Law
J
11
.R5
copy 2

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 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 Wednesday, May 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.

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

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is necessarily absent.

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

THE LATE SENATOR TRAMMELL

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association, and transmitted to the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, sympathizing with the Senate and the country upon the death of the late Senator TRAMMELL.

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

Resolution unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the association at a meeting held in Baltimore, Md., May 11, 1936

Whereas the members of this association have received the sad tidings of the passing of the Honorable PARK TRAMMELL, United States Senator from the State of Florida, on May 8, 1936, and having many recollections of his friendly attitude toward this association and his fine public service in promoting the well-being of the United States Navy and its Reserve forces: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the officers and members of the United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association hereby record their profound sorrow and deep regret on the loss sustained by them and by the Nation in the unfortunate death of the Honorable PARK TRAMMELL, United States Senator from the State of Florida; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the late Senator TRAMMELL, with expressions of the deep sympathy which is extended to them by the members of this association, and to also transmit a copy of these resolutions to the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, the body in which Senator TRAMMELL served so long and honorably.

Certified a true copy:

GEO. W. AKERS,
National Secretary,
United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11555. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Marcus and Narcissa Whitman in the Walla Walla Valley, Wash., and the founding of the Waiilatpu Mission; and

H. R. 12397. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the completion of the bridges in the San Francisco Bay area.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 11108. An act to advance a program of national safety and accident prevention; and

S. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of silver medals to the personnel of the Second Byrd Antarctic Expedition.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 254)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department, fiscal year 1936, in the amount of $150,000, to replace a shop building and facilities at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., that were destroyed by fire, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIMS AND SUITS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 252)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to pay claims and suits which had been settled by them under the provisions of law, amounting to $1,708.77, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

House Concurrent Resolution 4

Whereas the Federal land bank has persistently pursued a course in the foreclosure of mortgages against the citizens of this State adverse to the wishes of the President and the intent and purpose of the Congress; and

Whereas this practice has been most noticeable to parishes, localities, and neighborhoods where there are apparent possibilities of potential gas and oil development, this latter fact being so apparent as to cause universal criticism of the motions of this said Federal land bank; and

Whereas these unjust acts have not only been committed against old resident citizens who, together with their forbears, have been for generations the backbone and sinew of this country, but against many representatives of a new and fine citizenry who have moved into this State, invested their all in good faith, and yet have met with the same ruthless treatment; and

Whereas the purpose of our great President and the Congress of the United States in recommending and making appropriations to the said Federal land bank for the protection of these citizens in the security of their property rights and to aid them and tide them over these terrible years of depression, thereby giving them the help so badly needed to recoup from their misfortunes, and to enable them to become a substantial people who could and would contribute to their country's good; and most certainly not for the purpose of the said Federal land bank to make more money with, to create more high-salaried jobs, and create more moneyed potentates, but, instead, was for the stricken farmer and other sufferers who, due to no fault of their own, were engulfed by storms, droughts, excessive rainfall, innumerable pests—in short, by the cataclysms of nature—and who are rendered powerless to help themselves in their struggle for their very existence, let alone pay interest to said Federal land bank and taxes to the State government; and

Whereas we believe in the honesty and integrity of the American people as a whole and believe their inability to pay interest to this said Federal land bank and taxes to the State is due to a combination of the above-named causes and not to dishonesty and a desire to defraud, as evidenced by the fact that these same people or their forbears paid enormous sums and interest to English and Scotch loan companies in the '80's and '90's, as the parish records in Louisiana will show; and

Whereas we believe that moneys appropriated by Congress should be for the benefit of the common people and not for corporate interests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Louisiana go on record as approving every word of this resolution, and that this legislature memorialize the Congress of the United States to immediately take proper steps to have this abuse of Federal funds corrected; and further be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana delegation in Congress use every means within their power to bring pressure upon the Congress to correct the evils as set forth in this resolution and to have all properties unjustly taken from their rightful owners restored to them; and still further be it

Resolved, That the Congress pass all necessary moratoriums and a mandatory act to govern said Federal land bank with proper restrictions as to use of Government funds and proper safeguards for the sovereign people; also be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House, and also to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellenbogen low-cost housing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Central Labor Council of San Joaquin County, Calif., protesting against the alleged action of the Bureau of Reclamation in not observing the California law as to drilling in silica in rock tunnels located near Kenneth, Calif., which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COPELAND presented resolutions adopted by Branch 4, Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, of Brooklyn, and the League of the Physically Handicapped, of New York City, both in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called workers' social-insurance bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the New York Board of Trade, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2134, to prohibit employers from influencing the vote of their employees in national elections, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., protesting against the admission into the United States of former President Calles, of the Republic of Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Roosevelt Council, No. 45, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Lowell, Mass., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 4011, restricting immigration and providing for the deportation of undesirable aliens, and protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2969, to authorize the deportation of criminals, to guard against the separation from their families of aliens of the noncriminal classes, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Springfield, Mass., and vicinity, praying for the enactment of the so-called Frazier-Lemke farm refinancing bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

LOW-COST HOUSING

Mr. WAGNER presented resolutions adopted by the annual meeting of the Unitarian Ministerial Union at Boston, Mass., which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 25, 1936.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: As secretary of the Unitarian Ministerial Union, which held its annual meeting on Thursday, May 21, 1936, in Boston, I am very glad to transmit to you the following resolution in support of your housing bill:

Whereas the Unitarian Ministerial Union is vitally concerned in a national program of slum removal and the provision of better housing for people of small incomes; and

Whereas we believe that the passage of Senate bill 4424, setting up a Federal Housing Authority, will help toward this end: Be it

Resolved, That the Unitarian Ministerial Union go on record as favoring the passage of Senate bill 4424; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, the sponsor of the bill.

With every good wish for your success in this endeavor, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR W. OLSEN,
Secretary, Unitarian Ministerial Union.

THE MEXICAN LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a translation of a letter from the Library Commission of the Republic of Mexico, which papers were noted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations on the 25th instant.

There being no objection, the letter from the Secretary of State and the translation of the letter from the Library Commission of the Republic of Mexico were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 21, 1936.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

SIR: I take pleasure in transmitting herewith a translation of a letter dated March 20, 1936, addressed to "The Honorable Congress of the United States of North America" by the Commission of the Mexican Library of Congress in which the commission requests the cooperation of the Congress of the United States. A copy of the Commission's letter was transmitted to the Department of State by the American Ambassador at Mexico, D. F.

A translation of the Commission's letter is also being transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. As the Librarian of Congress is charged with certain duties pertaining to the international exchange of official publications, I have taken the liberty of referring to him a copy of the letter from the Commission of the Mexican Library of Congress.

If it is desired that the Commission's letter be acknowledged on behalf of the Senate, I shall be glad to instruct the American

Ambassador at Mexico, D. F., to make an appropriate acknowledgment.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

CORDELL HULL.

Enclosure: From Mexican Library of Congress, March 20, 1936 (translation).

[Translation]

MEXICO, D. F., *March 20, 1936.*

The Honorable Congress of the United States of North America, Washington, United States of America:

For 26 years Mexico has been agitated by an intense social upheaval which has attracted to this country, in the process of formation, the curiosity of all the world, principally because it was supposed that it was affected by a destructive tendency, since the intellectuals were few who had evaluated in a spirit of justice and historical recognition the true depth of our struggles which, in reality, date from very far back.

For the past few years the ends of our social agitation have been more clearly apparent to sociologists, politicians, and historians, and it is beginning to be understood that Mexico is making a colossal attempt to equilibrate its economic system and the peculiar racial differences in the Spanish-speaking countries.

This understanding has caused a friendly hand to be extended to us from everywhere, and we are taking advantage of this fact in order to deserve that those more advanced than ourselves look on us as a country that is anxious to attain the culture of the more advanced.

The intense work which the Government is carrying on in the educational field, creating annually thousands of schools, in accordance with the 6-year plan accepted in solemn promise of fulfillment by the President of the Republic has brought about, as a consequence, a keen interest in the establishment of libraries and the development and modernization of those already in existence.

The Congress of the Union, desirous of contributing to so noble a desire, resolved taking as a basis the libraries of the Chamber of Deputies, Senate, and of the Chief Accounting Office of Hacienda, a dependency of the first, libraries which were destined exclusively for the service of the representatives of the people to create a public library, with services and organization which may influence all those which exist and those which are being established in the vast extent of the Republic and, in order to carry out this work, a national library board has been constituted which will function even in the most modest villages.

For the adequate installation of the large library of the Congress of the Union, a spacious site, granted by the President of the Republic who is an enthusiastic collaborator in our work, and which is centrally located quite near the colegislative chambers, has been duly adapted.

Desirous that the intellectual manifestations of all the civilized countries be duly represented in the library in formation, we request that honorable Congress to patronize the new library in order that its name may be placed on an inscription which will appear on the walls of the central reading room, as well as the presentation of a collection of works of that nation, a collection which will have a special place.

Likewise, we beg that our request be transmitted, when it is convenient, to official departments, scientific, and literary societies, labor and cultural organizations of all kinds in your country in order that they may donate to us, through the undersigned commission, any publication, book, pamphlet, newspaper, or magazine of a scientific, historical, sociological, or legal character, which it may be possible to furnish us, dedicated to the library of the Congress of the Union, opened to the people by recent decree, and which our Congress is attempting to make a national center of study for all the social classes of our country.

The Congress of the Union of the United Mexican States, through us, and with the assurance that this petition which we make in its name will be heeded, presents in advance to Your Excellency and to the Members of that honorable Congress its appreciation and a greeting to you and best wishes for the prosperity and peace of your fatherland.

THE LIBRARY COMMISSION.

Deputies:

(Signed) LUIS MORA TOVAR.
CARLOS A. CALDERON.
DEMETRIO BOLAÑOS, E.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4673) to authorize the Attorney General to provide instruction and information on the subject of crime control, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 2111) thereon.

Mr. BURKE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4530) to amend the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926 by adding a new section to provide that section 259 of the Judicial Code, providing for traveling expenses of circuit justices, circuit and district judges actually incurred, and maintenance expenses in an amount not to exceed $10 per day, shall not be construed to be modified or repealed in any respect by any section of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2121) thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7688) to provide for the appointment and promotion of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2112) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4483) to authorize the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Harvard University, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2120) thereon.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 240) to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2113) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 3723) granting an annuity to Theresa E. Thoreson, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2114) thereon.

Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 565) for the relief of James L. Barnett, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2117) thereon.

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

S. 4488. A bill authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County, Md., over Hart Island and Millers Island, to a point near Tolchester, Kent County, Md. (Rept. No. 2124); and

S. 4622. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Alabama State Bridge Corporation to construct, maintain, and operate bridges across the Tennessee, Tombigbee, Warrior, Alabama, and Coosa Rivers within the State of Alabama", approved May 26, 1928 (Rept. No. 2115).

Mr. SHEPPARD also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4658) to aid the several States in making certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2116) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4699) to provide a commissioned strength for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the efficient performance of military and other statutory duties assigned to that corps, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 2118) thereon.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 3866) to further extend the period of time during which final proof may be offered by homestead and desert-land entrymen, reported it without amendment.

Mr. STEIWER, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9485) to convey certain lands to Clackamas County, Oreg., for public-park purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 2122) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9654) to authorize the purchase by the city of Scappoose, Oreg., of a certain tract of public land revested in the United States under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2123) thereon.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 3238) to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees of contractors on public buildings and public works, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2119) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LONERGAN:

A bill (S. 4705) for the relief of Henrietta Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUFFY:

A bill (S. 4706) for the relief of Joseph W. Bollenbeck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4707) for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Fla., and for the relief of the heirs of Lewis G. Norton; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 4708) relating to payments, under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, to dependents of certain veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 4709) authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Delaware River between points in the village of Barryville, Sullivan County, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pike County, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 4710) authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the West Branch of the Delaware River between a point in the vicinity of the village of Hancock, Delaware County, N. Y., and a point in the town of Buckingham, Wayne County, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4711) authorizing an appropriation for the purpose of completing a building to honor the detail which captured Major André, the British spy, at Tarrytown; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COOLIDGE:

A bill (S. 4712) for the relief of F. P. Delahanty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. POPE:

A bill (S. 4713) validating a town-lot certificate and authorizing and directing issuance of a patent for the same to Ernest F. Brass; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BENSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 276) to investigate un-American activities of secret orders seeking to establish dictatorship or rule by force and terror in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 11555. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Marcus and Narcissa Whitman in the Walla Walla Valley, Wash., and the founding of the Waiilatpu Mission; and

H. R. 12397. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the completion of the bridges in the San Francisco Bay area.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 10641) to provide for the protection and conservation of equities of rights of the Government resulting from railroad land grants was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. A similar bill has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and he has told me that he has no objection to the request which I am about to submit. I ask that the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

AMENDMENTS TO FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment providing for the appointment of boards to study and report upon the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal project, Florida, and the Passamaquoddy tidal-power project, Maine, and so forth, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, line 9, add the following proviso: *"Provided,* That nothing herein shall be construed to affect the status under the civil-service laws of any positions created under and by virtue of the act of April 27, 1935, or brought under the civil-service laws by Executive order heretofore or hereafter issued."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 60, after line 14, to insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"Support of Indians and administration of Indian property (tribal funds): Appropriations from tribal funds of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin, fiscal years 1935, 1936, and 1937, for general support of Indians and administration of Indian property (Keshena Agency), are hereby made available for hospitalization of Indians under contracts for such service for such fiscal years, and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing agents of the United States for payments heretofore made on this account."

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 8555, the merchant marine bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table; also that there be printed in the RECORD an explanation of the amendment.

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

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. WALSH to the bill (H. R. 8555) to develop a strong American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid national defense, and for other purposes, is as follows:

On page 48, line 8, after the name "United States", to strike out "(2) in the Panama Canal Zone."

The explanation of the amendment submitted by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

The reason for the inclusion of these words is not clear. The effect of their inclusion is to render the section ambiguous. The section prohibits the granting of an operating subsidy for any vessel engaged in the coastwise or intercoastal trade. This is eminently fair, because the coastwise or intercoastal trade is reserved under our laws for American ships, and foreign-flag ships cannot engage in this trade. The American-flag ship in the coastwise trade has no foreign-flag competitors, and hence there is no occasion for the payment of an operating differential. The section makes an exception in favor of vessels engaged in "round the world" voyages which include intercoastal ports of the United States; but since the intercoastal part of such voyages is protected against foreign-flag competition, then it is provided that the operating subsidy should be reduced proportionately to the gross revenue received from such protected part of the voyage. This is entirely fair.

The section also authorizes a vessel on a voyage in foreign trade to receive a subsidy, even though it stops at an island possession or island territory of the United States, but upon the condition that there will be a similar reduction in the operating subsidy. This also seems fair, because in effect there is no subsidy for the protected part of the voyage. This section permits our American vessels to stop at Puerto Rico or Hawaii on their voyages in foreign commerce and yet receive a subsidy for the foreign and unprotected part of the voyage.

The section then seems to indicate an intention to place the Panama Canal Zone in the same status as an island possession or island territory. Apparently the author has a complete misapprehension as to the legal status of the Panama Canal Zone or has some rather vague notion that voyages with stops at the Panama Canal Zone should be treated differently from voyages with stops at foreign ports; or it is intended by these words to indirectly extend the coastwise laws to the Canal Zone? In the first place, the coastwise laws do not extend to the Canal Zone. Under existing law there is no restriction upon foreign-flag ships engaging in trade between the ports of the United States and the ports of the Canal Zone. As a matter of fact, there are dozens of very powerful steamship lines with ports of the United States and ports of the Canal Zone as ports of call. Trade between the United States and Puerto Rico and Hawaii is restricted to American ships and is

covered by our coastwise laws. Such is not the case with the Canal Zone. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Luckenback S. S. Co.* v. *United States* (286 U. S. 180) clearly points this out. Since this is not within the protected trade, why should it be treated as such? In the second place, the foreign-flag competition in the trade between the United States and the Canal Zone is very intense and is probably more pronounced than on any other foreign trade route. No substantial reason can be advanced for penalizing those American ships engaged in foreign trade which make stops at the Canal Zone.

The adoption of the proposed amendment will prevent an obvious injustice to American ships stopping at Canal Zone ports, but will afford ample protection to those American ships engaged exclusively in coastwise trade against the competition of American ships engaged in the joint round-the-world and intercoastal trade and in the joint foreign and island possession or island territory trade. If an American shipowner engaged in foreign trade cannot make stops at the Canal Zone on a basis of competitive equality with a foreign-flag vessel, why would he build or operate American-flag ships when very obviously this bill does not create any advantages in favor of the American ship over a foreign-flag ship?

Let me illustrate the effect of this section unless it is amended as I have proposed. Any American ship sailing from any port of the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific to a port of Central or South America by way of the Canal Zone could not take cargo for the Canal Zone without losing a part of its operating subsidy, and the foreign-flag ships would carry the cargo. Certainly it is not the policy of this bill to do anything to discourage or prevent American ships from carrying cargo to the Canal Zone. The following foreign-flag ships are operating between Pacific coast ports and ports of the Canal Zone:

Outbound from United States	Flag	Inbound to west coast	Flag
Barber Line	British.	Barber Steamship Line	British.
Royal Mail	Do.	Donaldson Line	Do.
		Furness Line	Do.
French Line	French.	Riordan-Smith	Do.
		Royal Mail Steamship Line.	Do.
Hamburg-American Line	German.		
North German Lloyd	Do.	East Asiatic Steamship Co.	Danish.
Libra Line	Italian.	French Line	French.
N. Y. K	Japanese.	Hamburg-American Line	German.
O. S. K	Do.	North German Lloyd	Do.
Holland-American Line	Dutch.	Libra Line	Italian.
		Holland-American Line	Dutch.
		Fruit Express	Norwegian.
		Interocean Line	Do.
		Fred Olsen	Do.
		Johnson Line	Swedish.

And the following foreign lines are in active competition with American ships on voyages between the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States and the Canal Zone:

NORTH ATLANTIC

Outbound from United States	Flag	Inbound Panama to United States	Flag
Chile and North American Line.	Chile.	Blue Funnel Line	British.
West Coast Line	Do.	Canadian National steamers.	British (Canada).
Spanish Trans-Atlantic Line.	Spanish.	Osaka Shosen Kaisha	Japanese.

GULF

Outbound from United States	Flag	Inbound to Gulf	Flag
Vaccaro and Standard Fruit	Honduran-Nicaraguan.	N. Y. K	Japanese.
J. S. Webster & Son	British.	Standard	Honduran-Nicaraguan.
		Vaccaro	

Cargo for the Canal Zone as distinguished from the Republic of Panama is carried very largely by the Panama Railroad Steamship Co., which is owned by the United States. The ports of Cristobal and Balboa, in the Canal Zone, are the ports of entry for all cargo destined to the Republic of Panama, and for transshipment all over Latin America. It is of vital importance that this bill should encourage, in every possible way, the use of American ships in developing our water-borne commerce with our southern neighbors. If any restriction is placed on American ships so that they do not receive the full subsidy when calling at Canal Zone ports, then the cargo will move in foreign bottoms, or American companies desiring to engage in the Latin American trade will build and operate foreign-flag ships. Moreover, anything hampering the use of American ships in this trade would also result in a greater sale of European goods in the Latin American trade—to the great detriment of United States trade.

The purpose of the operating subsidy is to encourage the use and operation of American ships, and to place the operator of an American ship on a parity with his foreign-flag competitor. If the operating subsidy to an American ship calling at the Canal Zone is reduced and is less than the amount necessary to place the American on an equal footing with the foreigner, then this bill fails in its purpose.

Trade between the Canal Zone and the United States is foreign trade and not coastwise trade, and this section, if amended, fully protects unsubsidized ships from the competition of subsidized ships which engage in the joint coastwise and foreign trade.

Mr. WALSH also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8555) to develop a strong American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid national defense, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—DELLA ANDERSON

On motion by Mr. BONE, it was

Ordered, That the papers filed with the bill (S. 2102) granting a pension to Della Anderson be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY] be assigned to service on the Committee on Patents, on behalf of the majority, to fill an existing vacancy.

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

SENATOR M'KELLAR'S ADDRESS BEFORE TENNESSEE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. BACHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the able and interesting address delivered by my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] before the State Democratic convention of Tennessee at Nashville, Tenn., on May 21, 1936.

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

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it is a refreshing and invigorating experience to drink at the fountainhead of Tennessee Democracy, and I deeply appreciate the honor you have paid me in the privilege of addressing this great representative convention. I do not believe there has ever been a period in Tennessee history when our party has had more occasion for pride and enthusiasm. I was never prouder to be a Democrat.

We are assembled in convention today primarily for two most important purposes. First, to give our earnest, hearty, and grateful thanks to a very great man—a man who at the psychological moment in our history in 1933, when despair, collapse, and ruin were staring us in the face, took over the affairs of our people, rescued us from the awful depression that then beset us, and restored us to recovery, prosperity, and happiness.

Our second most important purpose is officially to give Tennessee's pledge to that same man for renomination and reelection which he has so justly earned and which he so richly deserves. Of course I refer to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

TENNESSEE AT LAST TREATED AS AN EQUAL

For the first time in more than 75 years Tennessee has been and is being treated by the President of the United States as an equal in the sisterhood of States. She has been particularly blessed under the administration of this great President. He has made no discrimination against Tennessee in any sense. Her representatives are always welcome at the White House. He has treated her people fairly and justly. For the first time since I have been in public life at Washington it has been no handicap to come from Tennessee. Our President keeps up with our problems. If those problems are meritorious, he is ever ready to lend a listening ear to them. If he cannot see them in the way you do, he tells you so, frankly. It is remarkable, indeed, how he keeps up not only with our problems but with the problems of each State in the Union, even to the smallest detail. He is not a sectional President. He is not the president of any group, nor of any interest, nor of any division of our people, nor of any section of our country, but he is the active, industrious, vigilant, able, intelligent, and helpful President of all the people whose social and economic interests and welfare are close to his heart, and after all that he has done for our State and our Nation, I feel honored to have been chosen by you as a spokesman for him at this convention, and my most earnest hope is that this great democracy of Tennessee will unanimously endorse him for another renomination and reelection.

HELPS ALL

My friends, Mr. Roosevelt has been a wonderful benefactor to our State. There is not a city nor a county nor an institution nor a corporation nor an individual, white or colored, that has not been directly or indirectly tremendously benefited by Mr. Roosevelt's wise leadership, by his wonderful planning ability, and by his fair and just treatment of all the people of our State. He has

indeed bestowed rich blessings upon us and upon all of us, and we should go to the polls on election day, and in the language of our own patron saint of democracy, Andrew Jackson, say by the eternal we are going to give him 4 more years in the White House.

APPOINTED TENNESSEEANS TO OFFICE

Nor has our President been inconsiderate of Tennessee in his appointments to office. He came to Tennessee for the highest minister in his official family. He came here for Secretary of State, and he made one of our most distinguished citizens, one of our ablest and best citizens, one of the strongest and best men in the country, the Honorable Cordell Hull, as his Secretary of State, and no man could have guided the foreign relations of this Government during the last 3 years better than Cordell Hull has done.

And there is Congressman JOSEPH W. BYRNS made Speaker by the House, and he is the President's leader in that body. It is the concensus of opinion in Washington that JOE BYRNS is one of the most capable and effective Speakers that the House of Representatives ever had.

Again, he appointed former Congressman Ewin L. Davis Federal Trade Commissioner, and a splendid Commissioner he is making in that important office.

He appointed George L. Berry to a high executive place in the labor relations in our country, and Major Berry is making good in the great trust assigned to him.

He appointed Mrs. Benton McMillin Civil Service Commissioner, and she is likewise making a great record in Washington.

He appointed Ed. Albright as Minister to Finland, where he is making a most enviable record.

He appointed Dwight Webb a member of the Home Loan Bank, that bank which has done more than any other for the home owners of the entire country.

And there is Ernest Rice, of Dyersburg, president of the farm land bank, who has done as much for the farmers as any other institution ever established.

There is Ashley Sowell, of Columbia, Tenn., appointed to a high position in the Department of Commerce, where he has made good all along the line and stands high in the estimation of his Department.

There is T. J. Murray, appointed Assistant Solicitor of the Post Office Department and making a great record.

Grover C. Sherrod, Solicitor in the State Department and making a most creditable record.

Jimmy Joe Murray, of Lewisburg, high in the councils of the Agricultural Department and making good.

Samuel E. Whittaker, of Chattanooga, Assistant Attorney General, and making good.

Mrs. Phoebe Omlie, high in the Department of Air Commerce.

Robert M. Gates, public-relations man in the Department of Justice and high in the councils of the Government.

Jack W. Gates, Postmaster of the Senate of the United States.

Mrs. Nancy Harfield, in the Rural Electrification Department, and stands as high as any woman in the Federal service.

And there is Paul Luton, of Waverley, who is an Assistant Solicitor in the Department of Justice; John W. Hilldrop, Assistant Solicitor in the Department of Justice; Neil Brooks, Assistant Solicitor in the R. F. C.; and many other Tennesseans representing practically every county in the State, appointed in almost all of the departments.

Mr. Roosevelt's appointments in the State of Tennessee of prominent Democrats, beginning with Judge John D. Martin, the first Democrat that ever was a Federal judge in Memphis and as honest and as fine a judge as ever sat on a district-court bench, and going along the splendid list of Federal officials in Tennessee too numerous to mention, but all of whom show the President's fine sense of discrimination in the selection of men and women to hold public office in the Federal Government.

POLICIES HELPFUL TO EVERYONE

Naturally, my friends, I have kept in close touch with all of Mr. Roosevelt's dealings with Tennessee and Tennesseeans, with the effect of his policies in Tennessee, and with his genuine interest in Tennessee and her problems, and I can truthfully say that these policies have benefited every person in our State, whether he be manufacturer, banker, capitalist, lawyer, doctor, laborer, merchant, businessman, railroad man—whether president or laborer, minister of the Gospel, farmer, Republican, Democrat, man without work or man with work, white or colored. His policies have helped every one of them, and the same is true of every State and Territory in this Nation.

REPUBLICANS ONE-TERMERS

I stop here long enough to recall to your minds a peculiar fact about our political history. Since the Civil War the Republicans have had 12 Presidents and only one of them has ever served two whole terms. While in that same period the Democrats have had three Presidents and two of them were reelected to succeed themselves and served two whole terms and the other one, Franklin Roosevelt, who is perhaps the greatest of them all, has already served one term and is going to be reelected to serve another.

What is the reason for this? There must be some underlying reason. To my mind it is perfectly plain. The Democrats when they nominate they select the best man they can for the nomination, while the Republicans when they select they select a man not because he will make a good President but because they think he will be a good candidate and that he will best serve the special interests. So far as the record shows, Ulysses S. Grant, and he was a war hero, was the only one of the 12 Republican Presidents that ever served two whole terms. McKinley was reelected but served only a few months of his second term. All the others served only one term, or a part of two terms.

There never was a better illustration of this policy of our Republican friends than their present attempt to nominate a President. Everybody knows that their outstanding candidate is Borah. He is able. He is eloquent. He is a learned man, a man of the highest character, a servant of all the people, and he would undoubtedly make a great President, but such a man does not please the Republican Party. They wish to have a man who primarily will serve the great selfish interests of the country. That is the reason they are thinking about nominating a man like Landon. They care less for the Presidency than they do about his qualifications to serve the Republican Party and the special interests. It may even take a Senate investigating committee to find out what his qualifications are. They certainly believe that Mr. Landon will serve the great special interests of the country, the oil people, the steel people, and the other vested interests.

TWO REPUBLICAN RECRUITS AND LIBERTY LEAGUE DINNER

But the Republican ranks have certainly been increased by two. How many they have lost in the last 4 years no man can tell. However that may be, they have added at least two converts who did not vote for Hoover 4 years ago. Perhaps I should tell you who they are. The first is William Randolph Hearst, capitalist and publisher of many papers. The other is Jouett Shouse, of Liberty League fame. When William Randolph Hearst announced that he was going to oppose Roosevelt, it probably added a million votes to the Roosevelt column. There are probably more than that many people in the country who would vote against any man who has the Hearst blessing, and Landon has already found that the Hearst support is a millstone around his neck. When Shouse announced that the Liberty League was going to oppose Mr. Roosevelt, that probably subtracted one vote and added another million votes to Roosevelt; but when the facts came out through the Liberty League Belshazzar feast in Washington that the 12 Du Ponts were furnishing the money for the Liberty League, it probably added more votes to Mr. Roosevelt. In fact, that Liberty League dinner virtually assured Mr. Roosevelt's election.

They call it the Liberty League, but that is a misnomer. It ought to be called the billion-dollar league for the 12 Du Ponts who have a corner on war munitions in this country, and the others who attended the dinner represented over a billion dollars, so the newspapers carried the day after the dinner occurred. The gaudy display of wealth at that banquet as represented by the Du Pont millions, as well as the fortunes of other nabobs of the Republican Party, was one of the most pitiful spectacles of ill-breeding and political assininity that I have ever known in the history of this country.

It is really astonishing to note the extent to which these lords of finance have concentrated the fear that their vested interests might be disturbed and they pour out all their venom upon Mr. Roosevelt. Fortunately this fanatical hatred which has taken hold of some of these people is more than compensated by the grateful love and admiration by millions of Americans who realize that Franklin Roosevelt is the leader of the plain people and has opened to them new gates of hope by restoring the Government to the people. The people will no longer be led to slaughter at the hands of the ancient vested oligarchy. Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party are not for sale.

I am going to make a suggestion to my Republican friends, whether they like it or not. It is that they save their time and money and try to recuperate in time to make a future fight. Republicans are claimed to be opposed to waste, but if they spend their campaign millions in this year's contest it is going to be the greatest object lesson in waste ever pulled off in this country.

Their plight reminds me of the situation of an Arkansas farmer living near Wapanaca Duck Club, near Memphis, found himself in a few years ago. He had a dog by the name of Bee, and he was very fond of Bee and proud of his accomplishments. The alert Bee, with canine sense and intuition, discovered rich pickings in the vicinity of the clubhouse and his regular visits were proving profitable. Sometimes he would steal a hen, sometimes a chicken, then a beef, and for awhile he lived sumptuously on the very fat of the club's larder. Bee actually outsmarted the clubhouse cook, whose efforts to catch the invader were unavailing.

In desperation the cook resorted to heroic measures. He loaded a piece of beef with dynamite, inserted a fuse, and placed the infernal bait at a tempting spot. The dog greedily swallowed beef, dynamite, and all, and half a minute later the dynamite exploded and scattered dog all over the yard. The farmer, a short distance away, hearing the explosion and apprehensive that his dog had been shot, ran to inquire of the cook, whereupon the cook replied, "There he is lying out there all over the back yard.". The farmer picked up a leg here, some hair there, a bone in another place, and despairingly said, "That sho' must be Bee; it looks like Bee and must be Bee; but if it is Bee, it is the damnedest busted Bee I ever saw in my life."

So when I look at the Republican Party and see dissensions here, discord there, and disputes going on between rival candidates, their lack of policy, their foolish issues, and pile them all in a heap, I am sure any Republican would say, "That is the Republican Party; but if it is the Republican Party, it is the damnedest busted Republican Party that I ever saw." In truth, the Republican Party is split into smithereens.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

Our Republican friends are certainly in a quandry. If they nominate BORAH, their best man, the East will not support him and not much of the West, because the West is going for Roosevelt anyway. It is true that BORAH is the ablest man they have, but he has voted just as much with the Democrats as with the Republicans, and the Republicans are not going to accept him as nominee.

If they nominate Mr. Hearst's Landon, he won't know what it is all about, and his lack of ability would not be discovered until it was too late.

If they nominate the Michigan wolverine, Mr. VANDENBERG, though a very able man, they stand a chance at the single State of Michigan.

If they nominate Mr. DICKINSON their chances would be worse. Senator DICKINSON is a fine man but he has no show.

If they nominate JIMMY WADSWORTH, a splendid man but a violent reactionary, it would just be too bad, even as able and as accomplished as he is.

The truth is they have not got outstanding Presidential timber this time, and what they have got, the most of them are on record for having approved some or the most of the Roosevelt policies. Even their keynoter, Mr. STEIWER, will find himself in an embarrassing predicament when he rises in the Cleveland convention to view with alarm and point with pride because time and again he has both voted for and spoken for the Roosevelt policies.

Finally, there is poor, neglected and angry Hoover, who was never able to entice prosperity around the corner. He was one of those one-termers, but stands vigorously for three principles of the Republican Party, which are: Promise anything to get in, do nothing, and say nothing after you get in. The Republicans have not offered a Presidential possibility for whom they would not have to apologize in some way.

SPECIAL INTERESTS

Of course, Mr. Roosevelt has benefited everybody, but some people assert that they think there are certain special interests that President Roosevelt has not benefited, namely, the power companies, the capitalists, the railroads, and the bankers. Those who thus affirm are not advised. In 1933 power stocks all over the country, in Tennessee as well as elsewhere, were of little value. Their bonds were a long way below par. The values of these bonds and stocks under the President's wise administration have continued to rise, and the profits of these companies are more than they have ever been.

Those who assert that capitalists have not been benefited are contradicted in indisputable terms when you look at the individual tax returns of this State and of the country. The large increase in the individual income-tax returns shows the wide benefits they have received under Mr. Roosevelt's policies, and yet they are supposed to be against him.

As for the banks, my personal knowledge of the facts and the truth compels me to say that, in my judgment, Franklin Roosevelt has done as much for the banks of Tennessee and of this entire Union as any man who ever sat in the Presidential chair. To my certain knowledge if it had not been for the wise policies of Mr. Roosevelt, of which all sensible men ought to have knowledge, there are literally thousands of banks in this country prosperous today that long since would have failed.

But some say that he has not benefited the railroads as he should. In 1933 when Mr. Roosevelt came in the railroads were staring bankruptcy in the face. They have been the recipient of the Government's richest bounty. Their stocks had decreased almost to nothing, and they were facing ruin.

This administration has upheld them, looked after their business interests, and the large increase in the value of both their stocks and their bonds, and their increased earnings afford indisputable proof that this administration has helped them tremendously.

If there is a capitalist, if there is a railroad official, if there is a banker, if there is a representative of a power company in this country today, I challenge him to say that he and the organization which he represents is not better off today than he was on the 4th of March 1933.

When I see the constant and reiterated publication today of the violent criticism of Mr. Roosevelt by representatives of these four classes of our people, I am reminded of a story that a county trustee, which is the tax collector of that county in Tennessee, told me not long ago. He said that just after the war a young friend of his returned and had no money, that he, the trustee, was well to do and the young man came to him and told him he wanted to get married and wanted to borrow $100 to marry with, and he lent him the money. Later on, the young man came and told him he wanted to rent a farm and make a crop but they had no money and he wanted to borrow $1,000, and the trustee lent him $1,000. He did well and repaid the money. Later on, the young man concluded to buy a farm and he did not have the money, and he borrowed it from the trustee, and paid it back on the installment plan, and soon had a farm. He then wanted to go into the merchandising business and he got his trustee friend to stake him to $5,000 more to go into a general-merchandising business in the neighborhood. Later, he wanted to go into the cattle business, and again the trustee staked him and he continued to prosper. There was hardly a month or a year that passed that the young man did not borrow from his old friend the trustee.

And there arose a time when the trustee found that he had opposition for reelection, and he was talking to his manager and counting noses. The trustee said he knew that the now rich young man whom he had so often befriended and done things for was going to support him and be his friend. The manager told him he had better look into that. He went to see the young man and he said, "You know I cannot support you." The trustee said, "Didn't I stake you to get married, stake you to rent a farm, stake you to buy a farm, stake you to the merchandising business, and stake you to the cattle business?" He said, "Oh, yes; all that is true, but you have not done anything for me lately, and I have quit you."

And when Mr. Roosevelt fails to do the slightest thing that they think he ought to do they are against him.

FARMERS AND LABORING MEN

The farmers compose in round numbers about one-third of our entire population. The laboring men of the country, in round numbers, compose about one-half. The secret of Mr. Roosevelt's success in overcoming the depression lies in his fundamental idea that if these two groups of our people are made prosperous, then the entire country will be prosperous. I want you to note this carefully. I repeat that Mr. Roosevelt's economic policies of reasonable prices for all the products of the farm and a reasonable wage for all those who work with their hands constitute the basis of all wealth and all prosperity in this Nation. These two policies have brought about the present recovery. These two policies tell the whole story of the country's rehabilitation. Let me repeat again, it is a decent return for the products of the farm and a decent wage for industrial workers. For whenever the farmer gets a reasonable return for the products of his toil and the workman in industry gets a reasonable return for his labor, the country must of necessity be prosperous. Buying power is restored. Manufacturing is increased. Commerce, business, and banking are more necessary, and when these two classes of our citizens, those who work with their hands and their brains, are prosperous, the whole country is prosperous. In my judgment, this is the secret of Mr. Roosevelt's success. He has made the farmer wonderfully prosperous and the laboring man get a reasonable return for his toil.

THE UNEMPLOYED

But there are many who criticize the President's policies by saying that these policies have not yet put all men and women back to work. This is, of course, true. There are still unemployed in our country and probably always have been and always will be, but certainly these policies have restored, to the knowledge of every one of us, millions to work. There is not an intelligent man or woman in our country that does not know that never in history have our unemployed been so well looked after as in Mr. Roosevelt's administration, and the unemployed situation is getting better every day.

RELIEF

And then comes the criticism that Mr. Roosevelt has spent too much money for relief. Well, Mr. Roosevelt was not responsible for bringing on the depression. It was at its worst when he came in. He did not shirk his obligation. He took it as he found it. He immediately stated that he was not going to let men and women starve in the midst of plenty. There is not an individual who possesses a heart and a soul who can conscientiously condone starvation of people underprivileged and in a depression no fault of their own. Many of our Republican friends voted for relief. Indeed, I believe that most of them favored it. They voted in large numbers for the big relief bill last year, and many of them will vote for the big relief bill this year. Most of the Republicans in the House of Representatives, in substance, voted for the relief bill, and the Republican Senators are favoring the same amount of relief this year that the Democrats are favoring. The only difference between the two parties on the subject of relief is that the Republicans want it spent by the States, while the Democrats want the Federal money spent by the Nation.

Mr. Landon has probably stated that he is in favor of relief, and in addition to that he has accepted $44,000,000 from the Government for the relief of his own people in Kansas. His position on relief and on the Budget balancing was exactly the same as the President's before he became a candidate. He balanced his budget, not counting the $44,000,000 he received from the Federal Government. The President balanced his Budget, not counting relief.

Mr. BORAH voted for the relief bill, as did the Republican leader, Mr. MCNARY. In fact, the Republicans in Congress and the Governors of Republican States have put themselves in such a position that they cannot justly criticize relief or failure to balance our Budget.

TRIVIAL CRITICISMS

But, while they vote for relief measures, they are full of trivial criticism in the manner in which relief laws have been administered. There has always been a good crop of carping critics. I do not remember much about the old C. W. A. There may have been some ground for criticism in that activity, but surely there is no ground for criticism of the splendid work done by the P. W. A. and the W. P. A. in Tennessee or in the Nation as a whole.

In Tennessee the P. W. A. has built and is building three slum clearances, one in Nashville and two in Memphis, to the great benefit of those cities. The P. W. A. has built public buildings and waterworks and sewers and many other useful projects in almost every county in the State. It has done a wonderful work under Mr. Kenneth Markwell.

The P. W. A., under Col. Harry S. Berry, has done a simply marvelous work in this State. They have already built 2,882 miles of farm-to-market roads, and they have 3,000 additional miles under contemplation. They have built hundreds of new school buildings. Grade crossings have been eliminated and are being eliminated. The building of streets, sewers, courthouses, and other public buildings has been carried on.

In addition to that we have C. C. C. camps all over the State, to the tremendous benefit of the young men not only of our State but of other States. The results of the President's planning along these lines have been fine indeed, and we would be an ungrateful people if we were not grateful for it.

PUBLIC DEBT

My friends, others have criticized the President, saying that he has needlessly piled up our public debt. I do not think this criticism is fair. The facts are that in the last 2 years and 2 months of the Hoover administration that President increased the public debt by more than $5,000,000,000, and no one has ever heard of any benefits arising from that expenditure of money. However, in the 3 years of Mr. Roosevelt's administration, ending March 1, 1936, it is true that Mr. Roosevelt increased the national debt $11,000,000,000—but what a difference between the value of this increase of the debt and the value of Mr. Hoover's increase in the debt. Under the wise and beneficial policies of Mr. Roosevelt the national income of the American people has risen from $35,000,000,000 in 1932 to $65,000,000,000 in 1935.

Who are some of these beneficiaries? The income of the railroads has increased from $325,000,000 in 1932 to $500,000,000 in 1935. Manufacturing interests from $5,600,000,000 in 1932 to $9,800,000,000 in 1935, almost double. Agricultural income from $5,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 in round numbers, and yet these carping critics talk about the Roosevelt policies not benefiting the country. The increase of the wealth in the United States alone has more than compensated for the increase in the public debt of $11,000,000,000 under Mr. Roosevelt, and it has proven that his expenditures were fully justified. His increase in the debt has not been lost or dissipated. It was a successful investment in prosperity which has gone into the pockets of the American people.

REPUBLICAN EXPENDITURES

To show the difference between the benefits of the Roosevelt expenditures and the way the Republicans have handled their finances, I call your attention to the fact that during the World War and soon after its close we loaned the Allies a like sum of $11,000,000,000. The Republican Party came into power and it became their duty to collect that loan, but they did not collect it, and that $11,000,000,000 went abroad with nothing in return for it. Substantially, as the case now stands every dollar of it has been lost by the inefficiency and neglect of the Republican Party. Mr. Hoover, himself, declared a moratorium on those debts. He not only did not attempt to collect them, but he helped our debtors to evade them.

And while I am talking about this waste of American money under the Republican administration, another $1,500,000,000 of good American investment money has been eternally lost through the instrumentality of the last Republican administration in permitting investments in foreign governments and foreign corporations. All these expenditures under the Republican administration, $12,500,000,000 in all, went into foreign pockets. The $11,000,000,000 increase in the national debt under Mr. Roosevelt, however, has gone into American business and into American farms and to American labor and into American factories. President Roosevelt recommended and the Congress passed a law which prohibits the purchase of worthless foreign and domestic securities.

Again, under the Hoover administration bank depositors lost more than $4,000,000,000 in lost or tied-up funds. Under Mr. Roosevelt's administration the guaranty of bank deposits makes the people's money secure and the banks are prosperous.

Under the Hoover administration the income of farmers dropped below the cost of production. The Roosevelt administration created the A. A. A., and, to my mind, it was the best act ever passed on behalf of the farmers. It is true a divided Supreme Court, by a vote of 5 to 4, held the act unconstitutional, but, in my judgment, the invalidation of this act was a great misfortune, not only to the farmers, but to the entire country.

Under the new Soil Conservation Act I believe the farmer will continue, at least under this administration and under the next, if it is headed by Mr. Roosevelt, to realize his share of the national income as he most assuredly should.

ROOSEVELT'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

My friends, when Mr. Roosevelt came in in 1933 he immediately began planning to restore the country to prosperity. We all remember his closing the banks which were facing destruction until it was determined just which ones should be permitted to go on, and this was a wonderful step in the restoration of confidence. It is remarkable to me that so many of our banker friends have forgotten it. It saved their banks.

The next step was the Federal guaranty of bank deposits law. The banks, for the most part, were against it, but the law has worked splendidly and everybody realizes what a wonderful step in advance that was. There have been substantially no bank failures, since the depositors have lost no money under the Roosevelt administration.

Farms were being sold under mortgage because the mortgagee could not pay. Steps were immediately taken and legislation passed authorizing the Government to lend money on farms to save these farms from foreclosure under mortgage. This not only relieved the farmers but it relieved the banks and made their assets more liquid.

In like manner, homes were being foreclosed and legislation was passed to save these homes from foreclosure, and more than $3,000,000,000 of the Government's money was used for this purpose and none of it has been lost.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed and, to my mind, that did more good in restoring farm prices and restoring the farmers to prosperity than any other act that has ever been passed, and while by a divided court it was declared unconstitutional, the Soil Erosion Act was passed to take its place, as I stated a little while ago.

The N. R. A. was passed and did great good, but unfortunately it was declared unconstitutional, but it helped both business and labor, and was a vast benefit to the country while it was on the statute books.

The Social Security Act was passed, which in some measure takes care of the forgotten man and woman, and it is destined to do greater good as the years go by.

The Securities Exchange Act was passed, and by that act the American investing public have been saved hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars. There were some critics of that at first, but I believe no sane man would now dare ask for its repeal.

The Gold Act was passed by which we went off of the gold standard, and by which we have recovered much of our foreign trade which is so essential to our prosperity. Talk about our currency not being stable. Why, of course, it is the most stable currency in all the world, because it is supported by more than two-thirds of all the gold in the world. The Nation's credit was never stronger, nor its securities more in demand.

The Soldiers' Compensation Act is a belated testimonial of the recognition due to soldiers of the World War, and while that act did not receive the President's approval, I am happy that that bill became a law in common justice to our soldiers.

Last but not least was the T. V. A. Act, one of the greatest blessings that has ever come to Tennessee or to the South. Under its provisions the waters of the Tennessee River are being harnessed for the benefit of the people as an inherent right rather than as a means of exploitation by New York speculators who would have used these great projects for their selfish purposes at enormous cost to the taxpayers of the entire Tennessee Valley. Already the price of electrical current has been more than cut in two, and as soon as this great project is in full operation the price of ordinary lighting will be from 1 to 3 cents per kilowatt. It will result in a saving of millions of dollars to the people of Tennessee and surrounding States every year for time to come. Moreover, it will put electricity within reach of every farm and hamlet of the State and enhance the happiness, convenience and welfare to all the people to whom this great national resource belongs. This great benefit for which some of us have been fighting for nearly a quarter of a century could not have been brought about except for the active and enthusiastic support of our great President, proving his progressive spirit and devotion to the interests of the people.

THE CONSTITUTION

In their desperate plight for a campaign issue, Republicans and Liberty Leaguers have made a studious effort to indict the administration for alleged disrespect of the Constitution. The Democratic Party has always been a party of the Constitution. It is today and it ever will be. I want to say that there is no conflict between the democracy of our constitutional fathers and the Roosevelt democracy. Neither closes its eyes to the requirements of the present nor the dangers of the future. Both will continue to be as progressive as the problems of the times impose and just as the founders intended. Jefferson himself realized that social requirements and knowledge change so rapidly as to require a revision of policies and laws from generation to generation.

I think my record will bear me out that no one is more devoted to that wonderful governmental instrument than I am. It has my most profound respect and admiration. I would not deliberately violate any of its provisions and I am confident that President Roosevelt has substantially the same view.

It so happens that some acts sponsored by the administration have been held unconstitutional. That does not imply that they were wrongfully conceived, nor is it the first time that unconstitutional measures have been passed. Four acts were declared invalid during the Hoover administration. In most of the decisions on acts of the Roosevelt administration the Court was about evenly divided, so that it became simply a question of the opinion of one man as to whether or not the Constitution in fact had been violated. There is no movement on foot either to violate or amend the Constitution, and most of the comment about violating the Constitution centers in a group who are not familiar with the terms of the organic law and who have either political or financial axes to grind. Our Constitution will remain the foundation stone upon which all our labors rest.

PLATFORM PLEDGES

But they say that we have violated our platform pledges. The answer to this is that they are evidently not familiar with the platform of 1932. There were 40 pledges given in that platform. Thirty-five of them have been carried out. Three of them have not been carried out, and two of them have not been carried out entirely. At worst, seven-eighths of the promises in our platform have been carried out literally, and I want to say in my judgment that no political party, either Democratic or Republican, or any

other party, in this country has ever carried out so much of its platform.

The two planks that are most commonly referred to as not having been carried out are that we did not balance the Budget, and that we did not reduce expenditures, and that is true. We could not balance the Budget because of the depression that the Republicans brought on the country. We could not reduce expenditures because we were confronted with another promise in our platform that we would not let American citizens starve. In that dilemma we would do one or the other, and this administration chose not to let Americans starve, and that plank was violated, and I say we did the only honorable, honest, and proper thing when we violated that platform and expended this money to prevent human want and suffering.

TAXES

Perhaps our Republican friends become most vociferous over the Budget and taxes. They find themselves in a peculiar position. Ever since they started preparations for the 1936 campaign they have been fussing and fuming, orating and publishing that the Nation was headed for ruin because the President did not balance the Budget. Continuously they charge that the Government should either quit spending so much or levy more taxes and balance the Budget. Then, just as we were headed for Budget balancing the Supreme Court by a margin of one vote held the A. A. A. Act unconstitutional and invalidated about $500,000,000 a year of processing taxes. Of course, it was inevitable that this money had to come from some other source, and it was necessary to enact laws to take the place of the processing taxes. In order to better balance the Budget, the President recommended some $300,000,000 additional, making about $800,000,000 in all, and he also recommended placing a levy on the undivided earnings of corporations or on money that was being withheld from stockholders.

Immediately the Republicans turned about face and opposed the levying of these taxes, and of course the only result of their position is that they are opposed to Budget balancing themselves because the most of them have voted for all the expenditures of this administration.

The truth is, we are going to balance the Budget at the earliest possible moment, and I see no reason why it cannot be done in the financial year following this one.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

My friends, in all honesty I do not believe there is a well-informed person in the United States who seriously doubts the reelection of Franklin Roosevelt next November. I will go further than that; I do not believe there is an individual who conscientiously thinks it is best for the country for him to be defeated. There is one thing certain in politics—you cannot defeat somebody with nobody, and up to date the Republicans have nobody with whom to defeat President Roosevelt.

On a basis of merit and in consideration of what is best for the country, as well as in gratitude for what he has already accomplished, there should not be any opposition to Mr. Roosevelt. I believe we should emulate the example of history and give him a unanimous election, as Mr. Monroe received more than a hundred years ago. His vision, his lofty patriotism, and his love of humanity enable him to plan ahead. He is a courageous leader and he takes people into his confidence. He is not afraid to fight for the things he believes to be right, and he is not ashamed to acknowledge his mistakes. He is affable, lovable, even-tempered, and sympathetic. He does not waste energy in anger, but concentrates his great mental and physical resources on thought and deed. He keeps his eye on the goal and that goal is the public welfare. The rank and file of the people of this country are supporting him, and while I do not claim the gift of prophecy, as the situation appears at this hour, and having faith as I do, the sense of fairness and justice of the American people, I am convinced that he has a fair chance to carry every State in the Union. I know he will carry the great majority of them. Speaking confidently of Tennessee, I know you will be emphatic with the largest vote ever given a Presidential candidate in the history of this Commonwealth, not excepting his own majority in 1932, and possibly not excepting the majority of James Monroe in 1820, which majority was 231 electoral votes to 1 for John Quincy Adams.

Before I close, I must mention two other matters.

JOHN N. GARNER

Of course, the Democratic Party will renominate John N. Garner for Vice President, and I hope you will instruct your delegates to vote for Mr. Garner for renomination and reelection. Mr. Garner is another man who has earned his renomination and reelection. I have served in the Senate under many presiding officers, and I say to you that we have never had a finer, an abler, and a more gifted one than John N. Garner. He is fair, he is quick, he is able, and fearless in the enforcement of the rules. The Senate could not have a better presiding officer than Mr. Garner. He has had long experience. He is one of the President's advisers, and he has a record that every Democrat in the Nation should be proud of. All honor to him. John N. Garner is a great leader and a great man.

THE STATE ADMINISTRATION

I want you not only to endorse the national administration today, but I want you to endorse the State administration and Governor McAlister. Governor McAlister became Governor 4 years ago, under the most trying circumstances. The State was overwhelmingly in debt, and its affairs were topsy-turvy. He had a hard job, but by his honesty, his determination to do right, and by his skillful management of the State's finances, we are far better off in the State than we have been for years. There never was a finer man than Hill McAlister. He has made mistakes, as all of us have made mistakes, of course, but he is a fair and upright public servant, and has earned an endorsement. This is a year for all Democrats to stay together.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT RHODE ISLAND DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Postmaster General Farley at the Democratic State convention in Providence, R. I., on May 19, 1936.

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

Up to date the campaign against the reelection of President Roosevelt pretty closely parallels the Republican effort of 1932, and I think you will agree with me that the prospects are that the results of the 1936 election will not be very different from that of 4 years ago.

Do you remember when Mr. Ogden Mills, Secretary of the Treasury at that time, was telling of the terrible things that would happen to our fiscal system if Mr. Hoover was defeated? You perhaps will also recall how Mr. Mills was flattened out by Senator CARTER GLASS on this particular subject. That campaign of doleful prophecy culminated in the declaration that grass would grow in the streets of our great cities and ruin would spread everywhere if the Republican policies of that day and that administration were departed from.

Change the date, and we hear the same moans of prospective disaster reverberating over the air and cluttering up the pages of the antiadministration press. Once again we are warned that unless President Roosevelt is taken out of the White House the country is doomed to socialism, communism, dictatorship, and that our economic system will dissolve into chaos.

Well, where is this country today after the dire happening so mournfully presented as a hideous possibility by the anti-Roosevelt orators of 1932?

I will never forget how stanchly your State of Rhode Island stood by the Democratic Party in that campaign and how valiantly it figured in the election returns. You were part and parcel of the popular uprising which eliminated Herbert Hoover and the things for which he stood and substituted a President who had the heart and the brain to tackle the problems before which the Republican administration had fallen down. Now, I ask you, is there anyone in this State who voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 who has any cause to regret that vote? On the contrary, the lot of the citizens of Rhode Island is much better than it was when your banks were crumbling, your mills were closing, and a pall of gloom and apprehension hung over you all. And what is true of Rhode Island is true of every State in our great Nation.

Instead of grass growing in the streets of Providence, those streets are busier today than they have been in 7 years. Instead of the chaos with which you were threatened should Roosevelt be elected, your mills are going, your farmers are getting along, and the shops of your merchants are full of customers. Instead of the break-down of the national finances, our dollar today is the standard currency of the world, our Government bonds are at a premium, despite the circumstance that the charge of carrying them has in many cases been cut in half.

Let me put the question to you, Is there any sanity, any sense, any logic, in the face of our growing prosperity, to this stale repetition by the President's enemies of their old stories of disaster to come if you do not get rid of the administration that has brought about this magnificent change in our economic position?

The phantom of disaster raised in the campaign of 1932 has been laid. There is no more substance to that specter today than there was then. It is the general appreciation of this fact that is responsible for the surge of sentiment shown by every registration figure from the Atlantic to the Pacific; echoed in every sample balloting, or other method by which the American voters have been able to reveal where they stand as between the President and any as yet unnamed candidate who will bear the burden of a valueless nomination by the convention soon to assemble at Cleveland, Ohio.

I have been going over the files of some of your local newspapers, and I find in them published the story of our depression distress and the almost magical recovery from that period of hopelessness. It is a perfectly easy thing for our opponents to cry extravagance, waste, usurpation, and all that sort of thing. It is so easy that it is probable that there never has been a campaign when the same cries were not raised. George Washington heard them, and Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Jefferson, and every other President whose memory is enshrined in the hearts of our people. Our first President was accused of wasting the public money in the planning of the White House and the Capitol. He was accused of violating the Constitution. He was accused of having carried his designs against liberty so far as to have put in jeopardy its very existence. It was a Philadelphia paper that made that charge. The same paper, by the way, which accused Washington of being perfidious, treacherous, and pretty much everything that he wasn't and never could have been. And you will find similar charges if you will dig into the musty files of our political history applied to one President after another.

Now they are saying the same thing about our present Chief Executive.

Does this sound familiar: "Why does the President seek to make the President of the United States the absolute lord over industrial life and death? * * * Thus to constitute * * * a despotism of which a Russian czar never dreamed."

That happens to be a quotation from a Chicago newspaper's arraignment of another Roosevelt. It was printed in 1908. At that same time a Baltimore newspaper was clamoring that "In addition to persistently bullying Congress, he has gone to the extreme of browbeating the courts until it is evident he would have but one power in the land, and that power Theodore Roosevelt."

I could go on indefinitely illustrating the triteness, as well as the baselessness of all the crimes of commission and omission that are now being attributed to the President of the United States by his political opponents.

As I said before, these things are so easy to say that in every campaign, where they have no valid or tangible cause of complaint, they resurrect the same old skeletons and tell you that you are threatened with dictatorship and all the rest of it.

It is not so easy to controvert the facts. I mean the simple record that tells where we were and where we are. I have to leave it to your own imagination to define where we would be if the people of the United States had heeded the Jeremiahs of 4 years ago.

I would like to call your attention to a few headlines in one of your own home papers, the Providence Journal. Just after the New Year of 1933 this paper printed—and this is the headline: "Grains, livestock decline severely—Year disastrous to farmers as prices slump while debt burden is unchanged."

A week later they told you: "Building activity off 57.9 percent, and General Electric orders drop 52 percent in 1932"; and on the 1st of February 1933 they presented: "United States Steel orders cut to 50 cents on its preferred—Thirty-one-million-dollar deficit shown."

Now let us jump to the new year of 3 years later. I am still quoting from the Providence Journal. "Steel production higher; eleventh consecutive increase carries operating rate to 39.2 percent." And "Auto sales 45 percent above a year ago." And "Real-estate issues reach best level in 3 years."

And yet on the second anniversary of Franklin D. Roosevelt's advent to the White House—that is, on March 4, 1935—the same newspaper dolefully recorded that "Concentration of authority in the Executive branch of Government and the building up of an egregious bureaucracy have exposed us as a people to difficulties and dangers that were never dreamed of when Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House."

During 1935 and 1936, despite this newspaper's mournful reflections on the perils that came with our President, its business pages—those unhysterical, sober-sided, matter-of-fact recitals of what was really happening—continued to record in their headlines "Increase in Rhode Island machinery"; "General business in Rhode Island registers gain during year"; "Textile mills report largest increase." And I might go on to report the cheerful headlines announcing improvement in practically every industry of this State.

Incidentally, a flock of orators and bales of editorials all over the country solemnly assure you that the business increases are not because of the Roosevelt policies but in spite of them. Now something caused the ledger figures of business throughout our land to turn from red to black, and while our opponents deny that they are due to the New Deal, I have yet to find any recital anywhere that tells what, in the opinion of democracy's critics, did cause the change.

Now, let's just suppose for a moment that the figures of business were down and not up, that the banks were again shaky, that business failures were happening all over the country, that the farm prices were at a point where they again took the farmers out of the purchasing class. Do any of my hearers think for a moment that his political enemies would not have charged President Roosevelt with full responsibility for such a doleful situation?

Do any of you imagine that if business were bad the Republican orators and the Du Pont Liberty League spellbinders would be talking about a natural commercial reaction, or a world trend, or any other of the generalities to which they try to attribute our progress toward recovery? Not a bit of it. The whole philosophy of the attacks on the administration is based on the theory that anything good that happens while that administration is in power is in spite of it, but that everything bad that might happen lies on the doorstep of President Roosevelt.

Of course, that does not make sense, any more than does the reiteration of the shrill cries that a continuation of the administration under which we have attained a measurable approach to prosperity means that the country is going to the dogs; that business, unable to stand all the things that they stupidly say the President is minded to inflict, would just fold up and die.

Ever since those people who begged the new administration to help them in their extremity have found their heads again above water they have been clamoring for a change back to the old conditions under which numbers of them piled up great fortunes and multitudes of us were made practically bankrupt.

In vain have these critics of the Roosevelt regime been asked to outline the policy they would pursue if they could succeed in supplanting this administration with a Republican regime. Their only answer has been more generalities, more vituperation, more vague promises that nobody can either analyze or define. They have no program, and their plea comes down simply to this: "Put us back in power and we will do the things the Democratic administration is doing, but because we are Republicans we will do them better." How many Americans are there, I wonder, who would be willing to take such a chance?

Our adversaries complain that the Roosevelt administration has been experimenting. Perhaps it has been doing that. What alternative was there in a situation that had no precedents? Does anybody think it would have been better to let things drift as they drifted prior to the advent of the present direction of national affairs?

Talking of experiments suggests another thought. The Republican Convention—if the political weather indications are correct—meditates the nomination for the presidency of a doubtless estimable gentleman, who, however, was unheard of in a national sense until the minority party began to beat the bushes for a candidate. Nothing anyone of the mentioned possibilities for the nomination has been able to say yet gives even the slightest clue of what he would do, or try to do, in relation to the continuing problems that beset us.

Can the hazard of anything the New Deal tried, or suggests trying, compare with the risk the country would run if the conduct of our Federal affairs was suddenly given into the hands of a man, with no experience in such matters; totally unversed in the larger processes of Government, and obviously with no clear idea of what can be done, should be done—or what has been done? That would be a perilous experiment.

And how has your State fared under the Roosevelt administration? I do not mean to imply by this that you have fared either better or worse than your sister States, because all of the States have been treated alike, with only the variation that their individual necessities or emergencies have compelled. So the same question might as well be propounded to each individual Commonwealth.

Has Rhode Island benefited or suffered since March 4, 1933? Has the cooperation with the Roosevelt policies of Governor Theodore F. Green, of Senator Peter G. Gerry, of Representative John M. O'Connell, who came in with the present administration, been of benefit to your State?

Rhode Island has participated in the use of Federal funds in excess of $72,000,000. A considerable portion of this was in the form of loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation loaned your banks, trust companies, etc., approximately $1,800,000, and another $90,000 in subscriptions for preferred stock of banks and trust companies. All but $500,000 of this has been repaid. Don't you believe that that helped your State? A similar amount was authorized for industrial or commercial businesses. This money was extended to your manufacturers and merchants at a time when no other credit was available, regardless of the securities that guaranteed the loans. You know perfectly well how much this credit did toward getting the wheels of industry turning and its effect is told in the headlines of your newspapers to which I have already referred. The total of loans extended was approximately $5,500,000, one-quarter of which has already been discharged and the balance of which is paying interest and will be paid as the amounts fall due.

The Department of Agriculture has spent up here upwards of $2,000,000, and the other departments of the Government another $500,000, not counting the emergency-relief expenditures.

The Farm Credit Administration advanced more than a million and a half to your farmers, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has lent $24,660,000 on the domiciles of your cities. As the property itself in every case is security for the loan, that will of course be paid back and meanwhile your people were saved from foreclosure proceedings in innumerable cases.

None of this money, or that expended on emergency-relief jobs or given directly in the form of doles, was handed out because it was Rhode Island or because the Government desired to enter into an orgy of almsgiving, or anything of the kind. It was just a part of a program to which the Government was compelled, because of an emergency which the Government alone was competent to meet.

Perhaps the most tangible evidence of dividends in this connection is not these payments of relief loans, considerable as that is. What really tells the story is the report of the income-tax division of the Treasury, which shows that your people paid $3,000,000 more on their incomes for 1935 than on their incomes for 1933. A rough estimate shows that this means that the incomes of your aggregate population amounted to $100,000,000 more last year than they netted 2 years before.

The administration has been scolded by its critics because there was still a considerable amount of unemployment. Just the same, the statisticians tell us that there has been an increase in the number of jobs filled in this State of 19 percent since the New Deal began to function. Your farmers, on the same authority, have realized 26 percent more for their products than they did in 1933.

Those who have sought to stir up resentment among you against the Federal administration suggest that the western farmers have profited at your expense. I hate to burden you with more figures, but just to point out how the increase in western prosperity has come back to you, I may tell you that the increased output of your mills and factories is a direct reflection of the restoration of purchasing power to the agricultural part of the country. For example, your greater gains enabled the people to buy 4,500 more automobiles this year than

they were able to buy 2 years ago. And for a further indication there is the fact that your people now have on deposit in the Rhode Island banks $5,000,000 more than they had then.

Best of all, the bank depositors can sleep nights now, where they used to lie awake wondering whether the banks in which their money was resting would open next morning.

I have talked so much about the evidence of prosperity for the simple reason that that is the only real issue of the coming election. The loud voices that talk of dictatorships, socialism, and extravagance, and waste, and coming chaos, comprise merely the smoke-screen thrown up to obscure the only question that concerns our citizens. It is vapor in its most negligible form. The figures of business tell the real story and it is because of what they tell that I assure you here tonight that President Roosevelt will be triumphantly, and enthusiastically, and emphatically reelected as definitely as he was elected 4 years ago, and I feel very happy at the assurance that Rhode Island will again play its part in bringing about that result.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—ADDRESS BY JAMES C. PEACOCK

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the American merchant marine, entitled "Criticism Versus Accomplishment", delivered by James Craig Peacock, Director of the Shipping Board Bureau, Department of Commerce, before the Propeller Club of Baltimore, Md., on National Maritime Day, May 22, 1936.

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

The past several years have been a period of great distress for world shipping. Subnormal cargo offering, low freight rates, and severe competition for such business as still moves in international trade have caused shipowners everywhere to concentrate their efforts on the desperate struggle for survival. Not all of them have succeeded in weathering the economic storm. There have been failures and receiverships, an unprecedented laying up of tonnage, consolidation of services, restricted or staggered sailings, and a general cutting down of overhead. High tariff walls, import quotas, and other trade barriers, coupled with subsidies for domestic production and fluctuations of foreign exchange—all, I take it, manifestations of the post-war trend to economic nationalism—lie at the root of the shipowner's troubles. To add to his perplexities, there has been a marked, relentless, and heartbreaking rise in operating costs.

Faced with dwindling revenues and steadily mounting costs, shipowners the world over have appealed more and more to their governments for financial support. That they have not appealed in vain is shown by the fact that Government aid to shipping is now the rule rather than the exception. If the Great War accentuated the value of merchant shipping, post-war developments have convinced the maritime nations that their merchant marine must be maintained by whatever means possible—if not by private initiative, then by the taxpayers, through the medium of government aid. Our own Admiral Gleaves, chief of convoy operations during the World War, put the case tersely when he said, "The outstanding lesson which the war has driven home to us is the value both in peace and in war of a prosperous deep-sea merchant marine."

At no time in the world's history has competition on the oceans been more intense than during the past 15 years. In this period all of the countries of our principal maritime competitors have adopted a strong national shipping policy. They have assisted their private shipping industry to survive the terrific slump in world trade, with its diastrous effect on shipping, by the liberal extension of Government credit or by private credit guaranteed by the Government; the renewal and extension of contract services in their essential trade routes; construction loans at low rates of interest; construction bounties; navigation bounties and other forms of aid. The adherence to such a policy by these countries has enabled foreign shipowners to scrap millions of tons of obsolete ships and to build new ones. It has not only enabled our competitors to maintain their relative competitive status in the trade routes of the world but has greatly enhanced and strengthened their position by the introduction of high-speed passenger ships, combination ships, and fast cargo liners. It would have been impossible for private capital to finance, without liberal Government assistance, such ships in the important North Atlantic passenger service as the *Rex*, the *Normandie*, and the *Queen Mary*.

Under these circumstances, how can American shipping meet foreign competition successfully without adequate Government assistance when the capital and operating costs of American ships are far greater than those of any of our foreign competitors?

During the depression American shipping has experienced all the vicissitudes which have beset the merchant marine of other nations. In addition it has had to face, continuously for the past 3 years, a heavy barrage of high-powered criticism, orginating, strangely enough, not in the countries of its competitors, but among our own people. From every direction the pitiless spotlight of publicity has been turned upon its every weakness and shortcoming, leaving its virtues obscured in the shadows.

Such a steady stream of adverse criticism has poured forth from congressional and departmental investigations and hearings and debates, from news and editorial writers and columnists of influential papers, from after-dinner speakers, and even from radio commentators, that the man in the street can scarcely be blamed if he has come to believe that our shipping situation constitutes a veritable public scandal and nothing more.

It would be a waste of your time and mine if I should attempt to analyze in detail the many charges which have been made against the operators of American ships. These charges have been given wide circulation and have gained wide credence. Many of them are one-sided and carry their own refutation, as, for example, the sweeping charge in a recent report that instead of an adequate American merchant marine, the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 has produced unconscionable exploiters, intent upon wringing every possible penny from the public purse, while giving an absolute minimum of service in return.

Admittedly the act of 1928 has failed to produce an adequate merchant marine since it has not brought about the building of much-needed cargo liners. But when we say this we should at the same time present the other side of the picture and add that the 33 vessels built under the act's provisions, at a cost of approximately $144,500,000, are, for the size and type, as modern and efficient as any in the world, and that they represent the finest merchant fleet ever assembled under the American flag since the advent of steam.

Much the same objection may be taken to a reference in the same report to what is called the myth of private ownership, and to the repeated attempts made to show that the Government's mortgage liens and equities are so great that our merchant marine is in effect owned by the Government, rather than by private American interests. Here again only a part of the picture is revealed by the floodlight of unfavorable publicity which has been thrown upon the merchant marine. I shall take the opportunity in a moment or so to refer more fully to the status of debtor shipowners.

I hold no brief for the individual American shipowner, but as Director of the Shipping Board Bureau I do hold a brief for the American merchant marine. You will understand that in saying this I in nowise condone the abuses and improper practices which have been indulged in by some members of the industry. I offer neither apologies nor excuses for those who have overstepped the proprieties, or who for personal or corporate gain have been guilty of breach of faith, if not of contract, with the American people. The point I wish to make is that there has been enough criticism of the abuses of the past. Surely the American merchant marine finds its natural economic handicaps burdensome enough, without this added handicap. What it sorely needs—though in some quarters it is not the fashion to say so—is sympathetic and constructive help. We cannot permit the recent flood of adverse criticism to make us waiver in our allegiance to one of the country's most essential industries. We cannot proceed on the false assumption that its greatness has forever vanished; that its former virtues have degenerated into vices; that no hope remains of perpetuating its glorious traditions.

Believing that it is high time we shifted the spotlight so as also to show other and more favorable parts of the picture, I propose in my remarks tonight to point out that one can find real achievement and substantial progress even in this supposedly dark age of the merchant marine. I shall try to show that the history of the past few years, if rightly interpreted, gives ample assurance that we still have the foundation upon which to build an era of maritime achievement surpassing in glory even the golden era of a century ago.

The outstanding accomplishment which must be placed to the credit of the American merchant marine in recent years is the maintenance, on every one of the country's essential trade routes, of regular and dependable service during this entire period of unparalleled stress in shipping and foreign trade. Here is a record that will bear favorable comparison with the showing made by any other merchant marine in the world, a record which is all the more remarkable when we consider the obsolete types of cargo ships which comprise the greater part of our fleet. Not only have these services been maintained but the percentage of American waterborne foreign commerce carried in American bottoms has held constant, even during the worst years of the depression. What better testimony could be offered to prove the zeal and enterprise displayed by American operators in the face of conditions which have driven many of their foreign competitors out of business?

Although I am reluctant to bring statistics into a speech of this sort, a few figures are necessary if I am to avoid the charge of dealing only in glittering generalities. Let me state, then, that for the past 14 years American ships have carried an average of approximately 34.3 percent of the total value of our foreign waterborne commerce, ranging between a low of 32.2 percent in 1926 and a high of 36.5 percent in 1933. Now, in analyzing these figures, the interesting fact develops that during the past 7 years—the period of the great depression—the yearly average is found to be somewhat higher than for the 7 years preceding the depression. Does anyone suppose that this just happened by chance or accident? I for one give credit to the business acumen, the ingenuity, and the dogged determination of the American shipowner, who, refusing to take the depression lying down, rolled up his sleeves, improved and intensified his methods of freight solicitation, and more than maintained his relative position while the rest of the business world was in the doldrums praying for a favorable breeze.

There can be no doubt that the new ships constructed under the much-criticized Merchant Marine Act of 1928 have helped American operators to hold their own during the trying years of the depression.

The two splendid passenger vessels built for operation in the North Atlantic have proved so popular that they have revolutionized the entire passenger rate and classification structure in the

world's outstanding ocean passenger route. During the travel season accommodations on these vessels have been taxed to capacity. For some months negotiations have been under way looking to the construction of a third vessel of the same type and size, though with still more modern equipment, with a view to rounding out this service on a weekly basis and securing a still greater share of the rich passenger traffic of the North Atlantic.

