PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRY: A bill (H. R. 11482) for the relief of Carlo Resta; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 11483) for the relief of Mary Kane, Ella Benz, Muriel Benz, John Benz, and Frank Restis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H. R. 11484) for the relief of the heirs of David H. Fish, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11485) granting a pension to Andrew J. Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11486) for the relief of Mary Hemke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 11487) for the relief of John E. Joy, Walter Beale, Lilly Ross, Lee C. Yokum, and Verna E. Yokum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO: A bill (H. R. 11488) for the relief of George A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11489) for the relief of Cecelia Folta, wife of Victor Folta, nee Patran Folta, or Karolina Szczygiel, or Carolina Szczygiel, alias Mary Folta, or Marya Fotta; or Marjanna Folta, alias Mary Ann Folta; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GEARHART: A bill (H. R. 11490) for the relief of Charles Barchard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11491) for the relief of Fred E. Shaffer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 11492) granting a pension to John F. Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11493) for the relief of Perry Randolph; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLANE: A bill (H. R. 11494) for the relief of Luther Woodrow Mayes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 11495) granting a pension to Mary Irene Broughton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 11496) granting a pension to Denis Keohane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUINN: A bill (H. R. 11497) for the relief of James H. Riffle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 11498) for the relief of Georgina Park; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 11499) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Rawlins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11500) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 498) for the relief of William K. Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 501) authorizing the President of the United States to award a posthumous Congressional Medal of Honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

10291. By Mr. BEITER: Letter signed by Edith M. MacVeigh and eight other residents, of Buffalo, N. Y., and vicinity, advocating the enactment of the Kerr immigration bill (H. R. 8163); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10292. By Mr. BIERMANN: Petition of Peter Paul Adams and others, asking for remedial patent legislation; to the Committee on Patents.

10293. Also, petition of Peter Paul Adams and others, asking for a bridge at Cassville, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10294. Also, petition of A. C. Gaunitz, of Lansing; N. O. Faldet, of Decorah; Hale & Sons, of Waukon; H. G. Gunhus, of Ridgeway, all in the State of Iowa; and many others, asking for passage of House bill 6246; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10295. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of 166 patrons of star routes at Rushville and Broken Bow, Nebr., favoring legislation to grant compensation to star-route carriers on equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10296. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition in the nature of a resolution of a majority of the members of the Downtown Owners' Committee, 120 Broadway, New York City, representing the ownership of 52 buildings in the Borough of Manhattan of the city of New York, with an aggregate assessed valuation of over $300,000,000, endorsing the proposal now before Congress to establish a landing field for mail and passenger planes at Governors Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10297. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Edith Perkinson, recording secretary of the Mayewood Council, No. 311, Daughters of America, Columbus, Ohio, to take House bill 5921 out of the hands of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and also protesting against the passage of the Kerr bill (H. R. 8163); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10298. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., requesting Congress to enact House bill 10408, which provides for the improvement of the New York State Barge Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

10299. By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 10962, requesting enactment of legislation that will indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10300. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition requesting Congress to restore to the District of Columbia its prohibition law by passing House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10301. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, Clarksville Council, No. 153; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10302. Also, petition of the Third National Co., mortgage loan department, Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10303. Also, petition of Branch 515, International Workers' Order, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10304. Also, petition of the Sergeant Jasper Post, No. 13, the American Legion, supporting House bill 6427; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10305. Also, petition of Sergeant Jasper Post, No. 13, the American Legion, supporting Senate bill 2253; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10306. Also, petition of the Methodist ministers' meeting in Philadelphia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10307. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Earl Farrier, Brownsville, Oreg., and 80 others of Linn County, Oreg., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, Feb. 24, 1936)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 26, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MURPHY] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is necessarily absent.

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

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 9062. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Esopus Creek and its tributaries of Birch, Bushnelville, Woodland, Warner Bushkill, and Beaverkill Creeks; Sawkill, Rondout, and Neversink Creeks, Ulster County; Schoharie and Catskill Creeks, Greene County; Neversink, Beaverkill, East Branch of Delaware, Willowemoc, and Lackawack Rivers, Sullivan County; Schoharie Creek and its tributaries, Schoharie County, all located in the State of New York, with a view to the controlling of floods; and

S. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution postponing the effective date of certain permit and labeling provisions of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act.

LOANS FOR CROP PRODUCTION—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a great many Senators are absent and the Senate is likely, at the conclusion of today's session, to take a recess until Monday, I wish to serve notice that on Monday I shall ask for the consideration of the veto message on the so-called seed-loan bill. I wanted to say this in order that all Senators who are interested in the bill may be present, because I am going to ask for a vote on the subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, let me suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that the veto message has been referred to his committee, and that before the bill can be brought back to the Senate it will be proper for the committee to meet and report it with some kind of recommendation.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that may be true, and I rather think it would help the situation for the committee to recommend that the bill pass, the President's objections to the contrary notwithstanding; but, in case I should not be able to hold a meeting of the committee between now and Monday, I am going to move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the message and bill and ask that the question be voted upon on the floor of the Senate.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that there are on the files of the Commission in Washington, D. C., and its several field offices, an accumulation of papers which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. WHEELER and Mr. COUZENS members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WALSH presented the petition of Somerville Post, No. 19, the American Legion, of Somerville, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for safety at sea, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Myra B. Conover, R. N. Superintendent of New England Hospital for Women and Children, Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of the so-called Dockweiler bill, being House bill 8000, to remove the tax on coconut oil used for soap manufacture, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a letter from Mrs. Arthur G. Robbins, chairman of the committee on social service, General Alliance of Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women, of Boston, Mass., relative to the so-called Pettengill bill, and regulation of the motion-picture industry, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from Local No. 1929, Silk and Rayon Workers' Union, of Holyoke; and Local No. 1715, United Textile Workers of America, of Lawrence, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the so-called Ellenbogen bill, being House bill 9072, relating to the textile industry, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the Motor Truck Club of Masachusetts, Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Pettengill bill relative to rates charged by common carriers, being the bill (H. R. 3263) to amend paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended February 28, 1920 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Central Labor Union, of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the use of Federal arms and equipment by State militia in industrial disputes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petitions of Dr. T. W. Hannigan, of Milford; and Charles A. Blackman, of Halifax, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to indefinitely extend all star-route contracts and also to benefit such routes, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of Helen E. Mummery, general secretary, Young Women's Christian Association, and sundry other citizens, of Lowell, Mass., praying for the enactment of the so-called Kerr bill pertaining to the deportation of aliens, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented letters in the nature of memorials from Norton Grange, No. 218, of Norton; Dover Grange, No. 117, of Dover; Mattapoisett Grange, No. 215, of Mattapoisett; Middlesex Central Pomona Grange, No. 23, of Bedford; and Borough Pomona Grange, No. 11, of Westborough, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 1632) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by water carriers operating in interstate and

foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by conventions of the Lynn District Epworth League at Cliftondale, and the Plymouth County Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Brockton, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the maintenance of peace and strict neutrality by the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of Industrial Council, No. 17, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 2969) to authorize the deportation of criminals, to guard against the separation from their families of aliens of the noncriminal classes, to provide for legalizing the residence in the United States of certain classes of aliens, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the Massachusetts Bay Yacht Clubs Association, Inc., remonstrating against the enactment of House bills 6202 and 7319, to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of Congress approved May 11, 1918 (relative to the minimum number of licensed deck and engineer officers required for safe navigation on vessels propelled by machinery), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DEPARTMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—PERMISSIONS TO FILE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate will today recess probably until Monday next. In the light of that fact, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have authority to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report on House bill 10630, being the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ROBERT N. POLLARD

As in executive session,

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Robert N. Pollard, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, an additional position authorized by law.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination of Robert N. Pollard, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia. I do this for the following reason: Judge Pollard is now a judge of a State court in Virginia. The Virginia Legislature is in session and will be in session only a few days longer. It is desired that the legislature should immediately select a successor to Judge Pollard when he is advanced to the Federal judiciary. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that his nomination, which has just been reported favorably from the Judiciary Committee, be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination of Judge Pollard is confirmed.

Mr. GLASS. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 26, 1936, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 399. An act to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia; and

S. 3035. An act to provide for enforcing the lien of the District of Columbia upon real estate bid off in its name when offered for sale for arrears of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4107) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. O'Brien (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4108) for the relief of Charles A. Cobb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4109) for the relief of John Gustav Baisch; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

A bill (S. 4110) to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, to provide for the separation of the regulatory functions of the Government over shipping from the Government's business interests in ships and shipping, to regulate the wages and working conditions of American seamen, to repeal certain former legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON (by request):

A bill (S. 4111) to provide for building up a strong American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 4112) for the relief of Hunter George Taft; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4113) authorizing the appointment of Robert P. Mortimer as a captain, Ordnance Department, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

A bill (S. 4114) to authorize a preliminary examination of the Republican River with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4115) for the relief of Charles D. Birkhead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULOW:

A bill (S. 4116) for the relief of Grant Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEYES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 220) authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider formulating plans for the construction of the Blair Memorial; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NYE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 221) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the sale and marketing of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TAXATION OF LIQUOR—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9185) to insure the collection of revenue on intoxicating liquor, to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the taxation of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 10630, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed. (See proposed amendment printed in full below.)

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted the following notice of motion to suspend the rules:

Pursuant to the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to suspend paragraph IV of rule XVI, for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz: On page 68, after line 10, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"The following-named reclamation projects are hereby authorized to be constructed, the cost thereof to be reimbursable under the reclamation law:

"Central Valley project, California: For flood control in aid of navigation and to provide for the general welfare in cooperation

with the State of California and for incidental purposes, including irrigation, drainage, and power production.

"Grand Lake-Big Thompson transmountain diversion project, Colorado: To irrigate public lands of the United States and to provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Colorado, and for incidental purposes, including the irrigation of patented land, power production, and flood control: *Provided*, That said project shall include the construction and the permanent maintenance of adequate compensatory or replacement reservoirs, necessary feeder canals, and other incidental works, at the most suitable sites within said State; the water impounded by said reservoirs to be used within said basin and the cost of constructing and maintaining such reservoirs, feeder canals, and incidental works shall be included in the cost of said project and be repaid by the beneficiaries of the water so diverted from said Colorado River basin: *Provided further*, That said project shall be constructed and operated in such manner as to continuously maintain the normal levels of the waters of said Grand Lake.

"Carlsbad project, New Mexico: To provide for the general welfarefare in cooperation with the State of New Mexico and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Deschutes project, Oregon: To provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Oregon and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Provo River project, Utah: To provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Utah and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Yakima project, Washington, Roza division: To provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Washington and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Casper-Alcova project, Wyoming: To irrigate public lands of the United States and to provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Wyoming and for incidental purposes, including the irrigation of patented lands, power production, and flood control."

A CONSTITUTIONAL CATECHISM (S. DOC. NO. 180)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a Senate document a paper by Nathan Boone Williams, Esq., of Washington, D. C., entitled "A Constitutional Catechism."

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

MASSACHUSETTS AND THE FIRST 10 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION (S. DOC. NO. 181)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a manuscript entitled "The Failure in Massachusetts of the First 10 Amendments to the United States Constitution", written by Denys P. Myers, research librarian of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy—administered by Tufts College, Massachusetts, with the cooperation of Harvard University—and also research director of the World Peace Foundation.

The manuscript was prepared at the request of the State Department, which, with the Archives Division, have expressed the hope that the information so compiled might be printed as a public document.

It is an able study of the facts concerning the question of the ratification of the first 10 amendments of the United States Constitution in Massachusetts. As appendixes to the article, Professor Myers has added certain documents with a view to throwing some historical light upon the attitude in Massachusetts concerning a bill of rights at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. Thus the appendixes contain textually the Massachusetts resolution of ratification of 1788, the congressional resolution of 1789, and the report of the joint committee of the General Court of 1790.

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

FEDERAL LAWS HELD UNCONSTITUTIONAL BY SUPREME COURT

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk the result of a rather extensive study made by Mr. W. C. Gilbert, of the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress. This study deals with the provisions of Federal laws which have been held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court during the entire history of the country. I think it of very great value and should like to have it made a Senate document. By reason of the rather extensive nature of the study I shall not at this time ask unanimous consent that it be made a Senate document, but I ask that the request, with the material in question, be referred to the Committee on Printing for the consideration of that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PITTMAN

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I tender for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], touching matters of legislation upon the subject of neutrality, as to which we understand further legislation very shortly is to be undertaken.

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

[Article from Today of Feb. 1, 1936]

LET'S NOT WAIT FOR PEACE

(By Senator KEY PITTMAN, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations)

The so-called neutrality bill introduced in the United States Senate on January 3 by me is naturally the subject of considerable public discussion, as it is not only of vital importance but admittedly far-reaching in its effect. This act is known as an administration measure because the State Department participated in its drafting and approved it before introduction.

The primary purpose of the act is to eliminate major causes for the involvement of the United States in foreign wars not of its own making. To this end the bill contains the following material provisions:

1. An absolute embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to belligerent countries.

2. An embargo upon the export of such other articles or materials above normal exports as the President may find are used in the manufacture of arms, ammunition, or implements of war, or in the conduct of war, or when he shall find that such embargo will serve to promote the security and preserve the neutrality of the United States.

3. Prohibition of credits to any belligerent government, except to the extent of short-time commercial credits in aid of the financing of legal exports.

4. Prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any belligerent country by American vessels.

5. Grant of discretion to the President to require all commercial transactions with belligerent countries to be conducted at the risk of the shipper, when such transactions threaten to involve our country in war.

6. Excluding use of passports for travel on belligerent vessels from ports in the United States, and prescribing, with certain exceptions, that all citizens traveling on belligerent vessels shall travel at their own risk.

7. Power to regulate terms and conditions upon which our ports may be used by belligerent vessels.

8. Particular restrictions with regard to submarines in the use of ports in the United States.

I have had the opportunity to read some severe criticisms of the proposed act. In none of these criticisms have I discovered any opposition to the embargo upon arms, ammunition, and implements of war. In fact, most of these critics approve such embargo. They do, however, strenuously oppose an embargo upon the materials which may be manufactured into arms, ammunition, and the implements of war. I do not see upon what theory they draw their distinction.

Is it upon the grounds that arms, ammunition, and implements of war have always been recognized as contraband of war that may be seized and confiscated by belligerents? Do these intelligent critics mean to contend that only arms, ammunition, and implements of war are contraband of war?

There is no international understanding as to what articles or materials constitute contraband of war. But certainly the general conception held before the World War as to what should constitute contraband of war and conditional contraband of war and noncontraband of war greatly changed during the World War.

The belligerents in the World War, before our entry, declared practically every article of commerce, including foodstuffs, as contraband of war and subject to seizure and confiscation. When the United States entered the war it also adopted the same rule as to contraband.

Who is to say that it is more inhuman and unjust to defeat a country by cutting off its essential war supplies than by exterminating its nationals? I deplore that wars should be carried to the extent of depriving nationals of belligerents of food. Without regard to what may be the highest concept as to what exports to belligerents should be permitted, the indisputable fact remains that belligerent governments reserve to themselves the right to declare what constitutes contraband of war, as they did during the World War; and these restrictions upon export, no matter how contrary they may be to the rights of neutrals, cannot be overcome except through the force of a superior navy.

It is charged that the bill aids the strong and penalizes the weak. Any exports to belligerent countries during a war must have this effect. The belligerent, or belligerents, having control of the seas will prevent any exports reaching the belligerents weaker upon the sea. How do we injure the weaker, therefore, by permitting fewer exports to all of the belligerents? We sympathize with the weak, but it is better for us that they suffer

than that our citizens be dragged into war unnecessarily. We are seeking primarily to keep our citizens out of war, and in this effort we cannot be deterred by the effect of our domestic action upon any belligerent. The act provides that we must treat all belligerents alike. Nothing could be more neutral.

It is contended also by some careless students that the bill grants to the President the power to discriminate in favor of one belligerent against another. There is no such authority granted in the act. The act expressly states that when upon the outbreak or during the progress of any war among two or more foreign states the President shall proclaim such facts; that thereafter it shall be unlawful to export, etc., to any of such belligerent countries named in the proclamation. It is mandatory in the act that he shall name in his proclamation the countries that are at war, and that proclamation determines the countries affected by the embargo. But, if there were any doubt about that language, it is definitely clarified in section 6, which provides:

"SEC. 6. Any embargo, prohibition, or restriction that may be imposed by or under the provisions of sections 2, 3, or 4 of this act shall apply equally to all belligerents, unless the Congress, with the approval of the President, shall declare otherwise."

One of the conditions that would justify the placing of an embargo on articles and materials other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war was "that to refrain from placing such restrictions would contribute to a prolongation or expansion of the war." Some critics contend that that would permit the President to aid the League of Nations in making effective its sanctions. The Secretary of State stated to the Committee on Foreign Relations that he had no such intention; that, on the contrary, as the restrictions on exports applied to all belligerents equally, he felt that it might be used impartially in aid of the ending of war. However, the Secretary at the time stated that he had no objection whatever to such language being stricken from the bill, and on my motion the language was stricken from the bill.

It is contended in some quarters that the language which states "upon the outbreak or during the progress of any war * * *" permits the President to delay action during a war until near its termination. This is plainly not the intent of the act. The whole section is mandatory. If a government declares war, the President knows definitely the time of the outbreak of the war and then he is commanded to make his proclamation. If war may have continued for weeks in the absence of any declaration of war, and without the knowledge of the President, then, of course, he could not issue the proclamation upon such outbreak but only upon his discovery that war was in progress.

To limit the President to issuing a proclamation upon the outbreak of war might be construed as denying him such power during the progress of the war if he failed to make such proclamation at its outbreak, even though he had no knowledge of it. No President would resort to a subterfuge to avoid the performance of his mandatory duty. But to remove even groundless suspicions there may be inserted the words "so soon as such facts shall come to the knowledge of the President." There, technical questions do not touch the principle involved, and it is the function of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, who now have such bill under consideration, to make such amendments as in their opinion will most clearly define the purpose and administration of the act.

Section 9 of the act, in giving the President permission to prescribe that commercial transactions carried on by and between our nationals and belligerent governments, or their nationals, shall be at the risk of our nationals when he finds that conditions are so serious as to threaten our neutrality, is intended to relieve our Government of the moral duty of engaging in war for the protection of such commerce. Such action does not constitute the abandonment, waiver, or modification of any of our rights under international law. For the purpose of restraining our own citizens we make it a condition of their commerce, under such critical conditions, that they will not call upon their Government for protection. This, of course, does not deprive the Government of utilizing such powers as it may possess—even its military forces—upon its own motion and initiative in the protection of such commerce, or any neutral rights in relation thereto.

It must be remembered that in this section we are not dealing with human life but with commodities, the loss of which may be compensated for in damages after the war has ceased. It is in reality transferring, in such critical situation, the liability of the Government to the liability of insurance companies. But, that it may be certain that the Government does not abandon, waive, or modify any of its rights as against foreign governments under international law, it is expressly provided in the act that the United States reserves and reaffirms its rights under international law as they existed prior to August 1, 1914. That language was transferred from section 16 and added as a proviso to section 9.

There are two proposals as a substitute for this act: (1) That in the event of such wars all trade with belligerent countries shall be restrained; (2) that there shall be no legislation, and that our Government shall rely upon and act under existing international law.

Personally, I should like to see international commerce as little disturbed as possible by war. I would rather attempt to induce belligerent governments to approve of the exports provided for in the proposed act. If a complete embargo, however, upon the export of all articles and materials to belligerent countries is necessary to prevent us from becoming involved in a foreign war, then, in my opinion, such embargo would gain us more than the temporary loss of a part of our foreign commerce.

Great as our trade was during the World War and high as were our profits, they did not begin to compensate for our financial losses arising out of the war, and cannot, of course, be considered as any compensation for the suffering and death imposed upon our soldiers.

Would we be better off without legislation? We would be in the position that we were in during the World War prior to our entry into that conflict. Our Government would have no authority to do those things it may do under this act. The results would probably be the same as during the World War.

It is contended that by the act we assert that such exports are legal, and, therefore, we are obligated to protect such exports. It is equally true that under international law, as it was considered to exist prior to the World War, we insisted that our citizens had a legal right to export many articles and materials that belligerent nations during the World War denied our authority to export to their enemies. Our duty toward our citizens was the same with regard to such exports as it is today with regard to the proposed exports in the proposed act. There are several ways in which the Government may protect its citizens against the abuse of their rights, but it is not required, necessarily, to adopt war in the protection of such rights. If we wait until there is peace in the world before we pass domestic legislation looking to the protection of our neutrality, we will never have the opportunity to enact such legislation.

DEPORTATION OF UNDESIRABLE ALIENS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Herald, the editorial being entitled "Congress and the Undesirable Alien Problem."

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

[From the Washington Herald of Feb. 27, 1936]

CONGRESS AND THE UNDESIRABLE-ALIEN PROBLEM

Congress now has pending for action two rival bills concerning our perplexing and menacing alien problem.

One is the Kerr-Coolidge bill, which Secretary Perkins of the Department of Labor supports.

The other is the Reynolds-Starnes bill, introduced a few days ago by Senator REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, and by Representative STARNES, of Alabama.

The American people should understand clearly and exactly what each of these bills undertakes to do.

The Kerr-Coolidge bill is actually a bill which would loosen immigration laws, extend opportunities for alien criminals and Communists to enter and remain in the United States, and open the gates to the worst of foreign immigration instead of the best.

1. The Reynolds bill provides for the registration and fingerprinting of "all aliens now in the United States or who may hereafter be admitted."

The Kerr bill makes no such provision—notwithstanding the fact that the Labor Department itself does not know how many aliens are in the United States nor how many of them are here illegally.

The necessity for an alien census and for supervision of aliens is not debatable.

In no other civilized nation has this public duty been neglected as it has been here.

2. The Reynolds bill would require the prompt and mandatory deportation of alien criminals.

Instead of making deportations mandatory, the Kerr bill would set up an interdepartmental committee and would give this committee discretionary power to suspend deportation laws passed by Congress and to permit certain classes of deportable and undesirable aliens to remain here—even convicted alien criminals.

3. The Reynolds bill aims to eliminate alien troubles by keeping out the undesirables.

It provides for intelligence tests to be made in the foreign country as a step toward selective immigration.

As a further step the bill provides that:

"No immigration visa shall be issued to any applicant * * * whose reputation or personal characteristics, in the judgment of the consul, would render the applicant not readily assimilable among the preponderant element of the population of the United States."

In addition, the bill would establish a system of fingerprinting by the American consulates abroad as a means of permanently identifying legal immigrants and preventing substitutions and passport frauds.

The Reynolds bill would also stop aliens from temporarily deserting their families abroad, entering the United States as quota immigrants, and then, on the plea of "separation of families", getting their families into this country as nonquota immigrants.

The Kerr bill, on the contrary, tends to restrict deportation, and makes no attempt to improve or regulate immigration.

4. The Reynolds bill would debar Communists and other revolutionaries and would deport agents of foreign governments engaged in espionage.

The Kerr bill contains no provisions to close these loopholes in the law.

5. The Reynolds bill would, in times of national emergency, permit the deportation of pauper aliens, as in other countries.

This would relieve the Federal and State Governments, as well as private charitable organizations, of the expense of maintain-

ing a horde of destitute foreigners in addition to the millions of our own people dependent on overstrained relief agencies, both public and private.

In addition it would simplify the problem of finding reemployment for Americans who are out of work by saving available jobs for our own people.

The Reynolds-Starnes bill does not attempt to deal with so-called "hardship" deportation cases, which are the main excuse for the Kerr bill.

Genuine "hardship" cases, which are in fact relatively few, are to be provided for in a separate measure.

The contrasting merits and demerits of the Reynolds bill and of the Kerr bill were described accurately by Senator REYNOLDS when he said:

"The bill which I have introduced proposes to expel definitely and positively all habitual criminals in the United States, which the so-called Kerr bill certainly would not accomplish.

"The Kerr bill makes two holes in our immigration barriers for every one it plugs."

A comprehensive alien and immigration measure is necessary at this session, and the Congress should see to it that the measure is comprehensive enough to deal adequately with all the problems involved.

The Reynolds-Starnes bill is not perfect. But if the Reynolds-Starnes bill should be taken as the basis for such legislation the legislators would be able to make any improving amendments deemed necessary or advisable without detriment to the real and predominant interests of the country.

TOWNSEND OLD-AGE-PENSION PLAN

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask that an article by Will P. Kennedy appearing in the Washington Evening Star of the issue of Tuesday, February 25, 1936, containing what purports to be a significant statement by Hon. JOSEPH P. MONAGHAN, of Montana, may be printed in the RECORD. Mr. MONAGHAN has heretofore been one of the strongest exponents of the Townsend old-age-pension plan.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star of Feb. 25, 1936]

TOWNSEND GROUP FOUND DECAYING—MONAGHAN REQUESTS PROBERS QUIZ CLEMENTS FIRST IN INQUIRY

By Will P. Kennedy

The Townsend-plan organization is disintegrating.

Representative JOSEPH P. MONAGHAN, Democrat, of Montana, chairman of the legislative strategy committee of the House (renamed "the legislative steering committee for the Townsend plan"), has asked the special investigating committee, of which Representative C. JASPER BELL, of Missouri, is chairman, to call as its first witness R. E. Clements, former real-estate agent of Long Beach, Calif., coorganizer and secretary of the Townsend movement.

He hopes to show how the Townsendites are being deceived, how the old people who have been led to believe that they are to be paid $200 a month are being buoyed up by false hopes, and that those in charge of the Townsend movement are not playing fair with those who have been endeavoring to get this legislation through Congress.

Representative MONAGHAN is sincerely working for an adequate old-age-pension system. He believes the way to stop old-age-pension "rackets" is to start a "decent old-age-pension system."

DEMANDS QUESTIONS BE ANSWERED

"If the Townsend Weekly, privately owned and admittedly no part of the O. A. R. P. (old-age revolving pension), is to continue to pose as the official spokesman of the Townsend plan and as its reporting organ, then all the questions propounded by me to Mr. Clements in my letter under date of February 19, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, should be answered, in all fairness to the people who are donating their moneys to the promotion of this plan in Congress", said Mr. MONAGHAN.

When the resolution for an investigation was before the House, Representative MONAGHAN placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which he had written to Mr. Clements charging bad faith and unfairness by the Townsend organizers and its official organ toward those Members of Congress who have worked hardest and sacrificed most in behalf of the Townsend plan.

Mr. MONAGHAN emphasized that he had gone into the Townsend movement and worked for it because he believes the power of public opinion behind this plan would make it possible to get a satisfactory old-age-pension system.

He charges that Mr. Clements and those directing the Townsend movement have shown bad faith within the organization toward Members of Congress, and especially those sponsoring this legislation. He censures the Townsend-plan leaders for not playing fair with the old people who are contributing their dimes, quarters, and dollars to the organization. He has no sympathy with the catch-penny schemes of the Townsend organization. He walked out on the first meeting in his district when they started a coin collection, and he denounced the collection at Great Falls, Mont.

QUOTES ROOSEVELT

Explaining how he came to support the Townsend plan, Mr. MONAGHAN recalled that President Roosevelt said "the power of public opinion once united in a fixed purpose is the most irresistible force in the world." "Realizing that it takes power of that character and a united effort of the forces of public opinion behind a movement, I wedded myself to the Townsend plan", said Mr. MONAGHAN. "At that time I realized that the demand for $200 a month, if not iself achieved, would lead eventually to some such pension." His idea was that if ever Congress is to pass a good social-security act it would have to have public opinion supporting it.

Representative MONAGHAN said that "approximately 20,000,000 Americans are hanging upon every word that is being said and done in this Congress to bring about adequate social security", and he does "not propose to sit idly by and see a great movement made a political football to advance the personal fortunes of men who have sat idly by while 63 loyal Members who stood up in the hour of greatest need are being betrayed on the cross of political aspiration."

THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM AND THE NEW DEAL—LETTER FROM JESSE A. LA RUE

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. Jesse A. La Rue, of Birmingham, Ala.

This letter is offered for the RECORD at the request of Mr. La Rue, who is a citizen of my State, and has given considerable study to the matter he discusses. I offer the letter for the RECORD by reason of the fact that it is an interesting discussion of the matters presented.

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

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *February 5, 1936.*

Hon. HUGO L. BLACK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The rejection of some New Deal measures by the Supreme Court and the President's recent request for the revocation of certain other New Deal laws have led to the belief in some quarters that, in order to bring about recovery of general employment, it is going to be necessary to entirely reorganize our economic system on a strictly nonprofit basis. This feeling is expressed in various new-party movements in their demand for "production for use instead of for profit."

It has been said of the President that he inaugurated the New Deal measures in an effort to "save the capitalist system." I do not, of course, know whether or not this represents his real intent. I have the distinct impression, however, that the President viewed those measures as a "combined reform and recovery program." I do not see that the "capitalist system", as our present economic order is sometimes called, should be in need of being "saved", since, rightly understood, it must be seen as a very good system for free men to live under.

Stripped of nonessentials, the capitalist system must be seen as one in which people can come and go and do as they please, always respecting the equal rights of others. One may employ his fellows to use his land, his machinery, his tools, and materials in creating useful things for many people, and out of the process derive a profit for himself—if he can. We know from experience that most of such enterprises prove unsuccessful. They are unsuccessful and pass out of the economic picture solely because they are not able to find a profit in operation, but find a loss instead.

Business statisticians tell us that about 97 percent of all business ventures fail of success. Could we, then, say with truth that the employees of that 97 percent of business enterprises suffered economic distress or unemployment because of any profits their employers derived from their labor? Would the survival of barely 3 percent of the enterprises that are started warrant the charge that the profit they derived has brought unemployment to our distressed millions? This would appear to prove rather too much, and therefore, perhaps, prove nothing.

It seems to me that those who demand the abolition of profits, and that "production for use" be substituted, have taken too superficial a view of our economic processes. All production is for use. Whatever a manufacturer produces must be useful and acceptable to consumers, and must actually go into consumption and be paid for before the manufacturer may himself eat of the fruits of his enterprise. If a man shall work for another, it is with the expectation of profit in the form of wages. If the man who employs this man and others to produce useful things shall receive no more for those things than he has paid out in money for their production, then the employer himself will fail to receive wages, and so must shortly cease to be an employer. And this is why so many fail in business—they are unable to obtain a profit, which is the only wages an employer can receive.

In a competitive field it is rarely that an employer's wages are excessive. Where employers obtain an excessive wage, in the form of profit, it usually is due to monopoly. This may be a natural monopoly, such as public utilities, or it may be an artificial monopoly, created by collusion or by extensive advertising. Undue wages, due to natural monopoly, can be prevented by adequate regulation under the law. Virtual monopoly, through collusion, can be prevented by existing law, if enforced. Practical monopoly, due to extensive advertising, can be defeated by the people themselves by buying competitive goods.

It is well recognized, however, that in some cases industry receives wages in the form of profits that are quite excessive. But just how does this destroy the employment of great numbers of our people? If these excessive profits that are gained by some industries shall, in turn, be expended by them, or paid out to their stockholders and by them expended, employment must be maintained by this spending just as truly as though these excessive

profits had been paid out in the first instance to their employees instead and spent by those employees in living. An unbiased view of all the facts must disclose that the unemployment of large numbers of our people has not come about through the earning of profits of itself. Rather this unemployment has come about from the fact that a considerable part of the economic capital that is withdrawn as wages, salaries, profits, rent, or interest is not returned to the economic pool by means of spending. This part is held as idle money, thus bringing about a continuous depletion of the economic capital, which is the very bloodstream of industry and enterprise of every kind.

I think it must be self-evident that any money-using society, such as ours, can keep itself fully and continuously employed, and at any existing price level, if its money income shall be completely exchanged for each other's goods or services. If, however, this money income shall not be completely exchanged—if a considerable portion of this national income shall be withheld from reexpenditure and be held as idle money, then it is inevitable that this must result in (a) unemployment in like proportion, or (b) a compensatory recession in the price level, or (c) such a combination of these two as will balance with the volume of money thus withdrawn and held in idleness. This is just another way of putting the old universally known truth that "idle money means idle men."

Money becomes idle for numerous reasons, the chief reason being that those owning idle money do not know of suitable opportunities to invest it with safety and profit. There has been little opportunity for profitable investment for some years past, and this condition still persists. This is for the reason that our "economic machine" has fairly been completed for the present. Practically all existing industrial plants already have been built considerably beyond present needs, and no new developments have come forward calling for any considerable funds. We thus appear to have reached an impasse. We cannot hope for the reemployment of our idle men until this great volume of idle money shall be gotten into motion. On the other hand, those owning these surplus and idle funds cannot, under present conditions, be induced to spend them. And yet, the necessity of getting this great volume of surplus funds into motion is so imperative that the Government practically will be forced to find a means of accomplishing it, if we would avoid utter chaos.

The most effective means that can be employed to get all surplus and idle money into motion would be to levy a Federal tax of about 6 percent per annum against bank deposits. This tax should be divided into four equal parts of 1½ percent each, and one part applied each quarter year. The banks themselves should apply this tax to each of their depositors' accounts after the close of business on the last business day of each quarter, and at once pass the totals to the Government. In the practical application of this measure it is my belief that exemption might be made of the first $100 of open accounts and the first $250 of savings accounts, without impairing the success of the measure.

To prevent the evasion of the bank-deposit tax by hoarding currency past the tax periods it would be necessary to also issue a new series of currency to take the place of all outstanding currency, the new currency to be conspicuously dated, and to depreciate in buying and debt-paying value at the same rate as the bank-deposit tax and at the same time the deposit tax is applied—quarterly. This type of currency could not successfully be hoarded.

The effect of this tax measure would be to make it unprofitable to hold surplus money too long in idleness, and it would cease to be done. Owners of such funds would find something to do with them in order to avoid the tax. While this tax could not possibly be evaded, yet it could be avoided by any depositor by using his funds before tax dates, since this tax should be applied not against average balances but against balances existing on tax dates.

The complete and frequent movement of money that would be induced by this measure would very rapidly and completely reemploy all our people at useful and productive occupations, and would permanently eradicate the periodical business slump that is known as the business cycle.

This tax would not prevent saving. It would, however, encourage the conversion of savings into lands, buildings, and other forms of material wealth without too great delay, and thus maintain employment.

This measure would be particularly opportune at this time. The Congress has enacted the bill to immediately pay the remainder of the so-called "soldiers' bonus", which will require approximately two and one-half billion dollars of additional revenue. The bank-deposit tax measure that I have herein outlined would yield in the first year approximately this amount, based upon the present volume of bank deposits. After this veterans' obligation shall have been discharged, most or all of the sales and excise taxes now levied ought to be abandoned, since so much revenue would not be needed, and this tax left, in effect, to perform the double function of producing needed revenue and forcing idle money to keep in motion.

The outstanding evils characterizing our present order are three: First, the inability of all the people to become and remain continuously employed in producing the things they need. Second, the fact that, to maintain employment, both the public and private debt structure must continuously grow higher and higher, and can never substantially be reduced, save by cancelation. Third, the process of the concentration of wealth into fewer and fewer hands is quite automatic and unavoidable. These evils, however, do not arise because of profits or by virtue of "rugged individualism." All of them are the direct and inevitable results of the nontaxation of money, which permits surplus and idle money to be held indefinitely without loss and without cost. If, however, we shall lay a tax against money as I have herein outlined, all these evils would be eliminated from our economic system, and the really good parts would still remain. By means of this tax, we can reemploy all our people; we can rapidly retire our entire debt burden, both public and private, and remain out of debt in the future, and we can attain a gradual but certain dissemination of concentrated wealth among all the people. All these benefits would flow out of this bank-deposit tax measure as certainly and as automatically as the evils now suffered flow out of the nontaxation of money.

It is not necessary that we abandon the so-called capitalist system of industry or forfeit our complete liberty of action and initiative in order to effect the reemployment of our people. The measure outlined will not only bring universal employment and permanent prosperity, but it will also vastly enlarge individual opportunities for all our people.

I do not think we should hide our heads in the sand. I think we should take a realistic view of our problems always. There is always an adequate remedy for our ills, if we shall be diligent enough to find it and shall also have the courage to apply it.

Yours very truly,

JESSE A. LA RUE.

PROCESSING TAXES AND PROTECTIVE TARIFFS

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the February issue of the Harvard Law Review, in which appears an article by Henry M. Hart, Jr., upon the subject Processing Taxes and Protective Tariffs, which I think would be exceedingly interesting reading not only to Senators, but to everybody else. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Mr. Justice ——— delivered the opinion of the Court:

In this case we must determine whether the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 590), commonly called the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, conflict with the Federal Constitution. The act is challenged by the petitioner on the authority of our recent decision in *United States* v. *Butler* (296 U. S. —), invalidating certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, 1933 (48 Stat. 31).

The Tariff Act of 1930 is entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes." Section 336 (a) of the act, entitled "Equalization of the Costs of Production", provides that "in order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this act intended", the Tariff Commission shall, on request of the President or of either or both Houses of Congress, on its own motion, or on application of an interested party, "investigate the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article." If the Commission upon investigation and hearing finds that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize such differences in costs of production, it is required so to report to the President and to specify what increases or decreases in the rate of duty fixed by statute, within a maximum limit of 50 percent, are necessary to effect such equalization. Section 336 (c) provides that the President shall by proclamation approve the changes reported by the Commission, if in his uncontrolled judgment "such rates of duty and changes are shown * * * to be necessary to equalize such differences in costs of production" (46 Stat. 701).

The petitioners made an importation into New York of cloth, in chief value of cotton, containing wool, which the collector of customs assessed at the dutiable rate of 70 percent ad valorem. This was 10 percent more than that fixed by statute (par. 906, ch. 497, 46 Stat. 642). The rate was raised by virtue of the proclamation of the President. Protest was made against payment both of the original duty and of the increase, and an appeal was taken under sections 514, 515, chapter 497, Forty-sixth Statutes, pages 734–735. The United States Customs Court unanimously upheld the constitutionality of the act. Thereafter the case was appealed to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, where the judgment was affirmed. In view of the manifest public importance of the question involved, we granted certiorari.

First. No question can here be raised as to the standing of the petitioners to contest the validity of the exaction. In this respect the obstacles in the way of the petitioners are much less serious than were those which confronted the taxpayers in the Butler case, supra. There the validity of the processing tax was attacked on the ground of the use to which its proceeds were to be put, by specific appropriation; and it was necessary for us, in order to hold the tax invalid, to distinguish the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447), which decided that a Federal income-tax payer had no standing to question the validity of expenditures appropriated out of general funds. In this case we are spared the embarrassment of again drawing this delicate distinction which, if maintained, can so easily be evaded by Congress. For here the asserted unconstitutionality lies not in the regulatory operation of the expenditure but in that of the tax itself. As we said in the Butler case, "The tax can only be sustained by ignoring the avowed purpose and operation of the act, and holding it a measure merely laying an excise * * * to raise revenue for the support of government." When Congress undertakes to regulate

not by expenditure of the proceeds of a tax but by the imposition of the tax itself, it is obviously much more difficult, indeed, it is impossible to ignore the avowed purpose and operation of what it has done.

Second. We are thus brought immediately to the consideration of the great and controlling question in the case, whether the exaction of which the petitions complain is, as it purports to be, a tax, or whether in truth and effect, as the petitioners contend, it is but a cloak for the attainment of ends outside and beyond the powers of the Federal Government. The principles which must govern the decision of this question are set forth with simplicity and clarity in the opinion in *United States* v. *Butler*, supra. We there said, "A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the Constitution, signifies an exaction for the support of the Government. The word has never been thought to connote the expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another. We may concede that the latter sort of imposition is constitutional when imposed to effectuate regulation of a matter in which both groups are interested and in respect of which there is a power of legislative regulation. But manifestly no justification for it can be found unless as an integral part of such regulation."

The United States insists that the tariff act is merely a revenue measure levying an excise upon the importation of foreign goods. It is true that one of the avowed purposes of the act is to raise revenue, but so was it also of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It is likewise true that the act does in fact produce substantial revenue, although in amounts far smaller than those produced by the processing taxes imposed by the Adjustment Act. These circumstances, however, cannot be permitted to blind us to the real character of the exaction. Beyond cavil the object of the legislation is "to encourage the industries of the United States" and "to protect American labor" by equalizing the costs of production at home and abroad, and in so doing to expropriate money from importers and consumers of goods, both foreign and domestic, and bestow it upon domestic producers.

"The tax plays an indispensable part in the plan of regulation" (*United States* v. *Butler*, supra). It is "the heart of the law", a means of helping domestic industries attain parity of costs with foreign competitors. The rate is fixed with the purpose of bringing about such parity. It is to equal "the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article." It may be altered, indeed is required to be altered, in such amount—within a maximum limit of 50 percent—as the Commission and the President find necessary to promote the policy of the act. "The exaction cannot be wrested out of its setting, denominated an excise for raising revenue and legalized by ignoring its purpose as a mere instrumentality for bringing about a desired end. To do this would be to shut our eyes to what all others than we can see and understand" (ibid.).

It is hardly necessary to reiterate that the Federal Union is a government of delegated powers. From this established principle it follows that powers not expressly granted or reasonably to be implied from such as are conferred are reserved to the States or to the people. The same proposition, otherwise stated, is that powers not granted are prohibited. No power is given to legislate in order to increase or decrease the wages of labor engaged in local activities, or the profits of capital similarly engaged, and therefore legislation by Congress for that purpose is forbidden. The fostering of industries, whether infant or adult, is to no greater extent a permissible object of Federal concern than is the fostering of agriculture. The Constitution and its amendments will be searched in vain for any power to legislate for either purpose.

"It is an established principle that the attainment of a prohibited end may not be accomplished under the pretext of the exertion of powers which are granted. * * * The power of taxation, which is expressly granted, may, of course, be adopted as a means to carry into operation another power also expressly granted. But resort to the taxing power to effectuate an end which is not legitimate, not within the scope of the Constitution, is obviously inadmissible" (*United States* v. *Butler*, supra; compare *Child Labor Tax Case*, 259 U. S. 20; *Linder* v. *United States*, 268 U. S. 5, 17; *United States* v. *Constantine*, 296 U. S. —).

It is true, as insisted, that the Agricultural Adjustment Act expropriated money directly from processors and then turned over to farmers the very money so expropriated, whereas the protective tariff transfers its benefits more circuitously. The Constitution, however, cannot be concerned with the mere mechanics of expropriation. A tax which makes possible the profitable operation of a protected industry at the expense, in part directly of importers, and in the end indirectly of consumers, is no less to be condemned than one which similarly favors a farmer at the expense immediately of processors, but likewise in the end of consumers. No less than the Hoosac Mills Corporation in the Butler case have the petitioners in this case been required to pay money for the benefit of other groups in the community. No less in this case than in that is the exaction resisted as a step in an unauthorized plan to control matters outside the competence of the Federal Government.

Still more unsubstantial, if possible, is the objection that the beneficiaries of the Agricultural Adjustment Act were coerced, by purchase, to comply with affirmative regulations—regulations beyond the power of the Federal Government to command—whereas the benefits of the Tariff Act are conferred unconditionally. It was precisely because the Adjustment Act achieved its regulatory ends thus conditionally and indirectly that the appraisal of its constitutionality was attended by such difficulty. The tariff act flaunts the Constitution without subterfuge, employing its tax as the sole and direct instrument for the equalization of production costs in local industries throughout the country. Compare *United States* v. *Constantine*, supra.

Third. It is urged on behalf of the Government that the protective tariff is supported by the power to regulate foreign commerce, and our footnote to that effect in the Butler case, which cited *Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 48), is referred to in support of the contention.

The constitutionality of a protective tariff was first considered in *J. W. Hampton, Jr., & Co.* v. *United States* (276 U. S. 394), and there sustained as a revenue measure. We said, "So long as the motive of Congress and the effect of its legislative action are to secure revenue for the benefit of the general government, * * * the existence of other motives cannot invalidate congressional action." At that time we were still adhering, for the most part, to our well-known doctrine that we would not inquire into the motives of Congress in levying a tax, a doctrine which had first been departed from in the Child Labor Tax case, supra, on the ground that there the nonfiscal motives were not merely incidental but primary. Recently, however, in the Constantine and Butler cases, we have adopted the principle that what all others can see and understand we will not shut our eyes to. Evidently we cannot shut our eyes to the motives of Congress when those motives are to benefit industrialists and open them when they are to benefit farmers. Nor can we say that the revenue motive is primary with a tariff that produces but $350,000,000 a year and not only less than primary but nonexistent with a processing tax which produces almost a billion.

In the University of Illinois case we abandoned without explanation our theory of a protective tariff as a revenue measure and referred it to the power to regulate foreign commerce. This was helpful in explaining a decision that the university was not entitled, as an instrumentality of the State, to an exemption from taxation on articles which it imported. Manifestly, we were not considering in that connection the use of the power to tax in order to regulate costs of production in every local enterprise throughout the land nor the use of the power to regulate foreign commerce for the same purpose; nor did we then have the benefit of the opinion in *United States* v. *Butler*, supra. This, indeed, is the conclusive answer to the Government's contention. Whether we were right in the Hampton case or in the University of Illinois case, or in both cases, we need not now determine. The power to levy a tariff for revenue only, or for revenue primarily, and the power even to impose an embargo (see *The Brigantine William*, 2 Hall's Amer. L. J. 255) in the genuine and not merely purported exercise of the power to regulate foreign commerce, may both be admitted, without going to the length of sustaining under either power the authority to equalize costs of production throughout the whole of agriculture and industry. The commerce power cannot any more than the taxing power be utilized for the attainment of a prohibited end.

This conclusion may be tested, if it can be thought to need testing, by supposing the processing tax levied by the Agricultural Adjustment Act to have been exacted as a condition of the movement in interstate commerce of processed commodities, or of unprocessed commodities intended for processing. Almost in terms our opinion in *United States* v. *Butler*, supra, will be found to condemn it. Such a conclusion, indeed, was anticipated by our decision at the previous term in the Railroad Pension case. We there pointed out that the "contentment" and "social welfare" of workingmen is not an object for the attainment of which the regulatory power over carriers engaged in interstate commerce can be exerted (*Railroad Retirement Board* v. *Alton R. Co.*, 295 U. S. 330, 368). Congress has no more power respecting the costs of industrial production than it has respecting "the fostering of a contented mind on the part of the employee." Compare *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495, 549).

The implications from a decision sustaining a contrary proposition would be startling. Compare *United States* v. *Constantine*, supra. If the cost of doing an intrastate business were itself the permitted object of Federal legislation, the extent of the legislation would be a question of discretion and not of power. Compare *Schecter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States*, supra, at page 549. If Congress can seek to bring about an equilibrium of costs, it can seek to bring about a disequilibrium, in favor of domestic producers. The concession of such a power would open the door to unlimited regulation of matters of State concern by Federal authority.

A few instances will illustrate the thought. As we observed in *United States* v. *Butler*, supra, "a possible result of sustaining the claimed Federal power would be that every business group which thought itself underprivileged might demand that a tax be laid on its vendors or vendees, the proceeds to be appropriated to the redress of its deficiency of income." The application of this statement to the question now before us needs no elaboration. What we said in the Railroad Pension case concerning the perils of a drive for "legislative largess" in "the halls of Congress' is equally pertinent. (See 295 U. S. at 351.)

Let us suppose Congress should determine that the farmer, the miner, or some other producer of raw materials is receiving too much for his products, with consequent depression of the processing industry and idleness of its employees. Though, by confession, there is no power vested in Congress to compel by statute a lowering of the prices of the raw material the same result might be accomplished, if the questioned act be valid, by lowering the tariff upon competing raw materials from abroad.

We have held in *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States*, supra, that Congress has no power to regulate wages in a local business. If the petitioners are right, this very end may be ac-

complished by removing a tariff from a protected industry so as, in effect, to compel a reduction in wages, or by restoring or increasing the tariff so as to make possible a restoration or even increase of wages. Should Congress ascertain that sugar refiners are not receiving a fair profit, and that this is detrimental to the entire industry, and in turn has its repercussions in trade and commerce generally, it might, following the example of the present law, impose a protective tariff of 2 cents a pound, thus increasing the price on every sale of the commodity, enabling the refiners to keep for themselves the funds so collected from consumers. Assume that too many shoes are being offered for sale throughout the Nation; that the market is saturated, the price depressed, the factories running half time, the employees suffering. Upon the principle of the statute in question Congress might simply raise the tariff so as to prevent the importation of foreign-manufactured shoes. Suppose that there are too many factory workers in the great industrial States; that this results in dislocation of the economic balance. Upon the principle contended for, the tariff on the principal manufactures of these States might be lowered while that protecting the products of the more sparsely populated States was increased. Thus, through the asserted power to impose a protective tariff, the Federal Government, against the will of individual States, might completely redistribute the industrial population. Whole intrastate industries might be made or destroyed merely by raising or lowering tariffs.

"These illustrations are given, not to suggest that any of the purposes mentioned are unworthy, but to demonstrate the scope of the principle for which the Government contends; to test the principle by its applications; to point out that, by the exercise of the asserted power, Congress would, in effect, under the pretext of exercising the taxing power, in reality accomplish prohibited ends. It cannot be said that they envisage improbable legislation" (*United States* v. *Butler*, supra).

Fourth. The remaining contentions of the Government may be dismissed summarily. We are told that the power to tax is inseparable from the effecting of consequences which Congress could not otherwise command; that every granted power of the Federal Government will be paralyzed if the motives and consequences of its exercise are themselves a limitation upon its scope. Whatever force these arguments might once have had, they come now too late. In *United States* v. *Butler*, supra, the same arguments were made and rejected. We are told that the power to levy a protective tariff is one which resides in the Government of every civilized country. The objection wholly and strangely misconceives the dual character of our constitutional system which differs radically from that of other nations where all legislative power, without restriction or limitation, is vested in a parliament or other legislative body subject to no restrictions except the discretion of its members. Again, we are told that as a practical matter it is unthinkable that the reserved power of the States, which we hold to have been invaded, should ever actually be exercised by the States.

We gave no weight to such considerations in the Butler case, however, and we shall give none here. We are told, finally, that the Tariff Act of 1930 was passed as a part of an effort by the party then in power to deal with a Nation-wide economic emergency; that that emergency has persisted; and that invalidation of the act at this time will be productive of economic distress and dislocation more widespread and intense than any which have preceded it. It is necessary simply to refer to recent decisions of this Court to show the irrelevance of these conditions. Emergency does not create or enlarge constitutional power (*Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States*, supra, at p. 528). Such power is no more to be confused with economic than with social desirability (compare *Railroad Retirement Board* v. *Alton R. Co.*, supra, at p. 367). When an act of Congress is appropriately challenged as not conforming to the constitutional mandate, this Court has only one inescapable duty—to lay the article of the Constitution which is invoked beside the statute which is challenged and to decide whether the latter squares with the former.

Since, as we have found, there was no power in the Congress to impose the contested exaction, the judgment below must be reversed.

HENRY M. HART, Jr.

CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES OF SELF-GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY DONALD R. RICHBERG

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on the 16th of February Mr. Donald R. Richberg delivered an address in Boston on the subject Constitutional Difficulties of Self-Government. I ask that his address may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The difficulties of self-government are as many as the obstacles to a blameless life. The politician who is not something of a statesman will lead us astray. The statesman who is not something of a politician will lead us nowhere. We may follow a demagogue to destruction, or a heavy thinker to futility. Our hope for useful leadership rests mainly with practical politicians who sincerely wish to render public service, who understand why we behave like human beings and who appeal not solely to our nobler passions, nor entirely to our baser appetites.

You can identify these men at the present time, because if they belong to the party in power you will find them doing all they can to assist the national administration to put in effect helpful public policies; and you will not find them masking personal antagonisms and political backsliding with emotional arguments about the Constitution and the imaginary dangers of communism.

In the opposition party you can also identify the useful leaders as those who are discussing the merits of alternative public policies; and who are not claiming that the particular opinions of a particular majority of the Supreme Court with which they happen to agree today are the last words of a superhuman wisdom which should determine the policies of the United States regardless of what a majority of 125,000,000 people may believe are sound public policies. Constitutional exhortations of that variety are simply efforts to evade discussing the real issues before the American people.

In order to establish self-government we must adopt a fundamental law providing for the organization of a State, distributing the governing powers, and declaring the political principles and purposes which are to be maintained. In the writing and execution of that fundamental law, which is called a constitution, the ideals of statesmen and the practical wisdom of politicians must be employed. A political system is thus established which will sustain by law the economic system through which the citizenship will obtain a livelihood. Then as the economic system changes, as new ways of earning a living develop, as new methods of producing and exchanging the necessities and comforts of life alter the habits, the interests, and the needs of the people, the political system must be modified and reconstructed so that it will continue to support the orderly operation of the economic system.

CHANGING CONDITIONS AND CHANGING LAWS

Necessarily we must continually revise the laws which regulate individual conduct. In days gone by the sewage of scattered homes or villages could be disposed of locally; but today the sewage of huge, crowded cities cannot be simply poured into a river to carry an intolerable pollution to other communities, even to other States. Furthermore, we have learned many things about sanitation and the spread of disease, of which our forefathers were ignorant. So we write many new laws; we undertake many new governmental duties; we impose many new public obligations. Problems that once were local become national. Laws and their administration that were once simple and inexpensive become complex and expensive. Taxes and governmental expenditures necessarily increase.

It is not politics, it is business that is regimenting our lives. It is not the political system, it is the economic system that is socializing our activities and modifying our pioneer individualism.

Our methods of earning a living are no longer merely the local concern of individuals and villages. The inhabitants of cities and States and of the entire Nation become interdependent upon the growing of wheat in Kansas, of corn in Iowa, of cotton in Texas, upon the making of textiles in the Carolinas, of shoes in Massachusetts, of clothing in New York, of meat in Chicago, and of automobiles in Michigan. The mining of coal, the production of oil, the making of steel, the generation of electricity, and the fabrication of articles of daily use in a thousand centers of manufacturing become matters of grave importance to all the people of the United States. Transportation, although essential to distribute the necessities of life to a huge population, is only one of the essential elements of a commerce which must be maintained "among the several States" in full vigor in order to keep all these people alive and healthy.

