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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

our national altar to enrich our national life. From the gift that each has given, all have gained.

This is no time to make capital out of religious disagreement, however honest. It is a time, rather, to make capital out of religious understanding. We who have faith cannot afford to fall out among ourselves. The very state of the world is a summons to us to stand together. For, as I see it, the chief religious issue is not between our various beliefs. It is between belief and unbelief. It is not your specific faith or mine that is being called into question, but all faith. Religion in wide areas of the earth is being confronted with irreligion; our faiths are being challenged. It is because of that threat that you and I must reach across the lines between our creeds, clasp hands, and make common cause.

To do that will do credit to the best of our religious tradition. It will do credit also to the best in our American tradition. The spiritual resources of our forebears have brought us a long way toward the goal which was set before the Nation at its founding as a Nation.

Yet I do not look upon these United States as a finished product. We are still in the making. The vision of the early days still requires the same qualities of faith in God and man for its fulfillment.

No greater thing could come to our land today than a revival of the spirit of religion—a revival that would sweep through the homes of the Nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a reassertion of their belief in God and their dedication of His will for themselves and for their world. I doubt if there is any problem—social, political, or economic—that would not melt away before the fire of such a spiritual awakening.

I know of no better way to kindle such a fire than through the fellowship that an occasion like this makes possible. For Brotherhood Day, after all, is an experiment in understanding; a venture in neighborliness.

I like to think of our country as one home in which the interests of each member are bound up with the happiness of all. We ought to know by now that the welfare of your family or mine cannot be bought at the sacrifice of our neighbor's family; that our well-being depends, in the long run, upon the well-being of our neighbors. The good-neighbor idea as we are trying to practice it in international relationships needs to be put into practice in our community relationships. When it is, we may discover that the road to understanding and fellowship is also the road to spiritual awakening. At our neighbor's fireside we may find new fuel for the fires of faith at our own hearthside.

It would be a fitting thing for an organization such as the National Conference of Jews and Christians to undertake this kind of a project in neighborliness. I should like to see associations of good neighbors in every town and city and in every rural community of our land. Such associations of sincere citizens like-minded as to the underlying principles and ideals would reach across the lines of creed or of economic status. It would bring together men and women of all stations to share their problems and their hopes, and to discover ways of mutual and neighborly helpfulness. Here, perhaps, is a way to pool our spiritual resources; to find common ground on which all of us of all faiths can stand; and thence to move forward as men and women concerned for the things of the spirit.

AMERICA SPEAKS—THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by me on the Townsend plan before Potomac Grange, No. 1, in Washington, February 19, 1936.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us whose address it is?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. It is my own address, and it is a very good address, too.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert an address delivered by me before Potomac Grange, No. 1, at Washington, D. C., February 19, 1936.

The address is as follows:

Brother Worthy Master, Brother Chairman Wallace, and my brothers and sisters of the Grange, I am very happy to have the privilege of addressing you this evening, and I assure you it is both an honor and a pleasure for me to appear before Potomac Grange, No. 1, which, I am advised, is the first Grange organized in the United States, in 1867. I am, myself, a Granger, as you know, and belong to Newton Grange in Grays Harbor County in the State of Washington. I am acquainted with National Master Louis J. Taber and State Master Ervin E. King, of my State, and during my service as a Member of Congress during the past 4 years I have been glad to cooperate with both of these leaders in active support of meritorious farm legislation advocated and favored by the National Grange.

My friends, I have been requested to discuss with you on this occasion the Townsend plan, in which I have been deeply interested for the past 2 years, for I first became interested in it at a time when there was not a single Townsend club in my State, and I have taken a prominent part in the campaign waged in its behalf in and outside of Congress.

If I were to give my remarks this evening a title, I would entitle them "America Speaks." A brief 2 years ago out in the far West, at Long Beach, Calif., Dr. F. E. Townsend, unheralded and unknown, raised his voice in behalf of his aged fellow citizens and all his countrymen, young as well as old, and made known to a small circle of his personal friends and afterward to the community in which he lived his plan of revolving old-age pensions and his program for permanent national recovery.

This plan, under the leadership of its author, Dr. Townsend, and that of his closest personal friend and its cofounder, Robert E. Clements, has since become the strongest, most dynamic social, economic, and political reform movement in the history of modern America. From the sun-kissed shores of the Pacific it has rapidly spread across the continent and everywhere captured the minds and hearts of the men and women of America—until tonight, as we are gathered here in the Nation's Capital, there are tens of millions of our fellow citizens residing in every town and city, in every village and hamlet, high in the mountainous regions and down in the vales and valleys and upon the rolling prairies, by lakes and rivers and harbors and in far-inland places, whose voices have become a mighty swelling chorus, the like of which has never before been heard in America, speaking in earnest, unmistakable tones to their public servants in the Halls of Congress and in the Executive Mansion on Pennsylvania Avenue, demanding social justice and the application to the affairs of their Government of those eternal principles of righteousness which exalteth a nation—demanding, if you please, the prompt, speedy enactment into law of the Townsend plan.

I have studied this plan for old-age pensions and national recovery for the past 2 years. I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 4, 1934, the first statement and explanation of the Townsend plan which was made in the Congress of the United States and the first official notice which it received in the National Capital. I have studied it continuously since then, and was one of a small group of House Members who drafted the first and second bills embodying the plan, the latter receiving 56 votes in the last session of Congress, and am again serving on the steering committee in this session.

The Townsend plan provides for a 2-percent transactions tax on the gross business turn-over of the United States, which amounted to thirteen hundred billion dollars in 1929, according to the reports of the Federal Reserve Banks, and these figures did not include the transactions passing through the State banks or cash transactions. However, taking the thirteen hundred billion dollars as a basis, a 2-percent transaction tax thereon will yield a revenue of $26,000,000,000 per annum, which is considerably more than the $19,200,000,000 required to pay 8,000,000 United States citizens of the age of 60 or over $2,400 per annum at the rate of $200 per month. The surplus will be $6,800,000,000 per annum, and I therefore favor including in any revised Townsend bill hereafter introduced in Congress a proviso to the effect that this surplus be applied toward the payment and liquidation of the national debt of the United States Government.

The citizens who receive the payment of $200 per month must spend it within 30 days, or during the calendar month it is received, thus placing the money in immediate circulation.

Money is the lifeblood of the Nation and it must circulate freely in the channels of business, trade, industry, and agriculture to maintain the life of the Nation. The circulation of blood in the human body is absolutely essential to the life of a human being—human life depends upon circulation of the blood—and when it fails to circulate paralysis and ultimately death ensue. Our beloved America is suffering today from lack of sufficient money in circulation in the hands of the people, and business, industry, and agriculture are paralyzed, and ultimately our Nation will perish if this condition is not changed. Our people do not have sufficient money to purchase the foodstuffs, goods, and wares which are produced by the farms and factories, and therefore these are unable to give employment to many millions of our citizens.

The Brookings Institution in Washington, D. C., the leading statistical organization in the country, has recently published two books—America's Capacity to Produce and America's Capacity to Consume, representing 5 years of intensive study and research. This great organization of experts has reached the conclusion and established the fact to be that the difference between production and consumption due to lack of purchasing power of the people is between sixteen and nineteen billion dollars per annum. The Townsend plan will place in the hands of 8,000,000 citizens the sum of $19,000,000,000 and requires them to spend it within the 12-month period, which the Brookings Institution declares will reemploy the unemployed, restore business, trade, industry, and agriculture, and permanently end the depression.

That these salutary results would be certain to follow is further corroborated by the statement issued by the United States Department of Labor to the effect that every time $2,400 per year of new income is placed in circulation a new job is created for an American citizen. Also, of the 8,000,000 aged citizens past the age of 60, who would have to retire from gainful pursuits, are 2,000,000 who are employed, according to the 1930 Census, which would release that many jobs to younger persons.

A transactions tax of 2 percent on every transaction sale or exchange of an article in commerce, trade, business, agriculture, industry, and finance is the most equitable and just tax that could possibly be devised, and it would not impose a hardship upon any-

body. It would amount to $2 on every $100, $20 on every $1,000, $2,000 on every $100,000, etc., and in the case of nearly all manufactured articles would involve directly a tax load of only five times the single 2 percent, while passing, first, through the hands of the producer of the raw materials; second, the manufacturer of the finished product; third, the jobber-broker-commission man; fourth, the wholesaler; and fifth, the retailer. Of course, the increase in the price level would undoubtedly be much greater than the 10 percent resulting directly from paying the 2 percent five times, owing to the stimulation of business, trade, industry, and agriculture, which would result; but that would be governed by the law of supply and demand, the same as is the case at the present time. Prices would go up as they always have in the past when times have been good, and wages would go up in proportion. Hence no damage or injury could be caused to the vendor of any commodity who would, in the very nature of things, be greatly benefited on account of the improved market and demand for everything that is produced on the farms and manufactured in the factories.

The Townsend plan provides a reasonable retiring annuity of $2,400 per year, payable in monthly installments of $200, for citizens 60 years old and over, who have labored, pioneered, and contributed materially to the growth, development, progress, and building of the great United States of today. When a citizen has been a law-abiding, useful citizen all his life, has been a producer and bread-winner for over 40 years, reared a family, worked and labored and produced wealth, he is by every rule of justice and reason entitled to enjoy the fruits and blessings of science, discovery, and invention in his old age. We are no longer satisfied to have a few thousand men with incomes of millions of dollars, and tens of millions of honest, God-fearing American citizens without a dollar to spend.

Fellow Grangers, I have endeavored to sketch in brief outline the most salient and outstanding features of this important legislative proposal which is engaging the attention and thought of such large numbers of our fellow citizens and Grangers throughout the land, and I hope that you also will approach it with an open mind, free from bias and prejudice, and consider it solely upon its merits. If all of the American people will only do that, the Townsend plan will eventually become the law of America, and bring employment, food, clothing, shelter, peace, happiness, and social security to every American citizen.

THE FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have signed the petition on the Speaker's desk in an effort to bring the Frazier-Lemke bill before this House, where it can be publicly debated so we may all know its merits and demerits. This is the true American fashion.

Signing this petition does not pledge me to vote for the bill.

In considering this bill one must not only look at it from a farmer's standpoint—although it is called the farm refinancing bill—for it proposes to alleviate the economic suffering of the farmer by granting him 100-percent value of his property as a mortgage at 1½ percent. Nevertheless, let us not forget that many city home owners are in a similar financial and economic distressed condition as the farmer, and all that the Government allows them through the H. O. L. C. is up to 70 percent valuation of their property as a mortgage, and this at 5 percent. Is this fair? Is this "special privileges to none, equal justice to all"?

Many years ago the north section of my district was a farm center. It was such a wonderful place that the grass was always green, thus called Greenpoint. These farms have all disappeared, and in their place homes and factories have developed and are occupied by individuals who are today my constituents. No better are found in this great wide world. They are genial, home-loving, loyal, industrious, faithful, and patriotic. These attributes, together with the brotherly love for one another—disregarding faith, creed, or color—have honored Greenpoint as the "garden spot of the world."

To the distressed landowners of my district, who are unable to pay the interest on their mortgages, the taxes on their property, and so forth, I ask for justice and fair play. Justice should be rendered to all the people and not to a few. I therefore intend, should the bill come before the House, to attach a rider to amend the H. O. L. C. Act so as to give the distressed city-land owner the same consideration as the Frazier-Lemke bill gives to the farmer.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

AUGUSTUS H. GARLAND

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 24, Mr. FULLER, my colleague from Arkansas, introduced a resolution asking the loan of a couch upon which Augustus H. Garland died, for our centennial exposition in Arkansas.

A colloquy ensued, in which the distinguished gentleman from New York, the minority leader [Mr. SNELL], said:

I would like to know if that man was a Democrat?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If he is dead, all right.

As the years go by those who lived and served and wrought history are soon forgotten. Few more distinguished men ever lived than Augustus Hill Garland, despite the fact that he never carved a niche, in the mind of the distinguished minority leader.

Augustus H. Garland lived in the county adjoining the one where I was born, and lived in the county where I afterward lived and served. It is inconceivable to me that any man who reads history does not know who Augustus H. Garland was. My father was a law student in his office, and afterward received a commission as a colonel in the National Guard signed by Augustus H. Garland. This commission hangs on the wall of my humble home.

Garland was recognized as one of the great lawyers of our Nation. He could not be placed among the great corporation lawyers, who flit here and there and get their decisions for the great corporations of the earth, but he ranks with the greatest lawyers who have adorned the bar of the land.

In order that the distinguished gentleman from New York, who never heard of Garland, and who asked if Garland were dead, may know, I call his attention to a suit that was filed and argued by this mighty Garland from my home county. It was known in the record as Ex parte Garland. He won it in the Supreme Court, which might have been termed a hostile court, but at least a high and honorable court, the decision in which lawyers of the South, after the War between the States, were again permitted to practice before this Court. It is part of the record of the simple and wonderful man, notwithstanding the great minority leader never heard of him and does not know whether or not he is dead.

He was one of the few men who served in both the Confederate Senate and the Senate of the United States, and because of his marvelous legal ability was selected by President Grover Cleveland, who I trust my distinguished friend from New York has heard of, as his legal adviser and the Attorney General of the United States.

True to his instincts and his simple desires he went back to his country home, Hominy Hill, after his public service ended, to fight the battles of his country among the simple people of his community. While arguing before the Supreme Court, that had regarded him as a man without guile but a man of honor, integrity, and great ability, the Creator reached down and touched him and he fell, as he would have ordained it himself, at work before the Court he loved and, on the couch mentioned in the resolution, died.

Augustus H. Garland was one of the really great men of our country and ranked along with Andrew Jackson and Grover Cleveland. He lies in a little cemetery in Little Rock and if my distinguished friend from New York ever desires an inspiration of patriotism, wisdom, and love for his fellow man, I would have him come down to this little cemetery, where my own ancestors lie buried, and read the history of Augustus H. Garland, whom he never heard of.

Augustus Hill Garland, a Senator from Arkansas; born in Tipton County, Tenn., June 11, 1832; attended St. Mary's College, and was graduated from St. Joseph's College in Kentucky in 1849; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1853, and commenced practice in Washington, Ark.; moved to Little Rock in 1856; Presidential elector on the Constitutional Union ticket of Bell and Everett in 1860; Union delegate to the State convention that passed the ordinance of secession in 1861; member of the provisional congress that met in Montgomery, Ala., in May 1861, and subsequently of the Confederate Congress, and served in both

houses; elected to the United States Senate for the term beginning March 4, 1867, but was not permitted to take his seat, as Arkansas had not been readmitted to representation; argued the test-oath case as to lawers in the Supreme Court of the United States and won it; followed the practice of law until the fall of 1874; Governor of Arkansas 1874–76; elected as a Democrat to the United States Senate in 1876; reelected in 1883, and served from March 4, 1877, to March 6, 1885, when he resigned, having been appointed Attorney General in the Cabinet of President Grover Cleveland, and served from March 9, 1885, to March 5, 1889, resumed the practice of law in Little Rock, and died in Washington, D. C., January 26, 1899.

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.

The motion was agreed to.

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.

The Clerk read as follows:

Biological investigations: For biological investigations, including the relations, habits, geographic distribution, and migration of animals and plants, and the preparation of maps of the life zones, and including $15,738 for investigations of the relations of wild-animal life to forests, under section 5 of the act approved May 22, 1928 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 581d), and for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the establishment, improvement, and increase of the reindeer industry and of musk oxen and mountain sheep in Alaska, including the erection of necessary buildings and other structures, $128,149.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTSON: On page 64, line 19, after the word "structures", strike out "$128,149" and insert in lieu thereof "$191,149."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the amendment, I should like to have an understanding with the chairman of the subcommittee about the time we can devote to this subject. The chairman knows that since the commencement of the Seventy-third Congress this House has not spent any time discussing the general subject of conservation of our natural resources. There are a number of States interested in this project. The interest is Nationwide. A number of Members have indicated to me a desire to say something about the work of the Biological Survey. As indicated yesterday, there are about 6,000,000 licensed hunters interested in the work of this Bureau. We are dealing here with a bureau that reaches millions of people in its activities, a bureau whose activities have never been discussed to any extent on the floor of Congress.

At the recent North American Wildlife Conference held in Washington a number of speakers said that the Congress was not interested in conservation and did not give the movement support. I made a brief speech there and said that that was a mistake; that the Members were interested, but that frequently they did not have knowledge of what the Federal bureaus were doing or what other conservation agencies were doing.

In order, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that Members from other States interested in the program of the Biological Survey may have some opportunity to express the views of their States on this work, and as this will probably be the only amendment offered to the section of the bill dealing with appropriations for the Biological Survey, I suggest to the chairman of the committee that we agree to limit debate on this paragraph to 40 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Everybody, of course, is interested in wildlife conservation.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what provision will be made for the division of time? There may be opposition.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is the desire of the chairman of the subcommittee to conclude this bill today. Would not 30 minutes be ample, 15 minutes to each side?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If that is agreeable, I shall modify my request accordingly and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. PIERCE. I should like to have a few minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can we not agree on 40 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered seeks to add $63,000 to the current appropriation of $128,149 for the establishment and operation of research stations by the Biological Survey. The Survey now has in operation seven research stations financed in part by Federal funds, in part by State funds, and in part by private funds. It also has two other stations that are financed exclusively by private funds.

It is the desire of the Biological Survey to establish 15 regional research stations in addition to the 2 that will be financed by private funds.

Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism to offer of the work of the Appropriations Committee in the preparation of this bill. As a matter of fact, I am in thorough accord and sympathy with the efforts of the Appropriations Committee to reduce public expenditures. There are several items in this bill that I think might have been further reduced. This is one item which I feel it would be good economy to increase. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $199,000 more for the work of the Biological Survey than was allowed by the committee. When we appropriate $1 for a research station we are, in the words of Billy Sunday, "casting our bread upon the waters to be returned covered with butter and jam." We get a contribution from the State game commissions of $1. We get a contribution from the State agricultural colleges of $1, and we get a contribution from the national game organizations of a considerable amount.

Mr. Chairman, this carries the work of a very necessary and scientific character to all sections of the United States. It has the endorsement of all the game departments of the States. Mr. Darling, who inaugurated this work last year, told me that in his opinion it was the most valuable work being done by the Biological Survey. I inserted in the RECORD yesterday a statement by the present Chief of the Biological Survey, in which he expressed the opinion that it was the most valuable work being done by that Bureau. Mr. Chairman, I was not, of course, elected to represent either the sportsmen or the citizens generally of the State of my good friend from Missouri, Mr. COCHRAN. The Biological Survey wants to establish one of these stations in Missouri. If the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. COCHRAN, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, do not favor locating one of these stations in Missouri, that, of course, is their privilege, and I do not criticize them for expressing their views on this subject.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. I think I may say that the subcommittee is sympathetic toward the objective mentioned by the gentleman in his remarks. The question rose as to whether or not sufficient field investigation had been made which would be necessary to establish these stations. Ultimately, of course, they must be established, but the question was whether it could be done advantageously at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will just take 1 more minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have not time to read the telegrams I have with me, and there are a number of them which I have not at hand at this time. May I say that from all over the country comes a demand for the establishment of these research stations. In the opinion of conservationists, it is the best type of work that the Federal Government can do. We cannot solve a particular problem until we know what the problem is. We have to lay the foundation by the development of scientific information concerning the problem at hand as a basis for its ultimate solution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. GREEVER].

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Since it became known that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would introduce this resolution, I have received telegrams from the Honorable Leslie A. Miller, Governor of the State of Wyoming; Hon. Andrew J. Martin, State game and fish commissioner of the State of Wyoming; and Hon. John W. Scott, of the Isaak Walton League, asking that I support the amendment increasing the appropriation providing for cooperative game-management surveys with land-grant colleges and State game and fish commissions.

It is very interesting to note that in the State of Wyoming there is one herd of elk consisting of 22,000 head. This is the Jackson Hole herd. In addition to that, in other herds there are approximately 16,000 head of elk, making a total elk population in the State of Wyoming of approximately 38,000 head. In addition to the elk there are 4,000 moose, 4,500 mountain sheep, 34,000 antelope, and 30,000 deer. These are the figures furnished me by the State game and fish commissioner of the State of Wyoming under date of February 27, and I believe present an accurate picture of the large game in the State, exclusive of bear and also exclusive of the buffalo herd in Yellowstone Park, which is under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service in cooperation with the United States Biological Survey. In addition, the State has large numbers of game birds and fur-bearing animals, and the streams and lakes abound with fish.

The problem of game and fish management has been a difficult and often perplexing one for a State of the small population of Wyoming, and tremendous problems have arisen to confront our most efficient State game and fish commission, which is a nonpartisan body and composed of men who are thoroughly familiar with wildlife. The game and fish of Wyoming and other Western States present a national problem. Sportsmen from all over the country, and, indeed, all over the world, visit our State and other Western States each year in quest of game. People by the thousands from all over the United States fish in the streams of Wyoming and of Yellowstone Park, which is situated within the State of Wyoming. We have no agency at the present time which is able to cope scientifically with certain problems arising in connection with game management, and for that reason the Robertson amendment is especially important.

It is necessary that we have in this locality somewhere, and preferably at the University of Wyoming, a station set up that can deal intelligently with the State game departments in problems that arise concerning the conservation, care, and propagation of this game. I read this morning in the report of the National Resources Board that the game of this country every year is worth $180,000,000 to the people of the United States.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEVER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is not discussing the amendment. The amendment is to establish certain ecological stations, and we hope the gentleman will discuss the amendment. Nothing the gentleman has said applies to an ecological station, and I wonder if the gentleman knows what an ecological station is.

Mr. GREEVER. The thing we are interested in in the State of Wyoming is cooperation——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is the gentleman interested in the amendment?

Mr. GREEVER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman tell us what are ecological stations?

Mr. GREEVER. The situation we are interested in in Wyoming are stations to accomplish what is provided for in the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am asking the gentleman to talk on the amendment.

Mr. GREEVER. I refuse to yield further to the gentleman. I am telling about the conditions we have in our State and in the West.

In order that the Members of the House may further know as to what the amendment seeks to accomplish, I wish to read from a letter addressed to me on February 14, 1936, by Mr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Chief of the Biological Survey, Washington, D. C.:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1936.

Hon. PAUL R. GREEVER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEVER: At the request of Dr. Scott, of the University of Wyoming, I am sending you the following information with regard to the program of cooperative research being carried on at various land-grant colleges.

With the funds made available last year the Biological Survey was able to establish cooperative research and demonstration work with wildlife species at none of the land-grant colleges. There are no funds available to increase this program at the present time, and the extent to which the program can be expanded into additional States would, of course, depend upon any additional funds which might become available for this purpose.

The programs as they are set up in the various States at the present time are in accordance with a three-way agreement. The Biological Survey and the American Wildlife Institute funds, which latter were made available to the States for this purpose, make up $6,000 a year. The land-grant college agrees to put in $6,000 a year in funds or equivalent services, which services are required to be of such a nature as will take the place of expenditures which would otherwise have to be made out of the cash funds. The State game department puts in $6,000 of cash or equivalent in services on the same basis as the land-grant college. In most of the cases the game commissions have been putting in half cash and half equivalent services, materials, etc. This makes an $18,000-a-year program at each of the stations.

The work at the stations is under the direction of a project leader, who is a member of the Biological Survey and whose salary is a part of that fund set up at each station by the Biological Survey. The principal part of the work at these stations is carried out by means of graduate student assistants or by contributed time from college faculty members. The administration of the affairs of these units is under an advisory committee in the State itself, usually consisting of the executive officer of the game commission, a representative designated by the college, and the project leader and field supervisor of the Biological Survey.