Four new vessels built for service from North Atlantic ports to ports on the Mediterranean Sea have also given an excellent account of themselves, as have the five outstanding passenger ships built under the provisions of the 1928 act for service on the Pacific. The all-round efficiency of these vessels, coupled with their excellent service and moderately priced fares, accounts for the high place they have won in the estimation of discerning patrons. If the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 had done nothing else, it would still deserve our gratitude for the way it has demonstrated that whenever the American shipowner is in a position to offer service comparable with, or superior to, the service furnished by foreign shipowners, the patronage of American shippers and travelers will gravitate to the ship flying the American flag.

The four new combination cargo and passenger vessels built for service to the west coast of Central and South America tell the same story. For their type and size they are as attractive and efficient as any ships ever built, and like other vessels constructed under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 they have won great favor with the shipping and traveling public. In view of recent criticism of American ships from the standpoint of safety, I think it well to point out that all the passenger-carrying ships built with Government aid since 1928 have exceeded the requirements laid down by the London Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, notwithstanding that this important treaty has not yet been ratified by the United States.

All told, as I have pointed out, 33 new and splendid ships, costing approximately $144,500,000, have been built under the 1928 act. The conversion or reconditioning of 42 old vessels, with a view to increasing their speed, installing refrigerator space, or making other betterments, has involved an additional expenditure of $17,700,000, making a total outlay of approximately $162,200,000 for modernizing the fleet during the depression years. The result is that our immediate needs in our principal passenger-carrying trades are, with a few notable exceptions, reasonably well taken care of. Our need for new cargo liners remains, however, a matter of very real concern.

A fair appraisal of the figures I have just quoted will show the unfairness of the highly critical views so frequently expressed as to the progress made in building up American shipping since the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928. When we consider the employment benefits accruing to American labor through the expenditure of $162,200,000 for building or reconditioning these 75 ships, the added millions paid to American seamen employed to run the newly built vessels, and the increased prestige enjoyed by the American-flag services in which the ships have been operated, it is decidedly unfair to imply that the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 was barren of worth-while results. The chief defects of the act were that it disguised the nature of the subsidy; that it did not make mandatory the replacement of obsolete tonnage, and that the method prescribed for determining the amount of Government aid was loose and open to abuses if not properly administered. More than counterbalancing these admittedly serious defects, however, the fact stands out—and I believe that it will be given full recognition when the maritime history of the post-war era is finally written—that but for the subsidy provisions of the act of 1928, few American lines, other than the so-called industrial carriers, would ever have survived the depression.

As pointed out a moment ago, the critics charge that while American shipowners have taken advantage of the liberal provisions of the 1928 act to build or recondition a number of ships, and have also purchased Government tonnage at market prices or less, they have been so slow in meeting their financial obligations to the Government that, in effect if not in law, the ships are owned by the mortgagee—in other words, by the Government. Here again the spotlight of adverse criticism reveals only part of the picture. I would like to show you the other part—made up of facts which I think speak for themselves.

On August 9, 1933, when the Presidential order abolishing the Shipping Board and transferring its activities to the Department of Commerce became effective, outstanding ship sales and construction-loan mortgages amounted to $154,742,561.80. Today that total has been reduced to $105,728,539.77. In other words, in less than 3 years $49,014,022.03, or almost one-third of the total, has been paid back to the Government, notwithstanding that by the terms of the loans most of them were to run for 15 or 20 years.

On the same date—August 9, 1933—13 active companies were in arrears on such mortgages. Since then only 2 small companies have been added to the list, while on the other hand 6 of the original 13 have completely paid up all arrearages. A seventh has for more than 2 years been making regular payments on a schedule which has already reduced its arrearages from $353,300 to $169,600, with every indication that it will be completely caught up on its payments by November of this year. Two of the six other companies still in default are in appreciably sounder financial condition than they were a year ago, and only two of them have had occasion to resort to receivership.

I submit that in all fairness to the American shipowner these facts deserve as widespread publicity as that which has been accorded the pessimistic reports of recent years. I do not believe that the American people want Government ownership and operation of industry, even though the industry be one which is so highly specialized, so difficult to manage, and so hazardous from the standpoint of financial returns as the American merchant marine. Our former maritime glory, wrested from our competitors in those far-off days of "wooden ships and iron men", was achieved under private American ownership. On the other hand our post-war experience with Government ownership and operation was marked by so much waste and inefficiency that I, for one, hope that it will never be repeated.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—ADDRESS BY DANIEL W. MAC CORMACK

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Would Happen if All Aliens Were Deported?" delivered in Atlantic City, N. J., on May 26, 1936, by Col. Daniel W. MacCormack, United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, upon the occasion of the National Conference on Social Work.

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

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF ALL ALIENS WERE DEPORTED?

It has been proposed as a simple cure for the depression that all aliens living in the United States should be summarily deported. The advocates of this measure usually argue that there are ten or twelve million aliens holding jobs in this country and an equal number of American citizens out of work. If the aliens are expelled, the idle citizens will step into their shoes, and, presto, the unemployment problem is solved.

Well, that may sound plausible enough in a stump speech or a rabble-rousing editorial, but it will not stand analysis. Let us examine this economic cure-all.

In the first place, those people who find the alien so convenient a scapegoat are careless about statistics. They invariably exaggerate the number of aliens in the United States. If the alien is a menace, as they claim, then the more aliens the greater the menace. It is easier to make our flesh creep when they multiply the figures by two or three. The number of aliens who are really living here today can be estimated with approximate accuracy. We know how many there were in 1930, at the time of the last census, for then they were carefully counted. We know that the recorded departures since 1930 have exceeded the recorded admissions by nearly 200,000. We know how many aliens have been naturalized since then, and we can estimate how many have died. On the basis of these figures the statisticians of the Immigration and Naturalization Service computed that the number of aliens in the United States today is 4,500,000.

We do not know how many of these 4,500,000 aliens are employed, but we do know that 4.5 percent of them are under 21 years of age, and that 43.7 percent are over 50 years of age. Included in these two groups there must be children too young and men and women too old to work. Slightly more than half of the 4,500,000 are females, and it is safe to assume that many of these are housewives and dependents. Just over a million aliens in this country are males between 20 and 50 years of age.

So the number of jobs which theoretically would remain to be filled by Americans after the expulsion of the aliens shrinks considerably.

Of course, it is by no means certain that the jobs vacated by aliens would be immediately or even eventually filled by Americans. Some of these jobs Americans would not readily accept, and for others they would not be qualified. I need not elaborate this point, but as a single example may I cite the agricultural labor performed by itinerant Mexicans in the Southwest. Perhaps southwestern agriculture would be organized ultimately on a different and possibly a better basis and Americans might be induced to enter into domestic and other personal services they now refuse as menial, but I merely wish to suggest that in many instances the immediate result of wholesale deportations would be not more jobs for Americans but the ruin of enterprises now dependent on alien labor or alien patronage.

I have said that there are something less than 4,500,000 aliens in the United States, and I have pointed out that by no means all of these are gainfully employed or competing in the labor market with American citizens. However, every one of these aliens is a consumer. The elimination of 4,500,000 consumers from the American market would be felt by every farmer and every manufacturer in the country. In certain localities the results would be disastrous. When the census of 1930 was taken there were 1,128,217 aliens in New York City. I suppose that there are nearly as many there today. I leave to your imagination what would be the effect on New York real estate, retail trade, and every business activity if 1,000,000 people were suddenly and permanently removed from the city. The results of mass deportation would be almost equally catastrophic in Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, and many other cities and towns with a relatively large alien population.

It seems to me that if we want to start another depression on the heels of the last one, this would be an excellent way to go about it.

Socially the alien is not an isolated unit. He has varied contacts and affiliations. Frequently he has an American wife and American-born children. Preliminary reports of a test survey of alien families by a social agency indicate that the average alien here has two American-citizen members of his family. These

dependents cannot be deported. Even if they elect to go into voluntary exile with the expelled husband and father, they may find that his native country will refuse to admit them. If we deport four and a half million aliens we will impose a quasi divorce and permanent separation on hundreds of thousands of American wives encumbered with children rendered fatherless by the same governmental act and deprived of their natural expectation of a normal and happy life. In other cases it may be the alien mother who is expelled, leaving husband and children behind.

Perhaps a truly patriotic economist and statesman can regard this wholesale destruction of families and wrecking of human lives with equanimity if only the goal is attained—more jobs for citizens. I fear that not many of us can take this detached and philosophic view. The whole procedure smacks too much of cannibalism. It recalls the shipwrecked mariners who, when they grew hungry, converted the cabin boy into steaks and chops. It may have been a sound idea but repugnant to one of a squeamish disposition.

But this idea of wholesale deportations is not even sound. The mere physical difficulties incident to the deportation of four and one-half million aliens deserve some consideration. More than half of them certainly would be destined to Europe. In 1917 and 1918 we sent approximately 2,000,000 men to France. It took all of our own shipping and all we could beg or borrow from our Allies. We were dealing then with men only, and with young men in sound health, who could endure a reasonable amount of discomfort and hardship. They slept in hammocks slung in cargo holds and in triple-deck bunks. To transport the same number of aliens of both sexes and all ages, including the sick and the infirm, would require a vastly greater tonnage. It could be done if it had to be done, but it would be a complicated and difficult undertaking and would take years to complete.

There remains a more serious obstacle which, as far as I know, the advocates of mass deportation have never taken into account. This is the probable reaction of the other nations of the world. Deportation, after all, is a transaction in which the country to which the alien is destined is no less concerned than the country from which he is expelled. We already find that in many cases in which deportation is mandatory under our law we cannot proceed because the alien's native land regards him as an expatriate and refuses to permit him to return.

If we undertake to deport all aliens, I think we may anticipate that the nations of the whole world will protest most vigorously, not only because of the hardship imposed on their citizens who came here in good faith and were legally admitted for permanent residence, but also because of the complication of their own domestic problems which would follow the enforced return of hundreds of thousands of their citizens who had severed all ties with the homeland and could not be easily reabsorbed in the national framework. This protest almost certainly would go to the length of a categorical refusal to admit these returning citizens. At any rate, international relations would be seriously strained to the detriment of our national prestige, accompanied on a material plane, if that alone must be considered, by a serious loss of the goodwill which makes for foreign trade.

To sum up, if we deported all the aliens in the United States it might indeed result in the employment of some citizens who cannot now find jobs, but not nearly so many as the advocates of this measure suppose. This would be offset by a serious dislocation of business due to the loss of four and one-half million consumers. The effects would be felt over the whole country, including those sections which have little or no alien population but must find an outlet for their products in the national market. In cities and towns with a large alien population the results would be no less than catastrophic.

Certain branches of agriculture, industry, and trade which employ alien labor or depend on alien patronage would face difficult readjustments. The sum total of these economic losses would far outweigh any gains that might reasonably be expected, and in the end for every citizen who found a job by stepping into an alien's shoes another somewhere would be thrown out of work.

In any case the whole scheme is impracticable for the one reason that it could not be carried to conclusion without the consent and the cooperation of the principal nations of the world, which would certainly refuse, both on grounds of equity and from motives of self-interest.

I will not stress the moral objections, except to say that these aliens came here with our consent if not on our invitation, usually burning their bridges behind them. Hence we would seem to be under some obligation to consider their interests as well as our own. With the inevitable byproduct of wrecked homes, women widowed, and children made orphans by administrative decree I have already dealt.

There is one final point which I wish that I could impress on those nervous citizens to whom the alien is an alarming bugaboo. Just this: To all intents, immigration has ceased. During the past 5 years more aliens left the United States than were admitted. In April 1930 the census enumerators found 6,234,613 aliens here. Many of these have since died. Others have been naturalized. We now have an alien population of about 4,500,000. Of these, approximately 1,500,000 have taken the first step toward naturalization. They are aliens today but they will be citizens tomorrow.

If the present policy of restrictive immigration is maintained, and it undoubtedly will be for years to come, the alien population of the United States will, in 10 years, be reduced almost to the vanishing point. Even foreign-born citizens will not be numerous, for most of them are in the higher age groups and rapidly dying off, and the new immigration from which they derive is reduced to a minimum. By 1946 it may be as hard to find an alien in the United States as a wild buffalo. Then even the professional patriots can sleep in peace.

DEBTS DUE THE UNITED STATES BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Dallas Journal of the 18th instant, entitled "France Remembers", having relation to the debts due the United States by foreign governments.

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

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Journal of May 18, 1936]

FRANCE REMEMBERS

Leon Blum says that France is interested in coming to a debt settlement with the United States. England is mumbling something about the idea also. But America ought to be clear-eyed in greeting such approaches. As realists, we can afford to reflect that Europe has come to understand two things: (1) Another world war is threatened. (2) Another world war without another Uncle Sam to furnish the war materials on credit will be the end of Europe. Also, as realists, we must face the fact that the only way Europe can pay us the war debts is in goods or services. If Europe pays us in goods, the defaults alone would require three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of European goods dumped into the United States to make the defaulters square with the books.

What, then, shall we do? Strange as it may seem, idealism has an answer to realism's problem. France, for example, owes us about $40,000,000 in defaulted payments. Suppose the United States should propose to France that this $40,000,000 should be laid out not in goods but in education? At $4,000 per student, that would provide for 10,000 students, half of them French and half of them American—the Frenchmen to come to American colleges and universities of their choice and the Americans to go to French schools and art centers of their choice.

A like application of this scheme to the war indemnities due from Germany to France and the interallied obligations would mean that thousands of young men and women would learn the language and customs and viewpoint of countries abroad and would form personal friendships there. No greater international bonds for peace could possibly be forged by treaty or agreement. It affords to American politicians who have said there shall be no repudiation an "out" which will not glut American markets with foreign goods and will not drain Europe of desperately needed food and clothing. It will stimulate travel abroad, both now and in the future, and save the "face" of foreign statesmen who have contended that their poverty-ridden constituents should not pay tribute to America.

Why not?

COTTON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Daily Times of Wilson, N. C., under date of Thursday, May 14, 1936, pertaining to the cotton situation in this country.

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

[From the Wilson (N. C.) Times of May 14, 1936]

TAR HEEL IMPRESSIONS IN WASHINGTON

By Hubert Holloway

From the standpoint of North Carolina—in fact the whole South—the Senate investigation of the decline of cotton prices is of sweeping importance. It undoubtedly affects—directly and indirectly—the livelihood of every single son and daughter of the Old North State. And it is, perhaps, the most comprehensive survey of marketing conditions ever undertaken under congressional sanction.

Digging, and digging deeply, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has uncovered the story of cotton from the time it is planted, through the mills, and to the shoulders of the wearers of goods made from cotton manufacturers.

Yet, strange to say, this inquiry has received scant attention: It has not been due to any lack of sensations, because the market manipulations disclosed would cause the noted pirate Captain Kidd to blush with shame; it has not been due to lack of importance, because everyone concerned realizes that the fate of the South hangs largely on cotton. Possibly it has been because the trade lingo—such as "hedges", "straddles", "call cotton", "spots", and what not—is just too dry in this day of sensation-giving headlines.

Guiding the inquiry has been Senator E. D. SMITH, of South Carolina, who has been wrapped up in cotton since the days when he had to stretch his arms upward to touch a fluffy boll. Thirty-one years ago he helped to organize the American Cotton Association. Some say he has grown weary. Well, it is impossible to

serve 27 years in the United States as King Cotton's prime minister and be as chipper as a young man just selected as class orator.

The investigation has disclosed some startling things. Of chief interest is the fact that the Government holdings of around 6,000,000 bales of cotton hangs over the whole industry like a sword of Damocles; that the cotton market is as the promises of last year's candidate for office; that mills are unable to buy cotton from the overstocked Government warehouses because of trade conditions that make it necessary for them to deal through cotton merchants, and that manipulation of the market through speculation is the rule rather than the exception.

All these things vitally affect the price the grower receives for cotton, the wages of mill workers, and dividends from mill stocks. In other words, a great cross-section of North Carolina people and interests.

"Inside sources" say that congressional experts are burning midnight oil drafting a measure for the regulation of the cotton industry. It may pop up on the floor of the Senate most any day. And it now seems certain that drastic steps will be taken to control "straddle" operations (speculation in cotton) and probably elimination entirely of "call" cotton, the present method of selling for future delivery. Approximately 90 percent of the cotton now sold to mills is "call" cotton.

In this latter connection, Alfred S. Wyllie and Levi H. David, attorneys for the committee, have been extremely busy "watching the record." It is interesting to note that numerous mill operators—including many from North Carolina—were invited to appear before the Senate committee. Only one came. He was H. B. Richardson, of Union, S. C. The transcript of the hearings—including Mr. Richardson's testimony—is now in the hands of the printers. It is, to say the least, astonishing.

On April 27, the following testimony appears:

"Mr. WYLLIE. What is your opinion regarding the selling of cotton by merchants to mills on call? Do you favor the practice?

"Mr. RICHARDSON. I do, provided no straddles are effected or manipulation of the base month."

However, on the following day, and after he had been shown committee reports indicating the intricate methods used by cotton merchants to build up a speculative interest in cotton sold on call—and the manipulative practices involved, Mr. Richardson expressed the view that the only relief for mills would be elimination of call sales. The committee may seek to do just that. Anyway, it was one of the high spots of the inquiry.

With reference to the Government holdings of cotton, the testimony is equally as astonishing. This for example—

"The CHAIRMAN. During the time that the Government was holding it (cotton) at 12 cents couldn't your mills buy cotton from the Government at around 12 cents?

"Mr. RICHARDSON. No, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. You couldn't buy it at that?

"Mr. RICHARDSON. No, sir; we didn't want to buy it.

"The CHAIRMAN. Why?

"Mr. RICHARDSON. Because the terms made it impossible for the mills to go directly to the Government. We were absolutely dependent upon going to merchants for our supply, due to the fact that we buy specified grade and staple, for which we pay a premium."

What may finally happen in the way of regulation is problematic; executive and legislative branches of the Government often differ as to what is best. But there is one thing evident. Growing in the field, with white bolls flashing in the sun, cotton is beautiful. But from then on it is a nightmare. And it is a particularly big nightmare to those trying to solve the industry problems through Federal legislation.

CHILD-LABOR AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of last Sunday in relation to a national poll taken on the pending child-labor amendment to the Constitution, which showed that the country stood 6 to 4 in favor of the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, in connection with that request, may I ask the Senator from New York if he knows how many of the 48 States have child-labor laws of their own?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not. I think the article points that out, too, so that the Senator may be informed. A number of States have such laws. New York State has, but there are a number of States that have not.

Mr. GLASS. I should like to ascertain how many States have not such laws. I doubt if many States have not child-labor laws of their own. I know Virginia has a very complete, and some persons think a very severe, prohibition against child labor; and I shall be glad if the Senator can ascertain and put in the RECORD the number of States and the particular States that have child-labor laws of their own.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 24, 1936]

NATIONAL POLL IS 6 TO 4 FOR CHILD-LABOR REGULATION BY CONGRESS—VOTERS IN 45 STATES BACK AMENDMENT'S PRINCIPLE—"AMERICA SPEAKS", INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION POLL, NOTES NEW YORK SENTIMENT 63 PERCENT IN FAVOR OF ACT; DEMOCRATS 72 PERCENT IN SUPPORT, WITH REPUBLICANS 54 PERCENT AGAINST PROPOSAL

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

By a vote of approximately 6 to 4 in a Nation-wide poll, the American people have declared in favor of giving Congress the power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

This is tantamount to approval of the much-mooted child-labor amendment, around which fights have been waged ever since it was submitted to the States for ratification in 1924. Although 24 States have ratified the amendment through their legislatures, and 22 have rejected it, the poll reported today is the first Nation-wide referendum of the actual voting populace on the child-labor issue.

It reveals dramatic clashes between the will of the people and the action of State legislatures in rejecting the amendment, between Republicans and Democrats, farmers and city folk, young people and the elderly.

The question asked on poll ballots which went to 130,951 voters, representing a cross-section of American opinion, was based on the wording of the child-labor amendment. It read: "Do you favor an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18?"

Replies for the Nation as a whole were: "Yes", 61 percent. "No", 39 percent.

THREE STATES VOTE "NO"

If the child-labor amendments were officially submitted to the people for ratification, 45 States would probably vote "yes", only 3 "no", according to the results of the poll. The three States that voted "no" in the poll were South Dakota, Kansas, and Maryland, indicating that the people in these States see eye to eye with their legislators, who have never ratified the amendment. Elsewhere, however, there is a clash of will between people and legislators.

In 19 States which have rejected the amendment in one or both houses of the legislature in past years, the voting public is today in favor of adopting it, the poll indicates. Connecticut's legislature, for example, has voted against ratification but, the results of the poll in Connecticut show 61 percent today in favor of Federal child-labor control. A scientifically selected cross section of voters in North Carolina, important southern textile State, are 56 percent in favor of the child-labor amendment now, although the State legislature has previously opposed it. New York, whose legislature killed the amendment in committee, a few weeks ago, votes 63 percent in favor of adopting it.

HOW PARTIES LINE UP

The divergences among the political parties in the poll are shown in the following figures:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
Democrats	72	28
Republicans	46	54
Socialists	81	19

Small towns voted 57 percent in favor of the amendment, and 43 percent against, and the large cities 66 percent for and 34 percent against.

Cross sections of varying groups of the population show similar disparities of viewpoint. A break-down on these figures follows:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
Farmers	46	54
Women	61	39
Reliefers	67	33
Young persons	72	28

The lively public interest in the child-labor question, which led the institute to take its poll, was largely brought about by depression. As unemployment grew adult laborers found themselves unable to get jobs, while children were being put to work. This condition speeded up the movement for ratification of the child-labor amendment. In the 2 years from 1933 to 1935 three times

as many States ratified as in the 9 years from 1924 to 1933. No time limit for ratification is specified in the amendment.

Although today's poll shows that the Nation agrees on the fundamental principle of child-labor regulation, it is interesting to note that public enthusiasm chills considerably as soon as the age of the children is defined. For example:

QUESTION REWORDED

The Institute of Public Opinion conducted a preliminary poll on child labor in which it used the general question, "Do you favor an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting child labor?"

Voters, apparently having visions of 6-year-old urchins chained all day to factory machines, replied with an overwhelming affirmative. The actual vote was—yes, 82 percent; no, 18 percent.

This was clearly a vote on a principle.

Next the institute experimented with another, more specific question, "Do you favor an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress power to regulate labor of persons under 18?" Even though the word "regulate" was used instead of "prohibit" as in the earlier question, the affirmative vote cascaded sharply. Only 86 percent of the voters replied "yes" to this question, against 82 percent on the first question.

When, in the third and final question, the words "limit" and "prohibit" were added to "regulate," thus conforming to the reading of the child-labor amendment, the "yes" vote dropped some more, to 61 percent.

Many sincere opponents of the child-labor amendment pitch their argument on the point illustrated in the foregoing figures, i. e., that a person of 18 is not a child. Others, notably Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, maintain that the words "limit, regulate, and prohibit" give Congress too sweeping power over the lives of the 45,000,000 persons under 18. Fearing that Congress could forbid children to sew, to help with the dishes or to sweep out the kitchen, these opponents favor a rewording of the amendment.

The answer that proponents of the amendment make is that Congress would do no such thing. They quote the late Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, who said, apropos of the amendment, "If we are going to hesitate to repose power of any body because that power may be abused we shall have to stop legislation altogether."

In general, today's poll would seem to indicate that public approval of Federal child-labor legislation would be greater if the age limit specified in the amendment were lowered.

Several thousand voters in the poll wrote across their ballots that the 18-year minimum was too high, but that they would favor the amendment if the limit were reduced to 16 years.

HOW STATES AND OTHER DIVISIONS VOTED

In the national poll on an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18, 61 percent voted "Yes", and 39 percent "No." The following tables show the poll percentages by State and other subdivisions:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
States:		
South Dakota	46	54
Kansas	46	54
Maryland	48	52
Rhode Island	51	49
Vermont	52	48
Missouri	52	48
Nebraska	52	48
Maine	53	47
Kentucky	53	47
Alabama	54	46
Mississippi	55	45
Idaho	55	45
Massachusetts	56	44
North Carolina	56	44
West Virginia	57	43
Arkansas	57	43
Virginia	58	42
Florida	58	42
Tennessee	58	42
Indiana	60	40
Iowa	60	40
Georgia	60	40
Oklahoma	60	40
Connecticut	61	39
New Jersey	61	39
Illinois	61	39
South Carolina	61	39
Louisiana	61	39
Utah	61	39
New York	63	37
Montana	63	37
Wyoming	63	37
New Mexico	63	37
New Hampshire	64	36
Pennsylvania	64	36
Ohio	64	36
Minnesota	64	36
Texas	64	36
Oregon	67	33
Delaware	68	32
North Dakota	69	31
Colorado	69	31
Nevada	69	31
California	70	30
States—Continued.		
Washington	70	30
Michigan	71	29
Wisconsin	71	29
Arizona	75	25
Parties:		
Democratic	72	28
Republican	46	54
Socialist	81	19
Groups:		
Farmers	46	54
Women	61	39
Reliefers	67	33
Young people	72	28
Places:		
Small towns	57	43
Big cities	66	34

CHILD LABOR NOW CITY-FARM AND POLITICAL ISSUE—CENTRALIZED POWER OVER LIVES OF YOUTH CHIEF OBJECTION OF OPPOSITION—FARMERS 54 PERCENT AGAINST BAN BY LAW; CITIES 66 PERCENT FOR IT, YOUTH 70 PERCENT IN FAVOR

The child-labor amendment was originally a nonpartisan issue. Endorsed in principle by Calvin Coolidge, it was passed by a Republican Congress with the aid of Democratic votes, and its ratification is now being urged by President Roosevelt. But today it is one of the most bitterly partisan of all issues.

Whereas in today's poll 72 percent of Democrats approve the child-labor amendment, 54 percent of Republicans oppose it.

Moreover, the amendment not only sets the parties at war against each other, but divides classes and age groups. Farmers are squared off against city folk, young people against their elders.

Farmers are, on the average, opposed to the amendment by a vote of 54 percent in the poll, whereas inhabitants of the 10 biggest cities are 66 percent in favor of it.

Enthusiasm for the amendment among young persons is marked by an affirmative vote of more than 70 percent. Older people, less willing to see child labor regulated by the Federal Government, are only 58 percent in favor of the amendment.

And so it goes, with class voting against class.

What made child labor a partisan issue? Why are many Republicans, whose party first sponsored the amendment in Congress, now lined up against it?

There may be several explanations. Probably the most important is simply the fact that the Roosevelt administration has come out strongly in favor of Federal child-labor regulation. Other polls of the institute have shown that whenever one party heartily espouses an issue, the other tends to take the opposite side, on principle, even though it may mean reversing a historic position.

Many of the N. R. A. codes abolished or regulated child labor, particularly in the textile manufacturing business. But even before N. R. A. was killed by the Supreme Court, President Roosevelt was urging uniform Federal control through the child-labor amendment. In November 1934 he said: "In the child-labor field the obvious method of maintaining the present gains is through ratification of the child-labor amendment. I hope this may be achieved." Political opposition to the amendment probably dates from this time, on the basis that it would centralize governmental power over private lives of young persons, as some critics contend.

FARMERS OPPOSE AMENDMENT

Next to Republicans the largest single group opposed to a child-labor amendment are the farmers. The explanation of this is probably that farmers look to their children for help during harvesting and planting. Undoubtedly they fear that Congress, in attempting to wipe out abuses of child labor in berry fields, onion fields, beet fields, etc., might jeopardize a farmer's right to ask his son to milk cows in the morning, or help with the spring plowing. Part of the farm opposition may also be due to the age limit of 18 years specified in the amendment. The average farmer looks upon a boy of 18 as an adult, not a child.

The poll vote of persons in big cities is in striking contrast to the farm vote. With an average of 66 percent in the affirmative, all of the 10 biggest cities favor the amendment.

	Percent	
	For	Against
Cook County (Chicago)	73	27
Allegheny County (Pittsburgh)	72	28
Los Angeles County	71	29
New York	68	32
Philadelphia	67	33
Detroit	64	36
Boston	61	39
Baltimore	60	40
Cleveland	59	41
St. Louis	58	42
Average	66	34

CROSS SECTION OF OPINION

There are four principal reasons why a majority of voters favor a constitutional amendment granting Congress power to deal with child labor. As given by the voters themselves, the first and most typical reason is:

"Children under 18 should all be in school, not out working. There's plenty of time for that later."

The next most typical reason mentioned by voters is an economic reason:

"It will help solve unemployment by providing more jobs for older people who need work most."

This same point was touched upon last month by President Roosevelt in his speech at Baltimore where he went on record in favor of limiting work to persons more than 18 and less than 65.

The other two reasons given by voters who favor Federal regulation of child labor are:

1. We must protect our children. They can't stand shop work. It ruins their health.

2. Child labor is a national problem, and Congress is most capable of handling it.

VIEWS OF THOSE AGAINST IT

As for the other side of the question, a half dozen reasons are given by voters who believe that the child-labor amendment should not be approved.

1. Many children under 18 have to help support their families. Look at farm youngsters and children of poor city families.

2. Many boys and girls under 18 have to work to keep from starving.

3. There's too much interference in private life already. Congress should be kept out of it.

4. Child labor is a problem for each State to handle.

5. A minimum age limit of 16 years would be acceptable. Eighteen is too old.

6. Anyone who can get a job should work. I did before 18, and it never hurt me.

JAPANESE ACTIVITIES IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, a little more than a year ago I presented to the Senate a report of my investigation of conditions in the Philippines. This report called attention, among other things, to the efforts of the Japanese to secure a foothold in the islands through infiltration.

In the same connection I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Robert Aura Smith, special correspondent for the New York Times, entitled "Japanese Forge Ahead in Philippines."

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

JAPANESE FORGE AHEAD IN PHILIPPINES—THE QUESTION RAISED BY THE SPREAD OF THEIR INFLUENCE IS BROUGHT TO THE FORE BY THE LAND-LEASE ISSUE

By Robert Aura Smith

MANILA.—The question of Japanese penetration, brought sharply to a head by President Quezon's personal investigation of Japanese landholdings in the Province of Davao, now looms as the possibly deciding factor in the economic and political future of the Philippines.

Japanese penetration has been a growing problem. As early as 1931 a plea was made in the Philippine Legislature for the rescue of the Philippine fishing industry from the Japanese. The situation in the Province of Davao had come to notice from time to time.

In 1935, under the direction of the then Governor General, Frank Murphy, a comprehensive examination of Japanese landholdings in Davao was conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture and Commerce, Eulogio Rodriguez, and it is upon the basis of these findings that an attempt is now being made to enforce Philippine law and safeguard Philippine land from alien penetration.

JAPANESE IN DAVAO

The Province of Davao is situated in the southeastern part of the island of Mindanao. Of its total area of about 4,500,000 acres only about 250,000 acres in the valley and coastal plain of the Davao River are arable. Of this arable land, the Japanese are in control, legally or illegally, of almost exactly one-half. The findings of the Rodriguez committee were that about 55,000 acres are held by the Japanese in direct violation of Philippine law.

It was during the World War that the Japanese, in the form of 31 corporations, went into Davao for the purpose of getting control of the rich timber land in the upper part of the Davao Valley. With the connivance of a Filipino official, Vicente Ceballos, Japanese companies received forestry permits for the cutting of timber.

In 1919 the Bureau of Forestry discovered the malfeasance of Ceballos and he was dismissed. Charges were preferred against him, but he fled the country. The Bureau discovered that Japanese penetration existed not only for the purpose of getting lumber out of Davao, but also for the purpose of clearing the land, by burning, if necessary, to prepare the way for agricultural crops. The Bureau estimated that commercial lumber destroyed by burning alone amounted to 200,000,000 pesos ($100,000,000).

Charges were filed against the 31 corporations, of which 20 were known to be Japanese. The corporations were found guilty, but the Governor General remitted their fines, holding that they had acted in good faith, and assessed against them only the ordinary charges for forestry service.

While it was expected that this would result in a wholesale cancelation of Japanese concessions and leaseholds in Davao, exactly the reverse was the case. Japanese attention was deflected from forestry and illegal forest operation to agriculture and particularly to the cultivation of hemp.

Some land was acquired by outright purchase from private individuals. Some was legally leased under permit from the Philippine government. The passage of an alien land law made further legal leases impossible and the practice arose of obtaining leases in connivance with Filipinos.

A Filipino would lease from the Government an area of hemp land. He would then employ a Japanese to develop and cultivate that land for him. The Japanese, however, instead of receiving wages would take the produce of the soil and pay an insignificant sum to the Filipino for the use of his name in securing the title.

DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

Credit for these operations was abundant. Several large development companies were formed, financed either in Manila or in Japan, and it was easy for the pioneers to market their product. Davao was a port of entry and was put on the regular steamship runs between Japan and Australia.

The Japanese settlers were hard-working and progressive. They supplanted the painfully slow hand stripping of hemp by decortication with up-to-date machinery. Their exports jumped amazingly and by 1930 this one province was in control of 40 percent of the hemp exports from the Philippines. The Japanese were able to set the standards and to set the price.

The colony meanwhile was growing steadily. The official figures of the Japanese consulate at the present time for Japanese in Davao show 12,742 residents. The estimate of the Rodriguez committee is 14,000. The total population of the province is 145,000, including the wild tribes in the mountains and 98,000 Christian Filipinos.

This group of 14,000 Japanese has gained a control of economic and social life in Davao out of all proportion to its numbers. The city of Davao is almost completely Japanese. Signs on the shops are in Japanese. There are excellent schools conducted in the Japanese language and the bulk of the trade is with Japan. In 1934 Japanese ships carried more than twice as much cargo in and out of Davao as the ships of all other nationalities combined.

QUESTION OF LEASES

The crux of the matter today is the illegal land leases held by the Japanese. The violation of the land law is clear and there exists, moreover, a direct violation of the Philippine constitutional provision that the agricultural land of the country may not be alienated.

When cancelation of the illegal leases was suggested the Japanese in Manila and Tokyo made strong protest, stating that many of the leases were acquired in good faith, and that the Japanese have an equity in the Province because of their work in its development.

The problem is now under consideration by President Quezon. If an attempt is made to enforce the provisions of the Philippine land law, it is apparent that a Japanese protest will be made and that in consequence the entire matter will be referred to the United States High Commissioner in the Philippines and eventually to the American State Department.

CONTROL OF FISHING

The "Davao question" is not the only one raised by Japanese penetration. Coordinately with the development of Davao, the Japanese have systematically taken over the power fishing in the Philippines. This they have done through the organization of companies nominally Filipino but actually Japanese in ownership and operation. In addition to the legal and quasi-legal Japanese fishing operations there is large-scale illegal Japanese fishing which the government, with its three inadequate coast-guard cutters, has been unable to stop.

The most spectacular case of Japanese penetration, however, has been in the field of retail trade. Prior to 1930 Japanese retail merchandising in the Philippines was negligible; most of it was done through Chinese stores. But when the Chinese boycott of Japanese goods in 1930–31 extended to the Philippines the Japanese found themselves without a retail outlet, and they set about systematically to create one.

In the city of Manila they matched the Chinese stores with bazaars on one street after another. In 3 years they jumped from controlling 7 percent of the retail merchandising in Manila to a control of 28 percent. The figure is still rising.

IMPORTS FROM JAPAN RISE

It was natural that this entrance into retail trade should be reflected in the entire field of imports. Japanese goods coming into the Philippines increased in 5 years by 300 percent. In the case of textiles the situation rapidly became so acute that the American State Department stepped in and consummated a gentlemen's agreement dividing equally between the United States and Japan the market previously controlled by the United States. Since then transshipments of textiles, particularly from Hong Kong, have already knocked this agreement into a cocked hat, and Japanese textiles are rapidly driving the American goods out of the Philippine market.

When a tariff proposal is made in the Philippine legislative body, which might possibly conflict with Japanese interests, it faces a powerful lobby called the Merchants Protective Association, which is directly traceable to Japanese sources. In 1934 the Japanese

consul in Manila, in a public address, openly urged that the legislature turn down the tariff recommendations of the then American Governor General and the Filipino party leaders.

This was an open and frontal attack. What has gone on behind the scenes no one knows. The suggestion has been made that economic penetration, which is already an accomplished fact, is only the forerunner to political and policy penetration. Filipino newspapers, which 2 years ago were unwilling to say that Japan presented the one great menace of external aggression to the projected Philippine State, are now putting it in headlines.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HOWARD BRUCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Howard Bruce, a prominent businessman of Baltimore city, at the Town Meeting of the Air, May 7, 1936, on the subject of relief.

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

In beginning, I wish to say that I have a warm personal regard for Mr. Hopkins and all of his associates with whom I have come in contact. I have the greatest respect for their sincerity and their singleness of purpose. Mr. Hopkins has had the most difficult administrative job that ever existed in this country. I may differ with him on policies, but that is all.

The greatest problem facing this country today is that of finding permanent and gainful employment for those out of work.

Estimates of the unemployed vary from less than 10,000,000 to over 12,000,000. Similar estimates of the employables in this country usually place the figure at somewhere in the neighborhood of 50,000,000. On this basis, the unemployed today are in the neighborhood of 20 percent of the total employables. Just what part of this 20 percent are normally unemployed, due to seasonal occupations, shifting of jobs, and other causes, no one really knows. Personally, I have the feeling that our problems will be over long before we absorb anywhere near 10,000,000 workers.

The destitute must be supported. There can be no difference of opinion between responsible people on that.

When a local community cannot take care of its own it becomes the responsibility of the State. When the States cannot bear this responsibility, it becomes the duty of the National Government. Should we falter in meeting this obligation fully, fairly, and in a humane way, we lose our self-respect.

There is no question that Federal aid for the needy and unemployed was essential. The burden was too great for the States and their political subdivisions. They were breaking under the load that they had up to 1933 been carrying. Their credit in many instances had been impaired and it was impossible for them to borrow. A great many States were prevented by constitutional restrictions from taking necessary steps, and plans for handling the situation had to be made by the Federal powers under great pressure; and a discussion of whether these were wise or unwise serves no good purpose at the present time.

In 1933 the country faced a tragic situation. People had lost hope of a restoration in our Government, and had lost hope of a restoration of prosperity. It was an emergency if such a thing ever existed. Emergency measures were justified and emergency measures were adopted. I am no critic of the measures that were adopted.

We have come a long way on the road toward complete recovery. Some of our problems have solved themselves; others have been solved by the Government; we still have many left; there is an outstanding one that up to the present time has not responded to treatment and that is our unemployment relief.

This is so clear that the time for treating unemployment as a temporary emergency has passed. It has been with us for years, and it is the part of wisdom to approach it on the assumption that in some form or in some degree it is going to be with us at least for a while longer.

This problem of unemployment relief is so complex and so enormous that I approach its discussion with a distinct sense of modesty. If I can accomplish anything by talking to you it will be by arousing discussion and interest among those who are interested in its solution.

My conclusions are as follows:

Such measures for the relief of the unemployed as were undertaken by the old C. W. A. and the present activities of the W. P. A. will not meet the situation; they do not supply even temporarily a satisfactory solution of the problem. Employment and relief for the destitute follow different lines and must be governed by different laws. Relief to be effective must be given to each case according to the needs of that particular case. Relief employment, on the other hand, is given at a specified wage without regard to the necessities of the individual. This means that a single man, or a married man receiving supplementary relief, which may be $10, $15, $20, or $30 a month, receives the same security wage as is paid to the head of a family of 10 or 12 children, receiving $80, $90, or $100 per month on relief. The one is being unnecessarily overpaid and the other is being underpaid.

In spite of the increased expenditures, it is my observation that there was more suffering immediately following the inauguration of the W. P. A. than was experienced under the system existing prior to W. P. A. made work.

Public work will and should form a part of any relief program, but the work project should first be selected for its intrinsic value and the unemployed should be fitted to the project, so that when completed the project approximates in value to the community the expenditure made upon it. If I agreed with Colonel Westbrook that the value of the project was 70 percent of the cost, I wouldn't argue so much. Work relief, where work under great pressure is devised to absorb millions of unemployed, which has this immediate absorption as its main motive, defeats its very object.

I maintain that made work under unorthodox regulations does not add to the self-respect of the individual. He knows he is on relief, and his effort will be to obtain the meager security wage with a minimum of effort. This results in actually detracting from the dignity of labor, and if employment on made work under artificial conditions is continued long enough, it is inevitable that it will make the worker less efficient and less effective should he secure employment where productivity has a bearing on wages and continuity of employment.

The further the source of relief money and the seat of authority are removed from the individual taxpayer, the less efficient will be the administration of relief, both from a humanitarian and a financial standpoint. No central authority can possibly appraise the needs of each city and county in this vast country. The fact that money comes from some far-removed national source creates the impression that it comes from an inexhaustible supply and destroys any feeling of personal or community responsibility for its proper and efficient expenditure. Instead of this sense of responsibility, there is created an urge for each community to get for itself as much as possible of this "easy money."

If I were to undertake to write a formula for unemployment relief during the next 12 months, I should say that the Federal Government should put up from 50 percent to 60 percent of the money required, the States and their subdivisions supplying the remainder; that the States and their subdivisions should be permitted to administer relief; that work relief as now handled would not play its present major part, and the part it would play would be at the selection of and under the control of semiautonomous subdivisions of the States.

From the funds supplied by the Federal Government there should be held back an equalization fund and the balance should be prorated among the States on a fixed basis. The moneys in the hands of the States should be similarly prorated among the political subdivisions after withholding an emergency or equalization fund.

Whatever the percentage of the Federal Government's expenditure may be, the policy should be to reduce this proportion until eventually the States and their subdivisions assume the major part of the load that they formerly carried and that really belongs to them.

I know the arguments against this policy, but I believe the citizens of counties and incorporated towns will have just as much human sympathy as either the States or Federal authorities, and they will have something that neither the States nor the Federal Government can possibly have, and that is a complete knowledge of their own neighborhood problems. [Applause.]

So long as the Federal Government makes grants in aid to States the Federal Government must retain a certain veto power and set up certain minimum requirements. The States, by the same rule, should retain the same control over their subdivisions. The influence of both Federal and State Governments should be to bring about the greatest amount of decentralization and the greatest administrative freedom in the hands of small political subdivisions.

In laying down rules for relief administration there should be established a balance of power between the social workers, on one hand, and the regular governmental powers on the other; complete domination by either is unfortunate. I don't know which is worse.

The objective of the Government, of business interests, and of the Nation as a whole is to reduce and demolish the citadel of unemployment. So far the strategy dictated by our Government has been in the main to accomplish this objective by frontal attacks—by storm. If we had succeeded at our first try, or even at our second, we would have nothing but acclaim for our strategy; but, after being repulsed twice—once in 1933–34 and once in 1935–36—isn't it time to count our losses? Maybe the strategy of direct action, of frontal attacks, entails too great losses with too small results, and possibly the indirect attack may yield greater success. I call the C. W. A., the W. P. A., and kindred projects frontal attacks; and I say that after the expenditure of billions we have accelerated recovery of consumption industries, but we still have the unemployment load undiminished.

Now, the indirect attack really has nothing indirect about it; it is just plain common sense. The American people must solve this problem by increasing employment and thereby gradually absorbing the army of employables now without work.

Agriculture and many lines of industry have already recovered from their depressed state; some industries have established new high records. The worst laggards are those enterprises that require the investment of money in capital or in durable goods. Money is notoriously timid and does not come out in time of uncertainty.

There is tremendous demand for the investment of money. Obsolescence and need for repairs have been piling up since 1930; buildings have continued to depreciate throughout the depression, possibly at a faster rate than the normal. Generally speaking, the needs for expenditure of this character are cumulative—what you don't do this year you must do some day.

This brings me to the question, Why are the American people not fully launched in this campaign of expenditure? The answer is in two parts:

The people of this country want to see a descending line of Government expenditures, with an ascending line of Government income. [Applause.] Then the average man can predict with some assurance the time when the two lines cross and the Budget is balanced.

No individual, no business, can go on indefinitely spending more than is collected as income without eventually landing in bankruptcy. The same is true of any government; its credit is measured by what the people think of it. If government extravagance is carried too far, there will be a collapse of credit, or inflation, or both, with all their tragic effect upon the citizens.

I don't think it is the size of our debt that worries people. It doesn't worry me. This is a big, rich country, and if we get the wheels turning, we can absorb the debt. The disturbing thing is not where we are but where are we going—when will we be in normal balance? [Applause.]

The other part of the answer is—and really it is the whole answer—we must create in the minds of those controlling expenditures, and through their faith transmit to the Nation, the belief that we are approaching a period of stability and security; that money can be invested with a reasonable prospect of return; that the rules of the game are not to be constantly changed; that we are not to have too large a dose of reform. When the average man recovers his sense of security, we will have restored to the American people the daring, aggressive, constructive characteristics that have made this Nation, and in my opinion, we will have a period of the greatest business, industrial, construction, and employment activity that this country has ever known. [Applause.]

Chairman DENNY. Thank you Mr. Bruce and Colonel Westbrook. I am sure you all agree that you have heard two sincere, honest, and capable expressions of opinions, however different they may be, on this important question. Now, these gentlemen will be very happy to undertake to answer your questions.

Question. Mr. Bruce, how would your plan of local autonomy work in New Jersey? [Applause.]

Mr. BRUCE. I am not as familiar with New Jersey as I am with Maryland. I will tell you how we would do it in Maryland. We would take care of our own people, and we wouldn't throw away any money; and by the same rule, I think it will work in New Jersey.

Question. Mr. Bruce made the remark that the unemployed on the W. P. A. relief jobs should be fitted for the work they do. That will leave a certain balance. Wouldn't they be included among the group called boondogglers?

Mr. BRUCE. I would leave them on direct relief. [Applause.] When I say "men fitted", I mean putting people on work relief who could be put on it without injustice to them or their communities; I mean putting them on work projects that have a value when they are finished approximating the cost of the project. [Applause.]

Question. Mr. Bruce, would you admit that the final and total cost of work relief would be less if the wages paid on works programs were prosperity wages rather than security wages, based on the proposition that higher wages would return purchasing power and make it possible for the average citizen to purchase the necessary commodities and thereby restore business?

Mr. BRUCE. I think the security wage is neither a wage nor is it relief. That is one of its greatest difficulties. I think it is too small as a wage and in many cases it is too high as relief. Does that answer you?

Question. Absolutely.

Chairman DENNY. Here is a written question to Colonel Westbrook: The city of New York receives $300,000,000 less from the Federal Government than it pays in taxes. In view of such large expenditures for such projects as C. C. C. in other parts of the country, ought not New York to have a larger W. P. A. program?

Colonel WESTBROOK. Because the people, the businessmen, the brokers, and others who constitute the city of New York are able to operate under the industrial mechanism that is set up under the protection of this Government, and because through the operation of that industrial mechanism they levy in effect what amounts to tribute all over the rest of the country, the city of New York is able to pay these taxes and it should pay them. New York is able to pay for the relief that is extended here. If in the city of New York people are not getting an adequate amount of relief, then that should be remedied on the merits of that case, not on the question of how much income the people who live in the city of New York get, and the corresponding amount of taxes they pay. They couldn't live without the hinterland—New York City couldn't.

Chairman DENNY. Mr. Bruce, here is a written question for you: Do you think that business is doing its utmost to end unemployment?

Mr. BRUCE. I will start by saying "No." [Applause.] When we started down the slide, and when we were in the darkest days of the depression, I think the performance of business was magnificent in maintaining themselves alive and taking care of their people way beyond cold-blooded business requirements. Now that we have turned the corner, the first impulse, and it is a natural one, is for business to extend the hours of those of its employees that were on short time. But I believe that is passing. I think business can do more than it is doing [applause] to put more people to work. I believe there is a tendency among business people to lay this too often on a Washington doorstep and let it go at that. [Applause.]

Question. Mr. Bruce, do you think we can rise from the depths of the business cycle and at the same time increase purchasing power without work relief?

Mr. BRUCE. I think you have got to have work relief. I have said so. But I say, let's get approximately 100 cents value for the dollar we spend on work relief. Let's cut out the boondoggling. [Applause.]

Chairman DENNY. A written question to Colonel Westbrook: When you say "industry", do you mean the manufacturer or do you mean all business of city and country, including the retailer?

Colonel WESTBROOK. Well, when I say "industrial mechanism", I mean that in a very general way; I mean all business entities, including agriculture, which produce goods or which perform valuable services. I mean the grocers, and I mean the lawyers, and I mean all of the people who have the privilege of carrying out their trades and professions under the protection of this Government. That is what I mean by "industrial mechanism."

Question. Mr. Bruce, are you aware that the 100 mayors of the 100 largest cities of the country in asking for specific appropriations larger than the President has asked for relief have stated that in all their cities they agree that all the projects have, as you said, intrinsic value; and also that they were of a character that would be of a permanent benefit to the public in the time to come? Are you aware of that?

Mr. BRUCE. I am aware of it, and it has made no impression on me whatsoever. [Laughter and applause.] I had an active, personal part in working out the program for Baltimore and for Maryland. I cooperated with public officials, and I know the projects that we in the main brought out were worthy projects. I have looked at men tickling the ground with shovels when it ought to have been done by trenching machines. I have looked at 271 people making an atlas of Baltimore. I don't believe they need one anyhow [laughter], and it doesn't make sense. We are not getting 100 cents for our money. [Applause.]

Question. Both speakers seem to agree that the main interest is to eliminate relief and eliminate expense, and we all agree that the main burden of taxes is falling on the so-called forgotten man. Why not divide the working hours so we will not have the relief question? Why is the industrialist, who carries the burden, so much against dividing the working hours? If they were not, they would not have the problem at all. [Applause.]

Colonel WESTBROOK. I think that might be a pretty good emergency measure if we could put it into effect. I don't believe we could put it into effect. I would like to see it tried.

Chairman DENNY. Mr. Bruce, will you take that same question? Does the 30-hour week come under your question?

QUESTIONER. Yes, shortening the hours of labor. They are trying to raise them at the present time, now that we have no N. R. A.

Mr. BRUCE. I will answer the 30-hour week in two ways. I will say, "yes", and then I will say, "no." [Laughter.] I will say, "yes", if it is brought about in an orderly way over a period of time, and the production per man-hour is increased simultaneously so that in the final analysis we haven't had a great increase of price. If it has got to be done suddenly by edict, I say, "no", because you are going to raise the cost of consumption products directly in proportion to the cost of labor, and you are not going to correspondingly increase the purchasing power; you are going to decrease consumption; you are going to destroy your export trade; you are going to put a tremendous premium on labor-saving devices. When you get through, I think you will be worse off than you are today. [Applause.]

Question. Mr. Bruce, in view of the fact that you say unemployment up to the present time has not responded to treatment, do you not think that the W. P. A. lay-offs that are going on at the present time will aggravate the problem of unemployment rather than solve it? [Applause.]

Mr. BRUCE. You better ask Colonel Westbrook about that. He knows more about those policies than I do.

QUESTIONER. I asked that question paticularly of Mr. Bruce, because he is in favor of discontinuing the W. P. A.

Chairman DENNY. Let's have both of them answer, the colonel, and then Mr. Bruce.

Colonel WESTBROOK. Well, if I understand the question, the gentleman wanted to know whether the discontinuance of W. P. A. would operate to increase unemployment. I believe that if these people who are now receiving W. P. A. checks should cease to receive W. P. A. checks all over the country, we would have the beginning of another pretty sizable depression. [Applause.]

Chairman DENNY. Now, Mr. Bruce, will you speak to that question now?

Mr. BRUCE. I don't advocate abolishing W. P. A. I advocate transferring the control to the local communities and getting 100-cents value for the money we spend. [Applause.]

Question. Colonel Westbrook, do you think that relief is being administered for the benefit of the needy, or for the benefit of the Democratic Party? [Applause and boos.]

Colonel WESTBROOK. Well, I think, in the first place, that is a frivolous question. In the second place, I think the people who have received relief are better qualified to answer that than I am. I think that the administration of relief, as far as the policy of the Federal Government is concerned, is honest and sincere, and I don't think that it can be successfully challenged by anybody who knows anything about it. [Applause.]

Question. Mr. Westbrook, would not the technological reforms advocated by Mr. Bruce increase the cost in the form of investigation and research, and would there be any benefit in that increase of cost?

Colonel WESTBROOK. I didn't gather that Mr. Bruce had advocated any technological reforms. My understanding of the principal thing he advocated was that we turn relief over to local communities. We tried that out during the F. E. R. A. and pretty well under the C. W. A.—principally under the F. E. R. A. While we had very excellent cases of administration, we had some very bad. It was not uniform. If the Federal Government agrees that it is the Federal Government's responsibility to provide the funds for relief, I don't think that it can avoid the responsibility for administering it.

Question. To both speakers: Being agreed, as we all are, that the best way to end unemployment relief is simply to end it, and the problem of ending unemployment being as it is, a man-made problem and not an adversity of nature like a famine or drought, but a problem arising out of our economic system of private property, shouldn't the solution be man-made? [Applause.]

Chairman DENNY. I am sorry, but I am not going to ask either speaker to answer that. That is a question for another meeting. Our subject is: "Should the present Federal unemployment relief program be continued?"

Question. Mr. Bruce, you made a statement that you thought that the power of distributing relief should go back to the States, instead of remaining with the Federal Government, because you thought that relief would be better administered. What would happen to people in the State of Kansas?

Mr. BRUCE. This transfer to the community, accompanied by placing directly upon the community a part of the money load, will change the situation from spending somebody else's money to spending in part your own. This will stimulate the effort to find employment; next, work relief will yield greater value, and finally shake off those receiving relief that are not entitled to it. There are in every community, and there always have been, people with invisible, illegal sources of income. You can name them as well as I can, and they are all on relief. When the local people are putting up a part of the money, they will go off relief. I have no quarrel with the standards of relief or the wages of relief work. Every vote I have ever had on that subject has been on the side of raising them. My only quarrel is with the abuses of people that are not entitled to relief, and of spending money under the guise of work that is a fraud; it is not work. [Applause.]

Question. I want to ask this question of both speakers. They both seem to want to get to normalcy as far as employment is concerned. One says keep it in the Federal Government; the other says put it among the States and the localities. There is a difference of opinion there. Neither one is talking to the subject, which is how to end and when to end Federal relief, which is the real question, it seems to me. I would ask both of them to answer it. What is your remedy for unemployment in this the richest country in the world, and why don't you tell us? [Applause.] We want to know what is their solution for this anomalous condition of the richest country, with the greatest amount of science and machinery, and still people ready, able to work, unable to find it? Why not tell us about free trade, taxing industry——

Chairman DENNY. I am sorry, but the question is, "Should the present Federal unemployment relief program be continued?" That is our subject. Next question.

Question. Mr. Bruce said we could have prosperity and the wheels of recovery going around. I can't understand how we can have them if we are going to bear down on relief, when purchasing power will be trimmed and the economic state will only fall. I can't see your point there. It sounds very completely flat. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUCE. I have not undertaken to bear down on anything. All I have undertaken to say is, let's put this back where it belongs; let's bring the Federal expenditures down in range with the income, and let's get a hundred cents' worth for the dollar we spend on work relief. That is all I have said. [Applause.]

Chairman DENNY. Mr. Bruce, here is another written question. How would you establish nonpolitical control of relief? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUCE. I will give you an illustration in the State of Maryland. There we have a State board. It is called the board of State aids and charities, and by long custom its membership is made up of people that are primarily interested in social welfare. They are not politically minded. I would have this board name for each local community a list of 15 names and allow in each county the county commissioners to pick 5 names out of the 15, and that board would be the county welfare board. I would have the finances come through the ordinary channels. I would have the spending in the hands of that welfare board, and when a disagreement occurs, public opinion would referee it.

I don't know which is worse; to turn it all over to professional social workers or turn it all over to politicians; one is as bad as the other, I think. [Applause.]

Chairman DENNY. Colonel Westbrook, here is a written question for you. Should any work of the W. P. A. be carried out by private contractors?

Colonel WESTBROOK. I think a plan could be worked out whereby the private contractors would give employment to the people who are destitute and who are eligible for it. Under those conditions, I think, yes. [Applause.]

Question. Mr. Bruce, I mean nothing unfriendly in this question. I hope it will be taken seriously. Your greatest indictment against the W. P. A. is that the public doesn't get 100 cents for its dollar. Your implication is, therefore, that it should be liquidated. Do you believe that that vocational group known as the bankers give the public 100 cents for its dollar? [Applause.]

Chairman DENNY. Just a minute. We are discussing one problem at a time. We can't discuss the banking problem now. Let's stick to the subject.

Question. In view of what you said, Mr. Bruce, regarding industrial cooperation and the lack of it today, and also in view of the present surplus of corporations, don't you think that there is something in this issue for more industrial cooperation rather than abolishment of relief?

Mr. BRUCE. I have stated that there ought to be more industrial cooperation. Sometimes I think that now that industry is in black ink that maybe by the reduction of prices and a present diminishing of profits, they might profit in the long run and the country be better off. Does that answer you?

QUESTIONER. Fine.

Question. Mr. Bruce, you stated that you were not opposed to W. P. A. As a W. P. A. worker, I would like to ask you whether you are opposed to the present lay-off of 700,000 workers all over the United States on W. P. A.

Mr. BRUCE. Having adopted a policy of supporting by work the employables on relief, I am not in favor of throwing them off until some other policy is established that takes them on. [Applause.]

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, yesterday, as appears from page 8090 of the RECORD, I stated to the Senate that after a conference with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] I was "satisfied that the bill now under consideration can be and will be promptly disposed of tomorrow." For that reason the bill was not proceeded with further yesterday afternoon.

The Senator from South Carolina is not present; I am informed that he is ill. I therefore ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12624, being the first deficiency appropriation bill.

I realize, Mr. President, that the friends of the commodity-exchange bill are anxious to have that measure disposed of, and it is my purpose to contribute to that end; but, in view of the absence of the Senator from South Carolina, who, I am informed by his secretary, will be present tomorrow, I make the request that is now being submitted to the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I realize the situation as outlined by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I think I may accept the assurance that we will go forward with the commodity-exchange bill tomorrow. I would not want the bill delayed over an extended period of time, even though the chairman might be ill. It is a committee bill, and the members of the committee are quite capable of handling it during the illness of the Senator from South Carolina. I think it is due to him, within the rules of propriety, that we may set aside the bill today, awaiting the return of the Senator from South Carolina tomorrow; but I should not want the consideration of the bill to be postponed for several days. With the understanding that the bill will be taken up tomorrow, I have no objection today, temporarily, to laying it aside and considering the deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none; the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside, and the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 12624.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative", on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

To pay to Beatrice Trammell, widow of Hon. Park Trammell, late a Senator from the State of Florida, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

For additional amount for the assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations to make the salary $4,800 per annum, fiscal year 1937, $600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1936, $50,000: *Provided*, That no motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles shall be purchased from this or any other appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, in his testimony before the appropriations subcommittee on the deficiency bill, Mr. Hopkins stated that at the peak of employment on work relief 3,800,000 were employed. This included 3,000,000 employed by the Works Progress Administration, 455,000 by the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the balance by the other agencies of the Government, including Public Works, Public Roads, and other Government agencies.

Mr. Hopkins plans, between March 1 and July 1 of the current year, to reduce the number employed by the W. P. A. by 700,000 and expects the number employed by the other agencies of the Government to increase by 400,000, leaving on the first of the coming month about 3,400,000 persons on relief work. To take care of these people on work relief, out of the $4,800,000,000 appropriation in 1935 the Government will have unexpended about a billion dollars; out of other balances unexpended under former appropriations since 1933, amounting to about $900,000,000, about $400,000,000, which will be available from the appropriations made for general public works; about $308,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps up to March 31 next, when that agency expires; and the $1,425,000,000 for works progress included in the present bill; or a total, including general public works, for work relief for the next fiscal year of substantially $4,050,000,000.

Much of the money included in the unexpended balances referred to is already allocated or obligated, but its actual expenditure and the work which it will enable the Government to carry on will be made during the coming fiscal year, provided the balances are not carried on into the following fiscal year, which Mr. Bell, the Director of the Budget, estimates may be done to the extent of some six or seven hundred million dollars. The whole amount of $4,055,000,000, however, is available for expenditure during the coming fiscal year should the program for its expenditure be speeded up to meet the immediate need of relief work.

Out of the available funds for relief during the present fiscal year up to the first of the coming July it is estimated that $3,618,000,000 will have been spent for relief work, including general public works, so that if this bill in its present form secures passage there will be available for relief work over $400,000,000 more than was expended during the current year.

To get the expenditures in the current year for work relief, out of the total expenditures for relief of $3,618,000,000 must be deducted the amount spent on the unemployables for the first 6 months of the year. On the first of last January or immediately prior thereto these unemployables were turned over to the State authorities. On the basis of $33 per month expended by the Federal Government for each unemployable case, which figure was given us by Mr. Hopkins in the relief hearings, and estimating the unemployables at 1,500,000—the President's figures—we must deduct $300,000,000 from the $3,618,000,000 spent to get the amount spent on work relief, or $3,318,000,000, which is $69,000,000 less than the expenditures estimated for the coming year and $737,000,000 less than is available if all of the unexpended balances are to be spent in the next fiscal year.

To sum up, we are to spend for work relief during the coming year as much as, if not more than, during the current year, and the one saving that the Government is making is a saving of $600,000,000 through turning the unemployables over to the State and local authorities.

On the other hand, Mr. Hopkins' testimony indicates that the average number on work relief for the coming year will be 2,875,000 in all. This represents a falling off, from the peak figures given us by the President for work-relief employment of nearly a million persons and a falling off of 409,000 from the lowest figures for work-relief employment given us by Mr. Hopkins covering the month of November 1935.

The additional cost per case comes partly from the fact that Works Progress is to employ less people and Public Works and other agencies more, but the actual increase for next year, through putting all Works Progress employees on the prevailing-wage scales, will involve a certain increase per person employed.

The relief appropriations since the present administration came into office in March 1933 aggregate $11,054,675,000. Substantially all of this money has been either expended, obligated, or allocated. If we add to this the $1,425,000,000 in the present bill for work relief and the $308,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps, and also the $400,000,000 appropriated for the next fiscal year for general public works, we find that the total relief appropriations up to the end of the next fiscal year will be $13,187,675,000. Even allowing for a certain carry-over of balances to the fiscal year 1938, this will leave an expenditure per year under the present administration of well over $3,000,000,000 a year for relief.

In March 1933 the unemployed in the country estimated by the American Federation of Labor numbered 15,652,000. Its estimate for March 1936 was 12,184,000. The figures of the National Industrial Conference Board for the same dates were: March 1933, 13,496,000, and March 1936, 9,649,000. Both sets of figures indicate a reduction in the unemployed of slightly over three and a half million persons. If the figures given us by the American Federation of Labor and the National Industrial Conference Board are either of them in any way accurate, it would appear that the priming of the pump to bring back prosperity has been a good deal of a failure. Manifestly the Government cannot operate perpetually under a program where its receipts are lower than its expenditures every year by more than $3,000,000,000.

Having tried out the expensive system of work relief on the theory that at the same time we were priming the pump to bring back prosperity, and having failed to do any such thing, is it not about time that we cut out this expensive experiment of Federal work relief and turn to some much more economical plan for taking care of our unemployed; that we then bend our every effort to encourage the speeding up of the business of the country and allow it to go ahead without being constantly harassed by the Government, and with some prospect of being allowed to realize on its investment? If this be done, we can get back that prosperity which the whole country is ready and hoping for, and the unemployment situation will largely, I believe, take care of itself.

Personally I have never been very enthusiastic over work relief. I have never taken a great deal of stock in the theory that by creating work which in times of prosperity the Government would not think of undertaking and putting men and women at work on these unnecessary jobs we were saving their morale and their self-respect. If I am right and this be true of the more valuable type of public-works projects, how much more is it true of many of the strange and inconceivable boondoggling projects of the Works Progress Administration which from time to time we hear of in the newspapers of the country.

I should like to be able to furnish the Senate with a list and a description of some of these projects. At my request, and with the consent of the chairman of the committee, the clerk of the committee asked for a list of the so-called "white collar" projects and the women's projects of the W. P. A., with a brief description of the purposes of the projects, the number of persons employed, and the money allocated. My request drew forth the reply that it would take weeks, and probably months, to furnish any such data. Some general information was furnished, but nothing in the way of the

specific information that I requested; and yet in this very bill we are asked to appropriate $171,000,000 for these very projects that are so difficult to define. I regret exceedingly that I cannot give the Senate the information that it really ought to have about the appropriation for these projects that it is called upon to make.

I say that I have never been very enthusiastic over work relief. I do believe that it is the duty of the Government to see that its people shall not starve or suffer from exposure; and, no matter in what straits the Government finds itself, that primarily important duty must first be attended to before any lesser obligations shall be placed on the Treasury. Human life may not be trifled with. That the Government, however, owes a job to every man and woman in the country who is without work is to my mind an entiretly false and dangerous theory and must lead to economic collapse. At a time when men and women are out of work on account of business depression the Government should not be called upon in its own hour of stress, which must come with every depression, to spend one dollar more than is absolutely essential to take care of the bodily welfare of its citizens.

I am firmly of the belief, especially since we have tried out the work-relief program, that the unemployed and the employables of the country should be taken care of through direct and not through work relief. Until the latter part of last year the Government did provide both direct and work relief for the unemployed. At that time direct relief on the part of the Federal Government ceased, and the unemployables were turned over to the State and local authorities. According to Mr. Hopkins' figures, as worked out when the Government was administering direct relief, these people were paid in the neighborhood of $400 a year per case; and the estimate is that that is substantially what the States will have to pay for taking care of them. The cost per case for work relief under the Works Progress Administration, which furnishes the cheapest form of work relief, is $972. This includes the cost of material for the work relief and the average contribution of substantially 18.6 percent paid by the sponsors on all projects. Other work relief provided under public works costs very much more, running up as high as an average of $2,470 per case, depending on the extent and cost of the material used.

It is fair to say in this connection that Secretary Ickes explained to the committee that the employment of every man on public works meant the indirect employment of several others on the material used in the project on which he was working.

I cannot persuade myself that in times of stress the Government of this country is warranted in running itself into debt, and mortgaging the future of its citizens, to provide funds to take care of its unemployed at a cost of $972 per case, much less $2,470 per case, when it could take care of the actual physical wants of its unemployed for $400 per case; and when I give the figure of $400 per case as the low figure, I am not by any means sure that under economical local management the $400 per case could not be materially lowered. However, be that as it may, work relief is the plan that we have adopted to take care of our unemployed employables; and if the deficiency bill goes through in the form that it came over to us from the House, or as amended in the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, work relief is the program that will be followed during the next fiscal year.

One argument for work relief that has always been advanced is that it would not only take care of the unemployed but would prime the pump to bring back business prosperity, by creating a demand among the workers both directly and indirectly employed for commodities. To a certain extent, among the class of commodities that these work-relief employees are able to purchase, the turning loose on the country of several billion dollars a year for work relief has probably had that effect. Also, the demand for material used has helped the heavy-goods industries. This probably largely accounts for what we are told are signs of returning business prosperity; but when we balance against that the effect on the business fabric of the country of the enormous borrowings by the Government, the enormous spending of the Government, and its consequent inability to balance its Budget, I am afraid the outlook for business as a whole will not be found to be entirely favorable.

As I have said, we are likely to go along for a while, at least, with work relief; and if we are to have work relief, it seems to me there are a few cardinal points in its administration that everyone will admit ought to be observed. In the first place, it should be administered with the utmost economy if it is to deserve the support of the people of the country. It is not enough that the higher administration in Washington should be conducted on a low percentage basis of cost; the same principle should apply to the field and local administration costs, including the costs of the foremen on the projects; and the usefulness of the projects should be so demonstrable as to make the advisability of their initiative unquestionable.

I have already said that I have been unable to get the information I asked for about the "white collar" and the women's projects. Whether or not all or the bulk of these projects are useful or reasonable projects I cannot inform the Senate. I have my own doubts. It seems to me that full publicity on such matters should be had. That the projects are being economically run some of the testimony we have had before the committee and the recent exposures in the newspapers about conditions in Westchester County, N. Y., would seem to refute.

In estimating his administration expenses at the low figure of 3.6 percent, Mr. Hopkins has not included the expenses of his foremen; and the large percentage of foremen on the jobs is particularly noticeable. In view of the fact that all the people of the country must eventually bear the costs of the country's relief work, it certainly is fair that no political influence, prejudice, or discrimination should have anything to do with the administration of work relief; but if the reports from West Virginia, New York, Missouri, and various other States are in any way reliable, political discrimination seems to be exceedingly rampant.

Politics ought to be and must be cut out of work relief if the people of the country are to have any confidence in its administration.

Last year we had a very considerable fight in the Senate over the question of whether relief work should be paid the prevailing-wage scale or the lower rate that would not subject business to competition with work relief for employment. The labor unions fought strenuously for the use of the prevailing-wage scale, but the President's recommendation for a lower relief scale prevailed. Mr. Hopkins last year was very much in favor of the lower wage scale, but this year he tells us that in nearly all cases the prevailing-wage scale has been adopted. This inevitably will have the effect of creating an unwillingness on the part of the workers to go back to private work, and will tend to prolong the maintenance of work relief.

As a matter of fact, in a great and rich country like ours I cannot subscribe to the claim we hear on many sides that we must always in the future keep up a work-relief program by the Federal Government. Federal buildings, river and harbor improvements, Federal highways, and other legitimate Federal projects will every year undoubtedly be undertaken; but, in my belief, such projects will be undertaken because we need the projects, and not because we need to take care of unemployment.

Work relief or direct relief should not be made attractive to those who are unfortunate enough to be on its rolls. All men and women on the relief rolls ought to realize that the employment they are getting on the rolls is but temporary and but a makeshift until they can get back to normal work.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has proposed an amendment to the present bill turning back to the States the appropriation in the bill for the Works Progress Administration, and providing a minimum contribution by

the States to the relief fund, to be administered by a bipartisan board in each State.

Already the care of the unemployables has been turned back to the State and local authorities. I am firmly of the opinion that with the States themselves contributing one-third toward their local relief program, and with the administration of the program entirely in their hands, a real economy in relief can be brought about. The people of each State know their own problems and know their own people. There will be little soldiering on relief when the local bipartisan boards realize that one-third of any waste incurred in relief work must be locally paid for.

I know that many people do not have the views that I have about relief work. It may well be that the States themselves will set up some form of work relief. That they are privileged to do under the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. At the very least, if they do set up such work relief, we know that in the interests of the localities such work relief will be as economically administered as its local committees can make it.

I very much hope that when this amendment is offered in the Senate it will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, on page 2, beginning in line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 13, to insert:

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, fiscal year 1936, $75,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for services, personal, professional, or otherwise, in excess of the rate of $3,600 per annum: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per-diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, contingent fund of the Senate, for the fiscal year 1936, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives", on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

For payment to the widow of Randolph Perkins, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 11, to insert the following:

For payment to the widow of William D. Thomas, late a Representative from the State of New York, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 23, to insert:

For payment to Lincoln Loy McCandless, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of McCandless against King, as audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 2, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, before the word "foregoing", to strike out "two" and insert "three", so as to read:

The three foregoing sums to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 7, to insert:

Expenses of special and select committees: For an additional amount for special and select committees authorized by the House, fiscal year 1937, $20,000 to be immediately available: *Provided*, That such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be available for each and every expense of the select committee of the House of Representatives acting pursuant to House Resolution 460, adopted April 29, 1936, including the employment of personal services, the traveling and incidental expenses of such committee or any subcommittee or member or employee thereof, and the pay and travel of witnesses; all such expenses to be paid on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts: *Provided further*, That no person shall be employed under such appropriation at a rate of compensation in excess of $3,600 per annum: *Provided further*, That the committee is authorized to procure information and assistance from any Federal executive agency, including the services of personnel therein, and any such agency is hereby authorized to render such assistance, furnish such information, and detail such personnel as the committee may request: *Provided further*, That the official committee stenographers of the House of Representatives may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 19, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1937

To enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1937, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, fiscal year 1937, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Architect of the Capitol", on page 6, after line 17, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For rewiring electrical circuits and new panel boards, $5,000; for parts for air-conditioning plant electrical equipment, $500; for electric-light bulbs, $1,500; in all, $7,000, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the bill about the appropriation for the Senate Office Building? Did the officials in charge of the Senate Office Building ask for more money?

Mr. ADAMS. They did. They asked for a substantial amount in addition to that allowed. We took the matter up with the Architect of the Capitol, and this item is approved.

