election procedure under the act of June 18, 1934, and for other purposes. This is an amendment to what is known as the "Wheeler-Howard Reorganization Act", which passed the Seventy-third Congress. It seeks to correct an error in that bill regarding the holding of an election. The Department has endorsed the bill, and the bill has passed the committee unanimously. The amendment will provide that instead of requiring a majority of the adult Indians to vote against the Wheeler-Howard Act before it can be imposed on the Indians, it will require only a majority of those voting to reject the act, provided that 30 percent of the adult Indians vote in such election. The reason the bill should be considered immediately is that unless this amendment is passed, the Department must hold 120 elections before June 18. That is the reason I am so anxious to get consideration of the bill at this time.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 7781.

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

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill at this time. The minority members of the committee are not present. So, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the Indian Commissioner approve this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. The Department of the Interior recommended the bill; the Indian Commissioner has approved the bill; the Secretary of the Interior has approved the bill. The Committee on Indian Affairs passed the bill unanimously.

Mr. BLANTON. Was the ranking minority member present?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Every member was present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where is the bill now?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. It is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let it come up in its regular order, then. I object to the present consideration of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

CORNERSTONE LAYING, RUTHERFORD, N. J.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the executive assistant to the Postmaster General on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the new post-office building at Rutherford, N. J.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Ambrose O'Connell, executive assistant to the Postmaster General, at the cornerstone laying of the United States post-office building at Rutherford, N. J., Saturday, May 18, 1935:

At the outset of my remarks, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the committee of arrangements for the courtesy which they have extended to me in permitting me to address this very delightful gathering. I bring with me the kind regards of Postmaster General James A. Farley, who wishes to extend his greetings to all.

It is a great pleasure to be with you today, to meet your citizens and distinguished guests, and to participate with you in these exercises. The cornerstone laying of a structure that promises to be a beautiful and inspiring edifice is an event in the history of Rutherford. The dream of its citizens, fostered and planned by them for so many years, is now well on the way to fulfillment.

In this connection I cannot speak too highly of the splendid work of your Congressman, the Honorable EDWARD A. KENNEY. He has been alert always in the interests of his constituents and the welfare of the people of his district. He has given constant attention in doing all he can to have the work on this building expedited so that the citizens of Rutherford may have a post office in keeping with the needs of the community. Congressman KENNEY has been one of the most able men in the House of Representatives, and you may well be proud of the manner in which he represents you in the Nation's Capital.

Into this structure will be permanently builded the aspirations, the prayers, and the life work of those good men and women who have devoted their time and who have labored to make Rutherford a happy dwelling place. It will be their monument.

On this occasion there is something in our make-up that brings to mind things of the past and causes us to look into the future. Your oldest inhabitants will reflect upon those early days when the post office here was comparatively small. They watched the growth of your city to its present development. Those who have the opportunity to be present today will look forward and wonder what the future has in store for them, for their homes, and for their country.

As a representative of the Postal Department, it is but natural that I should refer at least to some aspects of the service which we render to you and your fellow Americans. From the foundation of the Republic and even in colonial days the mail has been one of the most helpful factors in our everyday life. Its service is so dependable that it is almost taken for granted. Before I became a member of the administrative staff of the Department the mail service to me was a matter of course. Now and then a letter went astray which impressed me a great deal, while the constant and unfailing service I had received day in and day out seemed never to have made any impression whatever.

In the early 1800's the southern mail consisted of two bags carried from Bergen County to New York by rowboat. In those days the mail communication of the people of Bergen with the outside world was very limited, and what few letters there were, were brought from the offices at Newark or New York by anyone who visited those places. They were distributed as occasion offered, being sometime handed round at the church door on Sunday, and sometime left at the general store until called for. In 1807 General Granger established an office in a store in lower Jersey City, at the corner of York and Washington Streets, from whence the mail was distributed at first in the old way, or else by carriers, who collected the postage and delivery. The amount charged depended upon the distance of the place from which the letter was sent. Some time afterward a substation was established at the

Five Corners, where mail bags from the Jersey City station were left by the stages in passing. The mail for the town of Bergen was called for with considerable regularity by the school boys, who left any letters for the neighborhood at the store on Bergen Square.