The entire Nation also becomes concerned with the human outpourings of this new economic system. If unprofitable farms pour into the cities millions of people looking for work, if city factories pour millions of discarded or outworn workers into the streets, there can develop rapidly a national problem of 10,000,000 or more unemployed wage earners, which offers the prospect of thirty or forty million men, women, and children destitute and facing starvation. This is not simply a problem for New York or Chicago or New Jersey or Indiana to solve. Local governments could not support this increased burden even if they could confine their obligation to their own citizens and compel them to stay at home. Too much of the wealth of cities and States under our new economic system is siphoned out of them into national reservoirs, where it can only be subjected to social obligations through national taxation. It has also been proved conclusively that only the national credit is sufficient to meet the needs of a national emergency.

The stream of commerce that flows throughout the Nation is like the circulatory blood system in the human body. It cannot be maintained as a life-giving flow of goods and services merely by regulating the movement of the stream. If the processes of production are polluting the stream with economic diseases, such as unemployment, destructive trade practices, inadequate wages for industrial workers, and inadequate prices for farmers, the blood of the Nation will not sufficiently nourish the body; and it will carry disease to the vital organs, which are being poisoned by accumulated waste. Muscles will become flabby and nerves will become jittery. When the Nation is sick the blood stream of commerce cannot be purified, either by regulating its flow or by merely pumping in some new blood—obtaining a transfusion from the national credit.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE POWER

What this Nation has needed and needs today to insure a health-giving stream of commerce is constitutional treatment; this is, cooperative action in support of the economic system of private enterprise. This action has been authorized in the Constitution of the Nation, in the grant of power to the Congress to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the States. And yet, by some supreme process of illogic, that is

exactly the action which, when undertaken by the Congress of the United States, we are now being told is unauthorized and unconstitutional. We are being told that the Federal Government can provide for the general welfare by levying taxes and spending money, but not by regulating production or business done within a State; and that the Federal Government can regulate the flow of commerce, but not the production or distribution of articles of commerce within a State.

We know, however, that no single State can prevent or control commercial intercourse with other States, because that is prohibited in the Constitution. And we know that no single State can provide for the general welfare of citizens in other States. So, if we are being told the truth about the lack of power in the Federal Government, the fact must be that there is no governmental power anywhere to sustain the modern economic system of production and distribution with a cooperating political system; and that the people of America must either simply trust to Providence to maintain a healthy blood stream of commerce or else must rewrite the Federal Constitution so that, when the stream of commerce is polluted and stagnating, some power of government may be available to stop the progress of a dangerous disease and save the life of the Nation.

But is it the truth that the Federal Government lacks this essential power of self-preservation? Is it the truth that our forefathers in their wisdom denied this power to the National Legislature and reserved to the States or to the people a power to protect the general welfare which they cannot exercise? We are being told that the Supreme Court has so decided. We are told this most frequently by those whose knowledge of law and the opinions of the Supreme Court is limited to reading a few recent opinions in which members of the Supreme Court have differed most vigorously in their statements of what is the law.

On the other hand, men who have devoted their lives to a study of the Constitution and the opinions rendered by the Supreme Court during nearly 150 years, know that the Supreme Court has held over and over again that the Federal Government possesses the very powers that are now being substantially denied. There have been many differences of opinion as to the manner in which those powers can be exercised and the limitations within which they must be exercised. But the entire course of the supreme judicial opinion since the days of Chief Justice Marshall has steadfastly maintained the fundamental authority of the Federal Government which is now disputed, and has steadily expanded the area of Federal control far beyond the limits now being proclaimed.

DEBATABLE QUESTIONS OF CONSTITUTIONALITY

There is no sound basis for the contention which is frequently made today in order to attack and discredit the legislative program of the present administration—the claim that laws have been enacted in willful disregard of clearly established limitations upon the legislative powers of the Congress. Uncertainty as to the constitutionality of new legislation designed to meet new needs is an old, old story to those who have any comprehensive knowledge of the origins of the Federal Constitution, the intentions of those who wrote it, and the constructions and interpretations of its broad phrases which have been written in hundreds of the opinions of the Supreme Court.

There has been no law of major importance enacted by the Federal Government in all our history which involved the exercise of the indefinite powers of the Congress or which might be subject to the indefinite limitations upon those powers which has not been attacked as unconstitutional. There have been erected in the opinions of the Supreme Court scores of tombstones sacred to the memory of expensive constitutional lawyers who had assured their clients and argued to the Court that Federal statutes were unconstitutional. At rarer intervals you will find in this judicial cemetery a slab bearing the name of a lawyer for the Government whose argument in support of a Federal law has been judicially buried, although probably by only a majority of the justices, with a dissenting opinion chiseled on the stone for the solace of the bereaved.

NEW DEAL LEGISLATION

There has not been a single law sponsored by the present administration whose constitutionality has not been upheld by a large number of Federal judges or other expounders of constitutional law prior to its disapproval by a majority of the Supreme Court. In the case of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which was unanimously disapproved by the Court, the law had been previously upheld by no less than 65 district judges and 3 circuit courts of appeals; and the final decision reversed the unanimous opinion of 3 of the ablest Federal judges sitting on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, who had vigorously upheld the constitutionality of the law.

Does it not seem a trifle silly to argue that a law such as the A. A. A. should not have been enacted, because at the present time there happen to be on the Supreme Court three justices who think that the law is constitutional and six who think it is unconstitutional? This makes it plain that a majority of nine other equally able judges might have upheld the law. When there is ground for reasonable debate over a constitutional question, should the Congress always refrain from exercising its power? That doctrine would have prevented the passage of a large percentage of our present Federal laws. On the contrary, the Supreme Court has always held that, so long as there is a reasonable doubt as to a constitutional objection it is the duty of the Court to uphold the law. If, therefore, the Congress had been advised in advance that there was a conflict of opinion in the Supreme Court as to the constitutionality of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Congress would have been fully justified in deciding that it had the power to pass the law and in assuming that the Court would feel in duty bound to uphold the judgment of the National Legislature. This is because the Constitution does not give to the Supreme Court any authority to review a legislative determination of public policy, or to review the wisdom of a law, or to overrule a reasonable legislative construction of the Constitution.

CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS OF JUDICIAL AUTHORITY

This is a long-established limitation on the power of the Court, which was reaffirmed as recently as March 1934, when the Supreme Court again sustained the legislative power to adopt "whatever economic policy may reasonably be deemed to promote public welfare"; and held that: "The courts are without authority either to declare such policy, or, when it is declared by the legislature, to override it" (291 U. S. 502).

Since it is apparent that a great many people do not understand what makes a law "constitutional" or "unconstitutional", it seems worth while to emphasize that the Supreme Court has not been given an unqualified authority to settle such questions. The Court has, in fact, no authority to overrule the action of the Congress in adopting, and acting in accordance with, its own reasonable construction of the language of the Constitution.

This legislative power which must be respected by the Court is made clear in an opinion of the Court, written by Justice Holmes, which holds:

"It is not enough that a statute goes to the verge of constitutional power. We must be able to see clearly that it goes beyond that power. In case of real doubt a law must be sustained" (207 U. S. 79).

Those who yearn for a high degree of efficiency in government may think that the Supreme Court should have the power to nullify all laws of doubtful constitutionality. But that is exactly the power which has never been claimed by the Court and which is not given to the Court by the Constitution.

THE GREAT COMPROMISE OF 1787

The superior wisdom and lasting quality of our Constitution lies in the fact that many well-recognized principles of executive efficiency were set aside in 1787 in order to compromise the demands of conflicting interests.

To establish a Federal Union by consent of 13 independent States it was necessary to provide overlapping authorities for the State and Federal Governments, thereby insuring a future unending conflict in the making of laws.

To prevent the dominance of either the legislative, executive, or judicial power it was necessary to provide overlapping authorities for three groups of public officials, thereby insuring a future unending conflict in the interpretation and enforcement of laws.

To prevent the Government from regulating too freely the life of the individual citizen it was necessary to reserve to the people certain ultimate rights, thereby insuring a future unending conflict over the extent to which the power to make and enforce laws had been granted to either the State or Federal Governments.

If any claim had been made in 1787 that an ideally efficient Government had been established, it would have been refuted by the unanimous denial of the members of the Constitutional Convention. They sought and found a workable adjustment of different theories of government and opposing economic interests which were, and always will be, in profound conflict. And the great principle which triumphed in establishing a Government of "checks and balances" was the principle that self-government is a process of continuing compromise. The establishment of that principle gave to our experiment in government one of its most enduring qualities.

JUDICIAL DECISION OF INEVITABLE CONFLICTS OF LAW

But when our Federal Union of sovereign States was established on the basis of perpetuating a conflict of authority between State and Federal Governments and between independent branches of both Governments, and between granted powers and reserved rights, it was clearly necessary to provide also for the decision of the controversies which were thus made inevitable. As the basis for such decisions it was written that—

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

It is evident that the primary purpose of this language was to provide that in any conflict between any State laws and the laws of the United States which were either written in the National Constitution or under its authority the national law should be supreme.

To insure this national supremacy, it was further provided, in Article III of the Federal Constitution, that the judicial power of the United States should extend to all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States and should be vested in one Supreme Court and such inferior courts as the Congress might establish.

Thus a clear method was provided for the judicial decision of any conflict between Federal and State authority. The law of the United States, written in the National Constitution, or written by the Congress under the authority of the Constitution, was made supreme. But ever since the beginning of the Republic the question has been raised as to who shall finally decide whether a Federal statute is a law of the United States when the objection is made that the Constitution does not give the Congress any power to enact such a law.

We can save ourselves much useless argument if we will promptly admit that the Supreme Court must have the authority to pass upon this question. It is the duty of the Court to uphold the requirements of the Constitution as the supreme law of the land; and if any act of the Congress, or any act of an executive official, clearly violates a provision of the Constitution, the Court must be expected to enforce the law of supreme authority against the law of inferior authority.

For example, the Constitution provides that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." Certainly, the Supreme Court, being required to accept that prohibition as the supreme law, could not enforce an act of Congress laying a duty on the exports from any State.

The Constitution prohibits the Congress from interfering with religious freedom, or abridging freedom of speech or freedom of the press, or denying trial by jury. These prohibitions would become meaningless if the judges were not also bound by their oaths to respect them and, therefore, to refuse to enforce any act of Congress which clearly violated this supreme law.

Not only is the obligation to decide whether a Federal law, as well as a State law, conforms to the requirements of the Federal Constitution imposed upon the Supreme Court by the Constitution, but it is absolutely necessary, in a government wherein conflicts of law are inevitable, to have the supreme judicial authority empowered to make a judicial decision as to what law shall be enforced.

Nevertheless, the very fact that this power has been given, and must be given, to the Supreme Court makes it necessary for the Court itself to observe most scrupulously the constitutional limitations upon its own authority. Where there is a clear conflict between a State and Federal law, or where either a State legislature or the Congress enacts a statute which clearly violates some express requirement of the Federal Constitution, both legal opinion and the common judgment of the people will support the Supreme Court in maintaining the supreme authority of the Constitution and holding a legislative act invalid.

When, however, the Congress of the United States has enacted a law which is challenged upon the ground that it does not come within a broad indefinite grant of power, or that it is forbidden by some undefined limitation upon the legislative power, then a serious question arises as to the extent of the authority of the Supreme Court to overrule the judgment of the Congress. The Justices of the Supreme Court have themselves bitterly disagreed over the constitutional limitations upon their authority in such cases from the earliest deliberations of the Court down to its most recent opinions.

The most learned students of the law have pointed out that the Members of Congress, the President, and other executive officers, as well as Justices of the Supreme Court, have all taken an oath to support the Constitution. Since there are three independent branches of the Government, each deriving its authority from the Constitution, each has the independent obligation to decide what is a constitutional exercise of its authority; and there is nothing in the Constitution which requires one to subordinate its judgment to another.

HISTORIC DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

President Johnson vetoed the reconstruction acts on the ground that they were unconstitutional. President Taft vetoed the Webb-Kenyon Act on the same ground. But when these acts were passed over the veto both Presidents held it to be their duty to execute them as the law—accepting the final authority of the law-making body to enact a law conforming to its construction of the Constitution. Both laws were later upheld by the Supreme Court. To reverse this picture we may also recall that President Jackson vetoed the charter for a national bank on the ground that it was unconstitutional, although the Supreme Court had held it was constitutional. It is also well to remember that the Supreme Court once held an obstruction to navigation was unlawful, but when Congress then passed a law making the obstruction lawful this reversal of its opinion was accepted as binding on the Court.

In the Legal Tender cases the Supreme Court held that Congress had no power to make "greenbacks" legal tender; and then in a later case overruled its former decision. Time and time again the Supreme Court has reversed or greatly modified a former ruling, thereby changing its construction of the Constitution, either because of changing conditions or because of the altered views of the judges or a change in the membership of the Court.

In a score of recent cases it has been made apparent that it has not been the unalterable requirements of the Constitution, but the debatable opinions of the Justices of the Supreme Court, which have determined whether an act of Congress would be enforced as a law of the United States or nullified on the ground that it was unconstitutional.

Yet it was Abraham Lincoln, in his first inaugural, who said that "if the policy of the Government upon vital questions is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal." Nor should it be forgotten today that Lincoln was elected and the Republican Party came into power on a platform denouncing the "political heresy" of a decision of the Supreme Court.

IS THIS A "GOVERNMENT OF LAWS"?

There would be no truth in the assertion that we have a Government of laws, made by the elected representatives of the people, if in fact the Congress of the United States were only permitted to enact such laws as met with the approval of a majority of nine men appointed for life, who had the power to construe and modify the Constitution according to their political and economic opinions and accordingly to enforce or to nullify acts of Congress, and whose exercise of this power was subject only to their own self-restraint. The dangers of such an exercise of an unrestrained authority were made quite clear in the recent dissenting opinion of Justice Stone in the A. A. A. case; and they have been pointed out by practically every member of the present Supreme Court in opinions rendered in the last 2 years.

In three notable cases Justices Van Devanter, McReynolds, Sutherland, and Butler joined in dissents, in one of which Justice McReynolds said: "The impending legal and moral chaos is appalling" (294 U. S. 330). In another case the same Justice said that a "facile disregard of the Constitution as long interpreted and respected will inevitably lead to destruction" (291 U. S. 502). In another case Justice Sutherland said: "If the provisions of the Constitution be not upheld when they pinch as well as when they comfort, they may as well be abandoned" (290 U. S. 398). Then, in a realinement of the prevailing majority, Chief Justice Hughes, in a dissenting opinion in behalf also of Justices Brandeis, Stone, and Cardozo, said that the opinion of the other five Justices showed "a departure from sound principles and places an unwarranted limitation upon the commerce clause" (295 U. S. 330).

Shortly thereafter came an opinion by Justice Cardozo, in behalf also of Justices Brandeis and Stone, criticizing the majority opinion which held a Federal taxation law to be unconstitutional on the ground that, despite its declared purpose, the real purpose of the law was to regulate matters outside Federal control. This minority opinion said: "Thus the process of psychoanalysis has spread to unaccustomed fields" (80 L. Ed. 195).

Then came the notable conflict of opinion in the A. A. A. case, in which Justice Stone, in behalf also of Justices Brandeis and Cardozo, complained of "a tortured construction of the Constitution" by which the power to tax and spend which "the Constitution gives to Congress, in specific and unambiguous terms", was held "subject to limitations which do not find their origin in any express provision of the Constitution" (80 L. Ed. 287).

It is apparent from the foregoing quotations that all the present members of the Supreme Court have at one time or another taken the position that their associates were writing into the Constitution meanings which were not necessary and unavoidable, but which, on the contrary, represented a choice between debatable constructions of the Constitution. In a word, the undefined powers and limitations in the Constitution are being given by the decisions of the Court not those meanings which they must have but those meanings which a majority of the judges believe they ought to have. Thus the Constitution is being continually amended by the opinions of the Supreme Court, and this has been the practice since the beginning of our Government; a practice described and criticized in scores of opinions by eminent justices holding the most conservative as well as the most liberal views.

RESPECT FOR DECISIONS AND CRITICISM OF OPINIONS

The decisions of the Supreme Court must be respected and obeyed by law-abiding persons. But the power of self-government would be abdicated if the people of the United States failed to exercise freely their right to criticize the soundness and the wisdom of the opinions of the Court, and, by a habit of silent deference, permitted the Court to assume the unconstitutional authority of a final arbiter of public policy. The folly of such a subservient attitude was explained long ago by the late Chief Justice Taft, who said (in 1895):

"The opportunity freely and publicly to criticise judicial action is of vastly more importance to the body politic than the immunity of courts and judges from unjust aspersions and attack. * * * There are few men, whether they are judges for life or for a shorter term, who do not prefer to earn and hold the respect of all, and who cannot be reached and made to pause and deliberate by hostile public criticism. In the case of judges having a life tenure, indeed, their very independence makes the right freely to comment on their decisions of greater importance, because it is the only practical and available instrument in the hands of a free people to keep such judges alive to the reasonable demands of those they serve." (Quoted with approval by President Theodore Roosevelt in his sixth annual message.)

Abraham Lincoln exercised this right of criticism when he said: "We think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions, and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this."

THE OPPOSITION OF THE UNDEMOCRATIC PARTY

Today the coalition leaders of the undemocratic party, in their desire to establish an authority beyond the reach of public opinion, may repudiate the Republican leadership of Lincoln and Taft, as well as the Democratic leadership of Jefferson, Jackson, and Roosevelt. They have apparently undertaken to spend enormous amounts of money for the purpose of persuading the American people that they should regard the Constitution as a "civil bible" and the opinions of a shifting majority of Justices of the Supreme Court as the inspired revelations of divine wisdom. One of these leaders recently had the audacity to assert at a dinner of the undemocratic party that God has given us the kind of Supreme Court that cannot be moved by public opinion and to demand that the people pay the same reverence to the conflicting constitutional doctrines and revelations of the Justices that they would pay to the Holy Scripture.

Now, it is entirely proper to advise the American people to respect the law, and to respect and obey the decisions of the Supreme Court. But laws enacted by the Congress are also entitled to respect and to obedience so long as they are within a reasonable

construction of the constitutional authority of the Congress. We will not inspire respect for law by encouraging disrespect for those chosen to make the laws and respect only for those who overrule the lawmakers.

And, so long as we intend to remain a free, self-governing people, we cannot sanction any effort to establish the worship of a man-made document and reverence for its human interpreters as a state religion. We cannot tolerate the effort of a political organization to coerce the will of the people by proclaiming the divine authority of any hierarchy of public officials to decide what laws may be enacted to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the American people. We cannot permit criticism of public servants and discussion of public issues to be stifled by the assertion of divine rights.

On the contrary, as a free people we must maintain that those who disagree with the constructions placed upon the broad clauses of the Constitution by a majority of the Supreme Court have exactly the same right as those who agree to believe that their opinions are in accord with the fundamental purposes and principles of the Constitution and with the intentions of those who established the original Constitution and the subsequent amendments.

HISTORIC SUPPORT OF THE POWERS EXERCISED BY CONGRESS

A startling example of this right to disagree with opinions of the Supreme Court is given when we look into the origin of the principal difference of opinion concerning the constitutionality of most of the so-called New Deal legislation. A large part of this legislation has been based upon the assumption that the Congress has been granted the power to enact such legislation under the specific grants of power to the Congress to lay and collect taxes, "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States", and the power "to regulate commerce * * * among the several States."

But the Supreme Court has held in several recent cases that the power to enact laws to provide for the general welfare, or to regulate interstate commerce, is restricted by the power reserved to the States to regulate local activities, including the production of industrial and agricultural products. Yet long ago and often the Supreme Court has held that there are no reserved rights of the States "in hostility to the authorized exercise of Federal power." So said Justice Hughes in the *Minnesota Rate Cases* (230 U. S. 352).

It is, moreover, apparent that the States are separately incapable of adequately protecting or regulating industry or agriculture, because the States are forbidden to prevent the import of articles from other States; they cannot regulate interstate commerce; and they cannot protect their citizens from unfair competition in the production and distribution of products in other States. The result is that under the Constitution the States are denied the authority to protect local commerce by regulations affecting interstate commerce; and the Federal Government, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, is denied the authority to protect interstate commerce by regulations affecting local commerce. Thus, between the acknowledged areas of Federal and State regulation we have a growing area where no regulatory power of government can be exercised. We have a vacuum in which there can be no valid laws; an area of anarchy in which there can be no effective restraint upon activities destructive of the public interest; an area in which both State and Federal Governments are helpless to promote or to protect the general welfare.

Our forefathers, when they wrote the Constitution, realized that such a vacuum, in which legal authority could not function, would be abhorrent and intolerable, and they deliberately decided that the authority of the Federal Government should be extended over this area.

THE PLAN OF WASHINGTON, MADISON, AND RANDOLPH

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 the so-called Virginia plan was brought in by Governor Randolph, of Virginia, supported by George Washington and James Madison, and was finally adopted by a vote of 8 States in favor and only 2 opposed. It read:

"*Resolved*, That the National Legislature ought—

"1. To possess the legislative rights vested in Congress by the Confederation; and

"2. Moreover, to legislate in all cases for the general interests of the Union, and

"3. Also in those to which the States are separately incompetent, or

"4. In which the harmony of the United States may be interrupted by the exercise of individual legislation."

This resolution, having been approved, was then sent to the Committee of Detail for drafting, and since no revision of the plan was thereafter discussed, it is evident that this plan was substantially written into the Constitution in the two clauses of section 8, article I, wherein it was provided that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; and "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States."

If these clauses of the existing Constitution are construed in the light of their origin, it becomes apparent that they were intended to provide, in accordance with the Virginia plan, for legislation "for the general interests of the Union" and in all cases where "the States are separately incompetent" or where "the harmony of the United States may be interrupted by the exercise of individual legislation."

Therefore, when the power to legislate for the general welfare or to regulate interstate commerce is now held restricted by the powers of the States to legislate in matters where the States plainly cannot provide for the general welfare and cannot regulate interstate commerce, the result is to deny to the Federal Government exactly that power which those who wrote the Constitution of the United States intended to confer upon the Federal Government. Such a doctrine does not take us "back to the Constitution" of our forefathers, but carries us away from the purposes and the wisdom of the Constitution as they wrote it. We are carried back behind the Constitution of the Union—back to the preceding Articles of Confederation which were inadequate to make us a nation.

DANGERS OF ABUSE OF POWER

It may be conceded that there are dangers in the grant of broad powers to the Congress to legislate in order to provide for the general welfare and to foster and to protect interstate commerce. But that is no basis for denying to the Federal Government the authority which no State can exercise and which it is essential to have exercised.

Justice Stone, in the dissenting opinion in *United States* v. *Butler* (the A. A. A. case) answered the contention that a clear Federal power should be restricted because of the danger of its abuse, in the following language:

"The suggestion that it must now be curtailed by judicial fiat because it may be abused by unwise use hardly rises to the dignity of argument. So may judicial power be abused."

The sound corrective for an abuse of power by a legislative body is, as Justice Stone asserted, an appeal "not to the courts but to the ballot and to the processes of democratic government."

If, in the opinion of a majority of the Supreme Court, a Federal law, in attempting to provide for the general welfare or to regulate interstate commerce, goes too far in the direction of controlling matters of local concern and in restricting the powers of local self-government, the decision of this issue of public policy should not finally rest upon the political or economic opinions of the judges, but upon the deliberate judgment of the people acting through their elected law-making representatives.

WHY AMEND THE CONSTITUTION?

Those who argue that a method of amending the Constitution is provided and should be followed if the people disagree with the Supreme Court, overlook the fact that what is needed, for example, in this present situation, is not a change in the Constitution, but a change in the construction placed upon the Constitution by a majority of the Supreme Court. The power granted in the Constitution to provide for the general welfare, or to regulate interstate commerce is redefined in every case presented to the Court, according to the opinions of the Justices, as to how far this power can be exercised to control local activities, because, for example, the Court has repeatedly held that activities wholly within one State can be regulated by the Federal Government when such regulation is necessary to protect and promote interstate commerce.

It is manifestly unsound to suggest that every time the Court redefines the extent of the Federal authority in order to answer the questions presented in a particular case, that construction ought not to be changed except by two-thirds of the Congress submitting an amendment for the approval of three-fourths of the States. The Court itself can overrule or modify its opinion within a week or a month or after several years. But if such a change in the law of the United States can only be made either by a change in the opinion of the Court or by a constitutional amendment, the judicial power is given a dominance over the legislative power which was never intended and in which in the long run will be intolerable in a democratic form of government wherein the legislative power conferred upon the elected representatives of the people should be, in fact as in name, the dominant law-making power. As Justice Holmes wrote long ago: "It must be remembered that legislators are the ultimate guardians of the liberties and welfare of the people in quite as great a degree as the courts" (194 U. S. 267).

AN APPROPRIATE CONSTITUTIONAL REMEDY

It would be wholly consistent with the principles of our Constitution to provide that when a law not clearly prohibited by definite language in the Constitution had been held constructively unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, then the Congress should have the authority to reenact the law, notwithstanding the construction placed upon the Constitution by the Supreme Court. To give opportunity for a previous expression of public opinion this authority might be conferred upon the Congress assembled after the next succeeding general election.

This suggestion follows the proposal made over 130 years ago by the greatest expounder of the Constitution in our entire history. In 1804, facing the threatened impeachment of a Justice of the Supreme Court, the great Chief Justice Marshall himself wrote:

"A reversal of those legal opinions deemed unwise by the Legislature would certainly better comport with the mildness of our character than a removal of the judge who has rendered them unknowing of his fault."

Following the same logic, if those debatable opinions of the Court which construe an indefinite requirement of the Constitution were deliberately reversed by the Congress of the United States, this procedure would better comport with the principles of our Government than a process of amending the Constitution itself in order simply to change the debatable construction placed on the Constitution by a majority of nine judges.

CONCLUSION

We shall not solve the constitutional difficulties of self-government by empowering any small group of men—no matter how learned, how far-seeing, and how wise—to determine the extent

to which the elected representatives of the people shall be permitted to enact laws, which in their judgment are necessary for the general welfare and are consistent with the principles and methods of government ordained in the Constitution of the United States.

The proposition that the public policies of the Nation shall be determined by the political and economic opinions of a small group of men holding office for life and not made responsible to any corrective power of public opinion is fundamentally undemocratic. It can only be supported by those who lack faith in popular government and are always seeking some method of establishing some benevolent autocracy which can be relied upon to save the people from themselves and to furnish a continuing protection for the more fortunate members of society against the pressure of the less fortunate.

But let there be no mistake. The ultimate aim of this undemocratic program is not to enthrone the judges as a benevolent autocracy. The judge who is convinced of his own superior wisdom and integrity of purpose is, however, a helpful instrument for denying lawmaking powers to the elected representatives of the people and of establishing a higher law than the statutes—a higher law which is not found in the clear requirements of the Constitution, but in the ever-changing construction of vague phrases.

Sanctimonious reverence is given to such judicial opinions when they aid large private interests to escape public obligations. Thus, economic powers are enabled to dominate political powers; and the private custodians of concentrated wealth are able to control public services. And thus is created, again, around the dominant figures in our economic system, the ancient divinity that once did "hedge a king", and citizens of a democracy are gradually transformed into subjects of an economic kingdom.

Those who would have the Constitution regarded as a sacred writing of divine origin, and then exalt the justices of the Supreme Court to the position of priests of an established religion, whose interpretations of this writing must be accepted as the authentic reading of divine commandments, are not engaged in perpetuating the institutions of a democracy. They are, in fact, seeking to reestablish the divine right of kings in another disguise. And to them the faithful defenders of constitutional liberty and the powers of self-government may well answer in the words of the poet who wrote:

"All we have of freedom, all we use or know—
This our fathers bought for us long and long ago.
* * * * *
Howso' great their clamour, whatsoe'er their claim,
Suffer not the old King under any name!"

PARK, PARKWAY, AND RECREATIONAL-AREA FACILITIES

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1611, being House bill 10104.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10104) to aid in providing the people of the United States with adequate facilities for park, parkway, and recreational-area purposes, and to provide for the transfer of certain lands chiefly valuable for such purposes to States and political subdivisions thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, without expressing an opinion concerning the merits of the bill, but in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry, I ask would not the motion, if it should prevail, run counter to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday and displace the unfinished business, the consideration of which has been merely postponed until Wednesday next?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate should now decide to adopt the motion submitted by the Senator from New York, on next Wednesday, if the bill covered by the motion should still be before the Senate, it would be displaced by the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday.

Mr. McNARY. Then, if the motion submitted by the Senator from New York should prevail, it would not displace the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would not displace the unfinished business. On next Wednesday morning the bill referred to by the Senator from New York would be displaced, if then under consideration, by what is known as the Norris rural-electrification bill.

Mr. McNARY. So, if the motion should prevail, and the bill referred to by the Senator from New York should continue under consideration until Wednesday next, at that time the unfinished business, which has been temporarily laid aside, would again become the unfinished business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator states the situation correctly.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10104) to aid in providing the people of the United States with adequate facilities for park, parkway, and recreational-area purposes, and to provide for the transfer of certain lands chiefly valuable for such purposes to States and political subdivisions thereof, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys was, in section 1, page 2, line 17, after the word "them", to strike out "and may accept unconditional donations and gifts from private agencies, instrumentalities, and individuals", so as to make the section read:

That the Secretary of the Interior (herein called "the Secretary") is authorized and directed to cause the National Park Service to make a comprehensive study, other than on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, of the public park, parkway, and recreational-area programs of the United States, and of the several States and political subdivisions thereof, and of the lands throughout the United States which are or may be chiefly valuable as such areas. The said study shall be such as, in the judgment of the Secretary, will provide data helpful in developing a plan for coordinated and adequate public park, parkway, and recreational-area facilities for the people of the United States. In making the said study and in accomplishing any of the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized and directed, through the National Park Service, to seek and accept the cooperation and assistance of Federal departments or agencies having jurisdiction of lands belonging to the United States, and may cooperate and make agreements with and seek and accept the assistance of other Federal agencies and instrumentalities, and of States, political subdivisions thereof, and the agencies and instrumentalities of either of them.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. May I have an explanation as to why that provision is proposed to be stricken out by the committee?

Mr. WAGNER. The provision relating to the acceptance of donations?

Mr. COUZENS. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. The expenses of making the survey are really devoted to financing a public function. They are not mere donations of property. Therefore, the committee felt that they ought to be borne by a governmental appropriation. There was apprehension that otherwise private individuals or institutions proposing to make such a donation might influence or even perhaps control the survey and the method of procedure.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. My attention was diverted when the section was read. Is it the object of the bill to procure a survey, as it were, of park possibilities?

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. It does not undertake to establish parks and does not authorize the establishment of parks in and of themselves?

Mr. WAGNER. No. The bill provides for a survey of lands in the United States for the purpose of ascertaining whether some of the property not otherwise needed may be transferred to a State for the purpose of having a coordinated park system. But such a transfer will not be allowed until first, the President of the United States approves; second, the department having the particular property under its jurisdiction approves; and third, Congress approves; so that in effect this proposal is merely for a report of a survey to the Congress. I think it is a very desirable measure.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does not the bill go a little further than indicated by the Senator? I notice in line 25, page 2, the word "establishing." It would seem that the bill contemplates not

only the necessary preliminary work to plan for parks but it goes further and uses the word "establishing." It not only proposes to plan parks, State or National, or both, but to establish the parks, State or National, or both.

Mr. WAGNER. That cannot be done until Congress actually approves the establishment of the parks.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill provides that the Secretary may transfer these lands. Apparently that may be done without the approval of Congress, but merely under a report to Congress.

Mr. WAGNER. In the first place, the President must approve; in the second place, the department having the property under its jurisdiction must approve; and in the third place, Congress must approve. The approval must be in the form of action within 100 days after the report is submitted to Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator contend that the failure of Congress to act would constitute approval? If the matter is reported to Congress and we for some reason do not act within 100 days, does that constitute approval?

Mr. WAGNER. If we were not in session, the matter would go over to the following session, and we should then have 100 days while Congress is in session.

Mr. CONNALLY. But Congress has to veto it affirmatively within 100 days, and if we do not, then the transfer becomes effective. I am not favorable to any such proposal.

Mr. WAGNER. This is not a new provision or a new suggestion. We advocated the same policy and had an identical provision in the case of the powers granted to the President to reduce duties; and the position of the Democratic Party several years ago was that his approval should not be final unless Congress also approved. I think 100 days is ample time to consider the question of the transfer of property.

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

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that so many transfers of public lands were made by executives without the authority of Congress that finally Congress enacted a law forbidding the transfer of lands except by the Congress, because under the Constitution of the United States, as the Senator well knows, Congress has full authority over the public lands, and the President of the United States has not.

I am not in favor of permitting the President of the United States or any department to transfer lands to States or to political subdivisions of the States. Any public domain that is transferred ought to have the affirmative approval of legislative enactment of the Congress of the United States. I share the apprehension expressed by the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in regard to this provision.

Mr. WAGNER. The desire of the committee was that when a plan had been agreed upon as desirable from the standpoint of contributing to the health and recreation of the people of the United States some action ought to be assured. That is the reason that the 100-day limitation was inserted in the bill. But I am not at all wedded to the idea. If it is the feeling of the Senate that before such property can be transferred it should receive the affirmative approval of the Congress without any limitation as to the time within which the approval shall be given, I shall not press the matter.

I think this is one of the most worthy and most important social measures that has been before the Congress. It provides for the health and recreation for the people of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator suggests a question now as to the necessity of Congress acting without limitation of time. I hope the Senator will amend eliminating that requirement.

Mr. WAGNER. I have just said I am not wedded to the idea. The committee thought that was a way to assure action by Congress, but if it is desired by the Senate that we remove this limitation upon the time during which Congress may approve, I am quite satisfied.

Mr. BORAH. I should very much prefer to have that limitation omitted.

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

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

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand this provision, it does not provide for transferring title from one department of the United States Government to another, but only for transfer to a State or subdivision of a State.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not similar to the proposals we have had up heretofore, authorizing the President to transfer the activities of one department to another department.

Mr. WAGNER. No; quite the contrary, I may say to the Senator. No transfer of this property may be made, even to a State, unless the head of the department having that property under his jurisdiction approves it. This was inserted to overcome the opposition there was to the original bill, based upon the apprehension that the old bill might have permitted transfers from one department to another.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that many of the States, including my own, are now actively engaged in the development of parks. It has become a source of great pride in some of the States to develop outstanding places of scenery and recreation for State park purposes; and, of course, there is cooperation between the State park departments and the National Park Service. As I understand, this provision is simply to enable the Federal Government to make transfers to the State park agencies which are developing local parks, in order that there may be coordination and cooperation between them.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes. I wish all the Senators could have had the privilege I had, along with some other members of the Public Lands and Surveys Committee, of visiting our national parks at the end of the last session. During our trip we had a number of hearings. Not only is there great local interest in these parks and their development but the appreciation which the public has of the accessibility of these parks to persons of moderate means was evidenced by the fact that this year, I am told, there was the largest attendance that there has been in the history of the parks. I desire to pay a tribute to our National Parks Service for the magnificent way in which the parks are run for the benefit of our citizens.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I quite agree with the view which the Senator expresses; but I do want the bill so framed that Congress may have a voice in the ultimate determination.

Mr. WAGNER. If some amendment of that kind is offered, I am quite willing to have it adopted.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I ask the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. Would not this amendment meet the criticism just made?

On line 7, page 3, strike out the words "the President of the United States" and insert "Congress", so as to read:

> That for the purposes of this act, and subject to the approval of Congress, the Secretary is authorized to transfer—

And so forth.

That is now the law with respect to the public domain. No transfer may be made of the public domain today except by act of Congress, and when Congress approves, of course, that means the President of the United States.

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Would it not be better, on pages 4 and 5, beginning at line 25 on page 4, to strike out the remainder of the paragraph down to section 6 on page 5? In other words, strike out beginning at the words "after the expiration of 100 calendar days" and ending with the words "special session", just before section 6, and substitute therefor "when approved by Congress." It seems to me that would make it very simple.

Mr. WAGNER. That would be all right. I will say to the Senator that I think that amendment is preferable. There is the feeling among the various departments that one may,

in its activities, invade the province of another. The amended language will still require the approval of the department having jurisdiction, even before it comes to Congress.

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

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am afraid the Senator's suggested amendment, at the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5, will not cover the entire situation, because it refers only to transfers under subsection (1) of section 4, on the same page. Section 3 provides for transfers with the approval of the President to the States and subdivisions of the States; so if what the Senator is trying to do is to provide that any transfer, either under section 3 or under section 4, must be approved by Congress, he does not do it by the amendment he has suggested.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the transfer is really limited to the land set forth in section 4, as I read the bill. For instance, on lines 15 and 17 of section 3, it is provided:

> In the event that title to or jurisdiction over any land described in section 4 hereof is held in the name of any Federal agency or instrumentality, the Secretary is authorized to accept transfer thereof on behalf of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WAGNER. While the discussion is going on I should like to inquire where the amendment ought to be made, since it is apparently the desire of the Senate to make it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, while the Senator is making the investigation, will he yield?

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. It seems to me the amendment I have suggested meets the whole situation, and it is in conformity with existing law.

Mr. WAGNER. That may be true.

Mr. KING. Under the present law—and Congress forced that law through because, as I said, of the making of unwise and inexpedient withdrawals of public domain by the Executive—Congress said that no transfer of the public domain shall be made without the approval of Congress. It put into effect the constitutional provision that Congress has jurisdiction over all public domain.

Mr. WAGNER. Will the Senator permit me to examine the matter? Perhaps the Senator is right. In that event we probably should have to strike out section 5; but that would take only a moment.

Mr. KING. If this transfer is to be made by Congress, that is all that is needed. Then the National Park Service may prepare their plans and submit them to Congress, and if Congress enacts a law permitting the transfer the park will be established. Otherwise it will not be. I desire Congress to have the final say; not the President; not any department of the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment? I desire to get his amendment clearly in my mind.

As I recall, he suggested that on page 3, line 7, the words "the President of the United States" be stricken out and "Congress" inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. That, then, would make all transfers under the bill require the approval of Congress.

Mr. KING. Absolutely.

Mr. HATCH. If that should be done, section 5 could be eliminated entirely.

Mr. KING. I think so.

Mr. WAGNER. I think so, too; but let us see.

Mr. KING. Let the Park Service make the surveys and submit them in concrete form, with recommendations as to the lands to be transferred. Then, if Congress desires to transfer the lands, if it desires to alienate the territory of which it is the trustee, it may do so; but I am not willing to leave to any department, or to the President of the United States, authority to transfer the public domain.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that section 3 applies to all transfers under the bill, and not simply to those under section 3, it seems that the language suggested in section 3 should be sufficient to cover transfers under sections 3 and 4, because it refers to the bill instead of merely to the section.

Mr. WAGNER. I think if the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah should be accepted, it would obviate the necessity of section 5 of the bill.

Mr. KING. I think so.

Mr. McKELLAR. It might as well be stricken out entirely.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; it might be eliminated entirely. Does the Senator from Utah desire to offer the amendment?

Mr. KING. I do. Of course, I do not wish to offer anything that is inexpedient or improper; but it does seem to me that we ought to follow the course which Congress has pursued after calm deliberation, and because of the invasions by executive and other departments of the rights of Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the object may be accomplished by striking out "the President of the United States" and inserting "Congress."

Mr. KING. Exactly. That was the amendment I offered.

Mr. BORAH. Has that motion been made?

Mr. KING. I offer that amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. That is quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is an amendment pending, if the Senator from New York wishes to speak on that amendment; but I am protesting against the Senator from New York concluding the matter by accepting the amendment without any debate. I wish to debate the amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not attempting to conclude the matter. My views were asked, and I have said that, so far as I am concerned, I approve the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is on page 2.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah; but it does not cure the matter simply to insert "with the approval of the President." All of section 5 ought to come out.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; I said that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Furthermore, Mr. President, I desire to submit some remarks on the whole bill.

Frankly, I think this bill is of much more importance and more far-flung than Senators realize. Let us see what it does.

In section 1 the bill authorizes, supposedly, merely a survey by the Secretary of the Interior of the park facilities of the United States and of the several States and political subdivisions—all the State parks. Very well. Let us see what else the bill proposes to do after this study shall have been made.

The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with States and their subdivisions and with subdivisions and instrumentalities of the Federal Government; and then at the end of the bill there is a general authorization of any amounts Congress may see fit to appropriate for all these purposes.

Section 2 directs the Secretary to aid the States in planning and establishing such areas. The bill commits the Federal Government to going out and making agreements with States and political subdivisions about their parks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to ask a question of the Senator from New York?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much is it estimated it is going to cost to make this survey?

Mr. WAGNER. We were told by the representatives of the Interior Department that no appropriation at all would be necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill provides for an appropriation.

Mr. WAGNER. An authorization.

Mr. McKELLAR. An authorization; and wherever there is an authorization, an appropriation is always asked for.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, section 2 gives the Secretary of the Interior blanket authority to go out and

negotiate with States for planning their parks and establishing them. What does it mean by "establishing"?

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do.

Mr. LOGAN. That is true; section 2 does give the right to cooperate with the States to plan and to join in the establishment of parks; but sections 3 and 4 limit the part the Secretary may have in the establishment of parks. That is, certain lands which, after investigation, are found to be fitted for recreational or park purposes may be transferred to the States. The Secretary may not establish parks under this bill in any other way, or take any part in their establishment except to transfer the land.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me first answer the Senator from Kentucky, and then I will be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

What the Senator says is very true, but the Senator knows that the experience with the departments is that when we give these blanket authorizations they come to the Congress and want the money. Then a State may say, "You have broken faith with us unless you appropriate the money. The Secretary of the Interior told us that he was going to establish this park, and now we want the money."

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, he complains that we are proposing to give power to a member of the Park Service to make a survey of State recreational facilities.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not object to that, but I am talking about the authority to establish, authorizing them to go out and join a State in establishing a park.

Mr. WAGNER. The bill refers to the establishment of the area, but before anything can be done by way of transfer to a State Congress has to approve. There is no better way of safeguarding the matter. To present additional obstacles is tantamount to disagreeing with the whole venture.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that I am not out of sympathy with the establishment of parks; I am for it in all proper cases. But I am not favorable to Congress delegating to the Director of National Parks, or to anyone else, the sweeping and almost unheard of powers which this bill proposes.

Mr. WAGNER. I have tried to emphasize, and I think the provisions of the bill sustain my position, that all this bill does is to authorize the making of a survey, in order to ascertain what the recreational facilities of the States are, and what properties the Federal Government owns which may be useful to States in the development of a coordinated park system. After that is done, Congress will determine whether the transfers should be made and the parks established.

Mr. CONNALLY. That will be true, probably, if the suggested amendment shall be adopted, but that is not what the Senator from New York wanted. He wanted the bill as it was written, and that is what I am protesting against. The very fact that he is willing so quickly to abandon it shows how vicious it is.

Mr. WAGNER. Those are very unkind words.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are not meant to be unkind.

Mr. WAGNER. The entire Committee on Public Lands, which is composed of very conscientious Members of this body——

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely.

Mr. WAGNER. They all agreed to this plan. As a matter of fact, I have less knowledge upon this subject than the other members of the committee. I am guided a good deal by them. So I do not claim all the credit, nor do I deserve all of the criticism which has been showered upon me.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I retract any loose diatribes which may have been expressed by me or anyone else. I should like to have the Senator's attention if I am to reply to him. I think the Senator, after shooting me below the collar, should, at least, give me the courtesy of listening to what I am trying to say to him.

Mr. WAGNER. If the Senator is offended by anything I have said, I withdraw it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not offended, but I do say that the Senator is unusually disturbed in thinking I had any personal reference about this bill. I am speaking legislatively. I say I think it is a bad bill. That is no reflection on the Senator or on the committee, because there are many bad bills which come before the Congress—many bad bills come out of committees. I am not attacking the Senator's good faith, but I say it is a bad bill as it was reported, and the Senator acknowledges that, because he forswears the biggest part of it, willingly and gladly, when he is shown how bad it is.

Now let us see what section 3 provides. I said the bill gave unheard-of power to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. Before the Senator leaves section 2, I should like to ask him whether he believes that the authority granted therein to the Secretary of the Interior, where he is authorized to aid the several States, would permit the Secretary of the Interior to commit the Federal Government to the expenditure of Federal funds in the planning and establishment of such areas?

Mr. CONNALLY. It might not in a binding fashion, but it would certainly do so morally and put the Congress in the attitude of having the States come here and say, "You have pledged it and caused us to spend a lot of money making surveys and plans, and now you are not carrying out the project."

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. With reference to the question propounded by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON], of course, as a practical matter, we understand that there is and ought to be cooperation between the State park departments and the National Park Service. All this means, as I understand it, is that through the National Park Service the Federal Government may cooperate with the States in the matter of making surveys of national parks or of State parks. It may put at the disposal of a State park commissioner, for instance, the facilities of the National Park Service, and aid them in any proper way in deciding whether there shall be a park area set aside. I do not understand that it authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make any allotment of funds to a State park.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not so contend, and have not so contended. I say specifically that legally it would not be binding on the Federal Government, but if we authorize the Secretary to aid the States in planning and establishing parks, then they will come back to the Congress and will want the Congress to approve what has been done, which will put the Congress in the attitude of acceding or repudiating his actions and offending the States.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McADOO. Does not the Senator from Texas think it would be advisable to omit the words "and establishing", in line 25?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do.

Mr. McADOO. I think that is a dangerous feature of the section.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so.

Mr. McADOO. I see no objection to the bill being passed giving power to plan or consider, so that the matter may be submitted to the Congress for final action, but I think the words "and establishing" bring up an important question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. His interruption is quite in point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is only a substitute for language which is stricken out, which was in the bill as it passed the House, and which included more than we included here. The language of the bill as it passed the House was "planning, establishing, improving, and maintaining." The Senate committee has stricken out that language, and limited the authority of the Secretary to "planing and establishing."

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senate committee amendment could be amended by striking out the words "and establishing."

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know whether the Senator has reached the point or not, but I do not understand the language in lines 13 and 14 in section 3.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was just coming to that.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. What is proposed in section 3 of the bill? The proponents of the bill are not content with giving authority to the Secretary to dispose of any lands the Federal Government may now own, but the bill provides:

That for the purposes of this act, and subject to the approval of the President of the United States, the Secretary is authorized to transfer to any State or political subdivision thereof by lease, for such terms as he may deem best—

It is up to the Secretary to give away, by lease or otherwise, the public domain—

or by patent, such right, title, or interest in or to the land described in section 4 hereof as he may deem advisable: *Provided*, That all minerals in the land patented or leased shall be reserved to the United States. No lands shall be transferred, however, except with the approval of the head of the department having jurisdiction thereof.

Is that the language to which the Senator from Idaho referred?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it seemed to me that provision placed the power back in the hands of the Department with reference to the matter of transfer.

Mr. CONNALLY. It does, in effect; because while Congress, under the proposed amendment, would have to approve it, Congress could not approve it unless first it had been endorsed by the head of the Department.

Mr. BORAH. Not only that, but it would seem that even if the Secretary did approve it, it could not be transferred.

Mr. CONNALLY. Unless the amendment should be made very clear, that would be possible.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. That provision was inserted because of the apprehension of the Department of Agriculture that some of the national forests might be transferred without the consent of the Department. In order to assure everyone that no such transfer could be made without the consent of the head of the department concerned, this limitation was put into the bill. In addition, the whole thing is subject to the approval of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will be if this amendment shall be adopted.

Mr. WAGNER. It was before.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. WAGNER. We will not quarrel about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will get to that in a moment.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In just a moment I will yield.

I do not want to quarrel with the Senator from New York, though he seems very much disposed to do so. I am a man of peace, and I refuse to be drawn into any acrimonious discussion on this or any other matter with the Senator from New York. In fact, I am somewhat in the mood of the Senator from Illinois some years ago, when he was challenged by a Senator on the other side of the Senate in these words:

I hope the Senator from Illinois will not draw his sword on the Senator from New Hampshire.

The Senator from Illinois replied:

Mr. President, allow me to assure the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that if the Senator from Illinois ever points his sword at the Senator from New Hampshire, it will be tipped with a rose.

[Laughter.]

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky; but before I do so I wish now to paraphrase, in the case of the Senator from New York, the language heretofore used by the Senator from Illinois. If the Senator from Texas ever draws a weapon on the Senator from New York, it will be a toy pistol.

Mr. WAGNER. Fine! I never carry any kind of weapon, so the Senator is safe so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senators will not toy with each other about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I now yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I wish to find out whether I understand the present situation.

As I understand, the only disagreement between the Senator from New York and the Senator from Texas arises by reason of the fact that under the original bill when a transfer was made it had to go to Congress, and Congress had a right to disapprove it within 100 days; and if Congress did not disapprove it——

Mr. CONNALLY. Then it became final.

Mr. LOGAN. Yes; if Congress did not disapprove the transfer it became final.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator from Texas, knowing the habits of Congress and that at times it is a little somnolent and sleepy, is afraid Congress might not find out about it in 100 days.

Mr. CONNALLY. And very important matters may press us.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, if I understand the pending bill, I am very much for it. If I do not understand it, I desire the Senator from Texas to put me right.

As I comprehend the bill, it gives the Department of Agriculture power to make investigations in the States concerning their recreational facilities, their parks, and matters of that kind. Then it gives the departments having control of public lands power to make investigations to find out whether some of the lands owned by those departments will fit in with State projects, and the departments are authorized to convey their lands to the States. Therefore it is necessary to establish park areas in conjunction with the Federal Government. After the investigation has been made and it is found that some department of the Government owns land which will fit into a State project and is suitable for that purpose, that department has the power to transfer the land to the State or the municipality, provided Congress approves the transfer. Is not that about all there is to the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. With the proposed amendment; yes.

Mr. LOGAN. I assumed, for the purpose of my question, that the amendment was accepted.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not yet adopted.

Mr. LOGAN. As I understand the Senator from Texas, he thinks the amendment will be adopted, but he is going to make a speech against the bill on the idea that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am now speaking on the amendment. It is up for consideration, and I am speaking on it.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not see the harm which the Senator anticipates could flow from the enactment of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not the Senator from Kentucky in favor of the amendment?

Mr. LOGAN. I shall vote for it, but I do not care whether or not it is adopted. I do not think it makes any difference one way or another. I do not think Congress, however slow it is going to be, will allow a matter like that to be overlooked for a whole hundred days while Congress is in session.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have known Congress to overlook much more important matters than that for longer periods than 100 days.

The disagreement between the Senator from New York and myself is this: He insists that under the terms of the original bill the Department is required to submit its report to Congress, and if it does submit its report and Congress takes no action within 100 days such failure to act becomes the approval of Congress. I submit that such failure to act is not the approval of Congress. It could only be what it is—the omission or failure of Congress to act.

That is not affirmative approval by Congress; and I insist that before these wholesale alienations of public lands shall be effectuated, the affirmative approval of Congress shall be had.

If any Senator objects to that, I am sorry; that is all. I am glad to have convinced the Senator from Kentucky to the extent that he is going to vote for the amendment, though he did not care anything about whether or not it was adopted.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not think there is a single Senator in the body who has expressed any intention of voting against the amendment. The Senator from Texas is trying to prove a case that seems already to have been well proven.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator, because I have tried to prove it. Let us look at section 4. I am talking about the bill. I do not believe it had thorough consideration in the committee, and that is no reflection on the chairman of the committee.

What does section 4 provide? It contains the language "any land heretofore or hereafter acquired"—any land that the Federal Government may own. We know that throughout the United States there are literally hundreds of old post-office sites, valuable property in the cities of this country, worth millions of dollars in the total. Every city would be glad to have these old sites converted into public squares or public parks.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. I ask the Senator if he will not read section 3 and then read the limitation imposed upon section 3 by section 4. The difficulty the Senator is laboring under is that he has stopped before reading all of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. LOGAN. The power to alienate, as conferred in section 3, is limited to the property defined and described in section 4. Post-office buildings and other buildings of that kind do not fall within the limitation. They are excluded by the limitation in section 4.

Mr. CONNALLY. Where is the limitation in section 4?

Mr. LOGAN. It requires that only those properties which are suitable for park and recreational facilities and things of that kind shall be used in conjunction with the State or municipality.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right, Mr. President; I accept the Senator's construction. He is a distinguished lawyer, and I follow the court.

The Senator says the alienation applies only to such property as the Secretary of the Interior regards as proper for park purposes. What would be more proper and more appropriate for a park purpose than a piece of property situated in a great crowded city containing a post-office site on the public square? It would not take a Secretary of the Interior to know that that would make a fine park area or a plaza or a square giving that city a breathing space.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McADOO. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas that I think his point is well made; and I cite him to the city of New York, where the old Federal building, which has now been abandoned for the new one, stands adjoining the City Hall Square. It is a very valuable property; and, as I read the pending bill, the power is conferred to transfer property of that kind.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Congress thinks it should be.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. BARKLEY rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. He has been on his feet several times.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to give the Senator from Texas some instances in my State.

The Government has acquired various Mexican and Spanish land grants, from 20,000 acres up to 60,000 acres. While we are in sympathy with the policy of the National Park Service, under this bill those lands could be used only for national-park purposes. While we have considerable worry as to where we are going to feed our stock, which under present economic circumstances is of more vital importance than additional parks, these lands would be made into national-park areas in order to provide a place for us to go on a Sunday picnic, but would not permit us to take care of the present-day depression.