Mr. COPELAND. The matter I have in mind relates to the painting. As I understand, an air-conditioning system is to be installed in the Senate Office Building this summer. Of necessity, there will be marring of the walls, and I wondered whether or not any request had been made for an increase in the appropriation for painting in connection with that improvement.

Mr. ADAMS. As I recall, the request was for money to paint the new wing. Some of us who have offices in the new wing have felt that it was not necessary, because the air conditioning is already in that wing.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will forgive me for speaking about the matter. As former chairman of the Committee on Rules it was my duty to look into the needs of the Senate Office Building, and so I wondered whether the committee had given the officials in charge of that building all they thought they needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 6, beginning in line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, was the amendment on page 2, line 14, passed over?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I may say that the senior Senator from Kentucky asked me to request that that amendment be passed over if I was present when it was reached. I was not present when it was acted on.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wanted to have the amendment appropriating the money for the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses passed over. There are some matters I desire to look into in connection with the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the amendment be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over for the present. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 5, to insert:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

For the printing and binding of a compilation containing the provisions of Federal laws held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937, $1,200.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether the amendment on page 7, relating to the compilation of laws, includes all laws from the beginning of our Government which have been held to be unconstitutional?

Mr. ADAMS. I may say that the compilation has already been made and is available. The amendment is merely for the purpose of having it printed so that it may be distributed.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, is sufficient money provided so that those acts which will be invalidated in the future may be included in the compilation?

Mr. ADAMS. I think the Senator knows the answer to the inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 8, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive independent offices—Executive Office", at the top of page 8, to insert:

National Emergency Council: The President of the United States is hereby authorized to allocate to the National Emergency Council, out of funds appropriated to him by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 115), not to exceed $100,000 for the expenses of the committee designated by him, as an adjunct of the National Emergency Council, to make a study of the emergency and regular agencies of the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of making recommendations to secure the most efficient organization and management of that branch of the public service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 18, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

The unexpended balance of the "Conversion of inhabited alleys fund" of $500,000 established pursuant to the provisions of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling act, approved June 12, 1934, is hereby continued available for the purposes of said act until June 30, 1937, together with all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources, prior to June 30, 1937, as authorized in section 3 (b) of said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency conservation work", on page 9, line 7, after the word "regulations", to strike out "and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended", so as to read:

For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes", approved March 31, 1933, as amended, including personal services, without regard to civil-service laws and regulations, supplies and equipment, purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals and newspapers, printing and binding, travel expenses, rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles, also the purchase (including exchange) of one at not to exceed $1,500, and other necessary expenses, fiscal year 1937, $308,000,000, to be expended under the direction of the President and to remain available until March 31, 1937, of which sum $10,000,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment was considered in the committee and tentatively adopted as it has just been approved by the Senate, and as a result of conferences which have been held since that time I desire to offer an amendment to be added at the end of the paragraph.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 10, line 9, to add the following proviso:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to affect the status under the civil-service laws of any positions created under and by virtue of the act of April 27, 1935, or brought under the civil-service laws by Executive order heretofore or hereafter issued.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is not now in order, except by unanimous consent. It is an amendment to the House text. Does the Senator in charge of the bill object to the consideration of the amendment at the present time?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I do not object, but I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Wyoming as to the inclusion of the word "hereafter." It seems to me the amendment is rather broad when he attempts to have it apply to things which may happen in the future.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The thought was that the power of the President to make an Executive order should not be restricted by an appropriation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this is an individual amendment, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is in the nature of an amendment to the committee amendment, inasmuch as it is part of the general subject which was under discussion at the time the amendment just agreed to was adopted.

Mr. McNARY. I am not interposing objection to the amendment but only to the procedure. We have an agreement to consider first committee amendments. Does not this impinge on that agreement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am frank to say that probably it does.

Mr. McNARY. If it does, I shall insist that the unanimous-consent agreement be adhered to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The holding of the Chair is that it is an amendment to the House text and is not an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I withdraw the amendment for the time being and will offer it after the committee amendments shall have been acted on.

Mr. McNARY. I hope the Senator will follow that course. There is always confusion when we deviate from a general agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite understand that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming withdraws his amendment, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 5, to insert:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports necessary to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, including the salary of the Administrator and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings when determined by the Administrator to be necessary in furthering the work of the Administration; contract stenographic reporting services; special counsel fees, consulting engineering fees, and expert witness fees; materials, supplies, equipment, and services; rentals, including buildings and parts of buildings and garages, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, law books, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; financial and credit reports; purchase, rental, exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of typewriters, calculating machines, and other office appliances; purchase (not to exceed two), rental, exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes; printing and binding; and all other expenses necessary to administer said act, fiscal year 1937, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Rural Electrification Administration when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator in charge of the bill and to the other Senators present that I did not anticipate that we would take up the deficiency bill this morning. On my way to the Senate from the office building I was shown a memorandum from Mr. Cook, which I did not have time even to read, and I should like to consider it before the Senate passes on this amendment. I do not

know that I shall desire to offer any amendment to the committee amendment, but I may wish to do so when I have time to consider the memorandum. I should like to have the amendment temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Smithsonian Institution", on page 17, after line 9, to insert:

Astrophysical Observatory: For the establishment and maintenance of solar observing stations, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including assistance, subsistence, purchase of books, periodicals, and apparatus, making necessary observations in high altitudes, construction, rental, repairs, and alteration of buildings, preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations, traveling expenses, and other necessary expenses, fiscal year 1936, $200,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board", on page 23, line 14, after the word "elsewhere" and the semicolon, to strike out "employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise in the District of Columbia and elsewhere for special accounting, statistical, and mechanical services determined necessary by the Board, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) and the provisions of laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States", so as to read:

Wage records, Social Security Board: For all expenditures necessary to enable the Social Security Board to collect and record initial basic data concerning employers and employees, which, together with current individual wage records subsequently to be maintained, will thereafter constitute current total individual wage records and a basis for the identification of employees incidental to, and necessary for, benefit payments under title II of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935, including furnishing identification cards and emblems to employers and employees; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board; supplies; reproducing, photographing, and all other equipment, office appliances, and labor-saving devices; services; advertising, postage, telephone and telegraph; printing and binding; rentals, including garages, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and miscellaneous items, including those for public instruction and information deemed necessary by the Board, $12,400,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 3, to insert:

TARIFF COMMISSION

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for all printing and binding of the Tariff Commission, fiscal year 1936, including the same objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1936, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tennessee Valley Authority", on page 24, line 16, after the word "Dam", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "(hereafter to be known as 'McReynolds Dam')"; in line 19, after the name "Fowler Bend" and the comma, to strike out "and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of a dam on the lower Tennessee River" and insert "a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar, Tenn."; and on page 25, line 9, after the figures "1937" and the comma, to strike out "$39,900,000" and insert "$41,100,000", so as to read:

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933", approved May 18, 1933 (U. S. C., title 16, ch. 12a), as amended by the act approved August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1075–1081), including the continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, and Chickamauga Dam and the beginning of construction on a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowler Bend, a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar, Tenn., and the acquisition of necessary land, the clearing of such land, relocation of highways, and the construction or purchase of transmission lines and other facilities, and all other necessary works authorized by such acts, and for printing and binding, law books, books of reference, newspapers, periodicals, purchase, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and all necessary salaries and expenses connected with the organization, operation, and investigations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1937, $41,100,000.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in connection with the amendment on page 24, line 16. The House designated one of the dams under the Tennessee Valley Authority the "McReynolds Dam." The Committee on Appropriations received a letter from Representative McREYNOLDS in which he asked us, as an accommodation to him, to strike out the provision naming one of the dams "McReynolds Dam", as he preferred not to have a dam named after him. So that the change is made at the instance of the man who was sought to be honored by the designation of the name.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 27, to insert:

UNITED STATES HARVARD UNIVERSITY TERCENTENARY COMMISSION

For the expenses of carrying out the provisions of Public Resolution No. 88, approved May 7, 1936, authorizing the recognition of the three-hundredth anniversary of the founding of Harvard College and the beginning of higher education in the United States and providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the anniversary, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); traveling expenses; rent; printing and binding; official cards; entertainment; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the President, fiscal year 1937, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 17, to insert the heading:

TITLE II—RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I suggest that perhaps it would be well to pass over title II, dealing with the relief matters, until we conclude the miscellaneous amendments, because if there is to be any discussion probably it will be in connection with this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments in title II will be passed over, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 36, in line 9, to insert "Title III", so as to make the heading read:

TITLE III—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Supreme Court, District of Columbia", on page 40, after line 12, to insert:

Pay of bailiffs, etc.: For an additional amount for pay of bailiffs, etc., Supreme Court, District of Columbia, including the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, $2,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water service", at the top of page 47, to insert:

The appropriation of $123,000 contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936, approved June 14, 1935, for the purchase and installation of two 25,000,000-gallon-daily electrical motor-driven centrifugal pumping units at the Bryant Street pumping station, including all necessary appurtenances and alterations and removal of one 12,000,000-gallon and one 20,000,000-gallon obsolete steam pumping unit, is continued available in the fiscal year 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 6, after the numerals "475" and the comma, to insert "and Senate Document No. 211", and in line 8, before the word "together", to strike out "$9,011.35" and insert "$10,161.35", so as to read:

JUDGMENTS

For the payment of final judgments, including costs, rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Documents

Nos. 442 and 475 and Senate Document No. 211, Seventy-fourth Congress, $10,161.35, together with the further sum to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 20, to insert:

Audited claims, District of Columbia: For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia in Senate Document No. 211, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713, p. 1022), being for the service of the fiscal year 1933 and prior fiscal years: Refund taxes, District of Columbia, $747.99.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 12, to insert:

WEATHER BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for the same objects specified under this head in the Agriculture Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937, for the reestablishment, maintenance, and operation of the Weather Bureau station at Lynchburg, Va., $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 10, to insert:

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS

Soil survey of the Hawaiian Islands: Not to exceed $15,000 of the funds appropriated by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is hereby made available, to remain available until June 30, 1937, to meet all necessary expenses of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, Department of Agriculture, for the completion of a soil survey of the Hawaiian Islands, including personal services for map-drafting work in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Bureau of Air Commerce", on page 52, after line 17, to insert:

For an additional amount for the establishment and maintenance of aids to air navigation, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1937, $247,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I recall that a goodly appropriation for aids to air navigation is carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill which is now in conference. I have no objection to the item, but I do not know why it should appear in the bill under consideration when a similar item or one very much like it, touching the same subject matter, is contained in the Agricultural appropriation bill which is now in conference.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if I may answer the question asked by the Senator from Oregon, let me say that an effort was made to increase by a very considerable amount the appropriation for air navigational aids. As a result of the investigation into the Cutting disaster and safety in the air it has been made very apparent to our committee that not enough money is being spent for such navigational aids. Some additional money was appropriated in the Agricultural Department bill for weather reporting, but the item now under consideration has to do with radio beams and the other aids to navigation. The reason the sum is fixed at $247,000 is because there is an unappropriated balance of that amount already authorized by the Bureau of the Budget, and there was apparently no disposition on the part of the Bureau of the Budget to make further recommendations at this time. Therefore the $247,000 was added to the pending bill in order that at least that much might be available for the protection of those who navigate the air.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have simply one observation to make. I observe that the two preceding amendments, which were agreed to, deal with matters also touched upon in the Department of Agriculture bill. Why should those items be carried in two appropriation bills—the one now being considered and in the other which is in conference?

Mr. COPELAND. One of the other items had to do with weather reporting. That was contained in the Department of Agriculture bill. The item under consideration in the bill we are now discussing has to do with the Bureau of Air Commerce in connection with ground aids to navigation. I hope I have made it clear.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator has made it clear.

Mr. COPELAND. I urged both the appropriation referred to by the Senator from Oregon, contained in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and the one contained in the bill under consideration. As I previously said, the item contained in the Department of Agriculture bill had to do with weather reporting and the Weather Bureau.

Mr. McNARY. I am speaking now more of the practice than I am of the result which may be accomplished. I observe on page 51 an item for the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils and on page 50 an item for the Weather Bureau. All the items referred to are associated with the activities of the Department of Agriculture and carried in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], now on the floor, is chairman of the conference dealing with that bill. When the bill making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture contains items similar to those in the present bill, and when the first bill is still in conference, it seems strange to me that similar items should be contained in the bill now under consideration dealing with the same subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I made inquiry concerning that matter, and I have to say in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon that the bill now under discussion reached the Congress after the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill had been considered by both the Senate and the House. The matters referred to by the Senator from Oregon were not touched upon in the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. They were contained in the supplemental estimates, and therefore could not be submitted in the original appropriation bill. In that view I think they are proper items to be contained in the bill now under consideration.

Mr. McNARY. I think that observation covers the amendment referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 52, after line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 2, to insert:

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

District and cooperative office service: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1937, $15,000.

Domestic commerce and raw materials investigations: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1937, $15,000.

Lists of foreign buyers: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1937, $2,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Lighthouses", on page 53, after line 20, to insert:

Repairs, etc., due to flood damages: For rebuilding, repairing, and reestablishing such aids to navigation and structures connected therewith as were damaged or destroyed by flood conditions in March 1936 on the Atlantic coast and tributary rivers, and in the Mississippi River Basin, $91,500, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interior Department—Office of the Secretary", at the top of page 56, to insert:

War Minerals Relief Commission: For payment of awards made by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the act of Congress approved May 18, 1936 (Public, No. 602, 74th Cong.), amending section 5 of the War Minerals Relief Act of March 2, 1919, as amended, March 13, 1929, fiscal year 1936, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937, $900,000: *Provided*, That all

awards made by the Secretary of the Interior for payment under this appropriation shall be certified to the General Accounting Office for settlement through that office.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment appearing at the top of page 56 dealing with the War Minerals Relief Commission, in order to correct an error I ask that the word "March" in line 6 be stricken out and that the word "February" be substituted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I observe that the committee amendment carries an appropriation of nearly $1,000,000. What is the function of the War Minerals Relief Commission? What is the money appropriated for?

Mr. ADAMS. It is to carry out the provisions of an act passed during the present session, which is now a law, which carries out the provisions of the law previously enacted, which really requires the appropriation of a million and a quarter dollars. That amount was reduced to $900,000. It is a matter in which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is very much interested, and it was justified by reason of making payments of awards which have been made to certain claimants under the War Minerals Act. Perhaps that is not a very clear explanation, and I shall ask the junior Senator from Georgia to make a further explanation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hesitate to undertake the explanation of this item because various bills for the purpose of compensating those who engaged in the production of minerals during the war have been passed from time to time, and the matter has become somewhat complicated. As I understand, the act undertakes to compensate those who at the solicitation of the Government entered upon the production of various minerals during the war. An act was passed and approved providing for the payment of the principal of the amount, but due to the fact that some time elapsed before the payment of the principal could be made, those who responded to the call of the Government during the war suffered considerable loss of interest on the amount they had borrowed at the instigation and solicitation of the Government to start producing various minerals. The amount provided in the act which was approved only the other day, May 18, this current month, as I understand, will wipe out the entire question of claims under the War Minerals Relief Commission for all time in the future. It will provide a final liquidation of all claims against the Government growing out of the War Minerals Relief Act. The Senator from Maryland knows a great deal more about the matter than I do and will perhaps make an explanation thereof.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the Senator in charge of the bill already knows, this is about the sixth appropriation requested under the War Minerals Relief Commission. I do not doubt that many of the claims are meritorious, but it seems to me to be rather peculiar that there should be carried provisions for relief of the war minerals claimants in the last six deficiency bills. I should like to understand why the matter cannot be terminated in one bill. I should like to know why it is deemed necessary to provide an appropriation of a million dollars to four or five million dollars for war minerals relief in the various appropriation bills. Such items have been contained in the last six bills. I wonder whether similar items will not be found in other bills which shall come up for consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the objection raised by the Senator from Maryland might be well taken. Frankly I do not know all the details of the various claims. I know, however, that some of the claimants have presented their cases to me, and if their representations are correct their claims are meritorious. I may say to the Senator from Maryland, however, that I understand the pending bill finally liquidates the matter, and I do not think any claims for this purpose will appear hereafter.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I make the request that the amendment at the top of page 56 be passed over until the return of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it would be wise, Mr. President, to take that course. My colleague fully understands the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment at the top of page 56 dealing with the War Minerals Relief Commission will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Land Office", on page 57, after line 6, to insert:

Payments to States of 5 percent of proceeds from sales of public lands: For an additional amount for payment to the several States of 5 percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands lying within their limits, for the purpose of education, or of making public roads and improvements, fiscal year 1936, $1,291.39: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service", on page 61, after line 22, to insert:

Homestead National Monument of America, Nebr.: For the acquisition of land, and development and improvement of the Homestead National Monument of America, in Nebraska, in accordance with the act of Congress approved March 19, 1936 (Public, No. 480, 74th Cong.), fiscal year 1936, $24,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, for the benefit of the conferees after this bill shall go to conference I desire to make a brief explanation of the amendment which has just been agreed to. I think when it is understood there will be no question whatever in regard to it.

By the act of March 19, 1936, Congress provided for the purchase as a national homestead monument of the first homestead claim that was ever taken up under the Homestead Act of 1862, which went into effect on the 1st day of January 1863. I supposed that an appropriation would be inserted in the deficiency bill, as a matter of course, but the House committee rejected it, and the matter was not further considered on the floor of that body. I was greatly surprised at the action of the House committee, and I read a copy of the hearings, from which it clearly appears that the members of the House committee did not understand just what the act provided.

The measure to which I have referred, having been passed by Congress, I thought, as a matter of course, that the Appropriations Committee would carry it out by recommending the proper appropriation for the purpose. So I appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, submitted this amendment, and asked that it be incorporated in the bill, which was done, and the Senate has agreed to it.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln signed the first homestead act. It was introduced by then Representative Grow, of Pennsylvania, one of the great Members of the House of Representatives, as all Senators know. The act provided by its terms that it should go into effect on the 1st day of January 1863. Under that law a vast empire has been redeemed from a desert and a great portion of it has been made the most fertile region of our country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator from Tennessee in just a moment.

Millions of acres of land, where at one time buffaloes roamed and the inhabitants were chiefly Indians, have been converted into the great American bread basket. Included in that area are a large portion of the States of the great Mississippi Valley and other States outside that valley, some of them, States in the South. Under the beneficent homestead law, that imperial domain has been as highly developed as is any portion of our country. The homestead law is still on the statute books, but is practically inoperative because there are no more homesteads available, and the idea is, since it belongs practically to history, that there ought to be preserved as a national monument for future generations some place, somewhere that would commemorate the gradual transition of a vast region from the conditions of frontier life to a high state of civilization.

The House committee thought it was merely a Nebraska project. It is located in Nebraska because it happens that the first homestead entry made under the law was in the State of Nebraska, and so the act which was passed last March specifically described this tract of land and provided that it should become a national monument, so as to commemorate throughout all time the trials and tribulations of frontier life and exemplify for the benefit, enlightenment, and education of future generations the marvelous changes and progress which have followed the enactment of the homestead law.

Now I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to interrupt the Senator from Nebraska merely to make an observation. As the Senator will recall from history, and as I recall from history, former President Andrew Johnson, who served both as Representative and as Senator before he became President, made the homestead law his political life work while he was a Member of the two Houses and urged in season and out of season its passage. I merely wanted to make that reference to a former distinguished President from the State of Tennessee.

He offered his first homestead bill in March 1846, when a Member of the House.

In 1853, when he was elected Governor of Tennessee, "he brought his homestead hobby from Washington to Nashville." He urged the Tennessee Legislature "to instruct our Senators in Congress and to request our Representatives to use all reasonable exertion to procure the passage of a bill granting to every head of a family who is a citizen of the United States a homestead of a hundred and sixty acres of land, upon condition of settlement and cultivation for a number of years." While in the Senate in 1858, Johnson brought up his favorite bill and it was passed by a vote of 44 to 8. The House also passed it, but President Buchanan vetoed it. Though the act was not finally passed and approved until 1863, the homestead law was the result of Mr. Johnson's far-sighted and humanitarian efforts. But for him it doubtless never would have been passed. It was a wonderful piece of legislation.

I took great pleasure in voting for the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska in the committee and shall be glad to support it here. I only wish to add this bit of history to the proposal.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his observation. All he has stated is, of course, historically true.

Mr. President, the implements of agriculture have been gradually changing and developing since the homestead law was enacted, and it is the theory of those who believed in and advocated the project of making the first homestead ever taken under that law a national monument that there should be there preserved all the things that go to show the development and improvement of agriculture and at the same time the advance of the section in which this homestead is located from a buffalo country, an Indian country, to its present high state of civilization.

In the hearings that I read it was apparent from some of the questions the members of the committee asked that they were of the opinion that this was still an unsettled region. In Gage County, Nebr., is found one of the most fertile areas under the sun. Some members of the committee at least were of the opinion that it was still a frontier. It is within 5 miles of Beatrice, county seat of Gage County, which has a population of between ten and fifteen thousand, and is as enterprising a city as exists anywhere in the United States. It is 40 or 50 miles from Lincoln, which is located in the adjoining county of Lancaster, and is the capital of the State.

Mr. President, this is a national project, not a State project. The site only happens to be in the State of Nebraska, because there is where the first homestead that was taken under the law was located.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GLASS. Does the Senator understand that anyone is objecting to this appropriation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, though not in the Senate; but, as I have said, I want the RECORD to show the explanation of this matter in order that the conferees, when they go into conference on this bill, may have the record before them.

Mr. GLASS. Well, the Senators who probably will be members of the conference committee had the benefit of the Senator's statement to them, and I think they understand this proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think all those who will be conferees were present, although, perhaps, they were. However, I want the RECORD to show the facts, in order that the conferees on the part of the House and any probable conferee on the part of the Senate who was not present and did not hear the explanation, may understand what they are.

The objection was raised that probably the next thing we would have to do would be to build a road into this particular section of country. The road that formerly, in the days of the frontier, in the pioneer life of that section, went from the Missouri River west passed right through this tract of land. It is a well-graded gravel road today. It is 5 miles from Beatrice, where there is a paved road that will take one to the capitol at Lincoln, and, in fact, connects with paved roads which reach every part of the United States.

A question was asked about the cost of this project. My information is that the heirs of Daniel Freeman, who still own this land, have agreed to take $150 an acre for it. I have been there; I have seen the land. I lived for some time in the city of Beatrice, and practiced law there whenever I got anything to do. I have been over every foot of this land. It was selected by Daniel Freeman. There is no better land anywhere under the sun than this 160 acres. I think that $150 an acre for this land would be a fair price. Land in the vicinity can be bought for $125 an acre, but it does not have the traditions and other associations connected with it that are attached to this particular homestead. There is no desire to profit privately on the part of anyone in the purchase of this homestead. Occupying a central location in an area that has been settled and developed and civilized by the operations of the homestead law, it will eventually become a rendezvous for those who are interested from historical and other standpoints.

Daniel Freeman was a soldier in the Civil War; he was in that section in Nebraska for some time, serving his country under the direction of his superior officers.

I think he was a lieutenant or, at any rate, an officer of a lower grade. He was making some investigations and was ordered back to his regiment. He did not have time to wait until the land office opened the 1st day of January 1863 to make a filing if he was to obey the orders of his commander and return to his post.

There were a great many other prospective settlers who came to Brownville, where the land office was located, ready to file on homesteads the next day, the 1st of January. There was a dance that evening, attended by many of the prospective homesteaders who were going to file the next day. The officer who was going to open the land office the next morning was at that dance. Daniel Freeman knew if he stayed to file his homestead and waited until office hours began he would be unable to get back to his command. So he hunted up the official, told him his dilemma, and asked, "Will you not open the land office, so that I may file on this land right after 12 o'clock midnight?" The land-office official finally agreed; that is what happened; and before 1 o'clock in the morning Daniel Freeman had made his filing and was on his way to St. Louis. He served the remainder of his time in the Army and then went back to the homestead and acquired title under patent.

Mr. President, I understand that when Representative Grow retired from public office and went back to Pennsylvania

there was a celebration. Daniel Freeman was there and made a short address, and I want to read from what was said:

When Congressman Grow retired in 1903 and returned to his home he was surprised to find waiting at the station Freeman, the first homesteader. At the community celebration a little later Freeman told his story.

Now I quote from what Freeman said:

I was stationed at Brownville, Nebr., as a young soldier, to do some secret-service work. The town was the seat of a Government land office, and the place was filled with prospective settlers, who were waiting for the 1st of January, when the Grow homestead law was to become operative. I had in several details—

I presume he means military details of service—

I had in several details seen a good deal of Nebraska. I liked the soil of Gage County, so I staked my claim near Beatrice and waited anxiously for the time when I could make my filing at the Government office.

The fates seemed against me. I was ordered to St. Louis, and I had to leave early January 1, the day the homestead law went into effect. On the night of December 31 the prospective settlers had a dance. I sought out the assistant register of the land office, who was in the ballroom, and urged him to let me file on my claim at midnight so I could leave for St. Louis early next morning. He agreed to do this, and we went to the land office, where the preliminary papers were made out. Before 1 o'clock homestead entry no. 1 was signed, and I went on my way to St. Louis a happy lad.

At the expiration of my service in 1865 I returned to Nebraska, built a log cabin, married the young woman who owned the adjoining claim, and we lived happily on this property for 50 years.

That is the story of homestead no. 1. Little Creek runs through one part of this land. It was from the timber which grew on this land that the first log house was built in which Daniel Freeman and his bride made their home and raised a family. They became leading citizens in the development and growth of Gage County, Nebr.

It is that land which it is proposed shall be bought and maintained by the Government in commemoration of the homesteaders of America. This is the appropriation intended for the purchase of that land. We are erecting monuments, setting aside parks, and building roads to commemorate various events in our history. It is, I think, eminently fit and proper that the first homestead ever entered under the homestead law should be purchased and set aside and become a monument whereon may be recorded in a manner which can be evident to tourists the story of the different trials and tribulations which were suffered in order to make out of a desert, once roamed by the buffalo and inhabited by the Indians, one of the most fertile tracts in our entire country.

Mr. President, I thought this much of an explanation should be made to insure that the item will be retained in the bill when it is finally enacted into law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 62, after line 5, to insert:

Marker at Columbus, Ga.: For the erection in Columbus, Ga., of a suitable marker or markers, marking the site of the Engagement of Columbus fought in that city on April 16, 1865, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved April 10, 1936 (Public, No. 499, 74th Cong.), fiscal year 1936, to remain available until June 30, 1937, $1,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure until title to the land upon which the marker is to be erected is acquired by the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I asked that the amendment on page 2, line 13, be passed over in order that I might look into it. I have examined the amendment and now have no objection to its adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment was, on page 2, line 13, to insert the following:

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, fiscal year 1936, $75,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for services, personal, professional, or otherwise, in excess of the rate of $3,600 per annum: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per-diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 15, to insert:

Ackia National Memorial Commission and Battleground National Monument: The unexpended balance of the appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, Miss., and the establishment of the Ackia Battleground National Monument, and for other purposes", approved August 27, 1935, contained in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, is continued available for the fiscal year 1937 in order to provide for the commemoration during that year of the two hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 2, to insert:

Colonial National Monument, Virginia: For the acquisition of lands in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation of the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes", approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat., p. 855), as amended, the evidence of title to such lands to be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937, $187,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 10, to insert:

Andrew Johnson Homestead National Monument: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the Andrew Johnson Homestead National Monument", approved August 29, 1935, fiscal year 1936, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government in the Territories", on page 64, after line 11, to insert:

Insane of Alaska: For an additional amount for care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska, including the same objects and for the same services specified in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936, $1,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice, office of the Attorney General, Bureau of Investigation", on page 67, line 2, after the numerals "455", to insert "and Senate Document No. 218"; and in line 3, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$30.25" and insert "$34.27", so as to read:

Claims for damages: For the payment of claims for damages to any person or damages to or loss of privately owned property caused by employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, acting within the scope of their employment, considered, adjusted, and determined by the Attorney General, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment and settlement of certain claims arising out of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation", approved March 20, 1936 (Public, No. 481, 74th Cong.), as fully set forth in House Document No. 455 and Senate Document No. 218 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, $34.27.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marshals, district attorneys, clerks, and other expenses of United States courts", on page 72, line 5, after the numerals "1936", to strike out "$36,500" and insert "$36,500"; and after line 5, to insert:

For 1937, $87,500.

So as to read:

Miscellaneous expenses: For an additional amount for miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years that follow, respectively:

For 1930, $360.
For 1936, $36,500.
For 1937, $87,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Bureau of Navigation", on page 75, after line 17, to insert:

Acceptance of bequest of Henry H. Rogers: For crating, packing, transportation, and other necessary expenses in connection with the acceptance by the Secretary of the Navy, on behalf of the United States, of the collection of ship models bequeathed the United States Naval Academy by the late Henry H. Rogers, as authorized by the act approved April 25, 1936 (Public, No. 533), to remain available until June 30, 1937, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of State—Foreign intercourse", on page 83, after line 5, to insert:

Payment to Gladys Hinckley Werlich: For payment to Gladys Hinckley Werlich, widow of McCeney Werlich, late a Foreign Service officer of the United States at Paris, France, of 1 year's salary of her deceased husband who died while in the Foreign Service, as authorized by the act approved May 18, 1936 (Private Act No. 567, 74th Cong.), $4,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International congresses, commissions, bureaus, etc.", on page 89, after line 9, to insert:

Conference to Revise the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Brussels, Belgium: For the expenses of participation by the United States in the conference to convene at Brussels, Belgium, for the purpose of revising the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, concluded at Bern, September 9, 1886, and revised at Rome, June 2, 1928, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; traveling expenses; purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, maps, stationery, and official cards; entertainment; printing and binding; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, fiscal year 1936, $6,500, to remain available until June 30, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 5, to insert:

Ninth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy: For the expenses of participation by the United States in the Ninth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held in Rumania in 1937, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; traveling expenses; purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, maps, stationery, and official cards; entertainment; printing and binding, including the payment of not to exceed $500 to the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States toward the cost of printing the report of the American delegation to the Ninth Congress; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, fiscal year 1937, $11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask if representatives of these various groups came before the committee and made a showing with reference to the payment of their expenses? In other words, are the items which are now being considered similar to those which have appeared in this bill each year?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, these items seem to be cumulative. They came to the committee on the recommendation of the Budget Bureau, and, of course, with the customary letter from the President. There was no testimony before the committee and no statement other than that of the Director of the Budget, who made the statement that the items are based on acts passed by Congress, so apparently it was not optional with us whether or not they should be included.

Mr. McNARY. They are all supported by Budget estimates?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 91, after line 2, to insert:

International Council of Scientific Unions: For the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and associated unions, as authorized by the act approved June 16, 1934, as follows: International Council of Scientific Unions, $19.30; International Astronomical Union, $617.60; International Union of Chemistry, $675; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, $2,316; International Scientific Radio Union, $154.40; International Union of Physics, $62.72; and International Geographical Union, $194.66; in all, fiscal year 1935, $4,039.68, together with such additional sums, due to increases in rates of exchange, as may be necessary to pay in foreign currencies the contributions required by the statutes of each union.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, after line 17, to insert:

International Hydrographic Bureau: For the contribution of the United States to the International Hydrographic Bureau, together with such additional sums, due to increases in rates of exchange, as may be necessary to pay in foreign currencies the contribution required by the statutes of the Bureau, fiscal year 1936, $308.80.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, after line 23, to insert:

International Telegraph Consulting Committee: For the expenses of participation by the United States in the meeting of the International Telegraph Consulting Committee to be held at Warsaw, Poland, in 1936, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; traveling expenses; local transportation; printing and binding; official cards; purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, and periodicals; stationery, entertainment; and such other expenses as the Secretary of State may authorize, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments have been made for any purposes herein specified, fiscal year 1937, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, after line 14, to insert:

Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union: To aid in defraying the expenses of the Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to be held in the United States in June 1937, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; traveling expenses; local transportation; hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and maps; stationery; membership badges; official cards; entertainment; printing and binding; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, fiscal year 1937, $10,000, to remain available until June 30, 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs", on page 96, after line 8, to insert:

Refund to Edgar M. Barber: For refund to Edgar M. Barber of the amount of an unavailable item in his accounts as former special disbursing agent, Paris, France, paid by him, which unavailable item the Comptroller General of the United States was subsequently directed to allow in his accounts by Private Law No. 548, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 7, 1936, $51.25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Internal Revenue", on page 97, line 7, after the numerals "1937" and the comma, to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$5,801,550", and in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,421,100", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for expenses of assessing and collecting the internal-revenue taxes, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1937, $5,801,550, of which amount not to exceed $1,421,100 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, after line 10, to insert:

Payment of judgments against internal-revenue collectors: For payment of judgments rendered against Rufus W. Fontenot, individually and as acting collector of internal revenue, in each of 11 separate equity suits in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, New Orleans Division, covering injunction proceedings for the prevention of collection of processing taxes under and pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 31), as amended August 24, 1934 (49 Stat. 750), $2,782.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Procurement Division—Public Buildings Branch", on page 101, line 9, after the word "thereto", to insert "including post office and courthouse at Shawnee, Okla.", so as to read:

Public buildings outside the District of Columbia: For emergency construction of public-building projects outside of the District of Columbia (including the acquisition, where necessary, by purchase, condemnation, exchange, or otherwise of sites and additional land for such buildings; the demolition of old buildings where necessary and construction, remodeling, or extension of buildings; rental of temporary quarters during construction, including moving expenses; purchase of necessary equipment for buildings and such additional administrative expenses and salaries as may be required solely for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, including reimbursement to the appropriation "Emergency construction of public buildings, act August 12, 1935", for expenditures made for advance planning of public buildings), $60,000,000; such projects, including the sites therefor, to be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, acting jointly, from the public-building projects specified in statement no. 1 contained in House Report No. 1879, Seventy-third Congress, second session, as revised February 29, 1936, and statement no. 2 attached thereto, including post office and courthouse at Shawnee, Okla., and the projects so selected shall be carried out within the respective estimates of proposed limits of cost specified in such statement no. 1 and those hereafter fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General for projects selected from statement no. 2 and otherwise, except that the unobligated balance of the $2,500,000 fund established by the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1061), is hereby increased in an amount not to exceed $500,000 from the funds heretofore appropriated for emergency construction of public buildings, and such fund shall be available for the augmentation of limits of cost of projects heretofore or hereafter selected under the provisions of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1061) and under the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571), in an amount not exceeding 15 percent for any project; and shall be available also for the augmentation of limits of cost of projects selected under the provisions of this act in an amount not exceeding 10 percent of any project.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 21, after the word "paragraph", to strike out the comma and "and he is hereby authorized, when deemed by him desirable and advantageous, to employ, by contract or otherwise, temporary professional, technical, or nontechnical employees, firms, or corporations, to such extent as may be required to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, without reference to civil-service laws, rules, regulations, or to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5)", so as to make the further proviso read:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to direct the preparation of all sketches, estimates, plans, and specifications (including supervision and inspection thereof), and to enter into all contracts necessary for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to read and to gather from the reading the purport of the language stricken out. I should like to have some explanation of it. What reason does the able chairman of the subcommittee assign for the removal of this language?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will note line 3, of page 103, he will observe a reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. That is the section which requires all contracts for services and for materials to be advertised before they are let. The language which was stricken out apparently would have had the effect of permitting all contracts for services of the kinds mentioned to be let without reference to that statute; and the committee felt that the statute should not be waived.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think I should add that as the language was drafted it apparently would have allowed public-building contracts to be let without competitive bids.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, after line 9, to insert:

Memorial to persons killed in the wreck of Navy dirigible *Shenandoah:* For the erection near Ava, Ohio, on the spot where the Navy dirigible *Shenandoah* fell, of a suitable tablet or marker to commemorate the heroic services rendered by Commander Zachary Landsdowne and other members of the crew who died when the *Shenandoah* was destroyed, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1936 (Public, No. 614, 74th Cong.), fiscal year 1936, to remain available until June 30, 1937, $2,500: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure until title to the land upon which the tablet or marker is to be erected is acquired by the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department", on page 109, after line 3, to insert:

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

Promotion of rifle practice: For construction, equipment, and maintenance of rifle ranges, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Nonmilitary activities", on page 109, after line 10, to insert:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Cemeterial expenses: For maintaining and improving national cemeteries, including the same objects specified under this heading in the War Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936, and including also the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, at a cost not to exceed $250,000, of suitable lands for enlargement of existing national cemetery facilities as authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in the vicinity of New York City, N. Y.", approved May 18, 1936, $250,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 14, after the word "title", to strike out "II" and insert "IV", so as to make the heading read:

Title IV—Judgments and authorized claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Property damage claims", on page 110, line 17, before the word "For", to insert "(a)", so as to read:

SECTION 1. (a) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, after line 14, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case", approved December 28, 1922 (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 215–217), as fully set forth in Senate Documents Nos. 219 and 240 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, as follows:

Veterans' Administration, $100.24;
Works Progress Administration, $1,867.35;
Department of Agriculture, $992.64;
Department of the Interior, $1,565.49;
Department of Labor, $102.80;
Navy Department, $499.35;
Post Office Department (payable from postal revenues), $102.85;
Treasury Department, $307.37;
War Department, $3,777.56;
In all, $9,315.65.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States Courts", on page 112 line 21, after "456", to insert "and Senate Document No. 220", so as to read:

SEC. 2. (a) For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United

States", as amended by the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911 (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41, par. 20; sec. 258; secs. 761–765), certified to the Seventy-fourth Congress in House Document No. 456, and Senate Document No. 220, under the following departments and establishments, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, at the end of line 24, to strike out "$371.46" and insert "$747.46", so as to read:

Veterans' Administration, $746.46.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts", on page 113, line 3, after the words "In all", to strike out "$10,868.46" and insert "$11,243.46", so as to read:

In all, $11,243.46, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest as specified in such judgments or as provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 113, line 14, after the numerals "456", to insert "and Senate Document No. 220"; on page 113, after line 16, to insert "Navy Department, $14,356.31"; at the end of line 18, to strike out "$400" and insert "$7,654"; and after line 18, to insert "In all, $22,010.31", so as to read:

(b) For the payment of judgments, including costs of suits, rendered against the Government of the United States by United States District Courts under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damages caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 781–789), certified to the Seventy-fourth Congress in House Document No. 456, and Senate Document No. 220, under the following departments, namely:

Navy Department, $14,356.31;
Treasury Department, $7,654;
In all, $22,010.31.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, Court of Claims", on page 114, line 8, after the numerals "458", to insert "and Senate Document No. 221,"; after line 10, to insert "National Recovery Administration, $297.30"; at the end of line 14, to strike out "$11,658.67" and insert "$30,815.04"; at the end of line 16, to strike out "$339,535.22" and insert "$622,576.62"; and in line 17, after the words "In all", to strike out "$368,224.87" and insert "$670,719.94", so as to read:

SEC. 3. (a) For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and reported to the Seventy-fourth Congress in House Document No. 458, and Senate Document No. 221, under the following departments and establishments, namely:

National Recovery Administration, $297.30;
Veterans' Administration, $95.37;
Department of Labor, $903.50;
Navy Department, $30,815.04;
Treasury Department, $16,032.11;
War Department, $622,576.62;
In all, $670,719.94, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest as and where specified in such judgments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Audited claims", on page 115, after "Sec. 4", to insert "(a)", so as to read:

SEC. 4. (a) For the payment of the following claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, line 24, after the word "Prohibition", to strike out "$56.04" and insert "$66.04 (in lieu of $56.04 as certified in such document)", so as to read:

Department of Justice: For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prohibition, $66.04 (in lieu of $56.04 as certified in such document).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 2, after the word "courts", to strike out "$556.23" and insert "$546.23 (in lieu of $556.23 as certified in such document)", so as to read:

For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $546.23 (in lieu of $556.23 as certified in such document).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 6, after the word and numeral "section 4", to insert "(a)", so as to read:

Total, audited claims, section 4 (a), $206,735.82, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, after line 10, to insert:

(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1933 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 222, Seventy-fourth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

Independent offices: For investigation of enforcement of prohibition and other laws, $33.33.
For Interstate Commerce Commission, $5.35.
For Federal Trade Commission, $70.27.
For Army pensions, $13.33.
For Navy pensions, $80.
For medical and hospital services, Veterans' Bureau, $415.12.
For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $529.03.
For national home for disabled volunteer soldiers, Mountain Branch, $2.72.
Department of Agriculture: For salaries and expenses, Plant Quarantine and Control Administration, $72.84.
For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $30.41.
Department of Commerce: For air-navigation facilities, $310.
Department of the Interior: For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $5.40.
For suppressing liquor traffic among Indians, $146.48.
For reclaiming lands, Lummi Reservation, Wash. (reimbursable), $15.72.
Department of Justice: For printing and binding, Department of Justice and courts, $9.
For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $1,805.13.
For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prohibition, $517.44.
For fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, $7.80.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $160.75.
For probation system, United States courts, $3.88.
For support of United States prisoners, $51.30.
Navy Department: For aviation, Navy, $2,612.92.
For organizing the Naval Reserve, $119.20.
For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $25.80.
For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $2,746.59.
For pay of the Navy, $56.70.
For pay, Marine Corps, $116.85.
Department of State: For transportation of Foreign Service officers, $9.29.
Treasury Department: For Coast Guard, $22.50.
For fuel and water, Coast Guard, $140.
For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, $641.63.
For collecting the internal revenue, $1.80.
For preventing the spread of epidemic diseases, $1.50.
For enforcement of Narcotic and National Prohibition Acts, $59.07.
For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Narcotics, $2.
For general expenses of public buildings, $2.85.
For operating supplies for public buildings, $11.60.
War Department: For pay, and so forth, of the Army, $3,653.67.
For pay of the Army, $1,202.08.
For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $435.43.
For Army transportation, $394.22.
For barracks and quarters, $33.53.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, $14.
For mileage of the Army, $15.
For clothing and equipage, $184.91.
For ordnance service and supplies, Army, $1.70.
For replacing ordnance and ordnance stores, $1.43.
For arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, $5.38.
For National Guard, $882.30.
For pay of National Guard for armory drills, $568.
For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $108.50.
For cemeterial expenses, War Department, $2.05.
Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For city-delivery carriers, $662.64.
For compensation to postmasters, $705.89.
For mail messenger service, $24.
For miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices, $2.50.
For post-office equipment and supplies, $5.25.
For railroad transportation and mail messenger service, $35.62.

For rent, light, and fuel, $467.80.
For rural delivery service, $74.08.
For separating mail, $90.75.
For vehicle service, $376.15.
For indemnities, domestic mail, $42.09.
For indemnities, international mail, $9.65.
Total, audited claims, section 4 (b), $20,854.42, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 22, after the numerals "459" and the comma, to insert "and Senate Document No. 223", and in line 23, after the name "Department of Labor" and the comma, to strike out "$23,945.39" and insert "$42,951.29", so as to read:

SEC. 5. Judgments against collectors of customs: For the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office covering judgments rendered by United States district courts against collectors of customs, where certificates of probable cause have been issued as provided for under section 989, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 842), and certified to the Seventy-fourth Congress in House Document No. 459, and Senate Document No. 223, under the Department of Labor, $42,951.29.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the establishments or agencies named in subsection (b) of this section, shall after June 30, 1937, incur any obligations for administrative expenses, except pursuant to an annual appropriation specifically therefor by Congress.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the establishments or agencies named in subsection (b) of this section shall, after June 30, 1937, incur any obligations for administrative expenses, except pursuant to an annual appropriation specifically therefor, nor shall any such establishment or agency continue to function after said date unless its creation shall have been specifically authorized by Congress: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to extend the period during which any such establishment or agency heretofore has been authorized by law to function.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the establishments or agencies named in subsection (b) of this section shall, after June 30, 1937, incur any obligations for administrative expenses, except pursuant to an annual appropriation specifically therefor, nor shall any such establishment or agency continue to function after said date unless its creation shall have been specifically authorized by Congress: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to extend the period during which any such establishment or agency heretofore has been authorized by law to function.

(b) 1. Federal Home Loan Bank Board;
2. Home Owners' Loan Corporation;
3. Federal Housing Administration;
4. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;
5. Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation;
6. Export-Import Bank of Washington;
7. Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C.;
8. Reconstruction Finance Corporation;
9. Electric Home and Farm Authority;
10. Commodity Credit Corporation;
11. Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works;
12. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation;
13. Reconstruction Finance Mortgage Co.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, line 14, after the numerals "1933", to insert "shall be accomplished by transfer appropriation warrant and", so as to read:

SEC. 8. After June 30, 1936, advance payments under the provisions of title VI, part II, of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933, shall be accomplished by transfer appropriation warrant and shall have no longer period of availability for obligation than the appropriation from which such advance payments are made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of those passed over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I requested that the amendment on page 56, with reference to the War Minerals Relief Commission, be passed over until the return to the Chamber of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. That request was granted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has not as yet returned. There is an amendment on page 16, relative to the Rural Electrification Administration, which was passed over at the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. Title II also has been passed over.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think we had better have a quorum present.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; in view of that situation, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The clerk will state the first amendment passed over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is my understanding that the adoption of amendments to title II will not subsequently preclude the presentation of a complete substitute for title II, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is now present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment on page 56 was passed over during the absence of the Senator from Georgia. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the top of page 56 it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

War Minerals Relief Commission: For payment of awards made by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the act of Congress approved May 18, 1936 (Public, No. 602, 74th Cong.) amending section 5 of the War Minerals Relief Act of March 2, 1919, as amended, March 13, 1929, fiscal year 1936, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937, $900,000: *Provided*, That all awards made by the Secretary of the Interior for payment under this appropriation shall be certified to the General Accounting Office for settlement through that office.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it will be recalled that an appropriation of a very large sum of money—I believe about $50,000,000—was authorized in an act passed during the war period, the purpose of the act being to stimulate the production of certain necessary minerals for war purposes. After the end of the war the War Minerals Relief Act, approved March 2, 1919, provided for the adjustment of certain claims by those who had been induced to enter the field of production for the purpose of increasing the supply of certain necessary war materials. The act provided that losses sustained should be paid to the claimants, and the War Minerals Relief Commission, of course, followed as the agency through which the adjustments were to be made.

Controversies early arose, and for several Congresses the matter in one form or another has been before the Congress. Cases have been brought in the District of Columbia courts, and those cases have gone to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court itself more than once has passed upon one question in controversy. As a result of the decision of the Su-

preme Court, it finally was held that interest accrued up to the date of the passage of the act of March 13, 1929, was a proper item to be included in an award where all the other elements were present, but that no interest after the date of the act could be added. Courts in the District of Columbia took a view contrary to that, but the Supreme Court finally made that ruling. Several acts have been passed for the purpose of adjusting these claims where they had gone through the courts, and where a court itself had made an adjudication, or where the claims were filed by the date specified in the original War Minerals Act.

Finally a bill was passed at this session by both houses of the Congress, appropriating $1,250,000 in final settlement of all these war mineral claims. The $1,250,000 is not carried in the pending bill because it is still required that the several claimants shall have an adjudication of the amounts due them, and the only claimants who are now prepared to claim their pro-rata part of the appropriation have claims amounting to some $900,000, and it will be after the next Congress meets before the other claimants can have an adjudication of their claims. That will be the end of it.

I may say that this is one appropriation out of an original appropriation of $50,000,000, $40,000,000 of which was returned to the Treasury, and this is the end of the war minerals cases. Nine hundred thousand dollars is ample to cover all of the claims which are adjudicated, and I may say that there are several hundred of them. The claimants reside in various States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Most of the claimants are in the western mining areas of the country.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether the $900,000 carried in the bill covers all adjudicated claims?

Mr. GEORGE. It covers all adjudicated claims, or all the claims which probably could be adjudicated prior to the meeting of the next Congress. At that time it will be necessary to appropriate the balance provided in the bill, to wit, the difference between $900,000 and $1,250,000. It is not necessary that the appropriation be made in the pending bill, and therefore this estimate is sent to us. I make this statement by way of explanation of this particular item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment at the top of page 56.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 16, after line 5, to insert the following:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports necessary to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, including the salary of the Administrator and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings when determined by the Administrator to be necessary in furthering the work of the Administration; contract stenographic reporting services; special counsel fees, consulting engineering fees, and expert witness fees; materials, supplies, equipment, and services; rentals, including buildings and parts of buildings and garages, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, law books, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; financial and credit reports; purchase, rental, exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of typewriters, calculating machines, and other office appliances; purchase (not to exceed two), rental, exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes; printing and binding; and all other expenses necessary to administer said act, fiscal year 1937, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Rural Electrification Administration when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have not had opportunity to communicate with anyone connected with the Rural Electrification Administration, but I have conferred with several members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and I should like to have the Senator in charge of the bill tell me whether the information I have received is correct.

I understand that the Budget estimate was about $400,000 or $450,000 greater than the amount carried in the bill for this item; that the committee cut the estimate because this is a new activity, which has recently been provided, and no one can tell with certainty just what the administrative expenses will be; that the committee was of the opinion that, since it was a new activity and no one could tell definitely just what the amount should be, since Congress would meet again in January, there would be sufficient time so that we could have a pretty good idea as to just how much money for administrative purposes may be necessary.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator has made a correct statement of the views of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. With that understanding I have no further objection, because I think that if more money should be needed, as demonstrated by experience, we could readily get it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if that concludes the committee amendments, I have an amendment which I send to the desk, and which I should like to offer at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this does not conclude the committee amendments. We passed over the amendments in title II.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 27, line 18, to insert the following:

Title II—Relief and work relief.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thought another amendment of the committee had been passed over.

Mr. FLETCHER. The whole title was passed over.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that, but there were three committee amendments passed over, and two of them have been considered within the last few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk informs the Chair that all the amendments passed over have been agreed to except those in title II.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understand inquiry is now being made by the Senator from Oregon as to what the parliamentary status is with respect to a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President; I desire to know whether the committee amendments, save those in title II, had been considered by the Senate. I am advised that they have been.

Mr. ADAMS. There are a number of miscellaneous committee amendments, in different sections other than title II, which have not been presented; but I had rather assumed that in the regular order perhaps we would now take up title II.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, under the unanimous-consent agreement we could consider individual amendments as to parts of the bill, excepting title II, and consider the amendments in that part of the bill separately from the other divisions of the bill.

Mr. ADAMS. There is no objection, if the Senator would prefer that we take up the other items. There are some miscellaneous committee amendments to be offered. We will go ahead with them, if the Senator prefers.

Mr. McNARY. I think it would be quite orderly and practicable to clean up the individual amendments to the text, excepting as to title II, and let that stand by itself.

Mr. ADAMS. I am entirely willing to follow the suggestion of the Senator.

I have an amendment to offer on page 4, line 3, and I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment at that point was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. ADAMS. To the committee amendment I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 4, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "four", so as to read:

The four foregoing sums to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following:

For payment of Samuel Wilder King, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of McCandless against King, as audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections Numbered Two, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have another amendment I am directed by the committee to present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 47, after line 8, to insert the following:

For the payment of claims approved by the Commissioners under and in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia", approved February 11, 1929 (45 Stat. 1160), as amended by the act approved June 5, 1930 (46 Stat. 500), and reported in Senate Document No. 252, $1,708.77.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I present an amendment to be inserted on page 51 after line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert, on page 51, after line 4, the following:

For the purchase of land and erection of laboratory, greenhouse, and service buildings and purchase of equipment, to be used in connection with the sugarcane investigations of the Department of Agriculture, including the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia for the preparation of the plans, $100,000, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I submit another amendment at the direction of the committee. It would operate to repeal certain provisions making appropriations which are no longer needed by reason of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Guffey Coal Act case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

The appropriations for "Salaries and expenses" and "Printing and binding" for the Bituminous Coal Labor Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, contained in the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1937", are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I submit another amendment at the request of the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 103, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

United States Public Health Service buildings: For erecting, furnishing, and equipping suitable buildings for the use of the National Institute of Health and the United States Public Health Service, in or near the District of Columbia, authorized by the act of May 26, 1930, $1,363,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, that completes the committee amendments except as to title II. There are a number of rectifying amendments to title II.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, before taking up title II I wonder whether I may be permitted to offer an amendment concerning which I spoke to the Senator from Colorado. I do not think there will be any objection to it. The amendment provides for the acquisition by the Bureau of Fisheries of a site for a fish hatchery at Jessup's Mill, near Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, $10,000, which shall be immediately available. The amendment has been approved by the Department and is an item which was passed by the Senate in connection with another bill, but was stricken out in conference.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if the Senate is now going to consider individual amendments, some of us have amendments we should like to offer. I have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Montana, but it was understood that we were to complete the committee amendments before we should take up individual amendments.

Mr. WHEELER. I was wondering whether title II was to be considered before individual amendments were taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed by unanimous consent that committee amendments were to be first considered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it was unanimously agreed that committee amendments should first be considered, and that was done, except as to title II. A few moments ago it was understood the title II would be passed over, inasmuch as we had considered all other committee amendments, and that the Senate would proceed to consideration of individual amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I did not so understand the situation, I will say to the Senator. If I misunderstood the Senator from Oregon I regret it, but I thought the Senator from Oregon was dealing with miscellaneous committee amendments; that they were to be disposed of and that then we were to take up title II. I did not mean that we should take up miscellaneous individual amendments before we took up title II. I should not be willing to have that done.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I was trying to assist the Senator in amending his bill. Probably he does not need any assistance.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am always glad to receive assistance.

Mr. McNARY. I have no choice in the matter at all, except that I thought consideration of title II might well be deferred for a short time, and we could then dispose generally of all amendments to the text of the bill. However, if the Senator from Colorado desires the Senate, as I understand, now to consider miscellaneous committee amendments——

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, they have all been considered. There are no miscellaneous committee amendments pending other than as to title II. We have now reached the point of consideration of title II.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator does not desire to proceed with individual amendments?

Mr. ADAMS. No, Mr. President; I should prefer to go ahead and complete committee amendments, which include title II.

Mr. GLASS. If that is done, then it will put some of us, who should like to present individual amendments, to some inconvenience.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say, Mr. President, that if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations desires a different order, I acquiesce instantly.

Mr. GLASS. No, Mr. President; I do not desire a different order. It is rather inconvenient for us to debate title II when we desire to present amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, we have now reached the consideration of title II. There have been some changes made in the provisions as passed by the House. I, as well as other Senators, should like to have the able Senator from Colorado advise us what changes have been made, the reasons therefor, and the general purposes of the changes.

Mr. ADAMS. I shall be glad to try to do so. I do not mean to say that I can supply all the information asked for, but I shall be very glad to make a statement of my understanding of the changes.

We have modified the bill as it came from the House in one particular which appears in the first paragraph. The House bill placed the disposition of the appropriated funds in the hands of the W. P. A.; that is the organization headed by Mr. Hopkins. The Senate Committee on Appropriations believed that the form of the law which is now in effect was preferable, and consequently have amended the bill so as to place the authority for the distribution and allocation of the relief funds in the hands of the President rather than in the Works Progress Administration. The reasons for that, I think, are sufficiently obvious to require no further explanation. The President, being the head of the executive department, and having the authority for distribution and allocation of relief funds under the present law, it seemed wise to the Committee on Appropriations to continue that policy.

The committee has made one or two suggestions in reference to the various classifications to which relief money may be devoted. They are rather for clarification than otherwise.

The committee has changed textually the provisions with reference to the employment of aliens, not changing the substantial character or purposes of the House provisions but rather seeking to clarify them. As the bill is now framed it is provided that the President shall cause to be made a survey of unemployable persons who are applicants for work under the Relief Administration, and that aliens who are illegally within the United States, and other aliens who have not filed declarations of intentions to become citizens, shall be excluded from employment under the Relief Administration.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate provided that no Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds provided in this appropriation unless and until an amount sufficient for its completion has been allocated and irrevocably set aside for its completion. It was the intention of the committee that the relief appropriation should not be used for the inauguration of projects unless adequate funds were set aside from this appropriation to complete them.

An amendment was adopted by the committee, at the instance of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], making provision that not more than one-half of 1 percent of the total number of persons employed within a State shall be nonresidents of the State and that not more than 1 percent of the total amount allocated out of the appropriation within a State shall be paid to those who are not citizens.

A provision has been inserted to the effect that the fact that a person is entitled to or has received either an adjusted-service bond or a Treasury check in payment of adjusted-compensation certificate shall not be considered in determining his need of employment. In other words, the ex-service man who has a bond or a check shall not be denied relief, if he be in need, because of his possession of money derived from his adjusted compensation.

The Government, having argued with the ex-service men that they should, if possible, retain their bonds, it seemed to the committee that it should not at this time say to them, "You are not entitled to help unless you use up the bonds or the funds which are given you as compensation for war service."

The next important provision is in reference to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. It provides for what may be called an earmarking of certain funds for public works under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. At the present time the Administrator, who is now the Secretary of the Interior, has some $400,000,000 in securities. These securities may not be used for the purpose of making grants. They may be sold, but the proceeds can then only be used to make loans.

The Administrator of Public Works has $50,000,000 in cash available for grants. The committee felt that the public-works program of the Public Works Administrator should be carried on under reasonable limitations. The present law provides that the R. F. C. may purchase securities owned by the Public Works Administration, but limits the purchase by the R. F. C. by a provision that the R. F. C. may not hold in its portfolio at any one time to exceed $250,000,000. That is not the limit of their capacity to purchase but the limit of their holdings at one time.

So the committee have proposed an amendment to the effect that moneys received from the R. F. C. upon the purchase of securities by that organization shall be released from the requirement that they can only be used for loans; so that to the extent of $250,000,000 the proceeds received from the sale of securities by the R. F. C. are available for loans and grants. In substance this amendment makes possible a continuation of the Public Works Administraion program on a very substantial basis.

We have limited in the amendment the grants that may be made to 30 percent of the cost of the project where its cost is over $100,000, and to 45 percent where the project costs less than $100,000; in other words, feeling that by placing the 30-percent limit we will make the money go farther. Under the present program 45 percent in grants may be given to all projects. We are now proposing to restrict the grants to 30 percent. We are further putting a restriction that the only projects that may be authorized and constructed which receive grants must be those which can be substantially completed within 1 year. It seems to us that that will result in the construction of more projects. It will eliminate what some of us thought was the danger of the commencement of large projects which could not be completed. So by this provision we have given $250,000,000 in cash, made it available from their own funds, but it can be augmented by loans for construction, so that construction may be undertaken up to the amount of perhaps $800,000,000 under that provision, if minimum grants are made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I gladly yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is my understanding correct that nothing in this amendment reduces the funds which are available to the Public Works Administration under the present law:

Mr. ADAMS. There is not a reduction of a cent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that the Public Works Administration may continue, as now authorized by law, to expend any money that is available to it, and this provision merely exempts the P. W. A. from the limitation as to loans $250,000,000 which may be obtained through the R. F. C.?

Mr. ADAMS. In substance, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming it releases from the restrictions that their money shall only be used for loans $250,000,000 and makes available to the Public Works Administration $300,000,000 which may be used for grants, some of which may be made to the city of Cheyenne.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Or to the city of Pueblo.

Mr. ADAMS. Well, we hope so.

Mr. GLASS. And ought not to be made to either of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. We say both.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that Lynchburg has had some.

Mr. GLASS. If it has had, it ought to be ashamed of itself, as any other city ought to be.

Mr. ADAMS. I think, Mr. President, we will move off to some other State and get away from Virginia, Wyoming, and Colorado.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What has been stated was my understanding of the effect of the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. By way of illustration, if the Public Works Administration should make a grant of $300,000 for a project which might cost a million dollars, it would be left for the municipality, or the city, or the county, or the water district, or whatever type the organization might be, to borrow the additional $700,000. If the grant was to a smaller project, a hundred-thousand-dollar project, $45,000 could be loaned, and it would be left for the beneficiary to provide the $55,000.

No provision is made by the bill in reference to the making of additional loans. The Public Works Administration may continue to use all its funds for loans or may use up to $300,000,000 for grants and loans.

I think, Mr. President, that covers the substantial features of the bill as reported to the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] inquires how much the Public Works Administration has available? I do not know the full extent, but they do have available $450,000,000; that much I know. I understand that there are certain projects in process of completion which will run on through the year, but there are in the form of available securities and securities about to be available $400,000,000 and $50,000,000 of cash.

Mr. WAGNER. Does that include the $300,000,000 to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. ADAMS. That includes the $300,000,000 as a conversion of securities into cash, and making it available for grants where it is now only available for loans.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ADAMS] has made an exceedingly clear explanation of the changes the Appropriations Committee has made in the House bill except that he has omitted something which I undertook to explain to the committee, but which ought not to need any explanation anywhere.

I voted against the so-called grant or gift of so-called Federal funds to States or communities. It is a misnomer. It is not a grant. The Federal Treasury has not a dollar and never has had a dollar that it does not have to pick out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country. When a city, whether in Colorado, Wyoming, Virginia, or elsewhere, is given a grant, the impression is produced upon the people of that city that they are getting something for nothing; that they are getting something which they do not have to pay back. Some States and some cities are getting something which they do not have to pay back, but just in the measure that a city or a State has wealth of any sort it has to pay back every dollar, not only of the alleged grants to itself, but it has to help pay back grants to States and cities which do not pay any taxes and which will not have to pay back any of the grants.

This matter of grants has induced States and subdivisions of States to tax their every ingenuity to trump up useless projects upon which the funds of the taxpayers may be expended; to trump them up under the popular impression that they are getting something for nothing; that they are getting a gift from the Federal Government. They are simple enough not to know that they have to pay back to the Federal Government in the shape of taxes every dollar of the loan, every dollar of the grant as well as the loan. After the election is over they will find it out.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should like to submit for the RECORD a statement in reference to the Public Works Administration prepared and sent to me by Mr. E. H. Foley, Jr., director of the legal division of the Public Works Administration, giving his interpretation of the provision.

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

STATEMENT

The purpose of the provision relating to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works is to authorize the Administrator, upon the direction of the President, to use any funds now available to the Administrator for any purpose under existing law for the making of grants and loans and grants under this provision to aid in the financing of projects capable of being substantially completed, in the determination of the Administrator, not later than June 30, 1937. In addition to these funds available to the Administrator, the Administrator is authorized to use funds (not exceeding $250,000,000) hereafter received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to Public, No. 412, Seventy-third Congress, for grants alone or grants made in connection with loans for such projects.

The provision is not intended to disturb the use of the revolving fund for loans as authorized under Public, No. 412, or under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (Public Resolution 11, sec. 12, 74th Cong.), but its purpose is to permit the Administrator to use for grants moneys now available to him under previous appropriations, including the moneys now in the revolving fund, and up to $250,000,000 of moneys hereafter added to the revolving fund.

It is estimated, therefore, that the Administrator will be able to make grants amounting to $250,000,000 from moneys hereafter received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation plus $50,000,000 from unobligated balances now available to him, and such additional amounts, if any, as may be made available by the release from commitment of unexpended funds.

The provision confers supplemental and additional powers upon the Administrator and does not curtail any of his powers or functions under existing law.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, can the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] enlighten me as to certain unexpended balances which I am informed remain to the credit of the Public Works Administration? I have a memorandum from the Budget Director that on April 30 there were unexpended balances to the credit of relief and public works to the extent of $2,488,000,000, and that of that amount $750,000,000 had not been obligated. The balance had been obligated but was unexpended.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Director of the Budget submitted to the House committee a statement in reference to unobligated and unexpended balances. His statement which was there made was as of the 31st of March 1936. The hearings before the House committee were in progress shortly after that time. The figures which he then gave as to the Public Works Administration were that there was then available $751,000,000. That was the figure as of that date. The estimate which he made was that for the fiscal year 1937 there would remain available $500,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is referring to the unobligated amount. I am speaking of the unexpended balance as well.

Mr. ADAMS. The total unexpended in the Public Works Administration as of that date was $893,000,000. In the Works Progress Administration the total funds made available were $1,397,000,000. Of that the estimated expenditures up to the end of the fiscal year would be $1,350,000,000 with the estimate that only $47,000,000 would remain unexpended and unobligated at the end of this fiscal year. These figures appear at pages 426 and 438 of volume II of the House hearings.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think the Senator has included the items the Director of the Budget has given to me. I asked the Director of the Budget for all the funds under the head of relief which were unexpended as of April 30, and likewise the funds under public works, which includes the loans and grants to States and municipalities, which had not been expended, the loans to railroads for construction which had not been expended, funds for public highways, river and harbor work, Rural Electrification Administration, Works Progress Administration, and all others. The total of those unexpended balances he gave as $2,488,000,000. Of that amount $750,000,000 had not been allocated.

Mr. President, a few days ago I addressed a letter to the Director of the Budget asking for certain information with reference to appropriations and deficits. I ask the privilege of having the clerk read the letter which I received from the Director of the Budget so that it may appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, May 23, 1936.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have your letter of May 16, 1936, requesting (1) a statement of unexpended balances of any appropriations that relate to emergency relief or expenditures which result in employment; (2) a statement of the Federal income for the fiscal years 1933, 1934, 1935; (3) the expenditures and deficits for the same period; and (4) estimates for the fiscal years 1936 and 1937.

It is not possible to furnish you with an accurate statement of the unexpended balances of each of the emergency appropriations, except for the relief appropriation of $4,880,000,000, the accounting for which is centralized in the Treasury, without a great deal of effort and a delay of possibly more than 2 weeks in furnishing an answer to this question. There is, however, enclosed a statement showing, among other things, the total unexpended balances of the various emergency appropriations combined, as of April 30, 1936. This statement will also show the unobligated balances under each of the emergency appropriations, which it seems to me are the proper figures to be used in any discussion of this matter. There is also transmitted a summary report of the status as of April 30, 1936, of the appropriation provided in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935. Table 2 of this report shows the unexpended and unobligated balances of allocations made to the various organizations of the Government from this appropriation. For your further information I am submitting a similar report showing the status of this appropriation as of May 10, 1936, which is the latest information available as to this appropriation.

As to the Federal income, expenditures and deficits for the fiscal years 1933 to 1937, inclusive, there is set forth below a table furnishing this information.

Fiscal year—	Receipts	Expenditures	Deficit
1933	$2,079,696,742	$5,142,953,627	$3,063,256,885
1934	3,115,554,050	7,105,050,085	3,989,496,035
1935	3,800,467,202	7,375,825,166	3,575,357,964
1936 (estimated)	3,949,043,634	9,915,709,874	[1] 5,966,666,240
1937 (estimated)	5,596,917,650	8,272,554,370	[1] 2,675,636,720

[1] Based upon estimates contained in the 1937 Budget, adjusted as indicated in the following paragraph.

The estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1936 are adjusted to show the loss in processing taxes during that year because of the Supreme Court decision on the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, while the expenditures for 1936 contain a revised estimate of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration expenditures and include the entire cost, amounting to $2,237,000,000, of the adjusted-compensation payments to be made to veterans. The estimate of receipts for the fiscal year 1937 has been adjusted to show the loss in processing taxes due to the Supreme Court decision and include an estimate of additional revenue expected under the pending tax bill as passed by the House of Representatives. The estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1937 also include the revised estimated expenditures of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the anticipated expenditures under the pending relief bill. The adjusted estimates for the fiscal years 1936 and 1937 furnished herewith are in accord with the adjusted deficits for those years furnished the Senate Finance Committee by the Secretary of the Treasury in his recent testimony on the pending tax bill.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL, *Acting Director.*

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Has the Senator been able to interpret these figures, to know what they mean?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I shall try to explain them to the Senate.

Mr. COPELAND. I shall be glad if the Senator will.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am astonished to discover, and I think many will share my feeling, that in the fiscal year beginning July 1 next the Administration proposes to spend $600,000,000 more for ordinary expenses and for relief than for the present fiscal year. With improving conditions, I and nearly all other citizens expected a reduction in the colossal spending program.

The Budget Director says that for the current fiscal year we shall spend $9,915,709,874, less bonus, $2,237,000,000, net for ordinary expenses and for relief $7,678,709,874. For the current fiscal year our deficit will be approximately $6,000,000,000. For the appropriation year starting next July the Federal Government proposes to spend $8,272,554,370, an increase of nearly $600,000,000 over the present year. This means that we shall spend nearly $1,000,000,000 more than in 1935, and $3,000,000,000 more than in 1933; yet conditions today are greatly improved, and the need for relief and governmental expenditures much less than in these previous years.

Even after including the revenue expected from the House bill, the deficit in 1937 is estimated by the Budget Director to be $2,675,636,720, and this does not include the flood-control bill and other appropriations recently enacted.

The Budget Director also advises me that on April 30 for relief and public works we had unexpended $2,488,000,000, and of this amount $750,000,000 was not obligated; yet Congress is being asked to pass another heavy relief bill, notwithstanding the balances on hand.

In 1937 we shall collect in taxes $1,600,000,000 more than in 1936, and still the deficit continues in an alarming amount.

Mr. President, I ask that there be incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a list of the unexpended balances now in the Federal Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Statement showing the total amounts appropriated and allocated for recovery and relief, the unexpended balances thereunder, and the unobligated balances distributed by appropriations as of Apr. 30, 1936

	Total appropriated and allocated	Unexpended balance daily Treasury statement	Obligations outstanding against Treasury cash balance	Total unobligated balances	Distribution of unobligated balances					
					Specific	National Industrial Recovery Act, June 16, 1933	Emergency Relief and Public Works Act, June 19, 1934	Drought Relief Act, June 19, 1934	Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, Apr. 8, 1935	Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds
Agricultural aid:										
Agricultural Adjustment Administration	360.1	149.8	16.9	132.9	132.9					
Commodity Credit Corporation	492.4	208.3	145.7	62.6						62.6
Farm Credit Administration	626.4	238.7	57.7	181.0				22.1	28.0	130.9
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	200.0									
Federal land banks:										
Capital stock	125.0	3.1		3.1	3.1					
Paid-in surplus	145.0	45.9	1.5	44.4	44.4					
Reduction in interest rates on mortgages	59.0	15.9	5.5	10.4	10.4					

Statement showing the total amounts appropriated and allocated for recovery and relief, the unexpended balances thereunder, and the unobligated balances distributed by appropriations as of Apr. 30, 1936—Continued

	Total appropriated and allocated	Unexpended balance daily Treasury statement	Obligations outstanding against Treasury cash balance	Total unobligated balances	Distribution of unobligated balances					
					Specific	National Industrial Recovery Act, June 16, 1933	Emergency Relief and Public Works Act, June 19, 1934	Drought Relief Act, June 19, 1934	Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, Apr. 8, 1935	Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds
Relief:										
Federal Emergency Relief Administration (including Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation)	3,082.5	30.6	22.2	8.4					8.4	
Civil Works Administration	826.7	9.6	8.0	1.6	1.6					
Emergency Conservation work	1,341.7	136.9	73.8	63.1	.7	3.0			59.4	
Department of Agriculture, relief	85.3	2.1	2.1							
Public Works (including work relief):										
Boulder Canyon project	72.4	21.2	14.3	6.9		2.0			4.9	
Loans and grants to States, municipalities, etc	914.5	606.6	581.4	25.2					25.2	
Loans to railroads	192.1	182.0	182.0							
Public highways	1,193.5	432.6	277.1	155.5					155.5	
River and harbor work	479.8	135.0	123.9	11.1		.6	.4		10.1	
Rural Electrification Administration	10.5	9.6		9.6					9.6	
Works Progress Administration	1,409.8	496.4	250.6	245.8					245.8	
All other	1,221.7	425.7	202.4	223.3	18.1	55.1	3.0		147.1	
Aid to home owners:										
Home-loan system:										
Home loan bank stock	125.0	26.5	.3	26.2						26.2
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	200.0									
Federal savings and loan associations	50.0	.1		.1	.1					
Emergency housing	133.5	103.7	31.4	72.3		.3			72.0	
Federal Housing Administration	40.0	11.9	.5	11.4						11.4
Resettlement Administration	257.0	161.0	78.2	82.8		2.3			80.5	
Subsistence homesteads	6.7	.3	.3							
Miscellaneous:										
Export-Import Banks of Washington	36.3	16.6	15.5	1.1		1.0				.1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	150.0									
Administration for Industrial Recovery	24.4	.1	.1							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation, direct loans and expenditures	3,800.6	1,694.0	778.2	915.8						915.8
Tennessee Valley Authority	75.0									
Subtotal	17,736.9	5,164.2	2,869.6	2,294.6	211.3	64.3	3.4	22.1	846.5	1,147.0
Unallocated	19.7	19.7		19.7		3.9	5.4	.1	10.3	
Warrants pending approval	20.4	20.4		20.4					20.4	
Total	17,777.0	5,204.3	2,869.6	2,334.7	211.3	68.2	8.8	22.2	877.2	1,147.0

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment passed over in title II.