In building up the program of work at these stations one of the chief aims is to have the investigational and demonstration work built up from those problems which are found to exist in the State or the particular region in which the station is located. It is also one of the aims of each of these stations to make a major study of some one of the major game or fur resource species. In addition to this primary effort it is the aim to take up investigational work upon additional problems which will give some answer and pertinent information enabling a more intelligent administration and use of the wildlife resources. We believe that the work of these stations is not complete unless the program not only finds the facts but also works out the ways and means whereby these facts can be made use of in a practical way in conjunction with intelligent land use and intelligent fish and game administration for the States. Hence we are emphasizing the establishment of experimental demonstration areas on which wildlife management practices can be gotten under way and which will stand as examples of intelligent wildlife management.

It has been asked how much money would be required in order to carry out the program. The present participation of the Biological Survey in this program is on the basis of $42,000 per year. Naturally it will require that amount of money to maintain the work now under way, and we find that even now we are having to limit the scope of work at these stations in order to stay within the budgets. Any new stations set up would, of course, require additional funds, and the number of these would depend upon the amount of funds made available. The Bureau could probably locate personnel and make provision for supervision of around eight more additional stations during the coming year if funds were made available.

Trusting that this will give you the information you desire, and assuring you that we will be glad to furnish you any additional information.

Very truly yours,

IRA N. GABRIELSON, *Chief.*

The game of my State and of the United States is a great national resource. It affords an opportunity to lovers of outdoor life. It is a magnificent sight to people from the cities and from sections of the country where no game exists to visit the great game areas in the West and see there in their native habitat elk, deer, moose, and other wild animals.

The Western States have conserved their game at great expense. They have used the experience and wisdom of men who have lived in a game country all their lives in preserving and building up these herds. Stockmen in the State have been unselfish enough, at detriment to themselves, to build up herds of antelope, a species of animal that was fast disappearing, until now on one ranch in particular, the great Pitchfork Ranch located on the Greybull River in Park County, Wyo., and managed by Mr. Eugene Phelps and Mr. Charles Belden, there is now a herd of 2,500 head of these animals.

We need established at the University of Wyoming a station wherein the Biological Survey, the State Game and Fish Commission, and the university may cooperate in intelligent research of the many questions affecting the game situation in that State. It is necessary to coordinate the information and the scientific and practical knowledge available in order to intelligently manage and conserve this great resource.

I am assured that the University of Wyoming is willing to advance $6,000 during the next year for this work, or its equivalent services, which services would be required to be of such a nature as will take the place of cash. The State game and fish department of Wyoming has also agreed to put in $6,000 in cash or its equivalent in services on the same basis as the university. With the other $6,000 which will become available from this appropriation I feel that a work will be carried on which will be of lasting benefit to our great natural resources and will give to our local agencies the benefit of experience and advice of the Bureau of Biological Survey, under the capable and efficient management of its chief, Mr. Ira N. Gabrielson.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from Ira N. Gabrielson, Chief of the Biological Survey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Before the debate on the amendment proceeds any further, some of us would like to know what an ecological station is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I would not have asked for this time if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] had not mentioned my name and my State.

If the gentleman from Virginia thinks that $6,000 and a few telegrams are going to make me vote for an increase in this appropriation, he is very badly mistaken. I think I was fishing and hunting just as early in life as was the gentleman from Virginia, and I am just as much interested in conservation as the gentleman is; but let me say that yesterday we added almost $30,000,000 to this bill.

The people of this country are watching us and they are watching expenditures. Those of you on the Republican side, over 50 percent of your membership, who have been preaching "balance the Budget", joined with Democrats over here in unbalancing the Budget by adding these items to the appropriation bill on yesterday. You did not think of the Budget yesterday. I did.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am very sorry, but my time is so limited I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should pay some attention to the recommendations of the President, Budget Director, and also to our committees; and so far as I am concerned, even though I did receive the same telegrams, it was inspired propaganda, if you please, as the other Members of the House received, it is not going to sway me one bit in casting my vote against this amendment, nor will I be influenced by the fact that my State is going to receive $6,000.

If you will provide for a little research work all over the country in your State and mine in regard to our fish and game commissions, secure the facts and then fight to get the fish and game commissions out of politics, let the money collected from fishing and hunting licenses be spent for conservation and not for politics, we will not have to be coming to the Federal Treasury and asking for money all the time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk about the merits of this amendment, but I am going to talk a little about what the Congress has done for the Biological Survey. Look at the record and you will find the appropriation for the Biological Survey was $1,204,084, and for 1937 this committee recommends $1,841,595. You do not have to be an Einstein to see that this is an increase in 2 years of over 50 percent. An increase of $637,511. Now, let us be reasonable. Even though we are 100 percent in favor of conservation, why should we want to try and do all that the wildlife organizations recommend in 1 year?

I am in hopes that Congress will next year provide for the grouping of the various Government agencies engaged in conservation work and put them all under one head. Of course, when this is suggested you are going to get plenty of opposition, but if we can group these activities, cut down the cost of administrative expenses, and apply that money so that we will produce more game for the forests and more fish for our streams we will be getting somewhere. I have always maintained that it matters not what Government department administers a law, that law is going to be administered as Congress wants it administered.

I know I invite criticism when I say there is no reason on earth why the Biological Survey now in the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries in the Department of Commerce should not be under one head. Consideration could also be given at the same time to grouping national parks, forest reservations, Biological Survey, and the Forest Service. In the first instance, Biological Survey conserves game, and so forth, Fisheries conserves fish, while the forest reservations are nothing more than small national parks. Our national parks and forest reserves can and should be used to raise game and fish, and it should be distributed throughout the country. We now distribute fish from our hatcheries throughout the country and place the fish in streams and lakes. We can do the same on a large scale with game in the forest reservations and the national parks. It is true it has been done to some extent, but we have just scratched the surface.

Of course, our land-grant college at Columbia, Mo., would like to have this research station, and I should like to see it get it, but right now we must think about the situation that confronts us in the Treasury Department.

Conservation never had a better friend in the White House than Franklin D. Roosevelt. He not only preaches conservation but he fishes at every opportunity, and only yesterday we read where he is going to spend a week next month fishing in the South. With such a friend at the head of our Government, why can we not cooperate with him?

Take my own State. Just in the last 3 years the Government has provided for taking control of over 1,000,000 acres of ground in the Ozarks of Missouri for forest reservations. They have C. C. C. camps there now making trails and doing reforestation work. The Government is going to put game on those reservations, and I expect to see at least six fish hatcheries established, but I am not going to ask that it all be done this or next year.

Every man who has spoken on this amendment held in his hand at least one telegram he received, the same as the telegrams I received. As I stated Wednesday, I could not learn what the amendment was, although I spoke to about 50 Con-

gressmen. The people in my State and your State were aware that this amendment was to be offered when the Members of Congress did not know what it was. That is no way to legislate. If the Members of the House are going to continue to add to the appropriation bills as they come from the committee, then you are going to find that some of the projects that we are deeply interested in are going to suffer.

Take the appropriation yesterday for additional money for forest reservations. Why, the Bureau of Forestry working in my State has been unable to secure title to all the land it has purchased. It just has not had the time to do the work. That is the same situation throughout the country. More money will be forthcoming when they are ready for it.

In closing, let me say again, no Member of this House is more interested in conservation than I am. I happened to be the one who urged three Governors of my State to change our State laws so that the Government could come in and buy lands for forest reservations. Our original law limited the Government to 25 acres in any one county. That was changed to 25,000 acres, then to 100,000 acres, and finally the limit was taken off. All this has happened in the last 5 or 6 years, and, as I say, I was the Member of Congress who was urging the action. This in itself should show my interest in conservation.

If the condition of the Treasury would permit, I would support more liberal appropriations for conservation purposes; and I am sure that when conditions do permit, we will not have to be offering amendments on the floor, because the committee itself will take care of the matter. Let us look at the general situation, not solely because our State is to get an appropriation of a few thousand dollars.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. EKWALL].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman resumes his seat, there seems to be a good deal of question in the Committee as to what "ecology" means, and I suggest that the gentleman from Virginia explain whether ecology relates to plants or animals.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Ecology, Mr. Chairman, relates to the study, as the Greek derivation of the word indicates, of the life habits of birds and animals, and refers especially to a scientific study to find out why this resource is being wiped out and what we can do to restore it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am sorry the gentleman does not know the meaning of the word. The meaning of the word, according to the dictionary, includes both plants and animals, with reference to their environment and factors controlling their distribution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Ecology means study with relation to life habits, and it might refer to plants, but this clearly refers to birds and animals, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will look it up in the dictionary, he will find the correct definition; and if he will make a study of the regions to be serviced by his amendment, he will find their boundaries are determined by the plant foods they provide.

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much delighted at this lesson in word analysis on the part of our genial friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I had not thought that ecological had so limited a meaning as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] states. But whether it refers to one thing or another, the people of my State of Oregon, who have expressed themselves, are in favor of this increase. Talk about increasing the Budget, we strain at a gnat and swallow a camel here every day. This $60,000 is most important for biological investigations, but, as appropriations go, is very modest, indeed. I live in a part of the country that is the last frontier. We have many wild birds and animals. We are very desirous of making a study of their diseases and of the food and life habits of birds and animals so that we may conserve them. I think every conservationist in the country is interested in seeing that we spend adequately for this purpose, because it will come back one hundred fold into the pockets of the citizens of the country and into the Federal Treasury. This $60,000 increase will mean so much to this very important survey that I am sure it will be thoroughly justified. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] seems very much concerned because once in a while a Republican votes for a dollar or two of appropriation, but this is a splendid case, and I am sure it will be money so well invested that the results will change the opponents of today into the friends of tomorrow. I think the people of my State are strongly in favor of this additional appropriation.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EKWALL. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does the gentleman feel that the amendment will in any way refer to a study of the health and habits of the wild animals of the House?

Mr. EKWALL. No. The trouble with the wild animals of this House is that they are all too healthy now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, there appears to be some misconception of the attitude of the subcommittee toward this particular item, but if Members will examine into the sums provided, they will find that the committee has been liberal in all other respects so far as the work of the Biological Survey is concerned. From that we should conclude that there must have been some real reason why the committee did not allow the full amount for this item. I think it is fair to say that those in charge of this work have not made a complete survey of the country to ascertain just where they feel these additional stations should be placed. Ultimately, of course, it is the intention to have these additional stations provided for, and I assume that within 1 year this information will be available and these stations will be established. The committee well understands that in order to carry out the program so that each section of the country will be represented in this work these stations must be provided. The question with the committee was whether they should be carried in this bill at this time. There can be no difference of opinion as to the ultimate action that should be taken in regard to this subject. It is a question probably of whether it should be done this year or later, when adequate and thorough knowledge of the subject has been ascertained.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. FIESINGER].

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, 2 or 3 weeks ago there was held in the city of Washington the North American Wildlife Conference. I was a delegate to that convention from the State of Ohio. I enjoyed the proceedings and the enthusiasm of the gathering. The conference was called by the President of the United States, indicating his great interest in wildlife conservation; and there were not only delegates from all over the United States but there were delegates from Canada and Mexico. This proposal to extend these stations fits in with the program of the conference. A permanent organization was established under the name of the General Wildlife Federation. At the conclusion of the meeting I made a statement in the House of Representatives in which I said:

> I shall endeavor to use whatever little influence I may have to get proper appropriations for this work and to give the House the sense of its responsibility to this great conservation movement, that it may cooperate therewith.

In supporting the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON], I am endeavoring to carry out what I then said. The purpose of this appropriation of $63,000 is to establish eight additional stations. Nine stations have already been established in the United States. As I understand it, these stations are established in States in cooperation with their conservation departments. The stations not only make research into local problems, but set up areas where the wildlife and the management of wildlife may be observed by people who are interested in wildlife. That is, farmers, hunters, and others may come to these areas and study the habits and management of wildlife. This program is a program not to curtail production, but is the only program that I have heard proposed in this Congress that

has for its purpose an increase in production. It fits in with our great soil-conservation program. Many people in my State are vitally interest in the Robinson amendment, because it is on the program to establish one of these stations in the State of Ohio to work in cooperation with our division of conservation. Many farmers and others help their incomes by producing and selling the fur of wild animals, and it no doubt would be a source of pleasure as well as profit to get information concerning their activities near at home that the great United States Government has to offer, and see with their own eyes on an area to be provided the best methods of handling wildlife and environment, game management, utilization, and production.

Mr. Chairman, I have not favored other amendments to increase appropriations in this bill. I know the subcommittee, headed by my good friend Mr. CANNON of Missouri, has labored diligently to give us a good bill which will take care of the great agricultural interests of this country, and in this I have an especial interest; but I feel constrained, in view of the importance of this amendment and the small amount of money comparatively involved, to give it my support and to work for its adoption.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUFFY] and 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BERLIN].

Mr. DUFFY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I appeared before the subcommittee in this matter when it was conducting hearings. I take advantage of this 1 minute of time to put into the RECORD the following telegram from Mr. Osborne, conservation commissioner of the State of New York:

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 25, 1936.*

Hon. JAMES P. B. DUFFY,
New York State Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request your support of amendment to Agricultural appropriation bill to be offered by Congressman WILLIS ROBERTSON on Wednesday or Thursday providing funds for game management surveys through United States Biological Survey, land-grant colleges, and State conservation departments. New York in first line to receive one of these projects which will be of great benefit to this State.

LITHGOW OSBORNE,
Conservation Commissioner.

I have also received a telegram from Karl T. Frederick as president of New York State Conservation Council, urging adoption of Mr. ROBERTSON's amendment.

The council is keenly interested in having a demonstration unit in wildlife management established in New York State and will cooperate with the Bureau of Biological Survey and the State of New York Conservation Department to that end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUFFY] has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BERLIN].

Mr. BERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the importance of this amendment and the standing of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who has offered this amendment. Most of you know that the gentleman from Virginia for 7 years was game commissioner of the State of Virginia and he knows the necessary things pertaining to wildlife. I think this Committee should be swayed by that fact and for that reason support this small amendment. It only provides for $63,000. The gentleman from Missouri talked about $30,000,000 which we have increased this general appropriation bill, but we are only asking enough for a study of wildlife in America and for the protection of fur-bearing animals. It is only the small sum of $63,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who proposes this amendment, tells us it is to restore an item in the bill. He says it proposes the amount allowed by the Budget.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not make that statement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What statement did the gentleman make?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I said that the Budget recommended $30,000 more for this item than the committee included, and the committee cut the recommendation for the whole bill $199,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is exactly my charge. The gentleman heard we cut this item $30,000, and that shows the gentleman is wholly uninformed on the subject of his amendment. We did not cut it one dollar, and that is not the full extent of the lack of information on the part of the gentlemen who have supported this amendment. They do not even know what ecological stations are. There was not a man who spoke in support of the amendment who could tell us what the word means. They have spoken at length in support of an appropriation, the purpose of which is entirely unfamiliar to them.

We have been more than generous with the Biological Survey. We have increased the appropriation for general administrative expenses. We have increased the appropriation for the purchase of fur-animal experiment stations. We have increased the appropriation for game-management surveys. We have increased the appropriation for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. We have increased the appropriation for investigation of distribution of game birds. We have increased the appropriation for enforcement of the Lacey Act. We have increased the appropriation for maintenance of mammal reservations. We have increased the appropriation for the maintenance of new bird refuges. We have increased the appropriation for additional maintenance of Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge. We have increased the appropriation for additional lands for the Upper Mississippi Valley Wildlife Refuge. We have increased the appropriation for the investigation of diseases of birds. We have increased every appropriation. We have given them everything they asked in the Budget. It is evident they cannot be satisfied short of carte blanche to draw at will on the National Treasury.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Is it not true that the appropriation for the Bureau of Biological Survey in 1935 was $1,204,084 and this year the appropriation recommended by the committee was $1,841,595, which is an increase in 2 years of more than 50 percent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly. In the last 2 years we have increased the appropriation for the Bureau of Biological Survey, as the gentleman from North Carolina says, by more than 50 percent. It is one of the most-favored items in the entire Budget, and if you will just give us time, gentlemen; if you will not insist on everything being done in a day, we will be able to develop an expeditious and effective plan for the conservation and protection of the wildlife of America.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge the Members who receive these amendments to give them some consideration before they come in here and propose to disrupt one of these bills formulated after careful study and investigation, following long and exhaustive hearings. At least know what an ecological station is before you come in here and ask for one.

You ought to know that every one of this flood of telegrams you received yesterday and today are in response to instructions from a professional lobby here in Washington. Some fellow back home sends you a telegram, and as soon as you receive the telegram you rush in here and say, "I do not know what it is all about, but it is to spend money, and I am in favor of spending it." [Laughter and applause.]

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBERTSON) there were—ayes 37, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents: For investigations, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wild game; and in protecting stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies and other diseases in predatory wild animals, $600,000.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: On page 64, line 25, following the figures, strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be devoted to the poisoning of wild animals or birds."

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, it was my first thought to offer an amendment to cut this appropriation of $600,000 down to $300,000, but upon being approached by various Members of the House in regard to this matter, I was convinced that probably in some sections of this Nation peculiar conditions prevailed which may make it necessary that this $600,000 be put out for the benefit of a very few States in the Union. I would not wish to work a hardship upon the livestock interests in the West, but I do believe such matters should be handled with some degree of common sense.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is this the appropriation under which Secretary Tugwell sends men from Arkansas up to North Dakota to shoot jackrabbits?

Mr. FADDIS. I believe not; I do not believe that is part of his duties.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Under this appropriation efforts are made to exterminate coyotes in the West. The effect of the gentleman's amendment, of course, would be to prevent using it for the purpose intended.

Mr. FADDIS. I do not believe so; it is not so intended.

Mr. TARVER. A coyote is a wild animal.

Mr. FADDIS. My idea in introducing this amendment is to do away with the reprehensible campaign of indiscriminate poisoning not only of harmful animals but also desirable animals, which are also victims of the poison. I believe the extermination of the undersirable predatory animals can be accomplished by hunters and trappers, by employing people out of employment for this purpose. By this method of procedure the fur of those animals which are fur-bearing animals will be conserved. Under this campaign of poisoning, a large amount of valuable fur is lost.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows a great deal about wild game and conservation. Is it not a fact that in the State of Pennsylvania and in the State of New York, and in practically all of the States in the East, we take care of predatory animals through hunters and sportsmen without any assistance from the Federal Government?

Mr. FADDIS. Exactly; and we take care of them without injuring the animals we desire to conserve. The crow is a menace in the East but we control him without resorting to a wholesale poisoning campaign and without asking for assistance from the Federal Treasury. I believe that predatory animals and vermin can be controlled without destroying Nature's systems of checks and balances in such a drastic manner. There is no doubt but that incidental to poisoning coyotes and gophers many useful species of wildlife are also destroyed.

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. GREEVER. Does the gentleman believe that hunters are going to be able to catch prairie dogs out in the Western States?

Mr. FADDIS. In the Eastern States hunters, trappers, and farmers do away with their own vermin in that manner.

Mr. FORD of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD of California. Has the gentleman ever tried to trap a gopher?

Mr. FADDIS. No; but I have trapped things that were a great deal harder to trap than gophers, such as fox, mink, and otters, and I can do it.

Mr. Chairman, from every sportsmans magazine published in the United States we hear a great storm of protest against this senseless poisoning campaign which is being carried on throughout part of our Nation. In the interest of the wildlife of the country, I hope the Members will support my amendment and do away with this nonsensical proposition of trying to control predatory animals to the benefit of a few specially protected sheep and cattlemen in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago the Secretary of Agriculture came before the Committee on Agriculture and stated that the loss to the stockmen of the West from predatory wild animals amounted to about $20,000,000 a year. That is such a frightful loss that the industry really cannot stand it. The stockmen who graze their stock on the public domain and in the forest reserves have got to have this protection. The Biological Survey has been doing a marvelous amount of good work. They kill tens of thousands of wild animals every year. We have 140,000,000 acres in forest reserves throughout the Western States. These forest reserves are really the breeding ground for the bears, mountain lions, gray wolves, coyotes, bobcats, and other wild animals. Generally speaking, the forest reserves are uninhabited. These wild animals breed there at an appalling rate and practically unmolested by the general public, and the forest reserve officials are not equipped or required to do this work in a systematic way. The authority to trap or shoot them is not sufficient.

There are various other "animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wildlife game." There is no other effective way of killing off gophers except by poison. I think the coyote is the shrewdest wild animal in the world. He is genuinely intelligent, resourceful, cunning, and has a marvelously keen scent. Traps are not sufficient. We ought not to put any limit on any way to kill those crafty and vicious wild animals. Three or four wolves or a small band of coyotes often kill a whole herd of sheep in one night. The stock industry of the West is tremendously interested in this item, and I feel that the money cannot be better expended than in this way.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. We leave the conservation of wildlife to the Biological Survey. Is it consistent to think that in the use of poison they will do anything detrimental to that very function?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Why, no. The officials of the Biological Survey are splendidly expert, efficient, and careful. They try very hard not to destroy birds or domestic animals. They have a system of poisoning whereby the bird life is very largely conserved. If we take away from them the authority to poison coyotes, gray wolves, bobcats, and other predatory wild animals in the West and to eradicate the other vermin, rodents, and so forth, we will very seriously injure the efficiency of this service.

Mr. LEA of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA of California. Is it not true that in a large portion of the West it is a question of either the survival of the sheep industry or the coyotes?

According to the report of the Biological Survey, over 66,000 predatory animals were killed in the fiscal year 1935, the greater number of which were coyotes. The removal of such a menace to the livestock industry is a major accomplishment. Only experience, skill, and the use of most effective methods made that result possible. We should not, by the adoption of this amendment, handicap this great work.

A large proportion of those animals were killed without the use of poison. Poisons are the main reliance for combating injurious rodents. Persons outside of those familiar with the arid or semiarid regions cannot appreciate the importance of this work, or its necessity. The adoption of this amendment would greatly cripple that work so necessary in many large sections of the West.

So far as predatory animals are concerned, I venture to guess that if control methods were abandoned, the destruction of useful animal life would be greater than it is now due to any efforts of the Biological Survey.

From 1916 to 1935, inclusive, the States spent over $19,000,000 in rodent and predatory-animal control, in cooperation with the Federal Government.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman is quite correct. The coyotes live quite largely off the sheep out in that country. But they kill colts, calves, and all kinds of game and birds. They are frightfully destructive, and we have to kill them in every possible way and all the time.

I think all the Western States pay a bounty on them. My recollection is that Colorado pays $50 a head on wolves and mountain lions, and the Denver Post has for about 30 years paid an additional bounty of $25 on mountain lions.

Mr. GREEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. GREEVER. Is it not true that we have terrific game losses by reason of these predatory animals?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; it is appalling the way they slaughter the game. They destroy thousands of young deer and elk.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman think it is possible to kill cougars and mountain lions by the use of poison?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes; I think so. But this proposed amendment is not limited to those animals. The Biological Survey experts are thoroughly efficient. I feel that department is doing a wonderful work. We have considered this matter exhaustively and I believe it would be a great mistake to reduce or limit the practical use of this money.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. Is it not true that the use of poison gas is the best method of exterminating gophers, ground hogs, and the like?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; I understand so. I feel we are safe in leaving this question to the Biological Survey, and we should not hamper them as this amendment would do. Mr. Chairman, I trust the Members will vote down the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in the observation of the gentleman from Colorado to the effect that the coyote is the most cunning and elusive animal and the most difficult to eradicate. I venture to express the opinion that he is mistaken. It so happens I have had some experience with that particular animal in Texas. I can remember very well offering some small boys, averaging from 10 to 12 years of age, 50 cents a pair for coyote ears. They went to work in a range country, and at the end of 2 months I had to withdraw the offer. They brought in ears by the dozen. Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is the coyote is exceedingly easy to trap and kill. Coyotes are scavengers. Coyotes always return to the carcass. If you poison the carcass, you get the coyote. They have not a keen scent and they are very easy to trap and shoot. If the gentleman had mentioned wolves or the lobo of the Southwest, he would have been right, because that animal is the most cunning and keenest of all the animals that prey upon livestock. We used to pay a bounty of $100 for wolves.