It is not only important that some of these lands be used for national-park purposes but it is most important that they be used as a means of providing existence for the people of the State. Conditions of that sort arise also in other States.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Right along the point suggested by the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], I think the amendment which is going to be adopted——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky states with some assurance that the amendment is going to be adopted. I cannot say that that is the case.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not make the statement with any assurance. I take it for granted that the amendment is going to be adopted. The amendment has been suggested, and those in charge of the bill have agreed to accept it, and I think we may assume that it will go through without any great amount of trouble. It might shorten the debate to have a vote on the amendment and decide whether or not to adopt it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for suggesting that I vacate the floor; but I have been very generous with the Senator, and have already yielded to him three times during this discussion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know the Senator has done so. The Senator is always instructive and entertaining when he speaks, and I would not for anything be the means of taking him from the floor. It might clarify the situation, however, to have a vote taken on the question as to whether we shall adopt the amendment; and if it shall be defeated, then all these arguments against the amendment may be justified.

Getting back to the point under consideration, in the city of Louisville a new post-office building was built and the old one abandoned, in the very heart of the city. My colleague from Kentucky and I have made every possible effort to induce the various departments of the Federal Government to use the old abandoned building instead of renting space all over town for the activities of the Federal Government; but inspectors have examined the old building and reported adversely upon it, saying it would cost more money to renovate the old building than to pay rent.

I myself do not see any objection to the Federal Government donating to the city or the county that property, located in the very heart of the city, in order that the old building may be cleared off and the land turned into a park for the benefit of the people. I am not asking that it be done—and it cannot be done under this bill—but there are many such instances where it could be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. It cannot be done unless the bill is amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill is going to be amended; but there are many instances of that sort where the Federal Government has property which is not in use at all and is only a roosting place for bats and owls, an eyesore to the community in which it exists; a place which ought to be used for some useful purpose. In such a city, where our forefathers were rather short-sighted, as in most cities, with respect to providing recreational and park areas for the benefit of the people, I cannot imagine a finer use to which such land may be put than to make it into a park, where the people may gather for recreational purposes.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully appreciate the observations of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]; but we are faced with a very difficult problem. We feel very deeply sympathetic toward the policy of the National Park Service, and we know that there are many areas in the West which may be utilized for national-park purposes; but we are also interested in grazing. In my particular State hundreds of thousands of acres have been acquired by agencies of the Federal Government, and we insist that it is just as easy and of just as much importance to use those particular lands for grazing purposes as for park purposes, in order to make a living for the people in the community. It is just as important to do that as it is to allow somebody to go there on Sundays to enjoy the place for recreation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I agree with that statement; but the bill provides that such transfer which is to be made by Congress, if the amendment shall be adopted, shall be of lands that are particularly fitted for park purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But who decides that?

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress will, in that case.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In my opinion, section 4 practically gives complete authority to the National Park Service.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not sure, but I think the Senator has misapprehensions about this particular legislation.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas permit me to interrupt him further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WAGNER. What this bill provides is that, subject to the approval of Congress, Federal lands which may be useful for recreational purposes and which a State may desire for a coordinated park system may be transferred to the State. To do so it will be necessary, first, to obtain the consent of the Federal Government through Congress, and then there must be a desire on the part of the State to have the transfer made. There is nothing in the bill which authorizes the Federal Government to go into a State and confiscate territory or take away grazing property or to use any property for purposes other than the Congress and the State have agreed upon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And the lands which have been acquired by the Federal Government will not be transferred until a bill shall be passed.

Mr. WAGNER. Is the Senator speaking of lands in his State which are owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am speaking of lands which have been acquired by the Federal Government.

Mr. WAGNER. In the Senator's State?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; in my State.

Mr. WAGNER. Unless the State desires their retransfer to the State, there is nothing in this bill which will affect the existing situation. I feel sure that the Senator did not understand the provisions of the bill in that respect.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to be courteous to the Senators, but I hope I will not be interrupted, as I wish to conclude my remarks.

The Senator from Texas is chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and he knows to be true what the Senator from California says about old post-office sites throughout the country. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds receive a great many communications requesting that valuable public sites, worth millions of dollars, be given away simply on the plea that they will make nice parks. I think the Federal Government is under no obligation to furnish people within the States their own parks. I should like to see the Government cooperate in establishing parks or any other public improvements, but if the people do not want them badly enough to put up some of their money, they are not going to do them or anybody else much good.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CONNALLY. While I asked not to be interrupted, I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. WAGNER. If it does not disturb the Senator——

Mr. CONNALLY. Not at all. The Senator's interruptions ornament the debate.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the Senator for his compliment. Even if undeserved, it is pleasant to hear.

The Senator from California gave as a hypothetical case the transfer of property in New York City, upon which the old post office is now located and which under this bill might be used for park purposes. It so happens that I was connected originally with the legislation that provided for the construction of the new courthouse and new post office. In that legislation it was provided that upon the construction of the new courthouse—and the city of New York made a contribution of the property to the Federal Government—the title to the old courthouse would be transferred to the city of New York. So the Senator has chosen a very unfortunate illustration.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from California was unfortunate in the allusion, but the Senator from New York was fortunate that the city got the property.

Mr. WAGNER. We gave more to the Federal Government than was received in return.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not know that that situation existed. I absolve myself; I did not know anything about it; and I hope the Senator from New York will draw no unpleasant deductions.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McADOO. I may say that I think the city of New York was extremely fortunate in getting the legislation about which my distinguished friend from New York has informed us. I was not familiar with that condition, and I was using it only as an illustration. If, of course, the title still remains in the Federal Government a transfer could be effectuated under this bill.

Let me say just a word further. I am in sympathy with the general purposes of the bill, but I do not think the interests of the General Government are sufficiently protected against possible transfers or possible commitments which I think ought, in their finality, to be approved affirmatively by the Congress, and I am in sympathy with the view that it would be well to reconstruct the bill so as to give more effective protection to the Federal interests than is provided in the bill as now drafted. That is the only idea I have in mind in connection with the measure.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I do not want to let go unanswered the suggestion that the Federal Government conferred upon New York City a great favor in transferring this property, the old post-office site, to New York City. In return for that transfer the city gave property which I think—and as was established by an appraiser—was worth more than what the Federal Government gave to the city of New York.

Mr. McADOO. May I interrupt the Senator there to say that I do not dispute that? But it is not material.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator said that the city of New York was fortunate.

Mr. McADOO. It is not material to the point I was making, because I only used it as illustrative, upon the theory that such a transfer had not as yet been accomplished.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California simply meant that if that could happen in New York City it could happen anywhere.

Mr. McADOO. Yes. As I recall the situation, I think the site of this building was originally a part of the City Hall Park.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; and it belonged to the city of New York.

Mr. McADOO. And the city of New York conveyed it, for a consideration, to the Federal Government. I think the Government paid money for it, and the exchange of properties was, therefore, perfectly proper and was provided for in the original law. But the point I was making, in supple-

menting the argument of the Senator from Texas, was that where no such condition exists, under the bill, as I read it hurriedly, I think the Government might be committed to the transfer perhaps of very valuable property without any further affirmative action on the part of Congress. I think the bill should be safeguarded more effectively than has been done in the measure as reported to the Senate.

Mr. WAGNER. While the Senator is addressing himself to a proposed amendment, let me say that I think an amendment has been generally accepted, and with that amendment all the safeguards that can possibly be provided are provided, namely, that nothing can happen until Congress approves.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to, but I have not consulted the Senators around me. I have only heard the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky give assurances that it is going to be done, and I have no right to assume that other Senators are not going to express their own wishes and views when the time comes to vote.

Mr. President, in addition to the old post-office sites throughout the country there are many Army posts which have been abandoned or are not used by the Government; there are all sorts of public property of that kind throughout the United States which under this bill as drawn could be given away by the Secretary of the Interior on the theory that the property will make nice parks. So, Mr. President, I think this bill ought to go back to the committee for redrafting; and I move, therefore, that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

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

Mr. KING. I wish to make a few remarks in my own time.

(At this point Mr. SMITH gave notice that on Monday, Mar. 2, 1936, he would ask the Senate to consider the veto message of the President on the crop production loan bill (S. 3612); and Mr. LEWIS secured permission to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. PITTMAN. Both matters appear under the appropriate headings elsewhere in today's RECORD.)

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 report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes.

PARK, PARKWAY, AND RECREATIONAL-AREA FACILITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10104) to aid in providing the people of the United States with adequate facilities for park, parkway, and recreational-area purposes, and to provide for the transfer of certain lands chiefly valuable for such purposes to States and political subdivisions thereof.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Chair understand that I made a motion to recommit the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I made a motion a moment ago that the pending bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recommit, then, is pending. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to avail himself of the motion to recommit?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I desire to address myself to the bill. I wish to say, for the benefit of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], that while I am in thorough accord with the general objectives of the pending bill I am in sympathy with his motion to recommit the bill for further consideration, because I think it should be given more thought, in order that it may be of benefit not only to the Federal and State Governments, but particularly to the people of the entire United States.

I wish also to avail myself of this opportunity to say something in reference to the national parks and to the desirability and advantages of travel within the confines of the United States. I believe at this hour there is no subject matter we can discuss which is of more interest to all the people of the United States than that of the pending bill, because in no remote way it interests itself in travel. Travel is today intimately connected with the educational facilities of the country. Of course, we in this country are more deeply interested in educational facilities than are the peoples of any other country upon the face of the earth.

Likewise I shall be perfectly frank and candid in stating that I am delighted to have this opportunity in order that I may give to my State some advertising of its great national park, which I contend is the greatest national park in the United States. At this moment I am delighted to avail myself of the opportunity to proclaim to the entire world that in my beloved and heavenly section of western North Carolina there are presented for the national eye the most beautiful things to be found anywhere on this great hemisphere. I refer to the great Smoky Mountain National Park of western North Carolina and eastern Tennessee, the eastern entrance of which is to be found in my home town of Asheville, N. C., known as the Little Gem City of the continent. A more delightful, a more lovely spot than my home city of Asheville, N. C., cannot be found anywhere upon the face of the earth.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will admit that our sister State of Kentucky is likewise possessed of a great natural beauty in the form of Mammoth Cave.

Mr. WAGNER rose.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The State of New York presents to the American people some of the most interesting historic places of this entire continent, because it was in the city of New York that the beloved Father of his Country first took the oath of office as President of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Even Wyoming [laughter] can boast of the largest national park in America and some of the most beautiful scenery to be found anywhere. In addition thereto it boasts of a most magnificent State house at Cheyenne and one of the finest airports in America.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I simply want publicly to accept the Senator's invitation and to inquire when he will be at home for the reception of visitors. [Laughter.]

Mr. REYNOLDS. I may say to my eminent friend from Kentucky that I shall always be at home to receive him or any Member of this body or anybody else in the United States, so far as that is concerned. I may say further that in extending that invitation I assure my good friend from Kentucky that the latchstring is always on the outside and the dog is dead. [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to my good friend from Utah.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator in enumerating the great parks of the land will not forget the scenic beauties of the great State of Utah. We have the finest parks in the world except, of course, those in North Carolina, and some of us think they surpass even the beauteous Smoky Mountain Park.

Mr. GLASS rose.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator from Utah for his contribution, and I am delighted to yield to my beloved friend from Virginia, who just rose.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I simply desire to extend a cordial invitation to my friend from North Carolina and others to forget their provincialism and visit the Shenandoah Valley Park of Virginia, the greatest State on earth. [Laughter.]

Mr. REYNOLDS. That was one of the very first things I did, because I knew I could not properly recognize and appreciate the beauties of western North Carolina until I had seen all of our great historic sister State of Virginia, of which my friend has just spoken.

In answer to that which has been stated by my eminent friend from the State of Utah, I wish to say that his is a fine State. The State of Utah, as we all know, is, from an historic standpoint, one of the most interesting of all the States, and it has aided greatly in the development of this the greatest country on earth. Last summer while there I visited his State capitol building. Next to the capitol building of the State of Louisiana, I believe I did not see anything that was more inspiring than the capitol building I found atop the hill which overlooks the great city of Salt Lake City. In addition to that, while there last September, I had an opportunity to drive at the rate of 80 or 85 miles an hour over the great salt beds on my way from Salt Lake City, the capital of Utah, to the border line of Nevada. I quite agree with the Senator from Utah that he has a great State, and I shall go further in saying that the people of Utah have a great Senator.

Mr. President, I am interested in this subject because I am interested in the youth of our country. I am interested in this question because I know that educational facilities of the proper sort must be provided the youth of our land. I know there is no more lasting, no broader, no more liberal education to be attained than that derived from travel. It is concerning that which I want to speak.

Incidentally, when the matter was being considered a moment ago my friend the junior Senator from the great State of New York [Mr. WAGNER] mentioned the facilities to be provided the people of this country for travel and recreation by way of opportunities to visit our great national parks where he was last summer. That is a matter for very serious consideration. When we were considering that suggestion a moment ago I was reminded of the fact that last year my friend the colleague of the junior Senator from New York—and I refer to the able senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]—introduced in this body Senate bill 33, entitled "An act to encourage travel to and within the United States by citizens of foreign countries, and for other purposes." Mr. President, if a measure of that kind is to be considered by this body, I think it should be entitled "An act to encourage travel to and within the United States by citizens of the United States, and for no other purpose."

I wish to remind the Members of the Senate that the steel industry is not the largest industry on earth, that transportation by railroads and steamships is not the greatest industry on earth; but, sirs, one of the largest industries on earth, as large as those I have mentioned, if not larger, is the industry of travel. That is one thing in which we must now interest ourselves, for it is our duty to teach Americans first to see America before they venture across the blue waters of the Atlantic or the wind-swept surface of the Pacific.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGILL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Gladly.

Mr. KING. The statement just made by my friend about seeing America first reminds me of the fact that a Virginian, one of the most talented men that ever came to the State of Utah, was for a number of years secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Salt Lake City. He was indefatigable in his efforts to induce people to visit the West and the parks. He devised the slogan which for years and years was copied in many States, and was upon many letterheads—See America First. That sentence as a slogan emanated from Hon. Fisher Harris, a great Virginian, who was a distinguished resident of the State of Utah.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I gladly yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina if he does not think, however, the bill ought to go back to the committee for redrafting, in view of its high purposes?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have so stated, Mr. President. I unhesitatingly concede that to be true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] will let the bill go back to the committee, because a great many Senators are not satisfied with it in its present form. I think the Senator will save time if he will agree to let the bill be recommitted. Frankly, I think the bill will be voted down if that shall not be done.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in order to appreciate the greatness of America it is necessary for Americans to see America. I again say I am thankful to my colleague from the State of Utah for telling me that it was a Virginian who went to his State years ago and coined the phrase, "See America First." I was delighted to learn that he had been an official of the chamber of commerce in the State of Utah. At this time I wish to give credit where credit is due and state to the Senator from Utah that the chamber of commerce in Salt Lake City bears the enviable reputation of being one of the most active chambers of commerce in the entire United States. It was there, last September, that I was honored by Governor Blood of that great State by way of an invitation to attend a banquet given by the members of the chamber in Salt Lake City in honor of our Secretary of War, Mr. Dern; and I have never met a more hospitable, a more active people in all my travels.

I am interested in having Americans see America before they venture across the borders to our north and likewise before they venture across the borders to our south. I am particularly interested in having the younger people of this country observe the wonders, the great industrial centers, the historic spots, here at home before they venture across either the Atlantic or the Pacific. In other words, I want the people of America to see America first. I want the people of America to recognize and to realize what they have here at home before they venture to foreign shores, and I want them to do that because I want them to spend their money at home rather than spend their money abroad.

We know that too much American money is finding its way particularly to continental Europe, because if we have made a study of one subject that is of vital interest to us, we know that since the crash of October 1929 millions of persons, including large numbers of foreigners and aliens, have been upon public charity, sustained by the Government, and that from the money they have received from the F. E. R. A. and other Government sources $250,000,000 has gone out of this country to the pockets and the homes of those who reside 3,000 miles from here, across the blue waters of the Atlantic.

Gentlemen of the Senate, I wish to have American money as much as possible remain at home, because those who have given any study whatever to the matter know that year after year millions upon millions of American dollars are going into foreign lands in the form of moneys expended by American travelers in continental Europe and in the great Orient across the Pacific.

Mr. President, that is opposition. That is keen competition; but we have more competition. Only recently there has been opened a fine highway leading from Laredo to Monterey in the hill country of Mexico, south of us, and onward to the capital of our sister Republic of Mexico, with its 15,000,000 inhabitants. In addition to that, we know that we face competition north of us from those residing within the confines of the Dominion of Canada, where they have provided excellent highways of all kinds extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, clear across the Dominion. So we not only face competition in keeping American dollars at home from those who would expend them to be informed by way of travel abroad, but at this hour we find that we have competition to the north of us and to the south of us.

Mr. President, I am confident that you realize—if I may thus address the Chair—as do I, and as I stated a moment ago, that no form of education is more beneficial, more lasting, more indelible, more liberal than the education ob-

tained by travel. For years upon years I have been preaching that doctrine. I have been speaking in the public schools of my State and elsewhere at times as one of the executives of the American Automobile Association in an endeavor to have the people of America see America first. The people of America, however, have had the erroneous notion that it costs too much to travel in America, and that there is nothing in America to see. There are more interesting things in America for Americans to see than in any other part of the entire world; and after we have seen the interesting things in America I contend that the country which holds out for us the next greatest interest is the country of Mexico, south of us.

Many persons think it costs too much to travel in this country. I wish to convince Americans that it does not cost anything to travel in this country in comparison with what it costs to travel in Europe. Why? Why am I so interested in convincing our people that it is cheaper to travel in America than to travel in Europe or in any other part of the world? Because I want the 80,000,000 persons who reside within 18 hours by automobile of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park to visit my section of the United States and bring their tourist dollars there and leave them with North Carolinians instead of with the people of France, England, Ireland, Scotland, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Germany, Russia, Poland, Holland, or any other country that may be thought of, or that may be created between now and tomorrow, because the map of Europe is rapidly changing.

Mr. KING. Do not leave out Luxemburg.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will include Luxemburg as well. I want those tourist dollars to remain at home; and the only way we can be beneficial in keeping those dollars at home is to prove to the American people that they can travel here cheaper than they can travel in Europe.

Now let us see whether or not we have anything interesting in this country.

Mr. President, travel, with its many broadening influences, ought to be a major course, required in every man's education. I know, because I have been fortunate enough to have seen more of the world than most people. I started traveling when I was a college boy, made three trips across the Atlantic on a cattle boat—earning the princely sum of $20 a trip—and took a bicycle tour through Europe during one of my college days' vacations. I have seen Australia, South America, Central America, Africa, Russia, and have just recently completed my third trip around the world.

I believe in travel. So do a lot of other people, for travel ranks fourth or fifth among our major industries. But the best time to travel is when one is young. That is when the mind is fresh and pliant, retaining the colorful impressions that are lost as we grow older.

A long-standing hobby of mine is that young Americans must first travel in America. After they know something of their own great country and its people they can begin branching out, going to more places and seeing more things. But I believe in seeing America first. Too many people travel to Europe who should be learning about what a wonderfully rich and gloriously beautiful country is their own.

A lot of people would like to travel but are scared off by the expense. Travel is expensive, if you choose to make it expensive. It is fine to travel expensively, ride in Pullman cars, and stay at the best hotels; but you do not have to travel that way. Travel is cheap. It may be as cheap as staying at home; and there are more opportunities for cheap but comfortable travel in our own America than in any other country of the world. Our roads are unexcelled anywhere. Our automobiles are relatively cheap. The cost of fuel is low, much lower than it is in the majority of the countries of the world; and food and lodging, if you look for them in the right places, are not high.

I nursed along a pet theory of mine for a long time before I was able to try it out. The theory was that it was possible to spend 30 days seeing America from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico at the total cost of $100 in actual travel expenses. By seeing America I do not mean racing from dawn to dark along the highways at 60 miles an hour until you are so tired driving that you cannot sleep and so sleepy that you cannot drive.

By seeing America I mean visiting the beauty spots and getting your fill of what they offer. I mean visiting the places that are rich in the historical traditions of our land, soaking in the atmosphere, letting the imagination fold back the pages of history in the spots where history was made; seeing and learning to know the places you have read about all your life, and viewing the great industrial centers and agricultural sections of the United States.

I took a 30-day trip through America. I drove 11,500 miles, and did all the driving myself. I visited 31 States and the District of Columbia. I touched both coasts, drove through Ontario in Canada, and took a glimpse of Juarez, Mexico; drove through three of our great national parks, visited 14 State capitals, and stopped briefly in some 500 American cities and towns. By stopping I do not mean pulling up to a gas station and getting a tank filled, but stopping long enough to introduce myself to a policeman or a citizen of the place and requesting him to deliver to the mayor an envelope containing a letter from me and literature describing the wonders of our State of North Carolina, and I did it all for less than $400.

If four young men followed my plan and something of my schedule, they could do the same thing for $100 each, allowing something for an inexpensive present to bring to the folks back home and to go to an occasional movie en route or stop at a tourist camp if they wanted a change for a night.

Here is how I did it: I got a trailer equipped with a combination living room and sleeping quarters for two—berths that made up something like those in a Pullman car. There was a folding table, an alcove for a portable typewriter, an alcove for a small library, a radio, and reclining chairs like those in your living room at home. There was a kitchenette equipped with a small gasoline stove, a sink, hot and cold running water, a wardrobe for clothes, a compartment for shoes and linen, one for cooking utensils and dishes, one for groceries, and an ice box. There was also a shower bath and a telephone connection between the trailer and the power car in front and electric lights.

This trailer was hitched to the back of a small coupe. I started out from the Plaza in front of the Capitol at Washington, and returned 30 days later with more sights and memories and new facts I learned and new friends made than I ever before in all my life packed into 30 days. While I did all the driving—for my companion did not drive—I got back to Washington feeling better and in finer health than when I started. I had seen more than many people see in a lifetime, and I traveled almost as cheaply and just as comfortably as I ever traveled before.

You might object at this point—that I was able to do this because I had a trailer, and not many people have one. But, while mine was unusually fine, all trailers do not have to be equipped with electric lights and running water. Any ingenious boy, with the help of a mechanic, can knock together a good enough trailer to carry pup tents, cooking utensils, and the equipment one needs in such travel. They can be bought for prices starting remarkably low and going up to the more expensive ones ranging as high as $5,000.

We started from Washington and drove 35 miles to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., where we visited this fine training school for our future admirals and saw something of quaint and historic Annapolis, the capital of Maryland and the oldest chartered city in the United States. Here is to be seen the tomb of John Paul Jones and historic old naval vessels that defended America in the early days.

From there we drove through Baltimore, where during the bombardment of Fort McHenry, in 1814, Francis Scott Key, a Baltimore lawyer held prisoner on a British boat, wrote The Star-Spangled Banner.

A few hours thereafter found us driving northward through Wilmington, Del., where the first powder mill built

in America is still in use, and where is to be found the hearthstone on which Thomas Jefferson stood to read the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia.

Next was Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, a city that is rich in the history of infant, struggling America, home of famous Independence Hall and its precious antiquities relating to the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, the Liberty Bell, the Betsy Ross House in which the first American flag was made in 1777, the home of William Penn, and Christ Church Cemetery, containing the graves of Benjamin Franklin and his wife. It was at Philadelphia that Washington was inaugurated for his second term. In addition to these historic spots, Philadelphia boasts of the largest naval aircraft factory in the world, the world's largest single-span suspension bridge, and the largest natural park entirely within the limits of any city.

Mr. President, is that of interest to Americans? It should certainly be more interesting to our school children, our boys and girls, than anything to be found upon foreign shores.

Through Trenton, N. J., we motored at night; and I recalled that on Christmas night, in the year 1776, during the Revolutionary War, it was there that Washington crossed the Delaware River and surprised the Hessian garrison in the city, on the following morning winning a complete victory. As you drive through the city you will observe at Warren and Broad Streets a monument which marks the spot where the battle began.

From Trenton we drove to New York City, where Washington was first inaugurated President of the United States, and which is now the great melting pot of the world, where today more than 300,000 aliens who are not entitled to citizenship in this country reside at this hour; aliens whom I am endeavoring to have deported through the bill which a few days ago I introduced in the Senate, and concerning which I hope to have the cooperation of all Senators.

Thence we journeyed up the Hudson River to the United States Military Academy at West Point, where the future generals and the leaders of our Army will be developed; where were developed such men as Gen. Manus McCloskey, the commander of Fort Bragg, N. C., who, when he landed upon shores 3,000 miles away with his marines, and the command was given to retreat, said, "Retreat, hell; we have just gotten here."

Then we traveled northeast to Plymouth, Mass., where the Pilgrims landed in 1620, and over to Boston, one of the most historic cities in America. Here we visited, among half a hundred other interesting spots, the home of Paul Revere, and in leaving the city we drove over the same highway upon which he rode to Lexington, advising the patriots of the advance of the British, and on to Concord, where was fired in battle "the shot that was heard 'round the world." In passing along this highway from Boston, "the cradle of liberty", we drove through the campus of Harvard University, and in this vicinity saw the old homes of Longfellow and other famous men of literature.

Albany, the capital of the State of New York, was reached that night after a lovely drive through the invigorating Berkshire Hills, and you will recall that it was just across the river from Albany that Yankee Doodle was written.

Next in turn there came Buffalo and Niagara Falls, where we crossed the International Bridge into Canada, following one of the Dominion's fine roads for 300 miles across Ontario to Detroit. We stopped in Detroit long enough to visit an American automobile factory where they build a car from the ground up, fill it up with gas, and drive it away, all before your eyes. We saw what no American should miss—Henry Ford's Greenfield Village and Museum, which bring to one things of interest instead of making him go thousands of miles to see them; such, for instance, as the courthouse in which Lincoln practiced law and the laboratories in which Thomas Edison worked.

Incidentally thousands upon thousands of Canadians come to Detroit yearly, as they come to the city of New York, without any protection whatever for the American people, because we have no law making it compulsory for aliens to register in this country and make clear their intention of becoming citizens. I shall seek to have such a law enacted during the present session of Congress, an effort in which I trust I shall have the support of every Senator, regardless of the side of the aisle on which he may sit at the present time.

From Detroit, the greatest automobile-manufacturing city in the world, we drove to Chicago and visited the great slaughterhouses and packing plants, through Iowa, the greatest corn-growing State in the Union, and then into the famous Black Hills and the Bad Lands of South Dakota, where such colorful pioneer Americans as Deadwood Dick, Calamity Jane, and Wild Bill Hickok held forth. Then came Lead, S. Dak., the site of the largest gold-producing mine in the world, from which place we wended our way in serpentine fashion over towering hills to Rushmore National Park, where Gutzon Borglum, the noted sculptor, is carving giant likenesses of Washington, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt from the solid granite of a mountaintop which towers high above the surrounding country.

I want to tell you about an exciting night we spent here, one of our few misadventures. We started from a point near the mountaintop where the carving is being done, headed toward Wyoming, against the friendly advice of a young lady in charge of a filling station, who warned me I would not be able to negotiate the mountain passes and dangerous curves before dark. Well, I had gotten through the tunnels and around the perilous turns, when, all of a sudden, we had to start climbing a very steep grade without having an opportunity to gain momentum by a running start. I shoved the car into low gear, and crept up almost to the top, when the engine, boiling over and steaming, simply quit and went dead.

There we were, stalled on a steep mountain road, with a precipice on one side, a towering cliff on the other, and it was black dark. The air brakes on the trailer quit working when the engine stopped. I pulled on the emergency brake with all my strength, and held it until my companion jumped out and put a rock under one of the wheels. Then we let the engine cool, and started it up again. We worked for 2 hours there in the darkness, trying to nurse our load up that hill; but starting from a standstill, as we were, we could not make more than a foot at a time between "breathing spells" of the motor. You cannot back one of those trailers without a lot of slow, careful maneuvering, and I did not have the light by which to back. Finally, tired as dogs, we scotched the wheels with rocks and logs, got out our blankets, and went to sleep in the woods by the side of the road, afraid to sleep in our comfortable bunks in the trailer for fear it would break loose and carry us to our death over the side of the precipice extending from our right hundreds of feet below.

And did we sleep! It was daylight when we awoke, with a car stopped on the road in front of ours, and a man standing over us. I looked at the man, rubbed my eyes, threw back my blanket, looked at his car, and saw it had a District of Columbia license tag like mine. Then I told the owner of the car what had happened to us, and learned he was Mr. Borglum's son.

"Brother," I said, "your father got me into this mess. I drove thousands of miles to get here and see his work, and was heading for Wyoming and its 'Hell's Half Acre' when we stalled. So you will have to get us out."

He did. He turned his car around, hitched us on behind with a tow rope, and took us clear to the top of the mountain.

That reminds me of something, and it is this: If you are really in trouble on the road, you will always find a friend to pull you out. People are kindly and friendly and helpful the world over. It is the same way in any part of the United States, in any part of the world, as a matter of fact. People are friendly if you approach them in the right way and let them know you are friendly. That is one of the happiest things I have learned in traveling in my own country, over and around the world.

From South Dakota we followed the road to Wyoming State Park, said to be the largest State park in the United

States; then to Cheyenne, the capital of Wyoming, southward between the towering ranges of the Rockies to Colorado's capital at Denver, where in the neighborhood of its magnificent civic center we replenished the car with gas and continued to Colorado Springs, Pike's Peak, and the Garden of the Gods.

From the massive gateway rocks of vivid red sandstone of the Garden of the Gods we retraced our trail to Cheyenne through the oil fields of Wyoming and entered the Wind River Canyon, where a 12-mile stretch of automobile road paralleling the river between towering ranges has been blasted out of the solid rocks in three places, traveling through the solid granite of the Mammoth Mountains to Thermopolis, where is the largest hot-water spring in the world, flowing 18,600,000 gallons of healing mineral water every 24 hours. That night we drew up in front of the courthouse on the main street at Cody, Wyo., where is located the Buffalo Bill Museum.

The next morning we entered and crossed the Yellowstone National Park from east to west, and turned southward through Montana and down through the potato-growing State of Idaho to Salt Lake City.

I am glad the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is in the Chamber. I think we can greatly improve our public parks, and I think it is a matter deserving of much consideration. I know the Senator from New York visited the West last year, because those in charge of the respective parks visited by him advised me of his visits, and of his great interest in the welfare of the people of those respective sections. But I know he is particularly interested in the welfare of the people of the whole United States, who are entitled to enjoy those great parks. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from New York upon his great interest in this important subject.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator learned, as I did, that last year was the banner year for visits by Americans to their national parks.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; and I was glad to learn that. I might state in that connection that the Great Smoky Mountain National Park, in western North Carolina, the boundary of which is within a few miles of my home city of Asheville, N. C., had approximately 40,000 more visitors than did any other national park in the United States, with the exception of a small one in the State of Maine. That was attributable, of course, to the fact that the Great Smoky National Park, in western North Carolina, is accessible, within 18 hours by motor, to 80,000,000 people of the United States, while the Yosemite and the Yellowstone National Parks, in Wyoming and California, are some 7 days away.

I think the best way in the world to distribute wealth in this country, a subject concerning which we have heard so much, is by providing good roads, safe roads, eliminating curves, eliminating railroad crossings, broadening highways, making them smoother, and making it less expensive for the owners of the 25,000,000 automobiles of the United States to operate them.

Recurring to Salt Lake City, the capital of Utah, it was founded in 1847 by the Mormons under Brigham Young, and some of its most interesting houses are the historic ones which were occupied by Brigham Young and his wives. After visiting the capitol, the Mormon Temple, and driving through the State university grounds, we hit the road for the Great Salt Lake, where we sat upon the surface of the water in the blazing sun and looked over a newspaper. A few miles farther on we left the main highway and drove over the great salt flats for a distance of some 20 miles, where, as I have said, we sped our car up to 75 miles an hour, trailer and all. It was a real thrill. It was here that Sir Malcolm Campbell broke his own world's record in attaining a speed of over 300 miles an hour in his specially constructed racing car which he brought over with him from England.

Shortly thereafter we found ourselves in the desert of Nevada, and within 24 hours we had passed through Reno, visited the famous section of mines, Virginia City, where Mark Twain began his literary career as a reporter, and took a glimpse at the capital, Carson City, in leaving the State for California.

Daybreak found us maneuvering the Great Tioga Pass, at the top of which we entered the Yosemite National Park. We drove through it and then continued westward toward the setting sun to San Francisco and across the bay to the bleak island of Alcatraz, where dangerous Federal prisoners, such as Capone, are confined, and from which I feasted my eyes upon the Golden Gate.

We spent glorious days in southern California and took a peek at the movie industry in and around Los Angeles.

I have mentioned the places I have because of their outstanding historical importance. I have spoken of places of great natural beauty and places of outstanding commercial importance in America. I regret to say that on this trip, which covered a mileage of 11,500 miles, I did not visit the State represented by the Senators from Washington, who are honoring me by listening to me this afternoon; but I want to say that I have been to their State. Seattle, the garden of heaven! Seattle, a city of beauty, in a State well represented in the Senate of the United States.

From California we drove eastward to the petrified forest of Arizona, into New Mexico, stopped at the famous Carlsbad Caverns, said to be the largest and most beautiful crystal caverns in the world, then dropped down into Texas, and across to Old Mexico at El Paso over the International Bridge to Juarez, where we saw the building which was once used as headquarters of the Mexican bandit, Pancho Villa. Then we drove back to El Paso and across a stretch of the Lone Star State to San Antonio and the Alamo Mission where Davy Crockett and James Bowie, the inventor of the deadly Bowie knife, lost their lives while fighting the Mexicans in 1836.

I may say in passing that at San Antonio there is located the finest air field in America. That city has a population of 300,000. It is one of the most interesting places, historically, in all America. About 50 percent of its population, however, is made up of people from across the border, thousands upon thousands of whom are aliens in this country. No one knows the number of Mexicans there who are entitled to American citizenship, but everyone who has made an investigation of the question knows that a very large percentage of the people on the relief rolls in that city are aliens.

While I am on that subject, a subject in which I am greatly interested, and concerning which I expect to engage the attention of the Senate for some time when my bill pertaining to the limitation of immigration and the compulsory registration of aliens is reported, I wish to say that it has been conservatively estimated, and I believe that I shall be able to prove it, that 3,000,000 alien born who are not possessors of citizenship in this country have been on the relief rolls at one time or another since 1929, during which time it has cost you, Mr. President, and the citizens of your State and those of every other State in the Union, over $400,000,000.

From Houston and Beaumont, Tex., we drove to Baton Rouge, the Capital of Louisiana, on the capitol grounds of which, directly in front of the Capitol Building, is buried the late Senator Huey P. Long. From there we went to New Orleans, strolled through the streets of the quaint old French quarter, and saw the house constructed for Napoleon Bonaparte in case he succeeded in escaping from the Isle of St. Helena. Then we drove across the Mississippi River and the States of Alabama and Florida to St. Augustine, the oldest city in the United States, where is located the famous Fountain of Youth, said to have been discovered by the Spanish explorer, Ponce de Leon, in 1513.

Then we drove northward, through Atlanta, Ga., the capital of the State, where is to be seen the largest battle painting in the world, depicting the Battle of Atlanta, which was fought between the Confederate and Union soldiers during the Civil War. Tennessee followed, with brief stops at Chattanooga and Knoxville; and then we proceeded to North Carolina and Tennessee's magnificent Great Smoky Moun-

tain National Park, beyond which lies beautiful Asheville, N. C., the park's great eastern gateway. Then we drove to historic Kings Mountain, where was fought during the Revolutionary War the Battle of Kings Mountain, which is claimed by many to have been the turning point for the patriots. Thence we drove to busy Charlotte, N. C., which Cornwallis, the British leader, while encamped there, named The Hornet's Nest. It was here that the famous Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence was drafted, antedating Thomas Jefferson's by a whole year, and believed by many to be the basis for that which was written by Thomas Jefferson.

Up into Virginia we traveled, over the Natural Bridge, through the famous Shenandoah Valley and its hundreds of crystal caverns, to Charlottesville and nearby the famous homes and shrines of Jefferson, Monroe, and Madison.

From these historic places we drove to more which we found at Fredericksburg, where the Father of his Country, George Washington, with his sister Betty and his brothers Charles and Samuel, went to school, where is the grave of Mary Washington, the mother of George, and in this town there still stands the Masonic lodge in which Washington received his three degrees. Nearby are the offices in which James Monroe, fourth President of the United States, practiced law and which contains a large collection of the furniture owned by President and Mrs. Monroe.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is just as much interested as I am in this matter, because there is a great national park in his State, and our interests are alike. We are in accord, because we are trying to have established a great highway, the Shenandoah National Highway, leading from his great State to my great State and from my great State to his great State, and he wants tourist dollars there.

With a sigh of regret that we were nearing our journey's end—a journey which had provided us with a far better conception than we had ever had before of the vastness of our country, the courage of its war heroes and patriots, and the indomitable will of its builders—we turned the nose of our faithful little car toward the Capital of the greatest nation upon the face of the earth, Washington, which we reached from Fredericksburg, via Mount Vernon, on the Potomac River, the home and last resting place of George Washington and his wife, Martha. Then we glided smoothly over the Mount Vernon Boulevard for 13 miles, across the Memorial Bridge, which spans the Potomac, past the Lincoln Memorial, down Constitution Avenue, and up the "Hill" to the front of the Capitol, from which point just 30 days before we had set out to see America—and we saw it.

During this trip of 30 days we slept in the trailer at night and parked it wherever we wished. We slept in the trailer parked on busy Dyckman Street in New York. In Boston we had the use of the capitol grounds for our house on wheels. In Chicago we parked at the curb on Michigan Boulevard near the Art Museum and had a swell sleep. When we were driving through the countryside we stopped at night where we chose, parked our trailer in a spot that took our fancy, cooked our supper—which usually consisted of a big steak, light bread, and milk—and got to sleep early. And, believe me, it was no trouble to find sleep!

We made it a practice to get up in the morning about 30 minutes before dawn and put the coffeepot on the fire. Breakfast consisted of nothing but fruit and a steaming cup of black coffee. Then we started driving just about dawn. I found that the best time for driving was between dawn and 10 o'clock in the morning. You can cover more ground at that time, for there is less traffic on the road. Sometimes, when the notion struck us, we drove at night. We covered an average of about 375 miles every day. That is pretty tough driving when you are doing it all yourself, but not bad when there are others to spell you off. The amount of mileage we covered each day depended entirely upon where we wanted to stop and just what we wanted to see.

On this trip I found that a great many people had never seen a United States Senator. When they learned they were looking at one, they usually expressed surprise at seeing one dressed as I was, in overalls, and unshaved. That reminds me that at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., I parked the car at a mechanic's place for some repairs and was walking along the "main drag" when a nice-looking fellow came along whistling. I stopped him, intending to ask where the telegraph office was, holding up my hand in a friendly greeting. Without pausing, he said: "Sorry kid; I haven't got a dime", and increased his pace. He thought I was a panhandler. That shows how I must have looked to others, because there were days at a time when I enjoyed the luxury of not shaving, bathing, or changing my clothes, which wearing apparel consisted of a pair of overalls and a sweater.

We had a few break-downs, but, all in all, not much serious trouble. We were stalled twice in Yosemite National Park and once in Yellowstone, but fortunately someone always happened along and gave us a hand. The roads were good everywhere. In the Yellowstone and Yosemite Parks, many stretches of the road were found to be exceedingly rough and dangerous, and all without excuse, as many bad curves could be widened, roads broadened to permit cars to pass one another, and boulders and scrub trees removed from the highways and sidings without much expense to the National Government. We never were molested on the trip, and we never got into trouble without someone coming along and helping us.

In going across Arizona we came upon three boys with a small delivery truck from North Carolina, my home State. They were out of gas, so I took one of them to a gas station some miles away, gave him 10 gallons of gas in containers which he brought along, and sent him back to their car. They had been touring the country for 2 months during school vacation, and were having a grand time of it. They slept in their truck and prepared their meals in a frying pan over a wood fire in true Boy Scout fashion. More young Americans ought to do the same thing.

Now about expenses:

I used about 850 gallons of gasoline, and, all in all, spent approximately $250 for gas and oil. We did not cook all our own meals, as people along the routes were most kind to us, entertaining us frequently at noon and supper. We found that money wisely spent for food purchasable along the roadside can be bought 25 or 30 percent cheaper than in the city markets or stores. With $350 going for food and fuel, the only other additional expenses are tunnel and bridge tolls—not very much—and the occasional fees of entrance to museums and national parks—and here I pause to remark that in my opinion the National Government should provide its citizens with the parks and playgrounds without cost to its taxpayers—which will be adequately covered with $50, leaving a large enough balance to take care of all but serious repair bills.

I should advise anyone taking such a trip to supply himself with such essentials as a red lantern, rope or chain for towing, flashlights, a tent or tents—provided, of course, the trailer does not have sleeping accommodations—first-aid kit, water bucket, and a small gasoline or kerosene stove if you do not want to be put to the trouble of gathering faggots for fuel at mealtime.

The trip should be carefully planned in advance if you propose to get the most out of it. One wise method is to procure literature from such agencies as the American Automobile Association and State and city chambers of commerce describing the country that you intend to visit. Your journey will be more intelligently and satisfactorily carried out if this is done.

One bit of advice: Do not tie yourself down to a too definite daily schedule which forces you to go farther than you feel like going. Stop at the places which appeal to you, have a good time, and do not work yourself to death merely trying to cover ground, for, after all, the purpose of travel is to enjoy yourself and learn while you are doing it.

In every State there are comfortable and cheap tourist camps, and the national parks are fine camp sites where camping spots are designated. Many times we pulled up alongside a filling station in city, town, or country, replenished our oil and gas, filled the radiator, lubricated the car,

ate a snack, and turned in for the night ready for the great open spaces before dawn the next day.

Now, after hearing me, you may say, "Well, it can't be done." The same thing was said to me many, many times by friends to whom I confided my plans before starting on the trip to "see America in 30 days for $100." Well, I did it; and if I can do it, you can—that is, if you want to. But let me warn you that you cannot do any loafing and you cannot waste any money if you are determined to cover the United States and take a glimpse of Canada and New Mexico all within 30 days, and with an expense account limited to $100 each for four persons.

But here is luck if you do undertake it; and I venture the assertion that when you get back you will feel healthier and stronger and be more enthusiastic about your country than you have ever been before. It is a great country, whose history you ought to know; whose national wonders you should see; whose industrial centers you should visit; whose wholesome people—north, east, south, and west—you should meet; and whose fine highways you should motor over, from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico, with patriotism in your heart.

Luck to young Americans, boys and girls alike, who, as they travel, as I hope they may, the broad highways of their magnificent country, will be able, to the delight of their fathers and mothers, to drink in with their eyes a liberal education.

Mr. President, I hope that the pending bill will be recommitted, because, in my opinion, there are many things which ought to be in it which are not in it, and there are probably many things contained in the bill which ought not to be within its covers.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from the State of New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I might state just as well now as at any other time that it has been generally agreed that, in the course of time today, the Senate will take a recess until Monday, the pending bill to remain the unfinished business. During the recess we may get together upon certain amendments which will undoubtedly perfect the bill and make it satisfactory to all.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me again extend a warm invitation not only to the Members of this body but generally to the people of America to get in their automobiles next summer and drive southward and visit one of the greatest parks in the entire United States, the Great Smoky Mountain National Park. There they will be welcome; there they will be benefited; there they will be able to listen to the music of the rippling brooks, the chirping of the birds, feast their eyes upon the blue heavens, and view such scenery as they have never before beheld in any part of the world.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SMITH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the so-called farm relief bill, being Senate bill 3780.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS. I reannounce the absence of the Senators whose names were mentioned by me earlier today, and for the reasons then stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 3780.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest to the capable Senator from South Carolina that he make a statement concerning the changes made by the conference report in the bill as passed by the Senate and that passed by the other House.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there are not any substantial changes in the bill as it passed the Senate. One change which may be considered perhaps of importance is that, on the insistence of the conferees on the part of the House, there went out of the bill the so-called La Follette amendment. The House conferees, in the case of the sharecropper and tenant proposal, agreed to an amendment which very considerably modifies the provision as adopted by the House.

I do not think there are any other material changes, except that the House had included in its bill a provision which would practically turn over to the land-grant colleges and the Extension Service the administration of the bill. That was disagreed to, and that provision went out of the bill.

I do not recall that there is any material change from the original text of the bill except along the lines I have indicated.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. Did the conferees agree to the so-called Wagner amendment, which was defeated in the Senate?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that was agreed to by the conferees. I did overlook that. The House had a modified form of the amendment which the Senator from New York had proposed here and which was voted down in the Senate. The language which came from the House embodied the principle, but with different wording, and was agreed to by the conferees.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the bill was before the Senate for consideration I offered an amendment to the effect that payments or grants should be subject to the further condition that no crops intended for sale should be harvested from and no livestock intended for sale should be grazed or pastured on certain lands. Is such a provision contained in the conference report?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. There was considerable discussion as to what benefits might accrue to the dairy interests. The House had included certain language, and the Senate agreed to it with an amendment. I think the dairy interests are protected so far as they may be under a bill of this character.

Mr. McNARY. Inasmuch as the Senator has answered my inquiry in the affirmative and is familiar with the conference report, will he tell me wherein I may find the provision I offered on the floor at the request of the milk producers?

Mr. SMITH. I have not the conference report before me, but the dairy interests were taken care of. I will ask the clerk to find the specific amendment to the bill which was agreed to to take care of the dairy interests. I know they were taken care of, but the exact language and just where the provision appears in the conference report I cannot now state.

Mr. McNARY. It has been suggested, and I think very properly, that we should have the conference report read in its entirety. May that be done?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the conference report.

(For conference report, see p. 2804 of yesterday's Senate proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, evidently the Senator from South Carolina did not understand the nature of my inquiry. I asked if the amendment which I offered in the Senate, which was proposed by the Milk Producers' Associations, which largely controls the production of legumes and nitrogeneous plants, had been taken care of by the House and was in the conference report. The Senator from South Carolina, I assume, not understanding my question, answered in the affirmative. I assume responsibility for not making myself plain.

Upon reading the conference report and investigation of the RECORD, however, I find that the proposal which I submitted at the suggestion of the milk producers is not in the conference report; and I desire to have the RECORD plainly show that fact. In order to make the RECORD clear, I ask that the clerk may read the amendment I offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 6, in the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Mr. SMITH, at the end of section 8, it was proposed to insert the following:

And any payment or grant of other aid which is conditioned, in whole or in part, upon the growth of soil-restoration, soil-conservation, or erosion-preventing crops on any land, or any change in the kind of crop to be grown on any land, shall be subject to the further condition that no crops intended for sale be harvested from, and no livestock intended for sale, or the products of which are intended for sale, be grazed or pastured on, such land.

Mr. McNARY. On February 15, as appears at page 2160 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a vote was had on this proposal. The yeas were 28 and the nays were 45. Consequently, the amendment was rejected by the Senate.

The same amendment was offered in the House on February 21, and appears at page 2577 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The proposal was rejected by the House by a vote of 146 yeas and 224 nays.

Therefore, of necessity the proposal which I made to take care of the dairy industry is not in the conference report, and therefore is not in the bill. I desire to have it made very clear that in this bill neither the House nor the Senate in any way attempted to look after the interests of the great dairy industry.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon a question. As I understand, this amendment was rejected both by the Senate and by the House?

Mr. McNARY. That is true.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, therefore, the amendment could not be in the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I said.

Mr. NORRIS. So the conference committee is not to blame for that.

Mr. McNARY. I am not blaming anyone. A few moments ago I asked whether this proposal was in the bill, and I assume the Senator from South Carolina did not understand my inquiry, for he said it was.

Mr. NORRIS. If the conference committee had put it in the bill, the bill would have been subject to a point of order either in the House or here.

Mr. McNARY. Of course; I appreciate that fact. I have said so many, many times; but in response to my inquiry the Senator from South Carolina said the proposal I made was in the conference report. I assume that he did not understand my inquiry. I have simply made the record clear on that point without any criticism; that is all.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that the conferees were perfectly willing, in view of the language which the House had passed, to do all they could for the dairy interest in the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. I quite appreciate that. I am complaining about no one.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am candidly in search of knowledge.

In the conference report, subdivision (5) of section 7, there is found the following, which it is declared to be one of the purposes of the act to secure:

Reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909–July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio. The powers conferred under sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this act shall be used to assist voluntary action calculated to effectuate the purposes specified in this section. Such powers shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of foods and fibers sufficient to maintain normal domestic human consumption as determined by the Secretary from the records of domestic human consumption in the years 1920 to 1929, inclusive, taking into consideration increased population, quantities of any commodity that were forced into domestic consumption by decline in exports during such period, current trends in domestic consumption and exports of particular commodities, and the quantities of substitutes available for domestic consumption within any general class of food commodities.

Mr. President, I do not pause to discuss the constitutional question in this sweeping delegation of power. It is so manifestly in violation of all principles in a government of law that I must assume that was understood and accepted by the signers of the report.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, according to both the House and the Senate conferees, the interpretation was that even during the temporary period and during the period in which the States were to cooperate, the bill giving the power to the Secretary to veto or accept the program from the States, he should inform them in his proposition to them, to be adopted by them, the conditions necessary for reduction or increase, so as to meet as nearly as might be, according to his judgment, the situation as it then existed, when he was inviting the cooperation of the States in carrying out this measure.

To illustrate, if there were an excess of a product, he would suggest to the State—he having the veto power—if they saw fit to cooperate, then that particular thing would be reduced. Likewise for domestic consumption; the increase in population might necessarily cause him to change in the next year the percentage or the basis upon which he would recommend to the States, but the States all having the power either to accept or reject the proposition which he might make.

Mr. President, that was our interpretation of that very strained language, because I take it that it would be a considerable task for one so to arrange the production of a commodity as to bring it up to where the purchasing power which resulted from the sale of the product would match the purchasing power of those who bought it. Our interpretation was along the lines I have indicated, that the Secretary and his staff would always have in mind not only the volume necessary for export and domestic consumption but the relative value of the purchasing power of the consumer with that of the producer.

If the Senator will recall, in the Agricultural Adjustment Act we attempted by the processing tax to reach what we called "parity."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has been fiercely criticized from time to time during the administration of his office, but I do not join in that criticism, and have not done so. I think that, considering the task which he has had to perform, he has acted with perhaps as much efficiency and competency as could have been exhibited by any man who could be placed in that position. But we are here asked to confer upon him a task which would require omnipotence. It is crudely, on the face of it, an absurdity. The human mind is not equal to the task. I venture to say that no one can well understand the language of the bill, much less execute the duty imposed.

In the first place, there is no rule, no principle announced or incorporated, which would guide anyone. In other words, the discretion and judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture would be the sole rule of procedure under this provision.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I do not think that is a correct interpretation. I take it that he will gather statistics and facts upon which to base his conclusion as to the necessary increase or decrease in the production of a commodity.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there are no statistics and there are no facts which would enable anyone to determine between the purchasing power of the net income per person on a farm and the purchasing power of the net income of persons not on a farm, and the purchasing power is something wholly beyond the control of anyone under any rule which is announced in the legislation.

Mr. SMITH. I take it that the rate of wages received, and the price at which commodities are selling, upon which would be determined the approximate rate of wages the producer would receive, are possibly capable of being reduced to statistical form. I think that may be true, because, as we discussed the matter in conference, the question was how to determine the purchasing power of the consumer. That, of course, would depend upon the available statistics as to the rate of wage generally received, and the rate of wage which the producer would receive from the sale of his products.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the years referred to here are the years of domestic human consumption, 1920 to 1929. I suppose the period from 1920 to 1929 was taken as a basis upon the theory that at that time there was a living income coming from the farms of the United States; otherwise, that would not have been adopted as the rule. But the income from the farms of the United States from 1920 to 1929 could not in any sense be considered a living income.

Mr. SMITH. I do not think it has ever been a living income.

Mr. BORAH. We know perfectly well that from 1920, the time when the deflationary policy was initiated by the Federal Reserve Board, the income from the farm gradually decreased, until in 1928 and 1929 the farmers were in a very critical condition financially.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator will recall the sudden paralysis which occurred following the meeting of the Federal Reserve Board when they decided to deflate. There was a tremendous, panicky drop in all farm prices. From May 1920 until the succeeding fall, to illustrate, cotton dropped from 40 cents a pound to 10 cents a pound. But in 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926 there was a revival to such a point that most of the lost ground was regained.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator is thoroughly informed on that subject, of course; but from 1920, and for the next 6 or 8 years, while there was some revival after 1920 and 1920 and 1921, the farm conditions continued to be desperate. We were constantly trying to legislate upon the subject for the purpose of relieving the farmers. We had several measures before us looking to that end. To say that we should undertake to stabilize the income of the farmer upon the basis of the period from 1920 to 1929 seems to be a wrong theory upon which to proceed.

Mr. SMITH. We must take into consideration the fact that wages dropped almost in proportion at the same time.

Mr. BORAH. They did drop; they will always drop when there is distress on the farms.

Mr. SMITH. What the proponents of this legislation were driving at was the purchasing power of the wage earner as compared to the purchasing power of the farmer.

Mr. BORAH. But it seems to me we make a mistake in this proposition in taking the farmer and the wage earner and comparing their part of the national income, and assuming that there is a controversy between the producer and the wage earner. The trouble arises out of the fact that out of the national income the wage earner and the farmer combined do not get their due proportion. It is not wise to assume that the task is to divide more equitably the income of the producer and the wage earner; the problem is to increase their portion of the national income.

Mr. SMITH. No; but the purchasing power of the wage earner and the purchasing power of the producer were about equal; but since then, in the subsequent years, the wage earner's wages have increased, while the purchasing power of the producer has still further drastically declined. It was a relation between the two, the proponents of the legislation were attempting to reach.