The first amendment passed over in title II was, on page 27, after line 18, to strike out the subhead "Works Progress Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 19, to strike out:

To continue to provide relief, and work relief on useful projects, in the United States and its Territories and possessions, by the Works Progress Administration, $1,425,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937 (except as herein otherwise authorized).

And in lieu thereof to insert:

To continue to provide relief and work relief on useful projects in the United States, and its Territories and possessions, $1,425,000,000, to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President, together with the combined unexpended balances of funds heretofore made available to the Works Progress Administration, which are hereby reappropriated for such purposes under the provisions of the Relief Act of 1935, to remain available until June 30, 1937 (except as herein otherwise authorized).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 19, after "(f)", to strike out "white collar projects" and insert "assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons", so as to read:

(f) Assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons, $85,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 23, before the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "rural rehabilitation" and insert "loans"; and in line 24, after the word "farmers", to insert "and livestock growers", so as to read:

(j) loans and relief to farmers and livestock growers, $85,500,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado what is the effect of striking out the words "rural rehabilitation"?

Mr. ADAMS. Not very much, if it has any particular effect. I should not attempt to interpret it.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. If the Senator knows, what was the object of the committee in striking out that language?

Mr. ADAMS. I am unable to answer directly as to what was the intention of the members of the committee or of the Member who offered the amendment. The suggestion was that loans ought to be definitely specified, and that "relief to farmers" was broad enough to include practically everything which had been undertaken; but I do not pretend to put a personal interpretation on those words.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am very anxious to know what the effect of striking them out will be upon the program of the Resettlement Administration.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado if it was intended to discourage further expenditures by the Resettlement Administrator? The fact that the words are striken out naturally raises that inquiry; or is it the opinion of the committee that the Resettlement Administration may proceed under the broader powers of the bill, notwithstanding the elimination of this particular language?

Mr. ADAMS. I can only give to the Senator my own view of the words. That is, that there is a more definite specification of powers in the bill now than under the more vague term "rural rehabilitation." That is, the word "loans" has been substituted—a word which has a very definite meaning. "Rural rehabilitation" is a term of rather indefinite signification to me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if no definite purpose is to be accomplished by striking out these words with respect to some phase of the program, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

I realize that a great deal of criticism has been directed against the activities of the Resettlement Administration. In my opinion, a large amount of that criticism is not justified when the facts are all known. Be that as it may, however, every Senator must realize that we are confronted in this country today with one of the gravest problems which any nation has had to face in all history. The problem is to turn back the tide of evil results flowing from profligate and wasteful use of our soil resources. This phase of the pro-

gram of the Resettlement Administration, if that is what is aimed at in this amendment, is, to my mind, one of the things which in the end may prove to have been one of the most constructive steps this Government has taken in a great many years.

We have today in this country over 100,000,000 acres of land which has been rendered absolutely worthless for farm purposes by the manner in which we have used the soil. The loss this country is incurring from year to year in soil resources is conservatively estimated to be in excess of $400,000,000. So I sincerely trust this amendment is not aimed at the efforts, feeble and experimental though they may be, that are now being made in an attempt to meet the problem which generations of wasteful and profligate use of our most precious resource have now brought upon us.

The history of many civilizations that have gone down in the past proves that their collapse was due to wasteful use of soil resources.

Today in this country we are in a situation where, instead of curtailing our activities in this direction, we ought to be mobilizing the resources of the Nation in order to stem the tide of the destruction of our soil resources, to the end that we may transmit to the oncoming generations the heritage which we received, impaired though it was, from the generation which preceded us.

Despite all of the political attacks made upon R. A. and all of the prejudiced criticisms which have been leveled at the Resettlement Administration, when history comes to evaluate the efforts of this administration, in my opinion, this beginning which has been made in an effort to find a solution for the problem of the preservation and restoration of our soil resources will stand out as one of the most significant and constructive which it has undertaken.

Therefore, Mr. President, feeling, as I do, that this problem is of paramount importance, feeling, as I do, that we are trustees for the oncoming generations in this country, and that it is our duty in that light to protect and to preserve one of the most important resources in the gift of nature, I believe we should have a sound and a legitimate reason for action in respect to the amendment which is now pending before the Senate.

Personally, I trust that the committee amendment will be rejected. Under action already taken the resettlement program will be tremendously curtailed. Already it is evident that the rural population of this country is to have as a maximum out of this $1,500,000,000, $85,000,000 to be devoted to direct relief in agricultural areas, and to the further carrying on of this program in an effort to stem the wasteful use of our soil resources.

Therefore, while I am reluctant to see this program curtailed in its operations, so far as the total amount of money which may be available for it is concerned, I sincerely hope we will not eliminate language from the pending measure which will prevent this constructive side of the program being carried forward, and further improvement in it accomplished through experience which will come as a result of the efforts which have been made thus far.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I recall the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that we are dealing fundamentally with a House bill. The amendments we are making are to the House bill. In the House the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said that of the money provided by the bill not one dollar would be available to the Resettlement Administration. That is the bill we are seeking to amend. If we are making any changes, I am not sure but that the changes are along the line of the wishes of the Senator from Wisconsin. I am merely calling his attention to the bill as it came to us, and to the fact that we are dealing with a bill as to which the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations made the statement which I have repeated. So that we are now broadening, if anything, the terms of the measure.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, a few moments ago I made inquiry of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] with reference to this language, and it was his interpretation that as "rural rehabilitation" was stricken out and "loans and relief to farmers and livestock growers" was inserted, that did give to the Resettlement Administration the right to make loans and grant other relief, except to purchase land. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ADAMS. I may say to the Senator from Idaho that I think the amendment which has been offered by the Senate committee is a relaxation of the limits put upon the activity in the House and a broadening of the powers.

We had before us Mr. Hopkins, who said that under his program he never made a loan. He said, "I make only grants." Here is a broadening of the authority which he has exercised. We have taken this and put it in the hands of the President, and if we may, as we doubtless can, believe the press comments the President has said at a press conference, "I propose out of the measure to take care of the resettlement situation."

Mr. POPE. I was advised by representatives of the Resettlement Administration that under the language as it came from the House, "rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers", no part of the money could be used for the resettlement program.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the House bill provided for appropriating the entire fund to W. P. A. This fact was no doubt the basis for the statement made by the chairman of the House committee that no money was available for R. A. I am not resisting the insertion of the word "loans." I am in favor of it. I am resisting this amendment to strike out "rural rehabilitation." I think the language should read "rural rehabilitation, loans, and relief to farmers and livestock growers."

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, I was advised that the use of the words "rural rehabilitation" would not permit the Resettlement Administration to carry on any part of this program, that rural rehabilitation would be carried on by the Department of Agriculture in some other way, but it would not permit the present resettlement program to be carried on in any particular. I was advised by the Senator from South Carolina, as I suggested a moment ago, that the Resettlement Administration could make loans and grant other relief to livestock growers under the new language, but could not under the language as it came from the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken, I believe. The words "rural rehabilitation", if included, will permit carrying on work of that type.

I think the committee has made a very important and valuable contribution in inserting the words providing for loans. I certainly am not desirous of defeating my own ends by resisting that language. "Rural rehabilitation" is a term which will include the activities which I have had in mind, namely, the effort to take some of the exhausted acreage which is now by this further cultivation helping to bring about an exhaustion of soil resources, to return it to a suitable public use, and to obtain for the farmers who are now situated on this worn-out land acreage upon which they may have an opportunity to provide themselves with an income sufficient to maintain them without relief assistance in the future.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask, for information, whether or not it is the Senator's conception of the matter that the land which is to be improved in its soil fertility, and prevented from erosion, is now owned by private individuals?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have not looked into this matter recently, but, as I understand it, about 9,000,000 acres have been taken out of production, acreage which was found to be no longer suitable for agricultural purposes because the soil had been so completely exhausted that crops could no longer be produced in sufficient amounts to make it possible for the farmers to exist without help from Federal or local agencies. About 9,000,000 acres have been taken out of agricultural production and have been restored to reforestation and other purposes to which they are now suitable. The farmers who were attempting to operate on that land have been established on other acreage which is productive,

where they will have an opportunity to become self-sustaining again.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I was particularly directing my inquiry to whether or not, if this money is spent for the purposes outlined by the Senator, it will be spent upon land the title to which is now in individuals, or in the States, or in the name of the Federal Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, this 9,000,000 acres was purchased from individual owners. There were secured other lands, in other places, where the soil was more productive, and the title to the 9,000,000 acres thus purchased from private individuals came to the Federal Government; then that land was restored to forest uses or other public purposes to the end that erosion and the waste of the soil fertility could be checked and the soil eventually restored.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator perceives the purpose of my question. It would be one thing to spend this money on land the title to which was in the Federal Government and another thing to spend the money on land the title to which was in individuals, because it would be equivalent to the Federal Government repairing houses in the cities without any contribution on the part of the owners of the said houses. I think that language ought to be written in the bill, if the amendment is retained, to prevent the expenditure of any of this money on land to which the Federal Government does not own title. Otherwise, it might be expended to improve the quality of the soil owned by some individuals; and thus, where one farmer would buy fertilizer to improve the quality of his farm, another one would have the quality of his farm improved by an expenditure made by the Federal Government. I think safeguards ought to be thrown around the amendment, if it is to be retained, so that none of the money provided for shall be expended on any land save that to which the Federal Government holds title.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin seems to have so soon forgotten that about 2 weeks ago the Congress enacted a bill appropriating $450,000,000 for soil conservation, and that the bill now under consideration carries the sum of $128,000,000 for soil conservation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The 100,000,000 acres I have mentioned are in such an exhausted and depleted condition that the rotation of crops and other features of the program that is contemplated under the Soil Conservation Act cannot rehabilitate them. This land has been so exhausted that about all that can be done with it now is to restore it by reforestation and planting it to grass. Therefore I am against this amendment, which would result in preventing the resettlement program from being carried on, or such portion of it as could be carried out under the limitation of funds provided by the committee. We should not waste the experience that has been had in this field. We should not halt the progress which is being made under this very important program which seeks to check soil depletion and to restore the farmers who are in this unfortunate position to a situation where ultimately they will be able to take care of themselves and will not be in need of rural relief.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as a matter of fact it is my interpretation of the amendment that it will not permit further purchases of land by the so-called Resettlement agency, which has no statutory status whatsoever. We were told by Professor Tugwell that he was contemplating the purchase of a million acres of land in a single State. I do not think he could do it under this particular amendment. It may be that under title II, which puts into the hands of the President of the United States nearly one and one-half billion dollars, the President may allocate to Professor Tugwell a sufficient amount of money to engage in such vagaries as purchasing 100,000,000 acres of land in a single State, but he cannot do it under this amendment. Therefore, I hope the amendment will remain in the bill.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to an existing situation.

The Government of the United States already owns, in some of the Western States, irrigation projects which are not fully settled up. By reason of the drought in South Dakota and in eastern and western North Dakota and in various other sections, farmers located there are in difficult circumstances; and as a matter of economy to the Government of the United States those farmers should be taken off the lands on which they are now located and put on some of the irrigation projects on which they can make a living.

That is a project which has been talked about for many years. I do not know anything about the program of having the Government buy more land, but I do know that the railroads in the Northwest have been cooperating in an effort to get people off some of the poor lands which were taken up a few years ago, and getting them on smaller tracts of irrigated land, and in that way making the people self-supporting.

Unfortunately, a few years ago in the Northwest Territory there were brought out a great many persons who were placed on lands which never should have been settled for farming purposes. Those lands should have been left entirely as grazing lands. However, through the advertisements which were placed in the newspapers, and the propaganda that was carried on at that time, a large number of persons were placed on those lands. They never should have been placed there. The persons on those poor lands can raise a wheat crop only once in 3 or 4 years. Therefore the Government has been obliged to give them relief. It would be very helpful not only to the Government but to the citizenry of the United States as a whole if some way could be devised in the rural-rehabilitation program whereby those persons could be moved off of the poor lands and put on irrigated lands on which they could be self-supporting.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I desire to point out to the Senator from Montana that under the wording of the bill, as proposed by the committee, the situation he envisages could be carried out, for the bill reads:

Loans and relief to farmers and livestock growers, $85,500,000.

So "loans and relief to farmers" certainly would be broad enough to take care of the situation he pictures.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, such is not the fact. It is true that loans could be made to the people the Senator from Montana has been describing. It is true that they could be given direct relief. However, if the words "rural rehabilitation" shall be stricken out, it will end the program for transferring persons from these exhausted lands and obtaining an opportunity for them to make a new start, just as the pioneers did during the time when free lands were available. In the past, when farmers exhausted the land, there was plenty of good free land left. They moved West, and took up new land when the old land was exhausted. Now the frontier is closed. For the farmers who are living on these 100,000,000 acres of exhausted land no free land can be open without the assistance of the Government. I contend that in the last analysis it is the cheapest course for the Government to take, if one desires to look at the matter from the pure, hard, cold dollars-and-cents point of view, because, so long as the farmers stay on this exhausted land they are going to be in a situation where they will have to have relief in the form of money, either from the Federal Government or from the local governments, or from both. In the last analysis, the only way in which we can permanently solve the problem that confronts the farmers upon those 100,000,000 acres of exhausted land is to open up new land for them, and to give them another start.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, does not the Senator recall that the chairman of the subcommittee has stated to him that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives stated very definitely on the floor of the House, and it has been printed in all the newspapers, that the words "rural rehabilitation" do not authorize the expenditure of a dollar on the thing he is now suggesting?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Such was no doubt the case when the House bill appropriated all the money to W. P. A. Under the Senate bill, if the part of the committee amendment which provides for striking out the words "rural rehabilitation" is rejected, and the part of the amendment which provides for the insertion of "loans" is accepted, the resettlement program can go on.

If I may say just a word more about this subject, Mr. President, I should like to have Senators for a moment endeavor to forget the prejudices which have been created in their minds by the attacks which have been made upon this program. In the northern part of Wisconsin we had great timber resources. They were stripped off by the lumber companies. Then the land agents of the lumber companies advertised and offered cheap transportation. They took people into those northern counties and got them to buy the land from the lumber companies. People went on those lands, some of the lands not being suited to agriculture. In many instances failure was inevitable. What happened? Those communities nevertheless are compelled to provide schools, to provide roads, to provide all the facilities of government which are in the sum total measured in the tax bill of the community and the county as a whole.

Those areas can once more be restored by forestation and reforestation, and the tax burdens upon those communities can be relieved. In some places schools and roads are maintained for one or two families, because they are in these isolated areas unsuited for farming. In the last analysis, the taxpayer foots the bill.

In Wisconsin we feel that we have taken some steps forward. We have provided for the zoning of counties, in order that their uses may be scientifically determined and so that people may be removed from the exhausted lands and an opportunity given to them to start elsewhere, and thus the local communities be relieved of the terrific tax burden of providing roads and schools and other services of government which are so expensive.

However, this program cannot be carried on alone by the counties or by the States; assistance must be had from the Federal Government. I say again, I reemphasize and repeat, that in the last analysis this will prove to be the cheapest method, if we wish to measure the cost in the terms of cold, hard dollars and cents; for so long as these farmers continue their effort to subsist upon land which has become exhausted and which under the most frugal and scientific kind of management will no longer provide a living for them and their families we shall have a rural relief problem, and we will continue to have a relief problem, so far as such individuals and their families are concerned, so long as they have to live upon land of the character described.

A great deal of thought has been given to this program; and though many epithets have been hurled at it by individuals and by the newspapers and by men in public life, yet I say again, Mr. President, that the wasteful use of soil resources can be assigned as an important factor in the decline of most of the past civilizations during the recorded history of the world.

Nature is slow to punish. We had perhaps the greatest endowment of resources that any nation has ever known. Pioneers came into this country; they thought that its resources were unlimited and they were prodigal in their use of the soil. Throughout New England, the South, and nearly every other section of the country the abandoned farms tell the story of the first resettlement and rural rehabilitation problems in this country; but the farmers of the East could "solve" their problem by leaving it behind them. The frontier was still open and all they had to do was to gather their families, pack their tools, harness their oxen, start westward, and take up new lands on the frontier across the Alleghanies. Those lands were so vast and unlimited in extent that they did not even wait, in many instances, to cut down the trees; they burned the virgin timber, little realizing that by that process they were destroying the humus of the soil which it had taken over 400 years to provide. As that land became exhausted, they pushed westward again and again and again, until finally the frontier of this Nation touched the Pacific Ocean.

Then, Mr. President, came the World War and the demand for wheat. We put the grasslands to the plow in that great stretch of territory which reaches from the northern Montana boundary on the north to the panhandle of Texas on the south. We not only put it to the plow but we put it to the gang plow drawn by batteries of tractors operating day and night. It was harvested by the combines. All in an effort to help win the war by producing more wheat. Breaking those grass lands, Mr. President, was the blow which caused nature to speed up her relentless punishment for the abuse of her bounty. Breaking the grasslands broke the cover, subjected it to high winds and to heat and reduced the rainfall until such a condition has now been brought about that those upon the Atlantic seaboard in this country should be impressed with the fact that nature, for the profligate waste of our resources, is beginning to take its toll at a dear price from this generation. For the past two summers the dust blowing out of the panhandle of Texas and the former grasslands of Oklahoma and other States has soiled the furniture in the households of those living along the Atlantic seaboard.

Fun has been poked at this program of resettlement by those too stupid or too blind to care about the future. Nevertheless, it is a constructive effort. Mistakes have been made, it is true. It would be too much to expect that the mistakes made in 300 years could be corrected overnight and without error. I say that, taken as a whole, the program is constructive. It is a sincere effort to turn back the tide of destruction brought about by the profligate waste of soil resources that has gone on in this country ever since the Pilgrims first landed upon Plymouth Rock. To abandon that program now would be a tragic mistake. I therefore ask, Mr. President, that we may have the committee amendment divided, and I sincerely hope that the first part of the amendment which proposes to strike out the words "rural rehabilitation" will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to dividing the question? The Chair hears none, and the question is on the first branch of the amendment to strike out the words "rural rehabilitation."

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.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first branch of the committee amendment on page 28, line 23, proposing to strike out the words "rural rehabilitation."

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is very unfair to strike out the provision for rural rehabilitation and insert the word "loans." When loans are made, of course, they are made on security, while a great deal, at least, of the rehabilitation and resettlement work is for the benefit of farmers who have no security. The resettlement work has been taking care of many farmers throughout the United States who were taken off the relief rolls when the P. W. A. was started and made direct loans or grants to them.

Eighty-five million five hundred thousand dollars would not even allow loans or grants of that kind, as I understand. In other words, the farmers of this Nation, under this bill, are given $85,500,000 for loans, and the remainder of the appropriation of $1,339,500,000 goes for useful work projects, and under such work projects, according to the present plan at least, the farmers who may be just as badly in need of work as are those who are employed in the cities and towns are not included. I say it is hardly fair to allow $85,000,000

for a quarter of the people of the United States, those who work on the farms and produce food and other necessities which the people must have—and produce them most of the time at a loss—and to allow the remainder of the people on work projects $1,339,000,000.

I am very much interested in the work the Resettlement Administration has been doing, because they have done some excellent work in my home State, and I know they have been doing good work in other States. When the seed-loan question came up a few weeks ago the Resettlement Administration finally had to make arrangements to take care of the farmers who were on what they termed "grants" during the winter months or practically on relief. They told us, at that time, that last winter they had been taking care of 150,000 farm families throughout the United States.

I have a statement here from the Administrator of the Resettlement Administration dated May 18. I have taken up this question with him, and he finally wrote me a letter. I wish to read a paragraph or two and give some of the figures which he sets forth in his letter. He says that—

There has been delegated to the division—

He means the Resettlement Administration—

the responsibility for performing a number of services for destitute and low-income farm families by loans, grants, and debt adjustments. By June 30—

That is June 30 of this year, the coming June 30—

including $17,000,000 authorized from funds of the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation previously granted to the States by the Federal Government under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1933 there will have been expended in excess of $125,000,000—

Mr. President, the Resettlement Administration is spending for this year, the year ending June 30 next, $125,000,000, and all they are granted under this bill is $85,500,000 for loans. Recurring to the Administrator's statement:

There will have been expended in excess of $125,000,000, of which approximately $108,000,000 will be for loans and the balance for grants. Almost $90,000,000 of these amounts have already been paid to destitute and low-income farmers. It is further estimated that, at an administrative cost of less than 2 percent of the total indebtedness involved, debts of 30,000 farmers will have been adjusted, with scale-downs in excess of $25,000,000, or 27½ percent of the original indebtedness.

Mr. President, that work alone performed by the Resettlement Administration is worth while. They have scaled down for 30,000 farmers in 1 year 27½ percent of their indebtedness and have adjusted the debts of others and allowed those farmers to stay on their land and continue to carry on. That is worth while.

Making allowance for duplications more than 700,000 farm families will be aided through the rural rehabilitation program this year, as follows.

Then he gives the various standard loans, and so forth.

More than 700,000 farm families will be taken care of. A total of $85,500,000 for 700,000 farm families would make $122 per farm family for the coming year. That is not enough to take care of a family which is down and out. I had a telegram from one of the counties in the southwestern part of my State a day or two ago stating that the situation is getting worse. It is in the drought territory, where dust storms are again occurring. The grasshoppers are beginning to hatch out. It is said a thousand farm families in that county must be taken care of; and if the Resettlement Administration cannot take care of them, then some other provision must be made. I was told that taxes are not being paid, that the county is broke. It is a serious situation, not only in the drought area in North Dakota but in the drought areas in all the other States.

When the seed-loan bill was under consideration the Resettlement Administration made the statement that they were taking care of 150,000 farm families throughout the United States. Eighty-five million dollars is not enough and does not begin to be enough to take care of the situation.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FRAZIER. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the Senator from North Dakota, if it does not impose upon him too much, give some detail? What is the procedure or the method pursued in the resettlement work? What is done that resettles those in distress, and by what methods?

Mr. FRAZIER. In many instances where farmers, because of poor crops and low prices, have been unable to meet their payments on their mortgage indebtedness the Resettlement Administration has made adjustments for them, has persuaded the creditors to scale down the indebtedness. In the 30,000 cases which they readjusted the creditors were persuaded to scale down the amount of the indebtedness 27½ percent of the original debt, and arrangements were made to refinance the farmers so they could carry on.

Mr. LEWIS. But on the same land?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; on the same land. In other cases, where the land was so poor that officials of the Resettlement Administration did not feel the farmers could profitably proceed and make a living, the farmers have been moved to some other location and have been financed. If they did not have anything they were loaned money to buy a team of horses and a cow or two and a little machinery. It was believed it was much cheaper to take care of them in that way, giving them a chance to make a living, than to carry them on the relief roll. I think it has proven much cheaper.

A number of projects have been started in North Dakota. Farmers have been moved from the so-called dry territory to the new projects. Some land has been purchased in North Dakota and other States. After the land is appraised and made ready for purchase, then the farmers are moved to it. In some instances submarginal lands have been bought and the farmers transferred to other lands. If enough money is not provided to carry on the work, what will it mean? It will mean many disappointed families. Some 140,000 or 150,000 farm families throughout the Nation will be vitally disappointed if the work shall not be continued.

Dr. Tugwell, the Administrator, told me only a short time ago that unless money is provided his work will be practically finished the 30th day of June of this year because there will be no money to carry it further. If that is the wish of the Senate, I suppose it will have to be accepted, but I cannot see how the Senate, after appropriating money to start this work, can now take that attitude. A lot of good work has been done. As the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has said, perhaps mistakes have been made and perhaps too much money has been expended in overhead, but a lot of good work has been done. Dr. Tugwell in his letter said that less than 2 percent has been used for overhead expenses.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REYNOLDS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FRAZIER. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator from North Dakota interests me very much because the details are not only necessary to me for my own understanding, but sometimes in reciting to me in my own behalf it is informative to others. When the Senator says if this appropriation is not continued there will be great disappointment to many families, does he mean they will be homeless and taken off their lands and displaced completely? Will they be driven into the cities or onto other lands?

Mr. FRAZIER. That would be the situation in thousands of cases. They would be forced to leave the farms and go to the cities and join the unemployed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator so that I may be certain I am correct. I understood him to say there were certain lands in North Dakota which the

Government desired to obtain for resettlement purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are certain other lands in North Dakota which the Government wishes to obtain so the farmers may be taken off of them?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Government contemplate the purchase of good farms as well as the purchase of farms which are no longer useful for cultivation?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, they want to buy good farms, and useless or worthless farms, too. Is that correct?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is correct. The so-called submarginal lands, or what they consider worthless for agricultural purposes, will be revitalized. The soil fertility is to be built up and they are to be used for grazing purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. So it really involves the purchase of two farms by the Federal Government, one good farm and one bad farm of comparable size, in order to take one family off the bad land and put it on the good land?

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, that does not apply to many of the farms. Many of the poor farms are mortgaged for more than they are worth and the farmer has no equity under present values. He is simply transferred to other land where he will have a chance to make a living.

Mr. TYDINGS. But that is good land?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, he could not be transferred to it unless it was purchased for him and someone paid for it?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no one else to pay for it except the Federal Government, is there?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is correct. The Resettlement Administration is making loans to these men to purchase the land.

Mr. TYDINGS. The theory is that eventually the entire purchase price of the good farm is to be paid back to the Federal Government by the man who has been transplanted to it from a bad farm?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Could the Senator enlighten me by giving me the average price of good farm lands in North Dakota?

Mr. FRAZIER. I have not the exact figure. I imagine good land in the eastern part of the State is probably bringing $25 or $30 an acre.

Mr. TYDINGS. Are those good farms which are to be bought by the Government for resettlement purposes now occupied?

Mr. FRAZIER. Most of them are not occupied; or if they are occupied, where the farm is large, the Resettlement Administration is buying a part of it. Much of the land has been taken over by insurance companies and banks.

Mr. TYDINGS. Where it is not occupied, who owns it?

Mr. FRAZIER. Generally some insurance company or some bank that has foreclosed on it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then there is no land contemplated for resettlement purposes that at some time has not been used for farming and acquired by some individual either under tax sale or mortgage foreclosure?

Mr. FRAZIER. Not in North Dakota, at least.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is none in North Dakota?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; not in North Dakota.

Mr. TYDINGS. What happens is that the man who now owns the land sells it to the Federal Government; in many cases the land is not now occupied; the Federal Government transfers a family from the poor land to the good land under terms which envisage the repayment to the Federal Government of the money invested in the land. Is that the idea?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then what is to become of the bad land after the Government acquires it?

Mr. FRAZIER. Through the soil-conservation program it is expected to build up the fertility by seeding it back to grass and making grazing land of it.

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

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

Mr. NORRIS. I think the short answer to the Senator's question, which I think is a very proper one, is that it becomes Government land.

Mr. TYDINGS. It comes out of taxation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it becomes Government land, just as it was before it was ever taken, and becomes subject to any laws that may be passed in regard to Government land; in other words, subject to any action Congress may take regarding it.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me one question more, I should like to say that I am not trying to reflect on the proposal. I am trying to get the details of it.

Does the Senator from North Dakota feel that there is now sufficient profit in agriculture, say in North Dakota or in any comparable State, to enable the man who has been taken off bad land and put on a good farm to pay his county taxes and other expenses, and repay the Government the sum of money which the Government will have to put up in order to make the transfer?

Mr. FRAZIER. Under present conditions, I am sorry to admit that there probably is not much chance of his paying out; but, unless conditions change, the farmers are all going to go broke, and the Government or somebody else will have to take over all the land; and I do not believe that is going to be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think all the farmers are going broke.

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, a great many of them are.

Mr. TYDINGS. Some of them are not making the return that they should make, but I do not for a moment feel that they are all going broke. The point I make, however, is that certainly a scheme which is not going to allow a man to keep the farm which he starts to farm and starts to bring into productivity, and which he improves with the addition of buildings, fences, and so forth, which is not going to permit him to pay his debt, in the long run is only a form of deception, because if he does not make his payments, the Government must inevitably take the farm away from him again.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. FRAZIER. Just a moment. The Senator from Maryland admits that the farmers will go broke unless they can get cost of production and a little profit for the products they have to sell, does he not?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course they will, but——

Mr. FRAZIER. And the Senator is interested in seeing such conditions brought about that the farmer can make a little profit?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am.

Mr. FRAZIER. If he does get cost of production and a little more, the farmer under those circumstances will be enabled to make a profit.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me a moment more so that I may pursue this matter to its logical conclusion, if the Senator from North Dakota and others who are familiar with this matter feel that the farmer put on a good farm can make enough to own the farm eventually, then the scheme is sound from a business standpoint. If, on the other hand, there is no opportunity for the farmer placed on a Government farm to make enough to own it eventually, with some mercy and latitude shown him so that he can pay it out, then all we do is to give him a temporary rather than a real solution of his dilemma.

Mr. FRAZIER. If we are going to admit that that will be the case, of course we might as well let all the farmers go off the land and put them on the unemployment lists in the cities.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Maryland.

In many instances, farmers have mortgaged their land at very high values; and, as a result, under present conditions

many are probably suffering. I should like to emphasize the point that where a resettlement operation is undertaken for a farmer and his family, it is all on a voluntary basis. Some effort has been made to create the impression that it is contemplated forcibly to move people. Nothing of that kind is to be done; but, as I understand, in each case a very careful survey is made of the situation of the particular farm to which the farmer and his family are to be transferred, or on which they are to be resettled; and it is contemplated and it is estimated—and I understand the authorities are convinced that the estimates are conservative—that even if present conditions as to farm prices should prevail, under the long amortization period which the Federal Government of course can afford to allow, as distinguished from some commercial or private credit agency, the farmers will pay out.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has answered my question. What I have been trying to elicit is whether or not the farmer who is taken from a bad farm and put on a good one can, if given the greatest possible latitude in terms, really get the farm in the end. If he cannot get the farm in the end, obviously we are only fooling him and everybody else.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree with the Senator about that; but I am convinced that the program is set up on a conservative basis, and that the overwhelming majority of the farmers will be able to pay out under the conditions they have been given.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has asked some very proper questions which ought to have candid consideration. I do not believe anybody can give an answer which will apply to all the cases. In other words, nearly every case has its exceptions and its points in which it differs from any other case. Like fingerprints, cases differ, and each one will have to be decided on its individual merits.

The theory is that if a man is on a piece of land and, after investigation and examination, it is concluded that under all the circumstances the probabilities are that nobody can farm that piece of land successfully, that is a case where it will not be desirable to have him continue longer on the land. The sooner he gives it up the better. If he can be transferred from that land to another piece of land which is believed to be of such character that he can make a living on it if given the time the Senator from Wisconsin has indicated—a long time at a low rate of interest—he may eventually pay for and own the land.

All those circumstances will be considered. The individual will be considered. An examination will show that some individuals are more likely to succeed than others. All the elements will have their weight. They will all enter into the equation. With the experience a farmer has had, he is not likely to do again what he did in the past, even if he had an opportunity, and mortgage land at a high rate of interest on the theory that he is always going to produce crops on it or that it is such land that it can support him and his family. He is a little wiser than he was before, when he went through that operation.

The land he leaves, which the Government buys, will become Government land. It seems to me the idea we may have right at the moment as to what shall be done with it is somewhat immaterial, because, as I see the equation, no one can tell just exactly what will be done.

I will say to the Senator from Maryland that in some of these cases the efforts to establish the farmer will fail. I do not think we ought to deceive ourselves. No matter how careful the administrators of the law may be, failures will occur; there will be instances where the farmer will not be able to pay for the land; but the theory is that in the great majority of cases he will be able to do so, and we shall get a contented man instead of one who, if we do not do something for him, will become a burden on the taxpayers and will have to be supported, and his family will have to be supported. In other words, he will be on relief. The idea is that he may be self-sustaining, and it seems to me that is the only hope left in some of these cases. If we must abandon that hope, we know disaster and ruin and suffering must follow.

At the very best we are going to have difficulty about the matter. It is a difficult problem, impossible of administration without mistakes occurring here and there; but, as I view the problem, those administering this agency are doing the best they can. This seems to me the thing that is best to be done; and I believe we ought to give the administrative officers all possible encouragement, knowing that we are not dealing with a "dead cinch" or a sure thing. We are going to run some risk, but we are going to extend charity to persons who otherwise, we know, are going to be burdensome, and thrown entirely for their living upon the taxpayers.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I have not the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Assuming for the sake of argument that the $85,500,000 used for this purpose is all the money the Government has with which to acquire some good farms—not the marginal lands—for the 105,000 farm families which I understand are circumstanced as described by the Senator from Nebraska, it is an average of $850 per family. Now, if this is all the money that is to be used to purchase the good farms, I imagine we cannot get a very large farm, or a very good farm, for $850. So far as I am concerned, I am trying to get some information on how these men are going to come out, and the terms under which they are to resettle, and if they can pay off the debt, and whether we are really going to rehabilitate them or just provide some sort of a temporary makeshift.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. If $85,500,000 is all the money the Federal Government has for the good farms to which these farmers are to be transferred, and that is only $850 per farmer, in my opinion we cannot do the job for that much money.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Government has already spent $125,000,000 for the purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. But that was for the purchase of marginal lands which are to be abandoned or reforested.

Mr. FRAZIER. And for the purchase of some good lands, too. There were several projects where farmers were moved on better land.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not take issue with the Senator, and I am not going to intrude further on his time; but I do wish to make a concluding observation. It is my impression, though I have not the facts to support it, that the Government has acquired very few good farm lands in the rehabilitation program. What it has done is to buy up marginal lands; and, as the program is now set up, there probably is not going to be sufficient good land to rehabilitate the 105,000 farm families who are living on land which is nonproductive.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I think the Senator from Nebraska can well claim the credit of being the best constitutional lawyer in the Senate, because his is the only problem passed upon by the Congress which has been decided to be constitutional.

Now, I desire to ask the Senator a question. Is there any constitutional warrant for the Government acquiring lands in the way proposed here, or in any other way, except for actual Government purposes? The Government is not permitted to acquire a foot of land in any State of the Union without the specific sanction of the State itself.

We recently had a suit in Virginia contesting the right of the State of Virginia to condemn lands in the Shenandoah Valley in order to make a gift of them to the Government of the United States for park purposes, the contest being based upon the contention that the purpose was not a governmental purpose. The court decided that it was a governmental purpose, and therefore the complainant was thrown out of court.

It seems to me that in the case before us the purchase of lands from individuals for the mere purpose of transferring those individuals to some other lands to be purchased by the Government is not, in the strict sense, purchasing lands for a Government purpose. The Government is not using the lands; individuals are using the lands.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not going to discuss the constitutional question any further than to say that, as I understand, the Government is not condemning or getting title to any of this land by any attempt at condemnation; it is all voluntary.

Mr. GLASS. But is the Government authorized to purchase lands except for Government purposes? Remember, the Senator is the outstanding constitutional lawyer in the Senate; his reputation is at stake, and I want a square answer to that question. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think it is strictly a Government use; but I do not believe that question will be raised here, because we are not going to give the Court a chance. If a man does not want to sell, he does not have to.

Mr. GLASS. That is what we were told when we protested to the proponent of the N. R. A. that the act was unconstitutional, and his reply was, "Well, suppose it is unconstitutional; we can carry out its terms before it can ever get before the Court." And that is the answer of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. No; that is not the answer. But if no one complains, it will not get into court; and there cannot be any complaint, if we make no attempt to force a man to sell. He sells if he wants to. If he does not want to sell, he does not sell.

Mr. GLASS. The taxpayers who are to be taxed to pay for this land and this transition it seems to me might apply to the courts for a restraining order.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that no one desires to get into a discussion of the legal questions, but it strikes me that jurisdiction would be conferred on the proper courts, through the medium of a taxpayer in the county in which the land acquired was located suing out a writ for an injunction against illegal acquisition of the land by the Federal Government, because his rights would be invaded by having the amount and volume of the local taxes curtailed, and consequently his expenditure increased. That would bring into question whether or not the Federal act was good or bad as a matter of law.

I desire to say to the Senator from North Dakota, however, that my point in rising originally was to direct attention to the fact that, while his motive was a very humane one, I did not see, unless agriculture was going to be made profitable, how the man who got onto the good farm was ever going to pay for it.

Mr. FRAZIER. Unless agriculture is made profitable, the farmers who are on the farms now cannot pay for them. The Government will hold a mortgage on the land, and if it is not paid for, the Government will be the owner of the land, and it can open it for homestead entry, or for anything Congress desires to do with it.

Mr. GLASS. Suppose the new farm goes to waste; does the Senator propose that the Government buy the man another one?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; he would probably have to go to the city and go on the relief rolls.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator, before he asks for my attention, permit me to conclude by saying that while I have not read the opinion, I understand that the question I raised was decided in the courts, and the contention that the Government had no right under such circumstances to engage in a certain kind of operation was sustained. While I have no desire to argue the law of the case, I am afraid the Senator from North Dakota is setting up a proposition and proceeding with a theory which is going to be found not to hold water. If the farmers are to be helped, in my judgment, they ought to be helped in such a way that whatever is done for them will be permanent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I was interested in the original point the Senator raised, as to whether it was an effective philanthropy to put the farmers on these farms. I wish to give him the record of the first and original effort that has been made in creating resettlement farms, namely, the project at Matanuska.

Mr. FRAZIER. Both the Senator from Wisconsin and I have admitted that some mistakes have been made, and this may be one of them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to emphasize the challenge. Mr. Hokins, who handled the Matanuska project, told us on June 24, 1935, that it would cost $1,093,000. That was to create two hundred 40-acre farms. At the end of 6 months he found that he had missed his estimate by a little matter of 100 percent, and on December 27, 1935, he reported that the two hundred 40-acre farms had cost $2,325,000, and that they probably would cost $100,000 more.

He also said that half of that amount would be chargeable as a mortgage against the farmers themselves. So we have this contemplation: A farmer removed to Matanuska on a 40-acre farm starts out upon an alleged humane adventure with a $6,000 mortgage on a 40-acre farm. I do not believe that is humane in any language or in any land.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MINTON. I am getting a little bit confused about the legal proposition and desire to propound an inquiry. If the Senator does not wish to answer this legal question, I hope he will permit the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska to answer it.

It seems to be a public purpose for the Federal Government to buy preferred stock and save a lot of banks that are about to go to ruin. It seems to be a public purpose for the Federal Government to buy stock in, to take bonds of, and to lend money to business interests which are about to collapse. But it does not seem to be a public purpose, or in any way a governmental purpose, to help a farmer save his farm or to get a farm which he does not own in order that he may make a living on it. Can the Senator straighten me out on that legal proposition?

Mr. FRAZIER. There seems to be a difference in the definition of "general welfare" as it is provided in the Constitution. There seems to be quite a difference between the general welfare of a farmer and the general welfare of a banker.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not think anyone can stand up against the illustration drawn by the Senator from Indiana so far as justice is concerned. If it is right for one, it is right for the other. But from the standpoint of business, in a capitalistic society, sometimes the amount of security has a great deal to do with the question.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I think an examination of some of the securities held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will reveal that the capitalistic system was not so kind to

the Government when it made some of its loans to business in this country.

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not think there would be any more danger in lending on farms than in making some of the capitalistic loans which have been negotiated. It seems to me so utterly unfair to strike out rural rehabilitation in this measure that I hope the committee amendment will be rejected. Then I hope we can increase the amount of money appropriated in the bill for the farmer.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, it is particularly unfortunate that any discussion of the faults of our relief system shall be interpreted as opposition to relief. I was one of those who voted for Federal aid for relief in the very early stages of the effort which our Government has made to care for those in distress. I hope that my views concerning some features of the bill will not be interpreted as opposition to Federal contributions for relief. On the contrary, I still am very much in favor of Federal participation in a program which I know is far too heavy, far too extensive, for the local agencies to deal with successfully.

I cannot, however, escape the conclusion that there is a right way and a wrong way to meet our responsibility to the destitute, and I cannot escape the conclusion that the bill now pending before the Senate in many of its aspects reflects the wrong way.

The bill as reported from the Senate Committee on Appropriations in every important sense is a continuation of the program which was initiated last year by the Emergency Relief Act of 1935. It is a continuation of that program, Mr. President, because the Appropriation Committee's amendment takes the expenditure of the money away from the Works Progress Administration and by express terms makes the appropriation available "to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President." This is the precise language that was used in the bill of last year.

At the time the $4,880,000,000 bill was before the Senate, I voiced my objection to the writing of a blank check to any President to be expended in his discretion for uses that were only illy or partially defined, and in amounts which he alone would determine, in areas which he might select. I objected particularly to the failure of the Congress to write the program and to create the formula under which our Government should make its contribution for relief. I regarded it as unconstitutional, and I characterized it at that time as a perversion of the American system.

The act has never been construed by the court of last resort, but the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia has considered it and held it unconstitutional.

I do not propose to read at length from that opinion, but I desire to call attention to two or three excerpts which state more clearly than I could state the constitutional objection to this sort of procedure. The court said, in referring to the Presidential discretion, as follows:

> His discretion, in the language of the Schechter decision, is "virtually unfettered." He is at liberty to set up agencies and to prescribe such rules of conduct and fix such standards as he may deem proper. There is no criterion to govern his course as to housing and the various other projects enumerated in the act. The only possible guide or policy laid down by Congress is in the words "in order to provide relief, work relief, and to increase employment by providing for useful projects", which appear at the beginning of the act.

I will interrupt the reading at that point to say that under the committee amendment now before the Senate the language is:

> To continue to provide relief and work relief on useful projects in the United States—

And so forth. So that the constitutional evil which the court found in the bill of last year is deliberately repeated in the terms of the Senate amendment in the bill which is now pending before us.

I continue to read from the court's opinion:

> But this declaration of purpose is even more general and vague than the declaration of policy rejected in the Panama and Schechter cases.

So, Mr. President, we find ourselves dealing with language which one court of appeals of our Government has held is less definite than the language which the Supreme Court of the United States condemned in two very important cases.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Does the opinion from which the Senator is reading hold that Congress may not make an appropriation to an agent so that he may use the money?

Mr. STEIWER. No, Mr. President, I think not. The court holds that the Congress may not make an appropriation for vague and indefinite purposes and leave to an agent, either the President or anyone else, the determination, first, as to whether he spends the money at all, and, if he does elect to spend it, then the determination as to what he shall spend it for.

Mr. BORAH. Does the court hold that the Congress may not appropriate money and turn it over to the President to be used for relief purposes?

Mr. STEIWER. I would not so construe it. I do not think that is the effect of the decision.

Let me read further from the decision. I am reading now from page 12:

> If the power here granted to increase the maximum amount specified by 20 percent of the entire appropriation be invoked, we find that it is possible to expend, during the indefinite project of "housing", the sum of $976,000,000 in excess of the maximum specified, or a total upon this project alone of $1,426,000,000. It logically follows that the President and not the Congress is to legislate with respect to housing. The President, not the Congress, is to set up governmental agencies to carry out the purposes of the act. The President, not the Congress, is to prescribe the regulations and rules of conduct which shall govern. The President, not the Congress, is to decide where and when and how, if at all, this enormous sum of money is to be expended for "housing."

It may be said in behalf of the proposal which is pending before the Senate, that the discretionary latitude for expending additional amounts is not as extensive as it is in the bill which the court was discussing in the opinion just read. In the pending bill, the latitude is only to make an increase of 15 percent of the amounts in each of the several categories.

The conclusion of the court with respect to the Emergency Relief Act of 1935, which it was considering, is that it constituted an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power. The court said:

> There nowhere appears that adequate definition of the subject called for in the Schechter case. The money appropriated is made available for classes of projects, among which is one designated merely as "housing."
>
> There is nothing in the act directly prescribing the powers or duties of the President with respect to housing. Assuming that it may be inferred from the act that the funds are to be used by the President, yet there is nothing requiring their use, either absolutely or in any specified condition or circumstance. He is free to use them or not, as he sees fit.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I was called out of the Chamber just as the Senator was starting to speak. Are the Senator's remarks directed to the provisions which are mentioned on page 28, where, apparently, some effort has been made to identify or characterize the work that may be done under the Works Progress Administration?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes, Mr. President; my remarks are directed, first, to the amendment which starts at the bottom of page 27, and then to the categories which are listed on page 28, and I had intended before I concluded to discuss the matter which is immediately before the Senate, the subhead (j), which, according to the House bill, provided for rural rehabilitation, and, according to the Senate committee's amendment, for loans and relief to farmers and livestock growers.

Mr. BONE. I have great respect for the Senator's viewpoint and judgment. I understood him to be quoting from the decision of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in the recent case.

Mr. STEIWER. No, Mr. President; the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BONE. Yes. The decision wherein the Court declared the Resettlement Administration provision of the law was unconstitutional?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes.

Mr. BONE. Is it the Senator's viewpoint that these characterizations and identifications on page 28 are too vague to be lawful designations and lawful allocations of the money?

Mr. STEIWER. The court from which I am quoting is not the Supreme Court and is not a court of last resort, but if that court's view shall be sustained by the Supreme Court, then each of the designations on page 28, or at least most of them, are entirely too vague. They are not only ambiguous because they are uncertain and vague in themselves, but the whole language of the bill is vague because it does not mandatorily direct the President to make the expenditure, nor does it state any rule as to how he might make the expenditure. There is no rule of justice written into this bill. There is no formula suggested; there is no basis upon which the money is to be distributed between the States or between individual sufferers from the depression. The objection which I see in this matter is the complete, unfettered, discretionary power of the President to take a lump-sum appropriation and do with it much as he would like.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, if the Senator objects to my interrogating or interrupting him, I will be glad not to bother him further.

Mr. STEIWER. Not at all. I think we should all attempt to understand this question.

Mr. BONE. I take it that the language in line 9, "shall be available for", is what has challenged the Senator's attention. In other words, here is a blanket grant to the President to use this money without attempt to divert it into specific channels in the manner the Senator has indicated. If that be true, if my understanding and viewpoint be correct, what kind of language would the Senator from Oregon, as a good lawyer, suggest to make the provision more specific and certain? I seriously question that we can just tie down the distribution of relief money to too definite and too minute a category. I do not see how that would be possible.

Mr. STEIWER. Let us take the question of direct relief. Congress could provide that the President should distribute the money in accordance with need, subject to variation on account of difference in cost of living. What I object to is that there is no requirement upon the President to do anything with the money except to do as his discretion might suggest, and that is the basis of all unconstitutional delegation of powers.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what the Court held was that the Congress could not delegate legislative power to the President——

Mr. STEIWER. That is true.

Mr. BORAH. And I certainly would not contend for a moment that we could or should undertake to do so; but when we appropriate money to be turned over to the President for the kind of work which is here proposed what legislative act of his is called into existence? He is not legislating.

Mr. STEIWER. To determine whether or not, in fact, there is need——

Mr. BORAH. That is not legislative.

Mr. STEIWER. To determine whether or not relief must be extended, and then to determine what kind of relief he will extend, or if he will extend any; to determine whether or not he will deal with one State as he does with another State.

Mr. BORAH. That is all administrative; that is not legislative.

Mr. STEIWER. I am not prepared to concede that; I think it is legislative, because unless Congress acts upon that particular point Congress loses the entire control of the public purse; it is guilty of appropriating money to the President or to somebody else and letting that somebody else determine what is to become of the money.

Mr. BORAH. It may be an unwise thing to do; it may be an impolitic thing to do, but is it, in any sense, in violation of the provision of the Constitution that the Congress may not delegate legislative power to the President——

Mr. STEIWER. I so regard it.

Mr. BORAH. Because, it seems to me, he is not called upon to perform any legislative act but purely an administrative act? The Congress might appropriate a million dollars to John Doe, if it saw fit to do so, and tell him to build a bridge. He might not build it or he might build it in the wrong way, but it would be an administrative act which he was called upon to perform.

Mr. STEIWER. I know the Senator will agree that acts may be both legislative and administrative. The Court has said in dealing with the case from which I have been quoting that the determination and the use to be made of the money is a legislative act. I base my contention upon the decision of the Court.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes.

Mr. BONE. I know the Senator is familiar with the rather wide discretion and certainly the extreme latitude given many regulatory bodies set up under State statutes for the regulation of private utility enterprises.

Mr. STEIWER. But there is a rule.

Mr. BONE. I have thought of that so many times in our debates when we have talked about the delegation of so-called legislative power. We have set up railroad commissions and rate-making bodies.

Mr. STEIWER. But it has been held that the rule against a discriminatory rate is itself a standard by which such commissions must be guided.

Mr. BONE. Yes; but there is such a vast field there as to become almost a "twilight zone" in the realm of logic into which the Senator is entering.

It will certainly appeal to the Senator's practical sense, for he is familiar with the drafting and administration of statutes, to suggest the difficulty which would be encountered if we should go into the minute details the Senator has suggested in this instance. Just imagine what a mess we would get into if we undertook here to set up our own judgment and say so much must go here and so much must go there; that the man who is to administer the fund must have a certain state of mind or a certain attitude of mind toward the particular problem. If it touches his heart very deeply, he must give the applicants a little more money.

The Senator's viewpoint has probably much in it to commend it to those who think seriously, but, in the very nature of this problem, how in the world can 96 Senators undertake here to chart a course for the man who is trying to relieve the miseries of the people? I have a great deal of sympathy for the Senator's viewpoint, and I think I know what in his heart he desires, but I think this job is beyond the 96 Senators here. Shall we get a map and say we will put a road at a certain place, and mark the roadway which the executive who administers the law must traverse? I think it is too much for us to do. We have 96 judgments that we bring to bear; I doubt if there are two men in this body who could agree; and yet they would be perfectly sincere and perfectly honest.

I know in my own mind—perhaps, it is of no great moment—I have wrestled with this problem the Senator now confronts, whether it is better for us by legislative enactment to chart a course for the man in the White House or the men under him or to give him discretion, which, it seems to me, is within the four corners of the Constitution, a discretion which, in the very nature of things, he must be permitted to exercise, because certainly we cannot do it. The legislatures of the States have recognized the limitations not only on their own powers, but their own discretionary rights by vesting a wide authority in bodies of all sorts in the Senator's own State.

I hope I have not intruded too long on the time of my good friend the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. STEIWER. The Senator need not apologize. I agree that there are difficulties in any approach to a question which is as involved and intricate as the question of relief has grown to be in this country; but there are no difficulties in writing a formula which the Congress may wish to provide for the expenditure of money for relief. There is no difficulty in prescribing in a way that binds effectually every executive agency of the Government that there shall be a rule of justice as between relief families and as between areas and as between all those who may be the beneficiaries of the Government's great bounty.

It will appear as I proceed, I think, that the present lack of a formula, against which I contend is not only at fault because it is unconstitutional but it is at fault in the practical results which it achieves. The failure of Congress to write a formula has resulted in certain conditions which I wish now to outline to the Senate.

One result of the enactment of legislation such as the Relief Act of April 1935, is that there is a complete lack of restraint upon all executive agencies, including the President. Such lack of restraint has resulted in a want of responsibility with respect to the distribution of money for the purposes which Congress vaguely hinted in the act.

The first evidence of the want of responsibility is found in the immediate effect upon our accountancy system. I will not take the time of the Senate to discuss a matter with which all Senators, in varying degrees, are familiar, but I am going to proceed upon the theory that all Senators believe in an accountancy system, in an agent of Congress to determine whether expenditures are lawful and are authorized by law, or whether they are in violation of law. We have such a system as to a greater part of the appropriations which Congress makes, but we have effectively destroyed that system by reason of the type of legislation to which we resorted in 1935, and we will destroy it further by the type of legislation which is now pending before the Senate.

The General Accounting Office has not exercised any effective check over the expenditures under the $4,880,000,000 act. There has been no such check as might assure the expenditure of relief appropriations for the purposes contemplated by the Congress, namely, for relief and for work relief.

If a warrant submitted by the President states that the project is to "provide work relief and increase employment", or if the nature of the project is such that some employment would necessarily result, the General Accounting Office looks no further. I think someone said that if the evidence disclosed that the acquisition of land for some other sort of project which was put up to the Accounting Office would provide work for one man, the project would be regarded as qualified and eligible under the vague terms to which we have resorted.

There was an allocation of $100,000 to Prison Industries Reorganization, which affords a good example. I want to read to the Senate the whole justification that was sent to the Accounting Department in order to establish the eligibility of this particular project. It will be seen immediately that in a very substantial sense it was not a relief project at all. This is the justification:

> To provide funds for the making of surveys of industrial operations and allied activities of State penal institutions, to develop and recommend to the President for approval programs for the reorganization of State prison activities in such a way as to minimize the burden of competition between prison industries and private industries.

That I think is a very proper and laudable objective. I am not criticizing it at all. I am merely attempting to exhibit to the Senate by this illustration that there is no way by which our accounting office can determine whether or not the money is being expended for relief or work relief.

Let us pursue that a little further. The result is that very considerable sums of money are diverted from relief. It means that the taxpayers' money which we have appropriated to feed hungry mouths is diverted into some other avenue and either not used for relief at all, or, if used for relief, is used under a system so expensive, so inadequate, and so inequitable, that it may be substantially charged that our agencies have failed to carry out the will of Congress.

It is not for us to criticize the agencies. I make no criticism either of the President or the others who are distributing this money. I am trying to assert here in the most constructive way of which I am capable that the Congress of the United States should not evade the responsibility of writing the formula, so we can have some assurance that the money appropriated for relief will be used for that purpose.

Let me show briefly one or two of the consequences of the procedure we have followed and are here asked to continue. Dr. Tugwell appeared before the Senate subcommittee and the following is quoted from his testimony, on page 129 of the hearing:

> In doing this work, we have not done it as a relief job, although we have been guided by the mandate in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. But the money we have used has not been given for relief, except a very small part of it, which has been given as emergency grants to farm families in difficult circumstances, faced with disaster from drought, flood, or some circumstance of that kind.

Here is the word of an agent of our Government who is charged with the responsibility of expending $232,000,000 out of the appropriation of last year. He does not hesitate at all to appear before a committee of this body and to say to that committee that this money was not expended "for relief, except a very small part of it." We know the story of his administration. I make no attack upon him personally. I have no grievance because of the details with which he has carried out the work entrusted to him. I think none of us now is interested in those details when faced with the greater responsibility which is ours. We know what he has done. He has purchased between eight and nine million acres of land. He has under option, in addition, in excess of ten million acres of land.

I find a memorandum of the figures to which I shall now refer. The total amount that has been allocated to his administration is $278,347,170. Approximately $34,950,000 of this sum has been used or is to be used for administrative purposes. We have not made any requirements of these agencies respecting their administrative expenses. With respect to other agencies of our Government, we have fixed most definite limitations on the amount which they may expend for administrative expenses both in the field and in the District of Columbia, but with respect to this greatest of all expenditures in our Government we have not even hinted at a limitation upon the administrative expenses which may be indulged in by those who are distributing the money.

We find here a relatively obscure official of the Government reporting that he has used and will use nearly $35,000,000 in the administrative expenses of his department. A sum in excess of $44,000,000 will be used in the purchase of submarginal land. A total of $55,125,000 will be spent for land purchases.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. STEIWER. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not a fact that the purchases to which the Senator is referring were not made by the Resettlement Administration but were turned over to him for the purposes indicated by Mr. Hopkins, who made the purchases under the homestead administration, and they were not in reality made by the Resettlement Administration at all?

Mr. STEIWER. These particular purchases were the purchases of the Resettlement Administration.

Mr. HATCH. I understood the purchases were made by the Resettlement Administration in some cases, but Mr. Tugwell was carrying out the program which had previously been started and involved purchases made by Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. STEIWER. A number of the projects were inherited from the Interior Department and the F. E. R. A. Some of the most expensive ones were started under an administration previous to Dr. Tugwell's administration.

Mr. HATCH. That is what I thought.

Mr. STEIWER. I am very happy to say in fairness to Dr. Tugwell that I think some of the most expensive projects in terms of relief were started before the responsibility was his. Nevertheless, he completed the carrying out of the projects. There is one at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., where the expense per family unit was between $13,000 and $14,000. Dr. Tugwell was asked what justification there was under any relief program for such expenditures. His answer was that there was no justification. He was merely content to say that the project was started under an earlier administration.

But, Mr. President, the evils of this type of legislation were exhibited in the earlier legislation. What I am attempting to say to the Senate is that the whole system is wrong and that the responsibility is ours. If we fail to meet the responsibility, these agents of the Government will say that the Congress has placed its approval upon all this type of waste which has gone on before; and if the waste continues, we shall be charged, and not they, because apparently we shall have put our stamp of approval upon their conduct.

Thirty-one million dollars has been allocated for the development of four suburban resettlement projects. An additional $15,000,000 will be utilized for the completion of the subsistence homestead program.

In April of this year there were 17,055 administrative employees on the pay roll of the Resettlement Administration. At that time approximately 73,000 persons were working on relief projects under the Resettlement Administration. This means that there was one administrative employee to every four persons on work relief. It should be added, however, that there are a large number of families—I think 500,000 rural-rehabilitation cases—that were being cared for by the same administrative organization.

Mr. Hopkins submitted a statement which shows the amounts earmarked for land purchase, making a total in excess of $35,000,000 from the Emergency Relief Act of 1935. Over $22,000,000 of this sum was allocated to the Resettlement Administration. Resettlement has received from all sources for land purchases in excess of $55,000,000, so that $32,768,000 has been available to that agency from appropriations other than the 1935 act. Adding this to the total allocated from the 1935 act, the total sum earmarked for land purchases amounts to $67,986,000.

I have been unable to identify any figure which shows the total acreage of land purchases made or contemplated. Last year evidence was submitted that the total purchases were approximately 15,000,000 acres. The total amount under option at that time, I think, was seven or eight million acres more. I am told unofficially that the total purchase now is some twenty-two or twenty-four million acres of land. This area is substantially equivalent to one-half of the entire area of the State of Maine.

These purchases are made for a number of purposes. One is to take land out of production and to convert it to different uses. Another is to provide homes and gardens and small farms and better living conditions for low-income workers from suburban communities. A third is to remove families from poor land and rehabilitate them on locations better suited for contained self-support; and a fourth is to remove stranded industrial or agricultural workers and resettle them in more favorable locations.

It might be interesting on that score to notice what the court has said. I am referring again to the decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia:

The following excerpt from the opinion in the Butler case seems almost prophetic of the Federal Government's attempt to "resettle" destitute and low-income families: "Suppose that there are too many garment workers in the large cities; that this results in dislocation of the economic balance. Upon the principle contended for, an excise might be laid on the manufacture of all garments manufactured and the proceeds paid to those manufacturers who agree to remove their plants to cities having not more than a hundred thousand population. Thus, through the asserted power of taxation, the Federal Government, against the will of individual States, might completely redistribute the industrial population."

That language is quoted from the decision of the Supreme Court; and it applies most forcefully to the contention here that we may write into this bill words like "rural resettlement" or "land rehabilitation", or something of that sort, and thus authorize somebody in the executive branch to go into any area he may choose, to take a population he may desire, and to place that population anywhere he may care to place that population, without consulting the wishes of the States of the Union. In Montana there is an acquisition of a million acres, and the control of that million acres, which was privately owned land, has been taken over by the Resettlement Administration, and they propose to administer it as a grazing area; and in that instance they have neither sought nor obtained, as I understand, the consent of the State of Montana or of anyone else.

These land purchases are removing large areas from local tax rolls. For instance, the Montana project will result in the removal of one-third of the tax base of the county in which the project is located. No steps have been taken, and, so far as I know, no steps have been contemplated by the Resettlement Administration to reimburse the counties and States for the taxes lost as the result of its program.

We have, among the numerous results of this program, certain variations in the treatment which has been accorded by the Works Progress Administration to the various communities and the different States of the Union. We find in the House hearings, at page 229, the figures of contribution. They have developed the phrase "sponsor's contribution." As most of you know, the "sponsor" is the local agency that cooperates with the Works Progress Administration and makes a contribution either in cash or in materials or in the use of machinery or in the use of personnel of the local municipality in order to defray the expense of the project. At this page of the House hearings we find that the variation in contribution by States runs from a low of 8.2 percent to a high of 43 percent. There are several States where the contribution is 11 or 13 or 14 percent. There are numerous States where the contribution is in excess of 20 percent; there are some few where it is in excess of 30 percent; and one or two cases where the contribution is in excess of 40 percent.

The point I desire to make of this is that in the distribution of these funds our failure to write a formula to protect the rights of the several States and the different areas of our country has resulted in an inequitable and unfair distribution of the money and an inequitable and unfair distribution of some communities which have been permitted to enjoy the benefits of Federal contribution and at the same time make practically no contribution of their own.

The record discloses that the States which enjoy this favoritism are not always the weaker States, that the communities which enjoy this favoritism are not always the weaker communities. The place where we found the most notable favoritism was in the city of Greater New York, where the amount of the local contribution was exactly nothing at all and where the entire work program is financed with Federal money.

Another phase of the same thing is the variation in benefit as between families in different areas of the country. In this respect there has been no formula, and there are no two States upon the same basis.

Mr. President, I illustrate this situation by calling attention to a chart which I ask leave to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGILL in the chair). Is there objection?

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

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL EXPENDITURES FOR RELIEF

Expenditures under the F. E. R. A. program, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1935

State	(1) Estimated population, July 1, 1935 [1]	(2) Estimated number of families July 1, 1935 [2]	(3) Number of families on relief July 1935 [3] (actual)	(4) Percent of all families that were on relief (column 3÷column 2)	Calendar year 1935 (5) F. E. R. A. grants (Federal Emergency Relief) [4]	(6) State and local funds for emergency relief [4]	(7) Total emergency relief expenditures [4] (column 5+column 6)	(8) Percent of total relief expenditures from Federal funds (column 5÷column 7)	(9) Federal funds per family on relief (column 5÷column 3)	(10) State and local funds per family on relief (column 6÷column 3)	(11) Total Emergency relief expenditures per family on relief (column 7÷column 3)
Alabama	2,723,000	623,000	61,938	9.9	$17,331,528	$1,415,819	$18,747,347	92.4	$280	$23	$303
Arizona	461,000	116,000	16,026	13.8	6,902,827	[5] 923,138	7,825,965	88.2	431	58	488
Arkansas	1,880,000	456,000	52,719	11.6	16,942,786	583,955	17,526,741	96.7	321	11	332
California	6,254,000	1,834,000	169,371	9.2	91,687,753	37,439,023	129,126,776	71.0	541	221	762
Colorado	1,060,000	282,000	37,868	13.4	19,755,146	2,384,603	22,139,749	89.5	522	63	585
Connecticut	1,664,000	414,000	35,556	8.6	12,884,036	12,347,306	25,231,342	51.1	362	347	710
Delaware	248,000	63,000	3,492	5.5	642,928	[6] 569,738	1,212,666	53.0	184	163	347
District of Columbia	449,000	119,000	11,487	9.7	6,982,540	[6] 2,144,076	9,126,616	76.5	608	187	795
Florida	1,596,000	421,000	48,165	11.4	14,494,534	913,052	15,407,586	94.1	301	19	320
Georgia	2,911,000	669,000	54,757	8.2	20,343,180	[6] 1,307,361	21,650,541	94.0	372	24	395
Idaho	449,000	112,000	13,397	12.0	6,234,540	1,373,972	7,608,512	82.0	465	103	568
Illinois	7,926,000	2,064,000	277,016	13.4	100,502,123	22,421,473	122,923,596	81.8	363	81	444
Indiana	3,317,000	887,000	91,430	10.3	22,769,124	11,958,169	34,727,293	65.6	249	131	380
Iowa	2,488,000	658,000	37,075	5.6	12,392,639	7,525,674	19,918,313	62.2	334	203	537
Kansas	1,910,000	509,000	53,881	10.6	21,696,007	6,782,246	28,478,253	76.2	403	126	529
Kentucky	2,666,000	638,000	97,774	15.3	15,972,497	2,823,104	18,795,601	85.0	163	29	192
Louisiana	2,179,000	516,000	48,370	9.4	18,560,428	[6] 919,131	19,479,559	95.3	384	19	403
Maine	806,000	206,000	20,972	10.2	5,659,233	4,449,745	10,108,978	56.0	270	212	482
Maryland	1,679,000	407,000	29,153	7.2	14,383,874	2,540,448	16,924,322	85.0	493	87	581
Massachusetts	4,352,000	1,075,000	155,074	14.4	67,159,620	38,061,564	105,221,184	63.8	433	245	679
Michigan	5,143,000	1,289,000	137,246	10.6	49,892,324	16,559,105	66,451,429	75.1	364	121	484
Minnesota	2,610,000	635,000	66,329	10.4	34,435,134	9,976,515	44,411,649	77.5	519	151	670
Mississippi	2,067,000	498,000	37,773	7.6	12,713,575	928,374	13,641,949	93.2	337	25	361
Missouri	3,688,000	983,000	110,655	11.3	32,151,020	9,944,742	42,095,762	76.4	291	90	380
Montana	538,000	141,000	17,959	12.7	9,085,409	736,051	9,821,460	92.5	506	41	547
Nebraska	1,398,000	358,000	28,809	8.0	12,971,001	2,863,465	15,834,466	81.9	450	99	550
Nevada	95,000	28,000	1,693	6.0	2,308,553	467,891	2,776,444	83.1	1,360	276	1,640
New Hampshire	471,000	124,000	10,738	9.0	2,159,299	3,447,233	5,606,532	38.5	201	321	522
New Jersey	4,269,000	1,070,000	123,190	12.0	45,724,549	16,907,538	62,632,087	73.0	371	137	508
New Mexico	440,000	105,000	24,700	23.5	7,718,337	427,272	8,145,609	94.7	312	17	330
New York	13,153,000	3,390,000	439,094	13.0	172,306,206	136,338,032	308,644,238	55.8	392	310	703
North Carolina	3,327,000	692,000	56,384	8.1	16,294,426	[6] 48,558	16,342,984	99.7	289	(7)	290
North Dakota	689,000	150,000	27,072	18.0	11,860,493	1,875,884	13,736,377	86.3	438	69	507
Ohio	6,874,000	1,804,000	247,616	13.7	85,397,724	12,339,620	97,737,344	87.4	345	50	395
Oklahoma	2,491,000	602,000	93,150	15.5	19,439,486	2,242,088	21,681,574	89.7	209	24	233
Oregon	997,000	288,000	21,096	7.3	9,104,956	3,118,078	12,223,034	74.5	432	148	580
Pennsylvania	9,865,000	2,349,000	373,387	16.0	163,647,051	49,360,849	213,007,900	76.8	438	132	570
Rhode Island	708,000	175,000	15,914	9.1	3,038,140	5,642,163	8,680,303	35.0	191	355	545
South Carolina	1,752,000	377,000	34,965	9.3	12,449,258	327,752	12,777,010	97.4	356	9	365
South Dakota	708,000	169,000	19,002	11.2	12,020,466	[6] 1,314,544	13,335,010	90.1	633	69	702
Tennessee	2,688,000	632,000	65,070	10.3	16,486,435	1,668,713	18,155,148	90.8	253	26	279
Texas	6,123,000	1,490,000	133,709	9.0	39,320,117	5,991,406	45,311,523	86.8	294	45	339
Utah	522,000	1,222,000	20,642	1.7	8,267,073	2,308,885	10,575,958	78.2	400	112	512
Vermont	361,000	92,000	6,809	7.4	1,759,661	935,204	2,694,865	65.3	258	137	396
Virginia	2,451,000	548,000	45,279	8.3	13,357,218	811,509	14,168,727	94.3	295	18	313
Washington	1,617,000	453,000	49,575	10.9	16,687,670	4,198,572	20,886,242	79.9	337	85	421
West Virginia	1,798,000	398,000	76,768	19.3	17,679,605	3,028,196	20,707,801	85.4	230	39	270
Wisconsin	3,018,000	751,000	73,042	9.7	35,231,996	13,964,227	49,196,223	71.6	482	191	674
Wyoming	233,000	61,000	4,150	6.8	3,173,941	296,413	3,470,354	91.5	765	71	836
Total			3,677,337		1,359,978,466	466,952,476	1,826,930,942				
Continental United States [8]	127,521,000	31,900,000		11.5				74.4	370	127	497

[1] Obtained by adding to the official census estimate of population in each State on July 1, 1934, an amount equal to the net change in the population in that State between July 1, 1933, and July 1, 1934, as shown in estimates of the Bureau of the Census (Statistical Abstract 1935, p. 9). This procedure assumes, therefore, that the population in each State increased over 1934 by the same amount that it increased in 1934 over 1933.

[2] Obtained by dividing the estimated population in each State by an estimate of the average number of persons per family in that State. The average population per family in the United States in 1930 was 4.1, but this figure has been decreasing by two-tenths of a unit per decade since 1890, and it seems reasonable on the basis of the assumption that this decrease is continuing to reduce the 1930 figure by one-tenth in connection with the 1935 estimated population. This procedure has been used for each State, the 1930 figure for the average number of persons per family in the State being reduced by one-tenth for use with the 1935 estimated population in that State.

[3] F. E. R. A., division of research, statistics, and finance, release of Sept. 30, 1935.

[4] F. E. R. A., division of research, statistics, and finance, release of Mar. 18, 1936, no. 8579, which states that these figures include: "Obligations incurred for relief extended under the general relief program, under all special programs, and for administration; these figures also include purchases of materials, supplies, and equipment, rentals of equipment (such as team and truck hire), earnings of nonrelief persons employed and other expenses incident to the emergency work-relief program." It should, however, be noted that the expenditures under the works programs (W. P. A.) are not included. Before July 1, 1935, the F. E. R. A. program attempted to provide for both employables and unemployables. A transfer of employables to the works program began July 1, 1935, so that the expenditures for emergency relief declined from $188,571,767 in May 1935 to $70,555,119 in December 1935.

[5] State funds only. No local funds.

[6] Local funds only. No State funds.

[7] Less than 1.

[8] United States figures calculated on basis of official estimate of United States population and family estimate based on assured continental United States, average of 4.0 persons per family. The percentage of families on relief for United States, and the per family figures in the final columns are all based on continental United States figures rather than being averages of figures for individual States.

Mr. STEIWER. This chart, I should say, is not abstracted from the hearings before the committee, but was prepared by reference to the various publications of the different relief agencies, and I believe correctly portrays the basis of spending.

The chart to which I call attention is headed "Expenditures under the F. E. R. A. program, January 1–December 31, 1935." The chart discloses the amounts paid in relief by States. It discloses in the several columns the number of families or local units which were the beneficiaries of relief payments. Then in column no. 11 it discloses the total emergency relief expenditures per family on relief. I desire to read some of those relief expenditures per family.

In Alabama the expenditure was $303. That, Senators will remember is for 1 year, from January 1 to December 31, inclusive, 1935.

In Arizona the figure was $488.

In Arkansas the figure was $332.

In California it was $762.

In Colorado it was $585.

I will not read further, inasmuch as the chart will appear in the RECORD, but I desire to say that in one State of the Union the payment per family was as low as $192, and in

another State in the Union the payment was as high as $1,640.

Let Senators give consideration to this method of haphazard distribution, which results in such a disparity between relief units.