I can remember very well when this item was first started in the Agricultural Department appropriation bill. I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate at the time. I think the item was introduced by the Senator from Texas, and if my recollection is correct, it was about the year 1916 or 1917. In that year it provided that the money should be used for the eradication of "ground squirrels, wolves, and coyotes."

I tried to have the word "coyote" cut out, because I knew perfectly well that every ranchman in America knew how to go after them and eliminate them if he wanted to do so. It is the easiest thing in the world.

The item started at $20,000, if my memory is correct, and I see it has now grown to $600,000.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman's experience has been quite different from the experience I have, because I know from my experience that they are very hard to catch, and if you want to trap them you have got to set your traps at least 40 feet apart, so that in circling around you may catch one of them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think I shall have to go back to the panhandle of Texas and find a dozen 12-year-old boys and send them to the State of the gentleman.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not a fact that the coyotes are much scarcer now than they were when the gentleman was in the Panhandle, and that they are much more difficult to trap than they were then?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not sure whether they are scarcer now or not, but I venture the observation that the scarcer the coyotes the more numerous the jackrabbits.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman seems to qualify as an expert on predatory animals——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Only on the coyote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman has not said anything about the amendment. What is the gentleman's view of the wisdom of the pending amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am supporting the amendment, because, as I understand, the Biological Survey uses poison to eliminate coyotes. They can be easily trapped and shot, and the use of poison is dangerous to other animals in the neighborhood.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] certainly has seen a different kind of coyote from what we of the West have seen. I second all that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. AYERS] has said in regard to the shrewdness of this animal; it takes experts to carry out a trapping program successfully. The coyotes do great carnage to livestock and game. In a single night I have known one coyote to kill 24 sheep out of one band. They are difficult to control. Our trappers in Oregon took 150 in January this year and 4,469 during 1935.

Before talking more about the coyote I want to say just a word about this appropriation bill. I voted twice against the committee yesterday and I did not sleep very well last night on account of it. From now on there is going to be some really convincing argument to make me vote against the committee. They are the people who sit week in and week out studying these problems; they call before their meetings the various heads of departments, who know more about the matter than we do; and why should we try to defeat what the committee has taken days and weeks to prepare for our consideration?

I think we should not do that for light or trifling reasons, and I am for staying by the committee in this bill as well as appropriation bills generally, unless there is something different from the situation before us on this occasion.

In regard to the amendment of my friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I voted against it, and I am voting to sustain the committee on this amendment. I would like to have supported that amendment to increase the funds for research units, for I know the value of the Biological Survey. I know what it has done for our country. Years ago I was the author of a coyote bill that we put through the Oregon Legislature to pay a bounty. We paid it for years, and we did not reach the solution of the problem until the Government of the United States came in with the Biological Survey, and then we began to get some real benefits. About that time a young man came into our State and taught us how to control the coyote and how to poison squirrels and other rodents. That man, a scientific and trained biologist, did a wonderful work on the west coast, and he is today at the head of the Biological Survey. If we will let him point the way we will have a department of government that we will all be proud of. Do not cut or change or modify what he is trying to do in his Nation-wide program.

It has been stated here in this debate that this is a poison program. It is also a hunting and trapping program. There are occasions where you have to use poison, but many hunters are now paid and kept in the field by the Government. The State of Oregon contributes and the sheepmen contribute.

During the fiscal year 1935 the Federal and cooperative hunters in the Western States took less than 15 percent of all predatory animals with poison; the balance of more than 85 percent were taken by other means and principally by means of traps. A total of 66,662 predatory animals was taken during 1935, including 59,289 coyotes, 5,387 bobcats, 1,332 wolves, 349 mountain lions, and 305 predatory bear.

Rodent control was carried on over 32,751,372 acres of public, State, and private lands in cooperation with States, counties, and individuals. For this entire program the Federal Government provided $418,305, while States and other cooperative units provided $989,306, or more than two dollars for every dollar appropriated by the Federal Government.

I want to make it clear that the appropriation requested this year is part of a 10-year program for the control of predatory animals and rodents adopted by the Seventy-first Congress, which authorized a total expenditure of a million dollars annually for the control of injurious animals. The amount authorized has never been used, the totals actually budgeted through congressional appropriation varying from $608,243 in 1931 to the low point of $418,314 in 1934. The Budget recommendation for 1937 is $600,000, the same amount which was allowed for 1936.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. LEA of California. I presume the gentleman is aware that the Biological Survey has gone to great length to provide selective poisons so as to inflict the least possible injury on animals not injurious.

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEA of California. Also, from my own experience, not to qualify as an expert about coyotes, although I can act as a witness. When I was a young man a large part of my section of the country had to go out of the sheep business because of coyotes, and finally the Biological Survey came in and the industry was reestablished and is in a fairly flourishing condition today.

Mr. PIERCE. And the money spent by the Biological Survey for poisoning gophers and squirrels is money well spent. Let us stay by the committee. I am sorry I could not vote to increase the committee's recommendation for the wildlife research program, increasing the units.

For the first time an attempt is being made 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, and approaching the whole problem from the standpoint of the man who has to operate on the land.

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.

It is the ultimate hope that this work may result in some definite recommendations for practical land use and supplementary farm income, which same will not be competitive with present production.

The expansion of this cooperative wildlife economic study would be one of the soundest basic efforts that could be made toward a solution of the enigma of an intensifying demand for a more abundant wildlife crop and a willingness to pay for it, on the one hand, and a gradually sinking supply, on the other hand, at the same time that we are trying to find new economic uses for land areas which are noncompetitive with our major crop productions, and with no basic economic study being made of the possibilities.

The wildlife industry is worth many millions of dollars. The fur industry yields annually over $65,000,000 to trappers, the large percentage of whom are farmers and farm boys. Approximately $275,000,000 are spent annually in the pursuit of game. Some $12,000,000 are invested each year in hunting and fishing licenses. The annual meat value of wildlife crops is estimated at $150,000,000, a total of over a half billion dollars.

In spite of this value, the fur-trapping industry is disorganized and local prices paid trappers are too much under the control of itinerant and local fur buyers. Game available for hunting is largely on private land. State and Federal Governments have little hope of providing enough land to accommodate all those who wish to hunt. If adequate wildlife resources are to be maintained, they must be developed on private lands. Yet to date so little attention has been given to possibilities of wildlife as a crop that the landowner sees nothing in it to encourage him.

There is no surplus of game, and probably never will be. People who enjoy the recreation of hunting are more and more willing to pay for their recreation in some form or other. Yet the crop value and possibility of wildlife is unknown.

All over the country there are springing up plans and schemes to encourage wildlife production. Some have promise; many are theoretical and dangerous. But no one is making a basic study of them to determine their economic soundness or with a view to giving them guidance. One wonders how far the return from wildlife crops would have gone during the past few years in bridging over the depression for thousands of farmers if the teachers of agricultural practices, farm managers, and farm economists would have had at their disposal for wildlife utilization as carefully developed information as was at hand for hog raising, cotton farming, and wheat growing.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that in order to trap a coyote the trapper must be smarter than the coyote. That might account for the ease with which the people of New York catch their coyotes and the difficulties that we of the West have in catching the same animal.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. No, I cannot yield; I have not the time. I regret the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who made the coyote speech, is not here, because his remarks are not applicable to the western coyote. That is absolutely certain. The coyote is a sly, crafty, cunning animal. We who have lived there and have had to contend with these coyotes know that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said he paid the boys of New York 12½ cents for catching coyotes. The great State of California will give those same boys $5 for every scalp they bring in, and the State of Montana will do likewise, as will

a number of the Western States. The Biological Survey is organized for the purpose of protecting and propagating the game of this country. Do not be alarmed about any indiscriminate use of poison by this body that is organized for such a purpose.

Mr. BERLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I regret I have not the time to yield. They are going about this matter in a safe and sane way. If it is necessary for them to poison the coyotes of the West and the other sections of the country, I believe they should have that discretion. They should not be placed in a position where they cannot use that means. I might say that a distinguished Member from the State of California just informed me that he operated, with the assistance of an Indian from California, a line of traps in California for 3 years, and during that 3-year period, although these traps were set in a skillful way, he captured just two coyotes.

We need your assistance in this matter, and I trust the membership of this Committee will leave this appropriation in exactly the same condition it is at the present time and not impose the conditions asked by the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Protection of migratory birds: For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 703–711), to carry into effect the treaty with Great Britain for the protection of birds migrating between the United States and Canada (39 Stat., pt. 2, p. 1702), and for cooperation with local authorities in the protection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, $279,978: *Provided*, That of this sum not more than $29,000 may be used for the enforcement of sections 241, 242, 243, and 244 of the act approved March 4, 1909 (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 391–394), entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States", as amended by title II of the act approved June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 380–381), and for the enforcement of section 1 of the act approved May 25, 1900 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 701), entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes", including all necessary investigations in connection therewith.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 65, line 18, I move to strike out the word "agriculture", which is merely pro forma, to give me the floor.

Mr. Chairman, there is no better friend of agriculture in the United States than our chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. The farmers do not have a better friend in the world than the gentleman from Missouri. There is not a man in the House who during all his years of valuable service has tried to do more for agriculture and for the farmers than has the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He has the absolute confidence and respect of every farmer in Missouri. He is about the only man that I know of in the House who does not have opposition for reelection. He stands so well with the people of Missouri that they are for him to a man, because they know they can depend upon him.

Now, he has here the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. He cannot put in this bill just everything he would like to put in personally. He cannot put in it all the things his colleagues want. He is restricted by the financial program of the President. He is restricted in many ways by the Budget that his President sends here. I know how it must hurt him if colleagues gang up here and put $27,000,000 in his bill that exceeds the Budget estimates. I know just exactly the position it places him in with the administration.

I hope, as one of his colleagues who know his splendid work and his value, who know how hard he has worked for the farmers of the country, who know how zealously he has worked for the benefit of agriculture, that the membership of this House will stand behind him when we vote on this bill in the House and vote down these amendments adding increases and help him to keep this bill within the limitations that the President has requested on agricultural appropriations; he has given us a good bill, and unless you do that you will disrupt the President's financial program. You Democrats see these Republicans sniping at us across the aisle every day about expenses. The President wants the Budget kept in balance, but how is he going to do it if the membership here continues to put in great big items of millions here and millions there that are against his program?

Show me a President of the United States who has done more for the farmers than Franklin D. Roosevelt. Show me one who has had down deep in his heart any more sympathetic interest for the farmers of America. He is the only President that I know of in 60 years who has had a farm program that has been worth anything to the farmers. He is the only one who has given great thought to means of relieving the condition of the farmers.

The farmer has more enemies than anybody in the United States. He has the grasshopper, the boll weevil, the boll worm, the corn borer, the rust, hail, too much rain, too much drought. It seems that everything is against the farmer. The President of the United States has been down there in that White House thinking over their problems, trying to devise a way to bring them out of the morass of discouragement in which they have been for many years. They have been getting poorer and poorer, and he has been trying to help them. I want to plead with my colleagues here to stand by our chairman of this subcommittee. Let us vote with him and stop this raid on the Treasury. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has expired.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads, including salaries and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, office and laboratory fixtures and apparatus, traveling, and other necessary expenses; for conducting research and investigational studies, either independently or in cooperation with State highway departments, or other agencies, including studies of highway administration, legislation, finance, economics, transport, construction, operation, maintenance, utilization, and safety, and of street and highway traffic control; investigations and experiments in the best methods of road making, especially by the use of local materials; studies of types of mechanical plants and appliances used for road building and maintenance and of methods of road repair and maintenance suited to the needs of different localities; and maintenance and repairs of experimental highways, including the purchase of materials and equipment; for furnishing expert advice on these subjects; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same; and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and reports; to be paid from any moneys available from the administrative funds provided under the act of July 11, 1916 (39 Stat., pp. 355–359), as amended, or as otherwise provided.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Commitee a situation which it seems to me should have consideration.

Under section 6 of the Highway Authorizing Act passed in 1916, as amended, it is provided that in approving projects to receive Federal aid under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall give preference to such projects as will expedite the completion of an adequate, connected system of highways, interstate in character. As a practical matter, in working out these programs under the terms of the law amounts are allocated to each State.

Programs are submitted by those States, the Bureau of Public Roads having the veto power on any project or system of projects that may be submitted. Because of this peculiar method of approach there are a number of transcontinental highways that run across the corner of certain States, sometimes across the corners of two or three different States that have unclosed gaps. Naturally the different highway commissions are inclined to approve their own system of highways. The pressure on them is not for these transcontinental lines that may cut across the corner of the State, but on a system that the State as a whole is interested in. I am not criticizing the highway commissions. They have tremendous pressure and naturally they are like all the rest of us. They listen to those in whom they are interested and whom they represent. There is a provision in the law itself that preference shall be given to the completion of a connected system of highways, interstate in character. In order to protect commissions and in order to enable these gaps to

be closed in these transcontinental highways, I have drafted an amendment which definitely allocates a portion of the new funds to the grading and surfacing of those gaps in the transcontinental highways. I submitted that to the subcommittee. The subcommittee did not seem to prefer that it first be taken up with the legislative committee, although I have drafted it in such a way that it is germane to this bill. I have it here, but because of that situation, and out of deference to the subcommittee, I am not going to offer it at this time. I do feel, however, that in any future funds a definite allocation of a portion of those funds should be made available only for the closing of those gaps. Otherwise it is going to be a long time before we get the gaps closed.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman's thought, then, is that the discretion now vested in the respective highway departments of the several States should be eliminated and vested in the Federal Government.

Mr. JONES. No; I do not want to do that. I think the discretion should remain in the different highway commissions of the different States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

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 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. I would leave the present system and the present discretion undisturbed. I know the highway commission in my State has done good work, and I am sure the highway commissions of other States have likewise done good work. As a protection to them as much as anything else, I believe that a certain portion of these funds should be definitely allocated for the closing of these gaps. I believe it would be a protection to the highway commissions. I am sure they want to do it; and I should like to have an expression from some of the gentlemen on the subcommittee as to whether they do not think provision should be made for closing these gaps.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman that the subcommittee was entirely sympathetic with the gentleman's desire. The amount carried in this bill of $60,000,000 is in the main to take care of the Government's obligations under contracts already entered into. These should not be limited by the provision the gentleman has in mind. He desires to attach this requirement to future contracts, as I understand it. The bill insofar as it appropriates money under this item relates almost entirely to contracts where obligations have already been incurred. It therefore seemed to the subcommittee that it would be necessary to amend the basic legislation in order to accomplish what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I may state to the gentleman that, of course, probably the better way would be to amend the basic act, and I expect to offer such an amendment to that committee. That will take longer and I wanted to call this matter to the attention of the appropriating committee as well. I see the chairman of the Committee on Roads is here. I hope he may see fit to take this matter up and I submit it to him for this purpose.

Now, on the question of these funds, I find on inquiry from the Bureau of Roads that of the $40,000,000 made available for this year and the $60,000,000 to be made available for the ensuing year, about $65,000,000 has been obligated on contracts outstanding, leaving about $35,000,000 unobligated. So part of these funds are available for the purpose I have in mind. I want to afford an opportunity for its being done in the regular way, however, and I am simply calling it to the attention of the House. I want to file the amendment which I drafted because I undertook, after talking with the chairman and with the gentleman from Georgia, and other members of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON], and others, to modify the amendment in such a way as to cover the object sought.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would remind the gentleman that this appropriation deals with Federal aid and that the States are required to contribute one-half the amount. The expenditure of half the funds, at least, is directly a State matter, and I think it would be exceedingly unwise to undertake to vest in a department at Washington final discretion as to the expenditure of funds contributed by States.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is getting into an entirely different field. This amendment undertakes to direct that only a limited percentage—25 percent—be spent on closing gaps. Certainly, if the Federal Government is making these great expenditures, it is interested at least partially in closing the gaps and should have a voice to that extent. As a matter of fact, I think at least 50 percent should be so expended until these gaps are closed. I am sure the subcommittee which has made a study of these matters will agree with me.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that for the information of the Committee and without being taken out of the time allotted to the discussion of this paragraph that an amendment I have prepared be offered simply for information and read from the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER of Tennessee). Without objection, the amendment will be read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES for information: Page 72, line 20, after the word "roads", strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: *"Provided further*, That not less than 25 percent, or so much thereof as may be necessary for such purpose, of the funds made available by this paragraph and allotted to any State shall be used for the purpose of grading and surfacing gaps in the regularly designated Federal highways as authorized by section 6 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.' This proviso, however, shall not be construed so as to interfere with projects heretofore approved by the Bureau of Roads."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, supplementing the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON] and the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the committee has considered this amendment and is in heartiest accord with its purpose and with the proposition as outlined by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]. Beyond any question these missing links, these gaps in the national highways, ought to be closed, and this is about the only practical way of closing them. However, the committee after consideration deemed it inexpedient to include a legislative provision in this bill, and suggested that it be submitted to the legislative committee having jurisdiction.

I earnestly recommend to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Roads, that at some time in the future, when this class of legislation is being considered by his committee, they give careful thought to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. As chairman of the Committee on Roads, may I say that we shall be glad to consider this matter at a not too far distant date. We expect to have up for consideration a regular road bill shortly, and the Committee on Roads, I am sure, will be delighted to give this matter consideration. Personally, I see no harm in it.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat., pp. 355–359), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, including not to exceed $556,000 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, $60,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is part of the sum of $125,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1936, by section 4 of the act approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 994): *Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be employed, except this provision shall not apply to convict labor performed by convicts on parole or probation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $45,000 of the funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (U. S. C., title 23, secs. 21 and 23), shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles necessary for carrying out the provisions of said act, including the replacement of not to exceed one such vehicle for use in the administrative work of the Bureau of Public Roads in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That, during the fiscal year 1937, whenever performing authorized engineering or other services in connection with the survey, construction, and maintenance, or improvement of roads for other Government agencies the charge for such services may include depreciation on engineering and road-building equipment used, and the amounts received on account of such charges shall be credited to the appropriation concerned: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1937 the appropriations for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads, and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling), to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured, from the appropriation chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 from the administrative funds authorized by the act approved November 9, 1921, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, in addition to the amount remaining available under the authorizations contained in the Agricultural Appropriation Acts approved May 27, 1930, and May 17, 1935, shall be available for the construction of a laboratory, on a site already acquired, for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 70, line 24, after "$60,000,000", insert the following: "of the unobligated balances of funds allocated for other purposes than roads and grade-crossing eliminations appropriated by Public Resolution No. 11, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved April 8, 1935."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that it is legislation upon an appropriation. These funds in the pending bill have nothing to do with the grade-crossing proposition and the elimination of grade crossings referred to in the amendment, which are authorized by the Relief and Emergency Act of 1935. Therefore, the amendment is not germane to an appropriation which involves regular Federal-aid funds. This appropriation provides for Federal-aid funds, and the gentleman in his amendment is undertaking to deal with emergency highway and grade-crossing funds.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is clearly in error, because this is a pure reappropriation of funds that were appropriated under the act of April 8, 1935, out of unobligated balances other than those providing for the elimination of grade crossings and roads. It involves a reappropriation only.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I remind the gentleman that he is in error? It is not a reappropriation. I am doubtful about the matter. I am afraid that under the language of the amendment a reappropriation might not result. The funds are expended under entirely different laws and very greatly different rules and regulations. The Relief and Emergency Act of 1935 combined both legislation and appropriation. Laws governing expenditures cannot be changed by undertaking to reappropriate. This is not the case of an ordinary reappropriation. This is not an appropriation under the Emergency Act of 1935, but, on the contrary, it is an appropriation under an authorization of June 18, 1934, and has nothing whatsoever to do with grade crossings. This is Federal-aid legislation alone and has nothing to do with the fund to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman does not understand the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think I understand the amendment, although it was difficult on account of the noise for me to hear the amendment as read.

Mr. TABER. I have attempted to reappropriate certain funds which have heretofore been appropriated for other purposes instead of taking the funds out of the General Treasury.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman's amendment deals with grade-crossing funds, while this item involves Federal-aid highway funds and has nothing to do with emergency grade-crossing funds, covered by his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER of Tennessee). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] seeks to reappropriate certain unobligated funds heretofore appropriated. The Chair has before him a syllabus which is directly applicable to the point raised. It may be found in Cannon's Precedents, section 1158, and is as follows:

The reappropriation of unexpended balances for purposes authorized by law is in order, even though for different purposes than those for which originally appropriated.

The Chair thinks, therefore, that the amendment is in order, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may be again read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Taber amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order that we may cut down the amounts that are available for expenditure to a point somewhere near the real needs. Let me call attention to the fact that day before yesterday, if I recall correctly, the President of the United States sent to the Senate a veto message saying to the Congress, in effect, "You cannot take money out of the Treasury for seed loans without providing the taxes with which to pay it, but I can, and I have plenty of money available in the relief fund to take care of this job. I am going to do it that way."

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly evident from this veto message and from the report with reference to the expenditures under the $4,880,000,000 fund that there is plenty of money available for this particular purpose out of that appropriation which has not been obligated. May I say to the membership of the House that on the 1st of January 1936 there was in unobligated allotments of the Rural Rehabilitation outfit the sum of $120,000,000. All the way through the list there were unobligated allotments, totaling upward of a billion and a half dollars. A very small portion of this amount has been since obligated. There is unexpended under such an item as the resettlement operations at this time $187,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, why should we not stop such operations as Under Secretary of Agriculture Tugwell sending boys from Arkansas up to North Dakota to kill jack rabbits, when the farmers up there would kill these rabbits themselves if we would provide the cartridges? We should use this money for the construction of roads instead of permitting such ridiculous operations to continue. I want to reduce the direct appropriation out of the Treasury by $60,000,000 and take the money out of these fool operations which everyone with intelligence knows should not be performed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interfere with the road operations. I have specifically provided in my amendment that none of the fund allocated to roads or to the elimination

of grade crossings shall be touched. I provide that it shall be done out of that money that is not needed for things that the Government ought to do.

I hope that the membership of the House will adopt my amendment, which will cut down the amount of money that may be wasted from the Treasury of the United States, just as the President cut it down when he vetoed the measure providing seed loans and provided this money out of another fund. I hope as a result of the operation this bill can, through this reappropriation, be brought $60,000,000 more below the Budget.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, if adopted, in my judgment, would defeat the very purpose the gentleman states he has in mind. The gentleman's idea is that the $60,000,000 here appropriated for Federal aid could well be taken out of the unobligated emergency funds. The difficulty, however, with this proposition is twofold. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted, it will disrupt every contract made in the 48 States of the Union based upon Federal aid. Secondly, no Federal-aid funds at all might appropriate, for Members of Congress are repeatedly advised that all emergency funds have been obligated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is not correct, because my amendment does not apply to road allocation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The contracts covered by the pending appropriation have been made and the rules and regulations for the expenditure of Federal-aid funds are entirely different from the rules and regulations for the expenditure of emergency funds. No matter what the gentleman's intention might be, with all due deference, if he stopped by simply saying that this $60,000,000 covering contracts already approved and already allocated shall be taken out of the emergency fund, then it might be taken subject to the rules and regulations which have really prevented the construction of paving and permanent parts of highway road building, or emergency funds have been used for dumps and foundations because of the regulations respecting relief labor.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In a moment. I understand the gentleman's view. Practically all of the $200,000,000 expended for highway construction and all of the $200,000,000 expended for grade-crossing elimination has been used because of the rules and regulations in building the foundations of roads, and because of those rules and regulations the States that have been doing the work have been unable to put any tops or pavements on those foundations. Now, Federal aid is not subject to those rules and regulations, and I may say to the gentleman that I am in entire sympathy with his view, and I believe that relief and emergency funds could be better used in highway construction than they have been in many other projects to which they have been devoted; but I insist that the adoption of this amendment, which would restrict the expenditure of Federal-aid funds on contracts already made, where the State of New York and the State of Mississippi have matched Federal aid with the understanding that those projects would be carried out under rules and regulations applicable only to Federal aid, to entirely different rules and regulations respecting relief labor, especially in connection with relief and emergency funds, would destroy the purpose the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The fact is, my amendment would do nothing of the kind, because my amendment simply provides for taking this money out of emergency funds, other than the roads and the elimination of grade crossings, and letting it be used just as this bill provides.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; but the gentleman is a good lawyer, and the gentleman knows that his amendment does not go far enough; because when you take any part of the relief funds, then the funds can only be expended under the rules and regulations and Executive orders issued by the President of the United States, provided by the legislation in the Emergency Relief Act, unless there is legislation repealing in part the provisions of the Relief Act.