Mr. BORAH. It is assumed also, it seems from this report, that the increase of the products on the farm has a perceptible effect upon the increase of the cost of living for the laborer. That is not correct. The increase in the prices of the products upon the farm, of course, will have some effect, but it does not at all account for the immense increase in the cost of living. That takes place after the products leave the farm and before they get to the consumer, and the controversy should not be raised and the controversy cannot well be laid between the farmer and the wage earner. The power which fixes prices for both of them is power which keeps them from getting their due proposition of the national income, and we are not dealing with that; we are dealing with the supposed controversy between the two.

Mr. SMITH. I think the objective here is, of course, to so control the situation as to bring about an increase in the income of the farmer, and with his prosperity, of course, there generally follows an increase in the purchasing power of the consumer.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, now the Senator is expressing himself in accordance with my views. That is, if the income of the farmer is increased, it will increase the purchasing power of the farmer, it will increase the selling power and capacity of the manufacturer, and the manufacturer thereby will be enabled to employ a greater number of laborers at a better wage. That is the only way in which it can be done. This idea that even by Divine power we can go out and equalize the purchasing power of the producer and the purchasing power of the laborer, when above them both is a power which is fixing a rule under which they live, is to me inconceivable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. It is really as to a matter of geography. I ask the question at the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. McGILL], who was called from the Chamber.

In section 4, page 5, in referring to the $2,000,000 appropriation, the report says it shall be "for allocation and payment to the States in the southern Great Plains area."

Mr. SMITH. In reply to the Senator, I will say that we had a note from the Department saying that in cases where disastrous dust storms originated in certain areas, but affected areas not geographically included, the benefits would cover the area affected by the disaster.

Mr. HATCH. I quite understand the purpose of the allocation, and I am heartily in favor of it. What the Senator from Kansas wanted to know was just what section of the United States is included in the term "the southern Great Plains area."

Mr. SMITH. According to the description of the Department, it is where the dust storms originate; but they state that sporadically, sometimes incidentally, dust is raised—not political dust but actual dust—in some of the States bordering this area; and as the question was raised by those affected by the dust storms, but who do not live in the area in which they originate, we were informed by the Department that the specification as to that area would not exclude those border States affected by the disaster.

Mr. HATCH. One would be safe in assuming, then, that that area includes all the region where the dust storms have been originating?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I see the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] present. I am sure he would feel satisfied that that would include his State.

Mr. SMITH. That matter was discussed and the senior Senator from Kansas was a member of the conference committee.

Mr. HATCH. That was the point the Senator from Kansas [Mr. McGILL] desired to bring up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the recess of the Senate, the bill the conference report on which has just been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL BUILDING FOR INDIAN CHILDREN IN MOUNT VAIL COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, on January 16 of this year Senate bill 3093 was passed by the Senate. It is a bill to provide funds for a public school which Indian children attend. A little later an identical bill came from the House, was passed by the Senate, went to the White House, and was there vetoed by the President.

In order to straighten out the parliamentary situation with respect to this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered and that the measure be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 3093 was passed is reconsidered and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the controversy over the language in the park bill, which is the unfinished business, it has been agreed that the bill and the question of recommittal shall go over until Monday and remain the unfinished business at that time, with a view of enabling Senators to get together on language which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

Therefore, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and 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 A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination in order on the calendar.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry Army nominations heretofore passed over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army will be passed over.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leo J. Voell, of Wisconsin, to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nomination of Earl D. Cline to be postmaster at North Los Angeles, Calif., be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Earl D. Cline to be postmaster at North Los Angeles, Calif., will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. With that exception, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 2, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of Feb. 24), 1936

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Joe B. Mullins, of Tennessee, to be State engineer inspector for the Public Works Administration in Tennessee.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Lt. Robert W. Bockius to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from 1st day of August 1935.

Lt. John B. Lyon to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of October 1935.

Lt. Elmer F. Helmkamp to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of November 1935.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 30th day of June 1935:

Everett P. Newton, Jr.
James W. Haviland, 3d.

Lt. (junior grade) David G. Greenlee, Jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 5th day of September 1935.

Lt. (junior grade) Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 6th day of September 1935.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of October 1935:

John E. Florance
Ranald M. MacKinnon

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 4th day of October 1935:

Martin J. Drury
Alexander MacIntyre
Edward D. Crowley

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hugh P. Thomson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 8th day of October 1935.

Lt (Jr. Gr.) George P. Biggs to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 20th day of November 1935.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, from the dates stated opposite their names, to correct the dates of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Henry R. Oster, July 1, 1926.
Lawrence B. Richardson, July 1, 1926.
James R. Allen, June 2, 1927.
Charles A. Nicholson, 2d, June 2, 1927.

The following-named paymasters to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of June 1934, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Charles D. Kirk	John H. Davis
Charles S. Bailey	Harold T. Smith
Walter W. Mahany	Charles J. Lanier

Asst. Paymaster James P. Dowden to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of June 1935.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of October 1935:

Gerard J. O'Brien	Noyes V. Sanborn
Homer V. Randolph	John F. Pingley
Ralph A. Wiley	John D. Garland
Milton P. Dominquez	Percy D. Generous
Percy Bond	Roland B. McArthur
Charles G. Jenkins	

The following-named electricians to be chief electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of October 1935:

Charles E. Mowry
Perry E. Koon
James B. Terwilliger

Machinist Ernest E. Dobson to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of October 1935.

The following-named pay clerks to be chief pay clerks in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of September 1935:

Roland A. Platt
James D. Stephens
Louis J. Spare

Ensign James L. Kemper to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1935.

Pay Director Charles Conard to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, from the 14th day of November 1927.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of Feb. 24), 1936

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Leo J. Voell to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Robert N. Pollard to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

James M. Hayden, Delano.
Walter A. Filer, Fellows.
Mary G. Newby, San Quentin.
John J. Blaney, Weaverville.

CONNECTICUT

Francis T. Green, Naugatuck.
Patrick J. Goode, New Haven.

HAWAII

John I. Silva, Eleele.
Manuel J. Carvalho, Makaweli.

IOWA

Dee C. Batten, Chariton.
Mark R. Doud, Douds.
George T. Shanley, Webster City.

KANSAS

Mattie L. Binkley, Brewster.
Henry F. Schmidt, Dodge City.
James B. Doyle, Herington.
Wilbur Rothe, Otis.

MISSOURI

Edwin A. Williams, Boonville.
Bailey F. Brooks, Caruthersville.
William P. Carskadon, Dalton.
Clare Magee, Unionville.

NEBRASKA

Patrick F. Leonard, Anselmo.
Gustav A. Koza, Clarkson.
Gretchen Wohlfarth, Diller.
Edmund J. Barrett, Lawrence.
Kitty Hennessy, Platte Center.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles N. Dobbins, Yadkinville.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 27 (legislative day of Feb. 24), 1936

POSTMASTER

PENNSYLVANIA

Morrissey C. Miller to be postmaster at Beech Creek, in the State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Chesteen Smith, D. D., retired minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Infinite Father, we crave Thy blessing for the service of this hour. As the inspirer of human minds, wilt Thou enlighten us as we seek to think through the perplexing questions which face us in these days? We praise Thee for the privilege of being citizens in so glorious a land as this. We pray that we may ever keep in mind those great objectives of peace and righteousness and human welfare, that they may inspire us to seek with all earnestness to bring the Nation to these desired ends. May we never forget that the true grandeur of any nation is in the moral character of its people. Bless, we pray Thee, those who are charged with the responsibility of giving leadership in the great task of bringing in the day of brotherhood and cooperation, and may we recognize these as the great objectives which call for our best ability. May the work of this day make some valuable contribution to the devising of those policies and the enactment of those laws which will provide a better day in the history of mankind. We ask this in the name of Him who gave us such a marvelous revelation of Thy will to men. Amen.

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

HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF LOW INCOME

The SPEAKER. Under a special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking time today to explain the provisions of the bill introduced by me, H. R. 11146. This bill provides Federal aid to States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States for carrying out projects for housing for families of low income, and for other purposes.

In any consideration of the reasons why poor housing exists it becomes apparent that the old law of supply and demand has failed to function satisfactorily in the field of low-rent shelter. Homes of modern standards at low rents cannot be made available to the majority of American consumers through private production. Profits and ordinary methods of private enterprise presupposes high monthly rentals. Speculative builders cannot operate on a nonprofit basis.

The need for drastic action toward closing the gap between quality housing and low rents is strikingly shown by the fact that in New York and most of the large urban centers very few apartments or houses following the World War rented before the depression in 1929 at less than $15 per room per month, or $60 a month for a four-room apartment. It is commonly estimated in the United States that 25 percent of income for rent is the most the average worker can pay.

This includes the cost of fuel for heat and hot water. Therefore, no worker could afford to rent such accommodations unless he received a salary from $2,500 to $3,000. The lower-income groups were compelled to take the castoff, the unwanted, the obsolete in housing. While the depression caused some reductions in rents, it likewise reduced the income of wage earners. By 1932 the national wage bill had decreased to approximately two-thirds that of 1929. Today, with the maximum average income of wage earners falling below $1,000, they cannot properly pay more than $20 per month for shelter or from $5 to $7 per room. The builder is not alone responsible for this economic deadlock between home production and consumption as it relates to the families in the lower-bracket income. He is forced to pay a high price for land, and to get a return on his investment by erecting only high-cost buildings.

In New York City alone over 1,000,000 people are living in buildings declared unfit for human habitation many years ago. Ninety percent of the people who are in need of better

housing quarters have earnings of less than $2,500 a year, and therefore are unable to purchase the expensive type of house now being built.

In a recent survey made by a leading university on housing conditions in the United States the following table was prepared by the university based on 1929 incomes:

A $6,100 home is too expensive for 80 percent of American families.

A $5,100 home is too expensive for 75 percent of American families.

A $4,200 home is too expensive for 66 percent of American families.

A $3,400 home is too expensive for 53 percent of American families.

A $2,500 home is too expensive for 35 percent of American families.

The President in his address to Congress on June 8, 1934, said:

> Among our objectives I place the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first. This security for the individual and for the family concerns itself primarily with three factors. People want decent homes to live in; they want to locate where they can engage in productive work; and they want some safeguard against misfortunes which cannot be wholly eliminated in this man-made world of ours * * *. In pursuing this policy we are working toward the ultimate objective of making it possible for American families to live as Americans should.

The first municipal housing bill was introduced at Albany, N. Y., in March 1933, but was not adopted and passed until January 1934. This New York bill served as a pattern for similar legislation adopted by other States, and for the sample bill subsequently prepared by the Legal Division of the Public Works Administration. In February 1935 this latter model municipal housing authorities bill was submitted to the Governors of approximately 40 States where such legislation had not yet been adopted, the P. W. A. having been requested to submit sample drafts of a municipal housing plan.

Since the autumn of 1933 the cities of 18 States have been empowered to create local housing authorities. They are Alabama, California, Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

New York leads the States with the greatest number of cities which have taken advantage of their newly granted powers and have established local housing authorities—eight, including New York City, Buffalo, Schenectady, Syracuse, Lackawanna, Port Jervis, Yonkers, and Amsterdam.

American slums are among the worst in the western world. From coast to coast the housing conditions which families in the lower-bracket income are obliged to occupy are a shocking commentary on what we like to call the American standard of living. In nearly every American community families live in homes that are unfit for proper human habitation.

The Federal Government has under construction two large housing projects in Brooklyn and Harlem which will provide over 3,000 apartments at low rentals. In addition, the New York Housing Authority has constructed its first group of houses—of low-rent houses by the city. These projects, however, will be unable to rent rooms at a rent low enough to reach thousands of families who, on account of their small incomes, are unable to pay over $5 to $7 per month per room.

The only solution to the problem, to my mind, is the granting by the Government, under proper conditions, amounts up to 80 percent of the cost of carrying out projects; these projects to be well built and supply heat and hot water to the tenants at a rent not exceeding $7 per room per month.

This proposed plan would not interfere with private industry, inasmuch as they could not provide accommodations of this character for rents, specified, and make any profit. In addition, this construction would prove a boom for the building-trade workers. Just last week spokesmen for about 1,000,000 building-trades workers agreed with the labor housing conference held in Washington that a national housing program be commenced which would include a system of Federal subsidies, the establishment of a permanent Federal housing agency, and Federal standards in all public-aid projects.

Officers of the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor, representatives of building unions, and the Labor Housing Conference, adopted a declaration to form the basis of a drive by 60 labor housing committees affiliated with the Labor Housing Conference and other unions throughout the country.

Since 1932, it is said, about two-thirds of the building-trades workers have been unemployed. The union spokesman insisted on the following essentials of a building program:

First. There must be a permanent Federal housing agency, with the responsibility, the power, and the means to see that adequate low-rental housing is constructed.

Second. There must be a clear-cut system of Federal subsidies. In general, families with incomes under $1,200 to $1,500 cannot be housed without some form of outright grant or subsidy. The only agency that can supply such grants today is the Federal Government.

Third. There must be local initiative, cooperation, and responsibility in housing construction and management wherever possible and feasible.

Fourth. The Federal Government must exact adequate standards in all publicly assisted housing projects. One of the basic standards is that prevailing wages must be paid all workers on housing projects. Another is that every project must meet certain definite standards of physical space and equipment and neighborhood planning and facilities. Rent levels and management must be controlled by the housing agency.

The only way many of our people can obtain proper housing conditions is by governmental action. To my mind, it is the function of Government to inculcate a spirit of contentment in the people by providing decent, habitable living quarters properly equipped with heat, hot water, and other modern conveniences.

This objective may be accomplished by passing my bill. It will open a new outlook on life for families of low income in the Nation.

It will be recognized that the very next essential, after you provide food for a man who is in need, is to provide proper housing. It has been said, "Oh, you are going to put the Government in business to compete with the ordinary building trades." That is not so, because in the building of houses for low-income families in the cities of the United States, one cannot afford to buy the land and erect proper buildings at a price that would permit the low-income class of people to rent them. It is, therefore, necessary that the Government should step in and help this class. Take some of the propositions that the Government has financed in the large cities. They have tried the limited-dividend corporation, for instance.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I have been interested in the discussion the gentleman has given us and ask him this question. How far does the gentleman think we should go in creating by Government funds, raised from the taxpayers, nonprofit organizations to compete with private business?

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not speak of nonprofit corporations, other than municipal ones. My bill provides for the granting of subsidies to corporations, which are municipal, State, or other subdivision of the State. It does not provide for grants to either profit or nonprofit private corporations.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman in his statement to say that profit organizations could not do what he wants to do, so that I would think that would put this organization he wants to set up as opposed to profit organizations.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman perhaps did not follow me closely. I was trying to illustrate the fact that in cases of nonprofit organizations or limited profit ones, where the Government had made loans, even under those favorable auspices they were unable to erect proper housing to rent for less than $10, $12, or $14 per room per month.

Mr. SNELL. If we establish these nonprofit organizations with Government funds, why should we not follow it up in every other line of business?

Mr. BOYLAN. I fear the gentleman has not followed my remarks. I repeat that my bill does not provide for subsidies to corporations other than municipal corporations.

Mr. SNELL. But they are nonprofit organizations, competing with private business?

Mr. BOYLAN. No. They will not compete in that class. I have tried to make that clear, too, because the profit-making corporations or speculative builders cannot afford to enter into this class of construction, because it will not produce any return at all.

Mr. SNELL. That is just the point I am getting at.

Mr. BOYLAN. They will not go into business, as the gentleman knows, unless it is profitable.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman advocates putting the Government or a municipality into a business that does not produce any profit and that necessarily comes in competition with private funds trying to make a profit on their business?

Mr. BOYLAN. Oh, the gentleman is too well informed. I know the gentleman and I know his high standing——

Mr. SNELL. Well, never mind that now.

Mr. BOYLAN. Let me answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. SNELL. Never mind that. This is a question of economics I am asking the gentleman about now.

Mr. BOYLAN. I feel the gentleman would do anything possible to help the people of our country, but surely the gentleman is not going to say that the Government should not take a man out of these hovels—these hovels of the great cities—and out of the slums and say that that is a matter for private enterprise?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] has expired.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURLEY].

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Now, has the gentleman any more questions?

Mr. SNELL. I should like to have the gentleman answer the question I asked him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOYLAN. I cannot believe that, because the gentleman is too intelligent. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Let me make this statement: I am opposed to the Government in business. That is my philosophy. I should like to know just how far the gentleman would have the Government go in erecting buildings or in any other line of endeavor in competition with private business? If the gentleman would answer that, that is the only question I have to ask him.

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; I will answer that. It should go far enough to take the low-income people of the great urban centers of this country out of the obsolete houses in which they live in order to give them proper and adequate and decent shelter in order to make them better citizens of this Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. CURLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. As a Representative in this House of a district that is greatly interested in the proposed legislation which the gentleman has introduced, it is the object of this bill which the gentleman is introducing today to stimulate private industry. Is that not right?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; stimulate it; but, of course, in this particular field, there being no profit, private industry will leave it alone.

Mr. CURLEY. As a matter of fact, private interests are not financially able to enter into this construction?

Mr. BOYLAN. Absolutely not. They are not going to work without a reasonable chance to make a profit.

Mr. CURLEY. So that if the National Government does not take a hand in the reconstruction of these tenement-house sections, such as we have in our great city of New York, as well as other cities, we will have conditions such as we had in the past year, where there was great loss of life?

Mr. BOYLAN. Absolutely; loss of health and loss of life.

Mr. CURLEY. There are 161,000 one- and two-family houses in New York where there are five, six, and seven families living. Is that not right?

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired. [Applause.]

Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to yield to anybody during the 10 minutes I have unless my time can be extended.

I want to say a word with reference to the statement of the Federal Treasury. I think it is one of the things to which Members of this House have not given proper consideration. I believe the condition of the Federal Treasury is one of the most serious things that is facing the Nation today.

I had the privilege of the floor on Monday, when KENT KELLER asked my favorite question to the House, "Where are you going to get the money?" I said I could not answer, and I did not believe anybody else could. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. KENT KELLER, said he could. I yielded all of my time to him to answer it, and he made this statement:

> I want you to see that this question of balancing the Budget is not only not vital, but it is a piece of nonsense, in my judgment, to bring it out every time we get up here and talk about it unless we know what we are talking about.

KENT KELLER talked for 18 minutes, and I want you to read it and see whether he has given you anything constructive about balancing the Budget.

I want to call attention to the fact that we have collected this year, beginning July 1 to date, $2,309,601,642.20, and we have expended $4,682,586,233, or we have gone in the red $2,372,984,590.80. Now we are in debt thirty-two and one-half billion dollars. I want to know whether you think that is of serious moment and demands consideration by the Members of this House. When you think that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, says that by the end of this year we will be in the red $40,000,000,000, when a Harvard economist says that we are probably able to stand a $50,000,000,000 indebtedness, where are we going to stop? I say there is someone responsible for this, and I am going to center that responsibility on the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the leader on the majority side of the House of Representatives, and I will name a few other leaders who share this party responsibility with him; and I want it understood that I consider all of these gentlemen my friends, but I do not wish to do them any personal harm. All I wish to do is to get them to assume their responsibility to their party and to our Nation—the country which we all love.

It is up to him and the members of his party to see that we do not go further in debt. You must stop spending or do more taxing, or both.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I will when my 10 minutes have expired, if the gentleman gets me more time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman should yield now. Does the gentleman decline to yield?

Mr. RICH. I will not yield until my 10 minutes are up. I have too much to say to you.

I say it is the responsibility of Mr. BANKHEAD, the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Alabama, and the Members of this House. I present a few more facts, showing the responsibility of others: The President, Mr. Roosevelt, said

in Sioux City, Iowa, September 29, 1932, in referring to Mr. Hoover's administration; I quote:

I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peace times, in all our history—one which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission.

Now I wonder what he thinks of his ruthless expenditures. They must look awful in comparison.

In Pittsburgh, on October 19, 1932, President Roosevelt said:

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.

Let Mr. Roosevelt reflect upon his statement. What does he think of his ruthless expenditures?

In Butte, Mont., President Roosevelt said, on September 19, 1932—I quote:

Remember well that attitude and method, the way to do things, not just the way we say things, is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

Does Mr. Roosevelt now—or has he had any sincerity? I want you to remember this, too, that the expenditures of government from Washington to Wilson, 1789–1913, a total of 124 years, were $24,521,843,000. The expenditures of the Roosevelt administration for 3 years was $24,206,533,000. Someone should hide their face in shame.

Are you sincere in what you are trying to do? This is no foolish or laughing matter. Are you Members of the House going to stop this ruthless expenditure? If the majority leader [Mr. BANKHEAD] and his associates are not responsible, why are they permitting increases in all the bills which have come before us? We have passed the following appropriation bills: Independent offices, Interior, Treasury-Post Office, War Department, and we are now considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. Everyone of these appropriation bills is greatly increased over what it was for the current year.

The President of the United States said on January 3:

We are approaching the balanced Budget.

Read the Treasury statement. Nothing was further from the truth; and when Mr. Farley, out in Kansas the other day, said, "We are in the black"—well, "you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." [Applause.]

Let me say that it takes brains to make money, but any foolish person can spend it. [Laughter.] Any fool can spend other people's money. If you men are sincere in what you say you are going to do in the Democratic platform about a balanced Budget, and what you are expected to do, then you must handle things differently from now on than what you have been doing the past 3 years. It is certainly a very serious matter to me.

What I am saying should be taken a little more seriously.

A MEMBER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Chair will maintain order, for I am extremely anxious to hear this valuable contribution the gentleman is making.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. RICH. On this list in my hand are the names of the men mainly responsible for these large appropriations, and I will insert it in the RECORD. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is the leader of them in the House.

MEN RESPONSIBLE FOR RUTHLESS EXPENDITURES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

William B. Bankhead, majority leader; John J. O'Connor, Rules Committee; James P. Buchanan, Appropriations; Robert L. Doughton, Ways and Means; Lindsay Warren, Accounts; John J. Cochran, Expenditures in the Executive Departments; Marvin Jones, Agriculture; Sam Rayburn, Interstate and Foreign Commerce; John J. McSwain, Military Affairs; Carl Vinson, Naval Affairs; James M. Mead, the Post Office and Post Roads; Joseph J. Mansfield, Rivers and Harbors; Joseph W. Byrns, Speaker of the House; John N. Garner, Vice President; Senator Robinson, Senate majority leader; President Roosevelt, President of the United States; and other Democratic Party committee chairmen.

The bill for relief in 1934 was $2,338,000,000; in 1935 it was $3,188,000,000; in 1936 it will be $3,044,000,000. You will probably very soon be asking more money for relief, and probably it will be necessary; but you are on the wrong track in the laws you have enacted because they are having the very opposite effect to what you intended. You need new Jeffersonian Democrat advisers; and get rid of the "brain trusters." If we are to put 11,400,000 unemployed men back on the pay rolls of industry, it is going to be necessary to do something different from what we are doing and what we have been doing.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield to anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention once more to the first plank in the Democratic platform:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles and reforms herein advocated and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance; to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government; and we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate Executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

Are you going to do it? I want an answer from the Democratic leaders.

If you are going to spend money, are you going to raise it by bringing in a tax bill? Men, it is serious. You Democrats are compelled to bring in a bill for taxation. If you permit this great indebtedness to increase, you are going to find out that you will wreck the Nation. If the American flag behind the Speaker stands for anything to you, to me, or to the people of this country, we have got to preserve the financial structure of the Nation. We cannot permit it to go into bankruptcy, we cannot permit our debts to be canceled. If we do, we are going to lose our form of government; we have no alternative.

Mr. O'CONNOR rose.

Mr. RICH. You are one of those responsible. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Why not point out the Speaker; he is responsible, too.

Mr. RICH. I say he is an honest man.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. When my 10 minutes have expired and if the gentleman will get me more time, I will yield. Some have tried to lead class strife and hatred in the House, and at this point I shall read a statement made on the floor of the Senate in 1838 by Daniel Webster, which, I think, is very applicable in the present day:

There are persons who constantly clamor. They complain of oppression, speculation, and pernicious influence of accumulated wealth. They cry out loudly against all banks and corporations and all means by which small capitalists become united in order to produce important and beneficial results. They carry on mad hostility against all established institutions. They would choke the fountain of industry and dry all streams. In a country of unbounded liberty they clamor against oppression. In a country of perfect equality they would move heaven and earth against privilege and monopoly. In a country where property is more evenly divided than anywhere else they rend the air shouting agrarian doctrines. In a country where wages of labor are high beyond parallel they would teach the laborer he is but an oppressed slave.

Sir, what can such men want? What do they mean? They can want nothing, sir, but to enjoy the fruits of other men's labor. They can mean nothing but disturbance and disorder, the diffusion of corrupt principles, and the destruction of the moral sentiments and moral habits of society.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if we had more Daniel Webster's today, how much better we would be off! We certainly have too many demagogues!

Mr. Speaker, may I quote the following poem, in conclusion, and if I knew who the author was I would give him credit for it, but to me it is very apropos at this time:

TIRED

I'm tired, oh, so tired, of the whole New Deal;
Of the juggler's smile and the barker's spiel;
Of the mushy speech and the loud bassoon;
I'm tiredest of all of our leader's croon.

I'm tired of farmers goose-stepping to laws;
Of millions of itching job holders' paws;
Of fireside talks on commandeered mikes;
Of passing more laws to stimulate strikes.

I'm tired of the daily increasing debt;
I'm tired of promises not to be met;
Eating and sleeping by Government plan,
I'm tired forgetting the forgotten man.

I'm tired of every new "brain trust" thought;
Of the Ship of State turned into a yacht.
I'm tired of beating the courts by stealth,
And terribly tired of sharing the wealth.

I am tired of laws that ruin the land;
Of "brain trusters'" suggestions from every hand;
If Congress, sound business methods would adopt,
This administration might be saved from being a flop.

OPINION OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN GROSJEAN *v.* AMERICAN PRESS CO. (H. DOC. NO. 416)

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Printing I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 421

Resolved, That the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Alice Lee Grosjean, Supervisor of Public Accounts for the State of Louisiana, appellant*, v. *American Press Co., Inc., et al.*, involving the question of the freedom of the press, be printed as a House document; and that 3,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House document room.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to quote two sentences from this great opinion of the Supreme Court:

A free press stands as one of the great interpreters between the Government and the people. To allow it to be fettered is to fetter ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is introduced at the request of a number of Members, and will cost about $35 to print as a document.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas calls up a conference report and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the House insert the following:

"That the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes', approved April 27, 1935, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act also to secure, and the purposes of this Act shall also include, (1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility; (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; (4) the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control; and (5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the five-year period August 1909–July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio. The powers conferred under sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this Act shall be used to assist voluntary action calculated to effectuate the purposes specified in this section. Such powers shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of foods and fibers sufficient to maintain normal domestic human consumption as determined by the Secretary from the records of domestic human consumption in the years 1920 to 1929, inclusive, taking into consideration increased population, quantities of any commodity that were forced into domestic consumption by decline in exports during such period, current trends in domestic consumption and exports of particular commodities, and the quantities of substitutes available for domestic consumption within any general class of food commodities. In carrying out the purposes of this section due regard shall be given to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cooperate with States, in the execution of State plans to effectuate the purposes of this section, by making grants under this section to enable them to carry out such plans.

"'(c) Any State which submits to the Secretary, prior to such time and in such manner and form as the Secretary prescribes, a State plan to effectuate the purposes of this section shall be entitled to payments, as provided in this section, for the year to which such plan is applicable, if such plan is approved by the Secretary as provided in this section.

"'(d) No such plan shall be approved unless by its terms:

"'(1) It provides that the agency to administer the plan shall be such State agency as may be designated by the Secretary if such agency is authorized by the State, or such other State agency as is authorized by the State and approved by the Secretary;

"'(2) It provides for such methods of administration, and such participation in the administration of the plan by county and community committees or associations of agricultural producers organized for such purpose, as the Secretary finds necessary for the effective administration of the plan; and

"'(3) It provides for the submission to the Secretary of such reports as he finds necessary to ascertain whether the plan is being carried out according to its terms, and for compliance with such requirements as the Secretary may prescribe to assure the correctness of and make possible the verification of such reports.

"'(e) Such plan shall be approved if the Secretary finds that there is a reasonable prospect that—

"'(1) Substantial accomplishment in effectuating the purposes of this section will be brought about through the operation of such plan and the plans submitted by other States, and

"'(2) The operation of such plan will result in as substantial a furtherance of such accomplishment as may reasonably be achieved through the action of such State.

"'(f) Upon approval of any State plan for any year the Secretary shall allocate to such State such sum (not in excess of the maximum amount fixed in pursuance of subsection (g) for such State for such year) as he finds necessary to carry out such plan for such year, and thereupon shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such agency of the State as the Secretary of Agriculture certifies is designated in the plan, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to such agency, one-fourth of the amount so allocated. The remainder of the amount so allocated shall be similarly certified and paid in such installments (payable prior to the end of the calendar year) as may be provided in the plan. No such installment shall be certified for payment if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that, prior to the due date of such installment, there has been a substantial failure by the State to carry out the plan according to its terms, or that the further operation of the plan according to its terms will not tend to effectuate the purposes of this section. No amount shall be certified for payment under any such installment in excess of the amount the Secretary finds necessary for the effective carrying out of the plan during the period to which the installment relates.

"'(g) On or before November 1 of each year, the Secretary shall apportion among the several States the funds which will be available for carrying out State plans during the next calendar year, and in determining the amount to be apportioned to each State, the Secretary shall take into consideration the acreage and value of the major soil depleting and major export crops produced in the respective States during a representative period and the acreage and productivity of land devoted to agricultural production (including dairy products) in the respective States during a representative period: *Provided, however*, That apportionments of funds available for carrying out the purposes specified in this section for the year 1936 may be made at any time during 1936, and apportionments for 1937 may be made at any time during 1937. Notwithstanding the making of an apportionment to any State for any calendar year, the funds apportioned to any State for which no plan has been approved for such year, and any amount apportioned to any State

which is not required to carry out an approved plan for such State for such year, shall be available for carrying out the provisions of sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this Act.

"'SEC. 8. (a) In order to carry out the purposes specified in section 7 (a) during the period necessary to afford a reasonable opportunity for legislative action by a sufficient number of States to assure the effectuation of such purposes by State action and in order to promote the more effective accomplishment of such purposes by State action thereafter, the Secretary shall exercise the powers conferred in this section during the period prior to January 1, 1938, except with respect to farming operations commenced in any State after the effective date of a State plan for such State approved pursuant to section 7. No such powers shall be exercised after December 31, 1937, except with respect to payments or grants in connection with farming operations carried out prior to January 1, 1938.

"'(b) Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts, determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by, (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion, (2) changes in the use of their land, (3) a percentage of their normal production of any one or more agricultural commodities designated by the Secretary which equals that percentage of the normal national production of such commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption, or (4) any combination of the above. In determining the amount of any payment or grant measured by (1) or (2) the Secretary shall take into consideration the productivity of the land affected by the farming practices adopted during the year with respect to which such payment is made. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall, as far as practicable, protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to utilize county and community committees of agricultural producers and the agricultural extension service, or other approved agencies. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall not have power to enter into any contract binding upon any producer or to acquire any land or any right or interest therein. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall, in every practicable manner, protect the interests of small producers. The Secretary in administering this section shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil conserving and soil rebuilding practices rather than the growing of soil depleting commercial crops.

"'(c) Any payment or grant of aid made under subsection (b) shall be conditioned upon the utilization of the land, with respect to which such payment is made, in conformity with farming practices which the Secretary finds tend to effectuate the purposes specified in clause (1), (2), (3), or (4) of section 7 (a).

"'SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to conduct surveys, investigations, and research relating to the conditions and factors affecting, and methods of accomplishing most effectively, the policy and purposes of section 7 (a). Notwithstanding any provision of existing law, the Secretary is authorized to make public such information as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"'SEC. 10. The term "agricultultural commodity" as used in this Act means any such commodity and any regional or market classification, type, or grade thereof.

"'SEC. 11. All funds available for carrying out this Act shall be available for allotment to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture and for transfer to such other agencies of the Federal or State Governments as the Secretary may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out this Act.

"'SEC. 12. Whenever the Secretary finds that the exercise of the powers conferred in this section will tend to carry out the purpose specified in clause (5) of section 7 (a), or will tend to provide for and maintain a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers, or both, he shall use such part as he deems necessary of the sums appropriated to carry out this Act for the expansion of domestic and foreign markets or for seeking new or additional markets for agricultural commodities or the products thereof or for the removal or disposition of surpluses of such commodities or the products thereof.

"'SEC. 13. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized and directed to provide for the execution by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration of such powers conferred upon him under sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this Act as he deems may be appropriately exercised by such Administration, and for such purposes the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration shall apply.

"'SEC. 14. The facts constituting the bases for any payment or grant or the amount thereof authorized to be made under section 7 or 8 hereof, when officially determined in conformity with rules or regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be reviewable only by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"'SEC. 15. To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of sections 7 and 8 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year not exceeding $500,000,000.

"'SEC. 16. The obligations incurred for the purpose of carrying out, for any calendar year, the provisions of sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this Act shall not exceed $500,000,000.

"'SEC. 17. (a) This Act shall apply to the United States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the possession of Puerto Rico, and as used in this Act, the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"'(b) This Act may be cited as the "Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act."'

"SEC. 2. Section 32 of the Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, approved August 24, 1935, is amended by striking out clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof, '(3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion and what constitutes normal channels of trade and commerce and what constitutes normal production for domestic consumption shall be final.' and by striking out that part of the last sentence thereof which precedes the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof: 'The sums appropriated under this section shall be expended for such one or more of the above-specified purposes, and at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of the purposes of this section:'.

"SEC. 3. The unexpended balance of the funds appropriated by the second paragraph of Public Resolution Numbered 27, Seventy-third Congress, approved May 25, 1934, to carry out section 2 and section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act so as to include cattle and other products as basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes', approved April 7, 1934, and the unexpended balance of the funds appropriated or reappropriated by section 37 of Public Act Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', is authorized to be made available for the purposes enumerated in said Acts until June 30, 1937. The authorization, which is limited to June 30, 1936, contained in section 37 of Public Act Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, is likewise extended so that the funds therein authorized are authorized to be made available until June 30, 1937.

"SEC. 4. The sum of $2,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for relief purposes contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935, is hereby made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for allocation and payment to the States in the Southern Great Plains area, or to farmers therein, for wind erosion control, under plans to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 5. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words 'this title' wherever they appear the following: 'or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended'; and by striking out the words 'an adjustment' wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'any'."

And the House agree to the same.

MARVIN JONES,
H. P. FULMER,
WALL DOXEY,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

E. D. SMITH,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
LOUIS MURPHY,
LYNN J. FRAZIER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill (sec. 7 (a)) included, as one of the items constituting the policy and purposes of the bill, promotion of the economic use and conservation of land. In the House amendment the comparable provision omits the reference to conservation of land. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The Senate bill (sec. 7 (a)) included, in the statement of the policy and purposes of the bill, diminution of wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources. In the House amendment the comparable provision with respect to use of soil resources relates to the unprofitable use of such resources. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The Senate bill (sec. 7 (a)), in the statement of the policy and purposes of the bill, included protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control. No such express provision is contained in the House amendment. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The House amendment (section 7 (a)), in the statement of the policy and purposes of the bill, includes provision for and maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to domestic and foreign consumer requirements at prices fair to producers and consumers. Under the Senate bill the provision is not an independent policy and purpose but has

the effect of a factor to which due regard is to be given in carrying out the purposes of the section. Under the Senate bill the supply of agricultural commodities to which the provision related was one adequate to meet consumer demand rather than one adequate to meet domestic and foreign consumer requirements, as in the House amendment. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The Senate bill (section 7 (a)), in the statement of the policy and purposes of the bill, included reestablishment and maintenance of farmers' purchasing power.

The House amendment contains a similar provision considerably elaborated. It provides for the reestablishment and maintenance of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income of persons on farms and the income of persons not on farms that prevailed during the period August 1, 1909, to July 31, 1914. This ratio is to be reestablished at as rapid a rate as the Secretary determines to be practicable and in the public interest. Determinations under the provision are to be made from statistics available in the Department of Agriculture.

The House amendment also contains a provision, not expressly set forth in the Senate bill, under which the powers conferred in that part of the bill which amends the Soil Erosion Act are to be used to encourage voluntary action calculated to effectuate the purposes set forth in the beginning of the section.

The House amendment also contains a provision, not expressly set forth in the Senate bill, under which such powers are prohibited from being used to discourage the production of foods and fibers sufficient to maintain normal domestic human consumption as represented by the period 1920–29, inclusive, as determined by the Secretary. In determining domestic human consumption for these years the Secretary is to take into consideration increased population, quantities forced into domestic consumption by decline in exports, current trends in exports and domestic consumption, and substitutes available for domestic consumption.

The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Under the Senate bill (sec. 7 (b)) the Secretary was directed to cooperate with States in the execution of State plans to effectuate all the purposes of the section. Similarly, a State plan to effectuate all the purposes had to be submitted (sec. 7 (c)), and it had to have a reasonable prospect of effectuating them all in order to be approved (sec. 7 (e) (1)). If it no longer tended to effectuate them all, no further funds were to be available to the State (sec. 7 (f)). Under the House amendment in all these particulars the requirement is referable to one or more of the purposes of the section, rather than to them all. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The Senate bill provided (sec. 7 (d) (1)), among the requirements for approval of a State plan, that the agency to administer it be such agency as is authorized by the State and approved by the Secretary. Under the House amendment it is expressly provided that the agency is to be the land-grant college, or if more than one, all of them in the State, or, if not the land-grant college, such other State agency as may be approved by the Secretary. The provision as agreed to in conference provides that the agency to administer the plan shall be such State agency as may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture if such agency is authorized by the State or such other State agency as is authorized by the State and approved by the Secretary.

In determining amounts to be apportioned to any State for any calendar year the Senate bill (sec. 8 (g)) provided that the Secretary was to take into consideration the acreage and value of the major soil-depleting crops and export crops for a representative period. Under the House bill he is to take into consideration instead the farm population, value of agricultural commodities, and the acreage and productivity of land devoted to agricultural production during a representative period. In the conference agreement it is provided that the Secretary shall take into consideration the acreage and value of the major soil-depleting and major export crops produced in the respective States during a representative period and the acreage and productivity of land devoted to production in the respective States during a representative period, and in the case of consideration of acreage and productivity of land an express provision is inserted to make certain that land devoted to production of dairy products is included.

Under both the Senate bill and the House amendment (section 8 (g)) State plans can be approved and go into operation in 1936 by the provision authorizing apportionments for 1936 to be made at any time during 1936. The House bill authorized apportionments for 1937 likewise to be made at any time during that year. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Under the Senate bill (section 8 (g)) even if apportionments have been made for 1936 or 1937, funds which have been apportioned to any State if there is no plan approved for that State may be used under section 8 in any State for which no plan has been approved. The House amendment removes the limitation which confines the operation of the provision to 1936 and 1937 and makes it applicable to any calendar year. It makes funds not required to carry out an approved State plan or apportioned to a State for which no plan is approved available for carrying out sections 7 to 14, rather than section 8 (the temporary plan) alone. Neither bill, however, extends the temporary plan by reason of this provision. The conference agreement adopts the substance of the House provision and makes certain that the funds not required to carry out a State plan because no plan has been approved for such State may likewise be used for the purposes of sections 7 to 14.

Section 8 authorizes the Secretary to carry out the direct-payment plan but limits his authority to the period prior to January 1, 1938, except in connection with farming operations carried out prior to then. Section 8 (a) of the Senate bill contained an express provision, not found in the House amendment, prohibiting the exercise of the powers contained in that section in any State even prior to January 1, 1938, with respect to farming operations begun after the effective date of a State plan applicable in that State. The House amendment (section 8 (a)) strikes out the "shall" requiring him to exercise the powers given him by that section and inserts "may" in order to remove the possible contradiction in requiring him to carry out the temporary plan notwithstanding that section 7 requires the permanent plan during the temporary period if the plans of the States are approved. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision under which the Secretary is not to exercise powers conferred under the section even prior to January 1, 1938, in a State, with respect to farming operations commenced after the effective date of the plan for such State. It also restores the "shall", since, with the Senate provision, it is clear that the Secretary is not to exercise powers under the temporary plan in any State after the permanent plan is in operation in that State.

The Senate bill (sec. 8 (b)) authorized the Secretary to carry out all the purposes specified in section 7 (a) by making payments or grants to producers for the temporary period. The House amendment limits this authorization to the first three clauses of section 7 (a): Preservation and improvement of soil fertility; promotion of economic use of land; and diminution of unprofitable use of soil resources. The conference agreement adopts the House provision, expanded to include the fourth clause of section 7 (a), protection of rivers and harbors and maintenance of navigability of streams.

The House amendment (sec. 8 (b)) which authorizes payments or grants of other aid to "agricultural producers" expressly includes tenants and sharecroppers within such term. There is no comparable express provision in the Senate bill. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

The Senate bill (sec. 8 (b)) contained a provision under which the amounts to be paid to producers under the temporary plan were to be those determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of the purposes of the section during the year for which payments were to be made. No comparable express provision is contained in the House amendment. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Under the Senate bill (sec. 8 (b)) and the House amendment, the alternative bases or measures of payments were different. They are contrasted below under their corresponding numbers in the two provisions.

(1) The first basis of payment in the Senate bill was the acreage of crop land. The House amendment has, instead, treatment or use of land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion.

(2) The second basis in the Senate bill was the acreage of soil improving or erosion preventing crops. No corresponding express provision is contained in the House bill.

(3) The third basis in the Senate bill was changes in the farming practices during the year on the land with respect to which the payment is made. The comparable House provision (clause (2)) relates to changes in the use of land.

(4) Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorize payment on a domestic consumption percentage. They are substantially the same, except that the domestic consumption which is the basis for calculating the percentage in the Senate bill is domestic consumption through normal channels, while the House bill has no provision relating to normal channels.

(5) The Senate bill expressly authorized a combination of any of the four above-enumerated bases. The House bill contains no comparable express provision.

The conference agreement adopts the House provisions, but adds thereto the Senate provision authorizing a combination of the bases of payment.

The House amendment (sec. 8 (b)) provides that in determining the apportionment of any payment or grant with respect to land the Secretary shall take into consideration the contribution in services of tenants and croppers and any loss of income sustained by tenants or croppers by reason of changes in farming practices adopted in the years with respect to which the payments or grants are made. There is no comparable provision in the Senate bill. The conference agreement omits the House provision and substitutes therefor a provision under which the Secretary, in carrying out the section, as far as practicable, is to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers.

The House amendment (sec. 8 (b)) contains a provision not found in the Senate bill by which it is provided that the Secretary, in carrying out the temporary plan, shall in every practicable manner protect the interests of small producers. The conference agreement adopts this provision.

The House amendment (sec. 8 (b)) contains a provision not found in the Senate bill by which it is provided that the Secretary, in carrying out the temporary plan, shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding practices rather than the growing of soil-depleting commercial crops. The conference agreement adopts this provision.

Under the Senate bill (sec. 8 (c)) payments or grants made for the temporary period were to be conditioned upon utilization of the land in conformity with practices the Secretary finds tend to effectuate the purposes of the first three clauses of section 7 (a).

The House amendment provides that the payments or grants be conditioned upon such utilization by the producer of his land or a part thereof as the Secretary finds has tended to further the purposes so specified. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision expanded to include the purpose of protection of rivers and harbors and maintenance of navigability of streams.

The House amendment (sec. 11) inserts a section not contained in the Senate bill which makes funds to carry out the act available for allotment to bureaus and offices in the Department and to agencies of the Federal and State Governments requested to cooperate or assist in carrying out the act. The conference agreement adopts this provision.

Both the Senate bill (sec. 11) and the House amendment (sec. 12) make funds available for expansion of markets and removal of surpluses. Under the Senate bill the Secretary was to use such funds for such purposes if he found that their use would tend to carry out clause (4) of section 7 (a). This probably was a clerical error and the reference was intended to be to clause (5) which related to the reestablishment and maintenance of farmers' purchasing power. Under the House amendment the Secretary can use the funds if he finds that their use either would tend to establish or maintain farmers' purchasing power (clause (5)), or to provide for and maintain a continuous and stable supply adequate to consumer requirements at fair prices (clause (4)), or both. The conference agreement adopts the House provision with necessary clerical and technical changes.

The Senate bill (sec. 11) also authorized the use of funds for stabilization of markets and authorized the Secretary in carrying out such section to enter into contracts with associations of producers and associations composed of producer associations under which they could be designated by the Secretary to carry out any program authorized under the section. The Secretary was authorized to allot funds to such associations for such purposes. No comparable provision is contained in the House amendment. The conference agreement omits this provision.

The Senate bill (sec. 12) authorized the use of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in carrying out the sections of the bill which are added to the original Soil Erosion Act. The House amendment (sec. 13) extends this authorization to the use of the Administration in carrying out the provisions of the original Soil Erosion Act as well. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision as section 13.

Under the Senate bill (sec. 13) the facts constituting the bases for any payment or grant under section 7 or 8 of the bill or the amount thereof when officially determined in conformity with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture were reviewable only by him. The comparable provision of the House amendment (sec. 14) provides that the action of any officer or employee in determining the amount of or in making any such payment or grant shall not be subject to review except by the Secretary of Agriculture. The conference agreement adopts the substance of the Senate provision, as section 14, except that it applies to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary rather than to regulations promulgated by him.

The Senate bill (sec. 14) contained a provision authorizing an appropriation for any fiscal year of not more than $500,000,000 for carrying out sections 7 and 8. There is no comparable provision in the House amendment. The conference agreement adopts this provision as section 15.

The Senate bill (sec. 15) provided that the obligations incurred for carrying out the act (including the provisions of the original act to which this bill is added) for any fiscal year should not exceed $500,000,000. The comparable provision of the House amendment relates this provision to the carrying out of the amendatory sections (secs. 7 to 14, inclusive); puts the limitation on incurring obligations on a calendar-year basis rather than a fiscal-year basis; and makes it clear that the provision relates the limitation to the incurring of obligations with respect to the programs to be undertaken in a particular calendar year. The conference agreement adopts the House provision as section 16.

The Senate bill made the short title of the act the "Soil Conservation Act." The House amendment made the title the "Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act." The conference agreement adopts the House provision as section 17.

The House amendment, in the amendment to the provisions of existing law which authorizes the use of an amount equal to 30 percent of the customs receipts for certain purposes in connection with agriculture, inserts a provision which strikes out the authorization of existing law for financing adjustments in acreage or production and substitutes therefor a provision authorizing the reestablishment of farmers' purchasing power by the making of payments on a domestic-allotment basis. The House amendment also makes certain determinations by the Secretary under the section final. The House amendment also makes a technical correction in the provision laying down standards for payments. The conference agreement adopts the House provision with clerical changes in the reference to the section of existing law which is amended.

The House amendment makes technical changes in the provision of the Senate bill (sec. 3) authorizing extension to June 30, 1937, of authorizations to appropriate or reappropriate funds for dairy- and beef-cattle industries relief. The amendments are designed to make certain that the funds heretofore authorized may hereafter be appropriated and the funds heretofore appropriated may hereafter be reappropriated. They also make certain that such of the authorizations of appropriations as are not limited in time by their terms are not limited in time by this bill. The conference agreement adopts the House provisions.

The House amendment inserts a new section (sec. 4), not contained in the Senate bill, under which $2,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for relief purposes contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 is made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for allocation and payment to the States in the Southern Great Plains area, or to farmers therein, for wind-erosion control, under plans approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. The conference agreement adopts this provision.

MARVIN JONES,
H. P. FULMER,
WALL DOXEY,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JONES (interrupting reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, this statement covers several pages and is available to all Members. Unless someone insists on its being read at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading be dispensed with.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not insist on reading the report or the statement, but I think the gentleman should explain to the House what changes have been made in the conference report.

Mr. JONES. I will undertake to do that.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the conference report is an agreement signed by members of both the House and Senate conference group. In my judgment, it substantially follows the important House provisions. There are a number of clerical changes, where one or the other was taken, as the language seemed better suited to carry out the provisions of the act.

The first important question that came up was that of including in one of the purposes the protection of rivers and harbors from damage from soil erosion. The Senate provision was included in reference to that matter.

The next important provision was the one in reference to the protection of consumers; that is, the so-called consumer amendment. The consumer amendment was embodied as written in the House bill and is so reported by the conference.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Was the consumer amendment left exactly as the House passed it?

Mr. JONES. The consumer amendment was left just as the House passed it. There were two or three lines prior to the amendment, wherein there is some change in language, but the actual consumer amendment was adopted just as it passed the House.

Another change was a shift of language in connection with the amendment pertaining to an adequate supply of farm products on a fair price basis to satisfy the needs of the markets both at home and abroad. This matter was simply shifted to another part of the bill.

There was some change in the allocation of the funds, and a combination of Senate and House amendments was included. The so-called tenant amendment was somewhat modified in form but has substantially the same purpose as outlined in the original bill. The amendment for the protection of the small producer was retained in the measure.

Section 12, in substance, is as the House passed it. We included, in addition to the House limitations as to the amount of money that might be obligated, the Senate limitation on the amount that might be appropriated in any one year.

I believe this covers the substantial differences.

Mr. PIERCE and Mr. CHRISTIANSON rose.

Mr. JONES. I yield first to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. What is the situation with respect to flood control? Is there any limitation on that? I heard there was a provision put in that money could be used for flood control.

Mr. JONES. No; the reference is to soil rebuilding and soil conservation, having as one of its objects, among several others, the protection of rivers and harbors.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Did the Senate recede from the so-called La Follette amendment?

Mr. JONES. Yes; the La Follette amendment is not included in the measure.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. When the gentleman refers to the limitation on the amount as put in by the Senate, is that the Clark amendment?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. In the section of the bill that provides the method of distributing the money by the Secretary of Agriculture to the various States, I notice you have included language in the bill as it comes from the conference that did not appear in either the Senate bill or the House bill, namely, the words "including dairy products."

Mr. JONES. We understood that they were already included. But to make sure they were included in specific terms, and as we eliminated one of the other provisions of the House bill, we simply inserted that language to make sure that would be the interpretation.

Mr. BOILEAU. I notice you have just before that the words "and productivity of land devoted to agricultural production", and then follow the words "including dairy products." It there any doubt upon the part of the members of the conference that dairy products are agricultural commodities?

Mr. JONES. No; but some of the conferees wanted to be sure about the matter; and inasmuch as we were eliminating one other provision, we inserted that language. There was not any doubt in the minds of any of the members of the conference, but we wanted it framed so there could be no doubt in the mind of anybody who might be called upon to construe the language. We wanted to be sure our interpretation would be followed in its administration. There were some who thought that someone in its interpretation might be inclined to construe it as being limited to crops only, and we wanted to be sure that no such construction was possible.

Mr. BOILEAU. The language was "and productivity of land devoted to agricultural production", and then you have inserted "including dairy products." I was just wondering if there is any disposition on the part of anybody here to exclude dairy products or to think that dairy products are not agricultural commodities.

Mr. JONES. There was not any such disposition, but in view of the discussion here we wanted to make it perfectly clear that there could not be any such construction possible by anyone.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman says, "in view of the discussion here." Of course, this only applies to the permanent bill and has no connection with any fight made on the floor of the House with reference to the language of the bill.

Mr. JONES. I understand that, but there is no difference in the construction of language, whether it is to be temporary or permanent.

Mr. BOILEAU. This applies only to the permanent legislation and has no connection with the temporary program.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield I should like to ask one more question on that same section.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. The House bill carried a provision that in the distribution of these permanent funds the agricultural population of each State should be taken into consideration and that has been changed, as I understand, in the permanent bill.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What will be the effect of that?

Mr. JONES. I do not think there will be any very great effect, in view of the inclusive nature of the amendment. It includes all the major soil-depleting crops, all the major export crops, and it includes all agricultural production. We made it certain that that includes dairy products. So I think there will not be any very great difference, in view of the inclusive nature of the language.

Mr. SNELL. One reason I think that should be in the bill is that such language is something that everybody can definitely understand, while general language is always so indefinite it is sometimes hard to construe.

Mr. JONES. The figures are about as accurate with respect to the other things in view of the statistics that are gathered.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman is sure that will not make any trouble?

Mr. JONES. I think not.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that we did have some discussion with the representatives of the dairy sections as to the effect that there might be an undue expansion of the dairy and livestock industry.

Mr. JONES. Yes; I recall that.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Was any action taken by the conferees so as to, perhaps, retard any such movement?

Mr. JONES. The Senate agreed to the House amendment, which was put in and which the gentleman will recall I offered here. The Senate yielded on that.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman then think his amendment, which was adopted in the House, will be a yardstick so as not to permit an extensive expansion of the dairy and livestock industry?

Mr. JONES. I do not think we have the authority to insert a mandatory provision, but I hope every effort will be made to protect the dairy interests, and I am sure they will be, and we have other provisions in the bill which I think will also have the same effect. The gentleman will recall the letters from both Administrator Davis and Secretary Wallace which were printed in the RECORD and which give assurance on this matter.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Then the gentleman will say that it is the intent of Congress that there should not be an undue displacing of the livestock and dairy industries?

Mr. JONES. I am not authorized to say what is the intent of Congress; but I assert that it is my wish, and I think the wish of most of the Members, that there be no undue expansion or any injury done to any business.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman is able to express the intent of Congress.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. In view of the discussion which took place regarding the manner in which the money will be apportioned among the various States and the factors to be taken into consideration, particularly the elimination of the factor of farm population, I just wanted to say that I do not believe that that will make any material difference in the distribution of the funds, particularly as the original bill did not say what particular weight should be given by the Secretary to that factor; and this bill does not, so far as that is concerned. It simply sets up factors and permits the Department of Agriculture to give whatever weight it may deem right to these various factors which must be considered.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, which I think correctly interprets the provision.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a double question. Is not the phrase "including dairy products" subject to a point of order either in this House or in the Senate, and if the point of order is made those words will be stricken out as legislation not in either the House or the Senate bill?