I call attention also to another tabulation which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point. It is entitled "Allocation of funds under the emergency relief appropriation act of 1935 compared with relief cases by States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

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

Allocation of funds under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 compared with relief cases, by States[1]

State	Relief cases[2] June 1935	Total funds, all agencies	Total Works Progress Administration funds	Total funds per case	Works Progress Administration funds per case
Alabama	83,832	$64,446,977	$17,421,545	$768.76	$207.81
Arizona	20,387	37,921,823	5,198,424	1,860.10	254.99
Arkansas	74,160	59,820,101	14,366,301	806.64	193.72
California	241,327	269,228,356	77,061,694	1,115.62	319.32
Colorado	62,889	58,961,687	17,863,127	937.55	284.04
Connecticut	42,310	38,906,427	14,026,505	921.68	331.52
Delaware	4,149	7,043,767	1,645,972	1,697.70	396.72
District of Columbia	18,603	24,488,834	6,594,933	1,316.39	354.51
Florida	64,747	60,158,797	14,789,117	929.14	228.41
Georgia	77,003	68,423,966	19,116,876	888.59	248.26
Idaho	20,776	39,711,106	4,862,907	1,911.39	234.06
Illinois	303,936	241,365,688	85,387,356	794.13	280.94
Indiana	114,857	86,566,102	40,040,009	753.69	348.61
Iowa	49,929	46,958,400	12,968,713	940.50	259.74
Kansas	79,935	56,029,798	16,327,388	700.94	204.26
Kentucky	107,556	62,851,211	18,949,291	584.36	176.18
Louisiana	64,051	53,820,041	17,052,315	840.27	266.23
Maine	22,169	26,947,502	4,743,244	1,215.55	213.96
Maryland	38,320	53,447,970	11,179,104	1,394.78	291.73
Massachusetts	186,528	149,407,527	50,670,372	800.99	271.65
Michigan	168,785	135,751,398	45,070,145	804.29	267.03
Minnesota	104,125	95,099,363	29,677,101	913.32	285.01
Mississippi	59,169	48,107,380	11,227,113	813.05	189.75
Missouri	146,826	98,882,133	32,557,031	673.46	221.74
Montana	26,257	55,152,689	7,365,238	2,100.49	280.51
Nebraska	44,404	49,019,832	10,206,349	1,103.95	229.85
Nevada	3,030	12,103,165	1,393,762	3,994.44	459.99
New Hampshire	14,322	13,978,178	3,589,440	975.99	250.62
New Jersey	157,092	120,792,564	45,386,890	768.93	288.92
New Mexico	30,868	39,822,407	5,556,104	1,290.09	180.00
New York	541,138	548,963,934	259,734,795	1,014.47	479.98
North Carolina	70,759	57,946,689	12,174,890	818.93	172.06
North Dakota	39,944	31,639,395	5,282,211	792.09	132.24
Ohio	323,178	221,539,879	91,018,680	685.50	281.64
Oklahoma	118,526	77,516,000	26,285,339	654.00	221.77
Oregon	30,035	41,951,111	8,970,389	1,396.74	298.66
Pennsylvania	473,040	317,721,910	123,431,402	671.66	260.93
Rhode Island	18,661	16,768,548	6,658,024	898.59	356.79
South Carolina	[3] 59,573	46,413,065	9,240,333	779.10	155.11
South Dakota	59,378	32,591,453	6,019,019	548.88	101.37
Tennessee	77,208	68,939,257	15,102,526	892.90	195.61
Texas	198,316	166,310,825	34,997,881	838.62	176.48
Utah	26,798	28,910,252	6,961,844	1,078.82	259.79
Vermont	8,410	15,879,899	2,146,025	1,888.22	255.18
Virginia	52,182	57,370,734	11,695,941	1,099.44	224.14
Washington	67,394	85,206,559	17,193,235	1,264.30	255.12
West Virginia	88,642	63,957,213	21,476,388	721.52	242.28
Wisconsin	107,250	98,307,120	30,697,576	916.62	286.22
Wyoming	7,282	26,750,498	2,798,526	3,673.51	384.31
Continental United States	4,800,056	4,173,989,570	1,334,179,370	869.57	277.95

[1] Data on allotments from House of Representatives hearings on first deficiency appropriation bill, 1936.

[2] Data from Federal Emergency Relief Administration monthly report for June 1935.

[3] Includes some duplication of families or individuals who received relief under both the general relief and rural rehabilitation programs.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, in the two right-hand columns of this tabulation we find the headings "Total funds per case" and "W. P. A. funds per case." The one last mentioned is, of course, the allocation only from the Works Progress Administration.

I shall not read these figures separately at this time, but I call attention to the fact that the low figures per case of W. P. A. fund allocations were $101.37 in the lowest State, with a high of $459.99 in another State.

In the first chart I mentioned there is some explanation for the disparity between States, which comes from the fact that in some States nearly all the relief has been expended in the form of direct relief and in other States the relief has been in the form of public-works projects, which, by necessity, sometimes are very expensive. But in the last chart from which I read this comparison is not involved.

In the last column the figures relate only to allocations by the Works Progress Administration and the comparison is a comparison of allocations by that administration on a family basis, or unit basis, in the various States of the Union.

Mr. President, another variation of some interest, although probably not of controlling importance, is the variation in the annual cost on the basis of man-years. That variation throws much light on the total lack of system with which relief moneys are disbursed.

Our hearings disclosed that the peak of employment on relief was 3,800,000 relief workers. Of these, 3,000,050 were W. P. A. workers. This is 80.3 percent of the total number of relief workers. Please carry that figure in mind for just a moment.

All the other agencies of our Government furnished employment for 19.7 percent. But when we examine the figures of the amounts allotted in dollars we note the astounding fact that W. P. A. had only $1,363,926,000 and the other agencies had $2,216,000,000.

The conclusion we are forced to make is that W. P. A., with all its faults, is the most economic distributor of relief moneys we have yet found. The conclusion we are forced to make is that W. P. A., having 38 percent of the funds, has provided work for more than 80 percent of those who were getting aid by work relief, and that all the other agencies combined, having 62 percent of the funds, are providing work for 19.7 percent of those who are on work relief.

Mr. President, I have sometimes been a critic of the Works Progress Administration. I am still a critic of some of the political irregularities and abuses which we find in that administration; I think these figures tell a most eloquent story. If it is the desire of the Congress to provide the maximum relief within limits of the ability of our Treasury to pay, we would do well not to adopt the amendments suggested by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, because the bill that came to us from the House lodged the authority for the expenditure of this money in the Works Relief Administration, whereas the amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations goes back to the old error of permitting discretionary determination by the Executive as to how, and when, and where, and if the money is to be expended.

There is one other matter I want to consider, Mr. President, before I conclude. I want to refer briefly to the result of our policy of relief in aggregate cost. This consideration in my humble opinion is the most important of all. I think most of us would say that although we prefer a good system to a bad one, that if our Treasury were able to stand the strain we would be willing to indulge some irregularities, some unavoidable difficulties, in order that our Government might contribute to the relief burden which it should help to relieve. However, when we consider whether the program is one which we can meet we may very well pause and wonder not only as to the direction in which we are tending but as to the ultimate destination at which we will arrive if we shall permit this thing to continue.

I have here a statement taken from the record of hearings of the Senate committee. I desire to read some of the answers made by Mr. Hopkins in order to exhibit to the Senate and to the country, if the country is interested, the fact that as the relief load goes down the relief standards go up, and the cost of relief is increasing and not decreasing, and it is going to continue to increase, and it will never decrease under the system which we are now following. These questions were asked and these answers were given by Mr. Hopkins:

Senator STEIWER. Was the policy to raise the level of relief benefits and standards throughout the country in operation during the time of the F. E. R. A.?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Senator STEIWER. Is that your policy?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Senator STEIWER. Who determined that policy?

Mr. HOPKINS. I did.

Senator STEIWER. On what basis?

Mr. HOPKINS. On the basis of the studies of our nurses, and our nutrition workers, and competent people, as to the amount of relief people were getting and the amount of relief that people needed.

We found families, for instance, getting $2 a month relief. It did not take any expert to know that was miserably inadequate, and we insisted in our relations with the States as a part of our standards that they give reasonably adequate relief.

The results of this policy were different in various places, because in the last analysis relief largely is a matter of local public opinion. But we did deliberately attempt to increase the standards of relief. I do not think we ever got them up high enough.

Senator STEIWER. You are not suggesting further elevation of standards out of this appropriation?

Mr. HOPKINS. We have done it by our works program, because the average benefits in wages they get is higher than the amount they got in relief.

Senator STEIWER. But let me have a little more definite answer to my question. You do not plan from this appropriation to create a higher standard of relief as against the existing standards.

Mr. HOPKINS. No.

Senator STEIWER. As against the appropriation for last year.

Mr. HOPKINS. No; we do not intend to. We may modify existing wages in some instances, but we do not intend to make any general increases.

So, Mr. President, the President of the United States has not fixed the relief standards. The Congress failed in its responsibility to fix the relief standards. Apparently they have been fixed by one subordinate agent of our Government, and that agent was Mr. Hopkins; and he puts us on our guard by telling us that, although he does not propose to elevate the relief standards from this particular appropriation, that it is his judgment they are not high enough.

What is the conclusion to be drawn from that? I think the fair conclusion to be drawn is that if we permit him to go forward in his way the time will come when he will take advantage of the unfettered authority which Congress and the President confer upon him, and will further elevate the relief standards and consequently the relief costs in this country.

Let us see what this situation has done to us up to this time. I have had prepared a chart of recovery and relief expenditures from February 1, 1932, to May 22, 1936, by months, with totals for each fiscal year. The table is in millions of dollars, the last six ciphers being omitted, and is based upon information secured from the Bureau of the Budget. I ask, Mr. President, that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The table is as follows:

Recovery and relief expenditures from Feb. 1, 1932, to May 22, 1936, by months with totals for each fiscal year

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1932	Fiscal year 1933	Fiscal year 1934	Fiscal year 1935	Fiscal year 1936
July		150	75	236	347
August		116	139	309	289
September		15	81	283	244
October		83	104	278	286
November		37	294	390	261
December		76	463	321	247
January		112	808	252	241
February	130	147	447	248	301
March	96	157	448	288	214
April	189	109	370	279	314
May	182	193	350	347	[1] 236
June	296	82	423	425	
Total	893	1,277	4,002	3,656	[1] 2,980

[1] To May 22, inclusive.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, this tabulation shows that the relief expenditures starting in February 1932 were $130,000,000. In March of that year they were $96,000,000; in April, $189,000,000; in May, $182,000,000; in June, $296,000,000.

Starting the new fiscal year in July 1933, the relief expenditures were $150,000,000, and they continued through that year to a high in excess of $193,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1934, commencing in July, the relief expenditures were $75,000,000. They went up in December 1934 to $423,000,000. In January 1935 they went up to $808,000,000. In February they were $447,000,000. At the end of the year, June 1935, the amount was $423,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1935 relief expenditures varied from a low of $236,000,000 to a high figure of $425,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1936 relief expenditures varied from a low of $214,000,000 to a high of $347,000,000. The figures are only given down to May 22 of this year. It is anticipated that June 1936 will show the largest relief expenditures for any month in the year.

The total shows that the high cost of relief for the fiscal year 1934 was slightly in excess of $4,000,000,000. It is estimated by the Bureau of the Budget that the cost this year will be in excess of $3,600,000,000.

The grand total of Federal relief expenditures for this period was $12,808,000,000.

To this should be added State and local expenditures which will bring the total to approximately $15,000,000,000.

Mr. President, the conclusion that may fairly and properly be drawn from this array of figures is that although the relief load has gone down slightly, according to the claims of those in authority, the cost of relief continues to go up. As I said a while ago, as the relief load goes down the relief standard goes up, so that the cost is kept up. The Works Progress Administrator told our committee that he wants the standard raised yet higher. I do not know but that they ought to be raised. I am not in favor of niggardly relief. I am not in favor of harsh and unfair treatment of people who are destitute. I am merely trying to say to this body as earnestly as I can that the relief costs are not coming down, that the lowering of the relief load is not reducing the relief costs. We are geared up to an expenditure of about $3,500,000,000 per year of Federal contribution for relief. The Congress did not fix the amount. The President did not fix the amount, but the various heads of the relief agencies have fixed the standard and have determined the amount, and all we are called upon to do is to appropriate the lump sum of money necessary to meet the requirements which they have fixed upon our Government.

I do not undertake to deal with detailed instances. For the purposes of this discussion I do not care anything about inefficiency in administration or the criticisms so often directed against relief projects; nor do I even refer to the fact that there has been political irregularities over many areas of the country. I am trying to say only that we have failed to meet our responsibility to our country. We continue this failure by the form in which the committee would have this legislation enacted. We are asked now to give to the President the unfettered discretion with respect to the expenditure of this money. Then we are asked to put Dr. Tugwell's Resettlement Administration back in the bill. We are asked to put our approval upon everything that has been done, and to vote another lump sum without restriction as to its expenditure.

We are asked to approve this thing of employing 17,000 administrative assistants in the Resettlement Administration. We are asked to continue to leave to the executive departments and to subordinate agents the determination of what our policy is to be, and to permit under the cloak of humanitarianism and in the guise of beneficent paternalism the evolution of impractical and visonary projects which are utterly without justification. By the action of the Senate committee we are asked again to write a blank check for the President of the United States, and by doing so, to put our stamp of approval upon a system which makes of human misery a shield for the initiation and prosecution of projects which the Congress would not even seriously consider were they required to stand on their own merit.

I know that no word I can say will stay this Congress from doing that thing, but I am not willing to let the bill be passed without discharging my obligation to my country by standing here and, as vigorously as I can, condemning the whole thing of the delegation of powers and the appropriation of money without restraint, without control, without definition.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point letters from mayors of various cities in Oregon expressing their views as to the program of the Works Progress Administration in Oregon, approving it in every instance. They give their full approval to the program of the Works Progress Administration and pay tribute to the manner in which the funds have been administered in the State of Oregon.

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

MYRTLE POINT, OREG., *April 20, 1936.*

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION,
Bedell Building, Portland, Oreg.
(Attention: Mr. E. J. Griffith, State administrator.)

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of April 17th regarding the program of the Works Progress Administration and asking certain pertinent questions regarding the success of the program.

We feel that the idea of giving work rather than the dole is the proper method because, first, it has been demonstrated to us that the people who are in need of help would rather perform some labor for the help received and, secondly, that the sponsors of the various projects are securing much-needed assistance in work that is, or will be, within a couple of years necessary to be done, by the sponsors.

The work being done by us is a much-needed item. In our case we are making an extension to our water system which serves a number of people and which is at present inadequate as well as obsolete.

We have yet quite a lot of work that should be done in the matter of obsolete water mains, these already having served their allotted time, but which we would be unable to complete when necessary without the help of some governmental agency, so we would say that we have quite a lot of useful work yet to be done.

There is only one real criticism we would make and that would be in the time consumed in the passing on applications. It would appear that each State director should be allowed the privilege of passing and allowing project or else some method devised to secure more prompt action in the office at Washington, D. C., so that the work could be done at a time when the labor surplus is greatest. Taken all in all we feel that the W. P. A. is one of the most-needed governmental agencies both from the labor carry-over standpoint and as related to the necessary assistance given the sponsors.

Thanking you for giving us this chance of expressing our opinions and criticism, we are,

Yours very truly,

RALPH D. KING, *Mayor.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 27, 1936.*

Mr. E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
Bedell Building, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: In response to your letter of April 14, I offer you the following answers to your numbered inquiries:

1. Yes.
2. Yes; in the main.
3. Yes.
4. At a recent regional conference of the United States Conference of Mayors held in San Francisco, the attending mayors seemed to be unanimously of the opinion that until industry takes the initiative and provides for those who wish to work it will be necessary to carry on the W. P. A. program; certain it is our people do not wish to be on the dole.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH K. CARSON, Jr., *Mayor.*

AMITY, OREG.,
April 22, 1936.

Mr. E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator, W. P. A.,
Bedell Building, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of a questionnaire from your office asking as to how well the program of the Works Progress Administration is meeting the unemployment problem, etc. In reply would say:

1. Is work the proper method of meeting the unemployment problem as compared to the dole and idleness?

In my opinion work is far more preferable, as that is what self-respecting people want.

2. Are we doing useful and needed work under the W. P. A. program?

So far as this locality is concerned, all work that has been done has been on projects that were well worth while.

3. Is there useful work yet to be done under a continued W. P. A. program?

In this community there are a number of projects, such as more improvements to the city water-works system, street improvements, etc., that could be undertaken if they could be financed in part with Federal assistance.

4. Any comment you care to make.

The interest taken by W. P. A. officials who are connected with the rebuilding of our water-works system is greatly appreciated. The W. P. A. engineer (Mr. Hicks) has saved the city of Amity several hundred dollars by showing us where changes could be made that has saved us money. And nothing escapes his eagle eye.

Yours very sincerely,

JAMES D. WOODMAN, *Mayor.*

THE DALLES, OREG., APRIL 28, 1936.

E. J. GRIFFITH,
Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
12th Floor, Bedell Building, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: Your letter to Mayor Willerton has been given this office for reply.

It is the unanimous opinion of the members of Dalles City Council that under the Works Progress Administration the unemployment problem has been aided materially, that the work done or in progress is much needed and the W. P. A. programs should be continued.

For the past several months there has been several projects in this community, some sponsored by the State of Oregon and others by the port of The Dalles.

This city to date has not participated, although we have been trying, through Mr. W. M. Bartlett, division engineer, to get some W. P. A. projects under way.

Should W. P. A. programs be continued, we can assure you that this city will sponsor several. Sewers, sidewalks, and recreation grounds.

Yours very truly,

J. H. STEERS,
Recorder of Dalles City.

NORTH BEND, OREG., *April 21, 1936.*

E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator W. P. A., Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: In reply to your inquiry of April 17 regarding the unemployment problem:

1. Work is the proper method in meeting the unemployment situation, most of the unemployed do not want charity.
2. The W. P. A. projects now in operation constitute valuable public improvement of a permanent character, which we need but could not take care of if it were not for the W. P. A.
3. Yes; there is a lot of useful work yet to be done under a continued W. P. A. program.

Trusting that this is the information you desire, I remain,

Very truly yours,

L. A. CUTLIP.

HILLSBORO, OREG., *April 27, 1936.*

Hon. E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator, W. P. A.,
Bedell Building, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: In replying to your letter of inquiry as to the success and progress of the W. P. A. program, we are pleased to report as follows:

1. We favor work relief in preference to the dole or idleness for able-bodied unemployed men and women.
2. The Works Progress Administration in our city has been a success. Our efforts have been to furnish needed and useful projects of a general public benefit, such as improving and beautifying our city park and recreational center, constructing concrete sidewalks, curbs, and macadamizing streets.
3. There is much work yet to be done under the above-outlined projects and still other worthy projects which could be carried out under a continued W. P. A. program.
4. With few exceptions the employees have worked well and appreciated the opportunity of having such public work during the off season or at a time when private work was unobtainable.

We are of the opinion this community will continue to need some such a program as W. P. A. this coming winter to relieve unemployment when seasonable employment slacks up.

Very truly yours,

THE CITY OF HILLSBORO, OREG.,
By J. H. GARRETT, *Mayor.*

PENDLETON, OREG., *April 17, 1936.*

Mr. E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
Twelfth Floor, Bedell Building, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: I have received your letter of April 14, 1936, in which you request me to express an opinion on the program of the Works Progress Administration.

These questions I shall endeavor to answer in the order in which you have asked them.

No. 1. Is work the proper method of meeting the unemployment problem as compared to the dole and idleness?

My opinion on this subject is much the same as that given in the report of the United States Conference of Mayors, a copy of which you enclosed. There is, of course, a small percentage of workers from relief rolls who prefer, through sheer laziness, to accept a grocery order instead of doing a day's work. The great majority, however, always say, "I want a job, not charity." Enforced idleness, encouraged by the dole, is essentially destructive to the moral well-being of our people. Particularly in an agricultural area, where most of our people have been accustomed all their lives to manual labor, a work program is highly desirable as the solution of the relief problem.

No. 2. Are we doing useful and needed work under the W. P. A. program?

Decidedly; yes. I know from first-hand experience that the projects sponsored by Umatilla County have been useful and they are unquestionably needed. Any project for construction of a road is useful and needed, and most of our projects have been of that type.

No. 3. Is there useful work yet to be done under a continued W. P. A. program?

I should estimate that there is sufficient work already planned in Umatilla County, some of which has been submitted and approved, to take care of the situation for 3 years at least.

No. 4. Any comments you care to make.

On this subject, it is rather difficult to answer you. We have been exceptionally well pleased with the operation of the program and have no criticisms to offer. However, one point should be stressed in planning of your projects. I believe you should exercise extreme care that you do not undertake any work which would normally be done by the political subdivision acting as the sponsor. While I don't know of any specific cases where this has been overlooked, I do believe that it is quite possible that some counties or cities and school districts are taking unfair advantage of the availability of relief labor. Whenever this occurs, it, of course, throws men out of employment who would ordinarily be employed directly by the political subdivision involved. This causes harsh criticism.

Along another line, I should urge you to operate projects which offer a maximum of expenditures for labor, with the material cost held very low. Projects of this type would include clearing of river channels to prevent flood damage, and the strengthening of roadsides for erosion control and better drainage.

I trust that my remarks will be of some interest to you, and assure you that any cooperation we can offer will be most cheerfully given.

Very truly yours,

G. F. HODGES, *County Judge.*

TILLAMOOK CITY, OREG., *April 24, 1936.*

MR. E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator, Portland, Oreg.

MY DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: In answer to your letter of April 18, outlining four questions in relation to the work of the relief administration in Tillamook City, I will answer them as follows:

1. I believe wholeheartedly with the administration that the only proper method of meeting the unemployment problem is through public work, such as we have been doing with the relief money.

2. The work that we have been doing in Tillamook City and Tillamook County with the W. P. A. program has been of the most useful kind and is of a permanent nature, and benefits from it will be derived by the public in general for years and years to come.

3. We feel that there is more work that can be done and accomplished through a continued W. P. A. program. Tillamook City itself has several further projects that we would be interested in cooperating with if the program is continued.

In summary, I would say the method of furnishing employment through the W. P. A. to the unemployed public has been, to my mind, an outstanding accomplishment of the Democratic administration.

I feel that this method of unemployment relief is so far superior to the dole system that there is absolutely no comparison whatsoever, and I sincerely hope that the leaders in our country will never come to the point where they will simply dole money out to the unemployed, rather than have them work for what they get.

I am sure that the above expresses the viewpoint of all of the thinking people of our city and country.

Wishing you continued success in your operations, I am,

Yours sincerely,

A. J. SWETT,
Mayor, City of Tillamook.

GRESHAM, OREG., *April 20, 1936.*

E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
Bedell Building, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: It is a pleasure to reply to your letter of April 14 inquiring as to our experiences, etc., with the Works Progress Administration's program.

In the first place any red-blooded American citizen wants and is definitely entitled to work, and all of them resent the dole idea.

We feel that all of the work which has been done under W. P. A. in our community through the numerous recent small projects have been of useful nature and actually provided betterment to our public buildings, highways, drainage areas, etc., of a distinct improvement. There is now under construction in the city of Gresham, a P. W. A. sewage system and disposal plant, and we sincerely trust that your organization's facilities will be available for a street-repair and general clean-up project late this fall.

Yours very truly,

R. K. AKIN, *Mayor.*

MADRAS, OREG., *April 17, 1936.*

Re: W. P. A. program in Oregon.

MR. E. J. GRIFFITH,
State Administrator, Works Progress Administration,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: Your letter of the 14th received and read carefully, and in reply I will give you my opinion as to how well the program of the Works Progress Administration is meeting the unemployment here.

1. I think work is the proper method of meeting the unemployment problem as compared with the dole and idleness. The men say, "We want work, not charity, as we still have our pride with us and wish to maintain our freedom, liberty, and self-respect."

2. I want to state emphatically that the work projects in Jefferson County are not only useful but necessary. It is helping us to keep the men at work. It is also allowing us to get some needed road improvement which it would be impossible for the county to bear all the expense. We are beginning a grade Tuesday, the 21st, which is badly needed and could not be built by the county without the aid of the W. P. A. funds.

3. There is much more needed and useful work to be done in this county. We have on file in your offices a blanket county projects, totaling about $18,000, which I hope we may soon have approved.

4. I am sure that if we could have the rule amended, so that men who had been on the relief prior to May 1, 1935, to reach back to January 1, 1935, it would be a godsend to this country. I also believe the minimum rate should be raised to $45 per month and semi, and skilled, according.

Thanking you for this opportunity to express views on the W. P. A. program and assuring you of continued cooperation, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

W. R. COOK, *County Judge.*

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have had called to my attention recently a difficulty from which not only my own State but I think many other States have suffered, and I suspect that not many Members of the Senate have had it brought to their attention.

Under the regulations of the Works Progress Administration it has clearly appeared that a man might not be employed on public works unless he was on the relief rolls of the State in which he lived. I think all of us will realize how terribly humiliating that has been to many very fine people. I have been in homes where, by dint of greatest effort and by most humiliating sacrifices men had thus far, at the time I contacted them, kept off the relief rolls. I think it presented one of the saddest pictures I know of, where men I have known for years were spending every effort to keep from going on relief rolls and thus publicly announcing themselves to be paupers. I think my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], in the early part of the session introduced a bill which would have authorized those who were in need, and who had been out of work for any length of time, to take advantage of the Works Progress Administration program which was being carried on.

It seems to me the correction of the condition I have described is something that should appeal to every Member of the Senate. I think all of the Senators perhaps have had conditions of that sort brought to their attention at some time. Perhaps their own friends, through adversity, have been placed in that humiliating situation, and I think it is very unfair. It is just degrading.

On page 31 of the pending bill I observe this language—and it is to this language that I direct the attention of the Senator from Colorado:

> That in the employment of persons applicants in actual need whose names have not heretofore been placed on relief rolls shall be given the same eligibility for employment as applicants whose names have heretofore appeared on such rolls.

Let me ask the Senator if he thinks that language is broad enough not only to apply to the situation I have described but to remove that kind of a humiliating situation.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Washington that the very purpose of the language he has read is to remove that situation and to cure it. In my judgment, it will solve the problem, because no longer is it to be

required that in order to receive employment under the Relief Administration the applicant shall have been upon the relief rolls as of a particular date. The only test is that he shall be unemployed and in need. The amendment specifically says:

That in the employment of persons applicants in actual need whose names have not heretofore been placed on relief rolls shall be given the same eligibility for employment as applicants whose names have heretofore appeared on such rolls.

Mr. BONE. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that this condition has had a most demoralizing and degrading effect on many men, and it has compelled them virtually to take a pauper's oath. I really think we should not any longer impose that sort of a condition on decent Americans. I know abuses might grow out of a different course; but certainly the Senate has no right to put up that sort of a yardstick to a decent American.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BONE. I do.

Mr. GLASS. I may say to the Senator from Washington that it was the purpose of this provision to correct the very condition he points out. In my State a considerable public project had to be closed down because there were not enough persons on relief rolls in the particular two counties to do the necessary work. I will say, however, that when I brought the matter to the attention of the director of public relief he immediately corrected the situation; and the work, which was a large road project, went on.

Mr. BONE. I imagine the Senator probably feels as I do; and I suspect that in the very locality concerning which the Senator speaks there were a small army of persons who were in the position I have described, who gladly would have taken the jobs.

Mr. GLASS. Gladly; and, as a matter of fact, in that entire congressional district just one-half of 1 percent of persons were on the relief rolls, not nearly enough to complete the project which was then in progress.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4618, Calendar No. 2206.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand that it is a bridge bill.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a bridge bill. It meets with the approval of the departments, and is for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Baton Rouge, La.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 4618) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll highway bridge, or a railway bridge in combination with a free or toll highway bridge, and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Louisiana Highway Commission, an administrative body created and acting under the constitution and laws of the State of Louisiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll highway bridge, or a railway bridge in combination with a free or toll highway bridge, and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Baton Rouge, in the State of Louisiana, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridges, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

SAVANNAH RIVER BRIDGE, AUGUSTA, GA.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4549, Calendar No. 2196. It is a bill providing for the reconstruction of a bridge which was recently damaged by flood conditions in the Savannah River Basin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 4549) authorizing the State Highway Board of the State of Georgia to replace, reconstruct, or repair the free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near the city of Augusta, Ga., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State Highway Board of the State of Georgia is hereby authorized to replace, reconstruct, or repair the free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River, known as the North Augusta Bridge, at or near the city of Augusta, Ga., and to maintain and operate such bridge as a free highway bridge, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the State Highway Board of the State of Georgia all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, replacement, reconstruction, repair, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The authority granted by this act shall cease and be null and void unless the replacement, reconstruction, or repair authorized herein is actually commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

PRODUCTION COSTS OF WOOLEN KNIT GLOVES AND MITTENS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on the calendar is Senate Resolution 270, being Calendar No. 2217, submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], providing for an investigation under section 336 of the tariff act of the production costs of woolen knit gloves and mittens. It is in the usual form for resolutions of this character and was unanimously reported yesterday by the Finance Committee. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 270, submitted by Mr. COPELAND on March 31, 1936, for an investigation of the production of costs of woolen knit gloves and mittens, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed, under the authority conferred by section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for the purposes of that section, to investigate the differences in the costs of production of the following domestic articles and of any like or similar foreign articles: Knit gloves and mittens made wholly or in chief value of wool, dutiable under paragraph 1529 (a) of such act.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on that portion of the committee amendment on line 23, page 28,

striking out the words "rural rehabilitation." [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BONE. I should like to have the Chair advise us—I did not hear the question put—as to the effect of yea-and-nay votes on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yea-and-nay vote is being taken on the question whether the Senate will strike from the bill, as proposed by the committee amendment on line 23, page 28, the words "rural rehabilitation."

Mr. BONE. What would be the effect of a vote "yea" or a vote "nay" on this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An affirmative vote would be a vote to sustain the committee amendment striking out the words "rural rehabilitation", and a vote in the negative would be a vote to retain the language in the bill as it passed the House. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BILBO (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who is unavoidably absent. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRAZIER (when Mr. NYE's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent. He is paired on this vote with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If my colleague were present and voting, he would vote "nay", and I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], which I transfer to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], and vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. LOFTIN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mrs. LONG], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN].

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—28

Adams	Byrnes	Hale	O'Mahoney
Austin	Carey	Hastings	Pittman
Bachman	Copeland	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barbour	Couzens	Johnson	Steiwer
Bulkley	Gerry	Keyes	Tydings
Burke	Gibson	McKellar	Vandenberg
Byrd	Glass	Metcalf	Walsh

NAYS—38

Ashurst	Clark	Minton	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Connally	Murphy	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	Murray	Shipstead
Benson	Frazier	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Hatch	Norris	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Holt	Overton	Truman
Borah	La Follette	Pope	Wagner
Bulow	Lonergan	Reynolds	Wheeler
Capper	McGill	Robinson	
Caraway	Maloney	Russell	

NOT VOTING—30

Bankhead	Dieterich	Lewis	Norbeck
Bilbo	Donahey	Loftin	Nye
Brown	Duffy	Logan	Smith
Chavez	George	Long	Townsend
Coolidge	Gore	McAdoo	Van Nuys
Costigan	Guffey	McCarran	White
Davis	Harrison	McNary	
Dickinson	King	Moore	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I present an amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. This amendment is substantially Senate Joint Resolution 266, introduced by me on the 12th of May, and having relation to the Florida ship canal and the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. The amendment is proposed as an amendment to the committee amendment after line 10 on page 30. The amendment is not offered at this time, as it would not be in order, but I ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Arkansas move a recess at this time?

Mr. ROBINSON. I thought that perhaps the particular amendment which is under consideration might be acted on. Then I will make a motion that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. President, there was a division, the Chair will recall, of the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The question now is on agreeing to the insertion of the word "loans", after the word "rehabilitation", on page 28, line 23.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado if, in his opinion, a comma ought not to be inserted after the word "rehabilitation"?

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator thinks it ought to be inserted, I will accept his judgment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am asking the Senator's opinion about the matter.

Mr. ROBINSON. It makes a great deal of difference whether or not the comma is inserted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senate having rejected the committee amendment striking out the words "rural rehabilitation", thereby retaining those words in the bill, a comma should be inserted after the word "rehabilitation."

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; Mr. President, a comma should be inserted at that point.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That would make the clause read:

(j) rural rehabilitation, loans and relief to farmers and livestock growers,

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I am in favor of a comma being inserted at that point. It may restrain Mr. Tugwell from buying millions of acres of land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, a comma will be inserted after the word "rehabilitation."

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 28, line 23, to insert after the word "rehabilitation" and the comma the word "loans."

The amendment was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed House Bill 12120, to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories. This was in form and substance the Senate vocational education bill; but in passing the House bill the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] suggested that one phrase in the text of the Senate bill be incorporated as an amendment.

I have since talked with the Senator from Nebraska, and we have gone over the matter. He has authorized me to say that if it is agreeable to have unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which the amendment was adopted and the bill was passed, the amendment may be eliminated, so that there will be no necessity of sending the bill to conference. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which the Senate amendment was engrossed, and the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I gather that this course meets with the approval of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GEORGE. It does meet with the approval of the Senator from Nebraska. He authorized me to make the statement if he should be absent from the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered.

Mr. GEORGE. I now ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska was adopted may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. GEORGE. I now withdraw the amendment. I will state for the information of the Senate that one of the appropriations carried in the bill provided for the pay of teachers and directors of trade and industrial subjects. The amendment inserted the words "including public service and other service occupations." By withdrawing the amendment those words will not become a part of the bill.

I now ask that the Senate pass the House bill without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a digest of favorable comments of mayors and county and State officials on the conduct of the Works Progress Administration in the State of West Virginia under the leadership of Hon. F. W. McCullough.

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

O. E. Hogan, mayor of Williamson: "I feel that we have gotten wonderful results from the W. P. A. and have made much better progress than under any former set-up."

Ben F. Morris, mayor of Marmet: "* * * The projects have operated satisfactorily to the citizens of the town, and in a manner most commendable to the W. P. A. officials."

H. F. Brittingham, mayor of Philippi: "The W. P. A. has cooperated with us in every manner possible, and we are not only putting all our streets and alleys in good condition but giving employment to practically all our unemployed."

E. S. Tisdale, director, division of sanitary engineering: "* * * I want to thank you for the hearty cooperation which has been extended to our forces by your organization in dealing with flood sanitation."

Sidney E. Goad, mayor of Clendenin: "May I take this means of expressing the appreciation of the town of Clendenin, as well as personally, for the manner in which the W. P. A. and your Clendenin supervisor, Mr. J. Frank Huffman, handled the W. P. A. situation in your district, and for the great service which you and your assistants rendered our community?"

F. L. Larkin, mayor of Terra Alta: "The mayor and Town Council of Terra Alta desire to express to you our unqualified approval of the entire administration of projects sponsored by the town of Terra Alta."

Elmer W. Prince, city manager, Morgantown: "The cooperation of our townspeople and W. P. A. employees has been most gratifying, and we desire to take this opportunity to again express our appreciation of the assistance being rendered the city of Morgantown by the W. P. A. in making greatly needed permanent improvements about the city."

Paul W. Watson, secretary, Preston County Board of Education: "Without W. P. A. assistance it would be impossible for the board to make any of the many improvements which are now being effected."

Mattie Thomas, mayor of Sabraton: "So far as I know, there is absolutely no corruption of any kind in connection with the project (Sabraton Avenue project no. 1973). It is going along fine, everybody is satisfied, and we hope the project will continue as it is."

Goebel W. Harr, Fairmont, W. Va.: "The W. P. A. shouldn't apologize for the time or money spent on this job, which will affect the lives of at least 350 people and will continue to serve a useful purpose for an increased number long after its cost is forgotten. In fact, one good old-fashioned typhoid epidemic, which this sewer may prevent, would cost a great deal more than 8,500 feet of ditch and tile."

Warwood Boosters Club: "The Boosters have worked hard and long to secure a recreation and athletic center for our community, but we cannot overlook the fact that only through your influence and able assistance have we been able to realize our ambitions."

W. C. Bailey, superintendent, Wyoming County schools: "Since November 20, 1935, I have had under my supervision a county-wide school-repair project, no. 1958. Since this project has been of much value to Wyoming County please allow me this opportunity of saying a few words in behalf of same. * * * The men employed on this project were all taken from the list of unemployed and such work has enabled them to live, send their children to school, and fit into society in general in a much more efficient manner than they had formerly."

Troy M. Gillum, mayor of Shinnston: "I wish to extend to you and the W. P. A. our sincere appreciation for the assistance and cooperation received from you during the construction of the various projects in this city. * * * I desire to particularly emphasize the fact that absolute harmony exists between the W. P. A. and the city of Shinnston, and that the selection of foremen and subformen on the various projects has been entirely satisfactory to us."

J. A. Deegan, mayor of Bridgeport: "We appreciate the hearty cooperation received from your office and the supervisors and foremen, and we appreciate the wonderful improvement being made to the streets of this town."

R. J. Steward, mayor of Nutter Fort: "In behalf of the officials and citizens of the town of Nutter Fort, I wish to express to yourself and the directors of the W. P. A. our sincere thanks for the many services rendered the town in connection with its street-improvement projects under the W. P. A. The treatment accorded us has been of the highest type, courteous, and prompt."

Linn B. Ferrell, mayer of Salem: "* * * I want to express my appreciation to you and those connected with the Fairmont office of the W. P. A. for the splendid cooperation you and they have shown the city in connection with our W. P. A. sanitary sewer project. The same can be said for the foremen and timekeeper supervising the work locally."

F. W. Thompson, councilman, Salem: "We consider ourselves very fortunate in securing the grant now being used to take care of our sewage. The men we have at the head of this project are doing a great work—and a much-needed work—in our beautiful little town; work that the city itself was unable to do."

K. M. Jarrell, M. D., Princeton Sanitarium: "Mr. Wilfong, district engineer here, seems to be getting along nicely, and he will receive 100-percent cooperation from this outfit at the sanitarium."

K. M. Jarrell, M. D., superintendent, Pinecrest Sanatorium: "I appreciate greatly your approval on project no. 399 for Pinecrest Sanatorium. This project was badly needed and will be one which will be of great worth to this institution, as it falls in line with other plans for making Pinecrest Sanatorium an outstanding institution in the State of West Virginia."

R. E. Stewart, clerk, Hampshire County: "We have been very much encouraged all through the various channels regarding approval of the above-mentioned project, as it is designed to absorb a class of labor what might be called the white-collar class, and I do not believe there is another project submitted from Hampshire County that will absorb this class of labor. It is also work that will be of untold value to future generations." (The project referred to was that of reclassifying, rerecording, and reindexing old wills, appraisements, and settlements of estates.)

J. A. Chambers, president, West Virginia Board of Control: "Your cooperation on all of our projects has been 100 percent to date."

Elmer W. Prince, city manager, Morgantown: "Assuring you of the appreciation of the cooperation of your organization with the city administration, and further assuring you of the permanent work that is being accomplished by the Works Progress Administration."

S. C. Rothmann, Assistant State Director, United States Public Health Service: "It gives me great pleasure to bring to your attention the fact that we have met with utmost cooperation and friendliest of spirit upon the part of all of your district officials. We have found most of them helpful and eager to assist us in every way."

A. M. Price, M. D., collaborating epidemiologist, division of rural sanitation, State department of health: "I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation, as well as that of the United States Public Health Service, for the cooperation received from you and your staff in the field with the community sanitation program."

Guy Payne, Payne's Drug Store, Barrackville: "We would like to express our appreciation of a W. P. A. project that was worked out in Barrackville last summer and fall. That was the sanitary sewer that was laid from just back of our drug store through the Ice and Harden land to Buffalo Creek. Previously the sewage from approximately a dozen to 15 homes and business places was carried to a point less than 50 feet back of our store and emptied there, where it made a perfect breeding place for flies, disease, and mosquitoes.

* * * It would be in the same condition today had it not been for the work of the W. P. A."

W. F. Alexander, Charles Town, W. Va.: "I wish to thank you for the attention you have given to the matter of getting the roads clear in this county."

H. T. Diehl, vice president, Bradshaw-Diehl-Homer Co., department store, Huntington, W. Va.: "When the work of repaving Tenth Street in front of our store, which is a W. P. A. project, was started the first part of November we were very much disturbed over the matter, because we thought it would be impossible to get the street reopened for the holiday business. * * * The merchants were shown every courtesy by Mr. J. J. West, district administrator, W. P. A., and he finally convinced them that he could complete the job and get the street opened during the first part of December. * * * The street was thrown open for traffic on Saturday, December 7, and * * * we think it was about as good as could be expected, taking everything into consideration."

Ira J. Baer, judge, juvenile court, Huntington: "The recreational program and the community-center program that was developed in Cabell County under the E. R. A. set-up, and in which you played an important part, was worth so much as a preventive measure in our juvenile-delinquency work that I was worried for quite a while for fear the W. P. A. might not follow this up. But it is following it up, and the investigation of this court leads me to believe that this work is increasing in importance."

A. C. Spurr, Monongahela West Penn Public Service Co.: "I want you to know that splendid progress has been made on the Adams Street widening job here in Fairmont. Excellent time has been made and it has brought about much favorable comment on the type of work that is being done."

James E. Allen, president, Marshall College, Huntington: "I believe I am recording the desire of everybody here connected with the college when I state that we all recognize the great work you have done for Marshall College and Huntington and, for that matter, for the State, in making it possible to get this splendid new training school."

E. S. Tisdale, director, division of sanitary engineering: "I wish to express my appreciation for the cooperation you have given us up to date."

M. V. Chapman, mayor of Huntington: "Great as have been the material gains of W. P. A. projects of this community, I feel that they have been superseded by the moral gain of providing useful employment to the needy unemployed of this community. The projects now carried on by W. P. A. represent useful work of permanent benefit to the community."

Grover C. Evick, ex-mayor of Franklin: "* * * we Pendleton folks have been getting good accomplishments from the W. P. A. * * * and without this work we would have around 400 to 500 families who just could not exist unless they had some help from some source or other. * * * Never at any time has politics taken part in our county."

John B. Grumboin, superintendent of buildings and grounds, West Virginia University, Morgantown: "* * * It does not matter to me what anyone may say regarding the Works Progress Administration, for I know very definitely that in our two projects we have had sincere cooperation from all officials whom we contacted, and I know of not one case where politics entered in the slightest degree. The university has certainly profited by the assistance given through W. P. A."

J. T. Dailey, mayor of Kingwood: "We feel that the money expended in our small city has given much needed employment and has resulted in permanent and needed improvements, which, because of the constitutional tax limitation, we could not possibly have done."

Albert R. Field, mayor of Milton: "The vastness of the undertakings of the W. P. A. doubtless lays it bare to frequent public indictment, but I am sure our citizens here accept its endowments in the worthy and beneficent spirit in which the President and the Congress have provided them and are grateful."

R. F. Lipscomb, mayor of St. Albans: "The citizens of the town feel that they are getting the worth of the money spent and hope to get two more sewer projects as soon as these are finished."

Paul W. Watson, Preston County superintendent of schools: "The Preston County Board of Education has submitted 11 W. P. A. project proposals. At the present time three of those projects are in operation and one other has been approved. These projects are making it possible for a great many improvements to be made in connection with school properties which could not be made at all if it were not for this assistance from Federal funds."

J. W. Blakely, mayor of Welch: "Our projects are all working, except the Welch Municipal Airport, which was about 60 percent completed when the work was stopped, and we have absolutely no complaints to make on the treatment we have received from your office or executives."

Jay G. Auvillo, superintendent, Lewis County schools: "This is to notify you that our field project has been started and is progressing nicely. We trust through you we may thank the various people who have lent support to this end."

Clarence B. Bishoff, member of house of delegates, Manheim: "I wish to express to you, on behalf of my good friends and neighbors in this community, their appreciation for the good work that the W. P. A. is doing on our road, from the town of Rowlesburg to our village here."

L. M. Smith, Manheim: "As one who has long been a resident of the community, I wish to express to you and your associates my commendation of the road project you are now engaged with between Manheim and Rowlesburg. This has been a long-necessary road and is now beginning to fill a long-desired ambition of the people of the community."

Homer Ransberger, Leivasy, W. Va.: "I have found that your organization has not undertaken any project in the neighborhood of our lands except such projects as are permanent in their nature and for the benefit of the largest number of people. They have been designated so as to take care of the greatest number of unemployed, and as far as I have been able to observe, those projects have been carried out economically."

J. A. Jackson, secretary, Harrison County Board of Education: "This road is not only a credit to yourself and the organization you represent, but it is a great help to the many students who attend the Shinnston High School, as well as the bus drivers who must use that road. We assure you that we are all proud of this improvement."

N. D. Hooton, recorder of Rowlesburg: "As a resident of this town, I wish to express to you my appreciation of the road project now building between Rowlesburg and Manheim. * * * Everyone speaks of this road in the most favorable terms.

G. C. Billups, chairman flood-relief committee: "Permit me, as chairman of our flood-relief committee, to express to you and to your entire organization our deepest appreciation for all of your splendid cooperation and resources that you have placed at our disposal."

J. B. Couch, mayor of Point Pleasant: "At present we are just emerging from a disastrous flood. * * * Had it not been for the ceaseless, untiring efforts of W. P. A., the unstinted use of their entire facilities, together with other unselfish agencies, we could not have emerged in the excellent state of health and mind we are happily able to master."

W. C. Bailey, superintendent, Wyoming County schools: "The projects have all been very beneficial and have added quite a bit to the effectiveness of the present school term."

J. T. Dailey, mayor of Kingwood: "The writer wishes to express his appreciation for your prompt and favorable action, and in doing so wishes to also say that the people of our city also are greatly pleased about the street improvement, which this will enable us to complete."

Robert Sellers, Tyler County Young Democratic Club: "Let me express to you the feeling of the people in Middlebourne when I say that they are fully satisfied with the street project here and trust that we will be fortunate enough to secure another allocation to complete the original idea here."

L. K. Stump, D. D. S., Middlebourne: "The reaction to the W. P. A. in this community is, indeed, very gratifying, and our citizens here in Middlebourne are very grateful to this organization for the splendid street work that is now nearly completed."

Ava Stanard, superintendent, West Virginia Industrial School for Girls: "May I take this opportunity of expressing to you my appreciation of the splendid work of the W. P. A., as demonstrated in the projects at this institution."

J. C. Matthey, councilman, city of Salem: "It is also my opinion, formed from general observation, that the general public is well pleased with the work, and it has certainly been a great help to business in this community."

Paul K. Morgan, mayor of Ridgely: "The people of Ridgely deeply appreciate the interest you have shown in regard to the recent flood. Words alone cannot express our feeling toward you and your coworkers."

W. W. Foster, mayor of Lewisburg: "I have occasion to come in contact with the heads of the department here, also at Charleston, and they have been very courteous and tried to give us every assistance in expediting the project that we have here."

R. W. Rogers, mayor of Hillsboro: "* * * the W. P. A. in Hillsboro is working out satisfactorily to all of the men employed on the project and to almost all of the people who occasionally pass judgment on it. The general feeling of the people toward our street project would indicate that there is but little, if any, opposition."

J. C. Burr, mayor of White Sulphur Springs: "I wish to state that the general feeling here toward the W. P. A. is good and that we are very thankful we had those projects going this winter."

J. C. Gum, mayor of Cass: "We are very well pleased with the work being done under W. P. A."

J. W. Turner, town of Independence: "I am using this means to express a little of my appreciation of the good work that your administration is doing in this community."

William H. Kendrick, director, State 4-H camp, Weston: "I certainly appreciate your good letters and wish to assure you that Mr. Roth has met our urgent need and is making it possible for us to go right ahead. I thank you very much for this cooperation."

John R. Cork, secretary, Charleston Municipal Park Commission: "I am authorized by the park commission to express our feeling of gratitude and commendation relative to the efficient manner in which the W. P. A. handled this matter in what might be termed an emergency."

E. S. Tisdale, director, division of sanitary engineering, quoting from a report from the assistant director in charge of the mine-sealing program: "I also saw fish in the Coalton Dam where no fish has been able to live for 25 years. This, I think, is a particular commentary on the efficiency of mine-sealing operations."

C. T. Taylor, M. D., superintendent, Huntington State Hospital: "Without the assistance of W. P. A. it would have taken many years for us to have accomplished in the way of improvements

what the W. P. A. has done in less than a year, and would have held up indefinitely our plans."

H. H. Kerr, mayor of Elkins: "Project 65-41-1640, Cravens Run Bridge, is now completed, and we accept this project and at the same time extend thanks for this needed improvement to our city."

Frank C. Wimer, athletic director; E. S. McKee, principal, Elkins High School; and Bryan Hamilton, superintendent of Randolph County schools: "We feel that we have one of the best, if not the best, high-school stadiums in West Virginia. Again we ask you to accept our thanks and to express our appreciation to other members of your organization who cooperated so splendidly in this work."

W. W. Foster, mayor of Lewisburg: "The money spent upon the various projects that he have had here has been a God-send to many needy people."

B. C. Eddings, mayor of Logan: "A very useful and much-needed work is being done in our community under the W. P. A. program."

H. H. Blackburn, president, Greenbrier County Court: "The work-relief method of taking care of our needy is very superior to any system of dole or direct relief."

Frank L. Lowe, mayor of Pine Grove: "Here at Pine Grove we are very proud of a sewer system built under the W. P. A."

W. B. Van Scoy, county superintendent of Doddridge County schools: "In these projects we are well pleased with the type of work and improvements we are getting under the W. P. A. program."

E. L. Roush, mayor of Cairo: "I consider it highly desirable for Works Progress Administration to continue."

J. L. Waldeck, mayor of Shepherdstown: "Much work is needed and the town is without funds to do it with."

F. A. Darver, mayor of Iaeger: "The work being done in this town is not only very useful, but it is stable and lasting."

H. E. Woolwine, mayor of Pax: "The work we are doing is very useful and badly needed."

Dana A. Gordon, superintendent of West Virginia Colored Children's Home, Huntington: "Work done under the W. P. A. program * * * is very serviceable and useful, both for now and the future."

K. G. Hill, president, Boone County Court, Madison: 'There is an abundance of useful work yet to be done under a continued W. P. A. program."

Edward S. Maclin, president, New River State College, Montgomery: "The average man wants work with independence and freedom that comes from earning and spending money fairly secured."

J. A. Bridge, mayor of Gassaway: "The unemployed in Gassaway do not want the dole. They all want to work."

H. F. Brittingham, mayor of Philippi: "I desire to personally express my appreciation for the wonderful cooperation and help given us on our many needed city projects."

Martin V. Chapman, mayor of Huntington: "Great as have been the material gains of W. P. A. projects to this community, I feel that they have been superseded by the moral gain of providing useful employment to the needy."

John R. Yeager, president, board of education, Parsons: "The people of this county do not want a dole; they want work—a chance to earn an honest, honorable living."

R. C. Jackson, president, Ritchie County Court, Petroleum: "There has been some very useful work done in our county under the W. P. A. program which never would have been done any other way."

C. S. Boucher, West Virginia University, Morgantown: "There are still useful projects of similar character which we would be glad to recommend for approval if the W. P. A. program is continued."

A. W. McLean, president, Lincoln Country Court, Hamlin: "The unemployed in our rural county much prefer work relief to the dole."

E. E. Deitz, mayor of Richwood: "The W. P. A. in this city is dong useful work."

W. S. Parks, mayor of Albright: "There is useful work yet to be done under the continuance of the W. P. A."

C. M. Ramage, M. D., superintendent of Fairmont Emergency Hospital, Fairmont: "My men are 'run-of-mine' laborers—Democrats, Republicans, Negroes, foreigners; but they are better Americans than they were before W. P. A. started."

C. T. Taylor, M. D., superintendent, Huntington State Hospital, Huntington: "There is still much useful work that can be done under a continued W. P. A. program, and I think by all means it should be continued."

Frank H. Brazie, mayor of Fayetteville: "There is yet useful work to be done."

John T. Hereford, Jr., mayor of Kenova: "My experience with those employed on W. P. A. is that nearly 90 percent want work rather than a dole."

J. W. Blakely, mayor of Welch: "I believe all American citizens prefer work to the dole."

Grover C. Evick, mayor of Franklin: "There is much needed work yet to be done under a continued W. P. A. program."

Paul N. Elbin, president, West Liberty State Teachers' College, West Liberty: "I wish to say that there is a vast amount of useful work to be done here yet by the W. P. A."

C. H. Dailey, mayor of Martinsburg: "There is still a great amount of work to be done under the W. P. A. program which will be greatly appreciated by this community."

L. D. Nichols, recorder, Harpers Ferry: "The mayor and council extend to you and your forces their highest appreciation for the work rendered."

Grant Harper, Teterton: "The State is in no position to take care of the work you are doing, and neither were the counties before the State took over the county roads. * * * In all cases, so far as our district is concerned, these projects have opened up fine sections of country where lives a fine class of substantial citizens."

J. L. Waldeck, mayor of Shepherdstown: "All in all, Shepherdstown is happy and grateful to get this much-desired and necessary improvement."

I. L. Bennett, superintendent of Pendleton County schools: "The Pendleton County Board of Education made a special trip to the Circleville High School grounds Friday, May 8, and are unanimously pleased with the good work done there."

Olive R. Hammer, principal of the Franklin Grade School: "The work on W. P. A. projects in Pendleton County, under the supervision of Mr. Evick, is highly commendable."

Elmer W. Prince, city manager, Morgantown: "The city administration takes this opportunity to extend to you its sincere thanks for the assistance that has been rendered by the Works Progress Administration in this construction."

Hattie Spencer, mayor pro tempore, Middlebourne: "In appreciation of the fine work that is being done on the streets of Middlebourne by the W. P. A., and to convey to you our desire to fully cooperate in the completion of the present working project and in proposed improvements to other streets, we use this means of expression."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, if it suits the convenience of the Senator from Colorado, in charge of the bill, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, reported favorably the nomination of William Riddell, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Billings, Mont., vice Harry W. Hill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene H. Dooman, of New York, to be consul general of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carlisle P. Knight to be medical director.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Carroll E. Palmer to be passed assistant surgeon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER, WALNUT GROVE, MINN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on page 2 of the Executive Calendar appears the nomination of Charles C. Baxter to be postmaster at Walnut Grove, Minn. The Post Office Department wishes to have that nomination recommitted. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of the postmaster at Walnut Grove, Minn., will be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar, with the exception of the one just recommitted, be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters, with the exception stated, are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 29, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 12), 1936

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

David W. Ling, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge, district of Arizona, vice F. C. Jacobs, retired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

A. Miles Pratt, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Justin W. Macklin, of Ohio, to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents, vice Richard Spencer, resigned.

Henry Van Arsdale, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents, vice Bryan M. Battey, deceased.

Floyd J. Porter, of New York, to be Examiner in Chief, United States Patent Office, vice Frank C. Skinner, retired.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named young men to be ensigns in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from June 8, 1936:

Gerald Tillman Applegate	George Winchester Playdon
Raymond William Blouin	George Richard Reynolds
George Rowland Boyce, Jr.	Julius Edward Richey
Christian Rewoldt Couser	Fred Jacob Scheiber
William Bromfield Ellis	Benjamin Berry Scherescheswky
Thomas Fletcher Epley	Richard Robert Smith
Clifford Sylvester Gerde	Frederick John Statts
Samuel Gardner Guill	James Pomeroy Stow, III
Douglas Bruce Henderson	Clyde Harold Teague, Jr.
Arthur Wilber Johnson	Edward Carter Thompson, Jr.
Robert James Lafferty	Paul Edwin Trimble
John Wellman MacIntosh, Jr.	Russell Randolph Waesche, Jr.
Joseph Paul Martin	Robert Wilcox
James Schoolcraft Muzzy	Harold Lambert Wood
Guy Leon Ottinger	

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, revocable for 2 years, from the 4th day of June 1936:

Richard R. Bradley, Jr.

Clinton McKellar, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James A. Sanders to be postmaster at Beatrice, Ala., in place of J. A. Sanders. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1936.

Clyde H. West to be postmaster at Center, Ala., in place of S. R. Wester. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Hettye M. Snell to be postmaster at Clio, Ala., in place of J. T. Mizell, removed.

Leslie D. Stallworth to be postmaster at Cordova, Ala., in place of J. E. Hood. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1936.

James Claude Golden to be postmaster at Dora, Ala., in place of J. W. Brasfield, deceased.

James Davis Hilyer to be postmaster at East Tallassee, Ala., in place of M. I. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Clellon L. Wager to be postmaster at Heflin, Ala., in place of R. O. Atkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Albert C. Blacklidge to be postmaster at Phil Campbell, Ala., in place of M. D. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Mark C. Clayton to be postmaster at Cedar Bluff, Ala. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Annie M. Campbell to be postmaster at Lexington, Ala. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Oscar Sheffield to be postmaster at Pine Hill, Ala. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William H. Hoffman to be postmaster at Summerdale, Ala. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

ARIZONA

George G. Babbitt, Jr., to be postmaster at Flagstaff, Ariz., in place of Walter Runke. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1936.

Louisa L. Staggs to be postmaster Fort Defiance, Ariz. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Winnie M. Johnson to be postmaster at Gilbert, Ariz. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Josie B. Fenwick to be postmaster at Litchfield Park, Ariz. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Mary W. Hand to be postmaster at Winkelman, Ariz. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

ARKANSAS

William J. Pruitt to be postmaster at Jasper, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1934.

Alvin J. Wages to be postmaster at Norphlet, Ark., in place of F. L. Downs. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1936.

Mary C. Porter to be postmaster at Alpena Pass, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Howard R. Nabors to be postmaster at Chidester, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Joe C. Allen to be postmaster at Cove, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William L. Ellis to be postmaster at Cullendale, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Edgar G. Gunnels to be postmaster at Emerson, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Everett H. Bonds to be postmaster at Gillham, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Hoyt D. Estep to be postmaster at Hartman, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Ruth D. Slaton to be postmaster at Joiner, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Lora E. Wilkerson to be postmaster at Knobel, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Thomas W. Moore to be postmaster at Magazine, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Clyde V. Warr to be postmaster at State College, Ark. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

CALIFORNIA

Frank G. Kirby to be postmaster at Larkspur, Calif., in place of F. W. Ammann. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1935.

Mary K. Davis to be postmaster at San Carlos, Calif., in place of M. K. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Clarence G. Carratt to be postmaster at Templeton, Calif., in place of C. G. Carratt. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Jennie Sanford to be postmaster at Waterford, Calif., in place of J. E. Kirk. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Charles E. Stonesipher to be postmaster at Whittier, Calif., in place of William Braucht. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1936.

Edward Marion Sehorn to be postmaster at Willows, Calif., in place of C. E. Kline. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1936.

Thomas A. Grant to be postmaster at Arcadia, Calif., in place of J. V. Covell. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

William D. Parsons to be postmaster at Berdoo Camp, Calif. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Minnie Ferretti to be postmaster at Groveland, Calif. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Howard K. Goodwin to be postmaster at Long Beach, Calif. in place of F. W. McCullah, retired.

Volina B. Douglas to be postmaster at McKittrick, Calif. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Lewis F. Franklin to be postmaster at North Fork, Calif. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

COLORADO

John R. Kraxberger to be postmaster at Arriba, Colo., in place of John Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1936.

Albina D. Mackey to be postmaster at Climax, Colo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Nea G. Gallegos to be postmaster at San Luis, Colo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

CONNECTICUT

Catharine W. Quinlan to be postmaster at North Haven, Conn., in place of W. P. Leete. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

James H. Morrissey to be postmaster at Unionville, Conn., in place of T. J. Crockett. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

FLORIDA

Nancy L. Mims to be postmaster at Deerfield, Fla. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Rondal B. Handley to be postmaster at Holopaw, Fla. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Claudine J. Hansel to be postmaster at Pinecastle, Fla. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

GEORGIA

Anna Morrison to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ga., in place of M. P. Abt. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Charlie R. Hatcher to be postmaster at Attapulgus, Ga. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Fred M. Chandler to be postmaster at Bowman, Ga. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

John W. Moore to be postmaster at Crawford, Ga. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Joseph C. Williams to be postmaster at Lyerly, Ga. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Emory Davis to be postmaster at Rutledge, Ga. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

IDAHO

Arthur I. Dennis to be postmaster at Hagerman, Idaho, in place of R. M. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

Dazel B. Howells to be postmaster at Oakley, Idaho, in place of M. E. Elison. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Emory Olson to be postmaster at Deary, Idaho. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

ILLINOIS

Pearl Barnes to be postmaster at De Land, Ill., in place of W. E. Leischner, deceased.

Pearle J. Bergland to be postmaster at Galva, Ill., in place of J. J. Lord, deceased.

Clyde Hardbarger to be postmaster at Illiopolis, Ill., in place of A. P. Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Margaret Marshall to be postmaster at Ipava, Ill., in place of O. E. Carter. Incumbent's commission expires July 15, 1936.

Mary R. Wilson to be postmaster at Milan, Ill., in place of W. H. Blakely. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Carroll D. Young to be postmaster at Pawnee, Ill., in place of W. L. Dragoo. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Berryman P. Hurt to be postmaster at Pleasant Plains, Ill., in place of R. D. Coffin. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Fred C. Watermann to be postmaster at Bartlett, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

George R. Bradley to be postmaster at Chatham, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Robert R. Newton to be postmaster at Goreville, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Frank Fischer to be postmaster at Hamburg, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Charles T. O'Boyle to be postmaster at Ingleside, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Mary I. Brown to be postmaster at Little York, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William D. Meier to be postmaster at Meredosia, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Florence E. Stoerp to be postmaster at Prairie View, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Carney V. Kerley to be postmaster at Simpson, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Rudolph L. Lightfoot to be postmaster at Stonefort, Ill. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

INDIANA

Pierre Helms to be postmaster at Centerville, Ind., in place of Elizabeth Hatfield. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Jesse L. Hoppes to be postmaster at Farmland, Ind., in place of Hovey Thornburg. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

John F. Mitchell, Jr., to be postmaster at Greenfield, Ind., in place of R. R. Roudebush. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1936.

John G. Harding to be postmaster at Kirklin, Ind., in place of G. B. King. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Clarence A. Washler to be postmaster at Lynn, Ind., in place of E. H. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Melvin Woods to be postmaster at Milroy, Ind., in place of F. H. McGuire. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1936.

Maurice C. Ingerman to be postmaster at Milton, Ind., in place of H. R. Manlove. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Albert E. Sewell to be postmaster at Pleasant Lake, Ind., in place of S. A. Tuttle. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Guy R. Sears to be postmaster at Red Key, Ind., in place of D. E. Cantrall. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

Fred B. Pickett to be postmaster at Richmond, Ind., in place of J. J. McCauley. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

John E. McFarland to be postmaster at Ridgeville, Ind., in place of F. W. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

Rollin J. Clark to be postmaster at Topeka, Ind., in place of R. J. Meroney. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1936.

Orvah L. Hindsley to be postmaster at Union City, Ind., in place of J. J. Patchell. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Roy L. Marquis to be postmaster at Bunker Hill, Ind. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Walter E. Huber to be postmaster at Centerpoint, Ind. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Roy L. Jones to be postmaster at Colfax, Ind. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Jacob De Groot to be postmaster at Highland, Ind. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Faye C. Winsor to be postmaster at Versailles, Ind., in place of F. M. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1936.

IOWA

Raymond F. Sullivan to be postmaster at Afton, Iowa, in place of Patience Felger. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Rex O. Mayhew to be postmaster at Blairstown, Iowa, in place of G. W. Goss. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Joseph Benesh to be postmaster at Chelsea, Iowa, in place of S. G. Cross. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

Palmer H. Hedges to be postmaster at Hedrick, Iowa, in place of J. C. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

John M. Stephenson to be postmaster at Mediapolis, Iowa, in place of E. R. Nordstrom. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Raymond W. Baxter to be postmaster at Burlington, Iowa, in place of J. T. Garrett. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Ellen B. Neff to be postmaster at Calamus, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Samuel H. Sater to be postmaster at Danville, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Vernon M. Hill to be postmaster at Davis City, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Juanita Springer to be postmaster at Fremont, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Ida Kelly to be postmaster at Harpers Ferry, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Benjamin Roy Bogenrief to be postmaster at Hinton, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Emilie B. A. Krause to be postmaster at Ionia, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Anna Bliem to be postmaster at Plymouth, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Ruby E. Shinabargar to be postmaster at Randolph, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William H. Rehberg to be postmaster at Rowley, Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Claude A. Baber to be postmaster at Rudd Iowa. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

KANSAS

George J. Roeback to be postmaster at Arcadia, Kans., in place of C. J. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Kathryn Schieferecke to be postmaster at Lenora, Kans., in place of J. V. Barbo. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Emil R. Schwemmer to be postmaster at Durham, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

John F. Holshouser to be postmaster at Dwight, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Arden S. Morris to be postmaster at Elmdale, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William H. Schehrer to be postmaster at Eudora, Kans., in place of R. C. Ogden. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Albert J. Anderson to be postmaster at Green, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William T. Flowers to be postmaster at Havensville, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Susanna J. Jones to be postmaster at Maplehill, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Carl Eickholt to be postmaster at Offerle, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Helen L. Green to be postmaster at Silver Lake, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Peter J. Romme to be postmaster at Victoria, Kans., in place of E. F. Brungardt. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Henry M. Otis to be postmaster at Wilsey, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Irene M. Warrell to be postmaster at Zenda, Kans. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

KENTUCKY

Gilbert Adams, Jr., to be postmaster at Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of R. S. Hinton. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

John D. McDonogh to be postmaster at Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of M. L. Easum. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

James C. Morris to be postmaster at Masonic Home, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Charles F. Vest to be postmaster at Berry, Ky., in place of J. G. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1936.

George A. Buckner to be postmaster at Blue Diamond, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Lela O. Sanders to be postmaster at Burgin, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

John W. Cox to be postmaster at Evarts, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

John B. Pendleton to be postmaster at Hardyville, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Everett E. Warren to be postmaster at McHenry, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Anna Clare Rapier to be postmaster at Waverly, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William R. Livermore to be postmaster at Waverly Hills, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Sanna Bowling to be postmaster at White Plains, Ky. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

LOUISIANA

Henry E. Knight to be postmaster at Ferriday, La., in place of P. L. Dark. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Conrad Bourgeois to be postmaster at Lockport, La., in place of E. A. Delaune. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

Mark D. Sutherlin to be postmaster at Oberlin, La., in place of S. D. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Frank Reed, to be postmaster at Basile, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

David S. Leach to be postmaster at Florien, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Thomas W. Hendrix to be postmaster at Grayson, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Richard Broussard to be postmaster at Iota, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Henry P. Sobert to be postmaster at Labadieville, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

John A. Williams to be postmaster at Oakdale, La., in place of J. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Paul W. Arnolie to be postmaster at Port Sulphur, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Lawrence S. Bourgeois to be postmaster at Schriever, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Stellie F. Milstead to be postmaster at Sterlington, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

George M. Tannehill to be postmaster at Urania, La. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

MAINE

Ralph H. Egan to be postmaster at Ashland, Maine, in place of Hugh Hayward. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

James G. O'Connor to be postmaster at Bangor, Maine, in place of W. F. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1936. Removed without prejudice.

Arthur J. Remillard to be postmaster at Biddeford, Maine, in place of E. L. Harmon. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

David H. Smith to be postmaster at Darkharbor, Maine. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Ella Mae Quimby to be postmaster at Oquossoc, Maine. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Thomas G. Burdin to be postmaster at Turner, Maine. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

MARYLAND

Isaac Henry Morris to be postmaster at Federalsburg, Md., in place of H. M. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Ethel W. Gallagher to be postmaster at Preston, Md., in place of C. F. Noble. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1936.

Elizabeth E. Wood to be postmaster at Sandy Spring, Md., in place of J. J. Shoemaker, deceased.

Isabelle Chaney to be postmaster at Capitol Heights, Md. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

MASSACHUSETTS

James W. Evans to be postmaster at Fairhaven, Mass., in place of D. L. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Roy Seward Campbell to be postmaster at Rutland Heights, Mass., in place of G. M. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

William P. Hatton to be postmaster at Woronoco, Mass., in place of M. D. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

MICHIGAN

Edith B. Kleiber to be postmaster at Rock, Mich., in place of E. W. Huff. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Charles A. Vogelheim to be postmaster at Rogers City, Mich., in place of T. C. Bruning. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Roland J. Boudreau to be postmaster at Garden, Mich. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William J. Faircloth to be postmaster at Onaway, Mich., in place of O. L. Wickersham. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1934.

MINNESOTA

Claude C. Stubbe to be postmaster at Ashby, Minn., in place of C. C. Stubbe. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Ethel F. Lerohl to be postmaster at Bovey, Minn., in place of Agnes Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1936.

Owen J. Regan to be postmaster at Butterfield, Minn., in place of Bertha Finch, removed.

Milton O. Perry to be postmaster at Dodge Center, Minn., in place of Edgar Stivers. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Christopher J. Keefe to be postmaster at Eyota, Minn., in place of W. G. Early. Incumbent's commission expires July 15, 1936.

Elisha L. Creech to be postmaster at Grand Marais, Minn., in place of George Leng. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Frank M. Holecek to be postmaster at Jackson, Minn., in place of C. F. Mallahan. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1936.

Carl T. Torgerson to be postmaster at McIntosh, Minn., in place of A. E. Talle. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

Walter B. Gislason to be postmaster at Minneota, Minn., in place of H. G. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Dolphin W. Forsmark to be postmaster at Palisade, Minn., in place of A. L. Ober. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Raymond C. Faust to be postmaster at Pierz, Minn., in place of F. X. Virnig, resigned.

Chester C. Gallagher to be postmaster at Plainview, Minn., in place of W. G. Mack. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

T. Donald O'Connor to be postmaster at Renville, Minn., in place of Norman Hanson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

John F. Hawley to be postmaster at Sandstone, Minn., in place of A. S. Larson. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1936.

Joseph H. McCaffrey to be postmaster at Wabasha, Minn., in place of H. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Minor Buckingham to be postmaster at West Concord, Minn., in place of J. M. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1936.

Mary Young to be postmaster at Middle River, Minn., in place of C. M. Hjertos, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

George Y. Banks to be postmaster at Columbus, Miss., in place of E. H. Badger. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Lucy R. Park to be postmaster at Merigold, Miss., in place of H. R. Park, deceased.

George T. Mitchell to be postmaster at Guntown, Miss. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Thomas L. Guyton to be postmaster at Sallis, Miss. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

John R. Trimm to be postmaster at Tishomingo, Miss. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

MISSOURI

Lynn D. Carney to be postmaster at Crane, Mo., in place of J. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1935 (removed without prejudice).

Lottie Breedlove to be postmaster at Rogersville, Mo., in place of L. S. Eddings. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1936.

Ethel Enyart to be postmaster at Stanberry, Mo., in place of E. R. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Harley E. Church to be postmaster at Stockton, Mo., in place of E. W. Bright. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1936.

William R. Buche to be postmaster at Warrenton, Mo., in place of A. M. Schaper. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Clay C. Shelton to be postmaster at Clarkton, Mo., in place of E. E. Pillow. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Gideon Ward Miller to be postmaster at Edgerton, Mo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Walter T. Jensen to be postmaster at Eolia, Mo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Adam C. Eby to be postmaster at Holt, Mo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Harry L. Epperson to be postmaster at Hurdland, Mo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Morris O. Brasher to be postmaster at Jerico Springs, Mo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Frank H. Parker to be postmaster at Kidder, Mo. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Frank C. Murdock to be postmaster at Seneca, Mo., in place of E. L. Plummer, removed.

MONTANA

Nels K. Peterson to be postmaster at Bigfork, Mont. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Lars E. Kodalen to be postmaster at Dodson, Mont. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Frank H. McLean to be postmaster at Fairfield, Mont. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Arthur D. Liberman to be postmaster at Fort Harrison, Mont. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Theodore P. Hendrickson to be postmaster at Hingham, Mont. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Jessie G. Rolph to be postmaster at Joplin, Mont. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

John C. Abrahamson to be postmaster at Roberts, Mont. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

NEBRASKA

Frank A. Badura to be postmaster at Ashton, Nebr., in place of F. G. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Lyman G. Gake to be postmaster at Beaver Crossing, Nebr., in place of C. P. Smiley. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Richard M. Britt to be postmaster at Doniphan, Nebr. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Frank W. Fuhlrodt to be postmaster at Fremont, Nebr., in place of F. W. Fuhlrodt. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Roy W. Bruce to be postmaster at Genoa, Nebr., in place of E. D. Willard. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Peter P. Braun to be postmaster at Henderson, Nebr. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Blanche Goodreau to be postmaster at Liberty, Nebr., in place of J. H. Jimerson. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Frederick F. Thomas to be postmaster at Linwood, Nebr., in place of F. F. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Delbert O. Campbell to be postmaster at Lyman, Nebr., in place of O. C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Dorothy A. Crawford to be postmaster at Maxwell, Nebr. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Arthur H. Barstler to be postmaster at Nebraska City, Nebr., in place of F. A. Bartling. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Frank H. Kroger to be postmaster at Newcastle, Nebr., in place of D. H. Ehle. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Carolen Augusta Robb to be postmaster at Union, Nebr. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Harry H. Jordan to be postmaster at Wilcox, Nebr. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Fred M. Boynton to be postmaster at Tilton, N. H., in place of W. R. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

NEW JERSEY

Charles A. Hildebrand to be postmaster at Ridgefield, N. J., in place of A. F. Jahn. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

NEW YORK

Howard C. Gould to be postmaster at Alfred, N. Y., in place of M. F. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

William H. O'Brien, Jr., to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of A. L. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

James J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Ballston Spa, N. Y., in place of W. H. Estes. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1936.