The United States Postal Service is not only one of the most efficient organizations in the world but it is also one of its largest business units. We have 47,000 post offices scattered throughout the United States. We have beautiful edifices and impressive structures in the metropolitan centers, and in every city and hamlet throughout the country, and down at the crossroads we have some suitable building for housing the mails for the convenience of the public.

We have a vast army of men and women on our pay roll who are engaged in handling the correspondence and packages that are delivered to your homes and your places of business. To facilitate the work an army of trained men and women is employed, including some 46,000 postmasters, 240,000 clerks, carriers, chauffeurs, and mechanics; 25,000 substitute and 35,000 contractural employees. This gives some idea of the magnitude of our operations.

Our postal revenues last year amounted to approximately $586,000,000, but this year business has so increased that we are looking forward to receipts of approximately $615,000,000, which will readily indicate how conditions are improving. When Mr. Farley assumed office, attention was directed to the stupendous postal deficit of $153,000,000 in 1932. This deficit was a heavy tax on the people.

In the first full fiscal year of the Roosevelt administration this deficit was turned into a surplus of $12,000,000. It was done through the unwavering support of the rank and file of the army of postal employees who carried on despite curtailed salaries, delayed promotions, and lapsed vacations, now all happily restored. It was done through the elimination of wasteful methods and the practice of strict economies, such as any prudent business man would use in his own business. It was done by making certain that for every dollar expended the American public received a dollar's worth of service.

Much has been said and written about the wiping out of the postal deficit by this administration. Some of our friends evidently do not want to believe it was possible, or that it was accomplished. They allege it is a matter of bookkeeping. The fact remains that the method of bookkeeping we employed is that recognized by Congress and is the same which has always been used in the Post Office Department. The fact also remains that the Postal Service, for the first time in years, has balanced its budget.

I do not want to close my remarks today without paying a deserved tribute to President Roosevelt, whose matchless leadership has brought us through the darkest days of the depression and is bringing us back into the sunlight of prosperity.

Did you ever know an executive of definite views whose policies were not criticized, whether he was the President of the United States or the engineer of the train on which you travel? I don't think I ever made a journey where some of my fellow passengers were not complaining that we were going too fast or too slow, or who failed to blame the man in the engine cab for the bumps consequent on the roughness of the road—complaints that even those who uttered them forgot when we had safely reached our destination. It is the same way with our political government. From Washington down, our greatest Presidents functioned under a barrage of complaint frequently reaching the point of defamation, and yet history records their administrations as conspicuous successes; and we rear in grateful memory monuments to those who during their terms of office were called aristocrats or anarchists, despots or defectives. I don't recall seeing any monuments to those who threw the bricks, though they made a lot of noise in their day.

And so I sincerely say that all of the clamor against our administration has in no way dimmed the prestige nor lessened the popularity of the President with the people. Let us all uphold his hands, and we can rest assured that our country will speedily emerge from the distressing effects of the depression and that happiness and contentment will prevail again throughout the Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUCK, for today, on account of important business.

To Mr. JACOBSEN, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. WOOD, for 1 week, beginning May 26, on account of important business.

To Messrs. MCGRATH, O'CONNELL, SCOTT, HIGGINS of Connecticut, SEARS, CALDWELL, WILCOX, CARY, SCRUGHAM, and MAAS, on account of important business, to inspect naval base in Florida.