Mr. JONES. I do not think so. It is wholly clarifying and, I think, does not add to the substance or the meaning. It was in different section numbers of the House and the Senate bills. There can be no question about our right to add a clarifying expression to either one.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The other question is this: The gentleman remembers the amendment I tried to introduce to com-

pel dumping for domestic consumption before dumping is made for foreign consumption, in order to keep the prices up. Is there anything in the bill now as it is drawn by the conferees that gives more assurance that the domestic consumers will get the benefit of the dumping before the foreign consumers or merchants?

Mr. JONES. I do not think there will be any dumping in any event, but I state to the gentleman that we put a provision in similar to the one the gentleman suggested, in which we made it possible to use it in domestic fields, whereas the 30 percent, because of the way certain restrictions had been interpreted, could not be fully applied in that way before.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. That is in the domestic field for purposes other than the regular channels of trade?

Mr. JONES. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Reverting to the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], as to the interpretation of the word "dairying", does the gentleman not understand that the courts or the Department has said—some of the courts—that dairying is not agriculture as construed in connection with the Frazier-Lemke mortgage-moratorium bill?

Mr. JONES. I do not recall any such statement as having been made.

Mr. MICHENER. As I recall, the Judiciary Committee reported an amendment defining dairying as an agricultural pursuit. This was necessary because the courts had held otherwise. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] has law referred to. That law only refers to a specified section of the bankruptcy law, however.

Mr. JONES. I do not agree to such a construction. The whole dairy division is in agriculture.

Mr. MICHENER. As an illustration, a large dairy in New York, within the city of New York, was cited, where they had a large number of cattle, which were fed on imported feed. The dairy business was carried on entirely within the city limits, and that inasmuch as that was the case, that dairying was not agriculture.

Mr. JONES. That must have been dairy marketing the gentleman is talking about. I never heard of a dairy farm in the city limits of a big city. I think the gentleman is talking about a different expression. Undoubtedly the term "agriculture" includes dairy products. The whole dairy division is under agriculture and all of the language heretofore has been construed to include those things.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. I did not hear the gentleman's answer to the question regarding the La Follette amendment. Is that in or out?

Mr. JONES. That is eliminated.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Is the gentleman satisfied with the language employed in subsection (b) of section 8 in regard to carrying benefits of this act to tenants and sharecroppers?

Mr. JONES. I think that is the best that we can have, and I think it will assure that they will be fairly treated.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The gentleman believes that the tenant and sharecropper may have an assurance under this language that he will be fairly treated?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. I rise to congratulate the gentleman and the conferees, particularly on keeping in the bill the so-called consumers' amendment. I think the gentleman deserves great credit. It has been said somewhere by somebody that the House does fool things. I wish the House would do many more such fool things as it has done in the successful handling of this conference report.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the parliamentary situation to be that the gentleman from Texas has asked unanimous consent that the further reading of the conference report be dispensed with?

Mr. JONES. No. That has been granted. The conference report is under consideration.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. This language includes dairy products, and the chairman has stated it is merely clarifying language, although it was not in either the House bill or the Senate bill, but they feel that it properly comes here. I for one feel that a point of order should be made and ruled upon so that in the event it comes before the courts at least we have decided it and know that it is here.

The SPEAKER. Without passing on the merits of the point of order, the Chair will state it comes entirely too late.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I understand. I was just making a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. I might clear up the question as to what the courts have held is agriculture and what is not. In the State of Washington and a half a dozen other States the courts have held that agriculture means only the tilling of the soil, in passing on the Frazier-Lemke bankruptcy amendment. So in Public, No. 60 appears the definition of what a farmer is, and this was approved May 15, 1935. It reads as follows:

> (r) For the purposes of this section, section 4 (b), and section 74, the term "farmer" includes not only an individual who is primarily bona fide personally engaged in producing products of the soil, but also any individual who is primarily bona fide personally engaged in dairy farming, the production of poultry or livestock, or the production of poultry products or livestock products in their unmanufactured state, or the principal part of whose income is derived from any one or more of the foregoing operations, and includes the personal representative of a deceased farmer; and a farmer shall be deemed a resident of any county in which such operations occur.

I might state the courts in a half a dozen States have held that an agricultural farmer means a farmer who tills the soil.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will look at those decisions he will find they were cases which contained some special language. We put in this bill that agricultural products shall include all agricultural commodities, and all grades and types thereof. That is in the measure that we here present. Webster says in its broad sense the term "agriculture" includes livestock and all types of farming; all the things which the gentleman says now. His particular bill, I am sure he will find, when he looks into it, contained some special provision that made it apply to only one type. If any doubt arises, that will be corrected, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. LEMKE. That was a case where a person was raising livestock.

Mr. JONES. Well, what was it he wanted to do?

Mr. LEMKE. He wanted to come under the Frazier-Lemke moratorium, and the court said he was not a farmer and that his activities did not relate to agricultural production.

Mr. JONES. We are talking about agriculture and agricultural production. That was a measure, of course, that covered a particular thing, and that kind of a measure would be strictly construed, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. LEMKE. It was considered in a narrow sense and not in the broader sense. I am afraid the court will do the same thing with this act.

Mr. JONES. I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into a discussion of funds in connection with this bill, but I will state that with increased prices and increased business, both on the farms and in the industrial sections, you could take a very small part

of the increased price and still leave people with a lot more money and business than they had during the previous administration.

I want to read in this connection the definition of "agricultural commodity", this having been quite a controverted point:

SEC. 10. The term "agricultural commodity" as used in this act means any such commodity and any regional or market classification, type, or grade thereof.

Under this language I think there can be no doubt that dairy products would be included, even if there were any doubt otherwise.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the word "agriculture" in its ordinarily accepted meaning include every one of these things?

Mr. JONES. I do not think there can be any question about it.

Mr. MAY. If "agriculture" does not cover them, nothing will.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. TABER. How did it happen that the House conferees yielded in the matter of subsection 4 of section 7?—

The protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and watercourses and in aid of flood control.

Mr. JONES. I may state to the gentleman from New York that the same purpose, briefly, is stated in the original Soil Conservation Act. It seemed that the Senate conferees should have something out of this. We did not think it made much difference, so we yielded on this particular proposition.

Mr. TABER. It leaves a question as to jurisdiction.

Mr. JONES. I do not think it will be abused. I may state to the gentleman that this deals primarily with soil conservation, and not with rivers and harbors.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, March 3, the anniversary of the admission of the State of Maine into the Union, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes immediately following the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—next Tuesday is the regular day set aside for the calling of bills on the Private Calendar. We have not gotten along very well with the Private Calendar this session. So, while I will not object to the pending request, I will object to any further requests to address the House on that date.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of criticism of the disciplinary action taken by the War Department in the case of General Hagood. I believe this House has a desire to be fair in all things, and that the American public is imbued with a sense of fair play. We should not make up our minds or criticize the action of the War Department until we hear both sides of this case. I feel that very hasty judgment has been taken by many Members of the House and by some of the newspapers without a full knowledge of the facts upon which the War Department bases its action. I do not know whether it has become generally known, but this is not the first time disciplinary action has been recommended with reference to this officer; and in saying this I do not want in any way to detract from the soldierly qualities he has exhibited in times of national emergency. He was a good officer during the World War, but he seems to have lost track of the fact that he owes a loyalty to his Commander in Chief; that we must have discipline in the armed forces of this country.

A man who has been in the Army as long as General Hogood and has reached his high rank should know that freedom of speech is not license to voice personal opinions which are not those of the War Department and which are critical of the civil administration of government.

General Hagood's record, as made public by the War Department, shows that he has been reprimanded several times since 1919. In 1927 the then Inspector General of the Army described a book entitled "The Service of Supply", written by General Hagood, as containing "tactless, ill-advised, and doubtful statements of fact and opinion."

In the same year, upon his dismissal of Colonel Baltzell from command of the Twenty-second Infantry, he was advised by the War Department:

Your failure to conform to the usual approved methods of command, your faulty judgment, hasty action, and intemperate statements in administering discipline, conclusively shown in the investigation of this case, indicate you do not possess the qualities of command expected of an officer of your high rank.

Doubtless this is new information to most of you, after hearing the glowing eulogies of General Hagood the last few days. The record speaks for itself. Are we going to undermine discipline and loyalty to the service in this Army of ours by condoning a continuing course of conduct which is bound to have a most unwholesome effect upon the morale of the entire Army?

Fortunately civil authority has always been supreme in this country. The military has always been subservient to civil authority. This has not been the case in many of the nations of the world. We have, for example, today small military cliques in the Far East doing things we would all regret to have done in this country. We know that not only has this happened in Japan but also in Greece in recent months, and in South American countries from time to time. Fortunately for this democracy the Army has stayed out of politics, and for the safety of our country it always should stay out of politics.

General Hagood had full opportunity to revise his testimony. In view of his record, I submit the War Department had no option except to take the disciplinary action it did.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting therein the memorandum of the Chief of Staff upon the disciplinary action imposed on General Hagood.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—but is the House to understand from the gentleman's remarks that he condones the drastic action of the War Department in General Hagood's case? And does the gentleman think that when a general of the United States Army comes before any committee he should be muffled and not permitted to express his sentiments simply because he happens to be an officer in the Army?

Mr. HARTER. Answering the first question, may I say that I certainly do condone the action of the War Department, and feel it was justified in the action that has been taken in this case.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman intend to include in his extension of remarks the waiver which the Chief of Staff gave General Hagood when he appeared before this committee? If it is the gentleman's intention to include that, I will not object.

Mr. HARTER. That has already been inserted in the RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. CULKIN. This self-serving declaration of the War Department has appeared in the daily press. If the gentleman will insert the waiver, I have no objection; otherwise I shall object.

Mr. HARTER. If the gentleman will look at the RECORD of yesterday, page 2858, he will find that the waiver has been there inserted.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman inform us as to what language the general used that was objectionable to the Commander in Chief? Was it his reference to P. W. A. funds being stage money? Was that the principal objection?

Mr. HARTER. Well, I can quote to the gentleman from Oregon a part of what the general said. General Hagood told "what he thought of some of the New Deal relief spending." The general further said he was not familiar with the various pockets in which Uncle Sam keeps his money, and other statements. Does the gentleman care to have me repeat the other language, which, doubtless, he has read in the daily press?

Mr. MOTT. No; I simply wanted to know what particular language was objectionable. He referred to some of this money as being stage money.

Mr. HARTER. There are other objectionable statements included in the War Department's memorandum.

Mr. MOTT. I have no objection to including that; in fact, I would be very glad to see what it is that the President considered objectionable language.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS

In view of the attention that has been attracted to the recent disciplinary action imposed on Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, the War Department believes it advisable to break its usual rule of silence in this case. Accordingly it is making public the memorandum in which the Chief of Staff detailed the circumstances of Major General Hagood's violation of military discipline, together with the Secretary of War's approval of the action taken. It is thus made apparent that the entire matter is one falling within the administration of the War Department in its endeavor to maintain the high standard of conduct it requires of its personnel.

FEBRUARY 18, 1936.

Memorandum for the Secretary of War.

Subject: Testimony of Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood before subcommittee of House Appropriations Committee on December 17, 1935.

1. I deem it necessary for the good of the service to invite your attention to the testimony given by Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, now commanding the Eighth Corps Area, before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on December 17, 1935, as reported in the Washington Star of February 10, 1936, and to Major General Hagood's reply, by first endorsement, to letter of inquiry addressed to him under date of February 10, 1936, in which he admits that the statements attributed to him "are substantially correct." The clipping, letter, and endorsement are attached hereto.

2. According to this acccount General Hagood told "what he thought of some of the New Deal relief spending." A part of the account reads as follows:

"The general said he was 'not familiar with the various pockets in which Uncle Sam keeps his money', but that he understood 'there is Budget money, which is very hard to get; there is P. W. A. money, which is not so hard to get; and then there is a vast quantity of W. P. A. money, which is very easy to get for trifling projects but almost impossible to get for anything worth while.' He said he called W. P. A. funds 'stage money' because 'you can pass it around but you cannot get anything out of it in the end.' 'It is harder for me to get 5 cents to buy a lead pencil than to get a thousand dollars to teach hobbies to C. C. C. boys', Hagood told the committee. 'I do not like the Government standard lead pencils and I cannot get by the Comptroller with the kind of pencils I like. But C. C. C. hobbies are exempted from the Comptroller's decisions. They do not have to come up to Government specifications. One man can be taught to collect postage stamps while another man can be encouraged to take an interest in butterflies. Under the W. P. A. I can get $200 to build a gravel walk to the garden house but I cannot get $10 to repair a "busted" steam pipe.'"

Urging appropriations for permanent housing of the Army, he is further quoted as saying:

"I am suggesting that you do it now, when there is a lot of easy money floating around, and not to wait until you are skinning the Budget to the bone in order to make up for past extravagance. I got $45,000,000 last year for the C. C. C., and I got a lot of this stage money from the W. P. A. * * *."

3. These quotations speak for themselves. When a general officer who, within some 2 months, will be, except for the Chief of Staff, the ranking officer on duty with the Army, refers to the work which the Government is seeking to do in training young men to useful and gainful occupations as "C. C. C. hobbies", "collecting postage stamps", "taking an interest in butterflies", etc., and to expenditures made under the directions of the Work Progress Administration as money "almost impossible to get for anything worth while" and as "stage money", the writer of a telegram of protest addressed to you is certainly justified in characterizing General Hagood's statement as a "contemptuous reference to policy approved by the head of the State, who is also his Commander in Chief."

4. If this were the first offense of this nature, some measure of excuse might perhaps be found for an officer whose "eccentricities" were noted by Maj. Gen. F. W. Coe in an efficiency report made as early as 1919. But Major General Hagood's 18 years as a general officer have been marked by repeated examples of lack of self-control, irresponsible, and intemperate statements, and references to War Department policies in which his opposition and contempt have been very thinly veiled. There have been reprimands and explanations to little avail. In 1927, for example, without any apparent effort at securing authority or acquainting his superiors with the nature of his comments, he published a book entitled "The Service of Supply", in which he commented very freely on the defects and shortcomings of officers who headed important branches during the World War, specifically naming them and describing their supposed unfitness and incompetency. The Inspector General described the book as containing "tactless, ill-advised, and doubtful statements of fact and opinion" and "unmilitary in tone and tenor, and at times intemperate in both. If the circulation is extended, it will do considerable harm; among the uninformed it will bring ridicule upon the War Department; among the informed it will bring down ridicule upon the author. Both conditions militate against the service."

In the same year, General Hagood's conduct with respect to the relief of Col. George F. Baltzell from command of the Twenty-second Infantry resulted in a letter from the War Department in which he was advised that "your failure to conform to the usual approved methods of command, your faulty judgment, hasty action, and intemperate statements in administering discipline conclusively shown in the investigation of this case, indicate that you do not possess the qualities of command expected of an officer of your high rank."

His personal file discloses a reprimand, in 1929, in connection with the flippant tone used in forwarding a communication from the Adjutant General of South Dakota. Evidently the trait of flippancy is too ingrained for reprimand or admonition to have much effect.

5. General Hagood is an officer of high professional and technical attainment, of brilliant intellect and great energy, but he apparently feels that these endowments entitle him to express himself in a manner that would bring condign consequences on others. His remarks before the subcommittee can only be characterized as flippant in tone and entirely uncalled for, and designed to bring ridicule and contempt upon civil agencies of the Government. They were not necessary to the laudable purpose which he desired to accomplish, and can only be denominated as of the "wisecrack" political type which every Army officer—and most assuredly one of such high rank—should sedulously avoid in his public utterances. In stating that he was instructed by me that he was free to answer any question or to make any statement which he might choose, common sense, of course, should have made him understand that political comments and criticisms, never proper in an Army officer, might not freely be made. Nor can the effects of remarks so deliberately designed to hold up Government agencies and policies to ridicule and contempt be avoided by a telegram to the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee (found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Feb. 13, 1936, at p. 1980) that the officer is "deeply shocked at being accused of criticizing the President." General Hagood either intended his remarks in their natural satirical sense or he did not. If he did so intend them, the offense was deliberate; if he did not so intend them, his judgment and common sense are sadly lacking.

6. I am strongly of the opinion that disciplinary action is called for by these remarks. They have excited general comment throughout the Army and in the civilian press. If permitted to pass without comment by the War Department, it would be construed as hardly less than tacit approval of the sentiments expressed by an authorized spokesman. I do not recommend investigation with a view to trial by court martial, but I think that the situation is such that action of a nature to serve notice on all that the War Department will not tolerate this type of utterance should be taken, once and for all. General Hagood is over 62 years of age and is subject to compulsory retirement by the President under section 1244, Revised Statutes. (This was done in the case of Maj. Gen. Adelbert Cronkhite.) He might also be relieved from command and ordered home to await orders. A mere reprimand would be no more effective than it has been in the past.

I therefore recommend, in the interest of the Service, that General Hagood be relieved from his present station and duties and ordered to his home to await further orders.

MALIN CRAIG, *Chief of Staff.*

Approved February 21, 1936.

GEO. H. DERN, *Secretary of War.*

WAR DEPARTMENT,
February 26, 1936.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS

In connection with the War Department statement on the disciplinary action taken in the case of Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, Gen. Malin Craig, Chief of Staff, made the following statement:

1. The only projects financed by the Works Progress Administration regarding which General Hagood could be expected to have information are projects sponsored by the Army.

2. All W. P. A. projects sponsored by the Army were requested by military authorities on the basis of their usefulness and the ability of the relief labor available to accomplish them.

3. Military authorities recognize that funds provided under the Works Progress Administration must first be used to give work to persons on relief rolls, and they further recognize that the projects on which this work is to be done must be of such a nature that the persons who are on relief can accomplish them. If there are—and this is genrally true—only comparatively few skilled building-trade workers on relief, then the projects must be so designed that only comparatively few skilled workers will be required.

4. The various branches of the Army have cooperated actively and thoroughly with W. P. A. officials in developing these types of projects. It is the opinion of military authorities in a position to know that such projects generally are of very great value and that the use of relief labor on projects sponsored by the various branches of the Army represents as good an investment of public funds as could be made under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have been in session an hour and 15 minutes, and, although I regret having to object, I am compelled to do so.

Mr. BOILEAU. May I say to the gentleman that I did not object to Members on that side addressing the House.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

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

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 365, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—365

Adair	Berlin	Buck	Chapman
Allen	Biermann	Buckler, Minn.	Christianson
Amlie	Binderup	Burch	Church
Andresen	Blackney	Burdick	Citron
Andrew, Mass.	Bland	Burnham	Claiborne
Andrews, N. Y.	Blanton	Caldwell	Clark, Idaho
Arends	Bloom	Cannon, Mo.	Clark, N. C.
Ashbrook	Boehne	Carmichael	Cochran
Ayers	Boileau	Carpenter	Coffee
Bacon	Boland	Carter	Colden
Bankhead	Bolton	Cary	Cole, Md.
Barden	Boykin	Casey	Cole, N. Y.
Barry	Boylan	Castellow	Collins
Beam	Brewster	Cavicchia	Colmer
Beiter	Brown, Ga.	Celler	Connery
Bell	Brown, Mich.	Chandler	Cooley
Cooper, Ohio	Gregory	Maloney	Sanders, Tex.
Cooper, Tenn.	Griswold	Mansfield	Sauthoff
Costello	Guyer	Mapes	Schaefer
Cox	Gwynne	Marcantonio	Schuetz
Cravens	Haines	Marshall	Schulte
Crawford	Halleck	Martin, Colo.	Scrugham
Creal	Hamlin	Martin, Mass.	Sears
Cross, Tex.	Hancock, N. Y.	Mason	Secrest
Crosser, Ohio	Hancock, N. C.	Massingale	Seger
Crowe	Harlan	Maverick	Shanley
Crowther	Hart	May	Shannon
Culkin	Harter	Mead	Short
Cullen	Healey	Meeks	Sirovich
Cummings	Hennings	Merritt, Conn.	Sisson
Curley	Hess	Merritt, N. Y.	Smith, Conn.
Daly	Higgins, Conn.	Michener	Smith, Va.
Darden	Higgins, Mass.	Millard	Smith, Wash.
Darrow	Hildebrandt	Mitchell, Ill.	Smith, W. Va.
Deen	Hill, Ala.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Snell
Delaney	Hill, Knute	Montet	Snyder, Pa
Dempsey	Hobbs	Moran	Somers, N. Y.
DeRouen	Hoffman	Murdock	South
Dickstein	Hollister	Nelson	Spence
Dies	Hook	Norton	Stack
Dietrich	Hope	O'Brien	Stefan
Dingell	Houston	O'Connell	Stubbs
Dirksen	Huddleston	O'Connor	Sullivan
Disney	Hull	O'Day	Sumners, Tex.
Ditter	Imhoff	O'Leary	Sutphin
Dobbins	Jacobsen	O'Malley	Taber
Dockweiler	Johnson, Okla.	O'Neal	Tarver
Dondero	Johnson, Tex.	Owen	Taylor, Colo.
Dorsey	Johnson, W. Va.	Palmisano	Taylor, Tenn.
Doughton	Jones	Parks	Terry
Doxey	Kahn	Parsons	Thom
Drewry	Keller	Patman	Thomason
Driscoll	Kelly	Patterson	Thompson
Duffy, N. Y.	Kennedy, Md.	Patton	Thurston
Duncan	Kennedy, N. Y.	Pearson	Tinkham
Dunn, Miss.	Kenney	Perkins	Tobey
Dunn, Pa.	Kinzer	Peterson, Fla.	Tolan
Eagle	Kloeb	Peterson, Ga.	Tonry
Eaton	Kniffin	Pettengill	Turner
Eckert	Knutson	Peyser	Turpin
Edmiston	Kocialkowski	Pfeifer	Umstead
Eicher	Kopplemann	Pierce	Utterback
Ekwall	Kramer	Pittenger	Vinson, Ga.
Ellenbogen	Lambeth	Plumley	Vinson, Ky.
Engel	Lamneck	Polk	Wadsworth
Englebright	Lanham	Powers	Wallgren
Evans	Larrabee	Quinn	Walter
Faddis	Lea, Calif.	Rabaut	Warren
Farley	Lee, Okla.	Ramsay	Weaver
Ferguson	Lehlbach	Ramspeck	Welch
Fiesinger	Lemke	Randolph	Werner
Fitzpatrick	Lewis, Colo.	Rankin	West
Flannagan	Lewis, Md.	Ransley	Whelchel
Fletcher	Lord	Rayburn	White
Focht	Lucas	Reece	Whittington
Ford, Calif.	Luckey	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Ford, Miss.	Ludlow	Reed, N. Y.	Wilcox
Frey	Lundeen	Reilly	Williams
Fuller	McAndrews	Rich	Wilson, Pa
Fulmer	McClellan	Richards	Withrow
Gambrill	McCormack	Richardson	Wolcott
Gavagan	McFarlane	Robertson	Wolfenden
Gifford	McGrath	Robinson, Utah	Wolverton
Gilchrist	McKeough	Robsion, Ky.	Wood
Gildea	McLaughlin	Rogers, Mass.	Woodruff
Gillette	McLean	Rogers, N. H.	Woodrum
Goldsborough	McLeod	Rogers, Okla.	Young
Goodwin	McMillan	Romjue	Zimmerman
Granfield	McReynolds	Rudd	Zioncheck
Green	Maas	Russell	
Greenwood	Mahon	Ryan	
Greever	Main	Sadowski	

NOT VOTING—65

Bacharach	Fernandez	Kerr	Sanders, La.
Brennan	Fish	Kleberg	Sandlin
Brooks	Gasque	Kvale	Schneider, Wis.
Buchanan	Gassaway	Lambertson	Scott
Buckbee	Gearhart	Lesinski	Starnes
Buckley, N. Y.	Gehrmann	McGehee	Steagall
Bulwinkle	Gingery	McGroarty	Stewart
Cannon, Wis.	Gray, Ind.	McSwain	Sweeney
Carlson	Gray, Pa.	Miller	Taylor, S. C.
Cartwright	Greenway	Monaghan	Thomas
Corning	Hartley	Montague	Treadway
Crosby	Hill, Samuel B.	Moritz	Underwood
Dear	Hoeppel	Mott	Wearin
Doutrich	Holmes	Nichols	Wilson, La.
Driver	Jenckes, Ind.	Oliver	
Duffey, Ohio	Jenkins, Ohio	Risk	
Fenerty	Kee	Sabath	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Stewart.

Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Duffey of Ohio with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Driver with Mr. Buckbee.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Gehrmann.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Schneider of Wisconsin.
Mr. Brennan with Mr. Wearin.
Mr. Starnes with Mr. Dear.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Gray of Indiana.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. McGhee with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Gassaway with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wilson of Louisiana.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Underwood.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls for the regular order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. McREYNOLDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOILEAU moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, the enacting clause of this bill, which is an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, states that the bill is for the purpose of making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937.

I am very much interested in providing farm credit for the farmers of this Nation. I am very much interested in seeing to it that there is adequate farm credit afforded all the farmers in this country.

I may say that I have the idea that a better way can be provided for giving farm credit to the farmers of this country than is provided under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not confining himself to his motion. The gentleman is discussing a matter that has no relation to his motion, and I make the point of order that the gentleman must confine himself to his proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed in order.

Mr. BOILEAU. I wish to say that I do not believe that the farm credit provided in this bill is adequate. I want to say to the membership of this House that it is time we provide some real farm credit, and there are many Members of this House who feel as I do and we are meeting tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the caucus room of the old House Office Building.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed in order.

Mr. BOILEAU. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that tomorrow, when we meet to discuss farm credit as a substitute for the provisions of this bill—

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman's remarks are not germane to the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds the gentleman is not in order. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is it proper, under the rules of this House, for a Member to express views contrary to the provisions of a bill presented to the Committee, or are we gagged even in that respect?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not made any such ruling. The gentleman will confine himself to the bill and proceed in order.

Mr. BOILEAU. I should like to ask the Chairman if I may suggest methods of providing farm credit other than those expressed in this bill and I should like to have a ruling from the Chair on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that the gentleman is in order in that respect. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BOILEAU. I may say to the Members of the House that there is more than one way of providing farm credit and I wish to say to the Members of this House that since I have been a Member of the House——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of the fundamental rules of the House is that debate must be germane to the motion, and I insist that the gentleman must confine himself to the motion he has offered. The matter which the gentleman is now discussing has no relation to that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that there is an appropriation in the bill for farm credit, and if the gentleman confines his remarks to that subject the gentleman is in order. If the gentleman discusses matter foreign to the provisions of the bill, the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. BOILEAU. The Chair has not ruled on my parliamentary inquiry. My parliamentary inquiry is to determine whether or not I can advocate any other type of appropriation for farm credit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the gentleman cannot discuss such matters except as they may be contained in the pending bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. I should like to say to the membership of the House that I do not approve of the method provided for granting farm credit under the provisions of this bill. I do not think the method is adequate. I may say to the membership of the House that there are many others in the House who feel as I do on this proposition. [Applause.]

I may say further that those of us who feel as I do want to have an opportunity before the consideration of this bill is concluded to submit our views to this House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the motion to strike out the enacting clause should not be made the vehicle of Members who desire to violate the rules of the House by discussing matters foreign to the subject under consideration.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is in order as long as he is talking against any provision of the bill, and the Chair so holds.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the Chair. In order to further convince the Members of the House that there are better ways of providing farm credit than that provided in this bill——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not discussing the pending question.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is evident the gentleman is not confining his remarks to his motion.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield. I want to proceed, and I wish to say again that the Chair has ruled on the question; and I wish the gentleman from Missouri would recognize the ruling of the Chair. I have tried to conform to the rules of the House, and I submitted a parliamentary inquiry in order that I might be properly advised as to the attitude of the Chair; and the Chair stated I was within my rights when I advocated a different method of providing farm credit; and I appeal to the Members of the House who agree with me to work in unison to put forth a concerted effort. I hope you will meet with us tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock so we can advocate the Frazier-Lemke bill and explain our

position to the House with respect to a real farm-credit measure. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the Chair has repeatedly sustained points of order proposed, and the entire speech of the gentleman is in violation of the rules of the House. You cannot make an announcement of a meeting of Members, however laudable the purpose, under the guise of a motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. BOILEAU. I withdraw the motion, if no one objects.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma yesterday when the Committee rose.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON: Page 48, line 3, after the figures "$99,152", strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "And in addition thereto, $180,000 for completing shelterbelt investigations, and for the free distribution of shelterbelt trees to farmers."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes, having an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, first I want to bring to the attention of this Committee that a million dollars was recommended by the President and approved by the Budget for this item. At the time that the matter was before the committee I appeared, but the situation, as I am presenting it here today, was not presented. The committee had only the choice of $1,000,000 appropriation or nothing at all. I am trying to salvage something from the $2,200,000 that has been expended by the shelterbelt authorities in gathering seeds and planting trees that will grow in that western country. The Chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Silcox, wrote me this letter today. He is in favor of my amendment, and I should appreciate it very much if the Members would give the letter careful attention. The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1936.

Hon. PHIL FERGUSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FERGUSON: With reference to your telephone request this morning as to the amendment introduced by you yesterday upon the floor of the House:

Your inquiry was as to whether the sum requested would be adequate to carry out the purpose of your amendment. As quoted in the RECORD, your amendment to page 48, line 3, of the agricultural appropriation bill, by adding "and in addition thereto, $180,000 for completing shelterbelt investigations and for the free distribution of shelterbelt trees to farmers", is adequate to care for trees too small to plant this spring.

At the present time there are in the nurseries which are producing stock for the shelterbelt project about 95,000,000 trees. Of these about 35,000,000 trees will be planted in the spring of 1936. Most of these are 1 and 2 years old. This will leave in the nurseries about 60,000,000 1-year-old trees too small for planting this year. They have cost to date about $4 or $5 per thousand, or between $240,000 and $300,000. To carry these trees to a size suitable for planting under Plains conditions (2 or 3 years old) will cost about $2.25 per thousand, or about $130,000 total. To distribute these to farmers free of cost would cost about 50 cents per thousand, or about $30,000. This would involve packing, crating, shipping, etc.

This would leave about $20,000 for continuing the investigations of shelterbelt planting now under way by the Forest Service in the Plains region.

The total of $180,000, therefore, seems adequate to carry out the purpose of your amendment.

Very sincerely yours,

F. A. SILCOX,
Chief, Forest Service.

Can this Committee be so prejudiced that it would refuse $180,000 that the Chief of the Forest Service says would carry out the program? It would give them a chance to develop the trees to the age where the trees could be planted.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In effect, what the gentleman is asking Congress to do is to appropriate $180,000 to save $240,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is it exactly. That has already been expended on these trees. That does not include some $2,000,000 that has been spent for investigation all through this region to find trees that will grow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahome has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendment thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The subcommittee considering the shelterbelt proposed appropriation was convinced that this project is impractical, that it carries with it no prospect of any climatological benefits or general public benefits to the area in which it is proposed to be located, that such benefits as may follow from its being consummated will be benefits to the owners of land improved, for which they themselves should pay and not the Government.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. No; I have not the time. I shall not enter into any discussion as to the correctness of that conclusion, because I have not the time in the 5 minutes allotted me. The full committee, so far as the discussion of it indicated, was unanimously in accord with the conclusion of the subcommittee, and not one single voice was raised in favor of making the shelterbelt appropriation. So far as this proposition of appropriating $180,000 is concerned, to wind up the work, the appropriation, if made, would be absolutely futile. They have 95,000,000 trees, according to the letter read by Mr. FERGUSON, and they intend to continue planting this year so that they will plant 35,000,000 trees more, even after this action is taken by the Congress indicating that it does not think this project is practical, leaving 60,000,000 trees. How much does it cost to plant 60,000,000 trees? The evidence before us shows it costs $86.10 a thousand. For 60,000,000 trees that would be over $5,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I have already explained to the gentleman that I cannot yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The farmers are going to plant these trees. The Government does not plant the trees.

Mr. TARVER. There is no provision in the gentleman's amendment for the farmers to plant trees. The evidence before the committee discloses that it requires $86.10 a thousand to plant these trees. If you are going to continue with this impractical project and want the trees planted, you might as well appropriate enough money to do it.

Now, they have had an allocation of about $2,000,000 from relief moneys, of which $750,000 still remains to be expended, if they want to expend it during the balance of the present fiscal year. They ought not to expend it. After the Congress indicates, as I am sure it will indicate, that it does not desire that this project should be consummated, they ought to use their $750,000 which they have now to liquidate this project. If along the lines desired by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON], well and good; but at any rate, instead of our appropriating $180,000, evidently an absolutely insufficient amount if the planting of trees is contemplated, we ought, if we do anything, to provide that this $750,000 which they already have shall be used only for the purpose of liquidating this project. They have had allocated to them almost $2,000,000. They have planted 22,000 acres. They have 2,000,000 acres to plant. They have 3,000,000,000 trees to plant in the event the project is carried through to completion. If it is a practical project, if it is something which it is desired shall be consummated, then make your appropriation for it and make it in sufficient amount. If it is impractical, why spend $180,000 more or the $750,000 more already allocated from relief funds? Why carry on this project? Why not stop now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has expired.

The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LUCKEY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCKEY to the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON: After the word "investigation" insert "of which $50,000 shall be available for investigation of establishing, maintaining, and improving forestry and other tree and shrub plantings in the Plains region."

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify and specify more directly in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] as to what should be done with the money allocated. We have undertaken a great project out in the Great Plains region that has been very severely criticized, and probably justly so, as visionary. The purpose of my amendment is to enable the agricultural colleges, the land-grant colleges out in this section, to do work along the line of what may be possible and feasible to aid forestry and tree planting and shrubbery planting out in that section.

I hold in my hand a map from the Forestry Department which shows in the dark portions the forestry regions and the forestry experiment stations in connection therewith. It shows that this Great Plains section, including the two Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, and parts of Oklahoma and Texas, have no experiment stations and are not doing any forestry research work at all. There are possibilities there—not in the line of the so-called shelterbelt, but in the line of collecting and disseminating information about trees that will aid the farmer in planting windbreaks, improving his homesteads and farmsteads by proper planting of the right variety of trees. Every other region in the United States has forest experiment stations. The Great Plains area, where trees are needed most, has no such research and experimentation facilities. My amendment is for the purpose of enabling these land-grant colleges to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for the purpose of saving the face of one of the most ridiculous and silly proposals that was ever submitted to the American people. Originally it contemplated a timber belt about 100 miles in width, about 1,100 miles in length, and as time passed it became apparent that the plan was so impractical and absurd that it has almost been abandoned even by those who sponsored it in the commencement. There is an item on the next page, carried in this bill, which will provide that nurseries shall make experiments and studies into the development of trees that will be adaptable to this region, and this information will be disseminated among those who are interested. Originally the allocation for this purpose was $15,000,000. Thanks to the foresight and good common sense of the Comptroller General of the United States, General McCarl, only $1,000,000 was actually allocated for this purpose. Other funds were used, so that some sum in excess of $2,000,000 has been expended for this purpose. I will submit that while it may be helpful to the farmers in this region to have windbreaks around their premises and buildings, the same thought applies to farmers residing elsewhere in the United States, most of whom have erected or planted windbreaks around their homes, which can likewise be privately provided for in this respect.

To those of you who would like to have some definite and concrete information, I would suggest that you read the remarks carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] just last Monday. To show you how enthusiastic and yet impractical and absurd some of the men in the Department are, who are sponsoring this shelterbelt fiasco, when appearing before the committee they said that the land upon which these trees would be planted was worth about $40 per acre. Of course, anyone familiar with land values throughout the United States knows that the land value throughout the region in question is not worth probably one-third or one-fourth of that amount, excluding the land immediately adjacent to or upon which the buildings are situated.

As to the extent which this belt would protect abutting vegetation, the Chief Forester said about 7 feet in length for each 1 foot in height of the tree or bush that may be grown. One of his assistants in charge of this work said 20 feet. If you have to plant a row of trees or a row of shrubbery and it will only protect vegetation within a few feet, and then you must have these rows of trees, 20 or 30 feet apart, then you get a picture of the immense cost involved.

If they were to complete the project first submitted by this administration it would cost at least $100,000,000, with little or no permanent value to the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that time for debate on this amendment was fixed, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] having asked to be heard during this time, must first be recognized. The gentleman from Oklahoma has spoken once on the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee on the action it has taken in this particular regard. It is time to liquidate these undertakings and proven-unsuccessful experiments.

This shelterbelt proposition was one of the most fallacious experiments of them all. Its absurdity approaches the ridiculous. No one knows this better than the Members of Congress living in parts of the territory in which these shelter belts were to be established. I do not know exactly who was the author of the original dream. I do know, however, that the President advocated something of this sort. The plans were undoubtedly prepared by someone who used blueprints, formulas, and theories without any practical knowledge of the physical conditions of the country to be affected.

We who have faith in the forestry department are happy in the thought that this wild-eyed scheme apparently never met with the enthusiastic support of these officials. The proponents of this proposition evidently did not realize that trees will not grow in a desert country. And I can imagine the gentlemen who are advocating this amendment out with their sprinkling cans watering the millions of trees which the taxpayers of the country are asked to plant in this territory. Neither did the proponents realize that in many instances these trees would necessarily have to be protected by fences. In all, the proposition is not only fantastical but preposterous from any common-sense standpoint.

I do not want to find fault with our capable friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON], or with the splendid Representative from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN], who is apparently interested in this amendment, and who will undoubtedly be heard from. It is difficult for these gentlemen to take any other position. Their immediate territory is affected. However, if this local territory were not affected, I should be perfectly willing to leave this whole proposition to either one of these gentlemen and rest secure in the thought that the whole thing would be abandoned here and now.

A year ago I gave some little consideration to this matter. In my country the thing was a joke, and everybody having any knowledge of the facts were sure that it would terminate just as it has terminated.

Let me repeat that the President said early in the New Deal game that he would be the first to abandon failures. If there ever was a failure, this shelterbelt halucination is one of them. And even though the President's Budget did ask for an appropriation to carry on this work, yet this body is fortunate in having a reasonable, economic, and forward-looking subcommittee, which committee dares to oppose this type of money spending. I also want to compliment the House upon returning signs of independence. Let us hope that the day is not far off when the Congress will again function, use its own judgment, and legislate as the direct representatives of the people.

Sometime ago I asked Dean S. T. Dana, of the forestry department of the University of Michigan, to give me his views in reference to this shelterbelt project as embarked upon by the administration. I have a short synopsis of his statement, which I shall include as a part of my remarks. The statement is as follows:

Shelterbelts have the following advantages:

1. They increase crop production in a strip on their leeward side to a distance of 10 times or more the height of the trees. This is due to the checking of wind movement and the consequent reduction of evaporation in the protected strip and to the accumulation of snow, which adds to the moisture content of the soil.

2. They sometimes make possible the production of crops—for example, fruit trees—which could not be grown without their shelter.

3. They afford protection to people and to livestock from hot winds in summer and cold winds in winter.

4. They prevent the burying of buildings under heavy snowdrifts.

5. They check erosion.

6. They increase the supply of song and insectivorous birds and other wildlife.

7. They break up the monotony of the landscape and, in general, add materially to the attractiveness and livability of the region.

These benefits are primarily local in nature. Shelterbelts cannot be counted on to have any important influence on the general climate, and certainly not to prevent the recurrence of droughts and dust storms such as have occurred in recent years.

The establishment of shelterbelts in regions of scanty precipitation is a difficult task. Trees must be selected which are suited to both climatic and soil conditions; planting must be done with great care; plantations must be cultivated and, in some instances, watered for the first few years; stock must be excluded; and steps must be taken to prevent damage by insects and disease. All of these activities require the continued interest and attention of the farm owner.

The large shelterbelt project proposed by the administration is open to serious question because of the difficulty of tree planting in the region of 18- to 20-inch rainfall, because of the geometrical arrangement of the plantations, which may not be at all suited to soil conditions or local needs, and because of the administrative difficulties involved in Government ownership and control of such small and badly scattered tracts. Initial costs will be high, while protection and maintenance are likely to be even more expensive and to run into many unexpected difficulties.

A sounder program would apparently be to encourage the establishment of shelterbelts by individual farmers along somewhat the same lines that have been followed in the Canadian prairies. Under such a program the Government might well furnish planting stock at cost, or even at a nominal price, together with technical advice and assistance in the establishment and subsequent maintenance of the plantations. This would make it possible to take advantage of favorable local conditions, to make the shelterbelts an integral part of the farm under the direct care and control of the owner, and to avoid the difficulties inherent in so far-flung a governmental enterprise.

I might say that Dean Dana is one of the outstanding authorities of the country on forestry and, like all those persons interested in work of this kind, he is an enthusiast. I am sure that his appraisement as given above resolves all doubt in favor of any possible shelter belts. Information of this kind is of value to all of us because of its expert character and because the conclusions are not biased by personal or political interests.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. LUCKEY. I may say to the gentleman that I am not in favor of this so-called shelterbelt. I think it is visionary; but there is some merit in a forestry study of this Great Plains region.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; let us conduct the study. but let us not appropriate money to plant trees where it is known beforehand that they will not grow.

Mr. LUCKEY. I am with the gentleman in that statement.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. I think the committee has already made provision for the study indicated by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as much as I should like to do so, I cannot agree with my colleague from Oklahoma with reference to his proposed amendment. If this amendment is adopted, it is understood he proposes to move to strike the amendment I offered in the committee and adopted and now a part of the bill to prevent the continuation of the establishment of the so-called shelterbelt project, as follows:

No part of the appropriation contained in this act shall be used to continue the establishment of the so-called shelterbelt project of trees or shrubs in the Plains regions undertaken heretofore, pursuant to appropriations made for emergency purposes.

I fully realize that my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] is very much interested in getting $180,000 for the purpose of taking care of the remaining 60,000,000 trees that are seeded and now in the nurseries. So do I want the remaining trees planted, but if his amendment is adopted and then my amendment is stricken from the pending measure, as he says he will propose, there will be nothing to prevent the Forestry Service continuing the shelterbelt project indefinitely. In fact, his amendment specifically mentions the shelterbelt, and, if adopted, might prevent any of the 60,000,000 trees from being distributed to farmers outside of that narrow area known as the shelterbelt. I should like to see my good friend from Oklahoma, who is an active, capable, and valuable Member of this body, get every tree for his farmers that they will set out and properly care for. I should also like that every farmer in his district who is interested receive every tree that he desires to plant. In fact, it would please me to see a tree planted at every spot in western Oklahoma where a tree would grow. More than that, Mr. Chairman, I should like very much to see the 60,000,000 trees distributed to farmers who need and want them throughout the entire United States, but reference to page 18 of this bill shows that under the existing law every one of such trees that my colleague is worried about can be disposed of advantageously and no doubt all will be in cooperation with governmental agencies. It is useless and absurd, in my judgment, to try to make Members of Congress believe that these 60,000,000 trees are going to be wasted, burned, or otherwise destroyed, unless the Ferguson amendment is adopted. Oh, no. That will not be done. This or some future Congress will no doubt make appropriation sufficient to distribute all available trees to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. FERGUSON. All these trees are on leased ground; the Government does not own the ground they are on. Some provision will have to be made to take care of the trees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I should be glad to see such a provision made, but the gentleman's amendment provides that the trees shall be distributed in shelterbelts. In fact, his amendment specifically names only shelterbelts. I take the position, as I stated on the floor of the House yesterday, that every farmer in every area or section of the United States is as much entitled to these free Government trees as are the people who live in the so-called shelterbelt, much of which I regret to say is an arid section where in some places it is miles and miles from water and where trees will not grow under any circumstances. If I know anything about the sentiment of the Appropriations Committee or the membership of this House, a vast majority do not want the shelterbelt project continued and do not propose to take any chances on permitting that impractical project to be continued at a cost of $100,000,000 or more.

Mr. FERGUSON. These trees were especially developed. The seed from which the trees were grown were gathered in that area after an extensive study. They are especially adapted to that particular area. I should be glad to see a tree program carried on all over the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I deeply appreciate that fact, and I am anxious that every tree now seeded be properly set out and cared for. But why select a narrow area and discriminate against other sections in this tree-planting program? Just who conceived such an impractical scheme no one seems to know. It was inaugurated at a time when every possible effort was being made to put people to work.

Instead of wasting millions of dollars in a foolish and fruitless effort to establish a so-called shelterbelt, those 60,000,000 trees ought to be distributed to the farmers who will plant

and grow them and appreciate the opportunity of doing so. [Applause.] Certainly if this great magnanimous Government of ours will seed and ship trees to the farmers of the country, the farmers will undoubtedly be willing to plant and care for them without governmental supervision and red tape. I submit that the Federal Government should not be put to the expense of sending some society saphead from the city who is interested primarily in holding down a Government job, and who no doubt in some instances knows nothing about trees except what he might read in a Government bulletin to not only tell the farmers how to plant trees but to actually plant them—and mind you—at Government expense. [Applause.]

I maintain and insist, Mr. Chairman and Members, the farmers are sufficiently interested that if they are furnished free trees by the Forest Service they will gladly plant, fence, if necessary, and otherwise take care of them after they are planted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the amendment which I have offered they will have to plant the trees themselves.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, that may possibly be, although the amendment does not so provide, but, nevertheless, I still insist that every one of the 60,000,000 seedlings about which my colleague seems so deeply disturbed can be properly distributed to farmers who want them under the existing law, and that there is no rhyme or reason for confining the planting of the trees in question to the so-called shelterbelt. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes to increase this appropriation by $30,000 in order that the experimental work in San Dimas Experimental Forest may be adequately carried on during the coming year. In order to appreciate the need for this increase, one must understand something of the work that has already been done in this area during the past 6 years.

In Los Angeles County an area consisting of 17,000 acres has been set aside as a great outdoor experimental laboratory in which to study, for the first time in history, watershed management on a scale large enough to make possible accurate deductions regarding rainfall, run-off, erosion, and water storage by means of vegetation. Here in the East the problem is one of water drainage, while we in the West are concerned with water storage, subsurface water supply, flood control, and irrigation. The object of this experiment is to increase the yield of usable water by some method of systematic management of the watershed vegetation consistent with the control of floods and erosion, without allowing the vegetation itself to take too great a toll in consumption of water for its own growth.

In preparing this extensive area for the necessary experimentation a sum in excess of $1,250,000 has already been expended to construct some 17 stream-measuring stations, weather stations, over 300 rain gages, many sample vegetation plots, erosion-control experiments, debris reservoirs, and concrete dams. Roads, trails, and firebreaks have been built and all necessary buildings. In a word, the entire preliminary work has now been completed.

During the coming years the resultant studies will be made from this area by hydraulic engineers and water conservationists. It will require more than 5 years of continual study and research to evolve the data and information which is so essential in planning flood-control and water-supply systems. To curtail this work at this time, when the first fruits of this tremendous expenditure are within grasp, is indeed a short-sighted policy. To adequately and properly handle this program during the coming year, $75,000 should be expended, but I realize the futility of attempting to increase this appropriation by that amount, and I am urging but a $30,000 increase in the hope that this committee will grant at least this amount.

Los Angeles is not asking that the Federal Government stand the entire burden of cost for this work which means so much to us throughout the West. In 1934 the county of Los Angeles appropriated $295,113 for this work. To further impress you with the seriousness of the water situation in southern California, let me inform you that while the county has approximately 51 percent of the population of the State we have scarcely 1 percent of the total available water of the State. Moreover, 24 percent of the irrigated agricultural land of the State, producing an annual crop valued at $158,200,000, is located in the county. To augment our water supply we are bringing the water from the Colorado River into southern California at a cost of $200,000,000, which will be paid by the metropolitan water district. Let me also remind you that the entire cost of the Boulder Canyon project will be repaid to the Federal Government over a period of 50 years by the same metropolitan water district.

We are doing our share to build up our water resources, and I am confident you will not deny us this small additional appropriation which is so necessary to enable us to carry on a scientific program of water conservation and water storage. The information now being developed will be the basis for flood control and water development in this entire southwestern area, and the progress made here will lead the way to similar water conservation in other localities. I sincerely urge the adoption of my amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERGUSON) there were—ayes 35, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 48, line 3, after the word "lands", strike out "$99,152" and insert in lieu thereof "$129,152."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote continuous production of timber on lands chiefly valuable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 564–570), as amended, including also the study of the effect of tax laws and the investigation of timber insurance as provided in section 3 of said act, $1,578,632, of which $62,020 shall be available for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $2,500 for the purchase of supplies and equipment required for the purposes of said act in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WHITE: Page 49, line 9, after the word "act", strike out "$1,578,632" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this item deals with one of the most important activities of the Federal Government. I have reference to the protection of the remaining forests of this country. Under an arrangement we have now for cooperative fire protection the State, the National Government, and private owners contribute to an organization which is created for the purpose of affording fire protection to the remaining great stands of timber in the United States. To carry on this work there must be available a trained personnel. There must be depots, tools, and a complete organization. The amount included by the Budget for this item does not adequately provide for the Government contribution to this great activity. In fact, there has been a very serious reduction made from the amount proposed by the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read some figures in connection with this matter. The total area of State and privately owned forest lands aggregate 426,000,000 acres, of which 237,000,000 acres are now under some form of organized protection. Now, get this next item. This leaves 189,000,000

acres of forest lands unprotected. One-third of this area is burned over every year as compared with only about 1 percent of the area within the protected forests. In other words, through failure to render adequate protection to the land mentioned here, one-third of this unprotected area is being burned over every year.

The amendment provides the funds to adequately protect this land. The Government must come in and assist the States. This has been recognized by a number of acts that provide for the Government's participation in the protection of these vast resources.

I feel that in asking for this increase in the appropriation the Government will only be providing its just share in the financing of this great work.

Something has been said about the C. C. C. forces protecting the land from fire, but I wish to remind the members of the Committee that the C. C. C. is only useful in fire suppression, while this cooperative fire-protection organization is for fire prevention, being organized and having lookouts and trained administrative personnel to supervise the work and watch out for fires and having a staff of men to rush to any place where a fire may break out in order to suppress any fire and keep it from spreading out and ruining the forests, as they have in the past.

I also call your attention to the fact that this privately owned timber is surrounded and closely bound by great stands of timber owned by the Federal Government, and some means must be provided to protect this timber, so that the fires may not spread from privately owned land or State land and destroy vast quantities of Government timber.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe the gentleman said we have organized fire protection on 337,000,000 acres. Is it not 237,000,000 acres instead of 337,000,000 acres, as the gentleman stated?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman misunderstood my statement. The figure is 237,000,000 acres.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing quite a lot of discussion this afternoon about reforestation and about the Government undertaking a project for the building of a timber belt across the Nation. It has been conceded that this project probably has been a failure, but it cannot be successfully contended that the program for which this appropriation is to be made has been a failure. It was instituted under the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924, and during the 12 years we have made such substantial progress that we can now see the possibilities and the advantages of having the full appropriation authorized by that act.

As has been stated by the author of the amendment, we have already progressed far enough so that we have 237,000,000 acres of land included in this program with some kind of protection. We lack only 189,000,000 acres of having all of the forestry lands in the United States under this protection.

Some figures have been given you to show you the advantage of the work that is being done in the area that now receives limited protection. In the area where such protection has been provided only 1.1 percent is burned over each year by fire, resulting in damages to the 237,000,000 acres of only $8,000,000, whereas on the 189,000,000 acres that has no protection more than 20 percent of it was burned over last year, with the result that there were damages of $37,000,000. Therefore, for every dollar that the Government is investing in this project there is conserved annually $30 in value that would otherwise be destroyed.

You talk about appropriating money on projects that are worthless; in this instance you are making an investment for the good of the Nation, because you are conserving taxable resources that will help you, some day, balance the Budget, and I invite you to go along and let us make the appropriation up to the limit.

We have 38 States now participating and 2 other States who want to come into this program this year. If they do not all come in, the money will not have to be expended, but it can be authorized, so we may meet the situation.

If we will conserve our forests, if we will go along and do the sensible thing and the wise thing by making these appropriations that have been tried and proven and found to be economically justified, we will not have to talk about reforestation 10 or 20 years from now. Let us conserve our forests. It is a wise national policy to make adequate provision for this need.

The Budget Bureau asked for $152,750 more than the committee has allowed. I hope you will support this amendment, in order that this splendid program of fire prevention and timber conservation and forest preservation may be carried on and reasonably expanded, so that full and beneficial results may be obtained as far as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

As a Member of the House in the Committee of the Whole considering these appropriation bills I am a rather persistent voter in going along with the Committee. It is very seldom that I differ or cast my vote to change the figures that the committee brings in. I do this because I have confidence in the committees and I have confidence in the fact that they have gone into the matter and given it their best judgment; but on this matter I am supporting the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Idaho.

I know what these forests mean. We are cutting them and destroying them far faster than they are growing. I think the figures are something like 3 to 1; in other words, we are cutting down or destroying 3,000 feet to every 1,000 feet growing.

The figures vary somewhat, and I do not know what is correct; but I do know that the Federal Forest Service has saved vast forest stands in the Northwest from destruction by fire. Oregon has the largest stand of timber of any State in the Union, and it needs preservation for the use of States less fortunate in timber supply. It is important to all States to maintain the timber. It needs all the money that can be rightly used for that purpose in building towers, in watching fires when they start, in providing trails, and in getting men to the fires. No one who has not seen one of these forest fires can imagine what a holocaust it is and how it sweeps through the country. I have been astonished at the work of some of the forest men in controlling such fires. I am encouraged to vote for the amendment because the Budget itself grants $150,000 more than the committee saw fit to put into the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact also that the private timberland owners will contribute approximately the same amount as the Federal Government if we carry out this amendment?

Mr. PIERCE. Surely they will bear half the burden. Most of these fires are set by lightning, very few by tourists or hunters. When there is proper protection, when we have the proper towers, and the fires are located, when they can be seen when started and the telephones are up so that different people can reach the fires, they are put out before material damage has been done.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. TERRY. I call the gentleman's attention to page 24 of the hearings, which show that the Federal contribution for this year was $1,429,000 of a grand total of $6,229,000; so that $4,800,000 of the amount in this Budget has been put up by States and private owners.