Carl L. Baker to be postmaster at Candor, N. Y., in place of S. E. Terwilliger, deceased.

George A. Rackett to be postmaster at Greenport, N. Y., in place of W. C. Monsell. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Frederic F. Sheerin to be postmaster at Middletown, N. Y., in place of D. H. Werley. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

Peter Loef to be postmaster at Katonah, N. Y., in place of H. L. Merritt. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

NORTH CAROLINA

Jarnagin C. Rice to be postmaster at Montreat, N. C., in place of E. D. Lansing. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Lucile L. White to be postmaster at Salemburg, N. C., in place of L. L. White. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Singleton F. Thompson to be postmaster at Flat Rock, N. C. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

NORTH DAKOTA

Roald B. Halvorson to be postmaster at Buxton, N. Dak., in place of Selmer Erfjord. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

Howard B. Pruitt to be postmaster at Pettibone, N. Dak., in place of D. H. Loeppke. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1934.

David L. Botton to be postmaster at Rolette, N. Dak., in place of O. M. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Jennie M. Buck to be postmaster at Tappen, N. Dak., in place of L. R. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Kermit A. Peterson to be postmaster at West Fargo, N. Dak., in place of H. C. Stensatter. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

O. Ingmar Oleson to be postmaster at Ambrose, N. Dak., in place of R. G. W. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Harvey W. Emanuel to be postmaster at Berthold, N. Dak., in place of E. C. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Inez Evelyn Donovan to be postmaster at Bowbells, N. Dak., in place of Inez Grams. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1935.

Mayme E. Fleming to be postmaster at Bowman, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

Stephen J. Dunn to be postmaster at Center, N. Dak., in place of Ludwig Maurer. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Ella J. Fay to be postmaster at Columbus, N. Dak., in place of Odin Stompro, resigned.

Frank W. Kelly to be postmaster at Devils Lake, N. Dak., in place of Martin Olsen. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Francis Higgins to be postmaster at Dunseith, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Watkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1935.

Susie Drummond to be postmaster at Esmond, N. Dak., in place of Louis Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Louisa A. Bird to be postmaster at Flaxton, N. Dak., in place of M. C. Merrill. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1935.

Florence M. Law to be postmaster at Halliday, N. Dak., in place of H. M. Pippin, removed.

Ethel E. Hall to be postmaster at Hettinger, N. Dak., in place of D. E. DeLa removed.

John M. Lipp to be postmaster at Linton, N. Dak., in place of Alice Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Lawrence L. Walker to be postmaster at Maddock, N. Dak., in place of J. B. Dyrud. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Carrie M. Chapman to be postmaster at Minnewaukan, N. Dak., in place of O. S. Aaker. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Sarah Alice Ralston to be postmaster at Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of L. A. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

OHIO

Lorenz B. Anderson to be postmaster at Fostoria, Ohio, in place of F. M. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Ohmer R. Stroup to be postmaster at Germantown, Ohio, in place of F. H. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

John D. Reed to be postmaster at Green Springs, Ohio, in place of F. B. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Maynard C. Casey to be postmaster at Mayfield Heights, Ohio, in place of J. F. Koster, resigned.

Fred J. Lawler to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ohio, in place of L. H. Kelly, deceased.

Aymer Nye to be postmaster at Orwell, Ohio, in place of C. E. Loomis. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Claude E. Sourwine to be postmaster at Plymouth, Ohio, in place of W. M. Johns. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Leo A. McGaw to be postmaster at Shelby, Ohio, in place of Harry Sotzen. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Hartley D. Devore to be postmaster at Vinton, Ohio, in place of G. P. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Robert Mollett to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Ohio, in place of E. C. Bunger. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1936.

Frederick H. Kramer to be postmaster at Millersport, Ohio. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Laurence L. Ehler to be postmaster at West Alexandria, Ohio, in place of D. A. Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

OKLAHOMA

Roy L. Knecht to be postmaster at Heavener, Okla., in place of I. P. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Ada M. Thompson to be postmaster at Mannford, Okla., in place of A. M. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936.

Eloise L. McKenzie to be postmaster at Wilson, Okla., in place of J. M. D. Clowdus. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936.

OREGON

Leonard O. Ferguson to be postmaster at Arlington, Oreg., in place of L. E. Wheelhouse. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

William G. Hoover to be postmaster at Fossil, Oreg., in place of W. G. Hoover. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1936.

Harvey P. DeMoss to be postmaster at Hermiston, Oreg., in place of H. J. Stillings, resigned.

Margaret Daughtrey to be postmaster at Stanfield, Oreg. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

Nealia G. Haven to be postmaster at Sweet Home, Oreg. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

William A. Rankin to be postmaster at Turner, Oreg. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles I. Donley to be postmaster at Carmichaels, Pa., in place of S. E. Richey. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

John A. Barron to be postmaster at Cornwells Heights, Pa., in place of Ralph Simons. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1934.

Peter L. Tressler to be postmaster at Dalmatia, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

Elijah E. Hall to be postmaster at Elizabeth, Pa., in place of J. M. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Florence I. Kurtz to be postmaster at Elverson, Pa., in place of M. C. Hemmig. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Della M. Sullivan to be postmaster at Genesee, Pa., in place of E. E. Raymond. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Adam L. Winters to be postmaster at Holtwood, Pa., in place of H. C. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

John D. McConegly to be postmaster at Homestead, Pa., in place of W. A. Kessler. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1935.

John H. Boltz to be postmaster at Jonestown, Pa., in place of Gertrude Klinefelter. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1936.

James Frank Groover to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Pa., in place of W. N. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

Joseph Samuel Raisner to be postmaster at Marysville, Pa., in place of M. V. Roush. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1936.

Katherine M. Sherlock to be postmaster at Merion Station, Pa., in place of H. J. Kromer. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1935.

Walter S. Hattwick to be postmaster at Mill Hall, Pa., in place of M. G. Coffey. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

R. D. Hiram Hagenbuch to be postmaster at Montgomery, Pa., in place of S. E. Sterner. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Jackley L. Hines to be postmaster at Mount Jewett, Pa., in place of Charles Lunden. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Charles J. Bennett to be postmaster at Mount Joy, Pa., in place of William Tyndall, resigned.

Howard R. Miller to be postmaster at New Ringgold, Pa., in place of F. M. Berk. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

Michael P. Murphy to be postmaster at Oil City, Pa., in place of J. W. Snedden, removed.

Edward J. Donahue to be postmaster at Port Carbon, Pa., in place of L. M. Krebs. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Harry B. Wimer to be postmaster at Quarryville, Pa., in place of A. M. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Charles Q. Flickinger to be postmaster at Stowe, Pa., in place of R. E. Frech. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Charles W. Johnston to be postmaster at Strasburg, Pa., in place of M. T. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1936.

Catherine W. Stevenson to be postmaster at Waverly, Pa., in place of Carrie Saar. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

Thomas M. Hiester to be postmaster at Wernersville, Pa., in place of C. F. Wenrich. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Henrietta T. McEvoy to be postmaster at Willow Grove, Pa., in place of C. L. Corson. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1936.

Ruth A. Fetter to be postmaster at Yardley, Pa., in place of S. S. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Ward T. Deise to be postmaster at Avis, Pa., in place of Annabelle Busler. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Willis C. Jack to be postmaster at Freedom, Pa., in place of R. R. Rhodes, transferred.

John W. Mills to be postmaster at Koppel, Pa., in place of W. H. Law. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Guy L. Titman to be postmaster at Tunkhannock, Pa., in place of H. B. Asheld. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

PUERTO RICO

Judson Ulery McGuire to be postmaster at Bayamon, P. R., in place of Alfredo Gimenez y Moreno. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1934.

Rita M. Vecchini to be postmaster at Guayanilla, P. R., in place of L. G. Rodriguez, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

Samuel W. Smith, 3d, to be postmaster at Jamestown, R. I., in place of J. J. Ahern, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Pearl Youmans to be postmaster at Brunson, S. C., in place of D. C. Folk. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1936.

Mamie C. Spears to be postmaster at Lamar, S. C., in place of M. C. Spears. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Theodore G. Weiland to be postmaster at Bridgewater, S. Dak., in place of W. J. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Herbert C. Hagen to be postmaster at Britton, S. Dak., in place of L. E. Castle, removed.

Hollis M. Hill to be postmaster at De Smet, S. Dak., in place of L. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Ernest F. Heuer to be postmaster at Florence, S. Dak., in place of H. L. Meyer. Incumbent's commission expires June 15, 1936.

Paul A. Wiest to be postmaster at Newell, S. Dak., in place of E. R. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Eugene M. Coffield to be postmaster at Oelrichs, S. Dak., in place of E. M. Coffield. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1936.

John Loesch to be postmaster at Oldham, S. Dak., in place of Albert Koehne. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Agnes Parker to be postmaster at Timber Lake, S. Dak., in place of E. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Marion Peterson to be postmaster at Waubay, S. Dak., in place of J. A. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Loyal H. McKnight to be postmaster at Bruce, S. Dak., in place of L. D. Walters. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1936.

Doris L. Stewart to be postmaster at Cresbard, S. Dak., in place of M. C. Stewart, deceased.

Albert A. Schmidt to be postmaster at Freeman, S. Dak., in place of Francis Smidt. Incumbent's commission expires June 15, 1936.

Robert C. Baker to be postmaster at Lake Andes, S. Dak., in place of Florence Holden. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Sebastian A. Archer to be postmaster at Lake Preston, S. Dak., in place of M. E. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1936.

Fred J. Hepperle to be postmaster at Leola, S. Dak., in place of Della Reue. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Michael P. Garvey to be postmaster at Milbank, S. Dak., in place of C. S. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1936.

Arthur A. Kluckman to be postmaster at Mound City, S. Dak., in place of C. M. Kuehl. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1936.

Frank D. Fitch to be postmaster at Wessington, S. Dak., in place of G. M. King. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

TENNESSEE

John W. Nicholson to be postmaster at Ashland City, Tenn., in place of J. P. Gallaher. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Lyle S. Alexander to be postmaster at Ridgely, Tenn., in place of P. E. Walker. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1936.

Riley M. Grills to be postmaster at Trimble, Tenn., in place of A. L. Needham. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

TEXAS

Olive P. Jordan to be postmaster at Beckville, Tex., in place of J. B. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Samuel G. Hampton to be postmaster at Goree, Tex., in place of E. B. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1936.

Herman H. Cooke to be postmaster at Hempstead, Tex., in place of E. M. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

John A. Wilson to be postmaster at Knox City, Tex., in place of J. A. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

John Henry Read to be postmaster at Memphis, Tex., in place of W. M. Owens, removed.

Neville W. Durham to be postmaster at Merkel, Tex., in place of O. J. Aldcock. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936. (Removed without prejudice.)

John M. Meiners to be postmaster at Moulton, Tex., in place of W. K. Richter. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Mary Foster to be postmaster at Waelder, Tex., in place of R. H. Rhodes. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

David C. Harris to be postmaster at Mineral Wells, Tex., in place of J. D. Cranford. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

W. J. Smith to be postmaster at Montgomery, Tex., in place of M. A. Hough. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Sarah O. Beaver to be postmaster at Queen City, Tex. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1936.

VERMONT

Alfred P. Lonergan to be postmaster at Essex Junction, Vt., in place of L. H. Leach. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Maria B. Depaile to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, Vt., in place of E. L. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1936.

Robert F. Pierce to be postmaster at Lyndonville, Vt., in place of T. E. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

James McGovern to be postmaster at North Bennington, Vt., in place of L. W. Gaul. Incumbent's commission expires June 11, 1936.

Olive M. Mayo to be postmaster at Randolph, Vt., in place of F. H. Hayward. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1934. (Removed without prejudice.)

Harry L. Simonds to be postmaster at Saxtons River, Vt., in place of C. K. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

VIRGINIA

John F. Wolfenbarger to be postmaster at Clinchport, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

Grace D. Condon to be postmaster at Goshen, Va., in place of J. O. Humphreys. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

James David Miller to be postmaster at Newport, Va., in place of J. B. Porterfield. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

WASHINGTON

Elliot Curry to be postmaster at Colville, Wash., in place of W. W. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Regina M. Mohrmann to be postmaster at Ferndale, Wash., in place of C. W. Fisk. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

William Robert Ross to be postmaster at Grand Coulee, Wash., in place of C. E. Kinnune, deceased.

Esther H. Boaz to be postmaster at Manson, Wash., in place of Gertrude Eatherton. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1936.

Thomas Phil Hickman to be postmaster at Monroe, Wash., in place of H. T. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Truman W. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Quincy, Wash., in place of W. E. Field, removed.

Ethel R. Hanks to be postmaster at Port Orchard, Wash., in place of Frank Givens, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bennie D. Wiley to be postmaster at Athens, W. Va., in place of R. P. Oxley. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1936.

Oscar R. Conaway to be postmaster at Barrackville, W. Va., in place of Lawrence Barrackman. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Harper H. Hudson to be postmaster at Durbin, W. Va., in place of S. A. Willhide. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

James B. Shrewsbury to be postmaster at Princeton, W. Va., in place of L. E. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1936.

WISCONSIN

John W. O'Callaghan to be postmaster at Suring, Wis., in place of N. M. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 12), 1936

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Eugene H. Dooman to be consul general of the United States of America.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Carlisle P. Knight to be medical director.

Dr. Carroll E. Palmer to be passed assistant surgeon.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

William F. Twitchell to be naval constructor.

William W. Graham, Jr., to be lieutenant.

Edmund R. Norton to be naval constructor.

Randolph Meade, Jr. to be ensign.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Arthur A. Lawrence, East Berlin.

Clinton A. Theis, Madison.

MINNESOTA

Evelyn I. Reintjes, Big Lake.

Glen M. Squires, Blackduck.

Clifford J. Fitzgerald, Dilworth.

Edward B. Anderson, Elbow Lake.

Joseph O. Ellevold, Fairfax.

Edna M. Matzke, Hills.

Joseph M. Hilger, Iona.

Robert J. Mayheu, Ironton.

Gordon J. Dewar, Lewisville.

Joseph J. Gaffney, Morris.

Henry Falardeau, Oklee.

Leonard Reiland, Rollingstone.

NEBRASKA

Fay J. Clough, Allen.

C. Glenn Magee, Arapahoe.

Dolores Jensen, Hampton.

Magnus P. Hemmingsen, Marquette.

Orval C. Myers, Nelson.

Harley G. Moorhead, Omaha.

Agnes E. Sullivan, O'Neill.

Bessie A. Freed, Pender.

Martin Slattery, Shelton.

Jake R. Hanks, Thedford.

Elmer L. Bunger, Upland.

J. Marie D. Rutledge, Wilsonville.

NEW YORK

Harry J. Sheridan, McGraw.

OREGON

Delbert E. Pearson, Carlton.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Russell P. Barnett, Campobello.

Bayfield W. Smoak, Moultrieville.

Earle W. Chadwick, Parris Island.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Reverend Clifford H. Jope, D. D., pastor of the Ninth Street Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our divine Father, we thank Thee for the rich heritage which is ours from the years that are passed. It seems to us today that every privilege we enjoy is tinged with the red blood of the Nation's patriots.

We are grateful to Thee and to them for liberty and the opportunity to achieve, for safety and the institutions that nurture and protect us.

We praise Thee for the men and women among us who have consecrated themselves to the Nation's good. Grant, O Father, enlightenment in the making of laws and the compulsion of Thy spirit in the creation of a wider fraternal sympathy and comradeship between men. Give the necessary inspiration to enable us to seek and achieve peace and happiness. Free us from secret and open iniquity. Save us from dark forces that seek to destroy.

Grant to the President and all who share in the government of the realm the guidance of Thy spirit, and use them as ministers in Thy kingdom of truth.

In the spirit of Him who is truth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4511. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

S. 4512. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkersons Ferry, Miss.; and

S. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city and county of San Francisco to construct a causeway and highways on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes.

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by the American Ambassador to Mexico, on inter-American relations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Josephus Daniels, American Ambassador to Mexico, at the luncheon of the Mexico City Lion's Club in honor of the proposal of the President of the United States of America, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to group in one sole social and economic idea all the free nations on this continent, March 5, 1936:

The Lions International of Mexico City, the largest club of your organization in the world, emphasizes its cardinal principle of promoting peace by this luncheon given in honor of President Roosevelt. You meet today in recognition of his epoch-making action looking toward the undergirding of lasting understanding between the 21 democratic countries on this continent. This appreciation

of the President of my country by the Lions International of Mexico City emphasizes the importance of the proposed extraordinary inter-American conference as well as the spirit and purpose of your organization, which is quick to further all agencies to cement Pan American devotion to unity of action.

It is gratifying that in this latest step of solidarity on this hemisphere the President of the United States and the President of Mexico see eye to eye. In honoring the Chief Executive of my country you likewise pay tribute to the head of the Mexican Government. Congratulating President Roosevelt on what he characterizes "the nobility of outlook which your suggestion carries", President Cárdenas pledges enthusiastic cooperation, confirming Mexico's "traditional attitude regarding instruments of peace", and expresses faith in the principle of settling differences "without having to take recourse to force as an argument in the place of law."

This approval of the conference by the President of Mexico and the heads of other Pan American governments, to quote Dr. Saavedra Lamas, the Foreign Minister of Argentina, is proof that "for the first time a current of community of ideas and sentiments without suspicions and without ill will" pervades the American republics.

All progress is evolutionary. The proposal of this extraordinary conference is the fruition of the hopes and labors of patriotic men of all Pan America from the battles for freedom through many steps toward continental solidarity. It evidences the growth of the passion for peace and justice which dominates the heart and mind of President Roosevelt. His first utterance as he took the oath of office foreshadowed this latest piece of statesmanship.

Rarely before in history did the people of the world, and particularly on this hemisphere, await an utterance of a new President with such deep interest as on March 4, 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt took the oath of office of President of the United States of America. They had not long to wait. In his inaugural address Mr. Roosevelt showed that the New Deal was not confined to feeding the starving or lifting his own country out of the economic morass into which it had fallen. It is well to recall the very words that heartened all who have yearned for the completest understanding and brotherhood of Pan Americans. In a brief statement the new President enunciated a policy which had in it light and cheer. A new-born Pan American unity was ushered into existence by this declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

A short time thereafter, in an illuminating address before the governing board at a Pan American celebration, President Roosevelt made clear that the Monroe Doctrine was for the protection of the Western Hemisphere against outside aggression, not as a weapon to be employed by one American government against another. He also declared that all unnecessary and artificial barriers and restrictions which hampered the healthy flow of trade between the peoples of the American republics should be abolished.

In his address to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation on December 28, 1933, President Roosevelt quoted with approval the definite statement of President Wilson at Mobile that "the United States would never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest", adding this declaration of his policy: "The time has come to supplement the declaration of President Wilson by the further declaration that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention." And he added this statement, which may now be said to be a Roosevelt doctrine:

"The maintenance of constitutional government in other nations is not, after all, a sacred obligation devolving upon the United States alone. The maintenance of law and the orderly processes of government in this hemisphere is the concern of each individual nation within its borders first of all. It is only if and when the failure of orderly processes affects the other nations of the continent that it becomes their concern; and the point to stress is that in such an event it becomes the joint concern of the whole continent in which we are all neighbors."

If President Roosevelt had proclaimed the new doctrine and stopped there, its effect would have been salutary, but would have fallen far short of the desired goal. No one knew better than he that "fair words butter no parsnips." He promptly let his works prove the sincerity of his words. Since March 1933, what acts have shown that the good-neighbor policy is a modern application of the spirit of the Golden Rule? Let us examine the record of the new foreign policy in these 3 years:

1. Only this week an agreement has been reached with Panama to settle long-standing differences in ways mutually satisfactory to the two countries. In addition, Uncle Sam withdraws his big-brother attitude that Panama regarded as treading upon its sovereign rights.

2. Within a year treaties have been negotiated with six Pan American countries which have brought reciprocal and increased trade to those countries, and like reciprocal arrangements will increase the markets and prosperity of all America.

3. The Platt amendment no longer gives the right to the United States to intervene in Cuban affairs. The provision permitting American intervention in Cuba when the restoration of order was deemed necessary by the United States had long rankled among Spanish Americans as an indication of a desire to overlord the smaller countries.

4. Marines, first sent to Haiti, in the days of the World War, have been withdrawn, and the good-neighbor policy practiced in a way that proves genuine friendship and respect for the independence of that country.

5. Cooperation with all Pan American states for the pacific solution of questions which might provoke war.

6. The declaration subscribed to at Montevideo for the United States by the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, containing a provision that no State has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.

7. A recent statement by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State, that "dollar diplomacy, I am glad to say, is now a thing of the past."

These seven concrete steps already taken foreshadow the even more gratifying and far-reaching agreements which will give lasting distinction to the coming extraordinary Inter-American Conference.

Freed from fear of European nations, it is to the glory of this continent that nearly all disputes have been settled by arbitration. The example of Chile and Argentina in thus settling their boundary dispute in 1902 affords an example for world emulation. When that agreement was reached, the people erected a memorial following the example of the men of old, to keep in constant remembrance their high determination. That memorial, erected on the crest of the Andes, took the form of a statue of Christ the Prince of Peace, and it bears this inscription:

"Sooner shall these mountains become dust than that the peoples of Argentina and Chile break the peace which they have pledged at the feet of their Redeemer."

Shortly the extraordinary Inter-American Conference will be held. It will guarantee in our day the long-delayed perfect unity of Pan America for the safeguarding of peace, territorial integrity, and mutual covenants of brotherhood.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAREDES. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this House has stated, part seriously and part humorously, that if, upon the arrival of the American soldiers, after your admiral had sunk the Spanish fleet, there had been good interpreters in the islands there would have been no Philippine-American war. There may be an element of truth rather than humor in that statement.

When I was a boy of 16 I was one of the very few in a Spanish-controlled country who attempted to speak English. One day a squad of American soldiers called at our home and I was taken to headquarters. The family thought I was about to be shot or imprisoned. Instead I found I was to be used as an interpreter, and was assigned to an American officer then holding a not very high rank. Last week it was my pleasure to dine with this American officer, who is now a general in the United States Army, Maj. Gen. Thomas Q. Ashburn.

I was one of the few interpreters to whom your colleague, former Congressman Hawes, referred.

I make reference to this because I sometimes think what would have happened had there been no Philippine-American war and we had been permitted to work out our destinies in our own way with Spanish sovereignty removed.

It is all a matter of conjecture, but one thing you must admit would have happened. We would at least have had some world trade in markets throughout the world. They might have been small and unsatisfactory, but we would have had them, and in 37 years they might have been developed to large economic importance.

But your Congress decided otherwise. It established reciprocal free trade to secure for your American manufacturers, farmers, and livestock raisers a practical monopoly of the Philippine market until, as you know, it has grown to enormous proportions. It is probably your best market in the world, certainly, for many of your products. In some of your States manufacturers provide economic life for your people. In other States farming is the chief occupation; in other States mining; in other States cattle raising; and prosperity in these States depends not only upon the successful product of these various articles of commerce but upon their sale.

In my country, where we now have some 14,000,000 people, our chief product is sugar, constituting 63 percent of our

exports, and contributing through taxation to the support of our government a great proportion of our national revenue. The fate of our sugar industry will affect our future to a material extent.

The Philippines did not write their own sugar legislation; it was written by your Congress. We had nothing to say about the matter. Its development is your development, not ours.

Fair treatment for our Philippine sugar industry will not injure a single beet-sugar or cane-sugar producer in the United States. The reason is quite apparent. The American people each year consume approximately 6,500,000 tons of sugar, and, because of the limited American production, you are required to purchase at least 4,500,000 tons of sugar from what are called offshore areas, under the American flag, and Cuba, a foreign nation.

We are not seeking and never have sought to take anything away from the beet growers or the cane growers of the United States. All we ask is that, while under the American flag, we be treated fairly and equitably with other Territories and possessions of the United States.

The production of sugar, therefore, is not a controversy between Philippine producers and American producers; it is merely a demand to have our fair share of the business with two American offshore areas. We have no conflict with the domestic continental sugar producer, and we believe he now understands this.

With this in mind, I ask the privilege of extending this discussion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, giving such figures and facts as may be helpful to an understanding of our vital problems.

I make this request because I do not believe the situation is well understood, because I have heard arguments advanced which are not based upon facts and are due, I am sure, to an honest misunderstanding.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS—THE BACKGROUND

The sugar industry in the Philippine Islands dates back many centuries prior to the American occupation in 1898. Historical records show that the native Filipinos were already producing sugarcane when Magellan discovered the islands in 1521. Exports of sugar from the Philippines increased from 53,000 short tons in 1855 to more than 200,000 short tons 25 years later. The highest export peak during the Spanish regime was reached in 1895, when the Philippines exported 376,401 short tons of sugar.

As a matter of fact, the sugar industry was developed on a competitive level during the Spanish regime and Philippine sugar then was able to compete in the world's markets.

It is interesting and significant to note that for the 10-year period from 1880 to 1889, before the enforcement of the restrictive Spanish commercial laws in the Philippines, of the 200,000 short tons of sugar exported annually, more than 50 percent found its way into the United States, as the following figures indicate:

Year	Total quantity exported (short tons)	Percentage of total value of all exports	Exports to the United States (short tons)	Percentage of total sugar exported
1880	199,726	48.65	112,751	56.45
1881	230,167	50.47	87,149	37.86
1882	165,811	43.22	87,063	52.51
1883	216,970	45.83	140,484	64.75
1884	134,622	30.33	93,886	69.74
1885	225,114	42.18	148,869	66.13
1886	203,859	34.90	129,134	63.35
1887	189,324	31.66	122,841	64.88
1888	177,457	32.32	92,283	52.00
1889	251,841	35.45	138,629	55.05
Annual average	199,489		115,310	57.80

These figures demonstrate the fact that the United States was, as it is today, the principal market for Philippine sugar. As a result, however, of the restrictive Spanish commercial laws, the sugar exports from the Philippines to the United States, following the year 1890, decreased to 13 percent, as the following data show:

Year	Total quantity exported (short tons)	Percentage of total value of all exports	Exports to the United States (short tons)	Percentage of total sugar exported
1890	159,658	33.72	37,616	23.56
1891	152,358	27.29	51,730	33.95
1892	278,659	40.54	50,685	18.19
1893	288,276	46.74	11,124	3.86
1894	232,195	33.11	12,633	5.44
1895	376,402	31.34		
Annual average	247,924		32,757	13.21

The 6 years of revolution which started in 1896—first, the revolt against Spanish domination from 1896 to 1898; and second, the Philippine insurrection against American occupation, which lasted until 1901—completely paralyzed the basic industries of the islands, including the sugar industry, and not until 10 years thereafter, or until the establishment of the free-trade relations between the United States and the Philippines, did the industry begin to revive.

PHILIPPINES INCREASED ITS SUGAR PRODUCTION LESS THAN OTHER AREAS

It has been erroneously claimed that the Philippines increased its sugar production tremendously and out of proportion in comparison with other sugar-producing areas. The facts are that the Philippine increase in sugar production was relatively much less than that of other sugar-producing countries.

The Philippines reached its pre-war peak production in 1895, prior to American occupation, when it had a production of 431,000 short tons. Its recent peak of production was in the crop year 1933–34, when approximately 1,580,000 short tons was produced. In other words, for a period of 40 years the Philippines increased sugar production 367 percent.

For about the same period Cuba increased its production 489 percent; Puerto Rico, 662 percent; Hawaii, 412 percent; United States (beet), 1,988 percent; Java, 546 percent, as shown by the following record:

	Record production prior to American occupation of Philippines in 1898		Record production in recent years		Percent increase
	Short tons	Year	Short tons	Year	
Cuba	1,180,000	1893–94	5,775,000	1928–29	489
Puerto Rico	168,000	1879	1,113,000	1933–34	662
Hawaii	251,000	1897	1,035,000	1932–33	412
United States (beet)	87,000	1895	1,730,000	1933–34	1,988
Philippines	431,000	1895	1,580,000	1933–34	367
Java	602,000	1895	3,292,000	1927–28	546

The recent increase in sugar production in the Philippine Islands was the result of two factors:

First. Replacement of thousands of primitive mills by modern factories, which resulted in the increase in the sugar recovery from the cane from 60 to 95 percent, this improvement having been similarly accomplished in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other sugar-producing areas when those areas changed their methods of manufacture from the inefficient, antiquated methods to modern practice and equipment; and

Second. Increase in the unit yield per acre as a result of the planting of the same higher yielding varieties that have been utilized in Louisiana, Java, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other sugar-producing areas, and the use of fertilizers.

Unlike in Cuba, where there was a tremendous expansion of the sugar industry as a result of the American-Cuban Convention of 1902 and the World War, there has been no extensive expansion of the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands.

Practically the same area of lands devoted to sugarcane during the Spanish regime or prior to American occupation is now utilized for the cultivation of sugarcane, due to the restriction in the land laws enacted by Congress in 1902 limiting the land holdings to not more than 2,500 acres.

Unlike the case in Cuba and other tropical countries, where ownership of sugar-producing lands is confined to a few large proprietors, in the Philippines sugar lands are owned by thousands of farmers, with small holdings of a few acres.

John E. Dalton, formerly chief of the Sugar Section of the A. A. A., commenting upon the increase in production of sugar in Puerto Rico and the Philippines, made the following pertinent remarks: "It should be noted that the increase in the production of sugar in Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands did not result primarily from an expansion in the acreage under cultivation, but resulted from (a) larger cane tonnage per acre grown (through the substitution of new cane varieties); (b) increase sucrose content in such cane; and (c) improvement in milling which brought an increase in the amount of recoverable sugar from the cane. For example, in the Philippine Islands, between 1923 and 1931, the increase in the amount of sugar available for the United States was 243 percent; however, during that interval the area planted to sugarcane increased by about 13 percent."

FREE TRADE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES ESTABLISHED BY YOUR CONGRESS

In carrying out its policy of helping the Filipino people in their economic development, Congress enacted on August 1, 1909, 27 years ago, the Payne-Aldrich bill, which established free trade between the United States and the Philippines, under which all articles exported to the Philippines from the United States were admitted free of duty, and conversely all products from the Philippine Islands coming into the United States, except in any 1 year sugar in excess of 300,000 tons, and other limitations on rice and tobacco.

The limitations on sugar and tobacco were later removed in the Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act of 1913.

The Filipino people opposed the establishment of this free trade on the ground that it "would in the future become highly prejudicial to the economic interests of the Philippine people and would bring about a situation which might hinder the attainment of the independence of said people." But Congress saw fit to establish this relationship, and the Filipino people had to accept their status and planned and worked accordingly their economic development.

It is pertinent to record herein the lofty ideals and sentiments which actuated Congress in establishing this trade relationship with the Philippines.

The then distinguished Republican Senator, Elihu Root, speaking before the Senate of the United States in 1909, when this matter was being debated, said:

> The die is cast, Mr. President, upon which we have the responsibility for the Philippine Islands. No action of ours can reverse it. The good faith, the good name, the honor of the American people are all pledged to lead the people of the islands on by paths of growing prosperity and capacity for government to the point where they will be capable of supporting and governing themselves.
>
> We cannot fulfill that high duty by giving them money. * * * Gifts of money tend to reduce the independence of individual character. We cannot fulfill that duty by making the islands unsuccessful in business, by retarding and confining their industry. We can fulfill it only by giving to them the opportunities to national power, to grow in the accumulation of property and the diffusion of wealth, lying at the foundation of civilization. We can fulfill that duty only by making the people of the Philippines at once prosperous and intelligent.

In 1913, when the Democratic Party came into power, the eminent statesman, Oscar Underwood, referring to the removal of the restriction in the act of 1909, spoke as follows on the floor of the House, May 7, 1913: "The change in this paragraph of the bill is largely striking out the limitation on the importation of sugar, filler, and cigar tobacco and wrapper tobacco. * * * We may leave the limit where it is * * * but we would leave it where it is to the shame of every American citizen. We could not honestly face those dependent people who give us free trade in their markets if we close our doors here. * * * Because we do not want to stand and face that world in such a position as that and say (to the Filipinos) that under our law we command you to open the door, so that American goods can flow to your country, because we have the power to do it, and then turn around and say to them that, on the only thing they can import, practically, into our country and make a market for we will close our doors and prevent them developing their trade. I say that no true-born American citizen who faces the question fairly and squarely and understands the situation will consent to that.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE SUGAR INDUSTRY

By virtue of the free trade thus established, sugar from the Philippines received a preferential-tariff position in the American market against Cuban and foreign-grown sugar, thereby placing the sugar industry of the Philippines within the highly American protective tariff walls.

The immediate effect was the investment of American capital in the islands for the development of the sugar industry.

In 1910 a group of American investors established the first modern sugar factory in the island of Mindoro, and 2 years later two other American companies erected sugar centrals at Calamba, on the island of Luzon, and at San Carlos, on the island of Negros.

Thus the modern development of the sugar industry was initiated by pioneering American businessmen and American capital, for it took a decade to convince the Philippine farmers of the advantages of improving their sugar production and manufacture and take advantage of the protection of the American tariff, and not until 1918–21 did the Filipino sugar producers go into the modernization of their methods of manufacture and establish six cooperative sugar centrals with the financial aid of the government Philippine National Bank.

This development of the sugar industry has elevated the living standards of my people and helped them to carry out improvements in education, sanitation, and public works.

The investment in the Philippine Islands in the sugar industry runs over $250,000,000, largely in the control of Americans and Filipinos.

Like other industries, this business has an association. The president of the association is the Honorable Rafael R. Alunan, known throughout the Philippine Islands and in the United States to be a man of wide experience, given to accuracy of expression and conservative statements.

May I be permitted to quote him regarding investments and other matters relating to the growth of our sugar industry. He states:

> The total aggregate investments in the Philippine sugar industry amount to $251,512,535, as follows:

Investment in centrals	$84,012,535
Investment in lands	140,000,000
Crop loans	22,500,000
Miscellaneous investments	5,000,000
Total	251,512,535

> Of the total of $84,012,535 invested in centrals, 40 percent is American investment, 37 percent Filipino, 22 percent Spanish, and 1 percent cosmopolitan, as shown in the following table:

Nationality	Number of centrals	Total investments	Percentage of total investments
American	12	$33,815,650	40
Filipino	22	31,127,894	37
Spanish	9	18,276,574	22
Others	2	792,417	1
Total	45	84,012,535	100

> Of the 45 centrals in the Philippine Islands, approximately 24, or more than one-half of them, are small mills, with capacities ranging from 150 to 750 tons of cane per day. Most of these mills are financed by a group of Filipinos, while a few others were established by cosmopolitan investors, including Filipinos, Americans, and others. No Chinese are financially interested in the mills.
>
> Practically all the lands devoted to the cultivation of sugarcane in the Philippines are tilled by Filipinos. Filipinos engaged in sugar cultivation in the Philippines, including their families, number 2,000,000.
>
> Unlike other sugar-producing countries, which must rely on foreign labor to grow sugar, the Philippines depends solely upon native labor for its production of sugar.

Of the 48 Provinces, 17, with a population of over 7,000,000 people, or more than half of the total population of the islands, are directly or indirectly dependent upon the sugar industry.

At least 2,000,000 farmers, laborers, and their families depend for their livelihood upon the growing of sugarcane.

The sugar industry, more than any other industry in the islands, has been responsible for uplifting the standard of living of the Filipino people.

Recognized authorities place the standard of living of the Filipino people 300 percent above that of the peoples of their neighboring countries.

The money spent by the centrals and the planters for the purchase of supplies and materials required by the sugar industry amounts annually to approximately $30,000,000, or over 60 percent of the total money in circulation in the islands.

The sugar industry is the main support of the Philippine government. For every dollar of value of sugar produced in the Philippines the Philippine government derives in sales tax and other taxes approximately 20 cents.

In 1932 the value of sugar exported from the Philippine Islands constituted 63 percent of the total value of all their exports, as may be seen from the following table:

Value of principal exports from the Philippines for the calendar year 1932

	To all countries		To United States	
	Value	Percent	Value	Percent
1. Sugar and byproducts	$60,359,000	63.31	$60,145,000	99.64
2. Coconuts and manufactures of	15,455,000	16.21	12,063,000	78.05
3. Tobacco and manufactures of	6,399,000	6.71	3,243,000	50.68
4. Manila hemp and manufactures of	5,675,000	5.95	1,893,000	33.35
5. Embroideries	3,267,000	3.42	3,252,000	99.53
6. Lumber and timber	835,000	.87	173,000	20.74
7. Hats	591,000	.62	435,000	73.71
8. Pearl buttons	244,000	.26	244,000	100.00
9. Other exports	2,514,000	2.64	1,200,000	47.73
Total	95,339,000	100.00	82,648,000	86.69

The success of the cooperative system which has characterized the production of sugar in the Philippines has made the people realize the advantages of cooperative efforts among small producers and farmers.

In other words, the sugar industry of the Philippines has become a model for a modern scientific development of their other agricultural industries.

AMERICAN INTERESTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

It is obvious from an examination of the records that the free-trade relationship not only has been beneficial to the Philippine Islands but has also been advantageous to the United States.

To the Philippines it meant development of their economic resources, particularly their sugar industry, improvement in their standards of living, successful financing of their government in carrying out its manifold activities; in other words, it meant prosperity for the Filipino people.

It opened to the United States a great Philippine market for American agricultural and industrial products, American shipping, banking, insurance, mining, and other financial enterprises.

During Spanish sovereignty Philippine commerce was diversified throughout the world. The United States sold little to the Philippines—only approximately $3,000,000, or 3 percent of the Philippine purchases abroad, amounting to $111,000,000, for the 10-year period 1885–94, prior to American occupation.

With the establishment of free trade the United States has obtained a monopoly of the Philippine market, where it has enjoyed tariff preferences for 97 percent of its products going into the Philippine Islands.

For the last decade, 1924–33, the Philippines purchased from the United States over $680,000,000 worth of goods, or 61 percent of its total imports from abroad.

The Philippines today is the best market for American cotton cloths, galvanized steel sheets, dairy products, cigarettes, and truck and bus tire casings.

Moreover, the Philippine market is the best in the far-eastern markets for American steel-mill products and iron and steel advanced manufactures.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in its bulletin entitled "Our World Trade" in 1935, reported that the value of purchases of American merchandise by the Philippines for the calendar year 1935 increased 11.6 percent, while imports of the United States from the islands increased 11.5 percent. For the same period purchases of American merchandise by Cuba increased 32.7 percent, while American imports from Cuba increased 41.9 percent. In this connection the chamber of commerce also reported that while the value of purchases of American merchandise by Japan decreased 3.4 percent, the value of American imports from Japan increased 28.3 percent.

These figures show that the United States, despite the dumping of Japanese goods into the Philippines, has maintained its monopoly of the Philippine market and indicate the stability and potentiality of the Philippine market for American products.

It is to be borne in mind, however, that the continuation of the American monopoly of the Philippine market and control of the economic development of the country depend upon the ability of the Filipino people to market in the United States their basic exportable products, and the continuation, in an equitable and reciprocal manner, of the mutually advantageous economic relationship between the two countries.

WE APPEAL TO AMERICAN FAIRNESS

As already pointed out, our sugar industry has been developed on the basis of free trade with the United States, imposed upon us in the face of our protest.

Being the backbone of our economic life, its ruin and destruction would mean chaos and poverty to our people.

We cannot conceive nor believe that this great Republic would want to destroy the very foundation of our economic existence after it has fostered its development and encouraged us to take advantage of the free-trade relationship it saw fit to give us.

Under the Independence Act the duty-free sugar from the Philippine Islands allowed to come into the United States during the 10-year transition period was limited to 850,000 long tons, equivalent to approximately 973,000 short tons, raw value.

The injustice of this provision of the Independence Act has already been recognized in five instances since its enactment by Congress.

First. The President, in his message to Congress recommending the enactment of the independence bill, suggested changes in this legislation, and stated that "where imperfections or inequalities exist, I am confident that they can be corrected after proper hearing and in fairness to both peoples."

Second. The sugar producers of continental United States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, after 3 months of conferences and hearings, signed a voluntary marketing agreement in September 1933, under which they conceded to the Philippines an annual quota of export to the United States of 1,100,000 short tons and a reserve of 100,000 short tons, or a total of 1,200,000 short tons available for export to the United States.

Third. In his message to Congress on February 8, 1934, recommending the enactment of legislation stabilizing the sugar industry, the President proposed that the Philippines be given a quota of 1,037,000 short tons.

Fourth. In response to the request of the President, Congress enacted the so-called Jones-Costigan Act under which the Secretary of Agriculture fixed the basic quota for the Philippine Islands at 1,049,000 short tons.

Fifth. Recently, the Secretary of Agriculture, in revising the quotas for 1936, allotted the Philippines a quota this year of 1,068,057 short tons.

It will thus be seen that in every proposal for a sugar stabilization program, the Philippine Islands has been conceded a basic quota of from 1,037,000 to 1,200,000 short tons, and it is undoubtedly the intention in granting this concession to give the Philippines fair and equitable treatment with other areas.

But this intention will be defeated unless the Philippines will be permitted to bring duty-free into the United States its quota under the Jones-Costigan Act, for while the Philippines received this year an increase in its quota by 69,947

tons, it will have to pay the full duty of 1.875 cents per pound on 63,000 tons of this increase by reason of the operation of the duty-free limitation in the Independence Act, effective upon the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth, November 15, 1935.

Prior to the coming into effect of the duty-free limitation of the independence act, on November 15, 1935, the Philippines was entitled to send to the United States all the sugar it could have available for export during the years 1934 and 1935, but because of the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Act, after the Philippines had accepted the Independence Act, the Philippines was compelled to reduce its annual exports to the United States for 1934 and 1935 by 500,000 tons, or a total reduction of 1,000,000 tons for the 2 years, since its normal exports for these years, had there been no quota system, would have averaged 1,500,000 tons annually.

Thus the Jones-Costigan Act, in effect, caused the Philippine producers a loss of $70,000,000, which loss was reflected in revenues to the Philippine government and the curtailment of the purchases by the Philippines of American products.

This loss, however, was partly compensated by the payment of benefits of thousands of small growers in the islands from the processing tax, but these benefits did not apply to the Philippine sugar factories, as in other Territories and possessions of the United States, and did not compensate the Filipino laborers for the loss they incurred in the reduced sugar production.

Despite the fact that the Philippine sugar producers have shouldered the main burden of the sugar-stabilization program of the administration under the Jones-Costigan Act, they have fully cooperated and assisted in accomplishing its objectives. No serious opposition was encountered, considering the complicated cooperative system of sugar production, involving many thousands of small growers, and no disorders of any kind occurred. On the contrary, the Philippine Legislature, in response to the recommendation of the Governor General, enacted a limitation law restricting the production of sugar in conformity with the quotas established by the Jones-Costigan Act.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it seems, therefore, only fair that the Philippines should be permitted to benefit in the same proportionate degree as the other areas from any increase in quotas consequent to any improvement in consumption by allowing it to bring into the United States, all duty-free, whatever quota it is allotted under the Jones-Costigan Act or substitute bill as long as this quota system is in effect.

The Philippines cannot derive the full benefit of increased quotas because of the operation of the Independence Act, and the equity to us can be given without prejudicing the interests of the producers of continental United States or any of the offshore areas.

The Filipino people will do their utmost to follow the course which Congress charted for them toward their eventual freedom. It is our sincere desire and hope to be able not only to maintain but to improve the peaceful, prosperous, and happy condition in which this great Republic has placed us during the past 35 years.

Looking back to those years, the record will stand out unique in history for the unselfish work and devotion given on behalf of a dependent people, for the complete harmony and friendship between the conqueror and the conquered, and for the early fulfillment of our ideals for freedom without disturbance or bloodshed.

It is a source of pride and satisfaction to the Filipino people to look back to these years and behold that with your guidance we have been able to prosper and go forward on the path of civilization, ourselves paying every dollar required in the administration of our government, keeping absolute peace and public order, and meeting even the havoc of the recent serious depression without appealing for relief.

This achievement is the result of your enlightened guidance, which has given us, to quote the words of the eminent American statesman, "The opportunity to national power, to grow in the accumulation of wealth, lying at the foundation of civilization."

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'CONNOR, chairman of the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, reported the following privileged resolutions, which were referred to the calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 528 (Rept. No. 2834)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the Committee on the Judiciary to call up for consideration, without the intervention of any point of order, the following bills:

S. 3389. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the southern district of New York;

S. 2075. An act to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern and western districts of Missouri;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern, northern, and western districts of Oklahoma;

S. 2456. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia;

H. R. 11072. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

Each such bill, when called up, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. After general debate on each such bill, which shall continue not to exceed 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

House Resolution 529 (Rept. No. 2835)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to call up for consideration, without the intervention of any point of order, the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 2912. An act to repatriate native-born women who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 336. Joint resolution to clarify the provisions of section 4 of the act of May 24, 1934, with regard to period of residence required of an alien husband of a citizen of the United States as a prerequisite to naturalization;

H. R. 3472. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874);

H. R. 7221. A bill to authorize the shortening or termination of the stay in the United States of certain aliens not admitted for permanent residence, to authorize the deportation of certain aliens admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12325. A bill to protect for American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, and orchestral conductors the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5799. A bill to declare that a citizen of the United States who votes in a political election in a foreign state loses his citizenship; and

H. R. 3023. A bill to provide for citizenship to persons born in the United States who have not acquired any other nationality by personal affirmative act but who have heretofore lost their United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent under the laws of a foreign country, and for other purposes.

Each such bill and joint resolution, when called up, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. After general debate on each such bill, which shall continue not to exceed 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

House Resolution 530 (Rept. 2836)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11369, a bill "To authorize the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy." And all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

House Resolution 498 (Rept. 2837)

Resolved, That rule XXI, clause 3, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following named committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Pensions, to the Committee on Claims, to the Committee on War Claims, to the Committee on the Public Lands, and to the Committee on Accounts."

Mr. GREENWOOD, from the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, reported the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

House Resolution 531 (Rept. No. 2838)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 4020, an act "To authorize the acquisition of lands in the city of Alameda, County of Alameda, State of California, as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon." And all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 110]

Adair	Dear	Huddleston	Powers
Andrew, Mass.	Duffey, Ohio	Jenckes, Ind.	Rayburn
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	Jones	Rogers, N. H.
Barden	Englebright	Kee	Sandlin
Blackney	Ferguson	Kopplemann	Schaefer
Brennan	Fernandez	Lambertson	Sears
Brooks	Fish	Lanham	Short
Buckley, N. Y.	Gasque	Lee, Okla.	South
Bulwinkle	Gearhart	Lehlbach	Stewart
Caldwell	Green	Lewis, Md.	Tinkham
Cannon, Wis.	Gwynne	McGroarty	Utterback
Carmichael	Hartley	Mitchell, Ill.	Wadsworth
Cary	Hennings	Montet	Werner
Casey	Hill, Samuel B.	Nichols	Wigglesworth
Claiborne	Hoeppel	Norton	Wilcox
Colmer	Holmes	Oliver	Williams
Corning	Hook	O'Malley	Wood
Cox	Hope	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TOWNSEND OLD-AGE-PENSION PLAN

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Select Committee Investigating Old Age Pensions, I present a privileged report (Rept. No. 2857) and send it to the Clerk's desk, and ask that the Clerk read it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT AND CERTIFICATION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE OLD AGE PENSION PLANS

The Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans, proceeding as directed by House Resolution 443 to inquire into old-age-pension plans, with respect to which legislation has been submitted to the House of Representatives, and particularly that embodied in H. R. 7154 in the United States Congress, caused to be issued a subpena directing one Francis E. Townsend to appear before said select committee and to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation by said committee, the subpena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America

"TO THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Dr. Francis E. Townsend to be and appear before the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443, in their chamber, more specifically described as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on May 5, 1936, at the hour of 10 o'clock, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 20th day of April 1936.

"(Signed) JOSEPH W. BYRNS, *Speaker*.

"Attest:

"(Signed) SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk*.

Said subpena was on April 22, 1936, served upon said Francis E. Townsend by a deputy sergeant at arms, empowered by said House of Representatives to perform such act. The return of service of said deputy sergeant at arms being endorsed thereon which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Dr. Francis E. Townsend, before the Committee on the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations. Served Lafayette Hotel, Sixteenth and I Streets NW., Washington, D. C., April 22, 1936, 9 a. m. William A. Weber, Deputy Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives."

Said Francis E. Townsend, pursuant to said subpena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee to give such testimony as might be requested or required under and by virtue of House Resolution 443.

Said Francis E. Townsend after being duly sworn by the chairman, testified before said committee on May 19, 20, and 21, 1936. On May 21, 1936, as the examination of said Francis E. Townsend was proceeding shortly before the regular noon adjournment the following colloquy occurred:

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, this is all rather soporific. May I be excused 5 minutes?

"(Thereupon a short recess was taken.)

"The CHAIRMAN. Adjourn until 2:30.

"(Accordingly at 11:35 o'clock a. m. the select committee stood in recess until 2:30 o'clock p. m.")

At the afternoon session, convening at 2:30 o'clock p. m., a quorum of said committee being present, composed of the following members: C. Jasper Bell (chairman), Joseph A. Gavagan, Sam L. Collins, Scott W. Lucas, John H. Tolan, John B. Hollister, and Clare E. Hoffman, the following colloquy occurred:

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

"Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Bell, Dr. Townsend asked me to tell the committee that he could not be here until 3:30, but will be here at that time.

"The CHAIRMAN. I think we have another witness whom we can put on for a short time, have we not?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Until 3:30?

"Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, sir.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Is Dr. Townsend ill, Mr. Downey?

"Mr. DOWNEY. No; the doctor is not ill."

When Francis E. Townsend resumed the stand later in the afternoon, a quorum of the committee being present, C. Jasper Bell (chairman), Joseph A. Gavagan, Sam L. Collins, Scott W. Lucas, John H. Tolan, John E. Hollister, the following transpired:

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you take the stand, Dr. Townsend?

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, before the quiz starts, I have a brief statement which I wish you would allow me to present. It will take but a minute.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is it a written statement, Doctor?

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let me see it, Doctor.

"Dr. TOWNSEND (reading). 'Gentlemen, in view of the fact'——

"The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. You will have to abide by the ordinary rules. Do you want to submit the statement to the committee?

"Dr. TOWNSEND. I want to read it, and then I will submit it to you.

"The CHAIRMAN. You cannot do that, Doctor. You will have to conform to the usual rules in matters of this sort. If you want to submit it, the committee will be glad to consider it.

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Will you listen a moment to a statement which I have to make, then?

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Doctor.

"Dr. TOWNSEND. In view of the apparent unfriendly attitude of this committee and the unfair attitude it has shown to me and the members of my organization, I deem it my duty to say that I shall no longer attend these committee hearings. I am retiring from this sort of an inquisition, and I do not propose to come back again except under arrest. And I do refuse absolutely to make any further statement pertaining to this movement to this committee.

"Thank you and goodbye."

Because of the foregoing the said committee has been deprived of the testimony of said Francis E. Townsend relative to the subject matter which, under House Resolution 443, said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of the witness to testify further is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared and testified, and his willful refusal to testify further without having been first excused as a witness deprives the said committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States. The Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans, proceeding as directed by House Resolution 443 to inquire into old-age-pension plans, with respect to which legislation has been submitted to the House of Representatives, and particularly that embodied in H. R. 7154 in the United States Congress, caused to be issued a subpena directed to one Clinton Wunder to appear before said select committee and to testify concerning matters then and there

under investigation by said committee. The subpena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"TO THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Clinton Wunder, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., to be and appear before the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443 in their chamber, more specifically described as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington on May 21, 1936, at the hour of 10 o'clock then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 15th day of May 1936.

"JOSEPH W. BYRNS, *Speaker.*

"Attest:

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk.*"

SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

"Come and bring with you the exact copies of your Federal income-tax returns made by you for the years 1934 and 1935, and also that you bring with you the exact copies of any State income-tax return that you have filed for the years 1934 and 1935."

Said subpena was on the 18th day of May 1936 served upon said Clinton Wunder by the United States marshal, through his deputy for the United States southern district of California, a person empowered by the chairman of the said committee pursuant to House Resolution 443 to perform such act. The return of service of said deputy for the United States marshal is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"RETURN ON SERVICE OF WRIT

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

"Southern District of California, ss:

"I hereby certify and return that I served the annexed subpena on the therein-named Clinton Wunder by handing to and leaving a true and correct copy thereof with him personally at Los Angeles, in said district, on the 18th day of May, A. D. 1936.

"ROBERT E. CLARK,

"United States Marshal.

"By DAVID E. HAYDEN,

"Deputy."

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 18, 1936.*

Hon. C. JASPER BELL,

United States Congress, Official Building:

Subpena just served. West coast speaking engagements previously arranged would bring me back to New York about June 5. Would greatly appreciate your courtesy allowing me to appear then. Telegraph reply Hotel Biltmore. Regards.

CLINTON WUNDER.

That in reply thereto C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee, did cause to be sent and delivered to the said Clinton Wunder the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 19, 1936.*

CLINTON WUNDER,

Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Sincerely regret inability to grant continuance. Follow instructions of subpena. Mandatory you be here Thursday 10 a. m.

C. JASPER BELL, *Chairman.*

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 19, 1936.*

Congressman C. JASPER BELL,

House Office Building:

Require telegraphic approval from you stating airplane transportation will be paid for my appearance Thursday morning in Washington before your committee, since I must travel from Los Angeles. Reply Hotel Biltmore, Los Angeles.

CLINTON WUNDER.

That in reply thereto C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee, did cause to be sent and delivered to the said Clinton Wunder the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 19, 1936.*

Rev. CLINTON WUNDER,

Hotel Biltmore, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Airplane transportation arranged for call at T. W. A., Los Angeles.

C. JASPER BELL.

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 19, 1936.*

Congressman C. JASPER BELL,

Personal Delivery, House Office Building:

Downey, our attorney, just wired stating you had extended my time to May 26. Please telegraph me confirming this officially. Thank you.

CLINTON WUNDER.

That in reply thereto C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee, did cause to be sent and delivered to the said Clinton Wunder the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 19, 1936.*

Dr. CLINTON WUNDER,

Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Confirm arrangements with Attorney Downey made today in committee hearing extending your time to May 26.

C. JASPER BELL.

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 22, 1936.*

Hon. C. JASPER BELL,

Congressman, House Office Building:

Arriving Washington late Monday, May 25.

Dr. CLINTON WUNDER.

According to the arrangements made by interchange of the above set forth telegrams between the chairman of said committee and the said Clinton Wunder it was understood and agreed that the said Clinton Wunder would appear before the said Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans on May 26, 1936, at 10 o'clock a. m., but that in violation of the mandate provided by the subpena and in further violation of the agreement to appear at a later date made at the request of Clinton Wunder the said Clinton Wunder failed to appear and be sworn as witness at the meeting of said committee on May 26, 1936, though his name was called as a witness by said committee at that time.

On May 26, 1936, the said committee, because of the willful failure of the said Clinton Wunder to appear and be sworn as a witness, did issue a second subpena to be served upon Clinton Wunder commanding him to appear at 10 o'clock May 27, 1936, before said committee and to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation by said committee, the subpena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"To the SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Dr. Clinton Wunder to be and appear before the Special Investigating of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which Hon. C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443, in their chamber, more specifically known as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on May 27, at the hour of 10 o'clock, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 26th day of May 1936.

"JOSEPH W. BYRNS, *Speaker.*

"Attest:

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk.*"

Said subpena was, on May 26, 1936, served upon said Clinton Wunder by a person authorized by the chairman of the said committee pursuant to House Resolution 443 to perform such act, the return of service of said deputy being endorsed thereon, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Dr. Clinton Wunder before the special investigating committee served 4:15 p. m. on May 26, 1936, at room 1235, Ambassador Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

"VERNON E. MOORE."

On May 27, 1936, the chairman of the said committee did receive the following letter by registered mail, set forth in words and figures as follows:

[Envelope]

TOWNSEND VISUAL EDUCATION CO.,

905 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

Hon. JASPER C. BELL,

CHAIRMAN, BELL COMMITTEE,

UNITED STATES CONGRESS,

Washington, D. C.

[Letter]

OLD AGE REVOLVING PENSIONS, LTD., THE TOWNSEND PLAN, DR. F. E. TOWNSEND, FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT. OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL BUSINESS MANAGER, 601 SOUTHERN BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

National board of directors: Dr. F. E. Townsend (seal), Frank Arbuckle, J. B. Kiefer, Baxter G. Rankine, Nathan J. Roberts, Gomer Smith, Alfred J. Wright, Clinton Wunder, Gilmour Young.

905 NORTH CHARLES STREET,

Baltimore, Md., May 26, 1936.

Hon. JASPER C. BELL,

Chairman, Bell Committee, United States Congress,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received transportation from the United States Government from Los Angeles to Washington under the assumption that I would testify in Washington before your committee. Acting under the instructions of Dr. Townsend, I have decided not to testify, and therfore herewith find enclosed a certified check payable to your order in the sum of $106.89 to reimburse the Government for the amount advanced for my transportation.

Respectfully yours,

CLINTON WUNDER.

Which letter did enclose a remittance by check of $106.89 on the account of the Townsend Visual Education Co., no. 303, dated Baltimore, Md., May 26, 1936.

At the session of the committee on May 27, 1936, a quorum being present, said witness, Clinton Wunder, was called by the chairman and failed to appear.

Because of the foregoing the said committee has been deprived of the testimony of said Clinton Wunder relative to the subject matter under House Resolution 443 said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of Clinton Wunder to appear and to be sworn as a witness to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation is a violation of said subpena and deprives the said committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans proceeding as directed by House Resolution 443 to inquire into old-age pension plans, with respect to which legislation has been submitted to the House of Representatives, and particularly that embodied in H. R. 7154 in the United States Congress, caused to be issued a subpena directed to one John B. Kiefer to appear before said select committee and to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation by said committee, the subpena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"To the SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon J. B. Kiefer to be and appear before the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443, in their chamber, more specifically described as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on May 22, 1936, at the hour of 10 o'clock, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington this 15th day of May 1936.

"JOSEPH W. BYRNS, *Speaker*.

"Attest:

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk*."

Said subpena was on the 15th day of May 1936 served on J. B. Kiefer by a person empowered by the chairman of the said committee pursuant to House Resolution 443 to perform such act. The return of service of said person is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for J. B. Kiefer before the Committee on the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations served at 4:55 p. m. May 15, 1936, by handing original to him; he waived reading and accepted copy. J. O. Bowen, for Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives."

At the session of the committee on May 27, 1936, a quorum being present, said witness John B. Kiefer was called by the chairman and failed to appear.

Because of the foregoing the said committee has been deprived of the testimony of said John B. Kiefer relative to the subject matter which, under House Resolution 443, said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of John B. Kiefer to appear and to be sworn as a witness to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation is a violation of said subpena and deprives the said committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

C. JASPER BELL, *Chairman*.

The SPEAKER. The report is ordered printed.

Mr. BELL rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized to make the point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. But, Mr. Speaker, I rose before the gentleman from Texas made his point of order. I make the point of order that the report is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to make a point of order. The Chair cannot recognize both gentleman at the same time for the same purpose. The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that under the Constitution of the United States the House of Representatives of the legislative branch is a separate and distinct department of government from the judiciary, or the courts, that this is undoubtedly a contempt of the House of Representatives, the legislative branch, and is a contempt that should be tried and punished, not by the courts, but by the House of Representatives itself. We ought not to pass the buck to the courts. We ought to assume the responsibility ourselves.

I admit that all three witnesses clearly are in contempt, and deserve punishment and that the House ought to try these three witnesses, convict them of contempt, and punish all three of them with a heavy fine and send them all to jail, until they can have some respect for the institutions of their country. I therefore make the point of order that the House of Representatives should try its own contempt proceedings and fix its own punishment.

The SPEAKER. That matter is not under discussion now. This is simply a report from a select committee which has been read and which has been ordered printed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MONAGHAN. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, my point of order goes to the fact that this report is completely out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. My point of order is briefly this: The committee that was investigating the Townsend old-age pension plan clearly exceeded its bounds. It went beyond the matter of exercising a legislative function. It tried to make criminals out of the witnesses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order and not undertake to argue.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I am coming to it. I have to have a little time to state my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it and the Chair will rule upon it.

Mr. MONAGHAN. The Chair should be as courteous to me as he would be to a Member of the opposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair intends to be courteous and is courteous to the gentleman, but the Chair has a right to ask the gentleman to state his point of order. Then it will be determined whether or not the Chair will hear argument upon it.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I may say that if I am not permitted to explain my point of order I shall appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Any argument or explanation is for the benefit of the Chair, and if the Chair is already satisfied, of course, the Chair will not take up the time of the House in ruling upon it. Therefore, the gentleman will first state his point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. The point of order I make is that the committee has exceeded its function in the process of the inquiry that the House authorized it to proceed under.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair make this statement. That is not under consideration now. This is simply a report of the select committee, and the question as to whether or not the committee has exceeded its authority cannot arise at this time.

Mr. MONAGHAN. But the question that the committee has exceeded its authority is involved in the question of whether or not it shall be permitted to make a report of this sort.

The SPEAKER. The committee is within its right in submitting its report; it is its duty to report what it has done in order that the House may take such action as it determines to take. Therefore, the Chair overrules that point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to lay the appeal of the gentleman from Montana on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—ayes 230, noes 8.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those favoring taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Five Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the appeal by the gentleman from Montana from the decision of the Chair was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the select committee, I now present a privileged resolution and send it to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 532

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Francis E. Townsend, Clinton Wunder, and John B. Kiefer to testify before said committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Francis E. Townsend, Clinton Wunder, and John B. Kiefer may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the resolution is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were ayes 265 and noes 8.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those who favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will stand and remain standing until counted. [After counting.] Five Members have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the resolution divisible as to the three gentlemen named?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has been recognized and has the floor.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I make the point of order that the gentleman is proceeding out of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, is not that dilatory?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that that appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think it is dilatory, but he will allow it this time.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to lay the appeal on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—ayes 275 and noes 4.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri has his secretary on the floor, and is violating the rules of the House in so doing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the appeal because it is clearly dilatory. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot take the gentleman from Missouri off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SWEENEY. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I rise to a point of personal privilege and the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot take the gentleman from Missouri off his feet by a question of that kind. The question now pending is one involving the privileges of the House.

Mr. MONAGHAN. A question of personal privilege plus the privilege of the House is superior to the privilege of the House alone, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana will take his seat. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the report and resolution speak for themselves. They make prefectly clear the purpose of the resolution.

Therefore, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege and privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, may the Clerk read the last part of the resolution? We could not hear it on account of so much confusion.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The question now pending is a question of the privilege of the House, and that takes precedence over the question of privilege of the gentleman from Montana. There can be only one question of privilege before the House at a time, and one is now pending.

The Clerk will again read the resolution.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SWEENEY. Is any time allowed for debate on this resolution?

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is ordered, there will be no time allowed for debate.

Mr. SWEENEY. And if it is voted down, there will be time?

The SPEAKER. That is a question for the House.

The Clerk will again read the resolution.

(The Clerk again read the pending resolution.)

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the previous question be ordered on the resolution?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—ayes 243 and noes 30.

Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. MONAGHAN asked for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighteen Members have arisen, not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNERY. During the reading of the resolution there was some confusion and we could not hear part of it. Do I understand that if this resolution is passed, this question will be taken up by the courts and not by the House?

The SPEAKER. That is the object of the resolution, as the Chair understands it.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—ayes 271 and noes 41.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-six Members have arisen; not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

PREVENTION OF SALES DISCRIMINATION

Mr. MILLER. 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. 8442) making it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to discriminate in price or terms of sale between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, to prohibit the payment of brokerage or commission under certain conditions, to suppress pseudo advertising allowances, to provide a presumptive measure of damages in certain cases, and to protect the independent merchant, the public whom he serves, and the manufacturer from whom he buys, from exploitation by unfair competitors.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8442, with Mr. MEAD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNELL. How is this bill being read and when will amendments be in order? As I understand it, the bill now consists of one section, the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the bill comprises one section, and by agreement yesterday the first section of the bill was considered as read, and the second section, the committee amendment, has been read. Amendments will be offered to that section.

Mr. SNELL. Then we will read each section of the Senate bill and consider it as the original bill?

The CHAIRMAN. There is just one section to the House bill, and we have read that section. Amendments to that section are in order.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: On page 6, lines 4 to 17, strike out all of subsection 1.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take any time to discuss this amendment. This is the committee amendment which strikes out the classification subsection of the bill. We discussed it yesterday. Unless there is some opposition to the amendment, I ask for a vote.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: On page 7, lines 20 to 23, strike out all of subsection 5.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment and is one of the amendments that was discussed yesterday. It merely takes from the bill the basing-point provision. Unless there is some opposition to the amendment I ask for a vote.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman from Arkansas if it is not a fact that when a request was made for a rule for the consideration of this bill that two gentlemen on the Rules Committee, especially the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] objected to that provision and we felt that our chances for getting a rule would be jeopardized unless we agreed to take it out. That is one reason we agreed to take it out in addition to others.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not want it to appear that only these two gentlemen were opposed to that section, for I know many Members had voiced their opposition to the basing-point section in this bill because it is a substantive matter of law which has no place in the bill.

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

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I stated in addition that a large number of members of the committee were opposed to it. Then I stated that that was in addition to other reasons.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct in saying that I voiced my objection to the basing-point provision, as did many other Members of the House; but I want it distinctly understood that I made it as an individual Member of the House and not as a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PATMAN. We understood that.

Mr. MILLER. We understand that.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I want to congratulate the committee for eliminating this provision from the bill at the request of many of us. If the section had remained in, it would be ruinous to small-town industry located some distance from the market.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, if this provision remains in the bill, it would result in forcing f. o. b. shipping prices on manufacturers; but with this provision eliminated they will not be forced to charge f. o. b. shipping point prices. Otherwise, many would not be able to compete with foreign manufacturers, for instance, from Canada, who would not be subject to this provision if it remained in the bill.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee I voted to eliminate this paragraph, no. 5. I advocated the elimination of this paragraph in the committee, because I considered it would result in a hardship to the manufacturing industry of this country and of my own State.

LET'S BE FAIR TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT—HE IS PROTECTING INDUSTRY AND LABOR AGAINST ANY UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

Permit me to state at this time that I am opposed to any action upon the part of Congress that would place a burden upon industry and result in an advantage to foreign manufacturers. Ever since I came here I have endeavored to prevent unfair competition from foreign imports, and in that connection I protested the dumping of Japanese imports into our country. I am pleased to note that only the other day, upon a thorough study and recommendation of the Tariff Commission, the President has ordered that duties upon textile imports be raised. This was done fairly and

equitably to help particularly the textile industry of my region and without malice toward any nation.

I ADVOCATE A FAIR DEAL TO OUR DECENT MANUFACTURERS

I might add that I have advocated that the Government refuse contracts of supplies to any manufacturers who utilized child or convict labor or sweatshop methods, because I want a square deal in Government contracts for our decent manufacturers who are finding it increasingly difficult to bid in competition with chiselers—those who exploit labor, their stockholders, or their creditors.

Now, in some of these matters I have conscientiously differed with some members of the industry. Measures to improve their labor relations have brought opposition, even from some in my own State. Nevertheless, when they are right, I will agree with them, and when they are wrong, I shall not fear to express myself accordingly.

The paragraph in this bill that we are eliminating is as follows:

(5) That the word "price" as used in section 2 shall be construed to mean the amount received by the vendor after deducting freight or other transportation, if any, allowed or defrayed by the vendor.

REASONS AGAINST LIMITING MANUFACTURES TO F. O. B. SHIPPING POINT PRICE IN AMENDING OUR ANTITRUST LAWS

I believe that there are very important reasons why this paragraph should be eliminated entirely, not only for the reason that there is already under consideration a bill which has separately and wholly to do with the basing-point price method, and on which committee hearings have been held, but also for the reason that the basing-point price method has some economically sound merits, and to prohibit the legitimate carrying on of this pricing system by industries will have serious consequences in many industries doing business within the confines of the United States. There is still a further most important reason why this particular definition of price should be eliminated from the instant bill, which is that it would compel all manufacturers and wholesalers under the jurisdiction of the United States Government to ship all their merchandise on an f. o. b. point of origin basis and the consequences of such a statute would be to place many of our manufacturers and wholesalers at a serious disadvantage when competing with foreign manufacturers and exporters who do business in the United States.

But this paragraph involves more than the so-called basing-point system. All this system does is to equalize the freight which the customers of a given manufacturer or wholesaler pay, thereby giving an opportunity to all customers to operate on the same equal basis. There is an economic justification of this system, because it provides an open and aboveboard method for manufacturers and wholesalers to meet competition outside of their own local freight area. Second, whatever the cost of equalizing freight may be, it is more than offset by the economies of volume production and volume distribution which the greater trading area provides. In other words, the volume production thus obtained lowers the manufacturers' and wholesalers' per-unit cost and enables them to make lower prices to their customers in their own local trading areas.

But a more serious consequence of the inclusion of this definition of price, as previously stated, would be to compel all manufacturers to ship f. o. b. shipping point, and therefore compel the very definite localization of operations of all manufacturers and wholesalers, which would have the immediate effect of increasing costs as the result of seriously limited volume production.

VOLUME PRODUCTION

Volume production is the very lifeblood of many types of industries. If the products they manufacture cannot be made in large volume, upon which the low cost is dependent, the cost of the finished product would be so high that it would seriously curtail, if not entirely prohibit, their consumption.

This paragraph would seriously affect the publishers of national magazines, because it may mean that the national publishers cannot sell their magazines not only for the reason that the freight charges on the magazines to distant points will be so great as to prohibit the sale of the magazines at those points, but also for the reason that the magazines are dependent upon advertising revenues derived from national distributors whose operations will be seriously curtailed by this definition of price.

If this paragraph remains in this bill, it will mean the increased centralization of manufacturing in the more thickly populated industrial centers.

Some people say these consequences can easily be offset by manufacturers and wholesalers establishing wholesale-distributing points all over the United States. However, this would mean increasing the number of operations and the amount of handling, all of which entails increased cost which the consumer must pay, and only the larger manufacturers in the country could finance the cost, and it would mean the further submergence of the small industry and the small-business man, which would actually tend to enhance monopoly in all branches of industry.

I ADVOCATE PROTECTION FOR CONNECTICUT INDUSTRY AGAINST ANY UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

Another very serious objection to this paragraph is that in many instances our manufacturers and wholesalers would be placed at a serious disadvantage in meeting competition of manufacturers in other countries. Take an instance from my own State—the Scoville Manufacturing Co., a large and old established concern which manufactures thousands of different kinds of metal products, from articles for personal use—such as buttons—to parts to be used in the manufacture of other merchandise. Under the terms of this definition of price in the instant bill, they would be compelled to charge freight from Connecticut to New York City, to Baltimore, to New Orleans, to San Francisco, to Detroit, or to Chicago, just to mention a few major manufacturing centers. A manufacturer in the same kind of business, located in Canada or in Europe, or any other industrial country, and who is not subject to the jurisdiction of our Federal statutes, would be able to deliver his products f. o. b. to every one of these industrial cities which I have mentioned for the reason that they are all direct ports of entry into the United States. By the wording of this definition of price in this paragraph, the Scoville Manufacturing Co. could not meet the foreign competition, nor could any other manufacturer in the United States, under like conditions, meet that competition. The only way open to them would be to set up manufacturing branches in Canada, which would have the effect of further increasing unemployment in the United States.

Because of the reasons that I have given, I also favor the exclusion of this paragraph.

Mr. MILLER. I think the amendment ought to be adopted. I doubt whether that provision ought ever to be in this kind of bill anyway.