Mr. TABER. That is not correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And could not be expended as provided by the contracts that practically all the States of the Union have made. If the gentleman's amendment went further and if in his amendment he undertook to reform or repeal the rules and regulations governing the expenditure of relief funds so as to give the States that have matched this Federal aid the privileges they are entitled to in order to use the money they have matched, the situation would be entirely different. At least there is so much doubt that an amendment proposed on the floor that might interfere with the contracts approved should not be adopted.

I may say to the gentleman that if he wants to propose legislation that will take $60,000,000 or $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 of the unobligated and unexpended relief and emergency money and put it on the highways of the Nation, I am for that; but I do not want him to hamstring Federal aid by undertaking to couple Federal aid with the restrictions on the expenditure of relief and emergency funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, in employing labor under relief funds such money can only be expended by employing those on relief. No such restriction applies to Federal aid.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. TABER. If this amendment be adopted, all regulations and all rules with reference to the act of April 8, 1935, that the President has promulgated would cease to apply to this $60,000,000. It would be absolutely in the hands of the Bureau of Public Roads just the same as if it were a direct appropriation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is the gentleman's statement, but I beg leave to differ with him. The gentleman simply states in his amendment that this $60,000,000 shall be taken out of those funds for road purposes, and there he stops. There is nothing in the amendment that would undertake to repeal the law with respect to the disbursement of those funds. It is not the ordinary case of reappropriation of unexpended funds.

Mr. TABER. That is not necessary.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The amendment does not modify in any wise any of the rules and regulations issued by the Executive.

Mr. TABER. The money is reappropriated, and when it is reappropriated the act of April 8, 1935, ceases to apply to it at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of course, if the gentleman has in mind that he wants to disrupt the relief program of the administration——

Mr. TABER. It would not be disrupted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If you want to disrupt the relief program then put in your amendment the language that these funds reappropriated shall only be expended as provided by the act of June 18, 1934, instead of the Relief Act of April 1935.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman had made his speech at the time he made the point of order, in my judgment, he would have shown that the amendment was subject to a point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is not asking a question. Moreover, I did call attention that it was legislation on an appropriation and was not germane.

Mr. MICHENER. Because this does change existing legislation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree that it does, and for that reason made the point of order against the amendment. I do not yield unless the gentleman wishes to ask a question.

The long and short of it is just this: If you are going to take the agricultural appropriations for some $190,000,000, including Federal-aid highway purposes, out of the relief and emergency funds, all right; but I say to the gentleman, favoring, as he does, highway construction, unless he means to cripple such construction, then the amendment should be defeated, because, in my judgment, the States that have matched these funds and the contracts that have been made will be discriminated against and will be treated unfairly and unjustly by now applying restrictions that govern the expenditure of relief funds to Federal-aid contracts already made. There is another aspect of the amendment that might cause complications. The language of the amendment is, and I quote, "of the unobligated balances of funds allocated for other purposes." We are constantly reminded that all funds have been obligated or allocated. The word is "unobligated" and not "unexpended." Large amounts of the relief funds have not been expended, but the Administration advises that substantially all funds have been allocated or obligated. If obligated, the amendment if adopted would prevent Federal aid. There is no occasion to take chances on the floor with an amendment, not considered by the committee, that might prevent any Federal-aid appropriation. The safe course is to defeat the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] misunderstands the parliamentary situation and the legislative situation. If my amendment should be adopted, no rules which are adopted by the President under the act of April 8, 1935, would apply to this $60,000,000, but it would go into the Bureau of Highways to be administered in the regular way, just the same as if it were a regular appropriation out of the Treasury. Nothing relating to the act of 1935 would apply to it at all. There are no such regulations that would have any bearing upon it at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If it be the gentleman's idea that these relief funds could be better expended for highways, let me suggest that he offer an amendment to provide an additional appropriation independent of Federal aid, but do not destroy Federal aid for highways by insisting on the amendment which he has proposed. I emphasize that it is not the ordinary case of reappropriation. The result might be either no appropriation or one that would hamper Federal-aid highway construction. There is no occasion to take any chances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is wrong, as usual. Let me assure the gentleman that there is no misunderstanding as to the parliamentary situation at this time. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has clearly and accurately stated the situation with reference to this very important item. If Members of this Congress desire to keep faith with the several respective States that have heretofore made allocations and contracts under the Hayden-Cartwright bill, there is only one course to pursue at this time, and that is to stay with this committee and vote down the Taber amendment. I feel sure that the members of the committee understand the situation clearly and will not be led astray or have their minds befuddled by the distinguished gentleman from New York. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 30, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My purpose in doing so is to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question: In the annual appropriation bill for Federal highway legislation, at the appropriate place, which would be line 3, page 71, of the pending bill, in the appropriation for the fiscal year 1936, the following proviso occurs:

Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall act upon projects submitted to him under his apportionment of the $125,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, by section 4 of the act approved June 18, 1934 (Public, No. 393, 73d Cong., 48 Stat. 994), and his approval of any such project shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of its proportional contribution thereto.

The proviso to which I have directed attention does not occur in the pending bill for the fiscal year 1937, and I ask the chairman if it is not true that the proviso is eliminated because the committee is and was of the opinion that the matter is covered by substantive law?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the view of the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And in that connection, Mr. Chairman, if I may detain the Committee for just a moment, let me call attention to the fact that I agree with the views of the committee.

I think this language was wholly unnecessary in the Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936, and I believe that it is provided for in substantive law that occurs in the act of February 12, 1925, which act not only provides for the apportionment and the obligation of the Federal Government for the two authorizations in that act but for all future authorizations, and the provisions are really more liberal as to the time for the allotment, which may be in 3 years. The Secretary of Agriculture, under the substantive law and without the proviso, has authority to approve projects, which thereby become contractual obligations of the Government.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was the opinion of the committee, and acting on that assumption we eliminated the provision from the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, the Secretary would have the same authority now that he has been exercising for the last 10 years, and since the act of February 12, 1925, providing for the apportionment of appropriations thereby authorized, and in the language of the act from which I quote, "or which may hereafter be authorized."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro-forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural engineering: For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture, independently or in cooperation with Federal, State, county, or other public agencies, or with farm bureaus, organizations, or individuals; for investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation and the best methods to apply in practice; the different kinds of power and appliances; the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits; the duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water; the customs, regulations, and laws affecting irrigation; snow surveys and forecasts of irrigation water supplies, and the drainage of farms and of swamps and other wet lands which may be made available for agricultural purposes; for preparing plans for the removal of surplus water by drainage; for developing equipment for farm irrigation and drainage; for investigating and reporting upon farm domestic water supply and drainage disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical farm equipment; upon the engineering problems relating to the processing, transportation, and storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the

act approved April 19, 1930 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 424, 425); for giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins, plans, and reports; and for other necessary expenses, including travel, rent, repairs, and not to exceed $5,000 for construction of buildings, $385,669.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 74, line 12, strike out "$385,669" and insert in lieu thereof "$404,669."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire sympathy with the program of the committee and of the administration to curtail and to reduce expenditures wherever possible, and for that reason I maintain that appropriations in this bill should be limited to the matters and projects authorized by law and recommended by the Budget. The amendment that I propose involves an increase of only $19,000 in the pending item, and it is intended to provide for what is known as the experimental gin plant, located in the State of Mississippi but for the benefit of the entire Cotton Belt. May I say in this connection that the purpose of the agricultural appropriation bill is to provide for scientific investigations and experiments for the benefit of agriculture. The experimental gin plant was established some 6 years ago for the benefit of cotton, both the producer and the manufacturer being benefited.

That plant has resulted in great good. Bulletins have been issued and circulars have been distributed that have been of material value both to the textile manufacturers and to the producers of cotton. In that plant the very best grades of ginning machinery are utilized and experiments are conducted by the plant for the utilization of existing machinery. It may be said that the manufacturers of gin plants should undertake to improve the machinery. They have done so; but that same observation might be applied to all other scientific experimental operations conducted under the authorization of this bill. It may be argued that these experiments should be made by others than farmers. I refer to some of the results of these experiments.

I emphasize that in the proper preparation of cotton for ginning there is something for the farmers to do. The cotton should be ginned when it is dry. There has been perfected a dryer that is of benefit to the cotton growers throughout the cotton area. Cotton is one of the greatest agricultural crops of the Nation and comprises our chief export products and the large percentage of our foreign trade.

Again, the experiments conducted by this plant resulted in the farmers getting a better price for their cotton and in the manufacturer getting a better grade. Instead of being napped, instead of being cut, the cotton is smoother as a result of the experiments conducted by this plant. So it is that much of the highest appreciation of the work of this plant is from the manufacturers of cotton. The cotton growers get a better price because, as a result of the experiments, the ginners, for the benefit of the cotton growers, are using what is called a loose roll rather than a tight roll.

They are ginning more slowly. Where formerly the aim was quantity of bales ginned, it is now quality.

To give you a concrete illustration of the reduction of the cost made, as a result of an experiment that could not be made by the manufacturers and that cannot be made by the farmers in the type and installation of fan machinery in the gin plants, there was a saving in the territory in many cases during the past season of from 12 to 15 cents a bale in the cost of power in ginning. I trust the Committee will accept the amendment in the interest of both the cotton farmers and the manufacturers of cotton machinery in the United States.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to say that an experimental gin plant to improve the grade and quality of cotton ginned was established at Stoneville, Miss., under act approved April 19, 1930. It was contemplated than an annual appropriation of $75,000 would be required. The appropriation for the fiscal year 1936 and the amount carried in the bill for the fiscal year 1937 is $36,000. The Department of Agriculture and the Budget recommended an increase of $19,000 for the fiscal year 1937, which the committee refused, and which my amendment proposes.

An excellent plant has been established, and the Department reports and recommends that additional assistance is needed if full advantage is to be taken of the facilities. The investigations made have been most useful to cotton growers and to cotton ginners. They have been beneficial to the manufacturers of cotton. There is urgent need for at least two more well-trained men in connection with the engineering phases of the work, and there is constant need to replace equipment and keep it abreast of modern practices. Other phases of the cotton program were given considerable increases for 1936, and if improvement in cotton ginning is to keep abreast of the work of the Department on cotton, the increase recommended by the Budget is essential. The amendment proposed by me provides for an increase of $19,000, to be used for additional personnel in the field, new machine tools, and replacement of obsolete machinery.

It is urged that the manufacturers of gin machinery should invent better machinery. Improved machinery will not solve the problem. There is a responsibility on the farmers. Prior to the establishment of the experimental gin plant there was no scientific approach or facilities for improving ginning processes. The cotton farmer was partly to blame. It was impossible for the grower to know in what condition to bring his cotton to the gin. Damp cotton, rough cotton, reduced his income.

There was a responsibility with the ginners. The proper use of machinery has much to do with the quality of the lint. The tight roll and the loose roll influence the grade of the cotton.

The ginner is interested primarily in quantity. The farmer is interested in quality; so are the manufacturers. Roughly, ginned cotton and cut cotton are difficult to handle by the manufacturers of lint cotton.

The wisdom of the establishment of the experimental gin plant has been vindicated. The manufacturers of gin machinery, in adopting improved machinery, are benefiting the growers and the consumers. As a result of the experiments there has been better ginning. This means a better price for cotton. Again, the experiments have aided in reducing the costs of ginning and thus the cost of cotton production is reduced.

The plant is rendering excellent service as a result of its experiments in testing the fans of gins. The growers have thus been saved from 15 cents to 20 cents per bale in the cost of ginning.

Replacements in machinery are necessary. The price of cotton is largely determined by the grade. The experiments as to how machinery is to be operated—whether with a loose roll or with a tight roll, whether the proper operation of the saws and ribs, fast ginning, and slow ginning, the reduction of the costs of power or fuel are greatly advantageous to the grower.

The manufacturers complain and lose because cotton is improperly ginned, because the fiber is cut. The producers and the manufacturers, therefore, have greatly benefited from the operation of the experimental gin plant. The plant should be maintained.

The results of the experiments are available to cotton growers, and bulletins and pamphlets giving the results of the experiments have been issued and distributed for the benefit of cotton growers and manufacturers from time to time since the plant was established.

I repeat, I am in sympathy with the program not to increase expenditures. I am not asking for an increase over the recommendation of the Budget. The expenditures on this plant have been curtailed. The increase of $19,000 carried in my amendment and recommended by the Budget will be most beneficial. I trust the amendment will be adopted. I am advised that members of the committee from cotton districts say they know of no benefits to cotton growers or others as a result of the experiments of the cotton-ginning plant. I have already pointed out that the development of a process of drying seed cotton, the ginning with a loose

instead of a tight seed roll, results in a better quality of cotton. Surely these are benefits. Moreover, I have pointed out that the experiments respecting the type of fans had resulted in the reduction in the cost of fuel. I emphasize, as a practical cotton grower, that the plant has been of benefit to the cotton growers. Its location is in Mississippi, but the experiments are for the benefit of the entire cotton area. They are available to the gentleman from Georgia; they are available to his farmers. It strikes me that the recommendation of the Budget and the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture demonstrate the value of the plant, both to the growers and manufacturers.

It is said manufacturers can perfect machinery. The experiments are for the benefit of the cotton growers primarily. It increases the value of the cotton. It is of benefit to the manufacturers. If experiments and scientific investigations are in order respecting other agricultural commodities, it is passing strange that a Representative of a cotton area would oppose investigations and experiments respecting cotton. The results of the experiments can only be made available by an inspection of the plant and by bulletins. Such bulletins have been issued by the Department of Agriculture. I call attention to Farmers' Bulletin 1748, prepared by Mr. Charles A. Bennett, who has supervision of the cotton-ginning plant. I call attention to Miscellaneous Publication No. 149, by Charles A. Bennett. The Bulletin No. 5012, issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Engineering, is most valuable. Other bulletins have been prepared by Mr. Bennett. He has addressed agricultural meetings and associations of ginners from time to time. The results of his investigations are carried in agricultural publications. I refer to an article in Agricultural Engineering of March 1933 by Mr. Bennett, and to a recent article in Agricultural Engineering of October 1935. In the Employer for May 1934 there is an address he made before the Ginners' Association of Oklahoma. Articles by Mr. Bennett, in charge of the plant, have appeared from time to time in the American Ginners and the Cotton Ginners' Journal. I am advised that a bulletin giving the results of the experiments at the plant will be published in the near future.

Information is available. The results of the plant are available to cotton growers, gin manufacturers, and to cotton manufacturers. It is to be kept in mind, however, that the plant has only been in operation some 4 years. While the experiments are valuable, scientific investigations take time.

Improper ginning of cotton results in losses of from $5 to $10 per bale. Surely experiments in the use of machinery, and in the improvement of machinery for cotton ginning, are valuable to the growers if they result in better ginning and in better prices.

It is most unfortunate that a Representative of a cotton district opposes an appropriation in behalf of cotton when the facts and the hearings disclosed that cotton growers, as well as manufacturers, have already greatly benefited as a result of the experiments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I come from a cotton-growing section. It is but natural to assume that if I felt this amendment would be of any substantial benefit to the cotton growers of the South I would be earnestly in favor of it. I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] speak in glowing terms of the work accomplished at this station located in his State. I sorrowfully confess that if any benefit has ever been derived by any cotton farmer in my State or anywhere else from the operations of this plant, the fact has never been called to my attention.

Why should the Government engage in experiments for the perfection of cotton-ginning machinery or farm mechanical equipment? Why is that not a proper activity for the corporations which manufacture such machinery, and on what account should the Government undertake to do work for cotton gin manufacturing companies which other manufacturing companies manufacturing all other kinds of manufactured goods do for themselves?

It is natural for any gentleman to desire that a work of this character located in his State should be expanded. Remember, we have provided the same appropriation that this station had last year. If it is accomplishing anything, it can go ahead and proceed with its work in the same volume that it has proceeded heretofore. If we grant this appropriation, of course, it is in addition to that of last year, and they will hire more employees and will go to a great deal of additional expense in carrying out work which I regretfully believe has been of very little, if any, benefit to the cotton farmers.

Mr. Chairman, every activity of any department of the Government or any new activity authorized by Congress grows like a mushroom. It is first established, and then at every session of the Congress the departmental authorities come in and ask for large additional sums of money to expand it. That is the reason we have this tremendous bill, which, even though we cut $11,000,000 under the Budget, was still $12,000,000 above the appropriation bill for last year. With the two amendments adopted on yesterday, if they are concurred in by the House, it will be $39,000,000, even if you adopt no additional increase, above the agricultural appropriation bill for the year 1936.

Now, this is a small item. As I said, coming as I do from a cotton country, if it meant anything to the cotton farmers of my country whom I represent, I would be in favor of it; but believing as I do, that it does not mean anything to them, and that it would be an abnormal and unnecessary expansion of an activity which has not been very much worth while, I certainly hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi will be voted down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I just wanted to make this observation: That in the sugar business, where similar experiments have been carried on and where the Department of Agriculture has performed such outstanding, beneficial work, the sugar people have spent their own money in designing new machinery and in installing it, making it work in accordance with the recommendations of the Department.

Mr. TARVER. Who ever heard of a cotton farmer who used any machinery based upon experiments conducted at this station? If these experiments have benefited anybody, the attention of the subcommittee was not called to it. If they have benefited anybody, it is only the machinery manufacturers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does it not provide for only two additional employees?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooperation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, $661,289: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: Page 76, line 24, after the word "agencies", strike out "$661,289" and insert in lieu thereof "$686,289."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, 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. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment is to increase the amount of the appropriation by $25,000 for the purpose of establishing a definite and permanent service for reporting statistical information concerning the poultry business.

The income derived from poultry and egg products in this country during the last 5 years ranks this endeavor second in importance in agriculture. The farm census of 1930 showed that there were chickens on 85 percent of the farms in this country. So this is a matter that affects every section of our country and is one of great economic importance.

The Division of Crop and Livestock Estimates has never had available any particular funds for this purpose; and, although during the past few years they have attempted to supply the necessary information concerning the output and developments in this industry, they have had to do this as a mere incident in connection with other projects that are undertaken by this division of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Just what kind of statistics would this cover in connection with poultry?

Mr. HEALEY. It covers statistics concerning the status and output of this huge industry.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman means the number of eggs the hens lay?

Mr. HEALEY. Yes; among other things; and, furthermore, information concerning marketing and scientific developments made in the business of the production of poultry and eggs.

Mr. MICHENER. I should like to help the gentleman, but I should like to know just what information he expects to get from poultry yards.

Mr. HEALEY. I merely desire to extend to the poultry industry the same service that is furnished to other agricultural products. I think this is a very reasonable amendment. It was requested by the Bureau of the Budget, was estimated for, but the committee struck the Budget estimate from the bill.

I wish to call the Committee's attention to the fact that this is a very vital matter; that it really involves vital information that is necessary to the poultry industry. In this connection I read the following paragraph from a letter I received from the Massachusetts Federation of Poultry Associations:

> This additional $25,000 would give to the poultry industry of the country the much-needed information that they have been under a handicap for years in not having. Practically all of the other agricultural enterprises in the State have the proper statistical information published concerning their respective industries; and, as poultry is the second largest agricultural enterprise in the country, we strongly feel that they should be accorded this information which is so vital.

The amount and importance of this work done for the benefit of the poultry industry has fallen far short of the service required by the industry.

If this amount of $25,000, which has been recommended by the Budget, is restored, the industry will have the benefit of a service of vital interest to it. I feel that this amendment merits your support, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts carries out the desire of the Department of Agriculture, as set forth in its Budget estimate.

In answer to the gentleman from Michigan as to what this $25,000 could be used for, I call the Committee's attention to page 645 of the hearings, particularly to the following statement in explanation of the desire of the Department to increase the allotment for this year:

> The increase will provide for annual estimates of the total number of chickens and monthly reports on hens and pullets, frequent periodic reports on young chickens on hand, and on production of eggs. Special studies will be made of commercial flocks, eggs produced, rate of laying, breeds of chickens produced, estimates of sales and of farm consumption of eggs and poultry, farm prices, and much additional information of vital interest to the poultry industry. Analyses will be made of the data gathered in order to forecast probable future production.

I come from an industrial State, but it, too, has an extensive poultry and egg business. To grant this small amount and add it to this appropriation bill will help the Department of Agriculture in formulating and sending out poultry statistics. It lacks facilities to do this extensively at the present time. The issuance of such statistics and information will mean much to this industry all over the country, including the poultrymen of my section of the country.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CITRON. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman does not mean to say that this affects New England only, does he?

Mr. CITRON. This affects not only New England but all sections of our country. Eighty-five percent of the farms of this country raise poultry, among other things, and are interested in this subject.

I further call attention to the following portion of the hearings appearing at page 648 of the printed hearings:

> Mr. CANNON. You are asking under this item an increase of $25,000. In what way are you extending the work to justify that increase?
>
> Dr. BLACK. That increase was intended to give us better statistical service for the poultry industry. Under the appropriation for crop and livestock estimates our work on poultry is perhaps the least satisfactory, insofar as major agricultural products are concerned. Poultry is, in reality, a major agricultural commodity.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams from my State asking that this amount be reinstated in the appropriation. I am not asking that it be restored simply because I have received these letters and telegrams, but because a study of the hearings and a study of the subject convince me that the Department is entitled to this extra $25,000 to afford them an opportunity to study and set out the various statistics regarding this whole subject.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CITRON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KENNEY. Will this appropriation enable monthly reports to be made?

Mr. CITRON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEY. Annual reports only are now being prepared?

Mr. CITRON. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to add $25,000 to the crop and livestock appropriation in the bill now before the House for consideration, for the purpose of making the supply of poultry statistics more inclusive and helpful to poultry producers over the entire Nation. These funds would make possible the beginning of a monthly reporting service, which would give the poultrymen the same type of information the Government now provides through the Department of Agriculture to every other branch of production of agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the poultry business is now a billion-dollar industry and is the second largest industry in the country in point of livestock production. Existing facilities for research and survey only cover small-farm flocks of less than 200 birds. Forty percent of the poultry production in this country comes from flocks of 200 birds up to many thousands. A worth-while agricultural economy should provide for the protection of all classes of poultrymen by furnishing them complete, adequate statistical data on the trends and facts concerning large flocks, which represent 40 percent of the market supply.

The poultry industry has grown rapidly from 1929 to the present day, but the reportorial facilities and the supply of statistics needed have not kept pace with the growth of the business. There exists at the present time a big gap in the Department of Agriculture's information service.

Mr. Chairman, should this sum be granted, as I hope it will, the Department plans, and will be able to give, monthly service of trends and market information to the poultrymen of the Nation. There is a provision in the amendment, or

should be, to utilize $7,500 of this amount to compile data from the last agricultural census.

The amount requested is small, being less than the price of one airplane, but it would aid and encourage the poultry growers the Nation over. It has the endorsement of not only the Department of Agriculture but of many poultry associations in the country.

Mr. Chairman, the poultry industry has never had a fair chance. It has always been up against material handicaps. China, that far-away country in the old world, is flooding this country with eggs and egg powder, the result of production from farmers using cheap labor and living far below our American standards. They are competing and injuring our American poultry farmers. There is a bill to put a crimp in them now pending in the Ways and Means Committee, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], but we who are friends of the poultry industry cannot get a hearing for this bill. I ask for common justice to the farmers who deal in poultry. I ask that the Members of this House do not turn a deaf ear to this request for $25,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it my understanding that the Department of Agriculture recommended $40,000 for this purpose?