Mr. PIERCE. I think that is a fair contribution. I, myself, have contributed freely. The men who own land pay their share through assessments that are made by the State forester. We have a good fire-fighting force in Oregon, it is well organized, and appropriation ought not to be curtailed, for your benefit as well as for ours.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Referring further to the figures, the private owners have contributed $1,500,000 to that fund.

Mr. PIERCE. Yes. I, myself, have always contributed for fire protection on my timbered land.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman says that the appropriation ought not to be curtailed. As I understand it, the present appropriation gives the same amount as for the current fiscal year.

Mr. PIERCE. It is the same amount as for last year? The Budget recommended $150,000 more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the gentleman said that it ought not to be curtailed when, as a matter of fact, they are given just as much as for the current year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PIERCE) there were—ayes 39, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McCLELLAN: Page 49, line 9, after the word "act", strike out "$1,578,632" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,731,382."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF FOREST PLANTING STOCK

For cooperation with the various States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants in establishing windbreaks, shelterbelts, and farm wood lots upon denuded or nonforested lands within such cooperating States, under the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 567), and acts supplementary thereto, $70,579, of which amount not to exceed $2,740 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: Page 50, after line 3, insert the following:

"COOPERATION IN FOREST-LAND MANAGEMENT

"For carrying out the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to authorize cooperation with the several States for the purpose of stimulating the acquisition, development, and proper administration and management of State forests and coordinating Federal and State activities in carrying out a national program of forest-land management, and for other purposes', approved August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 963), $2,000,000."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to place in this appropriation bill at this time $2,000,000 to carry out the purpose of the bill we passed in the last session, H. R. 6914, which authorized an appropriation of $5,000,000 for the purpose of permitting the Federal Government to cooperate with the various States in the Union in purchasing State forest lands and in managing the administration of same. I am surprised that the appropriation is not carried in this bill. The forest service in every State and every citizen in the States interested in reforestation is for this legislation. The Forest Service under the Department of Agriculture sent to the Budget Director a strong report and, as I understand, requested that the $5,000,000 authorized in the bill be carried in the appropriation bill for the purpose, as stated, of purchasing State forest lands. We have spent millions in buying national-forest lands.

Many of the States have not been able to cooperate with the Federal Government in the national-forest program because of not being able to raise revenue to match the Federal Government. Under this bill we will be able to buy State forest lands in the various sections of the States where we can buy suitable forest lands. As a rule, in buying national-forest lands, they are bought adjacent to any national-forest unit already located in the State.

Here is a letter addressed to my colleague, Mr. GASQUE, of South Carolina, by the President of the United States, which I want to read in my time:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1936.*

Hon. A. H. GASQUE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am glad to learn of your interest in the Fulmer Act. It received my approval on August 29 last because I felt it was a sound, constructive measure.

This law provides, as you know, basic authority for Federal aid in acquiring State forests and for cooperation and stimulation in developing and administering them within such States as may qualify under provisions of the act. South Carolina, I understand, qualified by legislation which was passed on April 27 last.

The Fulmer Act authorizes, as you say, a total for all States of not to exceed $5,000,000 with the proviso that funds may become available only as the Congress may from time to time appropriate them. This provision is very definitely in my mind. It seems necessary, however, as I am sure you realize, to consider very carefully what seems consistent with Budget limitations as well as those of the act itself may be appropriated for the provisions of this act.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

My friends, you will note from this letter that this program is endorsed by the President, and according to the wording of his letter it clearly indicates that he expects a part of the authorization made at this time. The trouble with the Budget Director is that we have too many people connected with two or three departments buying land for various other purposes, along with those connected with the buying of national forests, who seem to be able to control the Budget Director in passing upon these matters.

I may say that when we had this legislation under consideration a number of States passed legislation so that they could qualify and cooperate with the Federal Government and are now in a position to take advantage of this wonderful act.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The President in that letter nowhere said that we should appropriate any sum of money—much less the sum the gentleman suggests—in this bill. On the contrary, he says—and he says it very emphatically—that it must be considered very carefully what is consistent with Budget limitations. And the Budget limitations specifically exclude any such appropriation. In other words, this letter from the President is an argument against the gentleman's amendment instead of an argument for it. In order that there may be no misapprehension on that point I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina, Did the President's Budget approve, either directly or indirectly, this expenditure at this time in this bill?

Mr. FULMER. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman from Missouri for the reason that the President's letter just read would clearly indicate that an appropriation would be made, but that we should keep in mind that the appropriation was to be made from time to time.

I want to say that there is not a man on the gentleman's committee who does not believe that this is a meritorious and constructive proposition, and that there ought to be some provision made now where we can put the bill into operation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the gentleman has given us the impression that the President approves of it. The letter which the gentleman has just read does not approve it. The letter disapproves it. The letter says such appropriations must be consistent with Budget recommendations, and the Budget recommends that no appropriation be made. The letter speaks for itself. There is no way to get around it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. The President plainly stated that in making this appropriation you should do so from time to time. He had in mind not putting in in the first instance $5,000,000, which was authorized, but certainly he is willing for us to get started with this very constructive program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He does not say it at this time. He says not unless the Budget recommends it, and his Budget Director has refused it. The letter from the President says plainly, "Do not make the appropriation in this bill."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The only effect of this amendment is to allocate a portion of this money and earmark it for that purpose?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely; to get started; something that we have not been doing.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman seeks funds to support an act which he sponsored in the legislative committee. Will the gentleman tell the Committee the distinction which that bears from other proposals?

Mr. FULMER. Yes. I will state that the purpose of this act is to use this money in cooperation with the States, through the State forest service, that has been or will be set up in accordance with the act. The purpose is to buy State forest lands.

Mr. THURSTON. Will that duplicate some purely Federal agency which is now promoting the acquisition of privately owned lands?

Mr. FULMER. None whatever. Permit me to say that a great many of the States represented here today have not been able to secure C. C. C. camps because they have not had State forest lands.

Mr. THURSTON. I have been informed that an amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois to carry $25,000,000 for acquiring public lands for forestry or submarginal purposes. Does the gentleman's appropriation cover the same field of activities?

Mr. FULMER. None whatever; and that amendment has not anything whatsoever to do with the program in which I am interested and the purpose of the bill referred to previously.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman says "starting with $2,000,000." How much does he contemplate it will cost ultimately?

Mr. FULMER. Only $5,000,000 has been authorized under the act.

Mr. THURSTON. And none has been used?

Mr. FULMER. None has been used. The President states himself that it is constructive. He did not state that we should not have any appropriation at this time, but to keep in mind that the bill stated that from time to time an appropriation ought to be made, and therefore I contend that we ought to have this appropriation today.

I want to call to the attention of the Members of the Committee that the Agricultural Committee, of which I have the honor of being a member, gave careful thought to this bill, holding hearings thereon, and gave a unanimous favorable report on the bill. My good friend and colleague, Congressman DOXEY, of Mississippi, who is also a member of the Agricultural Committee as well as a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission, gave lots of time in helping me with this bill. It meets with the hearty approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission, composed of several of the heads of the departments, Senator KEYES, of New Hampshire; Senator GEORGE, from Georgia; and Congressman WOODRUFF, from Michigan.

I want to take this opportunity of paying my respects to my colleague [Mr. DOXEY], who is one of the hard-working Congressmen on the Agricultural Committee, being well acquainted with agricultural problems and deeply interested in trying to help solve them. My friends, let us vote for this appropriation so as to be able to commence a very constructive program which will tend to rehabilitate the forest resources of the country, which is so necessary at this time if we are thinking of the welfare of future generations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], which simply provides for an appropriation of $2,000,000. This appropriation in no way conflicts with any other appropriation provided for in this bill for forestry purposes. This measure was considered originally by the Committee on Agriculture and it has the endorsement of forestry men from all the States in the Union. The committee acted upon the evidence submitted in a unanimous report. The bill passed the House virtually without opposition and was enacted into law. The legislation provided for a total authorization of $5,000,000. I feel that the entire amount should be approved in this bill, but those in charge of the amendment feel that if the program can be started so as to secure some State cooperation it will be an incentive for conservation in the various States, and we will have carried out a very desirable purpose.

Mr. DOXEY. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Knowing that we are both members of the committee, and we had representation from quite a number of States, is it not a fact that if we do not secure an appropriation to carry on this particular work a great many of the State forest services will suffer greatly? Here is an opportunity to revive this work by cooperating with them in furnishing these limited funds.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I may state further, Mr. Chairman, that the so-called Fulmer bill simply provides that a State forest may be set up in any State in the Union through Federal cooperation and Federal aid. The amount is very small, but it is sufficient that the States may start their own State forests. The money will eventually be returned to the Federal Government out of proceeds derived from the sale of products from these forests. It will give all the States an opportunity to establish State forests, and it occurs to me that every Member should heartily support this amendment. It will return to the States the right to have something to say about conservation programs. I hope the amendment will be supported unanimously at this time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. As I understand, the Federal forestry program takes in large tracts that are contiguous, that the Federal Government is not interested in the development of small tracts itself, but is interested in encouraging the States to develop these small tracts, even as small as 80, 100, or 160 acres, that the State may have taken in on account of delinquent taxes. The State receives Federal aid and develops these smaller tracts under State supervision, thus supplementing the Federal program.

Mr. ANDRESEN. That is correct; and, in addition to establishing State forests on these tax-delinquent lands, under the provisions of this bill even a county or a community can establish forests of tax-delinquent or other lands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how fully the Members of the House realize what is being done, but I think it is time they should give consideration to some of these things.

The Resettlement Administration is now engaged in buying lands of a submarginal character all over the country for forestry purposes. They have in their hands, allocated to them—and, frankly, I do not mean by saying this that I favor their operations—$189,000,000 of unexpended funds at the moment. For the purpose of acquiring additional forest lands there has also been allocated to the Department of

Agriculture out of the emergency-relief appropriation of last year the sum of $4,750,000. It is my estimate that upward of $10,000,000 has been spent on this program already by the Resettlement Administration, and the other item of $4,750,000 is akin to it.

I do not believe Congress ought to go further than the Budget in granting funds for this kind of proposition. I think we have gone too far already in the amount of expenditures we have made; and we are going to get ourselves into trouble if we commit ourselves to a program that goes far beyond the capacity of the people of the United States to pay. I believe the Congress at this time and in this place should show a conservative tendency, a tendency toward keeping down expenditures. I do not think anything would give the people of this country more comfort or encouragement than to feel that we had decided here in the House of Representatives against large expenditures just as far as we could. I hope the action of the committee will here and in this place be sustained.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is not an additional appropriation but is an attempt to do something we have not yet done in this session or any previous session of Congress, to earmark some of the money for a particular purpose. The fact that Tugwell has had $27,000,000 allotted to him out of a fund of $464,000,000, without the knowledge or consent of Congress, argues, it seems to me, that we should earmark this $2,000,000 so it can be used for no other purpose without further legislation from Congress.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that this is not an amendment to take additional funds out of the Treasury?

Mr. MAY. It merely earmarks a part of this appropriation to the extent of $2,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It earmarks a part of what appropriation?

Mr. MAY. A part of the sum allowed under this bill.

Mr. TABER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Then I ask, Mr. Chairman, that it be read out of my time.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER of Tennessee). Does the gentleman object to the amendment again being read?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I now have the amendment. I do not believe its language limits the appropriation to moneys already carried in the bill, but provides for an additional $2,000,000.

Mr. MAY. That is not my understanding of it.

Mr. TABER. That is the way it reads.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I find myself again in opposition to the committee; not that I feel they have not given the matter thought. I believe if this matter had been properly presented to the Budget the importance would have been realized and not only $2,000,000 assigned to this work but perhaps three or four million dollars would have been provided. It is of very great importance.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Does this amendment provide for an appropriation of $2,000,000 more or does it just earmark $2,000,000 out of an existing appropriation?

Mr. PIERCE. I understand it appropriates an additional $2,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I understood the gentleman to say he was of the opinion that if this matter had been presented to the Budget it would have been approved by them. May I say my information is it was presented to the Budget and they disapproved it.

Mr. PIERCE. When I was Governor of the State of Oregon 12 years ago we had the opportunity of acquiring quite a large tract of forest land for the State. I remember distinctly what a difficult time we had organizing our forest service to take care of these young trees. Had we at that time had the cooperation of the National Government, under a law like the Fulmer Act, with reasonable funds for cooperation, it would have made possible a forest several times as large as the one we started.

I realize fully and completely the necessity of the National Government assisting and helping the States in this matter. The State of Oregon now has the opportunity of acquiring several thousand acres of forest land in addition to what it owns. The States need the personnel of the Forest Service to carry out the program in a proper way. Reforestation is going to be an exceedingly slow process, especially when undertaken by States alone, without the help and assistance of the trained personnel of the United States Forestry Service. I voted for the Fulmer bill last year, believing at that time that it would be of great value to the States and the Nation. It has been a law for some time, but without an appropriation it is of value only as a statement of policy.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman that many of the States which have forest services have been preparing and getting ready to put into operation the bill which the gentleman referred to, believing that there would be an appropriation available at this time.

Mr. PIERCE. May I refer for a moment to the forest in western Oregon which the State of Oregon acquired? The timber in that forest, even at the cheap price of standing timber today, I am told, is worth four times as much as it cost the State of Oregon at the time it was acquired.

Mr. Chairman, there are forests in States throughout the West that can and do grow good timber, but the cooperation of the National Government is needed.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. This is a companion measure to aid the States in handling their State forests in the same way the national forests are handled?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes. This enables the States to secure the scientific knowledge of men who know how to do these things. It gives the States a service which they cannot acquire without the expenditure of a tremendous sum of money.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And from the sale of this timber, this fund will come back to the Federal Government?

Mr. PIERCE. It will all come back to the Federal Government eventually.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to state that I am most heartily in favor of the pending amendment. I hold in my hand a letter written by the commissioner of conservation, State of New York, which is in favor of this amendment and speaks for itself. It is dated February 13, 1936, addressed to Hon. JAMES P. B. DUFFY, and reads as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It has been brought to my attention that a request has been made to the subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for an appropriation of $5,000,000, with which to start work of acquiring lands for State forests under the so-called Fulmer bill.

My purpose in writing you is to urge you to do all you can to get favorable consideration for this item, for I am hopeful we can make extensive and desirable additions to our State forests under the Fulmer Act when appropriations are available to make it effective.

Very truly yours,

LITHGOW OSBORNE, *Commissioner*.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the State of Oregon who have contacted me relative to this amendment are very hopeful that this appropriation will be made, because they feel it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EKWALL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The several States are actually administering this act?

Mr. EKWALL. The gentleman is correct, and as he very aptly stated a few moments ago, this money will be re-

turned to the Federal Government from the sale of timber and the title to the land, as I understand it, will revert to the State. In the final analysis this appropriation is simply taking money out of one pocket and putting it back in the other, so to speak.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the United States Government has acquired in the last 2 years the greatest amount of land ever bought by any government in modern history. The Forestry Service has been buying land. The Biological Service has been buying land. The Resettlement Service has been buying land, and a half dozen other Government agencies have been buying land, until we have acquired through purchase something like 23,000,000 acres of land.

Mr. EKWALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. EKWALL. The gentleman has stated that this Government has bought more land than any government has ever purchased. How about the Louisiana Purchase for $15,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman desires to bring in the Louisiana Purchase I will amend the statement and say the United States Government has bought the largest amount of land ever bought by any government since the Louisiana Purchase and the Alaskan Treaty.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PARSONS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Government had purchased 26,000,000 acres of land in the last few years?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Twenty-three million acres.

Mr. PARSONS. The correct figures are between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 since the new conservation program was started.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman refers only to the Forestry Service. My colleague is speaking of the forestry branch as well as other branches of the Government.

Mr. PARSONS. I just wanted to keep the RECORD straight. I understood him to say that the Forestry Service had purchased that amount of land.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As a matter of fact, I have understated it rather than overstated it. If you desire to keep the RECORD straight, the exact figure at the last computation, on January 31, 1935, was 23,406,029 acres, and we have been buying as rapidly as we could buy ever since, so the present figure is no doubt considerably in excess of that amount; and for it the Government had paid at the close of the year the sum of $116,627,198.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. KELLER. What amount does the bill carry?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The bill carries nothing for the simple reason that the Budget recommended nothing, and that refutes the impression which some may have obtained to the effect that the President approves this amendment. Nothing could be further from the fact. The President has never, at any time, expressed his approval of any such amount or any other amount for this purpose in this bill.

On the contrary, he states in the letter just read to the Committee that we should be governed by the Budget recommendation.

It has also been stated here that this is a proposal merely to earmark money for the purpose. There is no money in the bill which can be earmarked. It is not a proposal to earmark; it is a proposal to take it out of the United States Treasury against the advice and consent of the Budget Bureau and against the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 68, noes 47.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. FULMER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 97, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS

For the acquisition of land in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the control of soil erosion and/or flood damage originating upon lands within the exterior boundaries of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah", approved August 26, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 866), not to exceed $50,000 from the entire receipts from the sale of natural resources or occupancy of public land within said national forests for that part of the fiscal year 1936 subsequent to August 31, 1935.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARSONS: Page 50, line 13, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following language: "For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat., p. 961), as amended, United States Code, title 16, sections 500, 513, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 521, 552, 563, $25,000,000, of which amount the sum of $10,000,000 shall be available for expenditure immediately upon approval of this act."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane at this point in the bill and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER of Tennessee). The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, the Weeks and the Clarke-McNary bills are complete authorizations for money to be appropriated by the Congress. This is now organic law, and under the terms of the amendment I have proposed there is absolutely no new legislation whatsoever, because it has been authorized, and the bill, in many places, and even in this paragraph, makes available $50,000 for the purchase of land in the Wasatch National Forest and makes it immediately available as the funds are collected, because these funds are to be used as they are collected for the purchase of such land.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is germane and in order at this point in the bill, and I ask for a ruling by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to the paragraph that has just been read, which has nothing to do with the items which are now proposed. The amendment is not germane to this paragraph and is entirely out of order at this point in the bill.

Further, I do not believe that the authorizations to which the gentleman refers go so far as to permit this type of appropriation or so large an appropriation.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, these sections provide, if I may say a further word, for the acquisition of land. There is no point in the bill where this amendment could come in except under this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER of Tennessee). Obviously, the Chair has not had time to examine the various references to the statutes contained in the amendment, but this part of the bill deals with the Forest Service and this particular paragraph deals with the subject of the acquisition of lands.

Mr. TABER. Not under those paragraphs referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois clearly relates to that subject and is germane to the part of the bill to which it is offered, and the point of order is therefore overruled.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement on time. I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. There is no use of our taking up so much time of the House. Nearly everyone knows what this amendment is for.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes additional. Is there objection?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion today about expenditures and about the Forest Service. I have a map before you by which I want to illustrate the purchase of forest units established in the last 2 years. In June 1933, after the Civilian Conservation Corps bill was passed, the President allocated $20,000,000 from the funds provided for the C. C. C. organization for the establishment of new forestry units in the country. All of the orange color you see on this map are those new units that were established by the Forest Reservation Commission from that time up until the present time. There are 84 of them in the United States in 27 States east of the Mississippi. They have also been purchasing lands in the West, and those lands adjoin what are now established national forests. The total purchase is about 15,000,000 acres at the cost of some $56,000,000. Again, in 1934, $10,000,000 additional was allocated, and in June last year two and a half million, and in July approximately twelve million more, making a total of about $44,532,000; but these new units that have been established are not completed. They are only in their infancy. There are something like 24,000,000 acres available to be purchased yet in all of these units to round out the national forests. Gentlemen on both sides of the aisle all know that the President in 1933 announced a policy and a plan for forestry service, and this is only carrying forward his plan of taking agricultural lands that are worn out out of production and placing them into a productive operation of the forest. The C. C. C. camps have been located in many instances in or near these forests. Thousands of miles of hard roads have been laid down and truck trails. If these funds are not made available now for the continuation of the purchase of these units, the camps will be moved away.

In addition to that, the whole thing will collapse, and the administrative expense which has been increased in this bill will become greater every year for the administration of the Forestry Service because they do not have all the land in a contiguous, compact unit. Up until 1933 the agricultural appropriation bill always contained from one to four million dollars a year for the purchase of these lands. When the President allocated this $20,000,000, that appropriation was eliminated. So far no funds have been provided this year, and we do not know that any will be provided, and in spite of that fact the Bureau of the Budget eliminated that part asking for the purchase of lands and no funds are made available for the acquisition of another acre. At the present moment there are 2,000,000 acres that have been optioned in all of these States, some in the West. The people expect to sell that land and get their money, but if this bill is passed without any appropriation, those people will still have their lands left on their hands, and they will have to continue to pay taxes. They will be disappointed and you, who have these units in your districts, will be very much disappointed if this bill does not carry these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will adopt my amendment and provide $25,000,000 for the purchase of forestry lands to complete the units that have been established.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 73, noes 29.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to vote for this amendment and provide for $25,000,000 additional for the purchase of these lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my interest in forestry and soil conservation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS] has advanced here a new brand of economics. He stated in effect that the way to reduce the administrative expenses of the Forestry Service is to buy more land. The truth is that each additional purchase of forest lands adds to the administrative expenses of the Forestry Service. The gentleman discussed expenditures by the Government for the purchase of land during the past few years. I call your attention to the following figures prepared for this committee, and which I assume are correct:

During the years of 1933, 1934, 1935, and the estimated expenditures for 1936 the following sums have been spent by the Government in the acquisition of land:

Interior Department, $7,364,464; Department of Agriculture, including the Forestry Service, $47,895,764; Resettlement Administration, $45,410,619; the Biological Survey, $5,772,009, making a total of $106,442,856 spent by the Federal Government through these four agencies for land, which will necessitate increased annual maintenance appropriations for all time to come.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I am sorry; I do not have time.

This is not a question as to whether or not we believe in preserving the resources of this country. We do. It is not a question as to whether or not we believe in forestry. We do. This amendment presents a question of an additional appropriation of $25,000,000, which will result in a large annual increase in this appropriation bill.

Many of you here complain about the expenditures of the Government and say that said expenditures must be decreased; yet the gentleman from Illinois, for whom I have much respect, proposes that the Government spend an additional $25,000,000 for the purchase of land, in order that the people who own said land may not be disappointed in the sale thereof. He appealed to those of you who have such land in your districts to vote for this measure, in order that your constituents may sell their land. I know the gentleman well, and it is difficult for me to believe that he intended to leave the impression that this amendment should be adopted in order to provide a market for those who desire to sell land to the Government.

In conclusion permit me to say that your subcommittee has no selfish desire in regard to this question. We, too, are interested in preserving the forests of this country. This is a matter of relative importance, and every bureau of the Government has important matters demanding the attention of the Federal Government. The responsibility in connection with appropriations is an individual matter for each Member of the House. In the opinion of our committee, this tremendous amount of money should not be at this time added to this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if any member of the committee on the minority side desires to speak, I shall be glad to yield. Otherwise I will take the time myself.

Mr. Chairman, I talked to a certain eminent member of this administration last week relative to an expenditure for another item. He said, "I know there are many things which are desirable and which we should like to finance, but", he said, "I want you people to remember that when JIM BUCHANAN and his crowd up there on the Hill spend a dollar, BOB DOUGHTON and his gang have got to raise it." Every one of you men are going back home to talk economy.

On the other side of the aisle you are going to call attention to the vast expenditures of this administration, and yet you have just voted to add $2,000,000 to this bill when the Budget opposed it and the committee, after long study, opposed it, and every rule of reason opposed it, at a time when we are deep in the red and cannot hope to balance the Budget for 2 or 3 years to come at best.

Why, Mr. Chairman, in this bill itself the Budget proposed an addition of $500,000 a year merely for the maintenance of the additional lands already purchased.

If it requires $500,000 a year to maintain the extra acreage already purchased, what do you suppose it would require to administer and maintain this huge amount of land which you propose to buy with this appropriation of $25,000,000? This $25,000,000 is merely an initial expenditure. And in addition you will be voting to saddle on this Government an annual cost of maintenance so vast and so far reaching as to be beyond the range of computation.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Members who are sitting in this Committee will remember their obligation to the Federal Treasury as well as to the landowners back in their districts who desire to unload their holdings on the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were ayes 80 and noes 64.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. PARSONS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 78 and noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural chemical investigation: For conducting the investigations contemplated by the act of May 15, 1862 (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 511, 512), relating to the application of chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups and starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for such purposes; for the technological investigation of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack investigations; for the investigation of chemicals for the control of noxious weeds and plants; and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis, $360,260.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 52, line 13, after the word "analysis", strike out "$360,260" and insert in lieu thereof "$383,930."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I call attention to that portion of the report appearing on page 443 of the printed hearings submitted by Dr. Skinner and Dr. Paine with reference to the work they are carrying on, which in part says:

Investigations conducted under this project to determine the identity, properties, and content of these carbohydrate constituents; to ascertain the factors which influence yield and quality of these constituents and derived products; to devise measures which will insure better and more uniform quality and better adaptation to market requirements.

Mr. Chairman, during the last few weeks we have been discussing, passing bills, and making appropriations for research with reference to agricultural products and the marketing of those products. The work which has been carried on by the carbohydrate division is exceedingly outstanding. Adding to the remarks I made yesterday with reference to the sugar industry, I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that about 5 years ago, while studying some exhibits at the Michigan State fair, Dr. Keane made himself known to me. Shortly thereafter he began an intensive research having to do with the quality of sugars taken from the domestic sugar beet. During the past 4 or 5 years Dr. Keane, under the direction of Dr. Paine and with the help of other contributors, has accomplished almost unbelievable results. Through their leadership the sugar-beet industry is today turning out a grade of beet sugar which meets all the practical uses of technical and home users of sugar. Within 5 years they have accomplished most amazing results. Today the beet sugar produced in the United States ranks on a par with cane sugar in quality.

I hold in my hand a report submitted by Dr. Keane, who has been in direct charge of this work. He summarizes the work as follows:

The various factors which have been discussed, such as the higher purity white massecuite made possible by three-boiling, the higher quality remelt sugars, the improved centrifugal operations, and efficient filtration at high densities of all liquors going to the white pan, have no doubt resulted in the remarkable improvement in sugar quality already accomplished. These results have been brought about in many factories by additional equipment. In other factories changes are being made which will facilitate the production of high-quality sugar. In many instances cost considerations are involved, but the various factors are discussed here only in relation to their bearing on sugar quality.

Mr. Chairman, as I remarked yesterday, something like 30,000,000 bags of beet sugar are produced in this country annually. If this quantity of sugar is sold at 40 cents per bag under the price of cane sugar at a time when we have reports showing that the quality of beet sugar is equal to the quality of cane sugar, it is an easy matter to compute the loss of $12,000,000 annually. Even if only one-half of the beet-sugar crop is sold at 40 cents per hundred under the price at which cane sugar sells, that involves an annual loss of $6,000,000. In my hand I hold a broker's market report dated February 26, 1936, quoting high-quality American-made beet sugar at $4.25 New York basis, less 2 percent, and foreign-grown cane sugar, New York basis, $4.65 per hundred, less 2 percent, a difference in price of $320 per carload on this basic commodity. We are appropriating funds from day to day for the purpose of carrying on research to the end that quality products will come from our farms and to the end that these quality products may be placed on the market. When we bear in mind the fact that the sugar-beet growers of this country sell their beets to the sugar processors on the basis of the price received for sugar, I feel that we should condemn the selling policy of the processors and refiners wherein they place on the market this high-grade home-grown American product at a price $320 per car less than the price at which the sugar grown by the foreign producer and imported into our market sells at. Wherein is there good judgment in making these appropriations, performing the research work, only to have its results squandered by those who care so little for the interests of the farmer?

I make these remarks at this time to call attention to this outstanding nonsurplus crop industry, the sugar-beet industry, to the end that as it asks for protection and to the end that as we make these appropriations for research work that, after this work is done, the farmers may reap the full benefit intended by Congress at the time the appropriations are made.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, permit me to make this additional observation: That as we appropriate these funds and carry out this research work and establish these facts beyond controversey, that our protected industries, particularly, do their part in every way possible to see that the farmers of the country receive the benefit of this research work.

These remarks are not made with the thought of criticizing in any way whatsoever any members of the industry;

they are made to draw attention to the fine work which is being accomplished and to draw attention to the necessity of these appropriations and help push along the establishment of nonsurplus crops and a market therefor.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to place in the RECORD certain facts and figures I have prepared in connection with the general situation having to do with the farm problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who have great faith in the good that comes through research, and my object in offering the amendment was for the purpose of securing time in which to discuss what I have just spoken about and to present some additional views and facts. We all know how badly the American farmer needs additional income with which to support his family, with which to pay his present fixed overhead operating costs, and last, but not least, how badly he needs income with which to buy the goods of heavy industry. We are appropriating millions of dollars annually for the purpose of carrying on agricultural research, to find new markets, and to help fit the products of American farms into the economic life of this Nation—all to help increase the farmers' income. What good will flow from this vast expenditure of funds and all of this effort in research if after the results have been accomplished the farmer still must sell his products for a mere existence? We cannot stop with just the passing of tariff laws designed to protect the American market. We cannot stop with just the performing of research work. We cannot stop with just the finding of a market here for more of the products of the soil. We must go a step further. If after all of this has been done we find through some unsound and unfair policy the American farmer is receiving no part of the benefits which were supposed to flow from all of this expenditure and research—as we do now find in some cases—then I ask, Mr. Chairman, why should the appropriations be continued? In this House and on this floor it is good that all phases of the question be debated and understood. Men are human, and the defects and weaknesses of human frailty can be found in every group, whether it be political, industrial, or other. In every phase of our existence we need checks and balances. When benefits are granted by the Congress, there is as great a responsibility upon this body to see that those benefits flow to the ones for which they were intended as to grant the benefits in the first instance.

THE BALANCE SHEET AND OPERATING STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FARM AS A WHOLE

The second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress and the administration are now engaged in a "death struggle" with the problem of agriculture. And this problem will not have been solved when the present Members of Congress return to their respective districts to seek reelection. The agricultural problem of this Nation is much bigger, broader, and deeper than any single session of Congress or than any single major political party. That is the reason the problem hangs on and on from one year to another and from one Congress to the next. The two major political parties will struggle and again struggle before they release that portion of their platforms which is to state what the individual position of the two respective parties shall be if elected. The farm population has not forgotten what was said by the two parties in their 1932 platforms, what transpired during the previous 12 years and what has taken place during the past 3½ years. Perhaps more has been done within the last 36 months to arouse the thought of the American farmer than during any previous length of time since that immediately preceding and following the Battle of Lexington.

Simultaneously with the decision of the Supreme Court holding the control features of the A. A. A. unconstitutional and beyond the power of the Federal Government, mother nature has blessed the great agricultural belt from north to south and from east to west. Great coldness has prevailed over the land dealing death to farm pests and insects. With the cold has come bounteous rains and snows, all meaning much moisture for the crops soon to be planted. This points the way to abundant yields per acre of the numerous crops which the American farmer plants. While the edict of man in the form of the Constitution is being upheld by the Supreme Court and those issued by minor officials are outlawed by the same decision, nature proceeds to operate under her own laws and the farmer is caught between the grinding wheels of man-made and natural laws. Six million eight hundred thousand farmers sit by their firesides and wonder. The farmer is thinking of the political promises made in the 1932 platforms by the two major political parties. He is reviewing in his own mind and his own way the radio speeches that flow to him on the waves of the air day and night. Incidentally, he wonders somewhat about the technicalities of laws made by man; something about what is constitutional and what is unconstitutional—because all of these things have so very much to do with his ability to buy and sell and to provide for his family the actual necessities of this modern age. He hears much talk and reads some about what constitutes inflation, deflation, sound currency, and metallic money. He does not forget the statements he sees and hears about stabilized buying power of the dollar, which is the trading or purchasing unit of the organized manufacturer, trader, and banker.

THE FARMER'S TRADING UNIT

The trading unit of the farmer is a bushel of corn, oats, or wheat, a pound of cotton, beef, or pork, or a ton of hay. These constitute his working capital to a great extent. His farm represents his manufacturing plant—a place on which to do business. On his farm he lives, and there he proceeds to join hands with nature in the manufacturing of the food supply of the Nation. There he takes a risk on the market through the purchase of seed, fertilizer, machinery, and repairs thereto; he goes into the labor market and hires help as does the man who operates the great manufacturing plants engaged in production of steel and automobiles. The farmer has little control over the amount of production which may come from his effort, as this depends upon the cooperation Mother Nature gives him. Due to the great complex exchange machine of domestic and foreign trade, the farmer has no control, of any consequence at all, over the price at which he shall sell his goods after they have been manufactured on the farm and are ready to be placed on the domestic and foreign markets. So he finds that one year his buying unit has a given purchasing power only 40 or 60 percent of what it has another year. He also finds that a given or certain amount of produce from his farm will buy only one-third of what the same production will buy in another year. And, too, he finds that one year his plant values, including operating capital in the form of feed, seed, and livestock, carry a value of $78,000,000,000 and a few years later these same assets carry a value of about $33,000,000,000. Along with the great fluctuation in the buying power of his unit of exchange he finds that his sources of credit dry up and insurance companies, on which he has depended for decades, run away from his collateral, and private investors no longer desire to carry farm paper in their portfolios. With all of these facts staring him in the face, the farmer actually wonders how the international banker would get along if his exchange rates fluctuated as wildly and as disastrously as do the exchange rates of the trading units which have to be used by the American farmer and which are in form of bushels and pounds and tons of what he has to sell. Could any other industry withstand the terrific shock of having its plant value drop from $78,000,000,000 in value in 1920 to $33,000,000,000 in 1933? Could any other industry with such a staggering investment survive if it had its sources of credit withdrawn in a manner as has been followed by insurance companies and private investors in running away from the promises to pay of the American farmer?

As the American farmer sits by his fire or goes about his chores or rides his cattle range he gives some thought to the matter of State and Federal legislation, which sticks and guarantees fixed returns—net—on invested capital of more than 5 percent per annum to those who have their money invested in railroad equipment and roadbeds, in tele-

phone lines and switchboards, in power transmission lines, bus bars, and steam and water turbines. Are these of greater interest to the welfare of a people than food-producing farms occupied and owned by a successful, contented, and prosperous group of farm owners and workers?

In 1932 the income of the American farmer was so low that after paying himself a starvation wage of only $17.53 per month, with board, and which amounted to only a fraction over 5 cents per hour, he was just short $968,000,000 of having any return at all on his plant investment of more than $30,000,000,000. In October 1935, with benefit payments in operation, this monthly wage throughout the United States, with board, amounted to only $20.57 or a fraction under 7 cents per hour. Does good work justify life or a living? If so, we shall have to give much more thought to the solution of this great agricultural tragedy.

NUMBER OF FARMS, POPULATION, INVESTMENT, AND SIZE

Late statistics show in round figures we have 6,811,689 farms in the United States aggregating 1,035,181,009 acres of land and occupied by a farm population of, say, 32,800,000 souls. For practical purposes, and considering presently going market values, we may consider the following breakdown in values:

Asset—Valuation

Farm real estate and buildings	$32,696,000,000
Live stock	3,354,000,000
Machinery	2,200,000,000
Working capital, in form of seed, feed, etc., estimated by some at $20,000,000,000, but let us say $1,500 per farm	10,200,000,000
Investment, 1935, deflated values	48,450,000,000

(5-percent return on investment would call for $2,422,500,000 annually.)

Starting with the great Hearst ranch in California and coming down to the small truck garden operated by the small operator just outside the metropolitan city, we find the size of the farms vary from, say under 3 acres up to many thousands of acres of land under a single management:

Number of farms:	
Under 3 acres	43,007
3 to 9 acres	315,497
10 to 19 acres	559,617
20 to 49 acres	1,440,388
50 to 99 acres	1,374,695
100 to 174 acres	1,342,927
175 to 259 acres	520,593
260 to 499 acres	451,338
500 to 1,000 acres	159,696
Over 1,000 acres	80,620

FARMERS' CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL INCOME

National income for 1934 was estimated at $51,920,000,000. Of this amount, agriculture contributed only 10.2 percent, which included benefit payments from processing taxes. This contribution amounted to only 60 percent of agriculture's contribution to national income during the pre-war period 1910–14. Between 1910 and 1934 agriculture's contribution to national income declined 45 percent, and its largest contribution, expressed in current dollars, was $12,182,000,000 in 1919, and its smallest, $3,582,000,000 in 1932.

For a moment let us look at agriculture's contribution in number of workers. The 1930 census being the latest official figures, we find total income producers gainfully employed, 10 years old and over, were 48,829,920. Those engaged in agricultural pursuits totaled 10,471,998, or 21.5 percent. In 1870 over one-half of the gainfully employed, over 16 years of age, were engaged in agricultural labor. In 1930 this had dropped to just over one-fifth. Increase in production of agricultural commodities has followed rather closely the rate of increase of population, leading to a relatively inelastic demand for foodstuffs. What would our volume of trade be if the agricultural class, making up 25 percent of our total population and contributing 21.5 percent of the gainful workers 10 years old and over, actually received as income, say, 21.5 or 25 percent of the national income? Let the national income advance to seventy-five or one hundred billion dollars and then give to the agricultural workers 21.5 or 25 percent of that increased income, and you would witness an increase in the production and exchange of goods such as mankind has never seen. This is what Mr. Ford and Mr. BORAH have reference to when they speak of production of goods and their exchange bringing prosperity to a nation and the farmer's enemy.

Strange to say, the variation in the production of goods for market during the past 15 years by the American farmer has been very small. Yet his share of the national income and the fluctuations in price of that labor which the farmer contributed in the form of goods to market measured in dollar income have varied clear beyond comprehension, excuse, or reason. It has reached a point that now calls for a showdown. It is now a great national issue engulfing both major political parties, involving national and international banking, domestic and foreign trade, sound currency and inflation, a new national land policy, and, last but not least, unemployment and taxation. Using a base of 100 for 1910–14, we find farm prices and gross farm income have since 1914 fluctuated from the base level up to a plus of 220 to 240 and down to a minus of 60 and 80, while at the same time there has been little variation in the amount of foodstuffs produced by the farmers. This wild and erratic price curve is enough to wreck any industry, and when added to the natural hazards of the farming industry it becomes of the gravest national concern and calls for the highest policy of the Nation.

WHAT DOES THE FARMER DO WITH HIS CASH INCOME?

Who are the real consumers of this Nation? I here refer to heavy goods, such as machinery, clothing, shoes, building material, and so forth. In looking over the Employees per million of United States population we find that in 1930 there were 85,294 agricultural workers, 49,805 clerks, 21,577 servants, 7,920 chauffeurs, 7,796 textile workers, 7,749 trainmen and brakemen, 7,570 carpenters, 6,731 steel workers, 6,064 miners, 5,215 machinists, 4,421 tailors and dressmakers, 4,261 painters, 3,123 engineers and firemen, and 3,049 barbers and hairdressers. Other occupational groups total less than 3,000 per million of population. What class in the groups here listed will do the consuming? Does the clerk, the servant, the chauffeur, the barber, or the hairdresser, or any of the other groups consume as does the farmer? Certainly not. And remember the agricultural workers number 85,294 per million of population.

In 1 year the business operating expenses of American farms—the cash paid out by American farmers in the course of producing their crops—amounted to more than $2,800,000,000. Look at these figures and then compare them with the purchases you make or your group makes, and that of your business:

PRODUCERS' GOODS BOUGHT BY FARMERS IN 1 YEAR

Articles:	
Feed, seed, fertilizer	$1,070,000,000
Containers, spray, twine	139,000,000
Operating cost of tractors, automobiles, trucks	417,000,000
Other costs—insurance, harness, ginnings, etc.	289,000,000
Current expense, or costs to be processed into foodstuffs by combination with man's labor and moisture and sunshine	1,915,000,000
Add:	
Machinery, tractors, repairs	408,000,000
Automobiles and trucks	262,000,000
Repairs on farm buildings	282,000,000
Grand total	2,867,000,000

That same year, 1926, six and one-third million American farmers received a total cash income of only $9,658,000,000. Out of this income they had to pay the above-mentioned operating expense, plus $932,000,000 for hired labor, $717,000,000 for interest, and $664,000,000 for taxes—a total deduction of $5,180,000,000. The farmer as a group had left only $4,478,000,000—30 percent of which came from his export market, since largely lost—for the labor of himself and family and as a return on his investment and the depreciation incident thereto on land, buildings, machinery, and so forth. With this he had to run his farm as a business and maintain as best he could his home and family. On the basis of population living on farms, power to consume, contribution to the national income in number of workers and production, he should have had a net of two and one-half times this amount.

PURCHASES FOR FAMILY USE MADE BY FARMERS WITH CASH INCOME

A study has been made which gives a fair idea of what an average farm family of 4.4 persons will purchase in 1 year if the money is available. All in addition to above-mentioned items, which are for use in producing a crop:

Clothing and food purchases	$452.00
Advancement (education, books, dues, etc.)	104.80
Operating goods (insurance, transportation, household supplies)	169.90
Furniture	40.20
Personal (gifts, candy, tobacco, etc.)	41.00
Life insurance and health insurance	40.80
Miscellaneous items, including health	64.30
Total for year	913.00

This double analysis shows the great diversity as well as volume of what the agricultural workers will buy when properly sharing in the national income.

SOME PRINCIPAL SOURCES FROM WHICH FARM INCOME FLOWS

By groups of commodities we find the American farmer's income in 1929 and in 1933 largely came from the following sources:

Source of income	1929	1933
Crops:		
Grains	$1,297,000,000	$506,000,000
Fruits and nuts	707,000,000	376,000,000
Vegetables	1,130,000,000	747,000,000
Sugar crops	83,000,000	81,000,000
Cotton and cottonseed	1,389,000,000	684,000,000
Tobacco	286,000,000	179,000,000
Other crops	542,000,000	301,000,000
Total	5,434,000,000	2,874,000,000
Livestock and livestock products:		
Cattle and calves	1,111,000,000	489,000,000
Hogs	1,531,000,000	619,000,000
Sheep and wool	262,000,000	153,000,000
Poultry and eggs	1,241,000,000	560,000,000
Dairy products	2,323,000,000	1,263,000,000
Other	39,000,000	27,000,000
Total	6,507,000,000	3,111,000,000
Total crops and livestock	11,941,000,000	5,985,000,000
Rental and benefit payments		271,000,000
Grand total, gross income from which must be deducted operating and production costs	11,941,000,000	6,256,000,000

The above comparative figures showing the paralyzing decline in farmers' purchasing power between 1929 and 1933 tell only a part of the story. It must be kept in mind that until about 1930 the farmers of America derived their gross income from sales made in two principal territories: Sales at home for domestic consumption; sales made abroad for foreign consumption.

What happened between 1929 and 1933? During the first half of the post-war decade exports accounted for more of farm income than in the pre-war period, but during the second half, far less than that amount. Do you remember those emotional posters scattered throughout the land during the war which said:

If you can't fight, farm. Food will win the war.

The American farmer believed that, and proceeded to do his bit through producing food. He plowed up grasslands. He toiled early and late. He supplied the tonnage. He mortgaged his lands to buy machinery and tools and repairs and barns and supplies for the production of more and more food. He fed the world to a very large extent, and it is estimated he put 40,000,000 acres of new land under cultivation.

A great conflict like the World War causes nations to become food-blockade conscious. Accordingly, and in due time, the other nations of the world began to block the importation of American foodstuffs. Civil population and military experts demanded this be done. There was a general willingness to pay the price of putting back on their feet the agricultural population living in foreign countries and which American dominance of the world market had for years been squeezing to the wall. England adopted the slogan, "Imperial preference—buy British", and other countries raised tariff barriers designed to protect home production. They wanted food produced within their own borders with which to feed their own population whether at peace or engaged in war. The American farmer lost about one-third of his gross farm income.

Directly and indirectly the American farmer's income suffered. Foreign sales declined and the unsold farm commodities which continued to be produced in the United States resolved themselves into a surplus. Both the foreign and domestic market at a profit was gone. True, domestic consumption continued without such a staggering decline in volume but the 10 major processors of American farm goods found themselves able to purchase at their own price and the unorganized selling American farmer found himself helpless. The Federal Farm Board's attempt at speculation did not suffice. The buyers knew the Farm Board would grow tired as an owner of vast supplies of foodstuffs and awaited their time to purchase. The Board in due course had to sell. The story is now past history.

FARMER'S SHARE OF CONSUMER'S DOLLAR

Receiving 56 cents out of each consumer's dollar paid for 10 major food items, such as beef, butter, bread, and so forth, before the war, the farmer's share dropped to 34.9 cents in 1932. The farm and retail value of these 10 major items, compared for 3 years, gives this shocking illustration:

	Retail value	Distributor's share	Farmer's share
April 1929	$25.93	$12.81	$13.12
April 1933	15.29	10.05	5.24
April 1935	21.42	10.69	10.73

This is a mathematical illustration of the dealth-dealing burden which the exchange machine imposes upon the primary producer—the American farmer.

In further support of the above illustration it has been found upon a comparison of net returns to capital of 10 food manufacturing corporations holding a dominant position in the market, and a relatively inelastic demand for food products, yielded to the food corporations returns of better than 10 percent from 1924 through 1931, and returns of almost 7 percent in 1933. For further proof of the toll taken by the food-exchange machine of this Nation one can refer to the balance sheets and operating statements of scores of manufacturing and distributing establishments engaged in handling the raw products which come from American farms and which are placed on the market almost entirely through the farmer dealing as an individual seller instead of through organized selling associations on a cooperative basis. Sharing such a small proportion of the retail value or price paid by the ultimate consumer, it is no wonder we find the percentage of the farmers' gross income available as a net return for their labor and capital, ranged from 71.6 percent in 1919 to 48.3 percent in 1932. With these facts before us we should be able to fully comprehend why the farmers of the Nation could not furnish to industrial workers the necessary buying power to keep American industry in the harness. The absence of farm buying power is immediately reflected in a falling off of employment in industrial centers. The presence of this buying power with farmers furnishes the necessary stimulant to start the industrial wheels turning and the stepping up of employment as was so thoroughly demonstrated in 1933 and 1934. A further study along this line shows that since 1920 the per capita purchasing power of available farm income—the dollar buying power after paying production costs out of money taken in—has never risen more than slightly above its pre-war level—only for a very short time and almost insignificant—and has suffered two deep depressions. The per capita level of wages and salaries stayed well above the pre-war level throughout the decade 1922–31 and returned to that level in 1934 while the farmer was still 22 points below its pre-war average.

WHY DOES THE AMERICAN FARMER FOLLOW HIS PRESENT MARKETING METHODS?

For many generations the American farmer has enjoyed the greatest independence of any large group of agriculturists operating anywhere in the world. He has very largely

been the king of his own domain. It has been an expensive independence. He toiled, sowed, reaped, and sold without much thought of cooperating with his fellow farmer in the disposition of the fruits of that labor. He had a foreign and domestic market, rich soils from which to draw his products, and a new frontier just beyond the western horizon. When the soil of one farm would wear out he could move westward to another and point his plow into virgin soil. Finally the land crop was harvested, America industrialized, and the World War was declared and America shifted from a debtor to a creditor Nation. The farmer's status was immediately changed.

A sound cooperative marketing plan must necessarily involve and embrace production, transportation, warehousing, financing, and then marketing. Goods produced without planning, inadequate warehousing and financing must necessarily lead to distressed selling. Where distressed sellers are pressing their goods on the market there can be no stabilization of prices. The buyer is wise to offerings and the market declines, the ownership of goods shifts into strong hands followed by an absence of distressed sellers pressing the market, and then we see prices advance.

To change from his old haphazard, individualistic manner of offering his goods on the market, the farmer must have assistance in many ways. This assistance could come from one of two or from both sources—the State and the Nation. Much time and energy must be devoted by the individual farmer to a study and comprehension of the problem involved. There must be created the necessary credit for the establishment of warehousing facilities to the end the goods to be sold may be offered on the market in an orderly manner. Rather distinct lines must be drawn as between the portion which moves into channels of domestic consumption and that part of the crop which is to move away for foreign consumption.

Although even prior to 1932, as well as at that time, the two major political parties very definitely pledged themselves to a program of cooperative marketing for farm products, the wheels of Government machinery and leadership have not moved rapidly enough to assist the farmer materially and permanently in getting away from his disadvantageous and unorganized selling position. True, some progress has been made. There are some successful cooperatives operating at the moment. Some credit machinery has been placed in operation. Some interest rates have been reduced. However, it must be very evident to any student of the problem that putting into operation cooperative marketing is a very slow process for transforming an industry as decentralized as is farming. In the meantime overhead costs must be radically reduced if the industry is to survive without the loss of tens of thousands of homes. We have had pointed out to us the thought that the financing of agricultural production in its many phases now becomes a highly complicated banking problem; that it must be given the most serious consideration, to the end that credit lines be maintained for the financing of production, warehousing, processing, and marketing of the major crops, to say the least. Certainly less important crops must have special attention also. The great pea-bean industry of the country presents one problem, the sugar-beet crop another, and the potato grown on a commercial scale another. Cotton, cattle, wool, and mohair all have their own peculiar problems, and these cannot be handled, like in the case where many of the production and marketing and pricing factors are known, as in organized industry. If credit is to be extended only on the basis of that which goes to highly organized and managed commercial undertakings, then in that case agriculture will always be in a distressed position. The primary producer will always have to dump his products on the market at harvest time, and the middleman or processor or distributor—or all combined—will continue to gather much the greater share of the return paid by the ultimate consumer. Cooperative marketing means cooperative production, processing, warehousing, and financing. All must move along together; otherwise the entire plan must necessarily fail. We have not gone this far with agriculture generally. Herein we have failed.

Certainly private investors, including insurance companies, shy away from farm mortgages as the inability of the farmer to meet his mortgage interest and principal payments becomes more and more apparent to the lender. Metropolitan banks will not desire to lend money to country banks for the purpose of advancing to farmers for harvesting and marketing operations. One only needs to look at the hesitancy of insurance companies to make loans on first mortgages. At the present time they are lending for farm first mortgages only about three-fourths to 1½ percent of their total loans, and this with the benefit payments going to farmers. With agriculture again back where it was in 1932 it is reasonable to predict private capital, including insurance companies, will be less inclined to go along with the farmer in financing his production and marketing needs. A recent study of the mortgaged farms of owner operators in 100 counties in 11 States indicates that the combined cost for interest, commission, and other financing as reported in the census of 1930, averaged 8.3 percent for farms having loans under $500 in amount, as compared with 7.3 percent for loans between $500 and $1,500. This staggering interest burden is imposed on farmers. Commercial-paper rates on 4 to 6 months' terms, is drawing only three-fourths of 1 percent. Production credit associations — farm cooperatives — were having to pay 5 percent straight, while the Government was borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars at rates ranging from 1⅛ percent per annum up to 3 percent on very long paper. Now, anyone familiar with the farm problem knows these farmers cannot continue to pay interest rates of this character and at the same time have any cash income left with which to support organized industry through purchase of fabricated heavy-industry goods or even consumers' goods. Today we face a clean-cut proposition of where the public, owner of bank credits in the form of deposits in banks, are willing for those credits to be used in the purchase of Government bonds through the agency of the banks. For the use of that money or those credits, the Government is paying our citizens about the same general average rate of money wages the bank formerly paid to depositors for their daily balances on demand and time deposits. The 1935 Banking Act fits into this very scheme or plan wherein it prohibits the payment of interest by banks on demand deposits. Furthermore, the banks are now arranging their program on time deposits and in many cases the rates paid by banks for time deposits amount to no more than 1 percent per annum. Everything moves in the direction of lower interest rates. The farmer desires to be considered, and naturally he wants, expects, and should demand that his rates be lowered, if he is expected to fit into the national economy and be worth while to the industries of the country as a customer for the goods they turn out.

INCREASED MARKETING BURDEN ON ACCOUNT OF DECREASE IN NUMBER OF HORSES AND MULES UTILIZED ON FARMS

More than 2,000,000 fewer horses than in 1930 are shown in the United States summary of the 1935 farm census just recently released by Director W. L. Austin. Mules, which reached the peak about 1925, are now decreasing in number. The recent census shows that on January 1, 1935, there were 11,857,850 horses and 4,818,160 mules, compared with 13,383,574 horses and 5,353,950 mules April 1930. This new influence has so very much to do with a diminished consumption of farm products. While the horse problem itself is of great importance, the decrease in work animals markedly affects the entire agricultural set-up.

For example, farmers must provide use for the several million acres of land formerly devoted to growing feed for the 2,000,000 horses which have disappeared since 1930—

Says the bulletin. Farm power in the form of motors, gas, and oils means less foodstuffs will be consumed in the production of the farm crops, and this places on the market just that much more labor of the farmer in the form of foodstuffs for man and beast.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Of course, the farm problem cannot be comprehended without taking into consideration the most unusual situation with reference to imports and exports. The trend-of-

export movement compiled from the Department of Commerce reports by the Foreign Agricultural Service Division January 1936 release shows export movement of—

Year	Wheat and flour (1,000 bushels)	Bacon, hams, and shoulders (1,000 pounds)	Lard (1,000 pounds)	Cotton, running bales (1,000 bales)
1922	235,307	631,452	766,950	6,015
1932	82,118	84,175	546,202	8,916
1934	36,536	83,725	431,238	5,753

The declines in exports here shown tell their own story of "bad news" for the American farmer. It shows his export market slipping away, and therefore it must be some other agricultural country is absorbing that market. South America and certain other parts of the world are in position to undersell the United States.

The trend of agricultural imports shows staggering and paralyzing increases in cattle, butter, wheat grain, corn, and oat grain. Combine this with a bumper crop for 1936 and with inadequate financing by reason of the increased demand and the unwillingness of banks and insurance companies to go along, and there is a fair chance for the debacle of 1932 being repeated in American agriculture.