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

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the committee's opinion that with this provision eliminated, the bill, if enacted into law, will be as strong and effective in eliminating underhanded concessions and trade practices as it would be with that provision in the bill?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know what the opinion of the committee is on that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the opinion of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman is addressing me, I am very much in favor of leaving the section; but I am offering the amendment at the request of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think the basing-point practice is indefensible and we should deal with it soon in a separate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN: On page 9, paragraph (e), after the word "price", in line 9, insert "or services or facilities furnished"; in line 16, after the word "price", insert "or the furnishing of services or facilities"; in line 18, after the word "competitor", strike out the period and insert "or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment agreed to unanimously by the committee, and was explained yesterday. It simply allows a seller to meet not only competition in price of other competitors but also competition in services and facilities furnished.

Unless there is some objection, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: On page 9, at the end of the committee amendment, add an additional section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. That nothing herein contained shall affect rights of action arising, or litigation pending, or orders of the Federal Trade Commission issued and in effect or pending on review, based on section 2 of said act of October 15, 1914, prior to the effective date of this amendatory act: *Provided*, That where, prior to the effective date of this amendatory act the Federal Trade Commission has issued an order requiring any person to cease and desist from a violation of section 2 of said act of October 15, 1914, and such order is pending on review or is in effect either as issued or as affirmed or modified by a court of competent jurisdiction, and the Commission shall have reason to believe that such person has committed, used, or carried on, since the effective date of this amendatory act, or is committing, using, or carrying on, any act, practice, or method in violation of any of the provisions of said section 2 as amended by this act, it may reopen such original proceeding and may issue and serve upon such person its complaint, supplementary to the original complaint, stating its charges in that respect. Thereupon the same proceedings shall be had upon such supplementary complaint as provided in section 11 of said act of October 15, 1914. If upon such hearing the Commission shall be of the opinion that any act, practice, or method charged in said supplementary complaint has been committed, used, or carried on since the effective date of this amendatory act, or is being committed, used, or carried on, in violation of said section 2 as amended by this act, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and serve upon such person its order modifying or amending its original order to include any additional violations of law so found. Thereafter the provisions of section 11 of said act of October 15, 1914, as to review and enforcement of orders of the Commission shall in all things apply to such modified or amended order. If upon review as provided in said section 11 the court shall set aside such modified or amended order, the original order shall not be affected thereby, but it shall be and remain in force and effect as fully and to the same extent as if such supplementary proceedings had not been taken."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that the Clerk has just read proposes to add a new section to the bill at the request of the Federal Trade Commission. It is not offered as a committee amendment. I do not know why the matter was not presented to the committee, but I have a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Commission, signed by Mr. Ayres, Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

This amendment accomplishes only one thing. In the Goodyear Tire & Rubber case, recently completed by the Federal Trade Commission, thousands and thousands of pages of testimony were taken and months were spent in trying the case. A cease-and-desist order was entered by the Federal Trade Commission. This record is now on appeal to the circuit court of appeals as provided by law. The amendment which I have just offered provides, in the event this particular bill is passed and should the respondent, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., refuse to comply with the orders of the Commission, made by virtue of this amendment, the matter could be heard on that record and additional orders made. That is all that the amendment seeks to accomplish.

The request comes, as I say, in the form of a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and is offered for the purpose of holding in statu quo the proceedings already had in the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. case.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is there any danger that these provisions could be made retroactive in reference to that particular case?

Mr. MILLER. No; the amendment specifically provides that cannot be done.

Mr. CELLER. If I understand correctly, the trial of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. case has occupied considerable time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. The case has taken years.

Mr. CELLER. I may be wrong or I may be right in what I am about to say, but I am asking for information because I only saw the amendment a short time ago. The amendment might have the effect of permitting the Federal Trade Commission to consolidate the action that is now pending with a future action that might arise out of the acts and doings of this defendant after the effective date of the bill we are now considering, if passed?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. So that in the interest of saving time they might be permitted to unite the actions?

Mr. MILLER. I may say there are several parties that have intervened in this particular case. It would save all of those parties the trouble and cost of taking anew that testimony and going over those proceedings again.

Mr. CELLER. Would it deprive the defendants of any rights?

Mr. MILLER. None whatsoever.

Mr. CELLER. The committee has not been able to consider the amendment at all?

Mr. MILLER. No. I will say very frankly the committee has not been able to consider it prior to this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit as a part of my remarks the letter of the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in which he requests that the amendment be adopted, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include this letter.

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

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, May 1, 1936.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman of the Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: I am handing you herewith suggested amendments to H. R. 8442, but which the Commission deems important amendments to whatever bill passes amending section 2 of the Clayton Act.

The principal suggested amendment is to make sure that any amendment of section 2 will not impair orders heretofore issued by the Commission under that section, notable among which is the recent order against the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. We deem it important not only that these existent orders be not affected by amendments to section 2, but also that provision be made whereby full competitive conditions may be restored or brought about by virtue of the amendments to section 2 by reopening the old case and thus avoid re-proof of facts that may be common to both the original and supplementary proceedings. Hence the proviso.

The other amendment is the usual provision covering possible partial invalidity of the provisions of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. AYRES, *Acting Chairman.*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not necessarily opposed to this amendment; however, it is offered at the eleventh hour. Certainly it is unfortunate that the members of the committee were not able to give it due reflection. It is a rather long amendment, having taken about 5 minutes to read. It certainly is ill advised at this stage to ask the Members of the House to pass upon an amendment of this character. To be frank, I do not know anything about it. I do not know whether it should be opposed or agreed to. I have great faith and confidence in what the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has stated with reference to the

amendment, but even he has had very little time for reflection on the amendment, and it seems rather ill-advised to act on it at this juncture.

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

Mr. CELLER. In just a moment.

However, inasmuch as the bills will have to be considered in conference, the Senate bill being different from the House bill, I hope the conferees who will be appointed will give sufficient time and reflection to this matter so that they can come to a proper conclusion thereon.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wanted to suggest what the gentleman has already brought out after I asked him to yield. The bill will go to conference and all the differences will be ironed out. If it is discovered that this is a bad amendment, I am sure the conferees will agree to strike it out, although I do not think it is a bad amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I have always supported legislation for the benefit of the little man. I supported the Kelly-Capper fair-trade bill, which bill had for its purpose to correct the evils complained of by the small merchants. I intend to vote for this bill, but, however, I am fearful that this bill will not accomplish the results claimed by its proponents, as I am satisfied the little merchants cannot compete with the chain stores in purchasing in bulk, and for another reason the chain store will organize its forces to deal within State lines, in which case the law will not apply.

I have always maintained the proper way to compete with the chain store is for the various States to pass laws defining each and every business and have a license for each business and not permit anyone to have more than three licenses for any one place of business, and to provide a double license fee for the second license and a triple fee for the third license. In that way you will not have department stores and chain drug stores selling everything from a toothpick to an automobile. If the men who are interested in this legislation will consider legislation as I propose, I feel that they will accomplish the purpose they are seeking, but I am afraid that they will not accomplish it under this present bill.

I may say further, considering the amendments which the committee has offered on the floor of the House, this brings back to my mind the time when we considered the Kelly-Capper bill in the House. The Kelly-Capper bill consisted of about three pages, and when it was considered in the House there were about a thousand amendments offered. It seems to me the committee itself is uncertain about its ground after considering it for hours and days and months, and now they come on the floor of the House and offer committee amendments that have never been considered in the committee. While I have gone along with the committee, I feel that this legislation will not accomplish the purpose they are seeking to bring about.

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

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I presume the gentleman refers to the Kelly-Capper bill when he speaks of the Kelly bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. And the gentleman would be in favor of the principle underlying the Kelly-Capper bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. I am in favor of the principle of the Kelly-Capper bill and I am in sympathy with the purpose of this bill, but I say that under this bill and under the provisions of the amendment you will not accomplish the purpose you are seeking.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman, and I am going to ask the gentleman this question. The gentleman from Massachusetts is going to offer an amendment embodying the Borah-Van Nuys provisions or the provisions of the Kelly-Capper bill, and I hope the gentleman will vote for that amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been very considerable lobbying going on for and against this proposed legislation. I presume every Member has had terrible pressure from back home, just as I have had, to commit himself to this legislation. I have declined to do this and have stated, frankly, to my constituents that my vote on the matter would depend upon the final form of the legislation and that is the way I feel about it now.

I am in sympathy, however, with the problems which are sought to be met by this legislation. I think, unquestionably, there has been grave discrimination against individual merchants and business establishments on the part of manufacturers who have been coerced in many cases into doing this because of the buying power of large financial organizations.

I want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to tell me whether or not in the investigation of this matter it developed or information was furnished with respect to what became of these secret rebates and dummy brokerages that his committee found were being paid. Did they go to the consumer or were they put in the pockets of the person or firm who got them?

Mr. PATMAN. The money was put in the pockets of the special few who were getting these rebates, and I will state to the gentleman that a "coop" has a wonderful opportunity for its manager not to pass all these benefits on to their members, and some of them I think are opposed to this bill because it will bring it all out in the open and they will not be able to get by with that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Then if we take away these dummy brokerages and these advertising allowances, which are pure fictions, instead of increasing the cost to the consumer, it will simply reduce the profit being wrongfully taken by these special-privileged people.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right. They will be passed on to the public.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what I had gathered, and I may also say that I am very pleased the committee has taken out subparagraph 5. I certainly could not have supported the legislation with that provision in it. While I may be wrong in my construction of it, my viewpoint is if that had been left in the bill it would have been ruinous to many manufacturers throughout the country.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I understand the gentleman from Texas, in his inquiry, investigated what is known as the Retail Federation, and it may be that some of the members of that organization may have pocketed these rebates, but this bill refers to all manufacturers, all manner and kind of dealers, all cooperatives and all chain stores, department stores, and mail-order houses, and it does not follow that the rebates that they may have received went into the pockets of all the owners of all of these enterprises. They passed them on to the consumer. All the economists I have come in contact with indicate that this bill indubitably will have the effect of raising prices to the consumer, because these entities could not buy more cheaply because of this bill's restrictions.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

I do not agree with the gentleman's construction as to what happened. I think most of the secret rebates and dummy brokerages that have been paid went into the treasury of the corporation that got them and at least the greater part of them were never passed on to the consumer.

I hope this bill will be so perfected by amendments that we can all support it. [Applause.]

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

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1924, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to be a party to, or assist in, any transaction of sale, or contract to sell, which discriminates to his knowledge against competitors of the purchaser, in that any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge is granted to the purchaser over and above any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge available at the time of such transaction to said competitors in respect of a sale of goods of like grade, quality, and quantity; to sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor in such part of the United States; or to sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

" 'Nothing in this section shall prevent a cooperative association from returning to producers or consumers, or a cooperative wholesale association from returning to its constituent retail members, the whole, or any part of, the net surplus resulting from its trading operations in proportion to purchases from, or sales to, the association.

" 'Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.' "

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Is this amendment offered as an amendment to the committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this amendment which I have offered as a substitute for the committee amendment is the so-called Borah-Van Nuys bill. The purpose of any legislation along the lines of the bill we are discussing, as I understand it, is to eliminate certain discriminatory practices which are being utilized by certain large chain organizations to the detriment of the small independent retailers.

In the hearings before the committee it developed that the chain stores were resorting to certain practices which gave them a decided advantage over the ordinary buyers, and it was shown that the principal practices they are relying on to obtain that advantage are so-called fictitious brokerage allowances, advertising discounts, and certain other unfair and unwarranted rebates, discounts, and allowances.

Some of these chain organizations maintain their own brokerage agencies. Through that medium they obtain a discriminatory advantage on their purchases denied to other buyers, large or small. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with legislation which seeks to eliminate these unequal and unfair advantages.

In my judgment, the Borah-Van Nuys bill in specific terms and direct and effective language prohibits price discriminations through these methods. It states specifically the acts and practices which are prohibited and provides a heavy penalty for violation. Its language is clear, concise, and understandable.

The Borah-Van Nuys bill is the only bill that has been offered on this subject, in my judgment, that does not directly or indirectly fix prices. It therefore more nearly conforms to the spirit of the Clayton Antitrust Act than many of the provisions of the bill under discussion. Because of its non-price-fixing features it is, in my opinion, a bill which will best safeguard the interests of the consumer, and we men who represent the large consuming districts must have regard for the consumer and be watchful of his interests. If as a result of more efficient methods in merchandizing savings can be made in the price of commodities to the ultimate consumer, we cannot penalize that efficiency to such an extent that it will affect him adversely.

The language in this bill, which I am offering as a substitute amendment, eliminates all of the advantages that the chain stores have been getting in the past. It effectually destroys these unfair practices and methods and defeats attempts to stifle or destroy competition.

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

Mr. HEALEY. Briefly.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I wish the gentleman would point out the difference between his substitute and the bill we have before us.

Mr. HEALEY. I am sorry, but the time remaining to me will not permit me to adequately discuss the difference.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us first dispose of the point of order reserved by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. BOILEAU. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the amendment pending before the House at the present time for the reason that the bill itself and the committee amendment deal only with the regulation of the activities of the seller. It is confined entirely to the operations of the seller in commerce. The amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts attempts to regulate both the seller and the buyer. For that reason I am of opinion that the amendment which regulates both the buyer and the seller is not germane to a bill that deals only with the seller; and for the further reason that the amendment to the amendment contains a penalty, provides a penalty for violation of its provisions, while the bill under consideration and the committee amendment carry no penalty in the form of fines and imprisonment. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts attempts to regulate both the buyer and the seller and provides penalties. For that reason I maintain that the amendment is not germane to the committee amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Does the Chair wish to hear further argument on the germaneness of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule; but the Chair will hear the gentleman from New York briefly.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the Borah-Van Nuys bill, the present amendment, does not seek to regulate the buyer; it seeks to regulate the seller, just exactly as is the case with the pending bill. To illustrate, the pending bill does not operate against the buyer in the way of penalties; it does not place restrictions on the buyer. It places restrictions only on the seller, just as the Borah-Van Nuys bill does in that sense. Both the pending amendment and the bill refer to price discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts involves, in the judgment of the Chair, the subject of price discrimination. In line 9 of page 5 of the pending bill we read in section 2:

where such commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States—

And so forth. It is therefore a problem of price discrimination. The amendment, in the judgment of the Chair, effectuates the same purpose as the purpose contained in the bill, attempts to modify the same legislation. It deals with the same general subject, and, in the judgment of the Chair, the amendment is in order. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

BORAH-VAN NUYS AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If this amendment is adopted, the bill is dead. In order to get the bill through, the Senate permitted this amendment to go in. If you adopt it now and the bill becomes a law, the bill will be unworkable; it will not mean anything in the world. Let me tell you about this Borah-Van Nuys amendment. Evidently it was very hastily drawn.

It applies only where the quantities are equal. It will not prohibit pseudo-brokerage or pseudo-advertising allowances or anything else, except where the quantities are exactly the same. They could change it by just taking one case out of a carload or putting one case more in the carload, and this would not apply.

Furthermore, it is worded in a way that the independents would have to show that this large corporate chain was doing it for the purpose of destroying him as a competitor. That means that the little independent would have to employ a staff of snoopers or clairvoyants or somebody to go out and get this evidence for him. He would have to go all over the Nation in order to do it. It would be absolutely impossible. You may just as well have no bill at all if you adopt this amendment. Furthermore, it provides that the competitors shall not sell at an unreasonably low price. Not only is that very indefinite as to what is an unreasonably low price but, in addition to that, it will also have to be shown that it was sold at an unreasonably low price for the purpose of destroying a competitor. If you really want a bill, if you want the Clayton Act amended so as to take out the weasel phrases that caused its destruction in 1914, if you want to really put teeth into the act in such a way that independent merchants will be protected and the consumers, the farmers, the wage earners would have a square deal, do not vote for this amendment. That would mean absolutely destroying the bill. If there is any doubt in your mind about that, I ask you to at least vote against it, and then when the bill goes to conference the question will be before the conferees, and if they still want to put it in, or any part of it, they can do it; but if you adopt this amendment, that question will not be in conference; it will be ended so far as the House and the Senate are concerned. So I plead with you, do not destroy this bill with all kinds of amendments, some of which sound very good, until you analyze them. This is one of them that sounds really good, but when you analyze the amendment you find that it is so artfully worded and contains such clever phrases that when you get through with such an amendment as this you have not got any law at all. What is the use of a penalty if there is no law? They make the argument that there is a penalty to it. If you have no law to enforce, why have a penalty? You certainly would have no law under this amendment. I would rather have the present Clayton Act. As ineffective and unenforcible as it is, I would rather have it than to have this provision written into the law.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Do we understand that the bill as passed by the Senate embodies this same Borah-Van Nuys amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. It does. Senator ROBINSON agreed to it, stating that he was opposed to it, but he was willing to have it go to conference. But if we agree to it here, it will not go to conference. I therefore ask you to vote down this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I must again differ with our colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. The Senate did not ill consider this so-called Borah-Van Nuys provision. They conducted lengthy and careful hearings thereupon. As a matter of fact, they held no hearings on the Robinson bill itself. I took the trouble to analyze the witnesses who appeared in these hearings in favor of the Borah-Van Nuys amendment. There were 21 witnesses coming from all over the country. Of those 21, every one of them approved of the principles underlying the Borah-Van Nuys bill, and condemned unanimously the so-called Robinson bill, which is very similar to the Patman bill. There was one marketing specialist; there were two economists, three representing huge housewives' and consumers' organizations; four retailers; five representing large farmer organizations, six representing manufacturers, and seven representing wholesalers.

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

Mr. CELLER. Briefly.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman explain to us in a few words the difference between the Borah-Van Nuys amendment and this amendment?

Mr. CELLER. I will be very happy to come to it. This Borah-Van Nuys proposition is heartily in accord with the wishes of the Manufacturers' Association, with the farmer cooperatives, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and all the other great farm organizations.

All the dairy interests are in favor of this Borah-Van Nuys proposition. Why? Because it very justly and properly, in simple language rather than language involved and difficult to comprehend as in the instant bill, provides this: If you set a price you must make that price available to all customers under like conditions. You cannot discriminate, under the Borah-Van Nuys proposition, in the matter of discounts, in the matter of advertising, in the matter of rebates. You must treat everybody alike. Offer to treat them all alike and there is no difficulty. You would not be compelled to go down to the Federal Trade Commission and defend yourself and prove, step by step, by exhibition of your books your differences, if any, in cost, and show all this at great difficulty and expense. The Borah-Van Nuys bill contains no severe and dangerous limitation upon quantity discounts.

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

Mr. CELLER. In just a minute. However, when you have to meet competition in a given locality, and the selling price is lower than yours, you have a right to go into that locality and meet that proposition—lower your price. Now, let us see how it would affect the dairy interests. Let us take, for instance, the vicinity of Chicago or New York. There are dairymen doing an intrastate business. In sections of Indiana and Illinois you have dairymen doing an intrastate business within the State. They give a price for milk. If the large dairy interests in and around those States have a price which is greater than the local price, they are out of business unless they can meet the lower price. If, for example, the Dairymen's League in New York cannot meet competition in New York City from local dealers, they might as well fold up and go out of business. The Borah-Van Nuys bill says you can meet the price of a competitor, but this bill says you cannot do so. It is unlawful and involves severe penalties if you do it. You cannot so lower your price or affect your conditions as to put a man out of business, so as to crush a competitor or to reduce or lessen competition. That you cannot do and should not do. It is illegal for you to do so and severe penalties are proscribed. But everybody is treated alike under the Borah-Van Nuys proposition. For that reason I commend it heartily to you.

The very last provision of the Borah-Van Nuys proposition offered by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] provides it shall be unlawful to sell or contract to sell goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or of eliminating a competitor.

It must be remembered that the Borah-Van Nuys provision does not run afoul of the desires of the farmers, the consumers, the mining interests, the manufacturers, the dairy interests, the labor interests, and the cooperatives. It does not subsidize the middleman, and any economies that could be saved in purchasing would be saved to the purchaser and inevitably passed on to the consumer.

Its language is judicial in its nature and does not put business into a legislative strait jacket. Under it one could sell at different prices in different sections of the country to meet competition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. The testimony was to the effect that that would have the exact effect as though we had passed the

Kelly-Capper bill with reference to loss leaders. The bane of existence of the retail druggists and the retail grocers in their competition with the large chains, is the extravagant and unwarranted use of so-called loss leaders—selling below cost, advertised, trade-marked, or copyrighted articles that are the subject of great advertisement and radio programs. Many witnesses testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee to the effect that this provision would do away, to an appreciable degree, with this wide-spread extravagant use of loss leaders. I believe one of the reasons that actuated the original sponsor of this bill was the practice of loss leaders. Here is an opportunity to do something against, to strike at these loss leaders. Let us avail ourselves of this opportunity. I am opposed to these loss leaders.

Here is an instrumentality to enable a retail grocer and retail druggist to get on all the better in their competition against these large mass buyers about whose iniquities we have heard so much—much, however, of which was fiction and little of which was fact.

The Borah-Van Nuys provision upholds the principle that competition should be free, provided it be just. It is a short and easily understood provision. It states specifically the acts prohibited, the actions interdicted. It not only provides a definite and powerful element of restraint but it also wisely leaves an alleged violation open to be decided entirely on its merits. Any law which goes further than that must actually operate in restraint of trade. The instant bill actually does operate in restraint of trade unless it be very drastically amended.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman mean by loss leader some popularly advertised article, advertised over the radio and through the magazines, which the chain stores will sell below cost?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; or the department stores, like Macy's in my section or Filene's in the gentleman's section. They undersell these advertised brands in the hope of inducing customers into their establishments, losing on those articles, but making up the difference on staple articles.

If you want to do something for those who are supposed to be benefited by the Robinson-Patman bill, vote to sustain the Borah-Van Nuys amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], who served with me as a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill, and for whom I have the highest regard, and who, I am sure, is sincere in what he says on the floor regarding the amendment that he has proposed, has stated, I call to the attention of the Members of the House, that the purpose he desires to accomplish by the amendment is the doing away with and the striking out of the three discounts which now cause the inequality between large and small purchasers in the price they pay for their goods. In other words, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] states that the purpose of the amendment he proposes is identical with the purpose of the amendment the committee has proposed in this bill. Without going into detail as to the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I may say that I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the subcommittee which considered this measure. We held lengthy hearings, and we held conferences following the hearings and discussed this legislation at great length. We considered the wording of this bill in order that we might accomplish the very things the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] states he desires to accomplish—namely, the elimination of fake brokerage discounts, dishonest discounts under the guise of advertising discounts, which are in fact fake advertising discounts, and quantity discounts which enable the large purchaser to secure an unconscionable advantage over the small purchaser. In working out the provisions of this bill in the form in which it is submitted to the House the members of the Committee on the Judiciary feel, after long consideration and determination, that the bill they presented accomplishes these purposes. Another bill now comes before us in the form of an amendment which, in the opinion of those members of the committee who worked on the bill, will not accomplish the purpose which the committee bill will accomplish. In the Senate bill the word "quantity" is used; so the discrimination must be a discrimination in the exact quantity. In other words, if a seller should take one case out of a shipment he would be excluded from the provisions of this bill. This does not obtain in the bill proposed by the House committee and as it comes to the House.

I have the highest regard for my very good friend, the gentleman from New York, and although he is from New York I think he speaks for the farmers in the language they use in New York in speaking for farmers, but when he states this will do away with the right to meet competition, that is not so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. With all due respect to my good friend from New York, the fact is that the bill before us, on page 9, lines 14 to 18, makes specific provision for the meeting of competition by a seller in the event he is confronted with the situation in which a competitor offers his goods at a lower price. I read the portion to which I refer:

> That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing that his lower price to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

If we amend this bill to allow a wholesaler not only to meet the low price of a competitor but to go below that price and discriminate below that price, I submit to this body that the whole purpose of this legislation has been destroyed. Such a provision would render this bill completely and totally ineffective. I sincerely trust, therefore, those who are in favor of this measure will vote down this amendment and support the committee in the work it has done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], who in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary but on his behalf and under the direction of the committee is handling the bill.

All Members of the House a day or two ago received a lengthy communication signed by leaders of various farm organizations. They made five objections to the bill. The first objection was directed against the provision of the bill relating to the basing point. The second objection related to classification of wholesalers, and so forth. Today the Committee of the Whole has accepted two committee amendments which struck out these two particular paragraphs; so these first two objections of the farm leaders have been met by the action of the Committee of the Whole in adopting these amendments.

Two of the other objections made by them are not, in my opinion, valid.

In my judgment, these two objections are not sound, because the language of the bill is very clear and does not justify their interpretation. However, in the opinion of these gentlemen with whom we have conferred, the language is not clear.

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of clarifying the congressional intent, I have taken this time to get the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas as to his understanding of the meaning of the language at the beginning

of section 2 (a), page 5, of the bill. The section starts out as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality—

And so forth. My understanding of that language is that the sellers may not discriminate, but they may, nevertheless, charge different prices in different communities to persons who are not competitors. In other words, as I understand it—and I ask the gentleman whether or not this is his opinion—a seller may sell a commodity in one community at one price and sell it in another community at a different price, because those two purchasers, even though they are purchasers for resale, are not competitors, and therefore there is no discrimination in price. Is that the understanding of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER]?

Mr. MILLER. They are operating in different markets. I do not think there is any doubt about the language.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am asking these questions at the request of certain farm organizations, and I want to show the congressional intent.

Mr. MILLER. As indicated by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. UTTERBACK], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and some others were appointed as a special subcommittee to work on this bill. That was our understanding. We undertook to draft a bill that would deal with the three principal things with which we are all familiar. It was not our intention to injure the organizations about which the gentleman is speaking. The gentleman has the right interpretation of the bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. In this particular letter, which refers to this particular section, I quote as follows:

We are fearful that this section, viewed in the light of the committee report, might be construed to mean that different prices could not be charged by the same seller in different markets.

Is it the gentleman's opinion that their fears in this respect are without foundation?

Mr. MILLER. They are entirely unfounded.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, the farm organizations have one further objection that needs clarification along the same line, and that is with reference to advertising allowances. They refer to sections 5 (c) and (d) insofar as these particular paragraphs affect advertising allowances.

In their communication they state as follows:

We are unwilling to have our operations put in a strait jacket under legislation which might require that if an advertising campaign is put on in Washington, D. C., a similar program must be followed in each market in the United States in which our cooperatives operate.

In other words, it is my understanding that under the language of the bill having to do with advertising allowances, paragraphs 5 (c) and (d), particularly (d), a manufacturer or other seller may give advertising allowances to stimulate trade in one community, but because he gives such advertising allowances in one community he is not required to give an identical, a similar, or a proportional advertising allowance to a customer in another community who is not in competition with the persons in the community in which the advertising allowances are granted.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is correct, and I call attention to the specific provision of the act, which appears in lines 3 to 6, inclusive, page 9, reading as follows:

(d) By such person, unless such payment or consideration is available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers competing in the distribution of such products or commodities.

Competing in the distribution on that market, in that community, and in that place.

Mr. BOILEAU. May I apologize to the House for having taken this time, but because of the fact a large group of people had what I considered an erroneous impression as to the provisions of this bill I wanted to use this time in order to clarify the congressional intent. With the permission of the gentleman from Arkansas, and without in any way reflecting upon his leadership in this matter, may I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], author of the bill, whether that is also his understanding of the provisions of the pending bill?

Mr. PATMAN. That is my understanding and I am thoroughly familiar with what the gentleman is talking about. I conferred with farm leaders, and I understand the situation just as the gentleman from Wisconsin has explained it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, the matter has been clarified to my satisfaction, and I therefore yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 9, line 24, after the word "association", add a new paragraph, as follows:

"(g) Nothing in this section shall apply to any farmer or livestock producer in reference to agricultural or livestock products sold by such farmer or producer prior to the first processing thereof."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in a helpful spirit only. I appreciate very much the fine work which these gentlemen have done, and I do not want to interfere in any way with the orderly working out of the bill as they have fashioned it. I expect to support the bill. However, it is their understanding that the individual farmer and livestock producer of raw products are not included; therefore this cannot in any way injure the measure.

I rarely offer amendments, and I regret exceedingly that I must do so in this instance. If you will look at certain features in the first part of the bill, it will be found it is unlawful for any person engaged in commerce or in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of like grade and quality where it may substantially lessen competition, and this applies to either sellers or buyers.

I submit to the thinking Members of the House that the individual farmer and livestock man stands on a little different basis from other businesses. Up to this time he has had very little to say about the price of his products. We are trying to work it around more and more so that we may approach the time when he will have the same voice as others have, and to illustrate the dangers that may arise, I live in what is known as the panhandle of Texas. The livestock, cattle, sheep, and hogs are practically all shipped in interstate commerce. We sell a great many of them at Kansas City. They are shipped to Kansas City. They are sometimes sold in competition in the yards. They are sometimes sold to buyers who come there and look at the cattle and purchase them before they go to the yards. They are sometimes purchased even before they are unloaded. They are in interstate commerce. For instance, a producer ships two cars of white-faced Hereford cattle to market. A feeder from Iowa bids 10.20 for one car. He can only get 9.50 bid on the car. What is he to do? Must he refuse to sell them and feed them stockyards hay at $1 per bale? The same thing applies to apples, as I understand from those who live in apple sections.

I cannot see how it would hurt the operations of this bill to say that on these unprocessed raw commodities there shall be no application of the terms of this bill.

There is involved this danger. If you will turn to subdivision (e) you will find that where a different price is charged, the burden of proof falls upon the person who charges a different price to establish the fact that he has not violated the law. A great many farmers and livestock men live near the borders of the different States and a

great many of these commodities go into interstate commerce. Commerce as used here, and as used in the definitions given by the leading authorities, is a very broad term.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to call the gentleman's attention not only to the fact that the burden of proof will be on the farmer, but under this bill, if his sale is, in effect, a discrimination, whether he realizes it or not, he becomes subject to a penalty, and if judgment is had in the Federal court, triple damages apply.

Mr. JONES. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill fully, and I thank the gentleman for his comment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was just such amendments as this that led to the entire destruction of the Clayton Act in 1914. They commenced to put this plausible amendment in and that plausible amendment in, and by the time the Clayton Act was passed all the teeth were taken out and it was not enforcible.

We are trying to make the act enforcible. This sounds like a plausible amendment, but do you think the farmers are going to discriminate against anybody? Do you think there is a farmer in this country who is big enough so that he is going to take advantage of somebody through advertising allowances and dummy brokerages and quantity discounts? There is not one in this Nation who is large enough for that, and although there are some large and important livestock producers in the gentleman's district, there is not one so large that he can take advantage of Swift and Armour and the big packers in the markets of Kansas City.

The argument of the gentleman from Texas sounds plausible, but this bill is not to affect cases like that. It only applies to discriminations. It is enforcing honesty, and honesty should apply to the farmers and stock raisers, I will say to my dear friend from Texas, just the same as it applies to the businessman. I am not willing to exempt the farmers from a provision requiring common honesty, and that is all we are doing here, and if they are violating the rule of common honesty, they should suffer the penalty just the same as anyone else.

Now, with regard to the matter of burden of proof, that is an argument that sounds very plausible. Just such arguments as that have destroyed every antitrust law that has ever been presented to the American Congress.

Let me analyze that for you. What does that mean? It means exactly the rule of law today. It is a restatement of existing law. So far as I am concerned you can strike it out. It makes no difference. It is the law of this land exactly as it is written there. If the gentleman were to have a farmer or a livestock grower so large that he would discriminate, become dishonest, treat his customers unfairly, and there should be a charge or complaint filed against him before the Federal Trade Commission, what would he have to do? They would write him a letter and send him a copy of the charges, and under this bill he would rebut that by a statement of the actual facts, and that is all there is to it. If he is not dishonest, if he has not treated his customers unfairly, there will be nothing else in the world to it.

I hope you will not start amending this bill. The Judiciary Committee has worked on the bill for months and months. The subcommittee spent nights and days and Sundays and all the time in the world that a committee could give to legislation the committee gave to this bill. Now, if you start here with amendments that are hastily drawn and quickly considered, you are just as likely to have a law that will not be worth the paper it is written on like the present Clayton Act. Therefore I plead with you not to amend this bill; leave it like it is. It is a good bill.

We have considered what the gentleman from Texas has said. The committee has considered that matter. We are just as much interested in the welfare of the farmer and the stock grower and the others involved as is the gentleman. We yield to no man on questions of that kind and I hope the gentleman will withdraw the amendment. I think the gentleman should withdraw it in order that not one stone may be thrown in the way of passing this legislation that is very much needed, and needed now. For what? To save the business of the independent merchants of this country who are rapidly becoming victims no. 1, and to save the wage earners who will be forced to pauper wages if something is not done.

The farmers are forced to sell at a price that causes them to do without the comforts and necessities of life. The farmers and the wage earners are victim no. 2. Whenever a monopoly is created there will be another victim, and that will be the consumer. He will be victim no. 3. He will be a victim because the monopoly will pay the producer whatever they want to pay and they will charge the consumer the price they want to charge in order to make up the high bonuses they pay their officers. So I ask you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is not the first plea we have heard at this session or past sessions to the effect, "Do not adopt this amendment. Let it go to the Senate, and if we are wrong the Senate or the conferees will take care of us." I think it is high time for the House to do its own thinking and its own legislating and to put its own bills in proper shape before they leave us.

My distinguished friend from Texas on more than one occasion in discussing the bill says that it is a question of common honesty. Nobody wants to take issue with him on a question of common honesty, because we all want to be honest. Our constituents want to be honest, but you cannot dispose of a proposition like this on the ground that it provides for common honesty.

Take the question of hazards that the farmer has to contend with, not only in selling but in producing. First is the hazard of the elements, next is the hazard of depreciation, especially with reference to fruits and vegetables. There is the hazard of the fluctuating and changing market. I have known the market for apples to fluctuate as much as 100 percent in 60 days.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman know that there is nothing in the bill that will hinder a man changing his price every day and every hour if his purpose is not to discriminate against a competitor?

Mr. ROBERTSON. On page 5 of the bill you provide that if he makes a different price the effect of which is a discrimination—and he may not intend any discrimination—it comes under the terms of the bill.

I know of a producer who can produce one-half million bushels of apples and who could flood the market in any city in the country. That man has had the hazard of the drought, the hazard of the wind and the frost; he has produced perishable fruit, and he faces a fluctuating market. He sells 10,000 bushels one day at, say, $1 a bushel. He gets from his agent in Liverpool a cable that the British market is flooded, or that the British Government is contemplating a new tariff, He faces a declining market. He must cut his crop loose. He has sold, say, to one Cincinnati dealer 10,000 bushels of apples, and that is all that dealer can handle. He knows of another dealer in Cincinnati who can handle 100,000 bushels of apples. He quotes him a price at 25 cents less a bushel on the same day he has sold the other, because he has had this word of a falling market. Under the terms of this bill the other dealer could take him into the Federal court at Cincinnati, and the first man would charge that he had discriminated against him, that the man to whom he sold the second consignment of apples was putting his apples on the market at 25 cents a bushel less. The first man would claim that he had been hurt financially and that he would sue the apple grower, and in the event of a recovery, the court then, as has been brought out, would grant triple damages. I have prepared an amendment, taken from the fruit and fresh vegetable code, which reads "To

avoid the hazards of depreciation of value of the product through decline of markets." This bill, as my friend knows, started as a wholesaler's code.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. This has no reference to the N. R. A. code. It is an amendment to an existing law to take out the weasel phrases that have made the law unenforceable.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. The bill was written by Mr. Teegarden originally, and he is the attorney for the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, and was their attorney at the time that the N. R. A. was declared unconstitutional.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Anyway, I prepared this amendment, taken from the fresh fruit and vegetable code. They recognized in making their code that they were dealing with a perishable article in a fluctuating market, and they put in there that they could change the code prices to avoid the hazard of depreciation of value of a product through a declining market. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is adopted, he has taken care of that situation, and I think that is the proper thing to do. I say to my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that we are stepping out on dangerous ground when we tell the farmers who produce from the soil that they cannot make a difference in price to protect themselves in a falling market. You are stepping on dangerous ground when you say to them, "You will be subject to prosecution; you will be subject to being haled clear across the country, where your product went, into a Federal court." Oh, gentlemen say that reputable lawyers would not accuse one of discrimination in such cases, but that is not the question. Someone may claim discrimination and he could mulct you for the nuisance damages. I am in sympathy with the retail merchants. I want to help them in every way we can, but certainly in trying to help one group we should not risk an unnecessary and unfair burden being placed on another. [Applause.]

Mr. DARDEN. Are not the gentleman's remarks equally applicable to potatoes, vegetables, and so forth?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Certainly; vegetables, potatoes, any perishable crop of that kind which you have to handle in a falling market. The farmer should have an inalienable right to adjust his prices in his own judgment, not in the judgment of the Federal Trade Commission or in the judgment of any other Federal agency, but in his own judgment, if his market is going to fall and he is handling a perishable product.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going directly to a practical illustration of what the gentleman has just brought out, in view of the fact that there is a tremendous amount of fruit raised in my State, suppose your apple grower in your district gets a cable from Liverpool that something has happened over there to his distributing machine, and that is what it is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And he then comes along and offers to the A. & P. Co., doing business in my State, 100,000 bushels of apples at 25 cents, or 50 cents a bushel under the market, what happens to the farmer in my State who is trying to get something out of his fruit crop? Is not that just as damaging?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely not; because the gentleman's farmer has the same right to figure markets as mine. It is a free competitive marketing system. We should not ever completely abandon it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But mine is a little grower with 5 or 10 or 15 acres.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Whenever you tell the farmer that the Government is to regulate the price of his product, you have left our fundamental principles, and even in this emergency we must stick to the free competitive system of doing business.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think there is any reason for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]. I want to call your attention to the theory of this bill. What are we trying to do in this bill? I call your attention to the first section on page 5. I want to say further to you that the farmer selling livestock, or corn, or cotton, or anything else cannot possibly come under this act unless he is creating a monopoly, and if he is creating a monopoly, a monopoly created by a farmer is just as bad as a monopoly created by a manufacturer.

Let me call your attention to this language:

> It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce, where such commodities are sold for use—

Under certain conditions—

> and where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or receives the benefit of such discrimination.

Then I call your attention to something else. This bill does this, and this only: It prevents quantity discounts, it prevents advertising allowances, it does away with fraudulent brokerage allowances, and that is all it does do. That is the theory of this bill. Of course, you can go out and dig up all kinds of scarecrows. You can set up all kinds of straw men and knock them down if you want to. You can bring in the farmer, you can bring in every class, but, after all, the question is this, whether or not we are going to let the monopolistic tendencies of the last 20 years continue.

I have no pride of authorship in this bill, although we worked very hard on it. They talk about apples and perishable goods. Let me call your attention to page 7, paragraph 3. It says:

> That nothing herein contained shall prevent price changes from time to time where in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the marketability of the goods concerned—

That takes care of the livestock people. It takes care of the things that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is attempting to cure.

Then it says further—

> such as but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court process.

Now, that is the situation that is confronting us here. I come from a rural district. If I ever return to the House it will be by the votes of the farmers. The largest town in my district is 6,000. Farmers are opposed to monopolies, and you cannot prevent monopolies if you pass an act like the old Clayton Act and shoot it full of provisos and amendments and loopholes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the interpretation of any member of this committee is just as important as the interpretation of the language given by a member of the Judiciary Committee. The interpretation placed upon the

language of section 2 (a) on page 5 with reference to the granting of a different price to a different customer in a different locality by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] I say is erroneous. The interpretation placed upon that language by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] and by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is erroneous. They all agree.

This language reads:

> That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality.

If that means anything, it means that you cannot discriminate——

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please proceed in order.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not in order. I am. I say that you cannot make, under the bill, a different price for the same goods of the same quality in a different locality. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] says there is a provision further down in the clause "where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly"; but whenever I charge a lower price to a different customer I have the effect of lowering competition, so I run afoul of the statute immediately. You cannot make a different price among your customers. That is the fly in the ointment.

Let us see what Mr. PATMAN said in the RECORD on yesterday, page 8111. He spoke of "the right of the manufacturer to have a different price for a different quantity, where there is a difference in the cost of manufacture. There is nothing in this bill to prohibit it, but the bill expressly provides that he may have a different price where there is a difference in the cost of manufacture." What will happen if there is no difference in the cost of manufacture, and the goods cost the same that I am selling to my customer. If what Mr. PATMAN says now is true, why did he not say so yesterday? Why did he not say so in all his speeches throughout the country? He has said at all times that the same goods of the same quantity must be always the same in all parts of the country; there can be no variation. As quoted from his speech of yesterday, there can be no difference if there is no difference in manufacturing cost. If there is no cost difference, then no difference in selling price under any conditions.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not overlook the fact that in future sales, that is, if you have offered a certain commodity at a certain price, you have to offer it to my competitor, but that does not apply——

Mr. CELLER. I am very sorry, but that is not the language you used yesterday. Why do you not accept the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], because he wants to do that very same thing?

Mr. PATMAN. Because I am not going to let the gentleman from Texas help destroy this bill. I am not going to allow the conferees to either.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I have no desire to injure and no thought of injuring the bill in any way. I expect to support the bill. I think we would help the bill by putting this provision in it. It is in the alternative. The wrong is committed if there is a difference in price that either lessens competition or tends to create monopoly or to destroy competition. It is not simply a question of creating a monopoly. It was found necessary in the old law to exempt cooperative organizations of farmers. We are simply following the same philosophy in offering this amendment to exempt them from the operations of the law. I know the sponsors of this bill are friendly to the farmers, and I wish they would agree to this amendment and let it go in to carry out the philosophy that has been practiced for 29 years.

Mr. CELLER. Let me draw your attention to the objections of the Dairymen's League of New York. There are 40,000 dairy farmers in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. It says the present law prevents price discrimination where, first, discrimination substantially lessens competition, or, second, creates monopoly. This bill provides the same price for the same goods of like grade and quality regardless of the location of the buyers.

The Dairymen's League operates in 170 markets. It says the price of milk can never be uniform in 170 markets because of, first, local competition; second, different retail prices in each market; third, different purchasing power of each community; and fourth, because milk-control boards control retail and wholesale prices in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. They sometimes make different prices in the same State. Twenty-two States fix milk prices. They must have the right to change prices to meet the prices fixed by the State boards.

The Pure Milk Association has 16,000 dairy farmers in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana. It sells milk to dealers in Chicago at 12 cents a quart. It sells milk to dealers in Hammond, Ind., at 10 cents a quart. It is obvious that if the dealers in Chicago are selling milk to consumers at 12 cents a quart, and the dealers in Hammond, Ind., are selling milk to consumers at 10 cents a quart, the Chicago dealers should be required to pay a higher price to the farmers than is paid by the Hammond dealers. Since it would obviously be impossible to charge the Hammond dealers any higher price for their milk if they are selling on a 10-cent basis, the net effect of the bill would be to require the association to sell its milk to Chicago dealers at the lower prices being charged to the Hammond dealers. The resultant loss to the farmers supplying milk to Chicago is obvious.

As another example, let us consider the case of Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative association, engaged in marketing butter, cheese, and other dairy products for approximately 400 local cooperative creameries and cheese factories east of Minneapolis. Under the terms of this bill they would be required to sell at the same price in every market in which they operate, although economic conditions, such as employment, might easily require a difference in price, let us say, for example, between the city of Washington and the city of Scranton, Pa.

It should be further noted that during the whole life of the N. R. A., manufacturers, wholesalers, and jobbers attempted to obtain a definition of wholesaler and retailer in order to cripple the operations of farmers' cooperative associations which purchase from manufacturers and sell direct to their farmer members, farm equipment and supplies, including fertilizer, creamery machinery, and so forth. The Federal Trade Commission is at the present time investigating the activities of the manufacturers of butter tubs in refusing to grant Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., a wholesaler's discount upon butter tubs, although Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., performs all of the functions of a wholesaler with the single exception that it sells direct to its member creameries rather than through a jobber.

This attempt to salvage economic waste by legislation promoting or protecting intermediaries between the producer and consumer of goods is in direct conflict with the whole theory of cooperative marketing and cooperative purchasing.

It has been specifically pointed out that a provision was inserted in the bill to permit certain discounts to be given to wholesalers without according such discounts to other persons who purchased in similar quantities. Thus, this bill which is designed to eliminate discrimination contains a violently discriminatory provision against the cooperative purchasing of farm equipment and supplies by farm organizations in favor of the private wholesaler and jobber of farm equipment and supplies. And this discrimination is to be paid for out of the pockets of our farmers.

As pointed out above, the wholesalers and jobbers attempted to obtain this special discrimination in their favor during the whole life of the N. R. A. The situation became

so bad that President Roosevelt was forced to issue two Executive orders on the subject, in which the President stated clearly and unequivocally that no code of fair competition should be construed or interpreted so as to prevent any cooperative organization from being entitled to receive and to distribute to its members discounts (a) ordinarily paid or allowed to other purchasers for purchases in wholesale or middleman quantities, or (b) paid or allowed pursuant to the requirements or provisions of any code of fair competition to other purchasers for purchases in wholesale or middleman quantities.

In addition, a similar provision was written in the so-called Guffey Coal Act of a similar nature so as to insure that cooperatives would be entitled to wholesale or jobbers discounts in connection with the operation of the Guffey Coal Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 74, noes 86.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JONES and Mr. MILLER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEYSER: Page 5, line 8, after the word "quality", insert "and design"; and on page 5, in line 22, after the word "quality", insert "and design."

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, in response to the statement made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Texas that he wants to try to set up an honest and a workable bill, I am offering this very simple amendment to add the words "and design" after the word "quality" where it appears in two places on page 5; and I hope the committee will not combat this particular amendment.

I call attention to the fact that there is no differential of design in the foods and drugs, so that would have no effect against the chain stores the bill is hoping to reach; but let us assume that two articles are made from the same quality of merchandise, but one is made under one design for a certain type of trade and the other is made under another design for another type of trade. The design itself may entitle the purchaser in either case to a differential in price, even though the basic quality of the merchandise involved is similar. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this amendment that should in any way affect the bill in itself at all. Quality of food is not involved. There is no design in the quality of food or drugs. There may be, however, a design differential in furniture or in ladies' shoes. Through the elimination of certain material here or there an opportunity may be given for a lowering of price, whereas the quality involved is the same. Under this bill the manufacturer would be penalized severely.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would not that permit the processor of a food commodity to change from a round-shaped package to a square-shaped package and call it a difference in design?

Mr. PEYSER. Absolutely not, because that would be a change in the design of the container, whereas the amendment refers to a design in the merchandise offered for sale. There is no style in baking powder, there is no style in paragoric, there is no style in castor oil. It will apply principally to textiles, probably to furniture, probably to shoes, but not to the commodities we are endeavoring to reach; and I think if the committee wants to carry out what the gentleman from Texas has suggested, a good, honest, workable bill that is fair to everybody, this is the way they can be fair.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this bill as now submitted will force a shoe manufacturer, for illustration, to sell all styles of shoes for the same price?

Mr. PEYSER. If the quality is the same. My amendment adds to the word "quality" only the two words "and design." I think it is a simple amendment, and I do not see any reason why, if they want to present a fair bill, it should not be accepted.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. How does this affect the tire business about which we have been hearing so much, the same tire sold with a different name on it, for instance?

Mr. PEYSER. If the quality were the same and the design were the same, it would be, in all component parts, the identical article. They are not going to have different designs for tires; they make them all the same.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 3 additional minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Suppose the design of the tread of the tire were different, what would be the case?

Mr. PEYSER. That, in my judgment, would not be considered a different design.

Mr. RABAUT. That is one of the big questions we are trying to eliminate.

Mr. PEYSER. It would be done, principally, for deceit and for evasion. The design of all tires is the same; they are round. Because the design of the tread is different does not mean there is any difference in the fabric. In the matter of a suit of clothes, a stripe could be added without changing the basic quality of the garment. That design may be put in there because it is more saleable in a certain section, still there could be no deviation in the price of the basic articles, because the quality is the same in each; and I think, where they endeavor to discriminate purely on the design of the tread of a tire, it could be set up immediately that it was done merely for the purpose of evasion.

Mr. RABAUT. That is what has been done recently.

Mr. PEYSER. That would cover the design. In my judgment you are not evading a design by putting on a different tread.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, speaking on behalf of the committee, I may say that this matter has had the consideration of the committee and it feels that if the word "design" is inserted in the qualifying phrases, as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PEYSER], the door will be open to a situation in which this bill may be flouted and the purposes of the bill destroyed.

As an example, it is felt by the committee that the same identical goods might be sold to a small-quantity purchaser for a certain price and level which would be higher than the same quality goods could be sold to the large-quantity purchaser by simply putting another label on the goods sold to the large-quantity purchaser. In other words, the design would be changed to comply with this act.

I may say that the committee feels this amendment should not be agreed to, and I call attention to the fact that the part of the Clayton Act which is now under consideration is the same in form in the present bill as in the original Clayton Act, which has been on the statute books for 24 years. After 24 years a suggestion is made that that part of the act be amended at this time. Incidentally, I

may say, with all respect and deference to my good friend from New York, the suggested amendment was proposed by one of our colleagues who appeared before the Rules Committee in opposition to the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. A great many of the industries in Ohio were very much in favor of the proviso in the Senate bill, appearing on page 4, and reading as follows:

And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different commodities made in good faith to meet competition.

I find that on page 9 of the Patman bill, beginning in line 14, there appear these words:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

Will the gentleman explain the difference between these two proposals?

Mr. PATMAN. If the Senate amendment should be adopted it would really destroy the bill. It would permit the corporate chains to go into a local market, cut the price down so low that it would destroy local competitors and make up for their losses in other places where they had already destroyed their competitors. One of the objects of the bill is to get around that phrase and prevent the large corporate chains from selling below cost in certain localities, thus destroying the independent merchants, and making it up at other places where their competitors have already been destroyed. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment, because it would be very destructive of the bill. The phrase "equally low price" means the corporate chain will have the right to compete with the local merchants. They may meet competition, which is all right, but they cannot cut down the price below cost for the purpose of destroying the local man.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What does the gentleman's proviso mean?

Mr. PATMAN. It means they may meet competition, but not cut down the price below cost. It means an equally low price but not below that. It permits competition, but it does not permit them to cut the price below cost in order to destroy their competitors. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not think the Senate provision permits them to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer back to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which pertained to the inclusion of the word "design" in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not Holy Writ and it is not a perfect document. It seems to be in the shape that the gentleman from Texas wants it, and he appeals to you not to change a single solitary word or sentence in the whole thing. This is not fair. I realize he has a steering committee here to see that the bill goes through exactly as he wants it to pass, but let me give you a little bit of the history of the bill.

The very first day it came before the Judiciary Committee the attorney who drew it realized there were imperfections in it and suggested certain amendments. It very soon became apparent to the Judiciary Committee that it was defective in many respects, and a subcommittee was appointed to rewrite it. The subcommittee spent many months in doing so. When they reported it to the full committee dozens of amendments were adopted in executive session. After it was reported here on the floor the Judiciary Committee agreed to still further amendments, which the putative author of the bill, and its chief sponsor, consented to accept.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York offered an amendment to add the word "design", so that there shall be no discrimination in price between purchasers of goods of the same grade, quality, and "design." Obviously the backers of this bill are interested in groceries. They are not interested in clothing, wallpaper, jewelry, or any of the other innumerable things that move in interstate commerce, the prices of which are influenced by attractive and popular designs and patterns.

Permit me to give you a single example. In my city there is a manufacturer of women's shoes, and every year he offers the market 50 or 60 different designs. Some of them are popular, and he can sell them at good prices. Others do not catch the fickle fancy of our feminine friends, and they are therefore a drug on the market. They are exactly the same grade and quality, but in order to move the unpopular shoes this manufacturer has to sell them for what he can get. He can command a good price for his popular shoes. The same thing is true with china, wallpaper, furniture, fixtures, and innumerable other commodities. Why do you want to penalize that class of business? Do not be carried away just because the gentleman from Texas would have you think this is a perfect piece of work. This bill has to go to the Senate, and it will be a far different one when you see it in final form. There is a lot of perfecting yet to be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PEYSER) there were—ayes 19, nays 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 5, line 8, after the word "quality", insert "purchased under like conditions"; also on page 5, line 22, after the word "quality", insert "purchased under like conditions."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, for days I have been trying to get exactly what is in the mind of the gentleman from Texas about so-called discriminations in prices. I maintain, and will maintain to the end of the discussion of this bill, that from what we have heard there is no question but that there can be no right to anyone selling goods to make any different prices to different customers where the goods are of like grade and quality and quantity, the gentleman from Texas notwithstanding.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] put in the RECORD yesterday the following language:

Now, with regard to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], here is what I said. I said that manufacturers would have to treat their customers alike and give them the same price, and I still say that. For what? For the same quantity under the same conditions. This is the part that the gentleman did not bring out. He simply failed to tell it all.

Now, I simply put his exact language in this amendment, and I say that where the goods are purchased thus under like conditions there can be no discrimination. When they are purchased under unlike conditions, the inference is there can be discrimination and change in price. That is logical and reasonable.

Now, if what the gentleman said this afternoon is so, he should not object to the amendment, as I have put his exact language in my amendment.

We know that goods may be of the same quantity, of the same quality, but may be purchased under unlike conditions. There may be different items of credit. One man may be entitled to a 60-day dating, while another man may be entitled only to cash on delivery. There may be questions of delivery datings. One man may want his deliveries within 10 days; another may want his deliveries in 60 days or 6 months or may want them daily. Certainly, where there are these different conditions, there ought to be the right given to effect a different price. He may want his goods with samples or he may want them without samples. There may be accorded the right to furnish demonstrators for toilet articles or similar goods or there may be no demonstrators. A man may have a strike on his hands or there may be a lock-out, or there may be no labor difficulties.

Certainly, if there are like conditions, there should be no discrimination, but if there are unlike conditions, which is the inference of my amendment, a man should have the right to contract under our Constitution as he sees fit and allow for these different conditions by a difference in price.

The bill, as now drafted, will not allow these differences and I urge upon you sincerely that you allow such differences, because of differing or unlike conditions. Put in the words to which the gentleman from Texas always adverts, namely "like conditions." He reiterates, "Under the same or like conditions." Put them in now. He questioned me yesterday and took me to task because I did not include these words. I include them now in the amendment and I offer them for your judicial and earnest consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is conscientiously opposed to this bill, and, naturally, he is going to do what he can to weaken it. If you were to adopt this amendment he would not vote for the bill. Therefore, he is trying to perfect it for us. So if it is already satisfactory to those of us who have been working on it in the committee and with the other sponsors of the legislation, why should he not let us have the bill we want.

If you put these words in the place where he proposes to insert them, without a sufficient explanation, you will just confuse the bill. You will have confusing language by placing them where he has proposed to put them.

What are the conditions? Delivery by truck, delivery over the railroad, delivery on a barge, delivery at a certain point that is a few miles removed from the other competitor. Any condition like this would remove the case from a question of discrimination if you were to adopt the gentleman's amendment.

The committee worked on this bill for months and a subcommittee worked on it for months. It is true they agreed to some amendments, but they have got a bill they think is all right, and I hope you do not amend it by putting in the weasel phrases and these statements that sound all right, but upon second thought or upon reflection or upon analysis, you find some of them are destructive of the purposes of the bill.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to cut off anyone from debating amendments on the bill, but I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement under which all debate on amendments may close.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have an amendment that I desire to offer.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments to this section close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this is a highly controversial bill, and a great many Members are interested and desire to offer amendments. To cut off debate in 30 minutes would be harmful.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says "on this section." That would end debate.

Mr. MILLER. That would end debate.

Mr. MICHENER. It would end debate in 30 minutes. I am going to vote for the bill, but there are many far-reaching provisions in the bill, and I think the gentleman ought not to close debate. I hope he will withdraw his request.

Mr. MILLER. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman, for the time being.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM: Page 9, line 6, after the word "commodities", change the period to a colon and insert "*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall apply to payments for window or counter displays actually made or signs actually used in advertising or displaying a vendor's products on the premises of a vendee."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of Members to paragraph (d). At no place in the bill is the word "advertising" used. It might refer to advertising, but it does not specifically say so. Now, clause (d) reads, as follows:

(d) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to pay or contract for the payment of anything of value to or for the benefit of a customer of such person in the course of such commerce as compensation or in consideration for any services or facilities furnished by or through such customer in connection with the processing, handling, sale, or offering for sale of any products or commodities manufactured, sold, or offered for sale by such person, unless such payment or consideration is available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers competing in the distribution of such products or commodities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that means just this: Remember it says "proportionally." In other words, this will prevent any manufacturer that is starting new in a business from having an opportunity of putting his goods on the market in the manner merchants have been doing for the last 50 years.

I am particularly interested in this one section for this reason: Forty years ago, in 1896, I started a music publishing business, and my success in the business at that time in Chicago was brought about by displaying in the window wax figures of a song I had at that time.

Under this provision, it could not be done. "Proportionally", it says. In other words, if the Coca Cola Co. should make a contract with a store, whether a drug store or grocery store or whatever it may be, and should say, if you buy $100 worth of goods we will give you a sign, then the fellow in the next street, or on the next corner, if he purchased only $50 worth of goods, according to this proposed bill, could have only half a sign. That is what it says. You cannot get away from the fact that this is not workable.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is there anything to keep the Coca Cola Co., or any other company, from going to drug stores and saying they want a certain amount of space?

Mr. BLOOM. No; you cannot do that under this section. You prevent it from being done.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman says that it cannot be done. The Coca Cola Co. under this bill could give anybody all the space they saw fit, but they could not give a discount or a lower price to someone for space which is not used.

Mr. BLOOM. That has nothing to do with this section. This is for services or facilities furnished. It has nothing to do with price.

Mr. MICHENER. But that is where these phony discriminations come in. They claim they render a service which they do not render.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. To finish this up, that is one of the troubles and discriminations here—that one of these manufacturers will sell to one store, say, a million units, provided they do so much advertising, and then, in turn, will exchange checks and pay the purchaser for doing the advertising, and the advertising consists in hanging up a two by four sign.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not yield for a speech. My amendment just takes care of that and provides for an emergency of that kind. It provides that nothing herein contained shall apply to payments for windows or counter display actually made or signs actually used in advertising or displaying the vendor's products on the premises of a vendee. It must be actually done, and if it is not a bona-fide contract, of course, then this would not apply; but if you have a window at

Fourteenth and F Streets and the manufacturer wants to make a contract with that store at Fourteenth and F Streets where thousands of people pass by every day, are you going to pay the same price for one down at Fourth and B Streets where only 50 people pass in the course of a day? My amendment would provide a fair way of advertising in that window or counter display.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the gentleman's amendment, at Fourteenth and F Streets, suppose I purchased 10,000 units with an agreement with the gentleman that I will sell through that distributing store, provided he gives me certain advertising allowances. If a man at Seventh and F Streets purchases the same number of units and makes the same distribution, is he entitled to the same advertising benefits?

Mr. BLOOM. That does not affect it here at all. I leave the word "proportionately" in. I am mentioning advertising specifically. I am saying to you this can be done, leaving this the way it is. You give every one the same kind of a deal all the way through. There is no discrimination here, but you have not advertising in here. There is no way that you can read advertising into it, notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] say there is. The word "advertising" is not in this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would read it in the words of line 22, page 8, where it says anything of value.

Mr. BLOOM. You can read it in, but it is not mentioned. You can read anything into it, and that is the trouble with the bill all the way through. You are reading a lot of things into the bill, but my amendment allows fair play to the manufacturer, and does not allow the destruction of the little manufacturer who wants to introduce his goods, but he cannot do it under this section of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand it, he could give the same benefit to all of the customers in the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. He could not do it; it would be impossible. There are no two windows alike, no two counters alike. One side of the street is different from the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. With all due deference to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], I may say that the committee, in considering the measure, gave a great deal of time to a discussion of the very things suggested by the gentleman from New York. It is the opinion of the committee that the bill in the form in which it is presented to the House fully protects all purchasers in the matter of advertising discounts, but it is also the opinion of the committee, after due deliberation, that if the bill were amended in the manner suggested by the gentleman from New York, it would be destructive of the purposes intended by the bill itself.

In other words, if you eliminate from consideration in this bill, in the matter of advertising discounts, window display, a situation might exist in which a company which does window-display advertising might put one of its display outfits in a window and then grant to a purchaser a substantial discount on account of that very fact. The bill as it is now drawn takes care of the situation amply.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield.

Mr. CURLEY. This bill, as I understand it, is fair; but how does it provide for these so-called loss leaders that we have so much talk about in the city of New York?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman's question is not germane to the point I am discussing. The gentleman can ask to strike out the last word and address himself to that point.

Mr. CURLEY. That is the question I asked the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. As a matter of fact, it will be taken care of, in the opinion of this committee, if this bill is passed, but I do not have time to go into that now.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. My amendment protects that; this being advertising, show-window and display advertising, that is actually made and delivered.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I understand that.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no fictitious advertising that can enter into it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I understand that.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman said advertising discounts. It is not advertising discounts at all. These people merely make a contract for a window display or a counter display, and that contract is a matter of public record, and the price they pay for it is a matter of record. There is nothing fictitious about it. It is actually made and paid for.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That contract contemplates that the manufacturer will pay the seller a certain amount for the use of his window.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is a discount under another name.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it the gentleman's thought that you cannot make any more window-display contracts?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Certainly not, but you can make them only on proportionately equal terms to all customers competing in the distribution of such product or commodity.

Mr. BLOOM. How can you do it on proportionately equal terms when there are no two places alike? Suppose one store is 25 feet and the other store is only 10 feet; what are you going to do with the 10-foot fellow? Give him a half a sign?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. You can give him a smaller sign. You do not have to cut the sign in two.

Mr. BLOOM. Then you will have all different kinds of signs; is that the idea?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They have all different kinds of signs now. What do you do today?

Mr. BLOOM. We do not do that. We would go broke if we did.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. At any rate, I may say that the amendment proposed has the effect, in the opinion of the committee, of destroying the very purpose of the bill so far as it affects the protection of the small purchaser on advertising discounts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask the gentleman from Nebraska or some other member of the committee the same question I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]. I do not read anything in this bill which would prevent the Coca Cola Co., for instance, from going to a druggist and making an agreement with him to put a sign across the top of his window. They can either pay him for it or they could do it for nothing. Am I correct?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is correct. But there must be no discrimination. He has to do it under such terms and conditions that there is no discrimination between competitors.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman does not understand my question. I say if he goes there, not in connection with the sale of Coca Cola, but goes to the merchant and says, "I want to put a Coca-Cola sign across the top of your window", but it has no connection with a sale, there is nothing to prevent that, is there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They would no doubt take into consideration whether or not that was a subterfuge in a sale or an independent transaction.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CULKIN: On page 9, strike out the proviso at the end of subsection (e), beginning in line 14 and ending in line 18, and insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing that the discrimination in price or furnishing of service or other facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet competition."

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset, for the purpose of meeting the probable suggestion that I am opposed to this bill, that I am not opposed to this bill. I am going to vote for it whether or not this amendment is adopted.

I have offered this amendment at the request of the farm organizations of America. The Members of the House received a letter from the various farm organizations, including the Farmers' National Grain Corporation, Northwestern Farmers' Union Legislative Committee, American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, in which it set forth a number of reasons why they were opposed to this bill. The amendment which I am now offering embodies one of those objections.

May I say that the farm cooperatives are, to my mind, the truly rational developments of American farming. Artificial aid of Government has never really functioned, but where the farmers have gone into cooperatives and have stood together shoulder to shoulder they have, as a rule, solved their problems. Through these organization they have eliminated one and sometimes two middlemen, and both the farmer and consumer are benefited.

Here is the way this bill, as it now stands, affects the Land O'Lakes cooperative, a great Minnesota dairy outfit:

This cooperative is selling butter in an eastern city. It goes to a local merchant, a grocer, we will say, and offers him some butter. He has been a regular customer. The grocer tells this Land O'Lakes representative: "I cannot buy your product; Swift, or Armour, is underselling you."

"All right; we will meet the competition. What are they offering?"

"Well, I cannot tell you what the packers are selling me for."

"Well, I will offer so-and-so."

"It is not a sufficient reduction."

"Then I will offer such a reduction."

Finally a price is agreed on. The grocer under that scheme of things does not disclose the price the packer is selling him the goods for; so this legislation is not copperplate, as the gentleman from Texas suggested, but it imposes an impossible duty upon this farm cooperative in selling its products under those circumstances.

I ask you gentlemen to consider the status of the farm cooperatives. They are carrying their own, they are ably officered. They are officered by intelligent, honest men, many of whom have come from the soil. Today they are marketing in America approximately $2,000,000,000 of farm products. One-quarter of the farm income is derived through the operation of these farm cooperatives. They speak vigorously and in thunder tones against this provision of the bill.

The zealous attitude, the zeal of the gentleman from Texas, is to be commended in this connection. He is a vigorous personality and has won his spurs in the House. I hope he will not take on the status of a killer and in fact destroy his own excellent work in this field by writing this impossible provision into this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CULKIN. I yield briefly.

Mr. FLETCHER. How differently does the gentleman's amendment affect the situation?

Mr. CULKIN. It does not require this cooperative to show at what price the other fellow is selling. That is what the bill as it is written requires. It imposes an impossible condition on the selling cooperative.

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

Mr. CULKIN. Briefly.

Mr. CELLER. In our State we have a milk-control board. They fix the price of milk. Certainly those outside the State selling in New York State should be able to meet that competition.

Mr. CULKIN. What the gentleman says is true. I want to call the attention of the House to this further fact. We have at the other end of this building a body known as the Senate which sometimes develops original traits; but they have already passed this bill and written into it the language:

Nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in prices made in good faith to meet competition.

That is what my amendment says, and I ask the members of the committee in all fairness to accept this really constructive amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman says, but this amendment, while offered under the guise of protecting farm cooperative associations, if adopted will open wide the gates not only to farm cooperatives but to every other kind of organization.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 7, line 7, after the word "established", insert a new section, to be known as subsection 2 (a) and to read as follows:

"That nothing herein contained shall be construed or applied in such a way as to increase the cost of goods, wares, or merchandise to the consumer."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to effect exactly what the proponents of the bill say it will do, namely, not increase the price of any goods, wares, or merchandise to the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 6, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25, and strike out also, on page 7, lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MEAD). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. What I seek to do by this amendment is to strike out what is known as the obnoxious restrictions concerning quantity discounts. The Borah-Van Nuys amendment provides that any discount may be given provided it is given equally to everyone under like conditions. The pending bill, however, states that you cannot treat everybody alike but that the Federal Trade Commission shall have something to say about it, shall have the right to fix a limitation beyond which you cannot go, regardless of the fact the buyer may purchase a million units and that millions of dollars may be involved in the order. The Federal Trade Commission can say: "Thus far you may go and no farther." It could under the bill—but not under the Constitution—interfere with your right of contract.

I have been criticized and twitted considerably because I have sought in a way to advance the opinions of the farm organizations in this Chamber. These farm organizations have seen fit to write to me. I do not know a single solitary representative of a farm organization; I would not know them if I were to fall over them; yet they have written to me because they look upon me as one who is seeking to advance their cause. I cannot help that. [Laughter.] I want to read to you this letter, whether you like it or not, whether you take me humorously or seriously. I asked them whether they were satisfied with the wording of the bill with reference to quantity discounts, because these are huge cooperative organizations buying and selling in trainload lots;

they indicated to me they were dissatisfied. This is the response I received from Mr. Chester Gray, Washington representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I I herewith give you his letter and my communication to him.

MAY 26, 1936.

Mr. CHESTER GRAY,
Washington representative,
American Farm Bureau Federation,
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GRAY: I note the various objections to the pending Patman bill, H. R. 8442, as set forth in the letter of May 25 signed by yourself and four other leading farm organizations.

Your letter is not clear, however, as to your attitude toward the section dealing with allowable quantity discounts—section 2 (a), subsection (2), on page 6, beginning with line 18.

You indicate in your letter that you favor elimination of "false allowances, false advertising allowances, and unreasonable quantity discounts." The inference is, of course, that you would insist on provisions in the bill to allow quantity discounts to cooperatives and all other large buyers, which would make it possible to pass on to such buyers the full savings of such quantity purchases; that is, savings in costs to the manufacturer due to elimination of selling expenses, advertising, warehousing, and similar overhead items.

Are you satisfied that the language of subsection (2) on page 6 permits of the full realization of these savings to cooperatives and other large buyers?

The language as it appears in the bill would seem to provide for such price differentials, but the special interpretation given this language by both the House committee and the Senate committee materially changes the apparent meaning of that language, in my opinion.

I should be glad to have your views on this point.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 26, 1936.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Replying to your letter of May 26, relative to the position of the farm organizations on the quantity-discount paragraph of the Patman bill (H. R. 8442), will say that this farm organization—and I believe all others—would insist on provisions which allow the full savings and economies of quantity purchases to be passed on by the manufacturer to such purchasers. It is only the unreasonable quantity discount which should be eliminated.

We have been somewhat puzzled by the special interpretation of the language of subsection (2) of section 2 (a), as given in the committee reports. These interpretations do seem to go far beyond the apparent meaning and intent of the language of the bill, which says that price discriminations between purchasers may be made "which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered." The language of the bill seems so clear at this point that we have been inclined to take it at face value, rather than to accept the explanation in the committee report.

If you think there is any possibility that the narrow interpretation of the committee might in later court action be adopted as the meaning of the language of the bill, we would be glad to join with you in endeavoring to get this language changed.

We would like to have you ask those in charge of this bill to state whether this language would permit the full economies of mass buying to be passed on to the buyer or whether such a buyer would be required to pay for facilities which he does not utilize, such as a pro-rata share of salesmen's expenses, advertising, warehousing, etc.?

If you do not get a satisfactory answer, we would urge you to insist upon changes in the language so as to allow all of the economies of mass cooperative buying to be passed on to the buyers.

Very respectfully,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CHESTER H. GRAY,
Washington Representative.

What does that mean? Suppose one of these cooperative farm organizations wants to buy some fertilizer. They go to a manufacturer and say, "We want to buy $50,000 worth of your products. We do not want to use your salesmen. We do not want to use your wholesalers or your jobbers. We do not want to avail ourselves of the benefit of any of your advertising, radio broadcasts, or any of that type of overhead. Now, what does it cost to conduct these radio programs?" The manufacturer says, "5 percent." "What is your advertising budget?" Another 5 percent. "What do you pay your salesmen?" Another 5 percent. The statement is made, "We are not going to use those facilities; therefore we want you to allow us the 15 percent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, they say, "We are not using the 15 percent that you have to lay out in these various directions. We want that difference allowed us. We do not use those facilities, so why should we not receive that difference which you otherwise pay for your advertising, for your radio, and for your wholesalers and salesmen?"

The farm organizations say that the quantity discount provisions as contained in this bill would not permit them to make these savings. It would not permit the manufacturers to give these allowances. The farm organizations and other large mass buyers feel they therefore would be prejudiced greatly by this bill. These savings they would be enabled to pass on to the farm cooperatives just as the other mass buyers would be precluded from passing on those savings to the consumers.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] whether or not he is willing to abide by what these farm organizations say in this regard?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, no real farm organization or no real farmer will oppose what this bill proposes to do in this regard. This bill seeks to prevent monopoly, the very thing that the farmer wants to prevent, and no friend of the farmer would want that provision stricken from the bill.

Mr. CELLER. I submit that is not an answer. I ask the gentleman what he thought of this letter from the farm organization with reference to a specific objection, and he speaks of monopolies. There is no monopoly anywhere. The Federal Trade Commission spent over a year and $1,000,000 to find out whether there was a monopoly in any trade or industry, and reported back there was no monopoly. So all this talk about monopolies and the great chain stores controlling everything in sight is just pure bunk and balderdash.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the favorable consideration of this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have debated these various amendments sufficiently. I think the membership understands them clearly. Therefore I ask for a vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: Page 7, line 7, after the word "established", insert: "*And provided further,* That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby empowered and directed, after due investigation and after hearings afforded to all interested parties, to determine, fix, and establish, and after like investigation and hearings, to modify and revise from time to time the maximum amounts (based on the percentage of the value of the merchandise affected, or otherwise) of the freight charges to be assumed, absorbed, or paid by a seller upon the sale of such merchandise; and the assumption, absorption, or payment of such freight charges in excess of the maximum amounts determined, fixed, and established as above provided shall be deemed to constitute unlawful price discrimination, and is hereby forbidden."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I was in hopes that the amendment which I have just offered would meet with the approval of the gentlemen in charge of the bill, as I consider it in thorough accord with the purposes of the bill. We now have a law which prohibits railroads from indulging in discrimination, a law which prevents them from giving rebates so far as freight charges are concerned. We have, however, no law affecting the freight charges paid by shippers. I have in mind a manufacturing concern in my district that informed me they are very much interested in this question. If they make a certain price to retailers and then

a larger manufacturing concern or importer by selling much larger quantities can afford to pay the freight, or a large proportion of the freight charges to the point of destination, it would be contrary to the purposes of this bill.