Mr. TOBEY. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Director of the Budget recommended $25,000?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is simply an attempt to get $25,000 back in the bill which the Director of the Budget recommended to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. TOBEY. The gentleman is entirely correct, and the gains to come from this additional $25,000 are far more important than the $25,000 expenditure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the subcommittee is informed as to the importance of the poultry industry in the United States, and in nowise shall I attempt to deprecate or lessen the importance assigned to this topic. However, the committee learned that last year a census of poultry was taken by another branch of the Government, and at this time in the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, figures are now being compiled of the poultry census that was taken in 1925. All the figures are now available for New England and the northeastern portion of the United States. The Director of that Bureau stated the entire work would be compiled within a period of 3 or 4 months. With this information available to the committee, we thought it would be unwise to allot additional public funds to take a census on the same subject so shortly after one had just been completed. We all know that the amount of poultry production in the country may be increased rapidly because of the short time involved to produce poultry. While the future may logically require additional information in regard to statistics concerning poultry, surely at this time we ought not to spend additional funds when we already have information of recent origin that will be available within the next 3 or 4 months.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. The purpose of this appropriation, as recommended by the Budget, was not merely to take a census all over the country. As I understood, it was to extend to this industry the same services as are extended to other livestock and agricultural industries.

Mr. THURSTON. We have research work in relation to diseases of poultry carried in other items of this bill.

Mr. HEALEY. This would include that sort of information.

Mr. THURSTON. But this item is confined to statistics. We are now considering the title "Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the gentleman appreciate the fact that under this amendment, if adopted, we will set up, not a general yearly census, but institute a monthly service, reporting on these various details and trends? The cotton and wheat and tobacco people already have this knowledge available to them, and the poultrymen are asking for the same thing. They want monthly bulletins showing trends and prices to be sent out all over the country, which will be invaluable to them. It is not a yearly census we are interested in.

Mr. THURSTON. I may say to my friend that many of those engaged in the different branches of agriculture referred to are rather hostile to such reports, because they claim they are inimical and harmful to their line of industry.

Mr. TOBEY. Then let their appropriations be withdrawn, but grant this small sum to the poultrymen who are asking for this helpful information.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEY. Do I understand that at the present time there is no specific appropriation of any kind for furnishing any information or statistics about poultry, but that the Department is spending about $5,000 a year, but that such work is not being conducted with a view to giving specific poultry information, but whatever work is done is incidental to the other work of the Department?

Mr. THURSTON. I may say it is incidental insofar as it is not touched by a complete survey made by other governmental agencies that was made last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEALEY and Mr. TOBEY) there were—ayes 32, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of April 26, 1910 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 121–134), entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes", $208,180.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 86, at line 20, after the period, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Enforcement of the Sea Food Inspectors Act: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packing, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), $80,000."

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. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, there is no one who has more sympathy with the desire of the committee to keep this bill within the estimates of the Budget than I have, and if I did not have the approval of the Budget for this item, I would not offer the amendment at this time, but we have in many sections of this country, in addition to my own section, a big sea-food industry. There is a prevalent opinion among many people in this country to the effect that canned sea foods will poison them and kill them. This same opinion prevailed with reference to the meat-packing industry of this country until the Government stepped in and furnished inspection for the meat-packing plants.

We have an authorization by the Congress for sea-food inspectors to inspect the sea foods that are canned just as meat is inspected by the Government where it is packed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I will be pleased to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I know the gentleman's great interest in the seafood industry, and I am wondering whether the amendment of the gentleman is broad enough to cover inspection of seafood from the Great Lakes or just seafood from salt water.

Mr. COLMER. I would say unquestionably it is, in my opinion.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEY. Can the gentleman tell us how many inspectors there are all over the country?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry I cannot answer that question specifically.

Mr. KENNEY. I understand there are 72 to cover the 48 States.

Mr. COLMER. I could not say about that, but I should say, for the gentleman's information, that there was not any provision made for seafood inspection until the Seventy-third Congress, when this law that I refer to was passed, and last year it was amended by adding the provision under which we are now seeking this appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from California, I believe the gentleman stated his amendment would cover seafood products from the Great Lakes.

Mr. COLMER. In my opinion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But it would not cover them so far as the appropriation is concerned. The gentleman is asking an appropriation for his specific industry in Mississippi only.

Mr. COLMER. I would say to the gentleman that the estimate is made by the Director of the Pure Food and Drugs Bureau.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But if they propose to extend this service to the Great Lakes, it would be necessary to increase the amount provided in the amendment.

Mr. COLMER. I assume that is true. I would not undertake to say that $80,000, which is requested in the amendment and which the Budget recommended, would cover all of the sea-food industry.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. But the gentleman would be willing to accept an amendment to include the Great Lakes, if not expressly provided for in the amendment?

Mr. COLMER. I shall be glad to do that, although I do not think an amendment of that sort would be either germane or necessary.

Mr. DONDERO. The sea-food industry on the Great Lakes is quite a large one.

Mr. COLMER. I may say to the gentleman that the language is broad enough to cover it, but the appropriation might not be.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking that this amendment be accepted for the purpose of giving this important industry this inspection service. I am asking that the people who eat the sea foods be given that additional protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the question involved here is not the immediate issue suggested by the gentleman but a national policy of such far-reaching importance the end of which it would be impossible to foretell. The question involved is whether or not the Government will supply this service to packing industries.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. THURSTON. Has the gentleman any idea of the cost to the United States Treasury if we should adopt the policy of inspecting all of the canned goods packed in the United States?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would be impossible to estimate. It is stupendous. The Government never has provided this service for the packer. The meat inspection is not a parallel case. That is provided for the protection of the consumer. If we should provide this protection for shrimp, then we should provide it for salmon and for vegetables and everything else sold in tin or glass. If we provide it for the Gulf of Mexico, we should provide it for the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and the Great Lakes. It is impossible to envision the gigantic scope of this policy once adopted.

The history of this proposition is interesting. The industry came before Congress 2 years ago and said, "Gentlemen, if you will merely authorize this service, we will pay the expense, we will pay the salaries of all the inspectors." We said, "All right; if you pay the expenses, we will certify the inspectors." Now they come in and say, "Oh, you authorized the inspectors, and you ought now to pay their salaries." In other words, the industry is going back on its contract with the United States Government. We not only provide the inspectors but they now insist that we pay their salaries. Is not that true?

Mr. COLMER. I am going to answer that question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it not true that you agreed to pay the salaries of these inspectors?

Mr. COLMER. When this bill was first passed——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Did you not agree to pay the salaries?

Mr. COLMER. I am sure that my good friend is asking questions and then answering them himself.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. You told us you would pay the salaries of these inspectors if we would agree to provide the inspectors.

Mr. COLMER. The original act was passed with that condition.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Are you keeping that contract when you come in now and ask us to pay their salaries?

Mr. COLMER. We certainly are attempting to keep that contract. We found when this law was enacted that the large packers could afford the inspectors and the small packers could not, and it was driving the small packers out of business.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have nothing to do with that. You agreed that if we would provide the inspectors you would pay their salaries. Now you want us to pay their salaries. The industry is welching on its agreement.

Mr. COLMER. I think that is a matter of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point on the subject just under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, it is perhaps well known that the Territory of Alaska supplies more than one-half, and on occasion as much as five-eighths, of all of the salmon produced in the world. In addition to salmon, considerable quantities of halibut, herring, and other fish are taken in the waters of Alaska and shipped to the United States. The records covering the fisheries of Alaska show that the average value of those fisheries for the past 15 years has been in excess of $33,000,000 per year.

In my opinion, it is highly important that Federal inspection be extended to Alaska fish products, and particularly to canned salmon, at the earliest possible date. The same reasons which impelled Congress to pass the laws compelling inspection of beef, pork, and other products will sustain an act providing for an inspection of fisheries. Perhaps there is more reason for requiring an inspection of fish products than there is for meat products, because fish deteriorates upon being taken from the water in a comparatively short time as compared with meat.

At the present time there is no inspection at the time of packing of canned salmon in Alaska. After reaching the United States, the canned product is inspected by the selec-

tion of sample cans from the various packs and in the event any fish is found unfit for human consumption the whole pack of that particular day, and sometimes the pack of several days, is seized and held for condemnation. Under the procedure followed by the Department, none of the fish so seized which is unfit for consumption is again placed on the market. Some time ago I was asked whether the salmon seized as being unfit for human consumption was reconditioned. The answer is, of course, that it is not and it cannot be. No attempt is made to recondition any food which is unfit for human consumption, but sometimes one or two or three or four bad fish will get into a day's pack, and the inspector who inspects the pack will get a can of that bad fish. Upon each can is stamped a certain code number, showing it was packed between certain hours of a certain day in a certain month. Then, instead of seizing only the salmon that is unfit for human consumption, the inspector seizes all of the salmon in that lot, which may cover the pack of several days. Sometimes as much as 20,000 cases of a pack is so seized.

The packer has two courses of action: He can fight the case and probably spend more money than he can make in 2 years in packing or he can plead guilty and have the Government release to the packer the entire amount that is seized. If the latter course is followed, the Government agent then designates the code numbers of the pack where the impure fish has been found. The rest of the seized pack can be sold; it is good fish; nothing has been found in it that is deleterious to human life or health or to make it unfit for human consumption. Then the Government condemns the cases embracing the code numbers in which the bad fish has been found, packed during a specified period, and every can of that code number must be opened. As every can is opened it can be discerned in a moment whether the contents are good or bad. The bad fish are rejected and thrown away. There may be only a few bad cans in thousands of cases, but the packer must, under the regulations, open every can of that code. He will perhaps find only a few bad cans in the whole lot. Those few cans are thrown overbroad, but the rest of the salmon, which is good salmon, must be reconditioned; that is, it is processed and canned and then goes on the market. But this salmon is and always was a perfectly good product.

I wish as strongly as I can to disabuse the minds of the people of the idea that any salmon unfit for human consumption ever seized by the Government is again made any use of at all. It is thrown away.

But in my judgment the whole procedure is wrong. The inspection should be had, as in the case of meat products, at the time the pack is put up, and I believe that eventually this will unquestionably be done. That procedure cannot be instituted too soon.

Moreover, it seems certain that inspection at the time of packing would in the long run work to the advantage of the packer, because then there would be no danger of a seizure of a large part of his pack, most of which may be good food, because a few cans are found to be bad or spoiled. An inspection at the time of the packing would prevent all this and would insure that only a good product goes to the public.

In spite of the lack of inspection at the time of packing, I believe that canned salmon is probably as good and pure a food as any that is put in cans, but the method of inspection after packing is certainly unscientific and uneconomical. The stamp on a can of salmon that it is Government inspected and passed certainly ought to be worth something on the market to the salmon packers.

I am informed that inspection of seafood products has already been largely given to the sardine-packing industry. Surely the salmon products are entitled to the same protection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion and soil and moisture depletion and methods for soil and moisture conservation, including construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, and other necessary expenses, $1,540,780.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do that not for the purpose of offering an amendment, for I am very anxious to keep this bill within the limits of the Budget Bureau and in accordance with the recommendations of the commitee. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question with reference to the subject of the republication of two important public documents which I have found in the past very valuable in diffusing useful information concerning agriculture. I refer to two books, one known as Diseases of Cattle and the other known as Diseases of the Horse. These publications have been out of print for a number of years. I know from experience that they are very valuable, and almost daily I receive requests from parties in my district desiring these publications. I have also talked with farmers and stock raisers and have heard them tell of the value of these publications in giving information by which they saved valuable cattle and horses both from disease and death. I think the Government spends a great deal of money that would not be nearly as useful or as valuable to the farmers as these two publications. I do not know whether an amendment authorizing a reprint of these books should be carried in this bill or not, but I should like to hear from the chairman of the committee with reference to the value of publications, and also as to whether the appropriation therefor should be in this or some other bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has raised that question. It is a matter of particular interest to every Member who represents an agricultural district. Of all the publications that have been issued by the Department of Agriculture none is more practicable or more valuable to the average farmer as those two books, Diseases of the Horse and Diseases of Cattle. I have heard of numbers of instances in which farmers have credited these publications with saving them the price of a valuable animal. Unfortunately provision for reprinting these books does not come within the purview of this bill. It is provided for in an item in the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The legislative appropriation bill has not yet been passed, has it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it has not yet been reported to the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the hearings been concluded?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The hearings have been concluded, as I understand it, but I hardly think the bill has been marked up. However, I will say that for the last 2 or 3 years the Department of Agriculture, in response to requests from the committee, has supplied data bringing those two publications down to date preparatory to their publication when the Congress should order them reprinted. Apparently the Congress has been a little dilatory, and as yet funds have not been provided for the purpose. It is to be hoped that the matter will have the earnest attention of the committee.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil and moisture conservation operations, demonstrations, and information: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and moisture; including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, the establishment and operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, the dissemination of information, and other necessary expenses, $20,453,485.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 89, beginning in line 22, strike out the paragraph ending on page 90, line 5.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity to save $20,453,485. It is in connection with this soil operation. We have already passed a law, under which $500,000,000 is authorized to be spent. The Senate passed something like $440,000,000. We ought not to be spending any more than that.

I have not attempted to touch the experimental features of this nor the investigating features of the Soil Conservation Service. I do feel, however, that this new service should confine itself specifically and particularly to the operations of experiment and instruction to farmers and leave the rest to the statute that was passed last week.

I hope the House will adopt this amendment and save twenty and a half million dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes; 10 minutes to be used by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SECREST. Reserving the right to object, I should like 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I amend my request; that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] unquestionably has this appropriation for soil conservation confused with the funds providing for the general agricultural program under the amendment to the Soil Conservation Act, which amendment was finally passed this week, and known as the farm-relief bill. The Soil Conservation Service, for which this appropriation is provided, was established in September 1933 under the office of the Secretary of the Interior to administer a grant of $5,000,000 made by the Public Works Administration. Later additional grants were made for this purpose in 1933 and 1934. The original plan for the Soil Conservation Service involved three distinct fields of operation, namely, erosion-control projects, investigations and surveys, and cooperation with State and Federal agencies. The work was carried on with the funds above mentioned until July 1935. In the meantime, by an act of Congress, the Soil Conservation Service was created as a regular bureau of the Government and placed under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the item for the Soil Conservation Service appears in this bill this year for the first time. Heretofore it has operated with funds provided from emergency appropriations. The Bureau of the Budget submitted to the subcommittee estimates amounting to $27,500,000 for the fiscal year 1937. The subcommittee after very careful and studious consideration of every item has recommended to the House a total of $22,469,265.

In addition to projects on watersheds largely owned by the Government, the Soil Conservation Service now has in operation 141 demonstration projects located in 41 States, which projects embrace an area of approximately 7,516,329 acres. Some of these projects have been under way for more than 2 years and are operated for the purpose of providing farmers with a concrete, practical demonstration of effective soil-conservation measures. Many methods of soil and moisture conservation are used on said projects, such as terracing, the restoration of grasses, the use of strip cropping, the proper crop rotation, the planting of shrubs and trees, and the retirement from cultivation of excessively eroded land. In addition to the above projects, the Soil Conservation Service is now conducting investigations with reference to soil moisture and land use and is operating a large number of experiment stations. This work is essential at this time. Conservation surveys are also being made, and the Service is cooperating with conservancy districts and other Federal and State agencies.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, no part of the relief money which has heretofore been appropriated by Congress has been spent for a purpose which will ultimately do more good or bring greater returns to the people of the United States than the money which has been spent for the control of soil erosion. I do not now have the time to discuss in detail the disastrous results of soil erosion throughout this Nation, and I do not have time to discuss soil erosion and soil conservation in other countries. I feel that Members of this House understand the importance of this work and that it ought not to be disturbed at this time.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. If the amendment of the gentleman from New York were adopted, it would mean the total elimination of the appropriation that is now asked, and none of these meritorious projects the gentleman has been talking about would be continued.

Mr. UMSTEAD. That is correct; and more than that, it would mean that the Bureau of Soil Conservation would be absolutely destroyed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I did not attempt to strike out that part which related to their experimental and development work. I was attempting to strike out their operations. I believe there is a decided distinction between the two.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman has been saying. Is it not true that this $20,000,000 came out of relief money?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I made the statement a moment ago, which I repeat, that up until this time all funds which have been expended by the Soil Conservation Service have come from relief allocations.

Mr. BIERMANN. Now it is put under one of the regular appropriations, and this is one of the reasons why the regular appropriations are increasing—they are taking over some of the relief work. Is that right?

Mr. UMSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, your subcommittee felt that the friends of soil conservation ought to join with us in agreeing to the reasonable cuts which were applied to this appropriation in order that this service may be placed upon an economical and efficient basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As a matter of fact, the committee, as I understand it, has already cut out more than $5,000,000 from the estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman is correct. The total deductions recommended by your subcommittee amount to $5,030,735. No further reductions, in my judgment, can be sustained without seriously impairing the splendid work of the soil-conservation service, which has grown to be exceedingly popular throughout the country.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I would like to restore the items which were stricken out and bring the total back to the Budget estimate.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I thoroughly appreciate the enthusiasm of the gentleman, and I, too, am an ardent supporter of the soil-conservation service. I have been actively interested in it since September 1933. In my judgment, the work provided for under this appropriation must be continued. It will not only aid the farmers of this country, but it will also inure to the benefit of the entire citizenship of this Nation. I would not want to see any cut made in the appropriation for this service except such cuts as are necessary to produce an economical and efficient administration. I believe that the cuts which have been made by this committee will ultimately render a service to soil conservation. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] should not prevail. The splendid work of soil conservation must go on.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein one chart.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I think without question the pending amendment should be defeated. There are many interesting facts with regard to soil conservation which have come to light within recent years.

Recently there came to my desk a small volume on conservation, the best, in fact, that I have ever seen. I opened it casually and my eyes fell upon a most startling bit of information. I read that recent studies indicate that the Sahara and Gobi Deserts were once occupied by prosperous peoples. I could hardly believe that these two greatest and most desolate deserts in the world ever boasted of a fertile topsoil capable of producing in abundance the products of ancient agriculture.

How long will it be, I wondered, with our present unconcern and waste, until this "desert disease" shall destroy for agricultural purposes the lands of my district and the Nation. Will the cities of our country ever stand deserted looking for hundreds of miles on barren acres that once were the source of their greatness, their wealth, their very life? Is this a nation of unlimited resources, from which we can draw forever, or is it possible that future generations will die for want of the things we waste today?

Nations of the ancient world grew where the soil was fertile. For generation after generation this Nation was strictly agricultural, growing in power and wealth as new lands were opened to cultivation. As our Nation grew, conservation seemed a foolish waste of time. When the old farm became unproductive new land could be had for little or nothing. Our good fortune made us a nation of destroyers. We cleared and burned our forests. When the new land became exhausted by cultivation and erosion we moved to a new location and repeated the process.

We have broken the orderly laws of nature and nature has struck back to exact her penalties. In this case the cost of the operation must be paid by the surgeon instead of the patient. To his own sorrow man has changed the face of our Nation.

In 1492, when Columbus came to America, eight-fourteenths of our whole land, or considerably more than half, was covered with virgin forests. The soil under these trees was perfectly preserved. Today only half of our forest lands remain. Five-fourteenths of our land was covered with abundant grass and other vegetation, wholly protecting the soil beneath. The other one-fourteenth was desert and mountainous waste.

Thus only 500 years ago thirteen-fourteenths, or 93 percent, of our whole Nation was covered with a deep rich topsoil, adequately protected by forests and vegetation. Nature not only guarded her treasure by covering it with the proper plant life but added to its value with each falling leaf or dying blade of grass.

Today we face a crisis not as well understood as many through which the Nation has passed, but certainly just as serious to our future welfare.

The soil-erosion specialists tell us that the dust storm of May 11, 1934, swept 300,000,000 tons of fertile topsoil off the great wheat plains, enough to spread a layer of soil 8 inches deep over every foot of Noble County, in which I live. This was only one of many dust storms, and a short time ago we read in the paper that another dust storm was sweeping great clouds of soil from the Texas Panhandle to the distant State of Nebraska.

Where our forefathers saw the skies darkened by great flocks of wildfowl, we see the sun made hazy because man plowed under the grassy plains and exposed a dry soil to the sun and wind.

The hills and rolling sections of the country have been farmed in most cases without plan or reason. Today streams that the pioneers found clear and well stocked with fish are clouded with the soil from millions of farms. Four hundred million tons of soil material, gathered from my district and other sections of the Middle West, are swept annually into the Gulf of Mexico by the Mississippi River. Every year wind and water erosion remove beyond use 3,000,000,000 tons of soil worth not less than $400,000,000. The most conservative estimates show that at least $10,000,000,000 worth of soil has forever gone since the first farmer began cultivation. If the farmers of the Nation had to replace at present prices the nitrates, phosphates, and potash washed away in this soil, the cost would be many times the $10,000,000,000. Erosion has already destroyed for profitable farming 100,000,000 acres which were once fertile—an area almost four times as large as the whole State of Ohio. Another 125,000,000 acres are seriously damaged. One hundred million acres more are threatened with damage. Our problem is magnified by the fact that these acres belong to the best farm lands of the United States.

Within 50 years another $20,000,000,000 worth of soil will be gone unless this Nation and its farmers cooperate to prevent it. Our only hope lies in saving the soil we have, for it would take nature centuries to restore a topsoil that has been swept away.

The problem is not alone for the farmer. It is just as much the concern of city, village, and hamlet. Destroy any city, and fertile lands and natural resources will build it again. Destroy the soil, and no city will survive.

My own State is one of the leading agricultural States in the Nation, yet the soil survey made in every county shows that one-half of Ohio is subject to erosion.

Unfortunately, the worst eroded area in Ohio covers the whole of my district. Only 10 percent of my district, located principally along streams and rivers, is relatively free from erosion. More than three-fourths of the topsoil and much of the subsoil has been washed completely away from no less than one-fourth of my six counties.

The balance of my district has suffered so seriously from erosion that only the greatest effort can save us. Farms that once yielded in abundance, making their owners well-to-do and contributing to the growth of every city and the wealth of every merchant, today will produce only a poor living at twice the effort. Those of us that have spent our lives in southeastern Ohio can hardly believe the indisputable facts.

The forces of Nature have stolen our soil so gradually and quietly that we did not even realize that it was gone. Of course, we observed barren hillsides and deep gullies. On many a county road and at the end of many a country lane we found deserted farmhouses. More and more our young people journey to distant States and cities. The population of our small counties declined, while that of the Nation rapidly increased.

We deluded ourselves by thinking our children and neighbors were going to fields of greater opportunity. That greater luxuries, more conveniences could be found elsewhere was accepted as the cause of all we observed.

Today I hope we understand. Today I hope we know. Our soil was going, washing away so fast that we could not believe the figures if we did not know them to be true.

My district contains approximately 1,960,000 acres. One inch of topsoil on an acre of ground weighs about 143 tons. From much of my six counties at least 6 inches of topsoil has been completely washed away since the forests were first removed from the hills. No one can dispute the fact that an average of 2 inches of topsoil is gone from the entire district, and studies of the soil-conservation service show that the loss far exceeds this figure.

A loss of 2 inches of soil means that 566,000,000 tons of good rich earth have been lost forever to my people. Scrape the remaining soil from 653,000 acres, and this 566,000,000 tons would cover them again with 6 inches of rich earth. From this acreage, composed entirely of soil washed from my district alone, could be grown enough corn to bring $23,523,000 at present market prices.

In an acre of original Muskingum topsoil there was about 3,000 pounds of nitrogen. Thus, at 12 cents per pound, $21,549,000 worth of nitrates have been washed from the farms of my district.

In an acre of original Muskingum topsoil there was about 800 pounds of phosphorus. The value of the phosphates that have been lost exceeds $3,066,000.

The loss in potash amounts to $100,086,000. These losses are from erosion alone and do not calculate the loss in the remaining soil caused by constant removal of crops.