Mr. DALY, at the request of Mr. DORSEY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert McFarland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 245. An act for the relief of Charles Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 317. An act to provide for the appointment of 2 additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, 1 additional judge for the Circuit Court, Ninth Judicial Circuit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 363. An act to increase the efficiency of the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 381. An act for the relief of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1383. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to make persons charged with crimes and offenses competent witnesses in United States and Territorial courts", approved March 16, 1878; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1439. An act amending the postal laws to include as second-class matter religious periodicals publishing local information; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 1454. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certain markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1504. An act authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1637. An act to extend further the operation of an act of Congress approved January 26, 1933 (47 Stat. 776), entitled "An act relating to the deferment and adjustment of construction charges for the years 1931 and 1932 on Indian irrigation projects"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1696. An act for the relief of Mary Sky Necklace; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1811. An act providing for the publication of statistics relating to spirits of turpentine and rosin; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2097. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine claims of certain bands or tribes of Indians residing in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2472. An act to pay an annuity to Frances Agramonte, the widow of Dr. Aristides Agramonte, member of the Yellow Fever Commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2533. An act for the relief of the rightful heirs of Tiwastewin or Anna; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2616. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Y. Underwood; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2625. An act to extend the facilities of the Public Health Service to seamen on Government vessels not in the Military or Naval Establishment; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2681. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near West Swanton, Vt., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2688. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the manner in which property shall be sold under orders and decrees of any United States courts", approved March 3, 1893, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2727. An act to authorize the acquisition of land for military purposes in Bexar County, Tex., for use as an addition to Kelly Field Military Reservation, and to settle certain claims in connection therewith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution making final disposition of records, files, and other property of the Federal Aviation

Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to carry out the intention of Congress with reference to the claims of the Crow Tribe of Indians of Montana and any band thereof against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6085. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the filling, grading, and paving of streets and sidewalks, the construction and improvement of sewers, and construction of necessary bridges and viaducts in connection with the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $35,000;

H. R. 6114. An act to amend section 128 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and

H. R. 6723. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to construct a public-school building and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $30,000; and to authorize said town to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1384. An act 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; and

S. 2311. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6085. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the filling, grading, and paving of streets and sidewalks, the construction and improvement of sewers, and construction of necessary bridges and viaducts in connection with the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $35,000; and

H. R. 6723. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to construct a public-school building and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $30,000, and to authorize said town to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, May 27, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

354. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the assistant to the Secretary of Labor, transmitting report of an accumulation of miscellaneous material in the office of the Secretary of Labor, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Children's Bureau, the Women's Bureau, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of no further use in the transaction of official business, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BREWSTER: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 280. Joint resolution for the designation of a street or avenue in the Mall to be known as "Maine Avenue"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1014). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2287. An act to authorize the crediting of service rendered by personnel (active or retired) subsequently to June 30, 1932, in the computation of their active or retired pay after June 30, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 1015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on Education. S. 1180. An act to amend section 4865 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5368. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1018). 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. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1105. A bill for the relief of Lucy Jane Ayer; with amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Johnson, State treasurer of the State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3202. A bill for the relief of W. H. Greene; with amendment (Rept. No. 990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3546. A bill for the relief of Sarah Elizabeth Ballentyne; with amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Raymond Parramore; with amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4436. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Alta Melvin and Tommy Melvin; with amendment (Rept. No. 993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4619. A bill for the relief of Joseph Salinghi; with amendment (Rept. No. 994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4791. A bill for the relief of the Hauser Construction Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ECKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Julius A. Geske; with amendment (Rept. No. 996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5122. A bill for the relief of R. C. McCoy, J. L. Garner, C. G. Kauffman, W. G. Smiley, R. A. Burks, C. W. Brazzelton, Jim Hamilton, Otis Hamilton, R. F. Brazzelton, Dave Cash, Mrs. A. W. Dykes, Jim Thereldkeld, R. R. Crain, J. B. Tolson, J. C. Rogers, S. K. Broach, Albert Easterling, J. L. Rivers, F. C. Wilson, J. E. Seymour, E. C. Finley, W. W. Mitchell, J. G. Carey, Carl Graves, Jerome Dupree, J. R. Mitchell, Roxie Anderson, J. L. Mitchell, and J. C. Russell; with amendment (Rept. No. 997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5550. A bill for the relief of Malachy Ryan; with amendment (Rept. No. 998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5746. A bill to authorize the removal of the bar of the statute of limitations with respect to certain taxes paid by Milton Kasch; with amendment (Rept. No. 999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6402. A bill for the relief of Julia M. Crowell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 28. An act for the relief of R. B. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 170. An act for the relief of Alva A. Murphy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 659. An act for the relief of Walter J. Bryson Paving Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 684. An act for the relief of Brown & Cunningham, of Port Deposit, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 685. An act for the relief of the Sanford & Brooks Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 712. An act for the relief of A. H. Marshall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 872. An act for the allowance of certain claims for extra labor above the legal day of 8 hours at the several navy yards and shore stations certified by the Court of Claims; with amendment (Rept. No. 1007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. S. 908. An act for the relief of Edwin C. Jenney, receiver of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1024. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Hampton & Branchville Railroad Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1079. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to execute a certain indemnity agreement; with amendment (Rept. No. 1010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. S. 1472. An act for the relief of the First Camden National Bank & Trust Co., of Camden, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1781. An act for the relief of George Voeltz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of Edgar Sampson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5815. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS: A bill (H. R. 8206) making it unlawful for any person, firm, association, or corporation not expressly excepted from the operation of the act by the provisions thereof, to use the mails to solicit or effect insurance or collect or transmit insurance premiums in any State without complying with the insurance laws thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8207) making it unlawful to use the mails to solicit or effect insurance or collect or transmit insurance premiums in any State without first securing a permit from the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8208) to prescribe the qualifications for major and superintendent and others in the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 8209) temporarily to exempt refunding bonds of the government of Puerto Rico from the limitation of public indebtedness under the Organic Act; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8210) to provide for participation by the Indian tribes in the control of their financial assets and to protect such assets from dissipation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 8211) to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KENNEY: A bill (H. R. 8212) authorizing an appropriation for the eradication and control of the tent caterpillar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 8213) to prohibit the use of traps, weirs, and pound nets for fishing in the waters of the Territory of Alaska, to limit certain types of salmon fishing to residents of the Territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 8214) to incorporate the American National Theater and Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8215) for the relief of third- and fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H. R. 8216) to amend section 118 of the Judicial Code to provide for the appointment of law clerks to United States district court judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGHAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 301) providing the number of judges which shall concur in holding an act of Congress unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 8217) authorizing the filing in the Court of Claim of a petition for a hearing of a claim for damage or loss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FENERTY: A bill (H. R. 8218) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Schutte & Koerting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 8219) for the relief of Frank Coffey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORD: A bill (H. R. 8220) for the relief of Helen Mahar Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PALMISANO: A bill (H. R. 8221) for the relief of Sophia Zeller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 8222) granting a pension to Mary A. Proudfit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8223) granting an increase of pension to Virginia F. Proudfit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 8224) for the relief of Catherine Grace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 8225) for the relief of Mathilda Carson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8226) granting a pension to Edna Newland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 8227) granting pension to Hanie Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 8228) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Bouchey; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

8605. By Mr. CROSSER of Ohio: Petition of several delegates and officers of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, urging an extension of the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8606. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of 58 residents of Jefferson County, N. Y., urging the extension of the National Recovery Administration for 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8607. By Mr. FENERTY: Petition of Branch No. 1, Fleet Reserve Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging Congress to enact pending legislation providing for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary (July 9, 1935) of the completion of Commodore John Barry's service in the American Navy of the Revolution (H. J. Res. 193 carries such provision); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8608. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of A. A. Parker, local agent of the Santa Fe, Midlothian, Tex., favoring House Joint Resolution No. 219; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8609. By Mr. LUCKEY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, cooperating with the President's program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8610. By Mr. MEEKS: Petition of members of the Pilot Grove Friends Bible School, headed by S. N. Hester, Ridgefarm, Ill., urging support of Congress of House Joint Resolution No. 167, introduced by Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8611. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the National Knitted Outerwear Association, New York, concerning continuation of the National Recovery Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8612. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York City, concerning regulating freight rates on ships in international trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8613. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of the Crosser-Wagner bills (H. R. 8121 and S. 2862); to the Committee on Labor.