HOW MUCH INCOME IS THE AMERICAN FARMER ENTITLED TO RECEIVE?

The farm problem of America is a business problem. Those familiar with the solution of business problems of great magnitude can easily comprehend the elements which go to make up this problem. The United States Steel, the American Telephone & Telegraph, the General Motors Corporation all have a simple way of arriving at the approximate amount of income necessary to support their operations and to keep them in balance. On the American farm, as a whole, people live. Seed and operating supplies are purchased, plantings are made, and from that point on it becomes a matter of cultivating, harvesting, transporting, processing, warehousing, and marketing. A definite amount of capital is invested in fixed, operating, and liquid assets. Balance sheets and operating statements now available indicate there should be a minimum return to the American farmers, as a group, of from twelve to fifteen billions of dollars annually. This problem being one which so directly relates to the social and economic welfare of the people of the entire Nation, it has, of course, become a great political issue. The two major political parties and the leaders of those parties are charged with the responsibility of proceeding without further delay. Some of the more important and vital steps that should be taken are the following:

First. Give the American farmer the American foodstuffs market, insofar as he is physically able to supply that market. This means stop the imports and let him produce.

Second. Provide the required credit machinery for financing the planting, cultivating, and harvesting operations. These to be known as production loans.

Third. Provide required credit machinery for financing the transportation, processing, and warehousing of the three surpluses of agricultural commodities:

(a) Those which are regional or seasonal in character and which are eventually consumed in the normal domestic market in the season in which produced.

(b) Those which are required to equalize the variations of productivity from one season to another caused by climatical and other conditions beyond human control.

(c) Those which exceed domestic requirements over the period of the cycle of production, including the equalization of the cyclical variations, which may be termed "excess" or "overall" surpluses.

Fourth. In all credits or loans provide interest rates of no greater amount than those charged by commercial bankers to food handlers, middlemen, processors, and distributors. The tilling of the earth is the bottom condition of our civilization and must be recognized. A banking system which lends money at three-quarters of 1 percent to handlers which at the same time burdens the primary producer with from 6½ to 10 percent is highly discriminatory in favor of the former and against the latter. Its continuation will eventually lead to the complete strangulation of the American farmer.

Fifth. No branch of financial investment is of greater primary importance to the general welfare than agriculture. Therefore, in whatever plans or policies there may be adopted, give full cognizance to the necessity of a fair return on invested capital of farmer the same as to investments in railroads, telephone and power equipment, and other branches of industry.

Sixth. Depreciation on farm real estate, buildings, machinery, and livestock used for production purposes is as great or greater than in general industry. Any agricultural program failing to recognize this factor will be utterly inadequate.

Seventh. Any plan adopted will not suffice if it fails to return to agriculture the direct and indirect costs of production. The people must be led to realize this fact.

Eighth. Give full weight to the fact that about 25 percent of total population lives on farms and about 21 percent of income producers of the Nation are agricultural workers.

Ninth. In view of the fact that a broad, sweeping program must necessarily be administered through the Federal Government and the States cooperating, the excess tax burden which is now being borne by the American farmer should be equalized. Specifically speaking, take the tax paid on, say, farm real estate valued at $100,000 and compare that tax with what is paid on a similar amount of value represented by Federal, State, or industrial bonds and corporation stocks. The farmer is a fabricator of foodstuffs who works in cooperation with the uncertain elements and whose competitors are the farmers of the other nations of the earth. His risks are greater by far than those of organized industry. Furthermore, he is a consumer of heavy industrial goods as well as light consumers' goods.

Tenth. Give full consideration to the fact foodstuffs take on the nature of other goods, insofar as the relation to interstate and foreign commerce is concerned. What activity can be more closely allied to interstate and foreign commerce than is agriculture?

CAN CERTAIN AND DEFINITE NEEDS OF AGRICULTURE BE ACCOMPLISHED INSOFAR AS LEGISLATION (STATE AND NATIONAL) IS CONCERNED?

Fifteen years ago many would have answered this question in the affirmative. At that time the leaders in both major parties certainly felt that most of the ills of the agricultural industry could be easily cured by passing legislation designed to meet certain problems. Today many are beginning to feel the problem is too great for solution by Congress. The Supreme Court decision, in which it dealt with certain powers of the Federal Government as applied to the production or nonproduction of crops, has added much food for thought. During the past 15 years both major political parties have had the opportunity to do a great deal of experimenting with legislation designed and passed and administered by the respective parties while in power. The evidence before us today appears to confirm the thought on the part of some that all of the plans of both major parties have utterly failed in bringing about a solution. Perhaps no better proof could be found than the fact that at the moment we have before us for consideration the present administration's substitute bill for the Agricultural Adjustment Act so recently held invalid by the Supreme Court. We also have before us the plans recently suggested by Messrs. Hoover, Landon, Vandenberg, McNary, Peek and McNary, Dickinson, Lowden, and Hope, to say nothing of the propositions submitted by the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union, and others. Press reports and submission of all of these plans would lead one to believe the agricultural problem is a very definite one and a big one at this very moment and after 15 years of trial and error. Shortly the national conventions of the two major political parties will be in session. At that time there will undoubtedly be much said about the agricultural plank in the two respective platforms. Again the farmers of the Nation will be called upon to support these planks insofar as they deal with agriculture.

Can better plans be found than those now before the country for consideration? Would it be good common horse sense for both parties to participate in less politics and utilize more "brain and cooperation" in seeking out the best and most effective steps to follow in legislating in behalf of agriculture? Is it not true, if both parties would work together, that from present plans there could be taken those parts which are constitutional, constructive, and effective and with these elements build a legislative program which would be as fair to agriculture as other legislation is fair to the other elements of our national life, such as banking, transportation, organized industry in manufactures, insurance, and so forth? Is it not true that after all Congress and the State legislative bodies are not big enough to comprehend the millions of details involved in the operation of almost 7,000,000 American farms in the soil handling, crop planning, foodstuff producing, and marketing activities? Can Washington with a bureau of five times the present personnel or that which was created by the A. A. A. manage from the seat of Central Government the farming activities of America? If so, upon what basis? Is it not true that if a bureau in Washington becomes the management of the farming activities of this Nation that regimentation must necessarily follow in all of its sordid details? Is it not true that if the plans of the President as now set forth in the new farm bill, as well as those proposed by the leaders of the other major political party, if carried out, must necessarily clothe the Secretary of Agriculture with vast and far-reaching powers in telling foodstuff growers, processors, and handlers what they can and cannot do? That seems to be the absolute judgment of the ranking Republican member on the House Agriculture Committee.

This question now being a part of big politics we shall have to deal with its political phases. But may we play as little politics as possible. Let us proceed to cooperate; make it as nonpolitical as possible; give and take.

Once the American farmer is placed on an adequate and comparable income basis, he will then resume his place in the national economy. He will buy goods by the billions of dollars' worth. Industry will be called upon to supply those goods. To supply them industry will have to employ American citizens unless we import the goods from abroad, and God forbid that we do this while our own people are starving for want of work. Increasing American industrial activity calls for employment, and this will reduce unemployment, relief rolls, Government expenditures, and finally the need of taxes for relief purposes. The national debt will cease to climb as a result of financing deficits through bond issues, and that will allow present inflation to be discontinued with the balancing of the Nation's Budget. At the same time farmers and workers in organized industry will be in a better position to carry such tax burden as may be necessary to pay off the debt which has already been created through the effort of the Government to support its people instead of letting the people support the Government.

If we rebuild on a sound agricultural structure, we shall go forward. Otherwise we must prepare for more unemployment, high taxes, continued inflation through an unbalanced Budget, and the disaster that must necessarily follow unless we correct our ways.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Industrial utilization of farm products and byproducts: For the investigation, development, experimental demonstration, and application of methods for the industrial utilization of agricultural products, waste, and byproducts, and products made therefrom, except as otherwise provided for in this act, by the application of chemical, physical, and technological methods, including the changes produced by micro-organisims such as yeasts, bacteria, molds, and fungi; the utilization for color, medicinal, and technical purposes of substances grown or produced in the United States, $171,243.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to that portion of the hearings appearing between pages 940 and 983 for the reason that in this document is to be found overwhelming evidence that our machinery for financing the farms of America has broken down. I think we are in a very serious situation this afternoon, fighting over an increase of $1,000,000 or $500,000 while Rome is burning. There are 2,000,000 farms that cannot be refinanced.

Mr. Chairman, I want to extend my remarks, and I shall attempt to prove to every Member of this House, not by a fair preponderance of the evidence but beyond any reasonable doubt, that the Farm Credit Administration has broken down.

I refer you to evidence submitted to this Committee.

During the last year they have ceased lending money, and in my district they have almost stopped altogether. While they have been refusing to make loans, they have been foreclosing. In 1935 there were the greatest number of foreclosures in the history of the depression. We thought we had struck the peak in 1933, but we had not. In 1935, if you will refer to page 941, you will see what is going on. I simply call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that before we close, regardless of what we appropriate for this or that, or whether we are for this bill or that bill, some provision must be made for the protection of the farm homes in America.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Is it not true that when we put over the Commissioner's loans the Farm Credit Act of this country was abolished and repealed because they sent out the appraisers from the various Federal land banks and reduced the appraisement value of the property, so that all we did on this floor in connection with the Commissioner's loan was to authorize the lending of money up to 75 percent of the value of the farms?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. Here is what the papers say:

Sharp decline in farm loans held good sign.

Why? Because the land banks are not lending money.

Mr. PIERCE. They are lending money, but they are doing so at such a low valuation that the farmer cannot accept.

Mr. BURDICK. They cannot make loans that may be applied for by the farmers.

Mr. PIERCE. That is because they appraise the property so low.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. PIERCE. They are still lending money, but they lend money only on 60 or 70 percent of the value.

Mr. BURDICK. In 1934 the Federal land banks lent $1,292,000,000, but last year when the emergency was greater than ever they lent only $449,000,000. If you will refer to the report made by Mr. Meyer, you will see his attitude toward farm financing. In the last year the Federal land bank has not been devoting its attention to farm loans because, it is said, we are in a period of retrenchment. In other words, it is foreclosing and selling land which it has already acquired. I did not want this opportunity to go by without calling the attention of the Members of the House to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee has just agreed to a very important amendment, known as the forestry amendment. Most likely when the bill is brought up in the House for final passage the Members will be called on for a separate vote in reference to this amendment. There is one thing I want to call attention to. We hear organizations and the people of this Nation crying "Buy American", and rightfully so. They tell us we should buy American, but let me say that unless this amendment is agreed to and placed upon the statute books of this Nation, we will not be able to buy American lumber within the next 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, the statistics show that our annual consumption of lumber is some 63,000,000,000 feet, and that within 20 years, if the cutting of timber is continued and the forests are allowed to be slashed away as they have been in the past and not acquired by this Government and not protected, we will not have any forests or lumber.

There is another thing to which attention should be directed. We will not be able to buy in this Nation the pulp which goes to make up newsprint paper. We will be forced to do as some of the newspapers of this Nation are now doing who are crying "Buy American." That is, go to foreign countries for our pulp. Some of the great newspapers of this Nation right today are buying every single, solitary bit of their newsprint paper from foreign countries. May I emphasize that if this amendment is not agreed to in the House, they will not only have the option of buying in foreign countries but will be forced to buy in foreign countries, because the only way we can keep up the growth of pulpwood in this country is through a reforestation program and the planting and growing of trees for this pulpwood.

May I invite attention to an article that was written by one of my colleagues on the opposite side of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], which covers this program in very great detail. The gentleman states that in his district alone, unless there is secured the proper amount of pulp through reforestation, the great paper mills will suffer. These trees should be planted and grown in the areas that have been cut over, which will provide the pulp to keep the great paper mills of this country going.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. May I say to the gentleman that there are paper mills situated in my State, and I can confirm his statement. It is a very able statement and is true in every respect.

Mr. HOOK. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, may I state I will include in my remarks a letter from the Ironwood Association of Commerce?

IRONWOOD ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Ironwood, Mich., February 16, 1936.

Mr. FRANK E. HOOK,
Representative, Twelfth District of Michigan,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I was very glad to get your long letter, and it goes without saying that everybody here knows that you are heart and soul for the forest program. However, we have now had the forest program in effect for nearly 1 year and we have suddenly come to the realization that our original objective of saving the Black River country and the Porcupine Mountain district and the roadside timber has not been realized in the least and that cutting of timber has been stepped up to 350,000,000 feet this year, or nearly trebled. The logging companies are now operating on the Black River road and it will be only a short time that this valuable source of beauty and tourist attraction will go by the board. Once gone, it is gone for good as far as we are concerned. What land has been purchased for the forest has almost entirely been cut-over land down near Watersmeet. Of course, the purchase of cut-over land is all right, but that does not save the timber, and that is our primary object. Now, this is not the fault of the Forest Department. They have all this north country cruised and under option but there are no available funds. Do you remember when we went before the Forest Reservation Commission that Mr. Tinker told them it would take about $9,000,000 to inaugurate a cutting plan and save the virgin timber? Well, the fact of the matter is that we still need the nine million, and it has not been forthcoming. And unless this appropriation is made in the next 2 or 3 months, before June 1, it will be too late. In our estimation, the only one who can save the situation is the President himself, and I am sure if he knew the urgency of the matter he would act. There has been some talk of the Forest Reservation Commission going before the President in a body and presenting the situation, and this would be a good move if it could be done. But, whatever the means, we need direct action, and soon. The people in Washington must be made to realize that this is not just a local project, but that the conserving of this last grand stand of virgin hardwood is a national problem and will benefit every person in these United States.

If the Ottawa Forest is developed in the way the Forest Service has planned it, this last virgin stand of timber will serve as an inspiration to everybody from far and wide, and this beautiful Lake Superior country, with its waterfalls and streams and mountains, will be a jewel in the crown of this whole United States. There is nothing like it anywhere in the United States today, forestry men say, and they ought to know. And coupled with that fact is the knowledge that it means the future living of this country. The money that the Government has sunk in Alaska for a handful of people on a very questionable enterprise would have put this whole plan in working order and been the means of livelihood of some 5,000 people in the future and now.

I have a letter from Mr. JAMES COUZENS assuring us of his support and willingness to work with you or anybody to put this project across. He states that there is a movement afoot among Members of the House from Michigan to recommend amendment to legislation to carry out proposal for the Government to purchase certain land in connection with a national-forest unit. We also understand that Representative PARSONS, of Illinois, has something afoot along this line also. This would seem to indicate that the need is felt there by a great many of the Congressmen, but they do not seem to understand the urgency of the situation and that something must be done now. If all these forces could be assembled together and made to realize that this forest is their forest and the last of its kind we would get action, I am sure. I wonder if you could not contact Congressman PRENTISS M. BROWN and get his interest. He is for the Mackinaw bridge project; but if all the timber in this country is destroyed, why, you could row the tourists across the Straits of Mackinaw in a rowboat that would be interested in coming up here. They have plenty of that desolated country below the straits.

Now, about the resettlement project. The feeling of the club and businessmen on this subject is this: Here we have a real project in the Ottowa Forest which is not getting any place, and yet the Government is thinking of putting in some millions of dollars in a project which at the best is highly questionable for the good of this town. We would much prefer that we get the forest project complete and that the money be used for this purpose and not for the other. You say that this has no connection with the other project, but I would like to point out this fact to you: We had a good start on the forest, and then we have had delegations in Washington wanting some more funds for another project. In the meanwhile, the forest project suffered. Our opinion is that while they may be in different departments, in the last analysis what we get from one will be subtracted from the other. And between the two, why, our vote is for the Ottowa National Forest and its full development every time; and we think that if this fact is made known, why, perhaps we will get somewhere with it. Why not let the President know that and, if necessary, transfer the funds to the forest project. It has been done before. Let's back one horse for a winner, because it will be a glorious winner if we put it across. And that is what we are going to do.

With my best personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

RAYMON DICK,
Chairman, Forest Conservation Committee.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural fires and explosive dusts: For the investigation, development, experimental demonstration, and application of methods for the prevention and control of dust explosions and fires during the harvesting, handling, milling, processing, fumigating, and storing of agricultural products, and for other dust explosions and resulting fires not otherwise provided for, including fires in grain mills and elevators, cotton gins, cotton-oil mills, and other structures; the heating, charring, and ignition of agricultural products; fires on farms and in rural communities and other explosions and fires in connection with farm and agricultural operations, $48,403.

Mr. GILDEA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Tht Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILDEA: Page 53, line 12, after the word "operations", strike out "$48,403" and insert "$58,403."

Mr. GILDEA. Mr. Chairman, after just restoring $27,000,000 to the items in this bill, the argument that we are keeping within the Budget no longer holds good, and this addition of $10,000 to this particular item no longer restores it to the Budget estimate.

The reason I think it should be restored is because of the work being done by this particular Bureau. The testimony of Dr. Skinner before the committee shows that the annual farm loss from fires is $100,000,000, and the annual loss from fires in rural communities is $225,000,000, or a daily loss of $600,000 every day in the farming and rural communities of the United States.

The Budget estimate would extend the study of spontaneous combustion in hay to all kinds of hay, not merely alfalfa, as at present, and to other farm commodities.

The explosive-dust experiment station is doing a service of benefit not merely to farmers and owners of grain elevators but to everybody that comes in contact with any form of explosive in this country.

During the recent miners' convention practically all of the delegates to that convention from the anthracite section went out to see what a dust explosion really is in action. These men are going down into the mines daily and coming into contact with explosive gas. The man who sees a mine explosion is always a victim of it. This experiment station permits them to see what explosions really mean, and dust can be compared with high explosive gas. When these miners go home after seeing the terrible force expended in one of these explosions they are going to be more careful workmen, and to extend this service so as to make it possible for the Department of Agriculture to conduct such experi-

ments as it is doing today throughout the country and appearing before firemen's conventions and taking the story into the rural communities——

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILDEA. Certainly.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman understands that the appropriations for investigation of explosive dust, in which the gentleman seems to be very much interested, is exactly the same in this bill as it was in the bill last year, and no increase in this respect was recommended by the Budget.

Mr. GILDEA. This is simply to extend the work of this same branch of the Department of Agriculture, and the addition of this $10,000 would extend it for research into spontaneous combustion.

Mr. TARVER. The matter in which the gentleman is interested is in connection with another item. The gentleman seems to be laboring under the impression that the Bureau of the Budget recommended an increase of $10,000 for investigation of explosive dust. This is in error. They did not recommend any increase in the item, and we have left the appropriation as recommended.

Mr. GILDEA. I realize that spontaneous combustion is listed fifth in the items given by Dr. Skinner in his testimony. However, the benefit of this study of explosive dust, in my opinion, would jusify this increase in the appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we ask for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil survey: For the investigation of soils and their origin, for survey of the extent of classes and types, and for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations and surveys, $301,208.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 53, line 20, strike out "$301,208" and insert "$381,208."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, no question can be raised against this amendment upon the ground that it is out of conformity with the estimates of the Budget. I have provided in the amendment just exactly the amount that is recommended by the Director of the Budget. The committee cut it down $80,000. I am in receipt of a letter from the director of the Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, in which he says:

This item is very important from the standpoint of farmers. Soil surveys furnish the basic facts on which must be based such activities as erosion control, resettlement, rehabilitation, soil conservation, land use, and farm management on individual farms.

I would not have been influenced even by this communication from so eminent an authority to offer this amendment if there had not been passed within the last few days a farm program that is based upon the theory of soil conservation. The conference report upon the bill inaugurating that program has been accepted, and is based fundamentally upon soil conservation. Soil conservation must scientifically be predicated upon a knowledge of the soil, and the knowledge of the soil must be gotten by the study that is contemplated in this amendment. The bill that passed today is a temporary bill for 2 years, with a permanent program in the offing, and that permanent program is based upon soil conservation. The importance of soil conservation will be recognized. In order to carry out intelligently any program of that character, information should be scientifically obtained.

Since I have been in Congress, for the last 16 years, there has come to me from time to time the urgency of further appropriations for just this sort of work. I have not undertaken to press those amendments because the urgency did not seem as great as at the present time, but I take it that the increased study at this time is in direct conformity with the program which we have adopted in this House and which the administration has prepared for the country. The amendment agrees with the estimate of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every Member of the House, and especially everyone who comes from an agricultural section, is deeply interested in the subject matter discussed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. The trouble about his amendment is that if it should be offered anywhere, it ought to be offered in connection with that portion of the bill which deals with the expenses of the publication of these surveys. It developed in the evidence before the committee that the Bureau is behind some 2 or 3 years in the publication of surveys that have already been made available for publication. The field surveys have been made, the mapping has been done, but they have not been able to catch up with their work of publishing those surveys and making them available to the public. In addition to that, it appears a great many of their surveys are out of print and they have not sufficient money to republish them so as to make them available to the people in the areas for which they were originally provided. It seemed to the committee it was not necessary to provide a large additional sum for field work and mapping purposes, to get ready a large number of additional surveys, when it was very apparent that the surveys if gotten ready could not be printed and made available to the public. We thought they ought to catch up with their program of surveys already made before undertaking to add to the appropriation heretofore had for the work of making surveys.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; but first I want to point out that we have allowed the same appropriation which they had last year.

Mr. BLAND. But that is not enough. What I want to ask the gentleman is, if it is not important to carry ahead the field work now in order that that field work may be translated into these reports later. The important thing now is getting the original data.

Mr. TARVER. That is very true, but may I say, however, that the same appropriation they had last year will be sufficient, in view of the fact that it has been sufficient heretofore, not only to provide all of the surveys that they could publish, but to provide so many more surveys than they could publish that they are 2 or 3 years behind already with the appropriation already had.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dutch elm disease eradication: For control and prevention of spread of the Dutch elm disease in the United States, $261,156, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORAN: Page 58, line 8, after the word "States", strike out "$261,156" and insert "$1,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, without going into detail, which is, of course, impossible in the short time available, let me comment on the fact that the Dutch elm disease is a new one as far as this country is concerned. The disease itself is incurable, and we must bear that fact in mind as we think of the values involved.

The disease appeared first in Ohio in 1930, then in New York and New Jersey in 1933, but the eradication work really did not begin until 1934. The method of attacking this disease has been in two forms: First, finding and destroying diseased trees—so far 14,074 diseased trees have been found—and, second, a sanitation program, cutting down trees—918,000 have been cut down, 1,219,000 trees have been

found dead or dying. At the present time this particular disease is confined principally to an area within 50 miles of the Statue of Liberty—principally around New York and New Jersey—but the New England States and Pennsylvania are in line for this attack.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Is this disease prevalent in the New England States at the present time?

Mr. MORAN. At the present time it is not. However, I look at it as I would look at a conflagration, not far away and headed in the direction of New England, and I continually bear in mind that this is a disease that is absolutely incurable; our only hope is eradication before all of our elms have gone.

Mr. HEALEY. Has the gentleman any information regarding the number of elm trees?

Mr. MORAN. There are 8,200,000 elm trees in Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. That is more than in any other State involved?

Mr. MORAN. More than in any State involved.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman proposes a very substantial increase. Has he any information which he can bring to the Committee to satisfy the Committee that they have trained personnel and that there is a real need for the amount that is indicated?

Mr. MORAN. I will try, if I may at this time, to show what was done last year.

With an appropriation of $261,156 in the bill for the coming fiscal year, which is the same amount as in the bill for this year, there was an additional amount of $2,730,000 available from emergency relief funds, making a total of $2,991,156, which was used as follows:

Scouting to locate diseased and dying trees within the generally infected area	$1,013,772
Sanitation work consisting of removal and destruction of dead and dying trees which harbor insect carriers of the disease	1,524,431
Scouting to locate diseased trees in the 13 outlying areas where the disease occurs or is suspected to exist	55,000
Scouting along railroad routes over which imported logs were shipped prior to prohibiting entry	21,483
Pathological examination of specimens from trees suspected to be infected with the disease	86,580
Studies on insects which may transmit the disease	6,000
Enforcement of quarantine	5,000
Removal and destruction of infected trees	98,745
Supervision and coordination of work done by State agencies, including general administration	180,145
Total	2,991,156

The point I make is that $3,000,000 is being spent this year on the fight against the Dutch elm disease, whereas in the coming year there will be only $261,156 available, unless emergency funds not now in sight become available. Therefore, my amendment to increase the appropriation from $261,156 to $1,500,000 means, if adopted, an expenditure of only half as much money as there is being spent this year for this same purpose.

In answer to the argument that this expenditure is useless because eradication is impossible, I call attention to statements to the contrary on pages 484 and 485 of the hearings, as testified by Lee A. Strong, Chief, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

To substantiate my statement that the proposed 1937 appropriation is not sufficient, I refer to Chief Strong's testimony—page 486 of hearings—that "this $261,000 is not anywhere near enough to do the job."

In answer to the argument that passage of my amendment would make the item exceed the Budget, I call attention to the fact that the Appropriations Committee itself has exceeded the Budget on two other items in this very same section of the bill: First, the Budget Bureau recommended $350,000 for Japanese-beetle control, but the committee increased that figure to $400,000; second, the Budget did not recommend a cent for screwworm control, but the committee inserted $460,000 for this purpose. I am not objecting to these two increases, but I do say to this House that the beautiful and valuable elm trees of New England, New York, and New Jersey are of infinitely more value than are many of the assets which we so tenderly protect under similar programs. There are 4,500,000 elm trees in Connecticut; 8,200,000 in Massachusetts; 1,200,000 in Rhode Island; 4,200,000 in my own State of Maine; 2,200,000 in Vermont; 3,500,000 in New Hampshire; 4,000,000 in New York; 3,750,000 in Pennsylvania; a total of 31,500,000 elm trees in these named States only. If there are any Members of this House who can travel through the many towns in New England without appreciating their beauty and realizing how irreparable their loss would be, then let me appeal on the dollars-and-cents basis and say that elm is valued for timber, and elm lumber brings good prices and has averaged well up among the hardwoods for many years. Let me say, further, that the total appropriations in this bill are so far below the Budget total that this increase would not make the total bill in excess of the Budget.

This Dutch elm eradication program has given employment, under the regular appropriation, to 68 persons and 8 on per-diem basis. Under the emergency allotment for this program employment has been given, as of week ending February 22, to 3,022 persons, taken from relief rolls, and 269 persons occupying supervisory, clerical, and technical positions.

America's elm trees are a real asset. We should meet the present attack vigorously, stamp it out, and bequeath to our children and grandchildren one of Nature's greatest gifts—the American elm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed an expression of surprise on the part of some Members when it was proposed by the gentleman from Maine that $1,500,000 be devoted to the purpose of combating the deadly menace of the Dutch elm disease, although last year we spent with the W. P. A. fund nearly $3,000,000 in this work.

We are faced with what threatens to be one of the greatest national calamities of a physical and aesthetic nature that has ever befallen this Nation in the absolute destruction of our elm trees. You can visualize what it would mean by thinking of what Washington would be like if these magnificent elm trees of ours were to be destroyed, left standing like ghosts, as they will be inevitably, unless we grapple with this menace now and adequately solve the problem.

One million five hundred thousand dollars is a very modest request under the circumstances. We really ought to have twice that. It has this advantage over the W. P. A. plan. If this $1,500,000 is granted in this bill, it will be administered by the skilled, able, and resourceful members of the Department of Agriculture, who are charged with the responsibility of heading off these imported plant and tree pests in this country.

This elm-tree pest appeared first around 1919 in Holland. It was imported from some obscure Asiatic source. Engaged in the struggle to rehabilitate themselves after the war, no attention was paid to this destruction of elms until the thing had spread everywhere. Then it was too late to do anything. Around 1929 the plague was introduced into this country by the importation of logs through New York, Baltimore, Norfolk, and New Orleans. This pest has appeared in Virginia near Norfolk. It has appeared in Maryland near Baltimore. It has appeared here and there in western sections where this imported lumber has been shipped. The handling of the problem is made difficult and slow because you have to go to a laboratory with portions of the diseased tree to determine whether it is in the tree or not. It is an infection of the lifestream of the tree.

It results in a curling, fading, and dying of the leaf followed by the complete death of the tree. They have to cut off a branch and take it to a laboratory to ascertain the cause of the death of the tree because this particular

disease is a form of inner infection. There is no cure for this deadly infection except the destruction of the tree, and this has to be done on the spot immediately, because to carry the tree hither and yon is to send the spore carriers flying into other trees, thus adding to the disaster.

Gentlemen, visualize what it means! These glorious trees threatened with extinction over our country east of the Rockies from the Canadian line to Florida.

This elm-tree disease can be likened to a streptococcus infection in a human being which poisons the entire system. This elm disease poisons the entire tree.

I sincerely hope that patriotism as well as economics will prevail in the consideration of this amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is not the damage done to the tree before the insect in the infected tree reaches the flying stage?

Mr. EATON. Yes; but the disease germ is carried from tree to tree by boring insects.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say the damage was done by an insect.

Mr. EATON. No; the disease is not inherent in the insect, as I understand it, but in what the insect brings.

I am informed that the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON of Missouri] is authority for the statement that in the opinion of the Agricultural Department and in his opinion the case is hopeless. Such an attitude of defeatism is beyond my comprehension. We have only been trifling with this menace thus far. If we face it in the spirit of patriotic determination to repel this alien invader, we can win the fight. It will cost money, effort, and the sacrifice of some part of our elm-tree wealth. But whatever it costs, we ought to head off this destruction of our elm trees before they meet the fate of the chestnuts a few years ago. There are millions of American citizens who are deeply concerned over this situation, and they expect, and have a right to expect, that their Government, which they so generously support by their taxes, will now protect them and their country against the ruin of a species of tree life which constitutes one of the chief glories of our landscape.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein statements prepared by the Bureau of Entomology.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief.

I look upon this amendment and the purpose to be gained therefrom as similar to preventive medicine. This is a tree disease that has come into this country from abroad, where the damage done has been tremendous. Within 60 miles of New York there are 25,000,000 elm trees, and a study made by the Bureau of Entomology discloses that there are 14,000 infected trees within that radius. The disease has cropped out in New England and New Jersey. Heroic efforts must be applied to check it. The amount asked in this amendment is less than the price of one torpedo boat or one destroyer, if you please; and if we can stop this thing before it spreads to wider areas it will be worth all its cost. This program will be carried out by the Bureau of Entomology, and the Bureau can be trusted to spend the money wisely. Their reputation along this line is commendable.

From an economic standpoint we cannot afford to neglect this menace to all the elm trees of the country. It cannot be measured only in terms of the loss of millions of dollars; it threatens the scenic beauty of large areas. We cannot wait and attack this menace in futurum. It is something we should take care of now, not 5 or 10 years from now. In certain sections of the East the disease has done a great deal of damage. It has broken out in Connecticut, attacking the beautiful elms in Old Lyme.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not true that had we undertaken to combat the ravages of the gypsy moth when it first made its appearance we could have eradicated this terrible pest? And is not this another case where we should start promptly in order not to have a repetition of what we had with the gypsy moth?

Mr. TOBEY. The gentleman is exactly right.

I was down to the morgue the other day when a telephone message came in that a man had died at the transient bureau from an attack of spinal meningitis. The coroner in charge immediately said: "Burn the body at once." This is what we must do now in the case of this tree disease. By systematic scouting, locate infested trees, cut them down and burn them. It can be called the spinal meningitis of the elm, a disease to be eradicated at once by applying extreme measures.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Even if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maine be adopted, the total amount available will be far less than it was a year ago. We had $2,730,000 in 1935 from the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, together with $569,220 carried in the regular bill.

Mr. TOBEY. The gentleman is correct. Reverting again to the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], we might also call attention to the starlings and the English sparrows that came over from the old country and have become a nuisance to us here. Those menaces could have been overcome had we tackled the job in time.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I extend my remarks by inserting the following letter from the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, which gives detailed information on the source of this disease, its progress in our Nation, the methods used in combating it, and a schedule of the allotment of funds for the summer of 1935 and the fiscal year 1936.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1936.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: You asked to be supplied with information showing how much money is available for Dutch elm disease eradication work in the current fiscal year and how it is being spent. You also asked what, if any, progress is being made in the effort to eradicate it and for any information available as to the number and importance or value of elm trees in the area involved.

The agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1936 provides $261,156 for Dutch elm disease eradication. In addition to this and during the latter part of last fiscal year $2,730,000 was allotted from the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, which has been available during 1936. The approximate amounts of these combined funds allotted to the various activities are itemized on the attached page.

Unless you have had opportunity to personally acquaint yourself with the nature of the problem presented by the presence of this disease in this country a brief explanation will perhaps assist you.

The disease is of foreign origin and was first found in this country in Ohio in 1930. At that time there was no knowledge as to how it had been introduced, and only a few trees were found affected, a total of only 11 trees having been found there prior to 1935. In August 1933 a diseased tree was found in New Jersey, and scouting was begun in that region at once, resulting in the finding of others. In the meantime it had been ascertained that elm burl logs being imported into this country from Europe were infected with the disease and infested with at least one species of bark beetle known to be a carrier of the disease. An embargo on elm-log importations followed, and scouting in the vicinity of ports of entry and along railways known to have transported such logs led to the discovery of one diseased tree in Baltimore, and later three at Brunswick, Md. In a similar way 4 trees have been found in Norfolk and Portsmouth, Va., and 14 diseased trees have been found at Indianapolis, and during the past summer 23 more diseased trees were discovered in Ohio. These, with five found at Old Lyme, Conn., are the only findings thus far outside of the area in which the infection appears to be rather generally distributed in the States of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey.

The area involved in these States may be described as comprising about 60 miles in width surrounding New York Harbor. Some light may be thrown on the intensity of the infection in this area when it is stated that an elm-tree census reveals the presence of

25,000,000 elms there, of which 14,000 trees have been found diseased. Here it might be appropriate to refer to your question as to progress in the work of eradicating the disease by calling to your attention this statement which has been made by the Department in response to similar queries. It is believed that definite progress has been made toward the eradication of the disease, and if vigorous work can be continued there is fair assurance of success which will protect trees in the general area of infection and prevent spread throughout the United States.

As indicated on the attached sheet, one of the larger items of expenditure is for the purpose of finding and destroying diseased trees. In this work the States concerned cooperate, the destruction of trees is done under State laws, and State representatives contact property owners, obtain permits for tree removal, and perform related functions. This does not represent the limit of State cooperation, as they have aided with State appropriations and in many helpful and important ways. Scouting for the disease is best done when foliage is on the trees. Visible evidence of early stages of infection are found in wilted twigs or branches. Samples of such trees are taken to the laboratory for confirmation, as the presence of the disease in a tree can only be determined with certainty by laboratory cultures.

A tree showing these early symptoms of infection is not believed to be a source of spread for a short time following and it is upon this principle the eradication program is based. Frequent scoutings to detect symptoms before spread results followed by prompt destruction is the best known means of protecting healthy elms and of stamping out the disease.

Another important factor is represented by the other of the two largest items of expenditure on the statement herewith transmitted, namely, the sanitation program. This expenditure represents the effort to facilitate the scouting and to a degree to get ahead of the disease by removing more or less worthless elms and those which are in an unhealthy condition though presence of the disease in such trees has not been determined. As previously stated, there are about 25,000,000 elms in this area. Half of these, because of their location or condition, or both, have little or no value, except for watershed purposes. More than 1,000,000 such trees have been removed and it is planned to continue this phase of the work in the infected area, because by their removal the work of scouting is correspondingly reduced and because their condition is such as to make them attractive as breeding places for the beetles known to act as carriers of the disease. These are the two major lines of work used in the eradication program.

You will note that only a comparatively few actually diseased trees have been found. These trees, however, because of the infectious nature of the disease, were a menace to all the elms of the country. If we may judge by the experience of other countries where the disease is destroying practically all the elms unless the infected trees are promptly located and destroyed and the abundance of the insect carriers of the disease reduced, the disease may spread into uninfected regions and the elms of the country be destroyed as the chestnut has been. The season when effective scouting can be done to locate infected trees is limited and emphasizes the importance of the general sanitation program in the area where infection is known.

The elm tree census in this area developed the fact that there were about 25,000,000 elms, of which half have little value except for watershed purposes. Of the other half, 6,250,000 are estimated to have value as timber or fuel and 6,250,000 are shade trees. In nearby States, such as the New England States and in the States of Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania, well beyond the known limits of infection estimates have been made as to the elm shade tree population. The list of States and the estimated number of elm shade trees follows:

Connecticut	4,500,000
Massachusetts	8,200,000
Rhode Island	1,200,000
Maine	4,200,000
Vermont	2,200,000
New Hampshire	3,500,000
New York	4,000,000
Pennsylvania	3,750,000
Total	31,550,000

Another question asked by you had to do with the value of elms. Elm is valued for timber and elm lumber brings good prices and has averaged well up among the hardwoods for lumber purposes for many years.

Average value of elm timber at the mill per 1,000 feet board measure

Year	All kinds of lumber	Elm
1899	$11.13	[1] $11.47
1920	38.42	[2] 47.23
1931	18.56	[3] 25.37

[1] From 1899 to 1931, inclusive.
[2] Elm consistently bettered average.
[3] Mill price for "All kinds of lumber."

Authority: Statistical Bulletin 21, pt. 2, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1928, "Lumber, Lath, and Shingles", 1930, p. 15, table 7, et seq.

Throughout the States listed above, however, and in other nearby States the elm is valued principally for shade. There are several accepted methods of computing shade-tree values. Four typical ones are:

1. Diameter-measurement method, $10 per inch of diameter, measurement breast high.
2. Circumferance-measurement method, $5 per inch of circumference, measurement breast high.
3. Replacement-value method:
   Gave Newark, N. J., average value of $30.72 each for its 66,308 trees.
   This conservative method gives $2,036,981.76 value.
4. Roth method:

Minimum cost of establishing tree	$15.00
Compound interest at 5 percent for 25 years	36.80
Total value for tree	51.80

(Conservative because no care cost considered.)

These and other accepted methods have withstood the test of litigation.

We trust that this will supply the information you desire.

Yours very truly,

AVERY S. HOYT,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

Allotment of funds available for eradication of Dutch elm disease for summer of 1935 and the fiscal year 1936, by activities

Scouting to locate diseased and dying trees within the generally infected area	$1,013,772
Sanitation work consisting of removal and destruction of dead and dying trees which harbor insect carriers of the disease	1,524,431
Scouting to locate diseased trees in the 13 outlying areas where the disease occurs or is suspected to exist	55,000
Scouting along railroad routes over which imported logs were shipped prior to prohibiting entry	21,483
Pathological examination of specimens from trees suspected to be infected with the disease	86,580
Studies on insects which may transmit the disease	6,000
Enforcement of quarantine	5,000
Removal and destruction of infected trees	98,745
Supervision and coordination of work done by State agencies, including general administration	180,145
Total	[1] 2,991,156

[1] Includes:

Regular appropriation, 1936	$261,156
Allotment from emergency funds, latter part of 1935 and 1936	2,730,000
Total	2,991,156

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, the State of New Jersey stands in the very center of the attack being made by the Dutch elm disease, and I am told today by authorities of the Department of Agriculture the fungus germ is more prevalent there than in the area embraced by the States of New York and Connecticut, which are also seriously affected.

The disease was first discovered in my district in north Jersey, on Independence Day, 1933. County Agricultural Agent Harold E. Wettyen reported it to the State authorities and the battle began. It was realized immediately that the fight was not to be a short one, but it was agreed there would be no armistice until public and private agencies had won or lost. New Jersey knew the story of Europe's terrible fight against the disease, first discovered in Rotterdam, during which thousands of magnificent trees were slaughtered.

"Who will win the battle?" asks Richard P. White in New Jersey Farm and Garden. And the Passaic Herald-News asks:

Is the New Jersey elm destined to survive or will it go with the noble New Jersey chestnut, perhaps to come back to us only after long years, after most of us are dead, as the chestnut, long believed to be extinct, shows some signs of doing?

We must have this Federal aid in order to prevent further spread as well as protect the investment already made. New Jersey's Secretary of Agriculture, W. B. Duryee, wires me as follows:

TRENTON, N. J., *February 26, 1936.*

Hon. GEORGE N. SEGER,
House of Representatives:

New Jersey vitally interested in Dutch elm disease eradication, because most of diseased elms occur here. May I urge your support of amended bill in order to prevent further spread and protect investment already made?

W. B. DURYEE,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Our State has already spent $85,000 appropriated by the legislature, and New York has added $324,000 and Connecticut $14,400.

Federal plant pathologists, Federal laboratories, and Federal workers are needed to rescue the infected areas in these eastern States and to prevent the slaughter of elms in other States. Europe, when faced with the issue, started too late. We must not fail in this important crisis now, unless, of course, we are willing to bid farewell to that noble tree, the elm, which has meant so much to our country.

I urge the prompt adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if there were any way to save these elm trees no amount of money would be too much to appropriate for the purpose. But the case is hopeless. We have already spent over $3,000,000 in a determined attempt to control the disease and have not cured a single tree. We have not yet retarded the progress of the disease a half meter. Holland has abandoned the fight. England, with her magnificent elm trees, has thrown up her hands. Germany, the cradle of horticulture, leader of the world in forest management, is making no further expenditures in the hopeless struggle. In all these countries and in all these years since its inception in 1919 not one single tree has been cured.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation of this money would retard the solution of the problem, and I will tell you why. There is only one way to meet this situation, and that is for the States through their police power to cut down all trees which are subject to immediate infection, just as in a conflagration you blow up the buildings in advance of the fire. You must remove the trees in advance of the contagion, as London was depopulated at the time of the black death, until the Dutch elm disease, having no further material to feed upon, burns itself out.

If this money is appropriated, what do they propose to do with it? After the tree is dead they go out and cut it down. If the Government did not do that, the owner would have to do it. Many of these trees have to be taken down limb by limb. It is expensive. All we are doing is appropriating this money to save the owner that expense, thereby retarding the solution of the problem just that much, because as long as the Federal Government spends money in this hopeless way the States will do nothing. The State must enact laws to compel every owner to cut not only the infected trees but those subject to infection. If we agree to this amendment, we will, in my opinion, to that extent condemn the elm trees of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EATON) there were—ayes 30, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Truck crops and garden insects: For insects affecting truck crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco, sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $366,418.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KOPPLEMANN: Page 58, line 14, strike out "$366,418" and insert "$375,418."

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered calls for a small sum of money and is introduced at this time because it did not receive consideration by the Committee on Appropriations. It was not discovered that this item had been left out until after the committee had made its report. A disease which is attacking tobacco and other products raised in the Connecticut Valley is now causing great damage annually. According to the statement of the man engaged by the State of Connecticut to work on the control of these insects, $2,000,000 annually is being lost to the farmers up there because of the beetle flies and other pests attacking farmers' crops.

My amendment simply requests $9,000 in addition to the $366,000 which is now provided in the bill for the control of insect devastation. The control and eradication of tobacco pests in other States has been undertaken by the Bureau of Entomology, but Connecticut was left out, inadvertently I am certain. The Bureau of Entomology writes me that it is worth while. The representative in the Connecticut River Valley wires me giving the loss as $2,000,000 and hopes for the enactment of this amendment.

We are simply asking for this small sum of money to round out the program of the Department as contained in this bill.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman surprises the Committee very much when he states that no part of this appropriation is available for the tobacco of the State of Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I did not say no part was available for tobacco. I said no part was available for the Connecticut Valley and the investigation and control through the Bureau of Entomology of those insects which are attacking our products. There is nothing in the bill for Connecticut.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman have particular reference to tobacco?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Tobacco and other products; yes.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is undoubtedly mistaken, because the appropriation for tobacco investigation and the investigation and control of tobacco insects is not local to any section of the country and is certainly available for use in the Connecticut Valley and elsewhere.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I have talked to the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology, and I have a letter in which it is stated there is no provision made for Connecticut.

Mr. TARVER. The provision applies to the country as a whole and may be used for Connecticut if desired. It is in the discretion of the Department. There is no law prohibiting it from doing so, and the committee intended that the whole problem should be taken care of, and they feel they have recommended a sufficient fund for this purpose.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That may be the gentleman's understanding, but I have a letter here from Lee A. Strong, Chief of the Bureau, in which he says that the Bureau recognizes there is a need for special studies to develop control measures which may be effectively used in controlling certain pests of tobacco in the Connecticut Valley. They further state that they have given consideration to the suggestion of locating a field laboratory in Connecticut, but under the present allotment reasonable adjustments cannot be made.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman has in mind the construction of a laboratory, that is distinctly something else. The appropriation to which he has referred does not cover the construction of laboratories.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for 2 additional minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. What we are asking is the service of the Department, with its laboratory and materials, to go into the Connecticut Valley and help us there, and the amount involved is very small.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield.

Mr. GRANFIELD. I listened to what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] had to say with reference to the gentleman's proposition being included in the bill, and I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is the fact.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no provision for this specific proposition in the bill, but there are, of course, funds which are available for the purpose generally throughout the United States.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. We simply ask, Mr. Chairman, for this $9,000, which is a very small percentage of the appropriation to be used for this purpose, and for this reason no one in the Committee should make any objection.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield.

Mr. CITRON. As a matter of fact, the money now appropriated is earmarked for other sections and there is none left for Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is correct; and why any section of the country should be left out is beyond my understanding. In my discussion of the matter with the chairman of the subcommittee he tells me that he can see no objection, and all that is required is the consent of this Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 26, noes 30.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut demands tellers. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members present, a quorum.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. KOPPLEMANN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 30, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

European corn-borer control: For the control and prevention of spread of the European corn borer and for the certification of products out of the infested areas to meet the requirements of State quarantines on account of the European corn borer, $32,939.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not an amendment. I think it is absolutely necessary, if we are going to get through this bill tomorrow night, with all the roll calls that will be necessary, to dispense with the motion to strike out the last word for the rest of the afternoon.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the gentleman withhold that for just 2 minutes?

Mr. TABER. I do not see how I can withhold the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. TABER. The point of order is that that is not an amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist it is a proper amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment striking out the last word. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from New York can now make a point of order, because I shall not speak directly to the amendment, but I hope the gentleman will withhold it for this reason. I am speaking as amicus curiae for a number of game associations and State departments interested in the establishment of research stations, and I want this opportunity to ask permission to insert in the RECORD a brief memorandum sent me today by the Chief of the Biological Survey outlining the work that is done by these research stations, and put the House on notice of an amendment that I shall offer tomorrow on page 64, at line 19, to add $63,000 to the item there, to provide for the establishment of eight additional research stations.

Everyone knows, following the National Wildlife Conference held here several weeks ago, of the depletion of the wildlife of the country. Everyone should know what it means to the farmer to have our fur supply gradually wiped out. When I last checked these figures 2 years ago, the retail value of furs was $500,000,000 a year. We imported $100,000,000 of furs a year. Our farm production of raw furs formerly was $65,000,000 a year. This has dropped to below $20,000,000 a year.

If we do not do something to protect the fur industry, it will be only a matter of a few years until it is wiped out.

We talk about farm relief. Here is one chance for us to help the farmer and the farm boy by conducting scientific studies to find out why we are losing these natural resources, what can be done to restore them, and how we can help our farm boys to supplement their limited incomes with the trapping of furs which should be abundant in this country.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, several years ago, when I was chairman of the Virginia commission, we placed a bounty of $5 on wildcats. Some months afterward I met a mountaineer and said to him, "I am pleased to learn you are interested in our campaign to control the wildcats", and he said, "That bounty saved my life. I got $75 last winter for trapping wildcats, and it was the only cash money I had during the winter and it carried me through. I would have starved to death without it."

That is but one instance of the limited cash income in rural sections. In 1926 the average income for the farms was only $600 a year, of which only $200 was in cash.

Mr. GREEVER. And does not the gentleman also think these scientific research stations in connection with land-grant colleges are beneficial to this study of wildlife of all kinds, including elk and moose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. They are going to conduct in these various regions, eight of them, not in my State—we already have a station in my State—but in these other States, a study of desirable species of wildlife. There are many nature lovers and 6,000,000 licensed hunters interested in this program.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including this brief statement from the Chief of the Bureau on how these stations are to be operated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEMORANDUM TO THE HONORABLE WILLIS ROBERTSON

The initiation of the cooperative wildlife research program with the States is one of the soundest basic efforts that has ever been made in an attempt to solve the complicated problem of perpetuation and use of our wildlife resources. Nine cooperative stations have been set up so far, and are beginning to attack some of the phases of work. Of these, seven are financed from Federal funds and two from other funds which have been made available for this work. The program at each station has for its chief objectives the following:

1. To carry on such research and investigation as will furnish foundation knowledge upon which to base practical wildlife management.

2. To establish actual experimental and demonstration areas where methods of handling wildlife and environment and methods of game management and utilization can be tested out, and where landowners, hunters, and all others interested in wildlife production can see examples of such management and utilization. These areas will be conducted under practical land-utilization conditions as they exist in various parts of the country.

3. To carry on educational work: (1) to make available to the public results of investigations and demonstrations, and (2) to promote a greater interest in wildlife production and in practical methods of making surplus crops available.

For the first time we are attempting to gear a wildlife conservation and restoration program into the existing agencies for development of land use and agencies for taking the information and practice out to the people in usable form.

PROJECTS NOW UNDER WAY

The programs of the various stations set up to date include the following:

1. Major life history and management studies on wild turkey, mourning dove, eastern white-tailed deer, eastern cottontail rabbit, woodcock, quail, central western cottontail, muskrat, mule deer, antelope, and sage grouse.

2. Supplementary experimental and management work on southern bobwhite, fox, ruffed grouse, moose, ring-necked pheasant, blue grouse, Texas bobwhite, forest and game relationships, utilization of wildlife statistics for administrative purposes.

3. Demonstration and management areas. (At each station one or more areas are being organized mostly in cooperation with private landowners, on which to demonstrate the practical methods worked out through experimental work.)

4. A definite program of educational wildlife work through extension services and other agencies.

5. A definite program of training men who will be equipped to handle wildlife management on an intelligent basis.

WORK LEFT TO BE DONE

The present stations cover only a small part of the natural-life zones which need study. Other regions or zones not yet covered are in as great need of study, but work cannot be done in them with present funds.

In the wildlife field the following are among important species and problems which need study and methods worked out for management very badly:

White-wing dove, big-horn sheep, black bear, javalina or wild hog, prairie chicken, sharp-tailed grouse, Hungarian patridge, raccoon, fox squirrel and gray squirrel, opossum, mink, beaver, marten, California quail, scaled quail; expansion of the work on sage grouse, blue grouse, antelope, moose; problems of effects of introduction of foreign species; the interrelation between predators and game species; problem of practical development of fur-bearers as a supplementary form of land use and income; additional problems of landowners in handling wildlife crops and hunters; the whole problem of what constitutes adequate environment for wildlife and what bearing wildlife has on the economic handling of land for other purposes.

Emphasis needs to be placed on the work with fur bearers. The money paid to trappers annually, mostly farmers and farm boys, runs into millions of dollars, yet little has been done to help develop this industry. An opportunity to increase the scope of the cooperative research program would afford opportunity in this field.

IRA M. GABRIELSON.

PROPOSED VIRGINIA RESEARCH PROGRAM

RESEARCH PROBLEMS

A. Primary problems:

1. Turkey.—This will be the major research effort and, in combination with grouse and deer, a major demonstration area project. (See North River area under demonstration.) The purpose will be to study the life history, movements, building up of natural production, improvement of wild type, and harvesting of the crop. The Camp Lee area will be used to furnish brook stock for experimental work, to test out methods of trapping, and to furnish stocking for stocking purposes. This is largely a continuation of work already under way and will require a minimum of Handley's time.

2. Quail.—This species will be secondary so far as pure research work is concerned, but a major effort as to demonstration and management areas.

The research phases will be only such as are needed in addition to available data, in order to work out applications to Virginia conditions.

The Blacksburn area will be essentially a quail research and management area.

The Cooperative Resettlement Service area will be a quail-turkey-deer area, with special reference to working out management and production and the harvesting of crops. Quail will receive major attention.

B. Secondary problem (prospective short-time results):

1. Ecology of native plants and relation to game management.—Massey is giving half time to this work. Considerable work has been done on this, and it is expected that an annotated list of plants will be ready for publication at the end of a year, and a major publication later. The work will serve as a background for all the studies and all the management practices on game projects. It is about the only project V. P. I. has requested in the program.

2. Fox studies.—This problem was approved if held to a minimum. It is essentially a continuation of work already under way and nearing completion in cooperation with the Biological Survey. It should not be dropped. It is possible that a publication will be put out on this by the Biological Survey at the end of another year.

3. Birds of Virginia: A piece of work under way which should be completed. A list of the birds will be published at end of year, it is expected. The work will be done largely by Dr. J. J. Murray, of Lexington, with some assistance by Handley. It will be good foundation work for graduate men in the game-research program.

4. Crows: Handley has done some preliminary work on crow control. This problem is proposed for about 2 weeks additional time and a small cost to finish up the data. It will be a short-time result problem.

5. Elk: At the present time this is proposed as a secondary problem to study the plantings of elk made in Virginia. De Le Bar seems especially fitted to carry on a 3-month study to attempt to determine the reasons for the poor results. This is important because of the pressure being brought to bear on the Game Commission to spend considerable additional funds for more introductions. It will be a valuable service project for the Commission and permit the publication of findings within about a year.

6. Miscellaneous service problems: There is opportunity to accomplish considerable game-improvement practice through cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service. This will be largely a matter of advice and guidance in helping this service to adapt their practices to game production.

DEMONSTRATION AREAS

A. Blacksburg area (quail): This is an area of land owned or leased by V. P. I. and located at the college. The handling of this area for quail experiments under farm and pasture conditions has the hearty support of the dean of agriculture and the other authorities. The purpose of the area will be: (1) To furnish experimental data for application to management areas; (2) to serve as a production area for surrounding privately owned area which is to be set up as a utilization area under a plan of controlled harvest. The dean of agriculture has volunteered to assist in the setting up of this additional area since he knows personally nearly all the landowners.