Think of the opportunity this would offer if by some miracle we could get it back. Think of the radios, the automobiles, and home conveniences it would buy. Think how many of our young people could find their happiness at home. How many people would rush with joy to their deserted farms? How many businessmen would share this abundant prosperity? Muddy streams and yellow rivers have meant little to us in the past. We watched them flow toward the ocean as a matter of natural course. Never again can we enjoy such complacency.

The future must be different. Every time we see a stream that is not clear we must shudder at the wealth we are losing. We must see our hopes, our heritage, our very life, flowing away with the current.

The problem is ours, and I can perform no greater service than to make all of my people conscious of the great loss that is continually taking place. Not only must we understand our problem but we must learn to properly apply the remedy.

Near Zanesville is a soil-erosion station, where many facts have been established and many remedies proven. We cannot get back the soil that is lost, but we can save that which remains on our farms.

First, let us understand the course of water, for water causes practically all erosion in my section. Water comes to the earth in the form of sleet, snow, fog, dew, and rain. Rain, because a large part of it rushes off immediately, is the most damaging to our lands. Our problem is to prevent the quick run-off of water. This can be accomplished best on steep hills by reforestation. On slopes too steep to cultivate, grass or sod is most effective. The only hope for large areas where the soil is practically gone is the planting of trees. If we can make water move slowly, we accomplish two necessary ends. We allow more of it to infiltrate into the ground as a source of needed moisture and we check erosion.

Many of our farms are hill farms, and we must continue to cultivate them. Nevertheless, there are many things we can do. The first step is to plan how we shall use every acre of our farm to conserve the most soil. In our own phrase, we should study "the lay of the land" and plant accordingly. In addition, some soils erode more easily than others. The character of the soil must be considered before we can determine the best crop for a given acre of land.

Studies at the Soil Erosion Experiment Station near Zanesville show that on a normal 12-percent slope 36.2 tons of soil will wash away each year if the field is planted year after year in corn. Such a field planted in corn for 28 consecutive years would lose 7 inches of topsoil. If the same field is planted in corn one year, wheat, and then grass, a normal crop rotation in my district, it would take 189 years for the elements to destroy the same 7 inches of soil. If the same field were covered every year with grass, timothy, or native sod, it would take 15,000 years to wash it away. Many of our hills are far more than a 12-percent slope, and no change by man can protect them with the same effectiveness as did Nature when she covered them with grass and forests. The degree of slope has much effect on the amount of erosion.

Where a 12-percent slope in continuous corn will lose 36.2 tons of earth per acre, an 8-percent slope will lose only 31.4 tons. Rotation for most farms in southeastern Ohio is not only advantageous but it is positively necessary if our soil is to be preserved.

In addition to crop rotation contour planting is absolutely essential to soil conservation in my district. Thus, when we plow with the contour of the land, the furrows are always at right angles to the direction of the flow of surface water. Each furrow then checks the water, permits it to infiltrate better, and causes it to drop behind each furrow much of the soil it is carrying.

Strip cropping also should be more generally practiced, especially on farms where hay is a needed crop. A long strip of land on a hillside may be planted in corn. A strip below may be planted in grass or other dense crops. The soil washing from the cornfield will then be caught and held by the dense growth of the lower crop. On large fields several strips of alternating crops may be necessary to check erosion with the maximum effect.

Erosion on some of our land has reached the stage where gullies have developed. Some of these can be restored to cultivation in a few years if the farmer will construct proper check dams at intervals in each gully. A small line of posts may be placed across the wash, and logs, brush, rocks, straw, old wire, and other materials may be thrown behind them.

The growth of vegetation, grass, trees, and so forth, should be encouraged. These dams retard the water and will often be filled or entirely covered by soil washed from above.

Every farmer in my district may go to the soil-conservation service in Zanesville and see in actual operation the many things he can do to preserve and improve the farm upon which he and our district must depend in the future. The future of all our 200,000 people will depend on our willingness to learn about conservation.

The value of wildlife in America is $1,000,000,000, and the future of game and fowl depends upon the shelter we give them by a wise program of conservation. This wildlife produces $190,000,000 worth of fur and meat alone each year. Forests and vegetation will protect and restore game as well as check erosion.

Stop the waste of soil, clear our streams of silt, mine acids, and factory pollution. Nature will then join hands with the sportsmen of the Nation in filling our streams with fish.

Seven million of our people belong to fish and game clubs and other sportsmen's organizations. Each year 13,000,000 of our people buy licenses to hunt and fish. All these are vitally interested in conservation.

While soil is our basic natural resource, we have two other resources in my district from which we derive great revenue and upon which this Nation depends for economic strength. These are coal and oil, and the conservation of both cannot longer be neglected.

Coal is absolutely necessary to our present and future economic existence. It is our greatest source of heat and power, both of which are indispensable to life and industry.

Our very civilization and well-being demand that we preserve this great natural resource for which a suitable substitute is extremely unlikely. Low wages and cutthroat competition have made it impossible to secure the maximum amount of coal from any given mine. That which was most accessible and could be mined most cheaply was taken from the vein. The rest was left in the mine. In fact, the report of the Natural Resources Board shows that 35 percent of our soft coal has been lost forever under conditions that have existed in the coal industry. In Europe, where efforts have been made toward stabilization, the loss in mining is only 5 percent.

When we realize that under present consumption and present conditions the greater part of all coal east of the Mississippi River will be practically gone within 100 years, the situation is appalling. Concern for future generations, as well as concern for those now engaged in mining, demand that action be taken to stabilize the industry at the earliest possible moment, and to insure sufficient wages and profits to make it possible to mine all the coal instead of a part.

Coal has been, coal is, and coal will continue to be the chief cornerstone upon which the progress and prosperity of industrial America must rest. The problems of those engaged in its production are the problems of all. Upon the men who mine coal depends the welfare of the steel worker and the worker in practically every factory in the Nation.

Vitally concerned is the farmer, who must depend upon the earnings of all labor to purchase the products of his farm.

For several generations the miners of the Nation waged a ceaseless struggle to secure in the form of wages a fair share of the wealth they produce. Year after year, by the greatest sacrifice and effort, working conditions steadily improved.

The depression, with its consequent loss of markets, swept away temporarily the progress of years. Collective bargaining was not recognized and conditions of labor and rates of pay were arbitrarily established by the owners of the mines. Many operators bid far below their competitors and then proceeded to pay starvation wages in an effort to realize a

profit. Other operators who desired to be fair were forced to cut wages in order to retain markets for their coal. This system of underbidding and wage slashing continued until the life of a miner in many cases was little better than that of the galley slaves of ancient Rome. Miners were forced to lay their own track, do their own timbering, and handle great quantities of slate and waste without one cent of pay. Some of them did almost as much work without pay as they did with it. In some fields conditions were better, but in general the industry was never in a more deplorable condition.

At this point the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed by Congress. It gave the miners the right to collective bargaining and it gave the operators an opportunity to cease cutting each other's throats. The 5-day week, long a dream of the miner, became a reality. Wages were increased and, generally, employment was greater and work was steadier than it had been for years. A sick industry was far on the road to recovery when the N. R. A. was declared unconstitutional.

The operators desire and are entitled to no more nor no less than a fair return on their investment.

The miner who turns a God-given, natural resource into wealth certainly has every moral right to a fair share of the wealth he produces. He hopes for and deserves a wage that will feed his family with wholesome food, clothe them respectably, allow them to enjoy a reasonable share of the conveniences and luxuries his labor makes possible, and permit his children to secure the same educational advantages as are given to the children of those for whom he works. By every rule of justice he is entitled to good wages for his hazardous work; he is deserving of good working conditions and the maximum guaranties of safety.

The Guffey bill has done much to stabilize the industry and permit him to reap a harvest from his toil commensurate with the great public service he renders the Nation.

Conservation of coal is now possible for the first time in American history.

I hope this and other wise legislation will preserve the coal industry of my district for many years to come. I am convinced that some similar legislation should be passed to protect the oil industry from possible chaos and certain waste. This industry ranks third in the United States and stands second only to cotton in our national exports. It is a great natural resource which we must conserve.

For generations we wasted the timber resources of our Nation, and today we are spending great sums to restore that which we so foolishly destroyed.

Unlike trees, oil cannot be replaced. Conditions should be such that no well will be abandoned from which it is possible to produce a reasonable supply of oil.

The question of conserving our natural resources is not only the concern of Government; it is the concern of every citizen. Upon land, coal, and oil we depend for food, heat, clothing, and power. All must be conserved. Every man must understand his part. This generation must act quickly and wisely before it is too late. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECREST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will not the gentleman say that instead of reducing appropriations when things are as serious as he states we ought to increase them and intensify our efforts to save American soil?

Mr. SECREST. I had an amendment prepared for that very purpose.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECREST. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. If the farm land of the United States is deteriorating at such a rapid rate, how does the gentleman account for the low price of good farm land?

Mr. SECREST. General business conditions, I would say, are responsible for that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] may proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that my good friend the gentleman from New York is serious in offering this amendment, that, if adopted, would practically destroy the soil-conservation service.

Mr. TABER. I can assure the gentleman that I am very serious in offering the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Since the gentleman from New York says he is serious in offering his amendment, I shall accept his word. Therefore we will assume that he is serious in wanting to eliminate all of this technical information that the soil-conservation service, and that service only, has——

Mr. TABER. That is not what the amendment would accomplish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I disagree with the gentleman. The pending amendment, as I stated at the outset, practically destroys the soil-conservation service. It strikes at the very heart of the service. This is the first regular appropriation ever made for this particular department. Emergency funds were allocated last year for the soil-conservation service, and from all sources it received, as I recall, about $36,000,000. This service was established by an act of Congress in 1935, and may I say that it has done a marvelous job in the short time it has been in operation.

Bear in mind that although during its first year of operation the Soil Conservation Service has used some $36,000,000 and could advantageously use more than that next year, considering the big job it has undertaken, the Bureau of the Budget came along and cut the Department to $27,500,000. Then the Appropriations Committee made another cut of $5,000,000. In fact, the cut already taken by this Department is so severe that I gave notice in the committee, and at least intimated on the floor of the House a day or two ago, that I might, when this item was reached, offer an amendment increasing it to the amount allowed by the Budget. I am sincere in saying I feel very deeply that it ought to be done. However, after a conference with Members of this as well as another body at the other end of this Capitol Building, I shall not do so now. Frankly I have reason to believe that this item will be taken care of in the Senate.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman offer that amendment? I should like to vote for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall not offer the amendment under the circumstances, although I feel confident that such an amendment would prevail. Many other Members, I am glad to say, have so expressed themselves, and the statement made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] would indicate that the committee feels kindly to the Soil Conservation Service. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying into effect the provisions of section 37 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat., pp. 750–793), $17,500,000 of the unobligated balance of the funds appropriated by Public Resolution No. 27, Seventy-third Congress, and reappropriated by said section 37 of the act approved August 24, 1935, together with any unobligated balance of the appropriation made for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1936 by said section 37, which balances are hereby continued available for obligation during the fiscal year 1937, for the elimination of diseased dairy and beef cattle, including cattle suffering from tuberculosis or Bang's disease, for payments to owners with respect thereto, and for other purposes, as authorized by said section 37, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia, and other necessary expenses.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WITHROW: Page 93, line 4, strike out "$17,500,000" and insert "$29,150,000."

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that most of the Representatives from dairy districts, as well as the dairy producers' organizations of the country, are very

much interested in this particular amendment. My amendment would raise the amount of $17,500,000 which is made available under this particular paragraph to $29,150,000, or an increase of $11,650,000.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will notice that this is a reappropriation of money which has heretofore been appropriated and which the Department was unable to use, and the evidence before the subcommittee indicates it will not be able to use any more than the amount here appropriated for the next fiscal year. So why appropriate the money if they cannot make use of it. They have about $32,000,000 under the Jones-Connally Act which they have been unable to use, and this is a reappropriation of $17,500,000, and if more were needed the committee would have recommended it.

Mr. WITHROW. I should like to be heard on that.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the Committee will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WITHROW. I would increase the amount $11,650,000. I realize there is carried in this paragraph an additional reappropriation of $3,000,000. Even with this $3,000,000 additional, the maximum possible program under this paragraph would be $20,500,000. Under my amendment the possible maximum program would be $32,150,000. Under the breakdown of the Department as shown in the testimony before the Appropriations Committee, a maximum of $11,350,000 for Bang's disease is contemplated, notwithstanding the fact that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, we will have spent more than $18,000,000 for Bang's disease. If the work did not increase any over the present rate, the provision made in this paragraph would be $7,000,000 short of the amount necessary to carry on the same program for Bang's disease for the next fiscal year. In addition, both Dr. Barnes, of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Animal Industry, and Mr. Moscrip, president of the Twin City Milk Producers' Association, indicated that the work would go forward with much greater rapidity in the next year than heretofore; and, therefore, estimated that $6,000,000 additional would be needed if one-third more cows were tested next year than were tested during the same period last year.

Certainly the $11,350,000 should be increased to at least $18,000,000, the amount necessary to carry on Bang's disease work, based on the present program of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The Department includes in their program $1,500,000 for bovine tuberculosis during the next fiscal year. We must add to this an additional $1,500,000 carried in the regular United States Department of Agriculture funds, making a total of $3,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am one of those entitled to 5 minutes of the time, and I should like to give my 5 minutes to my colleague from Wisconsin to finish his remarks on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, we spent $9,500,000 for bovine tuberculosis, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, $6,750,000. The Department recommends reducing the amount to be spent during the next fiscal year approximately 60 percent.

There is no contemplated plan for spending any money for mastitis work, notwithstanding the fact that in 1935 we spent $390,000, and will have spent during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an additional $610,000. There is a general and widespread demand throughout the United States for the continuance of mastitis work. The committee entirely disregarded the testimony of Dr. Mohler, who testified that mastitis was not under control and that it was only secondary in economic importance to Bang's disease; that it was more important than tuberculosis.

In addition, only $7,500,000 is to be available for the purchase of surplus dairy products, whereas at least $15,000,000 will be necessary because of the increase in production of dairy products which it is anticipated will occur from natural sources and the additional increase that we anticipate will arise due to the taking out of land used for the production of cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco and putting it into dairying under the Soil Conservation Act.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Does this call for the appropriation of any more money?

Mr. WITHROW. No; there is no additional appropriation involved whatsoever. These are unexpended balances. They have not been expended, and in their reappropriation lies the only safety valve the dairy producer will have during the next fiscal year. If they are not needed, they will not be spent. The testimony before the committee was that of June 30, 1936, there will be more than $32,000,000 in unexpended balances.

Even you who are the most optimistic must realize that the program proposed by the Agricultural Department relative to diseased animals and the purchase of dairy surpluses is liable to be entirely inadequate. We from the dairy States are very much concerned. We are fearful that the dairy surpluses during the next fiscal year will reach their peak because of the passage of certain pieces of legislation the effects of which we are fearful of. Whether we are right in this fear remains to be seen, but during the interim we feel it is no more than fair and proper that the interests of our constituents should be protected.

Gentlemen, do not fool yourselves. This is the only opportunity you will have to perfect legislation that will safeguard your people against anticipated surpluses. By reason of the difficulty of administration of a production-control program for dairying we have not been able to participate in the benefits that have accrued to some by reason of the passage of the A. A. A.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I have not any time, and I cannot get any time. I represent a dairy section. Is not this of deep concern, not only to dairymen themselves but to the consumers of diseased milk?

Mr. WITHROW. It is.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish the gentleman would enlarge on that for a moment.

Mr. WITHROW. It is not only desirable but necessary that milk be produced from healthy animals, or at least animals which are free from diseases communicable to human beings, so that people have no fear of drinking it in large quantities. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, when I made my remarks earlier in the afternoon in regard to this bill, about standing by the committee, I did not know that Bess, the old milk cow, was coming in later on. I cannot forget old Bess. There are two or three things in this that I think we should bear in mind. First, we have spent millions of dollars on the control of tuberculosis and Bang's disease. If we let up in our intensive campaign, much of that work will be lost. The work that we have done is of little value if the disease comes back again into these herds. We must wipe it out entirely. It is true that under the Triple A the dairy interests have not received the benefits that other agricultural lines have received. That is due largely to the fact that they could not get together on any definite program of cooperation with the Department.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. The price of dairy products is two or three times as high as they were 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. PIERCE. Not two or three times as high, but somewhat higher, about 50 percent, but the dairy interests have not received anything like the benefits the hog men or the wheat men obtained, nor have they received an increase comparable with the general prosperity of the country.

Mr. BIERMANN. They have certainly received a large benefit.

Mr. PIERCE. The Administration, under the able management of Secretary Wallace, would have been glad to extend the help of the A. A. A. to the dairy interests had they been able to get together, but the difficulty has been to follow the milk from the farm on into the city and get for the man who produced the milk anything like his proportion of the money that the dairy products cost the ultimate consumer.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is one of the fine experienced farmers that we have in the House. Is it his opinion that the Bang's disease can be eradicated if the program is carried on?

Mr. PIERCE. I believe it can be. I am so informed by those who ought to know. I am much taken with the argument that this amendment should pass because these are simply reappropriations.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. In view of the fact that we are spending about $500,000,000 to conserve the soil, does not the gentleman think it is well to spend a little more money to conserve the dairy cattle and to eliminate the undesirable and diseased cattle and enable a person to get wholesome milk by keeping the best cows?

Mr. PIERCE. I surely do. In the State of Oregon we have practically wiped out tuberculosis, but Bang's disease is still with us. It is a serious problem with the dairymen, especially the small dairyman, who cannot handle it himself.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does not the gentleman think it is strange that, with all the money we have spent in this country to eliminate tuberculosis, in all our reciprocal-tariff agreements, this country has let in milk and milk products from Canadian cattle that are not tuberculin tested?

Mr. PIERCE. I have no defense to make for letting in from Canada products that come in competition with the dairy cow.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman admits, then, he is hurt and the dairy farmers are hurt because of the importations of dairy products from Canada and other countries?

Mr. BIERMANN. Oh, that is ridiculous. The markets opened up for dairy products and farm products are much greater than the little bunch of territory they have given in return.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I am only stating what the gentleman from Oregon has stated, and he is one of the leading Democrats of this House.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman has not said that, and I do not believe he will say it.

Mr. PIERCE. I am going to vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, the dairyman is truly the forgotten man in the farm situation. I am not going to make any political inferences from that. I am more concerned about getting this additional money to aid the dairyman's present difficult condition.

I have made some rough figures, and I find that since this administration came into power approximately $2,300,000,000 have been spent on the farm situation. There was $1,321,000,000 from the A. A. A., $500,000,000 heretofore voted on the soil-conservation measure, and approximately $500,000,000 on departmental appropriation bills. Out of this vast sum the dairying group has had practically nothing. It is true that they are not as vocal as some other groups. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin simply extends an appropriation. It does not add to it. In that connection I have no criticism of this committee. We simply say that, perhaps, the facts were not placed fully before them. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture was not militant enough in this situation; but we do know that in order to carry out this program of disease eradication, of which the dairyman himself pays the greater part, it is necessary to have these additional funds. The case is fully stated in a letter from the National Milk Producers Federation, which, with your permission, I will insert at this point in my discussion of this question:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1936.

Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CULKIN: The appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the year 1937 now being considered by the House has provided totally inadequate funds for the continuation of the Federal program for the control of bovine diseases in dairy cows and cattle in this country.

The bill provides a total appropriation of $20,500,000, of which amount $7,500,000 is provided for the purchase of surplus dairy products for distribution in relief channels, and the remaining $13,000,000 is to be divided as follows: $11,350,000 for the eradication of Bang's disease, $1,500,000 for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis, and $150,000 for experimental work in connection with bovine diseases.

The appropriation of $11,350,000 for Bang's disease is hardly more than half of the amount now being spent for that purpose. The Bureau of Animal Industry is now spending an average of $1,500,000 a month on the eradication of Bang's disease. This makes a total of $18,000,000 necessary for this work, while the appropriation bill provides only $11,350,000.

The bill provides no funds whatsoever for the eradication of mastitis, although Dr. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, in testifying before the Agricultural Subcommittee, stated that this disease is secondary in economic importance only to Bang's disease.

Mr. WITHROW, of Wisconsin, will propose an amendment today, on page 93 of the bill, at line 24, to change the amount of the appropriation from $17,500,000 to $29,150,000. This will mean an addition of $11,650,000, of which $6,650,000 is necessary to bring the funds for Bang's disease up to the sum of $18,000,000 necessary to continue the work at its present level, and $5,000,000 is necessary to carry out a program for the eradication of mastitis.

This program of disease control and the purchase of surplus dairy products for relief purposes is the only assistance the dairy farmers have had from this administration. Congress, in the Jones-Connally Act and in the A. A. A. amendments of last year, indicated its desire to carry out this policy as regards dairy farmers. At the beginning of the fiscal year 1937 there will be approximately $32,000,000 in the Treasury of the United States which has already been appropriated and which has not been used. The Withrow amendment will not require any new funds, and thus will not increase the total Budget, but will only make available for use during the next fiscal year part of the Jones-Connally funds already appropriated.

I trust that we may have your active support in favor of this amendment.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

This amendment involves an added authorization of $11,000,000. It includes $5,000,000 for mastitis, for which nothing is carried. That is a disease that goes into the milk and is communicable to human beings. An additional amount for Bang's disease of a little over $6,000,000. That adds to the appropriation $11,000,000, and will carry on the program of disease eradication at the present pace. It does not accelerate it.

May I say for the information of the House that my own State regards this as so important that the State itself is putting into this program this year $3,500,000. We do not criticize the committee. The committee was perhaps badly advised. They must rely on their technicians. The technicians of the dairying group in America now tell us that this additional money is necessary; first, in order to conserve the dairyman's situation; and second, to conserve public health. You do no violence to the cause of worth-while legislation when you vote the sum of $30,000,000 for good milk. The cow is the foster mother of the human race. American childhood depends on milk. American invalids and American middle life depend on good milk. Milk has now come to be the favorite beverage of all ages and all walks of life. This added sum of money is essential to the carrying out of this dis-

ease-eradication program as it is viewed by the technicians in the dairy field.

It is the unanimous voice of the dairying group in America that in the interests of a proper supply of milk this sum should be added to this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in the House who has more cause to dread Bang's disease than I have. I have lost two herds by this malady. One of them I spent 15 years building up, and then had to send it to the abattoir. I was the first man to move a specific appropriation for the control of Bang's disease, so I believe I can speak with some personal interest on the subject. We have made more than ample provision for this item.

We provided last year, Mr. Chairman, only $4,000,000. This year we are giving three times the amount had last year.

Mr. Chairman, if we appropriated more they would not have the personnel to spend it. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this paragraph has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 39, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (U. S. C., title 23, sec. 23), including not to exceed $95,240 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, $7,082,600, which sum is composed of $3,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1936, by the act approved June 18, 1934, and $3,582,600, part of the sum of $10,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1937 by the act approved June 18, 1934: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the approval of this act, apportion, and prorate among the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, as provided in section 23 of said Federal Highway Act, the sum of $10,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, by the act approved June 18, 1934: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall incur obligations, approve projects, or enter into contracts under his apportionment and prorating of this authorization, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation on the part of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, or construction of buildings necessary for the storage of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $2,500: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, the expenditures on forest highways in Alaska from the amount herein appropriated shall not exceed $250,000.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: Page 94, line 21, after the word "Columbia", strike out "$7,082,600" and insert in lieu therof "$8,000,000."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I should like 5 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Committee would like to reserve 5 minutes.

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. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, by this amendment I am seeking to restore the figures to the amount recommended by the Budget. Turning to page 16 of the report on the bill, you will see that for forest roads and trails the Budget recommended $8,000,000.

If there is anything important for the development of industry in this section of the country, it is the development of roads by the Federal Government.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman simply to point out that the amount recommended by the committee is identical with the sum which was appropriated last year.

Mr. WHITE. But it was not recommended by the Budget. The Budget recommended $8,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the committee by the use of this map that in the district of central Idaho we have the greatest concentration of forest reserves in the United States. This topographical map of Idaho, showing the mountain ranges and valleys, indicates that it is one of the most rugged districts of the United States.