8614. By Mr. TONRY: Resolution of the executive committee of the county committee of the Kings County American Legion, New York City, unalterably opposed to the granting of any clemency whatever to Grover Cleveland Bergdoll; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8615. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of the Supplementary Code Authority for the Electro Plating and Metal Polishing and Metal Finishing Industry, Detroit, Mich., by Hugh Booth, approving the President's recommendations for the continuation of the National Recovery Administration for 2 years; to the Committee on Labor.

8616. Also, petition of members of Lodge 105 of the International Association of Machinists, Toledo, Ohio, by James Russell, urging passage of House Joint Resolution 219; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8617. Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union No. 38, Cleveland, Ohio, by Clayton R. Lee, urging support of House bill 7878; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

8618. Also, petition of the Acme Stamp Co., Cleveland, Ohio, by M. C. Lederer, president, urging extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act for a period of 2 more years as under this act they have been able to increase the wages and salaries of their employees and have also been able to secure a livelihood for themselves on capital invested because of the bringing together under a code all the manufacturers who were competitive and have, therefore, been able to eliminate to a great extent the chiseling and cutthroat competition which has been so ruinous; to the Committee on Labor.

8619. Also, petition of the Preble County Corn-Hog Control Association, Eaton, Ohio, by James A. Campbell, president, favoring and asking support of House bill 6123, which provides additional funds for agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8620. Also, petition of the Ohio State Grange, Butler County, by Deputy Master V. K. Rahfuse, West Chester, Ohio, urging support of House bill 7160; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8621. Also, petition of the Marion County Farm Bureau, by H. H. Berninger, Prospect, Ohio, urging support of the amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act as they believe them to be essential to the welfare of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8622. Also, petition of the Royal Stamp Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio, by R. W. Smith, secretary and treasurer, urging that the National Industrial Recovery Act be extended for another 2 years as under this act they have been able to increase the wages and salaries of their employees and shorten their hours practically 20 percent and have also been able to procure a livelihood for themselves on capital invested, because of the bringing together under a code all who are competitive, eliminating to a great extent the chiseling and cutthroat competition which has been so ruinous on invested capital in their business, reflecting seriously in the wages and salaries which are paid their employees; to the Committee on Labor.

8623. Also, petition of the Ohio State Grange, by C. G. Hoskins, deputy master of Trumbull County, Mesopotamia, Ohio, urging favorable consideration of House bill 7160 which provides for an increase of the appropriation for agricultural and home-economics extension service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8624. Also, petition of the Zanesville Federation of Labor, Zanesville, Ohio, by their secretary, Joseph A. Bauer, urging favorable consideration and passage of the Wagner labor-disputes bill, also the Black 30-hour-week bill, the Guffey coal bill, and the reenactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act for a period of 2 years; to the Committee on Labor.

8625. Also, petition of Frigidaire Employees' Committee, representing approximately 10,000 workers of the Frigidaire Corporation at Dayton, Ohio, favoring the Wagner labor-disputes bill which is now before Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

8626. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Newark, Ohio, by their manager, Wilbur Willey, opposing that section of House bill 6732, providing for the canalization of the Beaver, Mahoning, and Shenango Rivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8627. Also, petition of Wayne Council No. 42, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Wooster, Ohio, by their recording secretary, G. G. McKee, favoring House bills 5921, 6367, 7079, and 7223, which will strengthen the immigration and deportation laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8628. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Sixth City Lodge, No. 1106, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, J. F. Smith, favoring House Joint Resolution 219, which has for its purpose the renewal for 1 year of the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, which expires as of June 16, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.