B. North River area (turkey-deer-grouse area, with some quail possibility): An area of around 11,000 acres within the George Washington National Forest, is already established as a State game refuge. This forms the nucleus of a larger 48,000-acre area which has been set aside as a game-management unit. An approximate 1,000 acres is to be added to this later by moving one of the boundary marker fences to coincide with a new road. The purpose of the area will be to work out management plans and practices and conduct production studies, and to try out a method of controlled take on a public-owned area with a refuge as a nucleus and with a charge for hunting to cover the cost of administration. This latter depends on whether proper legal authority can be obtained to so handle the take, and Handley is to ascertain this.

C. Buckingham County Resettlement Service area (a quail, grouse, deer, and turkey area): The Resettlement Service has a large area in one of their projects which they are willing to handle as essentially a game area. Practically all the land is under option, and our understanding is that a good number of options are approved for purchase. The area ultimately will be turned over to the State conservation interests for administration. The Resettlement Service has indicated its willingness to carry out plans advised by the research set-up. The plan for this area has not been completed and will require considerable consultation work with the Resettlement Service. It is proposed that this area will be a management and hunting area. The special trial will be of a plan of utilizing selected farmers as farmer-caretakers, of the area under a share-cropping plan as designated for them. The purpose of maintaining directed agriculture on the area in a modified form is to find a practical way for maintaining sufficient openings and cleared area for quail and turkey. This is a game problem on large areas in Virginia because there is an increase in land abandoned from agriculture, and any such land rapidly reverts to dense brush and young timber growth, which is not favorable to quail or turkey. To keep enough openings for these without prohibitive cost is a problem.

The proposal is to select certain farmers in sympathy with wildlife, preferably from those now on the area, and instead of moving them off and abandoning the land to forest set them up on a farming plan designed chiefly for wildlife but with the purpose of so coordinating and arranging crops that a farm family can subsist and do the game-management work for a share of the crop.

EDUCATIONAL WORK

1. The assistant extension service director has practically assured us of the opportunity to give some game-management work at the county agent conference, to be followed up if possible at county agent's district conferences.

2. College authorities have agreed that a course of wildlife work can be included in the annual farm and home week program of work.

3. Attempts are being made to get the game commission to approve enough additional subsistence expense for their wardens, so that they can spend an extra day or two at the time of their regular district conference in game-management work, and in familiarizing themselves with the research program.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting man, household possessions, and animals, $150,148.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: Page 59, line 25, strike out "$150,148" and insert "$120,140."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment is to reduce the appropriation carried in line 25, page 59, to the figure for this present fiscal year. The language of this item attracted my attention and curiosity to a considerable degree because I notice that it affects insects affecting both man and animals. I had occasion to look up in the hearings just what group of insects are covered by that language. I approached the matter with considerable delicacy, but I find that many of the activities of this particular Bureau under this heading are devoted to the study of mosquitoes, and great emphasis is placed upon the fact, and the statement lodged before the committee, that mosquitoes carry yellow fever, that mosquitoes carry malaria

and Dengue fever, and apparently this Bureau is working on that problem. We have all known, since Walter Reed made certain tests down at Habana with enlisted men of the Army Medical Corps, who volunteered for service, that certain mosquitoes do carry yellow fever. The whole world is informed of it, and yellow fever has practically been stamped out. The same with malaria. What progress has been made in connection with Dengue fever I am not informed about, but, Mr. Chairman, is not that a public-health question in any event? Why should the Department of Agriculture expend money for the extermination of insects, mosquitoes, for example, which affect the health of man? I had understood that the Public Health Service performed functions of that kind, and it passes my comprehension why the Department of Agriculture should get into the medical field.

Yet, judging from the statements left before the committee, that is just what they are doing. They carry it further. They are investigating insects that infest house furnishings and dwellings, and again I feel some delicacy in approaching the subject. But does not that also affect public health rather than a problem of agriculture? I do not offer to destroy the appropriation; I merely ask that it be reduced to last year's figure, to see if the committee in the preparation of its next year's bill cannot determine whether or not the Department of Agriculture shall stay within its proper sphere and make inquiries as to whether the public health is not making investigations of exactly the kind contemplated in this appropriation.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman realize that the increase in the appropriation he is seeking to strike out has no reference whatever to the subject matter that he has been discussing, but has been added on the request of the Department and the Bureau of the Budget in order to do research work with regard to the screw-worm moth, which has infested 12 of the Southern States—6 in the southeast and 6 in the southwest.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does not say so in the bill

Mr. TARVER. It does in the report and in the hearings.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But in the bill the appropriation of $150,148 can be used for any or all of these purposes.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman's amendment should be adopted, striking out the increase, he would simply stop this research work in the diseases of animals and not touch the subject matter he has in mind.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not see how, because a sufficient amount of the fund would be left to do this screwworm work. I would like to see this department brought within its proper sphere; and if necessary to do so, we will offer some other kind of amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have one-half minute more. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. During the gentleman's long service here, could he tell us just how many millions of dollars we have paid out to eradicate the barberry bush?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot say. I know that the Biological Survey appropriation for the eradication of predatory animals started in the year 1916, as I remember, when I was a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. It started with $20,000, and it is now $600,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. But the barberry bush has been with us all these years, and has $200,000 in this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is a very pretty bush.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were ayes 22 and noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-eight Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCREYNOLDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3780) entitled "An act to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7147. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers and their tributaries, to include both drainage basins and their outlets, in Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif., with a view to the controlling of floods.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. WHEELER and Mr. COUZENS members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments", for the disposition of executive papers in the office of the Federal Communications Commission.

PARSONS AMENDMENT TO H. R. 11418, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment provided for an increase in an appropriation which was to be spent in the operating of the Government, I should be opposed to its adoption. However, this is not the case. The proposed amendment provides for an appropriation of $25,000,000, which is to be used in the purchase of forest lands, solidifying our present national forests. It is therefore an investment and not an operating cost of the Government. This investment will be intact and in fact worth more in 10 or 25 years than it is now, because of the growing timber, which adds a value to the land each year. It will help to establish a much-needed permanent policy in our National Forest Department.

I have been very much interested in this problem for many years. Permit me to give you the picture as I see it. On the one side we have 178,000,000 acres of land owned by the National Government, an area 13,000,000 acres larger than the State of Texas, not being utilized and nonproductive. On the other side we have 750 paper mills in America, 600 of which import their pulp and some of the other 150 their pulpwood. On the one side of the picture we have from nine to eleven million men unemployed. On the other side we have 70,000 men employed in foreign countries in the production of pulpwood and pulpwood products used in America. Industry tells us that it is now employing 7,000,000 men; that during the best of times it only employed approximately 9,000,000 and is only able to absorb 2,000,000 more

of those now unemployed. What to do with the remaining seven to nine million unemployed is a real problem.

According to the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1929, $580,000,000 of American capital are invested in foreign countries, employing foreign labor for the purpose of producing paper. Vice President Garner, then a Member of this House, commenting upon this situation, used the following language:

> Neither under a protective tariff nor for revenue only can it be justified. Whether it be under one theory or the other, you cannot justify the fact that you have $580,000,000 dollars of American money invested in foreign countries employing labor to produce a product that can be produced in this country.

In 1900 we imported 1 percent of our newsprint. In 1915 we imported 25 percent, and in 1934 we imported 66⅔ percent, and in 1935 the figures will show that the importations increased over 1934. Three million tons of newsprint were consumed in America in 1934. Nine hundred thousand tons were manufactured here; 2,100,000 tons were manufactured in Canada. One hundred thousand square miles of Canadian timber is used each year, I am informed, in manufacturing newsprint.

I recently investigated conditions among the pulpwood cutters in Michigan. They make approximately $1 a day and furnish their own board. This condition is deplorable to say the least. Due to the fact that pulpwood timber in this country is so scattered and that it must be hauled such long distances, and due to the keen foreign competition, the pulpwood and paper industry in America is forced to pay starvation wages to the cutter, the owner, and the men transporting such pulpwood, and even with these starvation wages paid, approximately 50 percent of the tonnage in America is in the hands of receivers.

According to the report of the Secretary of Labor, we spent $2,000,000,000 last year in Public Works programs, employing 475,000 men. In other words, it cost, according to these figures, $4,000 to support one man under a Public Works program. If this is true, it would take $280,000,000 in Public Works money to support the 70,000 men who are out of employment, but who might be employed if we produced our own paper and paper products.

What, then, is the answer to this problem? Some would place a tariff on pulp and paper products, with special reference to newsprint. This tariff would be high enough to protect labor in the payment of decent wages. Being a Republican, I naturally under ordinary circumstances would take that viewpoint. The opposition argues, on the other hand, that to have a tariff on newsprint high enough to protect local industry and protect labor in the payment of decent wages, it would have to be so high that it would increase materially the cost of newspapers and magazines. They further argue that it is more important that 126,000,000 people receive a low-price newspaper than it is to put 70,000 men at work. I am rather inclined to support that argument. If the tariff is not the answer, then the answer must be in the utilization of these millions of acres of land in the production of pulpwood and other timber.

The purpose of this appropriation is to purchase land in order to solidify the various national forests and to increase the area where it can be increased by the purchase of cheap lands. Pulp and paper mills erected near to a perpetual supply of raw material eliminate the cost of long-haul transportation and much overhead expense. We can then have cheap paper, utilize these millions of acres of land, and manufacture this product with American labor.

The Manistee National Forest is in my congressional district. One million acres are or should be in that forest. Twenty-seven thousand acres were planted last year to various kinds of timber in that forest. The picture I have in mind is this: Pulpwood matures in approximately 30 years. I hope to see the day when 30,000 acres of pulpwood will be harvested in my congressional district, the land cleared, and replanted each year. This assures a perpetual supply for mills that are now or that may come into that area at a cost that will enable them to compete with foreign countries. This will give us cheaper newsprint at home and at the same time furnish employment to those who need it. What is here said with regard to pulpwood and paper products applies equally to other timber used for other purposes in America.

FACTS ON BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a short statement of fact on butter substitutes, applying to the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, dairying is the most important agricultural industry in the United States. Farm cash income from the sale of dairy products is higher than that from any other commodity and amounts to about one-fourth of the total income of all agriculture. In 1934 cash income from dairying exceeded the combined cash income from wheat and cotton, the two leading cash crops, and almost equaled the income from both cattle and hogs.

[Figures from Creamery and Produce Review]

	Pounds
1934 sales of butter substitutes	258,079,735
1935 sales of butter substitutes	380,620,367
Gain in 1 year, 43.6 percent, or	122,540,632

Each pound of butter substitutes sold replaces the sale of 21 pounds of milk. Two hundred and fifty pounds of butter substitutes puts a cow out of business. Last year's butter-substitute sales displaced the production of 1,590,000 dairy cows.

If butter-substitute sales make yearly gains as great as that made last year we can reduce our dairy herds by 467,000 cows per year. This will destroy the market for 500,000 tons of hay and 400,000 tons of grain in addition to the loss of returns from the cow herself.

Fifty-four percent of the fats and oils used in butter-substitute manufacture last year were imported from foreign countries. The butter industry is practically 100 percent a domestic industry.

In the United States in 1935 there were 155,415 retail dealers in butter substitutes. This was an increase of 50,463 in 1 year. In New York State the number jumped from 4,108 to 13,867.

The only Federal tax on uncolored substitutes at present is one-fourth cent a pound stamp tax. Colored butter substitutes, of which very little is manufactured, bear a Federal tax of 10 cents a pound.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point immediately following the address by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] in Committee of the Whole, on the Dutch elm disease, page 58 of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

FREE EDUCATION FOR SONS OF DEAD WORLD WAR SOLDIERS

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD concerning the education of the orphans of dead World War soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for this opportunity of reaching, through the Members of Congress and through the relatives and friends of war orphans, those young men who are eligible under the act of June 8, 1926, for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy. Under said act of June 8, 1926, 40 sons of officers and enlisted men of the Army killed in action or died, prior to July 2, 1921, of wounds or injuries or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War are eligible for appointment to the Military Academy at West Point, and 20 of these orphans must be sons of officers so killed or died and 20 of them must be sons of enlisted men so killed or died. The same is true of the orphans of officers and enlisted men in the Navy and the Marine Corps. Forty such orphan boys may be appointed

to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and of them 20 must be sons of officers killed or died as above stated and 20 of them sons of enlisted men killed or died as above stated.

AMERICAN LEGION COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR ORPHANS

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has done a wonderful work through its national director of education of war orphans, Maj. Gen. Peter C. Harris, retired. They have tried to inspire the sons of these dead officers and enlisted men to prepare themselves for these scholarships at these academies. Of course, surely everybody knows that an education at these splendid schools is absolutely free to those appointed, and that the instruction and the training is just as good as can be had in the most expensive universities and colleges in the country. I have, therefore, been amazed, Mr. Speaker, to learn of the seeming lack of interest in these scholarships, especially among the sons of enlisted men. At present I am informed by General Harris that there are 4,550 orphans, both male and female, of such officers and enlisted men of both the Army and the Navy, now ranging between the ages of 18 and 21. Naturally, we assume that one-half of these orphans are boys. On July 1, 1936, there will be 17 vacancies for the sons of enlisted men and 6 vacancies for the sons of officers at the Military Academy. To fill these vacancies only 25 sons of enlisted men have applied for authority to take the examinations to be held March 3, 1936, whereas 18 sons of dead officers have applied for authority to take the examination on that date. In other words, there are 18 sons of officers competing for only 6 vacancies, whereas there are only 25 sons of enlisted men competing for 17 vacancies, and, judging from past experiences, we very much fear that there will not be found among the 25 sons of enlisted men 17 sufficiently prepared to pass the entrance examination.

SITUATION AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

But, Mr. Speaker, the picture as to the Naval Academy is still worse. There will be on July 1, 1936, nine vacancies for the sons of officers at the Naval Academy, and there are only five such sons applying for authority to take the entrance examinations. On the other hand, there will be 15 vacancies to be filled at the Naval Academy by the sons of enlisted men, and there will be 19 such sons competing to fill said vacancies. Knowing the high average required for entrance to these splendid institutions, I very much fear that there will be several vacancies for the sons of officers and more vacancies for the sons of enlisted men.

SOME ELOQUENT FIGURES

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly the ratio between the number of orphans of dead officers and those of dead enlisted men. We do know of the Army that the number of enlisted men killed was 48,261, and the number of officers killed was 2,214. The ratio of those dying since is perhaps the same. But, naturally, the officers, being older and more mature, more of them were married, and, therefore, their ratio of orphans would be higher. However, it would be a reasonably safe estimate to say that about one-third of all these orphans are the children of dead officers, and about two-thirds are the children of dead enlisted men. Upon that basis, of the 2,250 sons now between 18 and 21 years of age, about 750 would be the sons of dead officers, and about 1,500 would be the sons of dead enlisted men. Applying the same ratio to those under 18 years of age, as they shall come up to the age of entrance, there are 2,750 such male orphans under 18 years of age, of whom about 900 are sons of dead officers and about 1,800 the sons of dead enlisted men.

SOME INTERESTING FACTS

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to reach in this way these 3,300 sons of dead enlisted men and 1,650 sons of dead officers, and also to reach their mothers and their brothers and sisters, and all their relatives and friends, and to impress upon them the wonderful opportunity they are missing by not preparing for and applying for these scholarships that our generous Government has offered them. Those who are 18 years old have until 22 to enter the Military Academy and until 20 to enter the Naval Academy. Here is the best chance for a free education and for life career of honorable service that has ever come to a group of young Americans. All their relatives and their friends, members of local American Legion posts, Daughters of the American Revolution, and all patriotic and civic organizations ought to search out these individual orphan boys, both those 18 and above, and those below 18, and impress upon them the necessity of being prepared by a thorough high-school education and, if possible, by private instruction in addition to high-school training, so that they may be successful in their competition for these scholarships, and then may be able also to pass the entrance examinations, and, having entered, have sufficient ground work of education to carry on successfully their regular courses.

LET ALL GOOD PEOPLE HELP THESE BOYS

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am intending to send these remarks to the addresses of the mothers, the guardians, and the orphan boys themselves. I hope these remarks will fall into the hands of school teachers, ministers of the Gospel, American Legionnaires, and public-spirited citizens, and that they will cooperate with the unselfish, patriotic service being rendered by General Harris and will contact him by correspondence. They will receive all the necessary information from him, so as to get these boys, both the sons of officers and of enlisted men, prepared to take up these scholarships. I am sure that General Harris will be very helpful, and I, personally, invite correspondence with anyone interested in making these provisions of the act of June 8, 1926, available to the orphan boys of our honored dead.

LAUNCHING THE U. S. S. "TUCKER"

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein some remarks I made yesterday at the launching of the U. S. S. *Tucker*.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by myself on the occasion of the launching of the U. S. S. *Tucker*, at Norfolk Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va., February 26, 1936.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is, I think, proper that we should recall briefly some of the incidents in the life of that gallant naval officer, whose name this trim fighting ship will bear through the years that lie ahead.

Commodore Samuel Tucker was born at Marblehead, Mass., on November 1, 1747, almost 200 years ago. He was the son of Andrew Tucker, one of three brothers, who came to this country from Scotland. Andrew Tucker followed the sea. He belonged to that intrepid band of sea captains who did so much to develop the maritime interests of the New World and who in later years furnished naval commanders of great ability and daring.

Samuel Tucker followed in the footsteps of his father. At the age of 11 he entered the service of Great Britain and embarked on the sloop of war *Royal George*. The training which he received in the English Naval Service stood him in excellent stead in later years.

He was in London at the outbreak of the Revolution. It is reported that he refused a commission in His Majesty's service and that as a result he was forced to leave the city secretly. With the help of friends he obtained passage home on a ship belonging to Robert Morris, and, through the intervention of Morris, he was commissioned captain by Gen. George Washington on January 20, 1776, and placed in command of the armed schooner *Franklyn*.

Captain Tucker soon became a successful sea raider. He was so successful in fact that he received special commendation from General Washington, and in the spring of 1776 he was transferred to the command of the armed schooner *Hancock* in which his successes continued. The latter part of 1777 saw him given command of the frigate *Boston*. On February 10, 1778, he was ordered to convey to France the Honorable John Adams, who was being sent abroad as a special envoy. This difficult assignment he discharged most creditably. Having safely transported Adams to France, almost under the guns of the British naval forces, he joined a fleet of Frenchmen then cruising off the French coast. Here he sailed in company with that great sea captain, John Paul Jones.

Time does not permit me to enumerate the many other notable exploits of this capable naval officer. Justice Sprague, in a eulogy of Adams and Jefferson delivered at Hallowell, Maine, in 1826, had this to say in referring to him in connection with the voyage of Adams: "The public ship, on board which he embarked, was commanded by the gallant Commodore Tucker, now living and a citizen of this State, who took more guns from the enemy during the Revolutionary War than any other naval commander." This was a great and a deserved tribute.

The construction of this destroyer was authorized by the President of the United States from funds provided by the appropriation for public works in 1933. The purpose of this authorization was twofold. It was designed to give employment. This it has done both directly and indirectly. While the actual construction work has been done here in this fine old navy yard, whose history is almost one with the Republic's, the materials which have gone into the construction of this vessel have been gathered from many States and have given employment to many hands in the course of their preparation.

The second reason for the authorization lies in the determination of the President to place our sea power upon an adequate basis. He is not a militarist, but he is an authority on our naval needs. He earned the right to be so regarded by his splendid service as Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson. He is now Commander in Chief of the naval forces of the United States. In all its long history, which has been a glorious one, our Navy has never been commanded by one so responsive to its needs.

In closing I wish to pay tribute to the skill and the ability of those employed here in the construction of this vessel which will shortly take its place with our fleet. Theirs has been a great contribution.

It matters not where the *Tucker* may be called or on what distant seas she may see service, I know that she will always be worthy of the name that she bears and the flag that she flies, because there has been built into every inch of her trim lines that stamina which comes of honest work skillfully performed.

THE DEPRESSION—ITS CAUSE, CURSE, AND CURE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a statement on the money question. I have an estimate from the printer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent, among my constituents, a man who has devoted a lifetime to the study of the money question, and I present herewith, as a part of my remarks, an article on the depression by Mr. Frank E. Johnesse, a man of wide experience in business and mining in the State of Idaho and the Northwest.

It is generally conceded that with the individual discretion is the better part of valor, that it is best not to air one's troubles, and that to be an optimist is a commendable trait. This also applies to the citizenry of nations and the world in general, but there are exceptions to all rules.

Right now the world is struggling under one of the darkest periods since the dawn of civilization. The wheels of industry are silent, unemployment is rife throughout the land, millions of people are without means of sustenance, social unrest is becoming radical, and we are nearing the brink of revolution. The time is at hand when the seriousness of the situation must be acknowledged and faced with courage, and a united and determined effort made to provide a sane solution in the very near future. Various reasons have been given as to the cause, and numerous nostrums have been applied with no lasting relief.

Superficial treatment of the basic causes which have brought on existing conditions, not alone in our own country but throughout the world, will not end it. It may help some of its victims, but only temporarily at best. The present world-wide chaos is not a condition from which we can emerge on a basis of assured general prosperity without fundamental changes in the economic system of all leading nations. We have reached the stage of internationalism where no nation can emerge from it alone.

THE CAUSE

From an economic point of view our antiquated monetary system is the basic cause, for it is an established fact that the money or medium of exchange is the most profound, potent, and far-reaching influence affecting the general or individual welfare and prosperity of the people of any nation. In fact, now that the world has become so intensely commercialized, it is the lifeblood of every phase of society and human endeavor.

Our economic and monetary system has lagged far behind the broad advances that have been made in science and industry. From an industrial standpoint it is due very largely to mechanization—machine production; to our having in the recent past brought into general use a vast variety of labor-saving machines which have revolutionized the processing of commodities of all kinds, and our having failed to adjust our economic structure to meet the situation. This has thrown millions of people out of employment and deprived them of their purchasing power.

There has been a decided falling off of our export trade, due to the lack of an international monetary system and the fact that foreign nations have become modernized by the adoption of up-to-date industrial methods which supplies their demands in many lines. This has taken from us the privilege of functioning as the "bread basket" of the world, as has been our good fortune for the past threescore or more of years.

The fundamental or most profound reason, however, so far as our Nation is concerned, is the ignorance and indifference on the part of the electorate, which has made it impossible to keep our commercial, economic, and industrial system in conformity with the progress of mechanical and political science. As a result we have become victims of a bureaucratic and capitalistic form of government, and industry has become stagnant.

Under existing laws which form the basis of our economic system, and which, due to our ignorance and indifference, have been placed upon our statute books in the interest of the privileged class, the wealth of the Nation has become centralized in the hands of a few, and injustice and oppression is becoming intolerable.

The great majority living under our supposedly most advanced form of government know but little of even its fundamentals and have but the slightest conception of their individual responsibility in governmental affairs. And while in the recent past civilization has made great strides in many scientific lines, we still cling tenaciously to medieval political and economic methods.

Civil government or political science is a vital subject which seriously concerns our citizenship and which, if neglected until maturity by the average individual, they acquire very little knowledge of or interest in, and therefore do not realize what it means to their general well-being. This is due very largely to the fact that it has never been systematically, generally, and without prejudice taught in all grades of our public schools and other institutions of learning as it should be, for it is the one subject that should be outstanding in the curriculum of every grade of every educational institution from the kindergarten up; and until the public is more generally informed on this subject it is going to be difficult to eradicate those most devastating political evils so prevalent under existing conditions.

For a nation to function justly under any form of government it is absolutely necessary that each and every citizen living thereunder zealously realize and judiciously exercise their individual responsibility therein.

It has long ago become an established fact that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." That the people must know their government, or "government by, for, and of the people" will fail. Unfortunately the people so far have failed to understand this greatest of all truths: That government is the all-important, dominating influence in the advancement of civilization; that it means more, not merely in sentiment, but in dollars and cents or the necessities of life to the individual than do their private affairs. And this being true, it would seem that the next step in human progress should and must be that of bringing the electorate to a clearer understanding of their individual responsibility.

Unfortunately, reason plays a very small part in practical political education, while experience plays a very large one, and it is plainly evident that the time is at hand for the development of an exceedingly well-educated electorate, for if present conditions stay with us for any length of time, as they bid fair to do, the electorate should be in a way to acquire considerable political intelligence.

There is no question but that the most just and therefore the best system of government ever yet devised and adopted by man is that which derived its just power from the consent of the governed. Therefore if, while we are supposed to be functioning under such a government, the majority suffer from injustice, inequality, and a discriminating economic system, brought about by the centralization of wealth in the hands of a mercenary minority class which usurps legislative power and takes unto itself special privileges, thereby bringing about a discriminating industrial and social condition such as exists in our United States today, then it is not only the right but the bounden duty of the masses to take back unto themselves their constitutional birthright, abolish class rule, and build up a government of universal justice.

In the past ours has functioned as a very successful form of government, not so much because of a strict adherence to the Constitution, as is generally believed, but because of our vast and diversified natural resources which, with the freedom of individual initiative, has permitted the most intensive exploitation. But now that our natural resources have about all passed into the hands of the privileged class and individual initiative stifled, it can no longer function, and a new formula must be devised and adopted if democracy is to survive.

ITS CURSE

Because of the fact that most of our public utilities are owned and controlled by private corporations instead of by the municipalities, State or Nation, or through cooperative organizations, the average person, particularly the laboring class, do not receive a just service therefrom nor a fair proportion of the wealth created by their labor. This in a sense makes of them industrial slaves under our present wage system, as well as an inferior class socially, according to our dollar social standard. And because of our crude partisan political system and our ignorance of political economy we have failed to exercise our individual responsibility in governmental affairs. The result has been that instead of a government by, for, and of the people we have in reality a plutocracy which, through a cunningly devised system of propaganda and legislative corruption, maintains an invisible government, dominating the system under which the various departments of state function, with the result that we are ruled by bureaus, the courts, commissions, and other forms of dictatorships instead of by fixed laws, as our Constitution intended; and there has grown up thereunder an unjust class control, fostering the most gigantic system of graft and political corruption this world has ever known.

Our century and a half of independence shows an astounding record of scientific industrial development and wealth production. In the world's history no other nation has ever made such strides. But the opportunities of the masses are gradually fading. They must awaken and act collectively or soon it will be a mere legend. We have reached an advanced state of hereditary wealth. A parasitic class that never created an honest dollar now riots in luxury at the expense of the producing masses, and they know but little

of human nature who believe that extremes of luxury and poverty can coexist under our advanced educational system without generating envy, malice, all uncharitableness, and, sooner or later, insurrection.

The great majority of the population is laboring on land that is not their own—aliens, so to speak, on their native soil. They create the bulk of the Nation's wealth, but their freedom boast is a joke, for it is little more than "the boast of the slave in this supposedly land of the free and the home of the brave."

This unjust and inequitable distribution of our natural resources and the granting of special privileges robs humanity of its birthright, and, in spite of our protective tariff, farm relief, Federal Reserve Banking System, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the N. R. A., and other farcical palliatives that promised relief. The dark shadow of poverty thickens over the masses, class distinction becomes more pronounced, and the surging tide of industrial discontent is rapidly beating down the barriers of society.

It is now plainly evident that under our careless application of what has seemingly been the world's most satisfactory governmental system, there has developed serious defects, and we find that the hindrances to a realization of a government such as we have been striving for are so many and have become so burdensome that a large percentage of our citizenship have become indifferent through having lost heart, as is evidenced by the fact that except in the last general election, which recorded a strong protest against existing conditions, but little more than 50 percent of the electorate have gone to the polls. This certainly indicates a serious indifference, although there are those who are blind enough to attribute it to contentment and satisfaction on the part of the masses. Closely analyzed, however, it will prove to be discontent, discouragement, and disgust, which, having already been fanned to a certain heat, is fermenting an eruption in our body politic from which it is going to require most heroic efforts to save the Nation from a terrific catastrophe.

Our monopolistic commercial corporations and public utilities have outgrown the competitive system and the open market until the production and distribution of practically all necessary and luxurious commodities, other than raw farm products, are more or less under monopolistic control. Monopoly is contrary in every way to democratic principle, a great menace to a just economic and social structure, and must be abolished. It is nothing more or less than plutocracy which is opposed to the rule of the people, claiming that the masses are incompetent. But we have only to review history to learn that wherever power has been placed in the hands of the few, we have had graft, misery, and cruel oppression; while peace, contentment, and good will has ever attained those of a government by the whole people.

Every form of society to date that has existed for a century or more has built up a plutocratic class which has invariably developed within itself the germs of its own destruction. And while it usually, out of its ashes, points the ways and means of a slightly improved successorship, the gains made by such a slow process of evolution are by no means worth the cost.

In the past these disintegrating forces have developed slowly and at different periods in different nations; but today, as a result of the World War and the rapid progress of science and invention, which has brought about mass production and a broader and more rapid means of communication and transportation, a new era is dawning; not only in the leading nations, but in many of the most remote and backward nations of the world. Everywhere a progressive revolutionary spirit is strongly manifest as is evident from recent events in many nations of the world. Here in the United States it is becoming deep-rooted, and the movement has made greater progress than is generally understood; it is a spontaneous result of oppression and cannot be averted but should be met and dealt with in a logical way to prevent going to the other extreme.

We still have the ballot and a semifree press, but we will not have them long if we do not take advantage of them in the very near future.

The rulers of Rome shook off the Republic, did away with the ballot, forcibly installed an Emperor, and in due time—the inevitable—Rome fell. They were entrenched by a falsely constructed "public sentiment" built up by propaganda, which for a time gave them the army. A public sentiment created by falsehood, misrepresentation, and misunderstanding, which, due to the stupidity on the part of the masses, is easily established.

Time was when the masses were disposed to suffer so long as the evils were bearable, rather than to right themselves by modernizing and improving upon the form of government to which they have been accustomed, but under our advanced educational system they will, now that they are beginning to understand, insist on keeping pace with the progress of human endeavor. In the future it will not be possible to keep them in ignorance and maintain a class distinction based on the dollar standard. There is only one standard under which society can be graded and endure, and that is standard based on intellect, morals, and the Golden Rule.

Today, in our public schools, colleges, and universities, and even in our churches, paternal and benevolent orders, this class distinction based on the dollar, dress, and the make of the car one drives, has become so pronounced that it is actually humiliating to those who are unable to qualify. This has a very demoralizing effect on our social structure and breeds class hatred, the greatest disintegrating force in social life.

As the grip of plutocracy tightens, our courts assume more and more power not contemplated by our fundamental laws, and the powers thus assumed are almost invariably in favor of the ruling class.

It is a well-known fact that under our present dishonest class-controlled political system a very large percent of all our public elective or appointive offices are filled by incompetents, who are usually the political tools or hirelings of the ruling class. In no branch of our Government is this condition more pronounced than in our legislative halls. Go down to Washington while Congress is in session and make a close survey of those that represent us there and who are supposed to make our laws, and you will have much less respect for that supposedly august body and the system under which it functions. Except for a few independent, honest Members and the "inner circle" which controls to a large percent by a corrupt system both branches of Congress, the rest might as well leave their proxies with the "inner circle" to be voted as directed by the lobbyists that infest the city and return to their homes. This is quite as true of the average State legislature. It is certainly a revelation to the unsophisticated to have the opportunity of a close-up on our modern legislative bodies, for they are generally found to be composed largely not of statesmen or near-statesmen, as should be expected, but chiefly of some who are fossilized, others who are hypnotized, many dollarized, and not a few but who are seemingly mentally paralyzed.

Out of the 561 Members of our present Congress, there are but a small percent who really count. The balance are simply rubber stamps, tools (many unconsciously) of a corrupt political system, and it is only the independents or free lances who are accredited with any individuality or statesmanship.

The various lobbies that infest our National and State Capitols form an almost impregnable barrier between the people and their representatives, and the well-informed person cannot help but see that as a supposedly prosperous and contented Nation functioning under a representative form of government we are slipping fast. Popular rights have become political privileges, and the Nation is officially, economically, and morally sick.

In spite of the optimistic propaganda headlines in our daily press, poverty is increasing; every day it becomes more difficult for the laboring class to provide the necessities of life, discontent is spreading throughout the land, and none can deny but that as a result our social and moral standards are being rapidly shattered.

It makes but little difference what party is in power, our legislative bodies usually carry out the mandates of the plutocratic or dominating class, resulting in the building up of a bureaucratic form of government, the most burdensome, expensive, inefficient, and arbitrary ever imposed upon the human family. Teapot Dome and the alleged graft of the War Finance Board are but mild symptoms of the disease. For more serious results we have but to familiarize ourselves with statistics showing the tremendous growing national debt, the rapid increase in the delinquent tax list, the vast army of unemployed, the large percent of farmers who have lost their farms, the number of bank failures, the increase in crime, and the rapid accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few.

The majority of Congress appear to be imbued with dollar diplomacy, for while they are well aware of the fact that the public is being taxed billions of dollars each year in the payment of dividends on the highly watered stocks of public utilities, they favor such exploitation through private ownership.

One thing which is as great an obstacle to political and social progress as ignorance, if indeed they are not one and the same thing, is tradition. Humanity is prone to disregard the constantly increasing demand for changes in Government to conform to advances in science and intelligence, simply because they would supersede established customs. Our habits become crystalized, and so we drift along. The rich getting theirs by doing the Government and the poor owing their condition to neglect of Government. This is due largely to the fact that we put too much confidence in representative government, when it can so easily be controlled by the privileged class. Ours is no longer a government representing the masses, but representing predatory powers to whom we hand out our natural resources and monopolistic privileges. The natural resources of the Nation have been and are being exploited in a manner that reflects most unfavorably on the intelligence of its electorate.

The system has been carried to the hazardous extreme. The people leave it to legislative representatives, who, in turn, put it up to a committee, bureau, or department heads, whose verdict is generally final, and who are subjected to the influences of all the most powerful political trickery and bribery known to modern lobbyists, with the result that we have been constantly enacting class legislation and doling out these special privileges at the expense of the public.

History does not record one single instance where the dominating or ruling class in any country has ever voluntarily relaxed or made one important concession in favor of the oppressed. But on the contrary, they have invariably gradually added to their demands until the "worm has turned." It is, therefore, futile for the oppressed to look for relief from the oppressor, for it always has, always will, and must always come from their own efforts.

It is hardly necessary to enumerate the many other political depravities that have been running rampant in our governmental institutions as a result of this political degeneracy. Very few citizens will deny their existence, nor will they dispute that they have grown so general and so malignant as to threaten the very foundation of our Government.

We have only to recall the sugar scandal involving high political officials, the graft and corruption of the Veterans' Bureau, the dishonest sale of surplus war supplies; the shameful scandal of prohibition enforcement; the rotton administration of our

revenue office, the Treasury and the Interior Departments; the miscarriage of the Federal Reserve Banking System; the wholesale fraud and petty larceny of the Shipping and Farm Boards; and legalized graft in Congress, as well as the sinister actions and inactivities of the Department of Justice. All are matters of common knowledge, as is also the fact that graft in private and corporate business has become universal.

The greatest obstacle to getting just and unbiased information to the people on any vital subject of national importance is the propaganda methods which are now being so successfully employed by those who are in a position to influence or control the press and the radio. And should further abuse by thus imposing corrupt economic methods and industrial inequalities result in a revolution on the part of the masses this method of conveying misinformation to the people will be largely responsible for it.

Lincoln is credited with having said, "Government rests on public opinion. Whoever can change public opinion can rule the government." Propaganda can do it, and the forces that control the press and radio have every advantage.

The Government can always be relied upon to support those who own and control the industries and resources in any controversy with the laboring class or masses, regardless of the justice of its action. This is not necessarily due to the fact that all of those who administer the different branches of the Government are crooked or corrupt, but to the inherent function of any government to defend the social and economic system under which it exists and of which it is the most accurate reflection.

Usually our chief concern with respect to new legislation is its effect on industry and our pocketbooks, rather than on our social order. As an example, its effect on monopolized industry is the sole cause of the opposition to the Child Labor Act, which has met with such opposition in spite of the justice of it. Therefore, can it be denied that ours is no longer a government of, for, and by the people? It has become one of and by representatives of the privileged class.

Despite our splendid success in a war waged against foreign autocracy, our country is menaced by the growing power of an autocratic and reactionary minority influence at home. We are gradually losing many of the liberties and advances won in the course of our national development, and there is grave likelihood of our being left stagnant and backward in a world that, for the most part, is vigorously striving to reorganize its economic and political life.

Centralization of wealth and bureaucracy has been increasing rapidly in the organization of our Government, in the control of credit, and in the determination of public opinion. The very classes who labor in factory and field and form the basis and substance of our economic structure find no effective political medium through which to express their economic demands, but by deceptive diversions of our party system are denied their proper representation in the lawmaking bodies of the Nation.

Free speech and free press has become a joke; periodicals are suppressed by a dictator without a pretense of adequate hearing; public assemblies meeting under constitutional provisions are dispersed by official force or by mob violence bred of official intolerance; agricultural and labor organizers and political reformers are not only suppressed but are in many cases sent to penitentiaries for terms of such unprecedented severity as to surprise even the fallen despots of Europe.

The sad part of letting a condition that breeds such universal injustice and discontent continue until it reaches the breaking point is the fact that it is not those who create and impose the condition but the masses that must suffer most, and in many ways. But it is the system and not the individual or class upholding it that should first be condemned and disposed of, and every peaceful means possible should be employed to remedy the evil before resorting to harsher methods.

There is a propaganda going over the land to the effect that democracy has failed, when the fact is we have boasted of living under a democracy without ever having strictly applied its principles. Representative government is not real democracy.

Therefore, can there be any real doubt but that most poverty and a very large percent of all crime and suffering is the direct result of the stupidity of the electorate which permits this maladjustment of our legislative system and social order? And under these conditions is it not self-evident that we have reached the point where we must admit that representative government is a failure because it subjects the masses to the mercy of greed, the world's greatest foe?

THE CURE

The foregoing is a serious indictment, but literally true. The time has come for all free minds to meet in concerted effort to face and shape the crisis. There can be no lasting relief under our existing economic order. New and radical methods must be devised and adopted; which, first of all, must provide for a more equitable and just distribution of the wealth created from labor and our natural resources.

When all is said and done, the main objective in life is, or should be, intellectual achievement and contentment. And if we would but realize it, it is most abundantly obtained through friendly association with our fellow men, building for a common good. Doing for others brings far greater reward to one's peace of mind than to satisfy our own selfish desires. And yet while this fact is generally accepted as true, the present generation has a false idea as to how it is obtained and appears to be obsessed with the thought that it comes through mercenary tactics in accordance with our crude economic system.

The late war has revealed to all the world—except, perhaps, the personnel of the big corporations who control our Government—the basic importance and incomparable social value of labor. In the future the development of human society, if it is to continue on an upward trend, will have to be toward a very much better place for labor and its associate interest—which includes the agricultural class—than they have ever before had. To try to oppose such a movement is to oppose evolution. And evolution suppressed germinates revolution.

The real remedy lies with the people who must act collectively. Compulsory voting with a nonpartisan primary, direct legislation, and the recall is our constitutional salvation, or at least the beginning of it.

We must look elsewhere than to political party agencies for relief. Nothing but a determined nonpartisan movement will ever reclaim or revitalize these institutionalities so essential to the continuity of the Nation's welfare. Parties as constituted today are nothing more than class agencies, made up too often or led by Judases, ready at the opportune time to betray the public or each other to further their own selfish ends. Solidity of the masses enlisted for a common cause, regardless of party, with a broader knowledge of political economy is by far the most effective measure, and the desired results can thereby be more quickly and permanently established than through party organization. There would be no parties as we know them today were it not for the spoils.

The purification of our political problems depends on the men we put in office and not the party they represent. Were it not for the party subservience on the part of public officers, many of our present political evils never could have developed. A strict partisan is not a loyal citizen.

To get down to true democracy here in our own country it is going to be necessary to enact some such reform legislation before it is too late for such action. No intelligent person will expect all these necessary radical changes to be made spasmodically, nor could they be without most seriously disrupting our national equilibrium. It must be brought about by degrees, but the start must be made in the near future and readjustment carried on until at least these most destructive evils have been eradicated. To bring this about is going to require an educational campaign which should result in the passing of a law or an amendment to our Constitution providing for a compulsory nonpartisan primary voting system. Such a law would be the means of getting out close to 100 percent of the votes, and with that we need have no fear of results, for we would then be ruled by the majority instead of by a minority, as under our present system.

If we consider the question in the right spirit, we will readily see that voting is an obligation which we owe our country, and which every citizen should regard as a sacred responsibility. It is the highest test of patriotism. The real patriots are not those who worship the flag or cling blindly to established forms and customs because they were instituted by our honored dead, but are those who realize their personal responsibility in the Government under which they live, keep themselves informed, and are not a "citizen slacker." We must vote our unbiased convictions to safeguard our institutions against the enemies of democracy and all other political evils.

How quick we would arrest and punish a man were we to see him trample the flag beneath his feet. Yet we accept in good society the men and women who on election day turn their backs on the flag by not casting their ballot. In times of war there are always millions who are willing to die for their country, and it does seem that at all times everyone should be willing to at least vote for its preservation.

"The ballot is a greater national safeguard than the strongest army and navy we could maintain."

"A weapon that comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod;
But executes a freeman's will,
As lightning does the will of God."

If all qualified voters were to obliterate party allegiance and do more thinking for themselves along economic and political lines and never miss a chance to vote independently when the opportunity offers, there would be no question about sustaining and improving upon the basic system of our Government, which should rest on the people's will.

The next important law should be the adoption of the initiative and referendum in municipalities, State, and Nation; with a compulsory voting system it will prove most effective, for it is much safer to trust our fate to a majority of the electorate than to a representative body or a "brain trust."

Until such a law has been made operative it is a misrepresentation of facts to say that ours is a government that derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

In the past the people have not understood the initiative and referendum. They have looked upon it as an untried experiment, although it is nothing more than self-government—direct legislation; in other words, true democracy. It simply means that instead of the usual loose and indirect method the people shall act directly. And without such a system we are not in reality self-governing. With the adoption of these two most essential reform measures many of our numerous political evils would soon be dispelled.

The first requisite for relief from existing economic conditions is the stabilization of the purchasing power of money, and now that we are living in the metal age this can best be accomplished by having the price of a group of the leading industrial metals,

which are interchangeable, imperishable, and indispensable, fixed by a national or international law, each at a ratio with some fixed standard, for which gold would serve the purpose, and all debts, both public and private, redeemable in a national currency therewith secured. This would regulate the market and equalize the purchasing power of the dollar or medium of exchange and, therefore, stabilize industry as nothing else would. The price of all other commodities not included in the fixed standard would then soon become automatically adjusted to their relative production labor cost.

Under this system the price would regulate the supply and demand much more indiscriminately than supply and demand can regulate the price. It would prevent control of prices by trusts and combines and thereby distribute the usual excessive profits, which under our present system go to the middleman, between the producer and consumer. It would also provide the basis for an ideal international monetary system and in effect revolutionize or rectify to a large extent our present crude and unjust economic system, a reform which is very essential to our general well-being.

Prices, except for that of the raw farm products, are no longer subject to the law of supply and demand but are fixed by codes, combinations, and trusts, a fact that even the most unsophisticated must realize. Therefore, would it not be far better to have prices fixed automatically by a broad practical and equitable monetary system, functioning under natural laws, than by trusts and combines that operate solely to serve their own selfish ends?

With the afore-mentioned reform measures functioning properly, it would not be long before we would realize the justice and see the necessity of substituting our present tax system with a graduated income tax which could be made to include every known form of tax levy and provide the most equitable and just tax system ever yet proposed.

Our present tax system is a maze, the same as has been used since the dawn of civilization. It is antiquated, crude, burdensome, inequitable, and not adapted to advanced civilization. This is a scientific age, and it is not to be expected that medieval formulas will fit present conditions. For quick relief from existing conditions the chief requisite is the broadening of the metal basis backing our monetary system, as above stated. Then, with compulsory voting and the initiative and referendum, other reform measures will soon follow, and their early adoption will save us from despotism.

Unfortunately, the general public understands but little about any one of these vital principles, and as a rule "what we are not up on we are generally down on." However, if compelled to vote, they will very naturally want to know what and whom they are voting for, and it will be an incentive for broader information on their part.

With the initiative and referendum they will study the various problems upon which they will have to pass and, therefore, realize and exercise their individual responsibility a great deal more than if they were left to a representative body to pass upon.

There seems to be little doubt but that the present administration earnestly desires to overcome many of these existing evils, but it can never be accomplished through the building up of a greater bureaucracy and the stifling of individual initiative which appears to be their proposed method.

We have no call for a dictator, Hitlerism, socialism, or communism; nor can we expect a utopia on this earth. All that is necessary to bring about a more equal production and distribution of the bountiful store of the necessities as well as the comforts and luxuries of life is a strict application of democratic principles.

The fundamental principles of a democracy, as generally understood, are that of the greatest good for the greatest number. But in our zeal to promote industry and our natural inclination to follow the supreme law of nature, that of "the survival of the fittest", it has been disregarded in our modern legislation, and we have become imbued with the capitalistic idea which holds that, if big business is taken care of, the masses will in some way be provided for, instead of fostering and promoting the principle of common welfare or brotherly love.

The afore-mentioned proposed relief measures tend toward a more general application of the Golden Rule, which should be our main objective in the advance of civilization, and without the application of which we can never hope to attain anything like equal justice and universal peace. It has been the creed of every seer, prophet, or public benefactor since the inception of man, and the only creed that has never been assailed by false prophets. It assures peace and happiness, joy and contentment, love and devotion, good will and universal fellowship, and pays a thousandfold. It is a principle which saint and sinner, Jew and Gentile, and followers of every known faith can subscribe to and from which all can reap abundantly of the blessings of life. Boiled down, it is just brotherly love, which is the essence of all religion and the greatest civilizing factor in human life.

FRANK E. JOHNESSE.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7147. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers and their tributaries, to include both drainage basins and their outlets, in Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif., with a view to the controlling of floods.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution postponing the effective date of certain permit and labeling provisions of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 28, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Hearing before the Committee on the Public Lands, Friday, February 28, 1936. To be held in room 328 at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 10303, to establish a National Resources Board.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

680. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments", approved February 16, 1889 (25 Stat. 672), as amended by the act approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 933), a schedule of useless papers in the office of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D. C., and its several field offices, 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. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Report 2081. A resolution relating to lobbying pursuant to House Resolution 288. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 2912. An act to repatriate native-born women who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4670. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to settle outstanding claims against Chapman Field, Fla., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2107). 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. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 3399. A bill for the relief of Rosalie Piar Sprecher (nee Rosa Piar); without amendment (Rept. No. 2082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 857. A bill for the relief of Eugene McGirr and Rose McGirr; with amendment (Rept. No. 2083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1439. A bill for the relief of William Hayes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Henry O. Goddard; with amendment (Rept. No. 2085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4565. A bill for the relief of Lucile Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 2086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4955. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Jennie Brenner; with amendment (Rept. No. 2087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6344. A bill for the relief of the estate of John A. McGloin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6951. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. English; with amendment (Rept. No. 2089). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6999. A bill for the relief of Frank Rottkamp; with amendment (Rept. No. 2090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7529. A bill for the relief of Mariano Biondi; with amendment (Rept. No. 2091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8671. A bill for the reimbursement of R. H. Quynn, lieutenant, United States Navy, for loss of property by fire at the naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8685. A bill for the relief of Edwin Pickard; with amendment (Rept. No. 2093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8799. A bill for the relief of John N. Hunter, postmaster at South Bend, Ind.; Edmund D. Cook, acting postmaster at Allegan, Mich.; Fred C. Putnam, postmaster at Kalamazoo, Mich.; and Merchants National Bank of South Bend, South Bend, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9375. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers and former disbursing officers of the United States Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9455. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Mann; with amendment (Rept. No. 2096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 277. An act for the relief of the Perkins-Campbell Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. S. 918. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Union Iron Works; with amendment (Rept. No. 2098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1837. An act for the relief of W. W. Cook; with amendment (Rept. No. 2099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2188. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank B. Niles; with amendment (Rept. No. 2100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 2590. An act for the relief of James E. McDonald; without amendment (Rept. No. 2101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. S. 3001. An act for the relief of Walter F. Brittan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. S. 3090. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Cacace, Charles M. Cacace, and Mary E. Clibourne; with amendment (Rept. No. 2103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3274. An act for the relief of Mary Hobart; without amendment (Rept. No. 2104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 3683. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 2105). 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. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 11501) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Jacksonville, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BINDERUP: A bill (H. R. 11502) providing for the reorganization of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 11503) to provide for the payment of pension to certain blind veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 11504) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the city of Buffalo, N. Y., the right and privilege to occupy and use for sewage-disposal facilities part of the lands forming the pier and dikes of the Black Rock Harbor improvement at Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 11505) providing for continuing retirement pay, under certain conditions, of officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who incurred physical disability while in the service of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 11506) to amend the internal-revenue act to provide that there shall be levied, collected, and paid on cigars, if manufactured or imported to retail at not more than two for 5 cents, $1 per thousand, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 11507) to amend Public Law No. 271, Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 11508) to provide for the extension of the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 505) relating to the civil-service requirements of applicants for positions as medical officers in the Indian Service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AMLIE: A bill (H. R. 11509) for the relief of Frank Barlass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 11510) for the relief of Montrose Grimstead; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 11511) for the relief of William J. B. Hughes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 11512) for the relief of Max W. Amster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETTE: A bill (H. R. 11513) for the relief of Walford W. Watt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: A bill (H. R. 11514) for the relief of Harriet King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 11515) granting a pension to Mollie Clinkinbeard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11516) for the relief of First Lt. Frank Z. Pirkey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: A bill (H. R. 11517) for the relief of Grace Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 11518) for the relief of Lester B. McAllister; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 11519) for the relief of Joseph Noel Roberts; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 11520) for the relief of Lon D. Worsham Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 11521) granting a pension to Mary Eva Frazier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 504) to authorize the issuance to Sekigo Takahashi of a permit to reenter the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

10308. By Mr. BIERMANN: Petition of Irving J. Sweetser, H. J. Huber, and others, asking for remedial legislation in regard to star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10309. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the members of the Hudson Branch of the American League Against War and Fascism, opposing the passage of the Tydings-McCormack bill (H. R. 5845); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10310. By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of patrons of star route no. 10211, between Clarendon and Vandergrift Corners, Pa., urging enactment of legislation at this session of Congress to extend all star-route contracts and increase compensation on them; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10311. Also, petition of patrons of star route no. 10651, between Corydon and Warren, Pa., urging enactment of legislation at this session of Congress to extend all star-route contracts and increase compensation on them; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10312. Also, petition of patrons of star route no. 10175, between Warren and Oil City, Pa., urging enactment of legislation at this session of Congress to extend all star-route contracts and increase compensation on them; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10313. By Mr. FOCHT: Resolution of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Veterans' Association, supporting immediate passage of Senate bill 1632 and House bill 3263; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10314. By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: Petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33199, a part of the Tenth Indiana Congressional District, favoring legislation to indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts, and increase the compensation thereon, to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10315. Also, petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33197, a part of the Tenth Indiana Congressional District, favoring legislation to indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts, and increase the compensation thereon, to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10316. Also, petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33175, a part of the Tenth Indiana Congressional District, for legislation to indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts, and increase the compensation thereon, to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10317. By Mr. HENNINGS: Petition of the Greater St. Louis Colonial Patriotic Club, protesting against relief and aid being given by the United States Government to unnaturalized citizens, and against the fact that over 5,000,000 aliens are jobholders in the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10318. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of citizens of the State of Indiana, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the issuance of permanent contracts to all contractors and subcontractors on star routes and to increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10319. By Mr. SMITH of Washington: Petition signed by citizens and patrons of star mail route 71265, Montesano, Wash., urging the enactment of legislation that will indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10320. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Dolores County, Colo., requesting passage of legislation indefinitely extending all existing contracts for star routes, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10321. Also, petition of citizens of La Plata County, Colo., requesting passage of legislation indefinitely extending all existing contracts for star mail routes, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10322. Also, petition of citizens of Archuleta County, Colo., requesting passage of legislation indefinitely extending all existing contracts for star mail routes, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Lord God of Hosts, we are borne hither on the bosom of Thine innumerable mercies. Thou art not only a God of wisdom and might, but our Heavenly Father whom we know in the sanctuary of our souls. Bow down Thine ear, O Jehovah, and answer our prayer, for we are poor and needy. Teach us Thy way and unite our hearts to fear Thy name. We praise Thee that in joy and in sorrow, through light and darkness, we are sustained according to Thy promise that all things work together for good to them that love Thee. Unite our people everywhere and let the heart be as strong as the head. Do Thou let genuine patriotism and cooperation prevail, augmented by a forceful devotion to the public service. Heavenly Father, we earnestly pray Thee that Thy glorious word may be held in our hearts: "The memory of the just is blessed", and unto the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be eternal praises. Amen.

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

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the speech delivered by the President of the United States on religious freedom and tolerance on Brotherhood Day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of President Roosevelt Sunday, February 23, 1936, on religious freedom, in connection with the celebration of Brotherhood Day, as follows:

I am happy to speak to you from my own home on the evening of a Sabbath day which has been observed in so many of your home communities as Brotherhood Day. The National Conference of Jews and Christians has set aside a day on which we can meet, not primarily as Protestants or Catholics or Jews but as believing Americans; a day on which we can dedicate ourselves not to the things which divide but to the things which unite us. I hope that we have begun to see how many and how important are the things on which we are united. Now, of all times, we require that kind of thinking.

There are honest differences of religious belief among the citizens of your town as there are among the citizens of mine. It is a part of the spirit of Brotherhood Day, as it is a part of our American heritage, to respect those differences. And it is well for us to remember that this America of ours is the product of no single race or creed or class. Men and women—your fathers and mine—came here from the far corners of the earth with beliefs that widely varied. And yet each in his own way laid his own special gift upon