When the forest reserve was set aside it just so happened that they found in this great rugged, mountainous section unclaimed, unappropriated lands; and in this district we have what is said by Dr. Finch, the head of the Bureau of Mines, to be one of the greatest undeveloped gold areas in the United States. We last year increased the price of gold from $20.63 to $35 an ounce. By this legislation we put an annual premium on gold mined under the British flag to the extent of $225,000,000, yet we are leaving our gold properties in the national forests locked up for the want of sufficient roads. This is a matter the President has taken an interest in.

Mr. Chairman, I read an excerpt from a paper written by Dr. Francis Thomson, at one time the head of our Bureau of Mines but now the head of the Montana School of Mines. He has this to say about the great gold fields of central Idaho:

The Idaho batholith is probably one of the best-known geologic features of the Pacific Northwest. * * * "From gold veins in the batholith and in its roof were derived the placers of Boise Basin, in south-central Idaho, and Elk City, Florence, Pierce City, and other camps of north-central Idaho, all of which were so abundantly productive in the 60's and 70's." * * * (Accredited by the United States Geological Survey with a gold production of $250,000,000.)

The principal ore deposits of the country are steeply dipping fissure veins carrying principally gold and silver in a quartz gangue. * * *

Such veins compare favorably, so far as size is concerned, with the gold veins of Australia, California, and Cripple Creek. The so-called dike deposits are purposely omitted from the tabulation given above. * * *

The lack of suitable highways is such that, under existing transportation conditions, only placer mining and the working of bonanza gold veins could be expected to show a profit.

Mr. Chairman, I went into that district and was amazed at its extent. It extends from Orofino clear down to the great Boise Basin, a distance of 300 miles. All through these mountainous regions are old camps on big veins of ore that could not be worked by the old-fashioned amalgamation process, due to the refractory nature of the ore and distance from transportation. The miners and prospectors have made mining locations on these low-grade gold-bearing veins and conformed to the Government's requirements to retain title to these properties, many doing annual assessment work year after year, waiting for the day when the Government will build the necessary roads to give them an outlet.

Mining experts agree that in a country that has produced so much gold from its placers, the lodes and veins will produce as much or more than has been produced in the past.

It takes expensive machinery and a continual supply of diesel fuel oil to operate the machinery. Until we build roads into that great country we cannot bring these properties into production.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. What is that six hundred million tag up at the top?

Mr. WHITE. That tag represents the production of the great Coeur d'Alene lead-silver field, one of the biggest

silver-lead fields in the United States. South of that district we have the great Idaho gold-producing country. There are a large number of mines to be opened up out there, and right now the miners are struggling to bring in their machinery. In some places they are snubbing it down the hills with ropes on account of the ruggedness of the country and the lack of roads. There may be three or four mountain ranges between the main road and the place where the ore deposit is located.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has expressed an interest in this matter, and I am going to read an extract from a letter signed by the President, dated August 13, 1935:

I think we all recognize the need for specially active measures toward reducing the forest-fire losses in the particularly hazardous country in Idaho and that roads for this purpose naturally have first call on our resources.

Further on he said:

I understand that most of these roads are being built to improve the facilities for protection of the forests against fire, and for this purpose they are logically located along the ridges, whereas roads to be of most use in mining development would be along the valley bottoms.

Due to the policy followed by the Forest Service in building these roads for fire protection, the roads are built to the top of the hill; then along the top of the ridge over high mountain ranges in some places that are five and six thousand feet high. The road traverses the summit and stays there. Of course, that is very convenient in fighting fires but does not help the miners.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Committee to the further fact that these miners and their properties are entirely dependent on the Federal Government and the Forest Service for the construction of roads, because the State and county governments cannot go into the forest and build these roads. Only the main trunk roads are built by the States and counties, and these with Federal aid.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I have heard of a great many instances where private companies have gone out West and built roads for many, many miles, putting in pipe lines, moving machinery in there, and so forth, at an enormous expense. If it is so profitable to mine gold at the present time, why do not the companies build their own roads?

Mr. WHITE. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact we are interested in developing an industry? Those mines have not yet reached the developing stage. They are faced with the expense of building camps, in equipping their property, prospecting, installing machinery, and bringing in diesel oil, and so forth. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the further fact that once these mines are brought into production the Government steps in and through the capital tax, income tax, and all the other taxes, it is estimated the Government gets a profit of 30 percent in the production of the mines.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for time, not to speak on this particular amendment, but for the purpose of addressing my remarks to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, who stated that last year there was spent but $4,000,000 for Bang's disease in the United States by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Out of this bill.

Mr. ANDRESEN. That might be true.

Mr. WITHROW. No; it is not true. First, we will take the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935. There was spent in that year $10,687,175. The year to which the chairman addressed his remarks, namely, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936. There was spent out of the Jones-Connally fund, involved in this paragraph, $14,467,825, and the fund under section 37 of the act of August 24, 1935, an additional $4,000,000, making a total of $18,467,825 for Bang's disease.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman recalls that the original Jones-Connally Act authorized the appropriation of $250,000,000.

Mr. WITHROW. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Two hundred million dollars for the control of agricultural surpluses and $50,000,000 for the purchase of excess products to be given under relief. Of that sum, the bill passed appropriated $100,000,000.

Mr. WITHROW. Of the $200,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of the $200,000,000 and $50,000,000. We have left about $29,000,000 unexpended balance or surplus in the Jones-Connally fund.

We are appropriating out of the unexpended balance $17,500,000, but, as provided by this bill last year, there was expended only $4,000,000.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman is absolutely wrong. Over $18,000,000 was spent for Bang's disease last year.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Missouri is absolutely right. That was out of the Jones-Connally fund.

Mr. WITHROW. That is the fund involved in this particular paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was not out of the agricultural bill for 1936, which is the companion to this bill for 1937. That bill provided only $4,000,000.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman inferred to the House——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I did not infer at all. I made a statement.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman inferred that $4,000,000 was spent for Bang's disease, when, as a matter of fact, more than $18,000,000 was spent for Bang's disease, and the gentleman knows that is the fact.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are not considering emergency funds. We are considering the bill before the House. This bill last year appropriated $4,000,000 for Bang's disease. This year we are providing $13,350,000.

Mr. WITHROW. I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman asks me a question. I have answered it.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman said there was $4,000,000 spent, when, as a matter of fact, $18,000,000 was spent.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman says this bill carried $18,000,000 last year, he is sadly misinformed. It carried $4,000,000. This year it carries more than three times as much as it carried last year.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] should address his remarks to the pending amendment. The amendment covering Bang's disease has been disposed of by the Committee; therefore the remarks of the gentleman are not addressed to the pending amendment.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I realize I am not addressing my remarks to the pending amendment, but I thought in all fairness to myself and the Committee, inasmuch as we were arguing upon the premise that $18,000,000 was spent for Bang's disease last year, I should have the right to be heard on the matter, and I want to say that this is just in keeping with the way the dairy producer has been treated during the past few sessions of the Congress. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CULKIN 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. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is opposed to the bill?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes; in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, the colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, indicated that the members of this committee on the other side of the aisle got a mistaken impression from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee as to the amount of money that was spent last year on Bang's disease.

I have fairly average hearing and can claim at least not to be subnormal and my understanding from what the gentleman said was that only $4,000,000 had been spent on Bang's disease in the year 1935. Now, there was spent on Bang's disease in the year 1935 a sum amounting to more than $18,000,000. Under this bill that amount is reduced to $11,000,000, $7,000,000 less than is necessary for the carrying on of this program.

It occurs to me that in view of this misunderstanding that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle voted under a misapprehension. It would therefore be due to legislative propriety to return to that amendment anew.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. It occurs to me that the essential question involved is whether the Department needs and can use in this work for the next fiscal year more money than has been recommended in this bill. According to the estimates before us, they cannot use more.

Mr. CULKIN. I am familiar with that situation. Dr. Mohler testified, or at least I so inferred, that this is all that is necessary; but the dairy group in America do not agree with Dr. Mohler. They think he is slowing down this program, and every day that this program is slowed down creates a greater menace to the dairy herds of America and a greater menace to the welfare of the people of America, because, as I stated a moment ago, these diseases are, in fact, communicable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York to strike out the enacting clause.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] on Monday last addressed the House shortly after remarks made by me. During my remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts endeavored to interrupt, as appears on page 2693 of the RECORD, after I had made reference to the gentleman.

As soon as he obtained the floor in his own time he complained because he was not yielded to and immediately set himself up as an arbiter of courtesy, choosing to call names and hurl an epithet. Of course, I prefer that the gentleman do that in his own time, of which he always seems to have plenty.

Evidently the gentleman from Massachusetts does not like arch high priests, because in his first breath he hurled the epithet "arch high priest", which, of course, we must assume to be a part of his tenets of courtesy. The very courteous gentleman would have it appear that he desired to make a correction. But the gentleman made no correction in his own time, so that on that score he should have no complaint. The gentleman from Massachusetts attempted the following as his correction:

> He said that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] seemed worried about a tax bill. He was absolutely in error about that. I have not the slightest worry about a possible tax bill * * *.

It will be observed that according to the very words of the gentleman from Massachusetts I did not say he had the slightest worry about a possible tax bill. What I did say was, "He seems to be worried about the new tax plan that is coming into being." The gentleman must know that things are not always what they seem. However, I insist he had a worried look about him and seemed to me to be worried. In point of fact, therefore, the gentleman made no correction in the course of his statement.

The gentleman from Massachusetts further dwelt on the subject of a course of courtesy in a great institution of learning. May I say to the gentleman that there was no such course in my time. None was necessary, not even for me. Neither was there any course in discourtesy.

My main purpose in making this comment is not because of any feeling that the gentleman from Massachusetts can deprive anyone of the quality of courtesy, but rather to clear up a doubt which he expressed when he said:

> On the other hand, I doubt very much whether the course of training in that splendid institution had any leaning toward advocating gambling or lotteries * * *.

I wish to say to the gentleman that he need have no doubt whatever. The courses of training in the institution he referred to have no leaning whatever toward advocating gambling or lotteries in the sense that the gentleman from Massachusetts implies. As a matter of plain fact, they frown upon gambling and lotteries of that character.

I wish to state, however, that that is not the kind of lottery to which I directed the gentleman's attention through an editorial appearing in a leading newspaper circulating in his congressional district, the Springfield Republican. Rather was it the kind of lottery that evidently saved the individuality of Williams College.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is a graduate of Amherst College. He perhaps knows, as history records it, that Amherst College at its beginning came out of the loins of Williams. What is more, the establishment of Amherst brought on a concerted movement to merge Williams with Amherst, the merged institution to have its seat at Amherst.

Williams College did not, however, merge with Amherst. It retained its individuality. It is a great college. To the credit of the gentleman he said, "I have a very high regard for the institution of learning situated in my district from which that gentleman graduated." There can probably be no regret on the part of the gentleman that Williams is still Williams.

What enabled the college to retain its individuality? One of the main reasons was that the people of the district now represented by the gentleman had previously made their contributions to a lottery conducted by the Williamstown Free School, out of which grew Williams College, pursuant to authority vested in it by the senate and house of representatives in general court assembled in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It is a matter of history that Charles A. Dewey, a native of Williamstown, Mass., and an alumnus of Williams of the class of 1811, appeared before the Massachusetts Legislature in 1819 and presented strong argument against removal of the college from Williamstown. He referred to the fact that funds had been realized by the college from a lottery in which the residents of Williamstown and the surrounding towns, now constituting the gentleman's congressional district, participated. Mr. Dewey argued that the sale of the tickets was made in that region of the Berkshire Hills and that the lottery in its practical operation proved to be a tax upon the local inhabitants and that the good people of the neighborhood should not be deprived of the institution for which they were taxed, although the tax was voluntary. The legislature did not order its removal. The college was preserved.

I would hesitate to call the people in the neighborhood of the institution advocates of gambling or lotteries for having

saved the institution for Williamstown, nor would I reflect upon their descendants now inhabiting the First Congressional District of the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill during its consideration have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain letters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on page 32 the Committee adopted two amendments correcting supposed typographical errors. It now develops that those amendments were unnecessary, and I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which those amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes concerning a very important item in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, yesterday while we were in rather a hilarious mood, feeling liberal, even more than liberal, the members of this Committee voted a $25,000,000 increase for the Forest Service, to buy certain lands in various sections of the country that no doubt constituents of certain Members of Congress desire to unload on the great, magnanimous Government of the United States. I understand the Chairman of this Committee will ask for a separate vote upon this amendment, and I cannot conceive of so large an item as this $25,000,000 increase remaining in this bill.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to any amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now, of course, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, who is author of this $25,000,000, cannot be serious in his point of order. I am talking too much to the point to suit him. I obtained unanimous consent to speak, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the gentleman will not object to a brief discussion of his amendment nor to a record vote on it that I understand will be demanded within a few minutes. Let me call the gentleman's attention, as well as the attention of other Members, to the fact that since 1932 there has been expended for the same purpose as proposed in my good friend's amendment, outside of the money expended for slum clearance by P. W. A. and other agencies, the enormous sum of $106,442,856. Therefore, it is only fair to say that Congress has been liberal, if not magnanimous, in this respect.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said that constituents of certain Members of Congress wanted to unload some land on the Government. Can the gentleman name those Members of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me assure the gentleman that I meant no reflection on Members of Congress personally or otherwise. But the fact remains, and no one will deny, that there are constituents of several Members who are extremely anxious to unload a lot of land, worthless and otherwise, on the Federal Government. Let us not cloud the issue. Let us not talk economy at home and vote for $25,000,000 increases as if it were 25 cents. Here is an opportunity to make a real record for economy in government. Your vote today on this item will speak louder than loud speakers on rigid economy at home. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill, with the amendments, back to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCREYNOLDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 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, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Fulmer amendment adding $2,000,000 and on the Parsons amendment adding $25,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Fulmer amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULMER) there were—ayes 48, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Parsons amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PARSONS) there were—ayes 47, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFEDERATED BANDS OF UTE INDIANS LOCATED IN UTAH, COLORADO, AND NEW MEXICO

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma submitted the following conference report on the bill (S. 381) for the relief of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 381) for the relief of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, having met, after full and free

conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered (2) two to the said bill.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered (1) one to the said bill, and agree to the same.

WILL ROGERS,
ABE MURDOCK,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
LYNN J. FRAZIER,
W. J. BULOW,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 381) for the relief of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico report as follows:

This bill provides for the payment of $161,400 to the Ute Indians for 64,560 acres of land in western Colorado taken from said Indians by the United States by Executive orders dated December 6, 1916, and September 27, 1924. The lands concerned are oil-shale lands, and were taken in the first instance by the United States during the late World War as a naval oil reserve. The bill provides for the payment to the Indians at the rate of $2.50 per acre—the minimum set by existing statutes as the price to be paid for oil-shale land.

The bill as passed by the Senate provided that the payment of this sum should be "without prejudice to the claim of said Indians for 4-percent interest on said sums from the date of said Executive orders."

The House, by amendment no. 1, struck out this provision. The conferees from the Senate receded from its disagreement to this amendment, it being the opinion of the conferees that the words struck out are immaterial and that the language of the agreement of June 15, 1880, should govern the payment of interest.

The House, by amendment no. 2, also amended the bill so as to provide: "*Provided*, That from the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the foregoing purposes shall be deducted all gratuities granted to said tribe as defined in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act for 1935."

With respect to this amendment, the conferees had communications from the Comptroller General stating that it was not the function of the Comptroller to determine what is a gratuity. Moreover, the conferees ascertained that these same Indians obtained a large judgment against the United States in 1912, at which time all back claims of the Indians and the United States were adjusted against each other, and that all disbursements made by the United States for the benefit of said Indians up to 1933 have been paid out of the sum awarded to the Indians in 1911. There are, therefore, few, if any, gratuities that have been expended for the benefit of these Indians.

Further, it was ascertained by the conferees that the United States is still trustee for said Indians of the proceeds received or to be received from the sale of over 7,000,000 acres of land, which, under an existing treaty with said Indians, has either been or is to be sold by the United States for the benefit of said Indians at not less than $1.25 per acre. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 64th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 53, pt. 3, p. 2294.) If any gratuities have therefore been expended for said Indians, these gratuities may be set off against any claim that the Indians have relating to the millions of acres of land or proceeds thereof still held in trust for them.

The United States is amply protected. The conferees from the Senate consequently insisted that the aforesaid amendment of the House relating to the setting off of gratuities be struck from the bill, and your managers consented thereto.

WILL ROGERS,
ABE MURDOCK,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on the part of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and completion of matters on the Speaker's desk on next Tuesday morning I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes concerning a petition now on the Speaker's desk.

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

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, what is the petition about which the gentleman is going to speak?

Mr. HARLAN. A petition which was filed this afternoon, changing the tariff rates on dairy products.

Mr. BIERMANN. Reserving the right to object, Tuesday is the day set apart for the consideration of the Private Calendar. The Private Calendar has had very much the worst of it this session and last session. I do not like to object to the request of the gentleman, and I shall not object if he makes it for any other day, but on Tuesday I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include a short letter from the Milk Producers Confederation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE UNFAIRNESS OF RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY AND LABOR

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] may have permission to extend his own remarks by printing an address he made last night over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made over the radio on February 27:

There are two fundamental reasons for the failure of industry to resume its normal activities. First, the fact that this administration's monetary policy, including the devaluation of the dollar by reduction of its gold content, has undermined confidence in the business world and has developed reprisals in foreign countries exemplified by their depreciated currencies. If the dollar is to remain at the point of 59.6 cents, then industry and capital will adjust themselves to that level. But just so long as we have no definite plan as to this procedure, capital will remain in the banks and industry will mark time. Those who have money to invest in industrial enterprises will not enter that field with the possibility of the dollar being reduced to say 49 cents at a date of which nobody has knowledge.

The second reason for the slowing up of industry is the doubt and uncertainty that exists during the star chamber proceedings out of which finally emerge the so-called trade agreements with foreign countries. Manufacturers in the United States find themselves confronted with tariff reductions which may measure the difference between success and failure of their respective industries. They are permitted a brief 5 or 10 monutes for an oral presentation of their cases, and in addition to this the State Department magnanimously permits them to file a brief. That completes the program so far as the American manufacturer is concerned. During the period of consideration by the Hull-Sayre-Grady forum, the American manufacturer and his employees, who are vitally interested in continued employment, must mark time and sweat blood until notice is served that the agreement has been completed and is about to be signed, sealed, and delivered.

Under these circumstances what incentive is there for industry to expand its activities? The net result is that American manufacturers will purchase raw materials from hand to mouth. They will produce on the same basis. In other words, they are compelled to play safe. Hand-to-mouth purchase of raw materials, and the same method of production, is not conducive to a restoration or increase of employment; and if there is any one thing we need more than jobs for American workers, the "brain trust" has not yet discovered it.

These trade agreements are in a sense a revival of the reciprocity policy to which the Republican Party was committed in 1911, when the Canadian reciprocity bill was being considered. But the Republican notion of reciprocity differed very materially from the policy now being adopted by the New Deal administration. Just what the Republican policy was is best determined by quoting from the spokesman of that period. The Honorable Charles Emory Smith had this to say: "The principle is axiomatic. Brazil grows coffee and makes no machinery. We make machinery, but grow no coffee. Brazil needs fabrics of our factories and forges and we need the fruits of her tropical soil. We agree to concessions for her coffee and she agrees to concessions for our machinery. That is reciprocity."

Our Democratic friends refer frequently to the late President McKinley and his advocacy of reciprocity. Now is a good time to quote exactly what McKinley said in his inaugural address on the subject. In speaking of reciprocal relations with other countries he made this clear and convincing statement: "The end in view always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend rather to increase their employment."

That is the type of reciprocity that I stand for and it is what the Republican Party stands for. Granting tariff concessions on such materials and commodities as are not raised or produced in our own country, and that will not jeopardize our workers' pay envelopes, has all the earmarks of a common-sense policy.

The distinguished Secretary of State insists, however, that the policy must be broader than that and that in addition the most-favored-nations agreement must prevail, thus gradually bringing about a complete reduction in the tariff rates not only to the nation with whom the agreement is made but making these reduced rates

available to all other nations with whom we have signed treaties on that basis. At the present moment the reduced rates are not available to Germany and the Cuban rates are not applicable to other countries.

Mr. Samuel Crowther, in a recent study of the Cuban trade agreement, finds that we had an increase in Cuban trade amounting to 80 percent in 1934, and he proceeds to analyze the facts in the case. I quote:

"Now let us look at the other side of the ledger and discover how much the American people had to dig out of their pockets in order to make a $20,000,000 sale. Neither the State Department nor the Department of Commerce presents any figures on the cost of getting the business. They are concerned only with gross sales and not at all with the cost of making sales. Here is what the new business cost:

The President, by an order effective June 8, 1934, reduced the duty on Cuban raw sugar from 2 to 1.5 cents per pound. The trade agreement made a further reduction of 0.9 cent. In return for this concession, Cuba reduced duties on a number of American products. In 1933 we sold goods to Cuba in the amount of $25,093,000, and in 1934 we sold goods to the amount of $45,355,000—and of this, we sold $17,614,000 between September, when the treaty took effect, and the end of the year. A considerable portion of the Cuban exports of sugar—that is, 1,100,000 tons of raw and about 200,000 tons of refined—was held until after the treaty went into effect and paid duty at the new rate. This involved a loss of duties as between the new and the old tariff rates amounting to $32,323,000.

When the treaty went into effect about half a million tons were in American bonded warehouses and presumably had been bought at world prices. But another factor entered. The A. A. A. in its wisdom had fixed quotas for both domestic and foreign producers of sugar and the Cubans had cannily held off most of their exports to this country, not only until after the treaty date, but also until the other quotas were exhausted.

Therefore, they found themselves, not at all by accident, with a monopoly right to supply this country with sugar. Their average price to the world during the September–December 1934 period was 0.8 cent per pound f. o. b. Cuba. Their price to the United States under the monopoly given them by the A. A. A. was 1.97 cents per pound f. o. b. Cuba.

They engineered for themselves a present of 1.17 cents per pound, or more than $15,000,000. Adding this donation to the amount lost in duties makes a total of more than $47,000,000.

This is the sum that the American people paid in order to promote an additional gross export business of not over $20,000,000.

Taking the loss of duties and the additional price of sugar, the new tax laid upon the American people for the privilege of doing business with Cuba in the present year, therefore, will amount to more than $80,000,000.

This may be Yankee horse trading, but if it is, the Yankees are speaking Spanish.

The public is led to believe, as the result of widely distributed propaganda, that we must permit the entry of foreign merchandise in order that European nations may be enabled to pay us what they owe. I hope the American people will not be deceived by this implication. There is no relativity between these trade agreements and the vast sums that we loaned to these foreign nations. They still owe us the money we loaned them in the war period and they still refuse to liquidate that debt. The New Deal trade agreements have not changed that situation.

May I call your attention to the fact that under the existing law the President issued an order very recently making the reduced rates in the several trade agreements so far entered into available to all other countries, 77 of them. "Count 'em"—77. So you see that many nations with whom we have no agreements or treaties will benefit by these reductions and are giving us nothing in return. At this point I desire to state that in my opinion the Reciprocal Tariff Act is unconstitutional. No such unfettered delegation of legislative powers appears in any of the tariff acts, and upon the principles repeatedly declared by the Supreme Court of the United States the statute appears to me to be more vulnerable than N. R. A.

In the recently adopted trade agreement with Switzerland material reductions were made on dyestuffs and on watches and clocks. In view of the fact that Switzerland now supplies 55 percent of our watch requirements, a reduction of the tariff was entirely unwarranted. We had at one time 40 watch factories in the United States, employing several thousand people making high-grade watches. Today we have but three left—the Elgin, Waltham, and Hamilton.

The pottery industry is another victim of excessive imports, especially from Japan. For a long period of years the American pottery and tableware industry has struggled to hold one-half of the business here in our own country. Japan is dumping into the American market millions of dozens of pottery cups, saucers, plates, etc., without the slightest hindrance by the administration or any of its agencies. It seems that the idea is furthered that somehow or other Japan is a blessing in disguise.

During 1934 Japan sent to our shores 8,624,958 dozen pieces of ware competing with domestic production. The American potters' output for that year was 23,000,000 dozens. Japanese imports, you see, were 38 percent of our total production, and the figures for 1935 will be approximately the same. Japanese cotton floor rugs are imported in tremendous quantities, and they displace the use of thousands of square yards of fine wool rugs that can be made in this country and that are equal in design and wearing qualities to the widely advertised orientals.

The recent Canadian trade agreement will create havoc and loss, especially to our dairy farmers who are located in the northern border States. These so-called trade agreements may well be classified among the fantastic experiments of the New Deal.

The New Deal administration browbeats industry because they are not absorbing the prevalent unemployment, and then they proceed by this iniquitous tariff-reduction policy to cripple domestic producers by permitting their market to be sacrificed to cheap foreign producers. What a travesty on common sense.

I wonder if any of my listeners believe that you can restore employment to American workmen by making it easier for European manufactured goods to come into the country?—goods made by low-priced labor, peon labor, and child labor. This administration shouts from the hilltops its good-neighbor policy with the world. Why not begin the good-neighbor policy at home, help some of the jobless 10 millions by encouraging American industry to expand and go forward, rather than hamstring it by increasing competition of the orientals and Europeans who are boring in day and night to secure the finest market in the world? There is a way for us all to help the good-neighbor policy. Let's buy goods made in the United States of America. You not only secure fine merchandise but you are helping to buy a job for an American workman. Think it over.

THE LATE COL. HENRY LATROBE ROOSEVELT

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 2 minutes to pay a tribute to a great American, Col. Henry Latrobe Roosevelt.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation was saddened by the news of the death of Col. Henry Latrobe Roosevelt last Saturday evening. Nowhere was his death more sincerely mourned than in the beautiful little village of Skaneateles, where he made his home.

His fellow townsmen knew him as a kindly, genial, and generous friend and neighbor. They took pride in his distinguished career.

A member of an illustrious family, Colonel Roosevelt added luster to his family name. His first love was the Navy, and it was his last. As a boy he attended the Naval Academy, and when the Spanish-American War broke out he became an officer in the marines. He served with the Marine Corps during two wars and in several foreign expeditions with filedity and distinction.

After the World War the requirements of his growing family made it necessary for him to enter the more lucrative field of business, but when he was tendered the position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy he gladly accepted. I have heard him say there is no position he would rather hold. He served happily, joyously, for his heart was in his work.

During much of the past 3 years he has been Acting Secretary of the Navy, and the strain of the double burden doubtless hastened his death.

If he could speak to us now, I am sure he would comfort us by assuring us that he has no regrets, that he does not begrudge a moment of the service and devotion he gave so freely to the country he loved.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute to add my personal tribute to what has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Roosevelt, whom I have known for many, many years, was an ideal gentleman, a great soldier, an outstanding public servant, and, above all, a loyal friend. He lived up to his high principles and to his ideals. He was kind, just, noble. What more can one say of a friend?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence with the President and the Secretary of the Interior, referred to by me in my remarks on the forest and trails provision of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, may be included with my remarks and appear at that point.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE LATE JOSHUA W. ALEXANDER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to make an announcement with reference to the death of a former Member of this House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joshua W. Alexander, in his eighty-fifth year, died at his home in Gallatin, Mo., last night. He was a courageous public servant who entered public life in 1876, and those of us who were fortunate to know him are deeply affected by his passing.

While my acquaintance with him dates back 25 years, still, Mr. Speaker, as you served side by side with him for 12 years in this body you no doubt had a more intimate acquaintance with him than did I. That he was a man of outstanding intellect, devoted to his duty, everyone will agree. He started at the bottom of the ladder and ended his public career in the President's Cabinet.

Judge Alexander was twice elected mayor of Gallatin, and while holding other elective offices was for 21 years a member of the board of education of the Gallatin school district. In 1876 he was elected public administrator and was reelected to that position. Two years later found him a member of the Missouri Legislature. He was made chairman of the appropriations committee in 1882 and in 1884 was elected speaker of the house. From 1901 until 1907 he was a circuit judge, resigning that position to accept his seat in the Sixtieth Congress. He served in succeeding Congresses, including the Sixty-sixth, and then was named Secretary of Commerce by President Wilson. He had long been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was its chairman for 10 years, handling all the important legislation that came from that committee during the period of the World War. Judge Alexander was the representative of this House, named by President Wilson, on the United States Commission to the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, being chairman of the United States commission that sat in London, England, during 1913 and 1914.

Judge Alexander was born in Cincinnati in 1852. His father died when he was but 7 years of age. His mother brought him to Missouri at the age of 10 and, with the exception of the period he was in Washington, he remained there until his death. He was married to the daughter of the late Judge Samuel A. Richardson in 1876 and to this union were born four sons and three daughters. Four surviving children were with him at the time of his death; two others, Federal Judge George Alexander, of Alaska, and Preston Alexander, of this city, were on the way to their father's bedside. On February 3 the Judge and Mrs. Alexander celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary and her seventy-seventh birthday.

A long and honorable career was brought to a close with the passing of our friend. No history of my State will be complete without a chapter of the public service of the deceased. His loss is irreparable, especially to the family that he loved so well.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a friend and the Nation has lost an able, honest, and courageous public servant.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during the sessions of the House on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, after conference with the gentleman from Iowa, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LAMBETH, for Monday, March 2, on account of public business.

THE FEDERAL LAND-BANK SYSTEM CANNOT BE OF ANY USE TO THE 2,000,000 FARM HOMES NOW SUBJECT TO FORECLOSURE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, going into more detail here than I did in my speech on the floor of the House on February 27, 1936, I desire to assert and submit the proof that the Federal land-bank system of the country has broken down, so far as being able to help the 2,000,000 farm homes in America now subject to foreclosure.

There are two principal reasons for this failure: First, the values of farms have shrunken so greatly since the mortgages were executed that under the rules, regulations, and the law, commitments cannot now be made that can anywhere near grant a loan to pay off the old loan. Regarding the shrinkage in the value of farm lands, I desire to submit herewith the following tables:

Value of farm lands

1919	$79,000,000,000
1920	66,316,000,000
1929	58,000,000,000
1930	47,880,000,000
1932	37,027,000,000
1933	30,151,000,000
1934	31,655,000,000

Farm-land values, by States, showing percentage of value today as compared to the values in the pre-war period 1912–14.

The States are arranged in accordance with the lowest percentage of values, the first State named having the lowest percentage of value of farm lands as compared to the pre-war period:

	1935	Value in 1920
	Percent	*Percent*
1. South Dakota	54	181
2. Missouri	58	167
3. Indiana	61	161
4. Illinois	61	160
5. Ohio	66	159
6. Iowa	67	213
7. North Dakota	67	145
8. Nebraska	72	179
9. Georgia	72	217
10. Kansas	73	151
11. South Carolina	76	230
12. West Virginia	78	154
13. Pennsylvania	79	140
14. Wisconsin	82	171
15. Delaware	82	139
16. New York	82	133
17. Minnesota	83	213
18. Michigan	83	154

From the above tables it should be apparent to anyone that when a debt was contracted on a farm in 1920 or 1925—when the amount of farm mortgages reached the peak point—those farms were valued at 170 percent, average, of the pre-war period values. Today we are trying to make loans on the same farms using a value of 70 percent of the pre-war values.

A farm valued in pre-war period at $5,000 had a value of $8,500 when the loan was contracted. When we come now to make a new loan to refinance the old, we discover that

the value of the same farm is fixed at $3,500. On a valuation of $8,500, 1920–25, a loan was made for 50 percent of the value, or $4,250. The loan is past due, and we try to refinance it through the Federal land bank. The appraisal shows a value of only $3,500, or actually $1,000 less than the face of the loan. On this new value we can make a loan—if we are lucky—of 75 percent of the value, or $2,625. This new loan lacks just $1,625 of being enough to pay the old principal. Usually there is a large amount of unpaid taxes and accumulated interest to be added to the principal. Result—the loan is turned down.

The second reason why the land banks fail to relieve the farmer is because of the attitude of the Farm Credit Administration and of the land banks themselves.

There is not any question but what the Farm Credit Administration exercises absolute control over the policy and the operation of the Federal land banks. Here is the testimony of Governor Myers given before the Committee on Agriculture of the House, 1936:

We have an examination division to be sure that their accounts are in proper order and that everything is handled in the best businesslike manner.

We also assist the Federal land banks in solving various other problems that they have. For instance, as the volume of business has gone down they have reduced the number of their employees. And our personnel division has assisted them in working out the best personnel procedure in order to keep the most competent employees in the organization.

We do not make the loans, but if we thought a mistake had been made we would ask them to review it, and if we thought their policies were unsound we would ask them to review those policies. (P. 938, hearings.)

With the authority over these land banks fixed in the Farm Credit Administration let us see what the attitude of the Farm Credit Administration is with respect to the relief of the distressed farmer. Governor Myers says:

With the passing of the emergency, the Federal land banks are not required to place as much stress on the making of loans and are, therefore, enabled to give greater attention to collections and real-estate operations.

The Federal land banks are giving special attention to the problem of disposing of acquired real estate in an orderly and efficient manner. (P. 970, hearings.)

Asked in the committee if the amount in loans was being reduced, Governor Myers stated:

They have been declining somewhat through the year. You will see that it is about one-third of the amount of loans made in 1934.

Questioned by Mr. TARVER, Governor Myers made the following response to the following question:

Mr. TARVER. I presume it is the purpose of the Farm Credit Administration to have the Federal land banks to meet that legitimate demand (for loans).

Mr. MYERS. Yes, sir (p. 940, hearings).

From this testimony it is evident that the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration thinks the emergency for farm loans has passed. Is it no emergency for the 2,000,000 farmers who cannot be refinanced? Has the emergency passed with them? Does Governor Myers take the position that 10,000,000 people living on these 2,000,000 farm homes are to be abandoned?

Answering TARVER, Myers said it was the intention of the Farm Credit Administration to have the Federal land banks meet all legitimate demands. Does Governor Myers take the position that these 2,000,000 farmer mortgages are not legitimate?

No; the evidence is fixed and certain that the policy of the Federal bank system has been properly announced by Governor Myers when he said:

The Federal land banks are giving special attention to the problem of disposing acquired real estate in an orderly and efficient manner.

What real estate does he mean? He means the real estate which the Federal land banks have acquired through foreclosure, deed, and otherwise. The year 1935 was the banner year in farm foreclosures for the Federal land-bank system, and this happened because of the policy announced by Governor Myers. Here is the record of those foreclosures:

Foreclosures and acquisitions of properties by the Federal land banks

Year	Number of outright foreclosures	Number of acquisitions by voluntary deed	Other acquisitions	Total number of properties acquired
1930	4,645		71	4,716
1931	7,396		413	7,799
1932	10,039		1,369	11,408
1933	5,577	1,039	952	7,568
1934	5,024	756	1,095	5,875
1935	9,964	1,488	1,576	13,028

The amount loaned by the Federal land banks in 1934 and 1935 are given in the following table. This huge reduction came, no doubt, from the announced policy of the Federal land banks given by Governor Myers and hereinbefore quoted.

Farm Credit Administration—loans and discounts advanced and outstanding by institutions under the Farm Credit Administration for the years ended Dec. 31, 1934, and Dec. 31, 1935

Type of loan and institution	Loans and discount outstanding Dec. 31, 1933	Loans and discount closed 1934	Loans and discount closed 1935	Loans and discount outstanding Dec. 31, 1935
Farm mortgage loans:				
Federal land banks	$1,232,706,802	$739,256,321	$252,997,255	$2,071,924,721
Land bank commissioner	70,738,462	553,136,316	196,415,449	794,723,418
Total	1,303,445,264	1,292,392,637	449,412,704	2,866,651,139

In the field the same attitude of the Federal land banks is carried out to the letter. The attitude is to find some excuse for not making a loan. I now report a case from North Dakota where a farmer had retired 40 percent of the mortgage and then asked for help. The Farm Credit Administration wrote in connection with this particular case the following, among other things:

While there has been a large reduction in the mortgage indebtedness since the property was acquired, it is our understanding that the money used for this purpose was derived from an inheritance and not from the farm income.

Letter dated Washington, January 9, 1936.

If this farmer had in fact been honest enough to pay his inheritance on this mortgage he therefore was a bad risk, and so far as any assistance from the Federal land bank was concerned he would have to get out and shift for himself. He did this, and now his farm is under foreclosure. How do you Members of Congress like this attitude?

Listen to these letters from North Dakota:

I received an approval of $1,400 in April 1934 after waiting for several months. Before I could secure an agreement from the lien holders to accept bonds in lieu of cash they canceled my application. This action was a surprise to me after I had made my plans for liquidating my debts. I had been put to considerable expense in making my plans and securing consideration of my application. I immediately asked for a reconsideration, but the loan was rejected. If the loan had been granted, I could have paid up all my indebtedness and would have been in a position to make a living for myself and family and my father and mother. As it is, my husband had to go to Montana to get work. If he had remained here and gone on relief, I am sure the loan would have been made. We will soon lose this home now, and then what?

Yes; I repeat, "Then what?"

Another letter:

I received notice of intention to foreclose from the Federal land bank in St. Paul February 6. I have 30 days to either pay or make a settlement. I haven't any money and don't know where to get any. Haven't had a crop for 6 years. I want to pay up when I can and stay. I have lived here for 44 years, and I have a son 22 years old who is willing to stay with me on the farm. I don't want relief, and my son is getting discouraged. What would you advise me to do?

What could I say to this old farmer? There was not much I could say. I did, however, write him the following letter:

WASHINGTON, *February 18, 1936.*

I received your letter of February 14 in regard to the fact that they are about to foreclose on your land, and I'll do whatever I

can with the Farm Credit Administration here to stop this unwarranted procedure. I do not understand for the life of me how they expect to get out of this depression if they throw self-respecting farmers off their lands—men who don't want relief and don't ask for it—and compel them to join the ranks of the unemployed and the hungry. If this is the New Deal, I have had enough of it.

There is no use quoting these letters further. I have them here in stacks, and those above quoted are samples of them all.

It should now be established beyond any reasonable doubt that the Federal land banks have no intention of relieving the millions of farms now in distress because of their inability to be refinanced. I submit that this position has been established.

Can this Congress adjourn and go home and leave these millions defenseless? If you do not want to let us consider the Frazier-Lemke bill for the sake of millions of distressed people, consider some other bill—do anything—consider any bill now before Congress or bring in a new bill; but do something except to listen to Governor Myers philosophize on the policies of the Farm Credit Administration. Last year on the floor of this House I exposed this Federal land-bank system, and since then the situation has grown worse instead of better. The following is what I said at that time:

HOW THE FEDERAL LAND BANK AT ST. LOUIS OPERATES WITH FARMERS OF THE NORTHWEST AND HOW THE PRESENT SYSTEM CANNOT RELIEVE THE FARMERS

Monday, March 18, 1935

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker:

FEDERAL LAND BANK, ST. PAUL, ESTABLISHED IN 1920

Present officers

Roy A. Nelson, president. Republican. South Dakota banker formerly connected with Northwest National Bank of Minneapolis, member Northwest Bank Corporation, former receiver Southern Minneapolis Joint Stock Land Bank.

Frank G. Wanek, vice president and secretary. Republican; Hoover appointee. Secretary from 1928 to 1933. Now vice president. Chain banker.

G. S. Gordhamer, vice president and treasurer. Banker; Republican. Chain banker.

F. H. Klawon was director and president from 1928 to 1934, but on the demands of thousands of complaints coming from North Dakota, Klawon was removed as president, and Roy A. Nelson took his place. Klawon was a banker connected with the Minneapolis and St. Paul chain-bank ring. A Republican.

Being requested to resign, we lost sight of Klawon for about 24 hours. When the smoke of complaint cleared, we find him complacently sitting behind the desk of the president of the intermediate credit bank, just across the street, where he still remains, entrenched through the power of the Twin City chain-bank ring.

There were, of course, other directors, but they were scattered around the country. All bankers and all Republicans, but who were not actively engaged in the business.

The complaints against the bank still come in and the main complaint is that, no matter what the interest rate is, even if it were as low as the rate in the Frazier-Lemke bill, still the Federal land bank would not serve the farmers generally. It is manned by too many bankers, and by those whose reactionary tendencies render them quite incapable of rendering a service that is imperative and necessary.

I have not made an investigation of the countless army of field men, attorneys, and appraisers, but this I do know, that a great many of these men are "busted bankers" of the Northwest.

In the period from May 1, 1933, to December 31, 1934, the number of farm-loan applications from North Dakota alone to this bank was 41,759. Of this number only 13,377 land-bank loans were made, or 32 percent.

Seventeen thousand two hundred and sixty loans were converted into commissioners' loans, which required chattel security and crop security. Eleven thousand one hundred and twenty-two farmers from North Dakota were turned away, not receiving any help from either the bank or the commissioner.

In addition to this it must be remembered that of the loans actually made, all on an average were reduced 26 percent. In other words, of the original land-loan applications made by farmers only 74 percent of them were not reduced, and of this 74 percent considered only 32 percent were made by the bank. This leaves the percentage of loans made on the original applications only 26.88 percent.

In all, only $73,567,000 was loaned in North Dakota by both the Federal land bank and the commissioners. The farm indebtedness on land in North Dakota is three hundred million, nearly, if not all, of which is due. There is still needed two hundred and twenty-seven million to take up the debt. It cannot be had, and that is the reason why we have had to resort to holiday-association activity and secure State-wide moratoriums against foreclosures.

The financing of farms under the present Federal land-bank plan means in North Dakota, if all loans were made by the bank, an annual interest charge of $18,000,000. Under the Frazier-Lemke plan the annual interest charge would be on $4,500,000 and principal payments of $4,500,000, or a saving of $9,000,000 per year, and with the further security that as the annual payments were made, the whole debt would be wiped out at the end of the loan period. In 47 years—the loan period under the Frazier-Lemke bill—the farmers would make a saving of $423,000,000, and besides, the debt would be fully paid at the end of the period. Under the Federal land-bank plan in 47 years the farmers in North Dakota would have paid in interest alone $846,000,000, and they would still owe the debt of $300,000,000 besides.

The net difference would be, for North Dakota alone, $723,000,000, or nearly two and one-half times the amount of the present indebtedness.

Could the farmers of North Dakota buy anything with this seven hundred and twenty-three million? Would they become customers again in the trade channels? Would they buy manufactured products from the East and South? Would men who have no work find work?

Let each Congressman apply these figures to his own State and thus determine what can be done by a change in our system of farm loans.

Any Congressman, who knowing the situation these distressed farmers are in, will agree to adjourn this Congress and leave them at the mercy of the mortgagees who demand their "pound of flesh", under the Constitution, is guilty of neglect of duty.

Just how do you expect to thin the ranks of the unemployed if you drive a farm population of 10,000,000 into the cities and villages to swell the number of those who cannot now find employment? Will relief end? I submit to you that we are "fiddling while Rome burns."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3780. 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.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 2, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 11323. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first settlement on Long Island, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREEVER: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 3761. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to patent

certain land to the town of Wamsutter, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 3998. An act to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to better serve the farmers in orderly marketing, and to provide credit and facilities for carrying surpulses from season to season; without amendment (Rept. No. 2110). 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. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. S. 2268. An act for the relief of Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11013) granting a pension to Fannie Conrad, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 11522) to amend the charter of the National Union Insurance Co. of Washington in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 11523) to further extend the period of time during which final proof may be offered by homestead and desert-land entrymen; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIRKSEN: A bill (H. R. 11524) to provide for the refund of interest paid by veterans on loans secured by adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGROARTY: A bill (H. R. 11525) to provide retirement pay to 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 in line of duty in the service of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 11526) to provide for the continuation of trading in unlisted securities upon national securities exchanges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 11527) to amend paragraph V of part I, Veterans' Regulations No. 2 (a), Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11528) providing time for the filing of suit in cases where claims under a contract of yearly renewable term insurance has been disallowed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11529) to define the term "widow" under the Veterans' Regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11530) providing for the payment of compensation due to disappeared veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11531) to amend subparagraph (f) of paragraph I, Veterans' Regulation No. 11, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11532) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 by including the Cumberland River and its basin within the provisions of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 11533) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GILLETTE: A bill (H. R. 11534) declaring processing taxes on basic agricultural commodities collected by processors under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and proclamations issued thereunder, and not paid into the United States Treasury, to be trust funds, and providing for reporting and paying same into the Treasury of the United States, and providing certain rules of evidence with reference to such trust funds, their collection, and disposition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 11535) to enable consumers and farmers to recover from processors the amounts of processing taxes which were passed on by the processors to such consumers and farmers but which have now been turned over to the processors by the courts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 11536) to provide $25,000 for the restoring and preserving of the home of Dr. John McLoughlin at Oregon City, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11537) for the improvement of St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11538) for the relief of the Orland reclamation project, California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McGROARTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 506) to abolish the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to abolish the Office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to create an Indian Emancipation Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11539) granting an increase of pension to Martin O. Larsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAVENS: A bill (H. R. 11540) for the relief of Enoch F. Liles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 11541) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hardy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 11542) for the relief of Cecil Lodge, No. 125, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 11543) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Winklepleck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 11544) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSEN: A bill (H. R. 11545) for the relief of Ada Mary Tornau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLOEB: A bill (H. R. 11546) granting a pension to Effie P. Chiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALONEY: A bill (H. R. 11547) granting a pension to Rose Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11548) to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Clarence Q. Pair; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 11549) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Malinda J. Mast and William Lee Mast for the losses sustained by them by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11550) for the relief of Frank Stirk Hailey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 11551) granting a pension to Helen E. Broughton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11552) granting a pension to Lettie Creed; to the Commitee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

10323. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of 20 residents of Shiawassee County, relative to the issuance of currency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10324. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Schwenk's Bakery, Kingston, N. Y., protesting against substitute taxes in lieu of the processing tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10325. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Young Men's Christian Association, Lafayette, Ind., requesting early hearings on bills now pending in Congress relating to the motion-picture industry and the distribution of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10326. By Mr. HAINES: Resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Franklin County, Pa., and containing 37 signers, urging enactment of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10327. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of William Moran, president, National Union for Social Justice, Third Congressional District, New York, concerning the Frazier-Lemke bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10328. Also, petition of Towns & James, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Patman-Robinson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10329. By Mr. WERNER: Petition of patrons of star route no. 59161, from Whitewood to Spearfish, S. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to indefinitely extend existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committtee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10330. Also, petition of patrons of star route no. 59124, from Meadow to Athboy, S. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to indefinitely extend 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.

10331. By Mr. WOOD: Petition of 30 citizens of Greene and Polk Counties, Mo., requesting enactment of legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10332. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Tennessee Lumber, Millwork & Supply Dealers' Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10333. Also, petition of Club No. 1, of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Rules.

10334. Also, petition of the Nebraska Home Owners' Association; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1936

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, February 27, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

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

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a 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, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7147) 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, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

Mr. DIETERICH. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mrs. LONG] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

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

SIGNING OF AN ENROLLED BILL DURING RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have angranted by the Senate on the 27th ultimo, he signed, on Friday, February 28, 1936, the enrolled 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, said bill having previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

COMMITTEE REPORT FILED DURING RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, March 2, 1936.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

Under the order of the Senate of the 27th ultimo, Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, filed with me, as Secretary of the Senate, on February 29, 1936, 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, with amendments and an accompanying report (no. 1615).

Very truly yours,

EDWIN A. HALSEY, *Secretary.*

PRICE DISCRIMINATION—NOTICE BY SENATOR LOGAN

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that tomorrow, as soon as I can obtain recognition after the Senate convenes, I wish to discuss for a while the provisions of Senate bill 3154, known as the Robinson price-discrimination bill.