In this bill we give the Federal Trade Commission power to investigate and fix quantity discounts. This amendment would give them the same power to prevent similar discriminations with reference to the payment of freight charges to destination.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the question further, but I hope the gentlemen in charge of the bill will see their way clear to accept the amendment. I consider it in thorough accord with the purposes of the bill, and I may say that I am for the bill with or without this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some of us have gone into this question rather fully with the gentleman from Texas and others who are in favor of the amendment, and we do not think it is in accord with the purposes of this bill. It is what some call the basing point in reverse. This is a question that might well be considered in a separate bill, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will present the matter in a separate bill and urge consideration of it in that way and not attach it to this bill which is for a definite purpose that is not in accord with the amendment in our judgment. Therefore I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTSON: Page 7, line 9, after the word "where", insert "to avoid the hazards of depreciation of value of the product through decline of markets, or."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that I can offer an amendment that is in accord with the purposes of the bill. As a matter of fact, I have been assured by the committee members that the provisions contained in my amendment are already in subsection 3 on page 7 of the bill. At this point I want to repeat what I have previously said. No one is more interested than I in seeing eliminated and cured the abuses that have developed in the field of merchandising, much to the detriment of the independent merchants, but I do think we should make a serious effort to get as good a bill as we can.

The committee members contend that under subsection 3 the language, which authorizes price changes in response to changing conditions affecting the markets is sufficient to permit a man who has a perishable product to be marketed to cut his price in anticipation of a declining market in the future. My contention is that the committee bill takes into consideration only a condition that now exists, and in substantiation of that I point to the fact that they give these instances in that connection: "Such as imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court processes." These are conditions of a bad market that already exists.

Now, should not a man with apples or potatoes or vegetables, or any other kind of fruit, be permitted to exercise his sound judgment and discretion and anticipating the hazards of his market, cut the price when he thinks the market may decline, although the decline has not actually hit him. There is no use of giving a man the privilege of cutting his price when the market has already declined. He will have to then take what he can get.

We should be willing to put in this bill in haec verbis what the chairman of the committee assures me is in here, namely, that a man can cut his prices under circumstances of this kind in anticipation of the hazards of a decline of the market. If it is in here, why object to putting in language that we can all agree upon?

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Could not the seller do that under the bill if he offer the reduced price to everybody alike without any discrimination?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; I think possibly he could, but this may happen. In the morning of one day he sells to one man at one price and he learns of conditions that may affect his market—they have not happened, but in his judgment they are going to happen—and he wants to unload, and in the same town he sells at a lower price, which I say, as this section is now worded, he could not do with safety.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I ask that I may have 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. That is all right.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas one question which has not been satisfactorily discussed. My understanding is that the proviso, which, I believe, is in section 2 of the Clayton Act, is only referred to in this bill by implication, and there is no express repeal of it. Is this the fact?

Mr. MILLER. No; in this bill we amend section 2 of the Clayton Act "so as to read as follows", and this does away with the provisos in it. It is a reproduction of the same language.

Mr. MASSINGALE. It is a reproduction of the same language?

Mr. PATMAN. Except that all the weasel phrases are cut out.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay the House in the consideration of this bill. A short time ago I called attention to the desires of the steel industries in Ohio to have the proviso in the Senate bill put into the House bill. And in support of their contention I want to read a few lines. They say:

If this amendment is not retained, then we are out of business for long-distance shipments. This is a very vital amendment and must remain in the bill, if monopolies due to geographical locations are not to be created. In other words, unless we have this amendment, the local seller can reduce his price so that the distant manufacturer cannot possibly compete, and competition is ruined. You know the result, of course, when the distant manufacturer has dried up and torn down his mills to save taxes; then the local manufacturer increases prices because his competition has been removed.

I wanted to make that statement so that it can go into the RECORD, and I trust the proviso in the Senate bill will be accepted by the House.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, I may say that the committee gave due consideration to his proposed amendment, and feels that if the amendment is adopted it will open the door to a situation in which the manufacturer or anyone engaged in a selling activity could discriminate and excuse the discrimination on the ground of a future drop in the market.

The committee feels that section 3 is drawn to take care of that situation, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the Sugar Institute case relied upon by the distinguished attorney from New York [Mr. CELLER], who stated, on page 8342 of the RECORD, that any lawyer worth his salt would have to say that this bill is unconstitutional. He gave us an excerpt from that case which in itself, if properly applied, shows the contrary and that this bill is really constitutional.

But I want to call attention to another thing that the Supreme Court said in that case:

The restrictions imposed by the Sherman Act are not mechanical or artificial. We have repeatedly said that they set up the essential standard of reasonableness. (*Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States*, 221 U. S. 1; *United States* v. *American Tobacco Co.*, 221 U. S. 106.) They are aimed at contracts and combinations which "by reason of intent or the inherent nature of the contemplated acts, prejudice the public interests by unduly restraining competition or unduly obstructing the course of trade" (*Nash* v. *United States*, 229 U. S. 373, 376; *United States* v. *American Linseed Oil Co.*, 262 U. S.

371, 388, 389). Designed to frustrate unreasonable restraints, they do not prevent the adoption of reasonable means to protect interstate commerce from destructive or injurious practices and to promote competition upon a sound basis.

This bill is exactly in line with that decision. It is an attempt to adopt reasonable means to protect interstate commerce from destructive and injurious practices and to promote competition on a sound basis. It is designed to do away with fraudulent practices and secret rebates. It prevents unfair and destructive discriminations which work against the small country storekeeper and in favor of the big and powerful merchant. It prevents unfair discriminations only. It allows and upholds fair and open practices. For example, it allows proper and reasonable discounts and allowances for quantity purchasing. But such discounts and allowances must not be tricky and fraudulent ones. They must not be allowances which are discriminatory. The jobber, under the bill, will have a perfect right to give discounts resulting from quantity purchases provided that these discounts have a reasonable relation to the transaction itself and are based on the difference in the cost of manufacture or of sale or of delivery. What else ought they to be based upon? The manufacturer can give a discount to quantity purchasers if it is based upon a difference in the cost of manufacturing a large quantity instead of the small amount; or if it is based upon the difference in selling a large quantity instead of a small amount; or if it is based upon the difference in cost of delivering a quantity instead of a small amount. The bill has been misrepresented in this respect. And these are the very kind or character of things that were upheld in the Sugar Institute case. In that case the lower court enjoined the suger-refining companies from engaging in some 45 activities. About 2 months ago the Supreme Court of the United States passed upon it and upheld about 42 or 43 of these injunctions, and thereby appellants were prevented from doing many things that were in restraint of interstate and foreign commerce in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Instead of being an authority against the legality of the present proposal, the Sugar Institute case undoubtedly warrants us in saying that the present bill is constitutional. Just why the distinguished jurist and gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] cited it and quoted from it is very strange. And when he said in his speech that any lawyer worth his salt would have to agree that the present bill is unconstitutional, he was undoubtedly indulging in hyperbole, which in rhetoric is defined to be a figure of speech in which the expression is exaggerated fancifully through excitement or for effect.

Along the same line, something has been said in argument about the burden of proof, and it has been asserted that the bill is not constitutional because those who have specific and certain knowledge of their own good faith are permitted to prove it. We should distinguish between the duty of going forward with the evidence and the burden of proof. It is often wise to place the burden of producing evidence on the party best able to sustain it. It is very often held that where the party who does not have the original burden of proof, but who does possess positive and complete knowledge concerning the existence of facts which his opponent is called upon to negative; or, where, for any reason, the evidence to prove a fact is chiefly, if not entirely, within the control of the party who does not have the general or original burden of proof, then the burden of going forward with and producing this evidence rests upon him who does have the facts primarily and chiefly within his possession.

Paragraph (e) of section 2 of the bill does not provide that the burden of proof shall shift at any stage of the proceedings. On the other hand, it provides that, after it has been shown that a discrimination in price has really occurred, then the duty of going forward with the evidence to show justification and good faith rests upon the party who has almost exclusive possession of such evidence of good faith, and who has easy means of proving it. We should pass the bill and send it to conference.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] early this afternoon stated a case where an apple grower sells 10,000 bushels of apples for a dollar a bushel and then receives a cable from Liverpool saying that the market in Europe is going to pieces, and, on account of that and in anticipation of the bad market here, sells in the same city of Cincinnati 100,000 bushels of apples at 75 cents a bushel to another customer, and the gentleman stated that under this act the apple farmer would be liable to the penalty clauses of the bill. Is that correct or not?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Of course, there is no penalty clause in the bill, in the first place. But if there were, I would say, in the opinion of the committee, he would not be liable.

Mr. BIERMANN. What excuse would he have for doing that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. He would have the excuse provided in the bill in its present form in paragraph 3—that nothing therein contained shall prevent price changes from time to time in response to changing conditions affecting the market.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the gentleman admits that he cannot anticipate a change, but that it must exist.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 23, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert them in the place where the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] earlier in the day yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 9, line 24, after the word "association", insert a new subsection as subsection (g), as follows:

"Nothing herein shall prevent price discriminations to meet competition resulting from the importation of goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, grown, or produced outside of continental United States."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 9, line 19, strike out all in lines 19 to 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Nothing in this section contained shall prevent the payment or acceptance of commissions, brokerage, or other compensation to or by cooperative organizations, corporate or otherwise, for actual services rendered or performed in the purchase or sale of merchandise where such cooperative organizations return to their constituent members or stockholders the whole or any part of the net surplus derived from their operations, in the form of dividends or otherwise."

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MEAD, 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. 8442, and that, pursuant to Resolution 523, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-eight Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Adair	Duffey, Ohio	Lanham	Rayburn
Andresen	Dunn, Miss.	Larrabee	Sanders, La.
Andrew, Mass.	Englebright	Lea, Calif.	Schaefer
Andrews, N. Y.	Ferguson	Lee, Okla.	Sears
Barden	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Short
Blackney	Fish	McGroarty	Sisson
Brennan	Gearhart	McLean	Steagall
Brooks	Gray, Pa.	McSwain	Utterback
Buckley, N. Y.	Green	Montet	Wadsworth
Bulwinkle	Gwynne	Moran	Werner
Burch	Higgins, Mass.	Norton	Wilcox
Carter	Hoeppel	O'Day	Wood
Cary	Hope	Oliver	Zioncheck
Casey	Huddleston	O'Malley	
Culkin	Jenckes, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.	
Disney	Kee	Powers	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIES) there were—ayes 290 and noes 16.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 3154, which is a bill passed by the Senate dealing with the same subject matter as the bill H. R. 8442, be taken from the Speaker's table and amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of the House bill which has just been passed, and then I shall move to vacate the proceedings by which the House bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3154, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the provisions of the House bill which has just been passed. Is there objection?

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSPORTATION OF MERCHANDISE BY OTHER THAN COMMON CARRIERS IN THE PORT OF NEW YORK

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 589, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers in the port of New York district. That is a privilege that is accorded every port in the United States. However, the situation in New York is different. The port of New York district, under executive order of the President, embraces three ports, the ports of New York, Perth Amboy, and Newark. They are all in one district, created by Executive order of the President. It is the custom in other ports to move this merchandise in bond by the importers or private carriers. Under the situation which existed in New York until recently, we had that privilege. However, a late ruling of the Secretary has held, under section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and 873-A of the Customs Regulations of 1931, that on account of the peculiar conditions at New York, this merchandise would have to move by common carrier, and not as in other port districts.

There are no facilities for the movement of these goods between ports in that district by common carrier. The oil and the lumber industries are particularly affected. They have specially designed trucks and lighters to transport this oil and lumber. There are no facilities furnished by common carriers whatever. It is in order to give the privilege to these industries to move their bonded merchandise as in other ports that this resolution is offered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this a unanimous report from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. KENNEY. It is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this in any way affect the obligation of the bond?

Mr. KENNEY. None whatever.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Regardless of whether it is carried by contract carrier or by common carrier, the bond still is in force and effect?

Mr. KENNEY. Absolutely. The merchandise will be bonded in any event.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, was this ruling made by Executive order?

Mr. KENNEY. The ruling was made by the Secretary of the Treasury recently, that the cartage would have to be by common carrier, although for years, up until recently, the port of New York had the same privilege as other ports. However, by reason of the fact that the Executive order creating the port of New York district reserved to the ports of Perth Amboy and New York the rights and privileges of separate ports of entry, this amendment now is necessary in order to cure the inequitable situation existing in the port of New York.

Mr. RICH. It is to perfect the inequalities in the Executive order.

Mr. KENNEY. No; it is not that. The Executive order was issued following an act of Congress which approved a treaty between the States of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEY. I yield.

Mr. CROWTHER. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other Members present that this bill was given careful consideration by the subcommittee and also by the full committee and was reported unanimously. It does not in any way endanger the revenue. It is made necessary by the inclusion of these three ports as one—Newark, Perth Amboy, and New York City.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this in any way affect the present lottery laws?

Mr. KENNEY. Not at all, but I may say to the gentleman from Texas that yesterday up in Pennsylvania Senator NYE made a statement in which he said that within the next 10 years there would be a legal lottery law. My every effort is to bring this law into effect within 1 year. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, when it appears to him to be in the interest of commerce, and notwithstanding any provision of law or regulation requiring that the transportation of imported merchandise be by a bonded common carrier, to permit such merchandise which has been entered and examined for customs purposes to be transported by bonded cartmen or bonded lightermen between the ports of New York, Newark, and Perth Amboy, which are all included in customs collection district no. 10 (New York): *Provided*, That this resolution shall not be construed to deprive any of the ports affected of its rights and privileges as a port of entry.

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

TRANSFER OF LAND TO KENTUCKY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11916) to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., to the State of Kentucky, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SPENCE. This is a piece of land that was ceded to the National Government by the State of Kentucky in 1886 for lock and dam purposes. A highway has been built upon the land and now they want to make the highway a permanent structure, but the Highway Commission of the State of Kentucky will not proceed with it unless title to this land is vested in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why should we take the bill up tonight instead of waiting until the Consent Calendar is called on Monday?

Mr. SPENCE. This is the bill of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY], who is sick in the hospital.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will not make any difference in the status of the matter whether it is considered today or Monday, will it?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think there is any possible objection to this particular bill. It is only a small piece of land, sixty-five one-hundredths of an acre, which the War Department values at $5.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If we are going to pass all these bills by unanimous consent there will be nothing to do on Monday.

Mr. SPENCE. That will not be any great calamity, will it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think they ought to be taken up in the regular way.

Mr. SPENCE. I ask the gentleman to be a little indulgent about this bill. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY] has had no opportunity to be here to take care of it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the bill accompanied by a report from any committee?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors reported the bill favorably. The War Department values the land at $5.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for State road purposes, without expense to the United States, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the property line between the United States and R. V. Hammers and wife, the said point of beginning being 30 feet left and opposite station 905+40 in the center line of survey made by the Kentucky State Highway Commission; thence running with the said property line south 31° E. 295 feet, more or less, to a point in the property line between the United States and J. S. Bowles and wife, the said point being 23 feet left and opposite station 908+23 in the center line of survey; thence running with the last-named property line south 60° E. 21 feet, more or less, to a point 30 feet left and opposite station 908+40 in the center line of survey; thence running 30 feet from and parallel with the center line of 2°41′ curve in a northwesterly direction 182 feet, more or less, to a point 30 feet left and opposite station 906+58.7 in the center line of survey; thence continuing 30 feet from and parallel with the center line of 16° curve 182 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, as shown by plans on file at the office of the State highway department, Frankfort, Ky.

Such conveyance shall contain the express condition that if the State of Kentucky shall at any time cease to use said land for road or highway purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such land, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

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

BRIDGE ACROSS PASCAGOULA RIVER, WILKERSON'S FERRY, MISS.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4533) granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will not the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. COLMER. The bill provides for the erection of a free bridge across this river, which is in Jackson County, Miss., at a place where a small hand ferry is now being operated. It merely gives the State highway department the authority to construct a free bridge across the river at that point.

Mr. HOLMES. The gentleman is merely taking the precaution of getting the consent of Congress so that in the future should the question of the navigability of the stream at that point be raised, the gentleman will not be faced with the fact that he has not the sanction of Congress.

Mr. COLMER. That is so.

Mr. HOLMES. Otherwise it is an intrastate bridge and Congress would have no jurisdiction over it.

Mr. COLMER. Quite so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this bridge will be paid for wholly by the State and that there will be no bonds which will have to be retired from revenues?

Mr. COLMER. I may say in answer to the question that there have been no definite provisions made for the construction of a bridge at this point. This merely authorizes the State highway department to construct a free bridge.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I infer from the fact this is a free bridge that there will be no tolls charged for the use of it, and it will be constructed at the expense of the State of Mississippi?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on offering such a bill. It is rather unusual.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Pascagoula River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

DR. F. U. PAINTER, ET AL.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9125) for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire,

Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, and Dr. E. O. Arnold.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. KLEBERG. The amendment consists of adding another doctor's name, who was the subject of relief in this bill. One of the doctors died after an acute attack of appendicitis while on leave of absence from the S. S. *Brazos*.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the committee approved this change?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes. The House passed the bill sometime ago, and this doctor's name was inadvertently omitted. There was no increase in the amount.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a short statement with reference to the Black Legion and to include therein two short letters and a telegram.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this ought to go in the Appendix of the daily RECORD.

THE BLACK LEGION AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute, and to read two short letters and a telegram.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to speak for one-half minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the disclosures showing the activities of the Black Legion in Michigan are startling, but, analyzed, it will be discovered that the horror with which those activities are viewed may be traced, in part at least, to the extremes to which they have been carried; that is, to personal violence, to floggings, to murder.

The objectives of the organization are old; that is, the collection of revenue from those to whom regalia is sold and the grasping and exercise of an arbitrary power. Nor is there anything new in the method of obtaining these objectives; that is, by threat, intimidation, and the creation of fear.

May 5 I received from Benton Harbor, in my district, from someone who was displeased because of my refusal to back the Townsend plan, which its claimed author said would give to everyone, with certain qualifications, whether he needed it or not, who was upward of 60 years of age, a pension of $200 per month, a letter, which, referring to the Townsend committee, made, among others, the following statements:

You saps better look in glass and see if you see some green grass sprouting, as you are all going to have a green place two by six before many months unless you get doing something for the people.

You better start soon or the K. K. K. boy will give you a ride, as we are not all monkeys, as you think the most people are in your one-track mind. The big B has been looking after both old parties and they are rotten as hell and lots of us are in shape to take it in our hands to take all ——— for a ride.

I would like to punch that dirty mug of yours. * * * Seven spoke at meeting other night, and you are condemned a traitor and not fit to represent a dog house.

Yours for a fight mighty sooner than you expect.

K. K. K. MEMBER.

Don't get too many feathers in your hat, as all can be clipped or taken in a short time.

K. K. K.

Look out for the hood.

You need the limit, and I cannot say just what that will be; you are going to get a plenty of trouble brought on yourself.

In the same mail came another letter from a Townsendite, who, among other things, said:

You dirty, lazy boondoggling son of a —— have nothing to do but go around the country trying to discredit American citizens.

* * * * * * *

You Wall Street sons of —— are fighting for your life.

You lousy sons of a ——, I would like to meet you face to face and tell you what I think of you dirty thieves.

And there were only 163 words in this letter.

These are only samples. There are many others. The favorite sport—outdoor, indoor, summer, and winter—of some people, including a few reporters and editorial writers, seems to be jumping on Congressmen. Perhaps Congressmen should not criticize these efforts. Their authors are following what seems to be becoming a common practice—that is, the making of threats, the creating of fear, the withholding of benefits, unless certain political action is taken.

Not long ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of forms given to those seeking relief work, which required the applicant to disclose how he had voted, whether he had contributed to the Democratic organization, and the amount, if any, which he had contributed since a certain date. This was the Democratic practice followed in my home district, the Fourth Michigan.

However, apparently is it not local, and for evidence let me quote the following telegram and letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 18, 1936*.

Personal.

CHARLES NELSON,

Mac Sim Bar Paper Co., Otsego, Mich.:

Our Mr. J. F. Gormeley will call on you Tuesday. Will appreciate your seeing him.

W. FORBES MORGAN,
Secretary, Democratic Committee.

MAC SIM BAR PAPER CO.,
Otsego, Mich., May 25, 1936.

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: We are sending you the enclosed information which you may use as you see fit. Further explaining this matter, will say that the enclosed telegram was received on the morning of May 19, and 30 minutes later Mr. Gormeley called me on the telephone and wanted an appointment, from Kalamazoo.

Upon this request we asked him what the appointment was for, and he said he wanted us to subscribe to the Democratic campaign fund. We advised him that we didn't believe we would be interested today in making a subscription and he asked me, in a very insolent manner, what I meant by "today." I repeated the answer and he asked me if we would be interested in subscribing at a later date and we told him we did not think so.

Then he asked me, in a very nasty manner, if we wanted him to report this to Washington, that we refused to contribute to this fund. My answer was "Yes." The telephone was immediately slammed up and this ended the conversation.

If you do not care to use this information just forget about it.

Yours truly,

MAC SIM BAR PAPER CO.,
C. E. NELSON, *President.*

The Mac Sim Bar Paper Co. is a large, legitimate business organization, conducting its business in a legal manner and in accordance with recognized trade practices. No fault of any kind is found by anyone with the way in which it does business, so far as its management is aware.

Yet here is a telegram from W. Forbes Morgan—and, by the way, what is his relationship, if any, to the Roosevelts?—secretary of the Democratic National Committee, telling the president of that company that Mr. Morgan's Mr. Gormeley will call upon him, and Mr. Gormeley in effect telling this paper company that it had better come across with a cam-

paign contribution, and threatens that if it does not its action will be reported to Washington.

Is the Mac Sim Bar Paper Co. to be harassed by Federal agents investigating trumped-up charges?

And, after all, what is the difference between the objectives of the Black Legion and the New Deal administration?

The Black Legion wants its way at all costs. Apparently it wants money. It enforces its will by intimidation.

The New Deal is always grasping for power. It is continually taking the funds of one class of citizens and giving them to another. Common knowledge, as well as the decisions of the Supreme Court, establishes this.

Here we are in a campaign year. Those seeking their share of public funds appropriated for relief, and to which they are entitled, are required to give allegiance to the Democratic Party before they can get it.

Here is a telegram from the secretary of the Democratic National Committee arranging for an appointment for his agent to meet the head of a business concern, and that agent informs the president of the business concern that if he does not, in common parlance, "come across" he will be reported to Washington—a threat, an attempt to intimidate, to create fear.

The secretary of the Democratic National Committee cannot, like the hooded legion, beat up on the Mac Sim Bar Paper Co., but he can issue threats, vague and uncertain, as to what will happen if his wishes are not followed.

If my conclusions seem farfetched, read Macfadden in Liberty. Read Senator DICKINSON in the same magazine. Read George N. Peek, former Triple A Administrator, in the Saturday Evening Post. Read almost any national newspaper or magazine.

By all means, let the authorities clean up the Black Legion. And, while it is being done, let the New Deal set its own house in order.

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES AFFECTING THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me from the Secretary of Commerce and a copy of my letter to him.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence with the Secretary of Commerce:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 27, 1936.

Hon. VITO MARCANTONIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I desire to refer to the matter of the statements of the seamen which you transmitted to me with your letter of April 29. At that time we had in mind the appointment of a special committee for the purpose of making a careful and thorough investigation of the allegations contained in the statements. It was thought that the committee to be seleced should be along the lines of the proposed Marine Casualty Investigating Committee, provided for in H. R. 8599, then in the final stages of passage in Congress. However, prior to the enactment of that legislation, Senator COPELAND, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, appointed a special subcommittee for the purpose of making investigations into various charges affecting the merchant marine, and inasmuch as such an investigation by the Senate committee would necessarily duplicate and overlap any investigation which might be made by the special committee that we had in mind, it was believed that in the interest of economy and expedition of these matters, that they should be handled by the same committee.

Furthermore, Chairman COPELAND'S committee will look into certain claims presented by ship operators and it would appear quite desirable that in order that his committee may develop the entire picture as a whole, the committee should also examine into the allegations made by the seamen.

This arrangement having met with the approval of Chairman COPELAND and officials of the Department of Commerce, we are turning over the statements of the seamen to Chairman COPELAND, by whom I am confident a thorough and comprehensive investigation will be conducted.

Very sincerely,

DANIEL C. ROPER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Copy of letter sent by Congressman MARCANTONIO to Hon. Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce, in answer to Mr. Roper's letter sent to the Congressman, May 27, 1936:

MAY 27, 1936.

Hon. DANIEL C. ROPER,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me your letter of the 27th instant in which you advise me that the memorandum containing serious charges of lack of safety at sea submitted by the striking seamen of New York City has been turned over to the committee appointed by Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND for a "thorough and comprehensive investigation."

It is most unfortunate that these charges have been turned over to this committee. The striking seamen have no faith in the committee appointed by Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND. The so-called representatives of labor on that committee are Mr. David Grange, Mr. John Bley, and Mr. Paul Sharenberg. These gentlemen are not truly representative of labor. Furthermore, their records of opposition to the striking seamen who have presented these charges to you and at your request disqualify them to sit as impartial judges of these charges.

Mr. Bley's strong-armed tactics against seamen are well known. He is completely out of harmony with the principles for which these men are striking. Mr. Sharenberg was expelled from his own local by an overwhelming vote. His expulsion disqualifies him from sitting as a representative of labor. Mr. David Grange has been repeatedly repudiated by the rank and file of his own union. He was one of the officials who signed an agreement with shipowners after a similar agreement had been rejected by an overwhelming vote of five to one by the seamen at a referendum. Despite this decision on the part of the seamen, Mr. Grange and his colleagues arbitrarily signed a similar agreement with the shipowners. Only several weeks ago Mr. Grange sought to enjoin these seamen who have presented these charges to you from striking. The character of the testimony presented by Mr. Grange was so repulsive that even Mr. Grange's attorneys were compelled to withdraw the application in the midst of the trial. How can Mr. Grange sit as an impartial judge and pass with fairness on the charges made by these same seamen whom he has fought for the past 3 months?

In view of the character of the so-called labor personnel of this committee, it is obvious that the charges presented to you cannot receive a thorough and comprehensive investigation at their hands.

Furthermore, on April 2 you informed me as follows:

"With reference to the conference held yesterday with you and a group of seamen, headed by Mr. Curran of New York, I am anxious to immediately take proper action on any and all matters affecting safety of life at sea. I hope, therefore, you may be able to furnish me the memorandum promised."

On April 28 I submitted this memorandum, composed of 110 statements signed by the seamen. On the same day you acknowledged receipt of this memorandum. You will also recall that at the meeting held before you on April 21 you promised to conduct a thorough investigation of this matter. In view of the so-called labor personnel of the committee appointed by Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND, in view of the seriousness of the charges made by the seamen, in view of your promise to investigate these charges, I submit that turning these charges over to this committee is tantamount to ordinary "buck passing." The responsibility "to immediately take proper action on any and all matters affecting safety at sea", and these words are your own, rests with you and your department. In my opinion, the transferral of these charges to this committee evades this responsibility. I must, therefore, strongly urge that you carry out the promise made by you to these seamen and that you conduct a fair and impartial investigation of these charges.

Very truly yours,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES AROUND SAN ANTONIO, TEX., AND WHAT IT MEANS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from the Secretary of War together with a few complimentary remarks which I may make about the Secretary of War.

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

There was no objection.

SAN ANTONIO'S GREAT MILITARY CENTER

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently mentioned the fact that I represent the county of Bexar, State of Texas, in which is located San Antonio, Tex.; and in my district is the greatest military center in America.

We have numerous air fields and depots, quartermaster depots, old Fort Sam Houston, a great arsenal, and tactical grounds.

In the upkeep of these posts and the continuation of efficient service to the Nation, I have constantly cooperated

with the Secretary of War, who tells me that the War Department appreciates "your deep interest in the Army and your efforts in its behalf." He says that the results obtained are best evidenced by the sums of money expended by and for the Army in and near San Antonio to the lasting good not only of national defense but of the community as well.

LETTER OF SECRETARY OF WAR

The full letter of the Secretary of War is as follows:

MAY 26, 1936.

Hon. MAURY MAVERICK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MAVERICK: In reply to your letter of May 7, 1936, wherein you request information about Army properties and expenditures at San Antonio, Tex., the following data has been prepared:

WAR DEPARTMENT PROPERTIES NEAR SAN ANTONIO

a. Résumé of War Department properties in and near San Antonio, Tex., their value, etc.:

Name	Acreage	Land value, 1929	Buildings and improvements, replacement value	Total value
Brooks Field	954.27	$476,750.00	$1,357,720	$1,834,470.00
Kelly Field	2,656.09	646,187.00	1,784,210	2,430,397.00
Normoyle quartermaster depot	88.12	50,400.00	2,353,724	2,404,124.00
Randolph Field	2,318.79	579,697.50	11,172,036	11,751,733.50
Fort Sam Houston	3,270.53	3,607,982.50	13,936,992	17,544,974.50
San Antonio air depot	423.59	(1)	954,553	954,553.00
San Antonio Arsenal	19.65	750,000.00	1,825,000	2,575,000.00
Leon Springs	21,816.84	(2)	(2)	(2)
San Antonio National Cemetery	67.74	25,821.00	74,180	100,001.00
Total	31,615.62	6,136,838.00	33,458,415	39,595,253.00

[1] Included in Kelly Field.
[2] Included in San Antonio Arsenal.

AMOUNT ANNUALLY SPENT IN SAN ANTONIO

b. The amount annually spent by the Government through the War Department agencies at San Antonio covers such items as pay, subsistence, fuel, repairs, upkeep, etc. The total of all such expenditures for an average normal year is approximately $19,500,000. This amount includes expenditures at all of the stations listed above. During the past year, however, the expenditures were approximately $17,000,000 more than the above figure, or a total of $36,500,000, due to C. C. C. and relief expenditures. These figures are as close and reasonably accurate estimates as can be made within a short period of time.

RECENT BUILDING EXPENSE

c. The following table shows the amounts spent each year since 1932 on buildings and extraordinary expenses, including fuel, light, power, operating supplies, maintenance, and repair of buildings and structures and new construction:

Station	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936
Brooks Field	$72,018	$55,280.00	$56,864	$52,133	$208,505
Kelly Field	123,310	97,159.00	231,402	46,636	583,845
Normoyle quartermaster depot	40,818	41,613.00	36,623	23,337	83,218
Randolph Field	506,668	542,387.07	1,488,147	163,788	147,567
Fort Sam Houston	894,187	851,186.00	3,795,155	2,500,416	403,916
San Antonio:					
Air depot	434,740	241,137.00	176,751	75,154	211,804
Arsenal	151,860	148,789.00	148,579	149,081	185,000
National cemetery	5,242	4,612.00	3,952	12,508	9,418

Totals spent for buildings and extraordinary expenses:

1932	$2,228,843.00
1933	1,982,163.07
1934	5,937,473.00
1935	3,023,053.00
1936	1,833,273.00

THE SECRETARY OF WAR SAYS

The War Department appreciates your deep interest in the Army and your efforts in its behalf. The results obtained are best evidenced by the sums of money expended by and for the Army in and near San Antonio, to the lasting good not only of the national defense but of the community as well.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) GEO. H. DERN,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of War, is a level-headed civilian and not a noisy militarist. He was Governor of Utah, where he delivered the goods in the most capable manner and was selected by Mr. Roosevelt as a western Democrat of great executive ability to be Secretary of War.

Mr. Dern has constantly refused to connect himself with any move to restrict civil liberties; he did not encourage the military disaffection bill, which would have taken freedom away from the American people, and finally gave a public statement to the effect that he did not favor that character of legislation and thereby effectively killed it.

It has been a custom in this country not to get a militarist or military man to be Secretary of War, but to appoint an outstanding civilian of administrative and executive experience.

I appreciate the good will of the Secretary of War personally, and on behalf of my people.

By unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD in tabular form, precisely as issued by Military Affairs Committee, a list of the membership indicating also rank and seniority, with States:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS
SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

John J. McSwain, South Carolina, chairman.
Lister Hill, Alabama.
Numa F. Montet, Louisiana.
Andrew J. May, Kentucky.
Ewing Thomason, Texas.
William N. Rogers, New Hampshire.
Dow W. Harter, Ohio.
Charles I. Faddis, Pennsylvania.
Clarence W. Turner, Tennessee.
Andrew Edmiston, West Virginia.
Edwin M. Schaefer, Illinois.
J. Joseph Smith, Connecticut.
Matthew J. Merritt, New York.
Maury Maverick, Texas.
Frank J. G. Dorsey, Pennsylvania.
John M. Costello, California.
J. Mark Wilcox, Florida.
Paul J. Kvale, Minnesota.
Harry C. Ransley, Pennsylvania.
Walter G. Andrews, New York.
Donald H. McLean, New Jersey.
Charles A. Plumley, Vermont.
Sam L. Collins, California.
Dewey Short, Missouri.
L. C. Arends, Illinois.
Samuel W. King, Hawaii.
Kenneth Anderson, clerk.
A. E. Sloan, assistant clerk.

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN BILL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by me to the Federal Trade Commission and their reply thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the legislation under consideration—the Robinson-Patman bill—to outlaw price discrimination and unfair trade practices, is vitally necessary to stability of business throughout the country and the maintenance of fair prices to the consumer everywhere.

For the information of the Members of the House, I include in these remarks a copy of a bill which was introduced by myself to prohibit manufacturers' special rebates, and so forth, a copy of my letter to the Federal Trade Commission and the Commission's reply thereto.

[H. R. 6246, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to prohibit manufacturers' special rebates or discounts to chain- or branch-store organizations competing with independent retail establishments, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer, directly or indirectly, by any special price, rebate, discount, or other device, to charge, demand, collect, or receive from any chain store or mail-order organization, or any similar or other retail sales organization, or any unit or branch thereof, which competes with independent or individual retail establishments, a lesser price for goods, wares, or merchandise than it charges, demands, collects, or receives from any other individual, partnership, association, or corporation for like goods, wares, or merchandise. Any individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this act shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor

more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 6 months nor more than 2 years, or both.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1935.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This office is in receipt of a number of petitions asking for certain relief, signed by a majority of representative businessmen of the important cities and towns of the First Congressional District of Idaho which I have the duty to represent.

The petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, citizens of this congressional district, earnestly and respectfully petition, urge, and request you, as our Representative in the Congress, to use your best efforts in securing national legislation necessary to abolish and prohibit the nefarious discriminatory practice of manufacturers granting special secret rebates and discounts to the so-called chain stores, mail-order houses, and other syndicates operating in opposition to the independent business interests of the country, regardless of the pretext or subterfuge under which such discounts, rebates, or other special privileges and benefits may be granted."

Doubtless your Commission has information concerning trade practices which are unfair and constitute unfair competition, which the petitioners seek to have checked and eliminated. It is apparent that the practice referred to is designed to destroy and eliminate competition, with the ultimate objective of permitting profiteering by price-fixing methods, which is, to my mind, a large contributing factor in creating the present business instability and the resulting depression the country is now experiencing.

I should appreciate a report from your Commission on this matter, with any recommendations you may care to make to correct the abuses complained of.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, February 15, 1935.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing in reply to your letter of February 12, setting forth petition received from citizens of your district, with respect to alleged practice of manufacturers granting rebates to chain stores, etc.

You may recall that in response to Senate Resolution 224, Seventieth Congress, first session, the Federal Trade Commission made an exhaustive investigation of the chain-store industry, and as a result of such inquiry submitted to the Senate some 33 factual reports covering various phases of the industry. A list of these reports is enclosed. The reports have been printed as Senate documents. Copies of any of these reports if available, and which may be of especial interest to you or to your constituents, will be furnished upon request.

At the conclusion of the inquiry the Commission submitted to the Senate on December 14, 1934, its final report, including conclusions and recommendations based upon the factual material theretofore reported to the Senate. This final report is now in the hands of the Public Printer and copies are expected to be available for distribution within a very short while. I have listed your name to receive a copy as soon as available.

In the meantime there is transmitted for your information an uncorrected page proof of the final report, together with separate copy in mimeographed form, of the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission. Additional copies may be had upon request. It is believed that the subject matter of the petition to which you refer in your letter of February 12 is covered by the final report and conclusions and recommendations of the Commission.

In pursuance of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Commission is charged with the duty of preventing unfair methods of competition in commerce; by the provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act it is charged with the duty of preventing certain other practices, such as unlawful price discriminations, tying contracts, stock acquisitions, and interlocking directorates. The Commission is, of course, ready at all times to receive and investigate complaints of practices in alleged violation of the laws which it administers, and if your constituents desire to lay before the Commission evidence of such alleged unlawful practices, the Commission will give as prompt attention to the matter as possible.

If you care to submit the names and addresses of a limited number of your constituents who are especially interested in the subject matter, I am sure the Commission will be pleased to forward a copy of its final chain-store report when available, which report will include its conclusions and recommendations.

If additional information on the subject is desired, I shall be glad to attempt a prompt reply to your further inquiry.

Respectfully,

OTIS B. JOHNSON, *Secretary.*

The unfair trade practices that will be curbed by the Robinson-Patman bill go far beyond the grocery trade and extend into the merchandising of most of the necessities used on the farms and in basic industries—implements, tools, and supplies of all kinds. In a word, trade practices that have operated to destroy competition, to be followed by price fixing after competitors have been driven out of business, creating a condition that permits a monopoly and the exaction of exorbitant and unfair prices, will upset price parity and undermine the business structure throughout the country. It is apparent that business must be rescued from this perilous situation, and I am unqualifiedly in favor of passing this bill.

ADDRESS AT THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech which I recently delivered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address delivered by me before the Republican State convention, Peoria, Ill., May 22, 1936:

We are met today in the heart of one of the great Commonwealths of the Nation to ponder the past, to take inventory of the present, and to find hope and inspiration for the future. We meet within a short distance of the very place where Abraham Lincoln, patron saint of our party, 82 years ago, defined the issues of his day, forecast the crisis that was then impending, and reaffirmed his devotion to sound moral, economic, and political principles as the only remedy to cure the malady which then afflicted our people. We meet to hear the standard bearers of our party, to dedicate ourselves to an earnest and forthright Republicanism, to pledge ourselves to harmony of spirit, purpose, and action, and to engender a crusading zeal that will insure victory to our cause in November.

In approaching this solemn task there are some fundamentals which must not be obscured. This is a crucial period. On every hand we see the strivings and hear the yearnings of a people, punch drunk from the repeated blows of a depression, who clung so fondly to the promises that were made by this administration to lead them into the Promised Land. They are beset with bewilderment and confusion. They are beset with doubts and uncertainties. They seek enlightenment and truth. Like Lincoln, they share the sentiment that if they but knew where the Nation is, and whither it is tending, they would know the better what to do.

There devolves upon the Republican Party, therefore, an educational mission such as it has scarcely ever been called upon to perform. This is an hour for dispassionate truth and common sense. This is an hour in which we must solemnly pledge ourselves to refrain from emotionalism and stick to the facts. This is an hour for careful abstinence from name calling, personalities, and invective, principles must not be sacrificed to sound and fury. Instead of emphasizing nonessentials, as in the case of the small boy who importuned the captain to stop the ship in the middle of a dangerous whirlpool because his apple had fallen overboard, we must place the emphasis on important things and think in terms of national destiny.

I am not insensible to the political philosophy that would bid us win at any price and that would have us match the promises of the administration with even greater and more glorious promises, but let us not forget that in the past we builded this Nation on the rock of enduring policies and that we can justify our high place in the history of this Nation only by thinking of the years to come as well as of the fleeting present.

As we ponder the past in order to throw light on the present, we find that but 20 years ago the Nation was plunged into a war for democracy. From that war we emerged with thousands of lives of our young soldiers sacrificed, with billions of our national wealth destroyed or loaned to foreign nations, with artificially high prices and high wages, with the industrial and agricultural structure of the Nation expanded far beyond normal needs, and a foreign trade the highest in the history of this Republic. The headache was to come afterward. No thinking person who knows how inevitable the law of compensation is could escape the conviction that someday there must be a reckoning, and that every drop of blood shed in a man-made war must one day be expiated by the living who dwell in the earth. So long as we continued to loan European nations the money with which to buy our products, so long would prosperity last. So long as our goods continued to go abroad to be paid for with our money, so long would jobs be plentiful, prices high, and the exhilaration of prosperity endure.

The crash came in 1929, and the wonder is that it did not come sooner. Our President and our party had as much to do with that collapse as did one of the sacrificial pigs with the pig-slaughter policy of the administration. But it was laid on our doorstep, together with all the ghastly distress and despair that sprang from the ensuing unemployment, price deflation, and complete collapse of morale. What a ten-strike it would be if our opponents could capitalize that despair. What a splendid political accomplishment and what a ghastly moral achievement if by clever propaganda, adequately financed, the collapse could be fastened upon the Republican Party.

What a grim and frightful deception! What matter that there was a depression in every other major nation in the world? What matter that the economic disturbances in other nations were far more aggravated than our own? What matter that the groundwork for gradual but certain recovery had already been laid by the Republican Party? Now was the time to smear the President, enthrone hate, and enshrine bitterness and sow the seed of unrest and greater despair. Thus it was that in 1932 the Democratic national executive committee moved from its seldom-used, one-room office in Washington to a palatial suite in the National Press Building under the management of a Kansas lawyer and a Washington newspaperman, fortified with $250,000 advanced by John J. Raskob and a drawing account of $10,000 per month. This was the instrument with which the incumbent President was to be smeared. This was the machine which with Machiavellian cleverness was to develop the psychology that we "need a change", and how well it worked in converting despair into hate and distress into bitterness is best evidenced by the results in 1932.

In its efforts it was amplified by the usual recriminations and promises that attend a national campaign. What high and grim humor there was about those lambastings of 1932. Turn the Republicans out! They have destroyed the credit of the Nation and unbalanced its Budget. They have set up commission after commission to eat out the taxpayers' substance. They have placed 15,000,000 citizens in the ranks of unemployment. They have destroyed foreign trade. They have been extravagant and wasteful. They have failed to reduce the national debt. They place property rights above human rights. They are reactionaries and Tories. They have brought the Nation to ruin and disaster. How strange! Yes; how strange that the Republican Party, after 70 years of almost uninterrupted constructive service to the country, should suddenly have completely altered its principles and policies. How strange that this same party, which saved this Nation from disunion, provided pensions for the Civil War soldiers, provided homesteads, gave the Nation its first civil-service law, and a Federal income tax, should have suddenly become so vicious, so reactionary, and so destructive. How strange that the Republican Party, which, under Theodore Roosevelt, stopped public-land frauds and saved this domain for the people, enlarged the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to protect both the public and the railroad employees, which for the first time enforced the antitrust laws, provided compensation for injured railroad employees, and gave the Nation its first Pure Food and Drug Act, should suddenly have become so unmindful of its obligations to the Nation and to the people.

How strange that this Republican Party, which under Taft gave the Nation a postal-savings system, a parcel-post system, and withdrew power sites from public entry so they might be conserved for the people, should have suddenly become so inimical to human rights.

How strange that the Republican Party, with its leaders and its members, having brought this Nation to a high state of human freedom and prosperity, should suddenly become a party of witch doctors and Tories, a party of corporals of disaster and sergeants of despair! Such is the power of propaganda and promises hurled against a background of economic distress.

Now we have a change! Faced with a host of promises and the stern demand of the distressed to make good, the promises of the present administration began to unfold in terms of action, and, whatever might be said, let it be set down to the everlasting credit of Republicans that, unlike a Democratic Congress in 1932, which stalemated every effort of a Republican President to deal with the situation at hand, we have placed national welfare above politics and citizenship above partisanship by cooperating to the utmost to lift the Nation out of its difficulties. We have made no effort to hamstring the President. We have sought by voice and vote to help him.

And now for a peek at the record. In 1932 we were charged with having destroyed farm prices, having destroyed the farmers' foreign market, and with having maintained an extravagant Farm Board which lost millions of dollars. What has been done? A combination of Nature, agricultural adjustment, and an expenditure of one and one-half billions has raised farm prices. Nature's drought is over. The A. A. A. has been invalidated by the Supreme Court. Farm prices have been materially improved, but we expect to spend four hundred and eighty millions annually through soil-conversation work to maintain them. Meanwhile by reciprocal-trade agreements we are handing the farmers' home market over to foreign competition. Argentine corn, Canadian pork, Argentine beef, Polish rye, Canadian wheat, Australian and Danish butter, and Chinese soybeans are threatening his market and his prices. We expended the taxpayers' money to retire some of the finest Illinois land in existence from cultivation, and at the same time expend the taxpayers' funds to make additional millions of acres of western desert to bloom like the rose, and over it all we scattered the sacrificial blood of 6,000,000 little pigs and 250,000 brood sows. Where we were charged with maintaining an extravagant Farm Board, we have today a Commodity Credit Corporation, whose losses on cotton already aggregate more than $50,000,000.

We were charged in 1932 with having brought about widespread unemployment and distress. What was done to cure it? We have spent eight hundred and sixteen millions on a glorified leaf-raking program known as the C. W. A., one and one-fourth billion on the C. C. C., two and two-thirds billions to build 24,000 P. W. A. projects, and more than a billion on W. P. A., not to speak of the funds devoted to direct relief. In 3 years we have spent $8,500,000,000 for employment and employment relief, and, according to the American Federation of Labor's report for March 16, 1936, we still have in excess of 12,000,000 people out of work and more than 16,000,000 on relief. Worse than all else perhaps in connection with unemployment and relief is the unrest and hysteria that spring from this condition. Long ago Isaiah wrote: "And it shall come to pass that when man is hungry, he shall fret himself, and when he frets himself he shall curse his God and his king."

We were charged with having set up unnecessary bureaus and commissions and that these must be, and would be, curtailed. Yet the record will show that, in addition to all agencies which existed when the Government was taken over in 1933, 60 new agencies have been created and 250,000 civilian employees have been added to the Government rolls, with a monthly pay roll in excess of $125,000,000.

We were charged with running this Nation into debt. When President Wilson left office the national debt was, roughly, $26,000,000,000. In 10 years the Republican Party had reduced it by $10,000,000,000. On April 30, 1936, the national debt had risen to $31,500,000,000, and the end is not yet. What more need be said to establish that today we are doing a land-office business on borrowed money and daily swelling a debt that some day must be paid off with taxes garnered from all classes of people?

We have been charged with failure to reduce governmental expenditures and heard the siren promise to reduce them by at least 25 percent. The deficit for the last 3 years approximates $11,000,000,000. When outgo exceeds income by eleven billions, what more need be added to show that the Government's fiscal house is not only not in order today but sadly disordered?

A solemn promise was made in 1932 that a sound currency must be maintained at all hazards, yet today we have a 59-cent dollar, with no assurances that it will not be revalued up or devalued down; we have embarked on a program to purchase silver until it should be in the ratio of 1 to 3 to the gold in our monetary system. The result of that program is that we have almost ruined the monetary systems of all nations on a silver basis and driven them to a managed-currency system when we were being beguiled with the argument that the silver-purchase program would re-create foreign trade. Having purchased 900,000,000 ounces or more of silver, we find that the price is about back where it was when the program started. All this has served to create uncertainty in the minds of businessmen who must purchase stocks of raw materials in advance to keep the wheels of industry moving in order to maintain men in their jobs.

We were informed that a housing program would create jobs for craftsmen who are out of work and at the same time stimulate the durable-goods industry. After 3 years of sketchy effort and several unsuccessful starts we have no housing program on the statute books, and in most localities carpenters, bricklayers, and artisans are still unemployed. Our closest approach to housing is a few so-called low-cost housing units that look like Harvard dormitories and the noble experiment at Reedsville, W. Va., where we built 190 houses, on which we shall lose at least $3,000 per house.

We have embarked upon a program of reform, much of which turned out to be destructive rather than constructive in purpose, with the result that business, from whence must come the jobs to absorb the unemployed, has been stricken with bewilderment and fear. What a paradox it is in the richest nation in the world that we have twenty-five billion idle dollars in the national banks, 12,000,000 pairs of idle hands, and unlimited home market, each separated from the other by a wall of fear and uncertainty, so that the Nation cannot go forward with a great surge of joyous confidence.

As we ponder this paradoxical situation, what shall we say of it, and what shall we as Republicans offer? Must we deny that any good has been accomplished in order to secure a favorable hearing from the people for our cause? I think not. Must we go farther along the road toward paternalism than the present administration and meet erratic and inconsistent policies with promises and policies that are still more erratic and inconsistent? I think not. Must we be stumped by the oft-repeated and rather beguiling question, "Are you not better off than you were in 1933?" I think not. Must we commit our party to promises that we know full well to be unsound and unworkable in order to make an effective bid for popular support? I think not.

We as a party are not only not opposed to reform but submit to the people that most of the constructive reforms that have been inscribed on the books have emanated with the Republican Party. We can, however, and must stand definitely against alleged reforms that are wholly destructive in character and which seek to tear down rather than build up.

We are not opposed to relief, realizing that self-preservation is the most impelling impulse in humankind. We are, however, opposed to the remote control of relief from Washington. We are opposed to relief which develops a bureaucracy. We are opposed to relief which in innumerable instances has been shot through with waste, extravagance, corruption, and political control. Moreover, we can be definitely committed to the administration of relief by States and localities because they can do so more sympathetically, more efficiently, and with less of the sting of charity in its administration. I submit to you as earnestly as I know how that the men and women of this Nation want work rather than relief. They want the security of jobs rather than the insecurity of made work. To the man who earns a livelihood with a paintbrush or a carpenter's saw, with a mason's trowel or on a drill press, with a plow or with a plumber's wrench, there is a future. To any man or woman who works and envisions advancement there is a future. But there is no future in relief. We would be unfair and unjust to American labor and to the future of labor if we did not place all emphasis upon the re-creating of those conditions in American

industry that will bring about reemployment and the security that goes with the job.

The social reforms which came from the Republican Party in the past are the best evidence that we have not lost our zealous interest in raising wages, eliminating child labor, and in shortening hours; but, in marching toward that objective, we need not put the Nation in a straitjacket of regimentation.

Year in and year out we have steadily affirmed to labor our support of the principle of collective bargaining. To labor we can go further than that. Today huge imports of cheap products from Japan are taking bread from the mouths of American workers. Standards of living in Japan and other nations are so low that American industry cannot compete except that our own living standards be lowered. We must set ourselves resolutely against any effort to impair that living standard, and instead give to American labor adequate guaranties of protection of his home market.

We do not decry or protest against a policy of public works to take up the slack in employment, but we do protest most vigorously against building a $160,000,000 canal at the taxpayers' expense in the north end of Florida when such a canal is not wanted except by a few professional real-estate promoters; we protest against using the taxpayers' money to build dog pounds in Memphis and monkey cages in Mississippi; we protest against spending the taxpayers' money on a project like the Passamaquoddy in Maine, where after the expenditure of millions of dollars it now appears that the project is anything but feasible and practical. We protest against the folly of boondoggling projects that have no enduring values. We believe that there are enough useful projects in the land where the taxpayer gets a dollar in value for every dollar which is expended.

We do not and have not opposed the principle of parity for agriculture. The farmer is entitled to a square deal, to adequate prices, and to protection, but must we destroy 6,000,000 little pigs in order to achieve that parity?

We do not oppose the exercise of emergency powers when emergencies exist, but must the power of Congress be destroyed and must the civil service and merit system be destroyed in order to cope with such an emergency? In March 1933, 80 percent of all Government employees were under civil service. Today less than 60 percent have this protection, the lowest percentage in the last 30 years. It is an eloquent commentary on the ruthlessness of spoils politics. To the taxpayers it is a costly philosophy which maintains thousands in the Government service without a single regard for merit.

Nor are we insensible to the new needs which arise and must be met. Lincoln himself phrased it well when he said, "The occasion is piled high with difficulty. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." He did not, however, say that in order to meet new needs we should destroy our whole system of government or undermine the balance of functions that has carefully preserved the rights and liberties of the citizens since the founding of the Nation.

He did not say that in meeting those needs we should ignore the Constitution or destroy the Supreme Court, or divest it of its functions. I venture the prediction that those persons who would impair the power of the Supreme Court because it rendered a decision in which they do not concur would be the first to restore its powers if their lives and their rights were in jeopardy. It is the only instrument which stands between and safeguards the rights of the citizens against abuses of executive and legislative power.

With these considerations in mind, let us then be about our business of fabricating a program that by its common sense, its soundness, and its directness will appeal to labor, to agriculture, and to business; let us express a philosophy that will appeal to the young and old, rich and poor; let us give guaranties to the voters of this great State that are not only forward-looking and humane but which will be founded on the rock of good government and be within the Constitution.

The best platform ever penned by the hand of man would be a dull and lifeless thing unless it is interpreted and supported by a virile and living organism which we call a political party. It can be translated with conviction into the consciousness of the people only by a part that is aggressive, militant, and harmonious.

With a contrite spirit, and mindful of the gravity of our task, let us stand shoulder to shoulder in the ranks of Republicanism and carry our gospel into every corner of this Commonwealth.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I made under the auspices of the Jewish war veterans last Sunday in this city.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this an address by the gentleman?

Mr. HARTER. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address delivered by me at Adas Israel Cemetery, Sunday, May 24, 1936, 2 p. m., under the auspices of Jewish War Veterans, Washington Post No. 58:

We meet here today to honor those who in times of our country's need were ready to make any sacrifice so that America and its democratic ideals might be perpetuated. It is a sacred privilege for me to address you at your memorial services to the soldier dead who lie in this and neighboring Jewish cemeteries.

To keep faith with those who are buried here, Memorial Day should inspire in us all a devotion to duty when danger threatens the Nation. This day has a far deeper meaning and a more solemn purpose than the celebration of military victory. The show of flags and the sound of marching feet of living comrades are not for the purpose of inspiring the coming generation toward military pomp or to create a desire for war. Those of you who endured the horrors and privations of the World War are among the last to want future wars, subjecting your children and future generations to the fearful experience through which you passed in 1917 and 1918.

Many misguided persons would have us discontinue all measures of national defense. These people rightfully believe in a lasting and enduring world peace, but the methods which they pursue to accomplish this are different from those followed by we who believe that peace can only be secured and maintained through an adequate system of defense, which has been the fundamental military policy of this country since its inception. A strong and adequate Navy, a small and efficient standing Army, with these two branches supplemented in modern times by an adequate air force—the ultimate result to be obtained—peace—is the desire of every true American.

We do want to preserve for all time those institutions which are so peculiarly ours and which have been built with the genius of many races and of many people. The World War was won by the cooperation of all—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—who worked side by side, shoulder to shoulder, to achieve victory.

To you, sprung from the loins of that people which for ages has suffered persecution and risen above it, which has preserved its integrity and its intellectual and moral greatness through hardship and cruelty unparalleled in the world's history, it is unnecessary to expatiate upon the horrors of war, its brutality, its innate inhumanity.

You have splendid traditions to preserve. The Jewish people are peace loving, but they have not hesitated nor been backward in taking up arms whenever the need arose. In every war in which our country has been engaged, the Jew, I am happy to say, enlisted cheerfully, fought gallantly, and died bravely.

In no spirit of boastful exploitation of Jewish patriotism let me mention the honor records of special heroism during the World War. More than 1,100 citations for valor were awarded to men of Jewish faith. Of these, some 700 were conferred by the American command, about 300 by the French, and 33 by the British. The Congressional Medal of Honor, which is the most highly prized of all citations issued by this Government, has been awarded to only 68 persons, 3 of these being Jewish soldiers. Our Distinguished Service Cross is worn by 150 American Jews and the French Croix de Guerre was bestowed on 174 Jews of the American Expeditionary Forces.

No account of the famous "Lost Battalion" in the Argonne Forest fails to set forth the daring and endurance of the Jewish soldiers in this gallant outfit. Recorded figures show that more than 200,000 men of Jewish faith served during the World War. Thousands made the supreme sacrifice, while many other thousands were wounded. Six hundred American Jews still lie buried in the cemeteries of France, Belgium, and England.

The Star of David is found with the cross in beautiful, everlasting marble. As they lived together, fought together, so they lie buried side by side. They gave their best, their all, to their country.

In the American Army the Jewish soldier was dependable. Those qualities which enabled his race to survive through the centuries in spite of intolerance and persecution, made him a worthy fighter in the American cause. Thank God, we live in an enlightened land, where one's right to worship as his conscience dictates is rigidly upheld.

May we always, as citizens of this great Republic, be foremost in the protection of those liberties for which our forefathers fought and which are so fully guaranteed to us under the Constitution. Let us forever banish prejudice and intolerance or any unfair or unkind practice which might arise through religious or racial differences.

The United States owes to the Jews, as it does to many groups, deep appreciation for the Jewish contributions to our arts, sciences, and material progress in nearly every line of human endeavor. May no spirit of intolerance ever blind our eyes to the debt of gratitude owing our Jewish citizens for their help in making America what it is.

So today let us honor those Jewish heroes, both living and dead, who offered themselves to this, their country. We best pay tribute to their sacrifices and their memories by loyalty to the principles for which they fought and died. These precepts are set forth with clarity and in forceful language in the preamble of the Jewish War Veterans' constitution:

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To maintain true allegiance to our country, to spread the doctrine of loyalty to the Government, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free

institutions, and to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men."

In closing, may we offer a prayer that peace on earth may soon come, bringing with it a sympathy for each other, and a tolerant spirit; an earnest desire to love our neighbor. So let us turn our eyes upon our own beloved United States and determine to build up and preserve here the freedom, the rights, the democracy which war destroys and which peace nourishes. In this spirit, we observe Memorial Day, a fitting tribute to those who have served our country.

THOMAS MARINE RAILWAY CO., INC.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4148) for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "Lighthouse Service" and insert "Quartermaster Corps."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill about?

Mr. DARDEN. This is a bill that passed the House sometime ago in which there was an error in connection with the name of one of the Government departments. The error was corrected when the bill passed the Senate, and it is my request to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This merely changes the title?

Mr. DARDEN. It is not in the title of the bill. It concerns the name of a Government department in the body of the act.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

INVESTIGATION OF THE CALIFORNIA SARDINE (PILCHARD) FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 597) authorizing an investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries of the California sardine (pilchard) fishing industry.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to that request.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. LEHLBACH. This resolution is necessary as an emergency in order that a start may be made intelligently to conserve a great fishing industry which may be in danger of depletion. Action must be taken now in order to pass it in the Senate and have the Bureau of Fisheries commence the investigation. There is nothing controversial about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why cannot the joint resolution be passed Monday just as well as now?

Mr. LEHLBACH. For the same reason, and no different reason, that it should be passed now.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield so that I may ask the gentleman from Virginia a question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Why cannot the Bureau of Fisheries make us a report on this matter without spending $10,000 and without such a resolution?

Mr. BLAND. Because it will require a very detailed investigation and search. There has been a considerable fight before the committee as to the possible depletion of the sardine or pilchard industry in the Pacific Ocean. The fight is between shore plants and floating plants. There have been some researches by Stanford University and the California Fish and Game Commission, and we have come to the conclusion that there ought to be an investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries. There is authorized an initial appropriation of $10,000, and unless we can get this joint resolution passed they cannot get the initial appropriation to conduct the investigation.

Mr. BLANTON. Can they not do this without getting this appropriation?

Mr. BLAND. I doubt that they can, because it covers a very broad subject.

Mr. BLANTON. On the statement of the gentleman from Virginia I shall not object, but I am going to object to every other investigation requested in this session of the Congress, and I am going to fight against making any more appropriations for investigations.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if the bill that he asks to have considered now by unanimous consent is satisfactory to the people from California who are interested in this pilchard-fishing legislation?

Mr. BLAND. I do not think it is satisfactory to them. There were two sides and you could not satisfy both sides. There was nothing that could be brought out that would be satisfactory to both of them. The committee felt it needed further information on the matter and that there ought to be a scientific investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries as to whether this important resource is being depleted or not.

Mr. MOTT. Then may I ask if there is anything controversial about the bill which you now ask to have considered and which will be considered without debate, of course?

Mr. BLAND. It has the endorsement of the members of the committee from California, Mr. WELCH and Mr. COLDEN, and also has the approval of Mr. WALLGREN, of Washington.

Mr. MOTT. I am from Oregon.

Mr. BLAND. This not alone affects California, but it is an investigation of an important resource having for its purpose to see that this resource is not depleted. There was the thought expressed that there were other floating plants coming in, and we felt that the investigation should proceed as soon as possible by an independent agency, and that this agency should be the Federal Government.

Mr. MOTT. I may say to the gentleman that Oregon is only indirectly interested in this particular matter.

Mr. BLAND. We understand that.

Mr. MOTT. And if the people from California are satisfied to have the bill considered in this way, it is all right with me, and I withdraw my objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that if you are trying to benefit the people of the West in regard to the fishing industry, and they are not satisfied as a unit out there, they should come to an agreement while the matter is in committee and before the gentleman brings the bill before the House and asks us to spend several thousand dollars to make an investigation, and, in my opinion, there is no reason why the Bureau of Fisheries could not make this investigation now without spending $10,000.

Mr. BLAND. There is a great deal of information to be obtained and the bill is not in the interest of California alone.

Mr. RICH. I think the matter should go over until Monday, and I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COX. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

GEORGE HUDDLESTON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, The business of sending men to this body and keeping them here is rightfully that of the people of the several districts of the country, but we are all interested in protecting the reputation of one another when wrongfully assaulted.

Yesterday's papers carried a statement credited to one of our colleagues by his opponent to the effect that money would reelect him here.

This Member is an old-timer, one with whom we may often differ but whose sincerity we never question. He is a man of highest character, great ability, and courage, and those

of us who have served here with him for many years know that it is impossible for him to have made any such statement, for it is foreign to his nature and his life. The gentleman that I refer to is a statesman in the highest sense of the word, an ornament to the Congress and the great State from which he comes.

Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this House whom people who toil should be prouder to honor and call their own than GEORGE HUDDLESTON, of the State of Alabama. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 582, granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into the amendatory agreement executed on April 1, 1936, by the commissioners duly appointed on the part of such States, amending the original agreement entered into by such States for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, which original agreement was consented to by Congress by Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, approved February 16, 1928, and every part and article of such amendatory agreement is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of such amendatory agreement; which amendatory agreement is as follows:

Whereas the States of New York and Vermont heretofore and on the 11th day of May 1927 entered into an agreement or compact, duly authorized by law, creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; and

Whereas the legislatures of said States have authorized their respective commissioners to enter into an agreement or compact amending said existing agreement or compact: Now, therefore,

The said States of New York and Vermont do hereby enter into the following agreement, to wit:

The agreement heretofore made between the State of New York and the State of Vermont pursuant to chapter 321 of the laws of 1927 of the State of New York, entitled "An act authorizing designated authorities in behalf of the State of New York to enter into an agreement or compact with designated authorities of the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain bridge commission, the establishment of the Lake Champlain bridge commission, and the defining of the powers and duties of such commission and making an appropriation for such purposes", and no. 139 of the acts of 1927 of the State of Vermont, entitled "An act ratifying a proposed agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain bridge commission and providing for carrying out the provisions of said agreement or compact", as the same was amended by the agreement or compact entered into the 30th day of March 1935 by and under the authority of chapter 201 of the laws of 1933, as amended by chapter 355 of the laws of 1935 of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of no. 209 of the acts of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont of 1935, entitled "An act authorizing an agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York to amend the existing agreement or compact between said States creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, in relation to the construction of a new bridge across Lake Champlain, the issuance of bonds by said commission, and providing for the payment of said bonds", approved by the Governor February 27, 1935, as amended by no. 210 of the acts of 1935 of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, approved by the Governor March 21, 1935, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following articles:

ARTICLE XXXVI

The Lake Champlain bridge commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to issue its negotiable bonds in addition to those issued prior to March 1, 1933, for the purpose of refunding its bonds issued before said date: *Provided, however*, That the aggregate principal amount of such bonds so issued to pay off and refund its bonds issued before said date shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of the bonds so retired.

ARTICLE XXXVII

Such commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to call for payment and to pay its bonds issued before March 1, 1933, in accordance with the terms under which said bonds were issued and for such purposes to use any funds which it has or shall have in reserves and sinking fund and in investments at the time said bonds are called for payment, notwithstanding any provision heretofore set forth in this or any previous compact or agreement.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

1. The bonds issued under authority of article XXXVI shall be authorized by resolution of such commission and shall bear such date or dates, mature at such time or times, not exceeding 50 years from their respective dates, bear interest at such rate or rates, not exceeding 5 percent per annum payable semiannually, be in such denominations, be in such form, either coupon or registered, carry such registration privileges, be executed in such manner, be payable in such medium of payments, at such place or places, and be subject to such terms of redemption as such resolution or resolutions may provide. Said bonds may be sold at public or private sale for such price or prices as such commission shall determine, provided that the interest cost to maturity of the money received for any issue of said bonds shall not exceed 5 percent per annum.

2. Neither the members of such commission nor any person executing said bonds shall be liable personally on said bonds or be subject to any personal liability or accountability by reason of the issuance thereof.

3. The bonds issued under the authority of article XXXVI shall constitute a first lien upon the property, tolls, and revenues pledged to secure the bonds issued by such commission prior to March 1, 1933, and subject to the terms of any agreement made or to be made with holders of bonds issued by such commission under article XXVI of the amendments to this compact shall be a lien upon the tolls and revenues of the bridge referred to as the Rouses Point Bridge, and in accordance with subdivision 4 of article XXVI of the amendments to this compact any of such tolls and revenues which would otherwise have been payable into the State treasuries of the two States may be pledged to the payment of said bonds.

4. Said bonds shall not be a debt of the State of New York or of the State of Vermont, and neither State shall be liable thereon, nor shall they be payable out of any funds other than those of such commission.

5. Said bonds shall be exempt from taxation and are hereby made securities in which all public officers and bodies of each State and of its municipal subdivisions, all insurance companies and associations, all savings banks and savings institutions, including savings and loan associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees, and all other fiduciaries in each State may properly and legally invest the funds within their control.

6. Such commission shall have power, out of any funds available therefor, to purchase any bonds issued by it at a price not more than the redemption price thereof at the time of such purchase with accrued interest.

ARTICLE XXXIX

Such commission shall have the power to apply to the Congress of the United States or any department of the United States for consent or approval of this compact as amended, but in the absence of such consent by Congress and until the same shall have been secured, this compact, as amended, shall be binding upon the State of New York when ratified by it and the State of Vermont when ratified by it without the consent of Congress to cooperate for the purposes enumerated in this agreement and in the manner herein provided and for all purposes that it legally may be.

In witness whereof, by and under the authority of chapters 73 and 219 of the Laws of 1936 of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of Public Act No. 19 of the acts and resolves passed by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont at the special session 1935-36, approved by the Governor December 14, 1935, we have signed this compact or agreement, in duplicate, this 1st day of April 1936.

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

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

BEQUEST OF DR. MALCOLM STORER

Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 26, Mr. VINSON of Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, presented a concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of Congress for a bequest of a collection of naval and other medals from the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass.

I respectfully request unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD, together with a brief sketch of the life and activities of Dr. Storer which I have prepared.

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

There was no objection.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE LATE DR. MALCOLM STORER, OF BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, at the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress an act was passed which was signed by the President July 12, 1935, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States a bequest of certain personal property of the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass.

The bequest consisted of a valuable collection of naval and other medals, together with the sum of $500 to be used to cover the expense of the installation of the collection as an exhibit at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.

The collection of medals has been received at the Naval Academy and recently I made an inspection of the same, although as yet they are not fully installed. The curator, Lt. Wade DeWeese, made this interesting statement in reference to it—

> This collection is unique and the arrangements I am making for its permanent exhibition may be something of an innovation in the display of medals and coins. Briefly, they will be mounted in swinging leaf stands so that both obverse and reverse sides of every medal can be seen at a glance. The manner of insertion and securing in the stands, however, as well as the medals themselves, will be of interest to all numismatists.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with the acceptance of this collection we might well express not only our appreciation of the gift, but include therewith a brief sketch of the life and activities of Dr. Storer.

He was born at Milton, Mass., April 26, 1862, son of Horatio Robinson Storer and Emily Elvira (Gilmore) Storer. He died at his home in Boston, January 3, 1935. His widow and a daughter, Mrs. Edgerton B. Sawtelle of Augusta, Me., survive him.

He came from a long line of distinguished and sturdy New England ancestry, including such men as Dudley, Winthrop, Langdon, and Boyd. On the Storer branch were several distinguished physicians, mostly Harvard graduates.

Dr. Storer graduated from Harvard in 1885 and took his M. D. from the medical department in 1889. After graduation he had 15 months of medical study in Vienna and Dublin. For a time he was surgical house officer in the Massachusetts General Hospital. He began his private practice of medicine in Boston in 1891. He was an assistant and later an instructor in gynecology at the Harvard Medical School until 1923. Also he was a member of the staff at the Carney Hospital, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and at the Boston Dispensary. He was active for 30 years in many administrative positions as well as societies. He was chief of staff of the Boston Dispensary; secretary and then president of the Boston Obstetrical Society; president of the North End Diet Kitchen, which supports the food clinics for regulatory diet of the Massachusetts General Hospital. He was also on the executive committee of the Boston Medical Library and a counselor of the Harvard Medical Alumni Association. In the latter connection he made a report to the association for raising money for the medical school from the medical alumni. He was also a member of the Society for Medical Improvement of Boston, the Massachusetts Medical Society, and the American Medical Association. In medicine he was known as the author of numerous papers in the field of gynecology.

His avocation lay in the numismatic field. His search for rare medals and coins was as keen as that of the hunter for his quarry. He pursued it with success, even to distinction, alongside his medical duties, without undue interferences with the latter; so that at his death he was the most prominent member of the Boston Numismatic Society, with a very wide and thorough knowledge of his subject.

In this field he was author of a paper on Admiral Vernon Medals (1919) and of a volume entitled "Numismatics of Massachusetts" (1923) and editor of his father's Medicina in Nummis (1931). His most important book, the History of Massachusetts Medals, was published as volume 76 of the transactions of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 328 pages, with index and 38 plates. It mentions 2,300 medals. This publication promises to establish a standard for like publications. He also wrote an article on Pine Tree Shillings and Other Colonial Money, October 1929, in Old Time New England. He was, besides, entrusted with the care of important numismatic collections in the Boston region. He had made for himself a considerable collection of naval medals; this collection has come, very properly, to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. He was curator of the collection of medical medals presented by his father to the Boston Medical Library, of the coins and medals at the Massachusetts Historical Society, and was honorary keeper of coins at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. In addition, he belonged to the American Numismatic Society and to the American Numismatic Association.

He was also a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society and of its council from 1925; and a vice president of the Bunker Hill Monument Association and the Naval History Society.

His clubs were the old Puritan, the St. Botolph, the Odd Volumes, and the Harvard Club, all of Boston; also the Harvard Club of Rhode Island.

He was well read, had a retentive memory, and a command of French, German, Spanish, and Italian. His command of English was excellent. All this qualified him as a reader to pass upon books for the Boston Public Library.

During the World War he was signed up in the Volunteer Medical Reserve, but was not called for active service. He felt the needs of the situation, however, and, long before the United States declared war and later, he worked very steadily for over 3 years in charge of the supplies for the American Fund for French Wounded and Italian Relief. A few years before he died, he write, What a Fine Thing Life Is.

THE INDEPENDENT MERCHANT, THE INDIVIDUAL MAN, AND THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there is a moral, a lesson to be read from the history of the growth and development of the organized communities of the country, how all grew up and clustered around the independent pioneer merchant in the spirit of individual enterprise, and flowered into the village, town, and county seat. First came the merchant in the early days, with his store of supplies for the people, his store building crude, but a nucleus around which clustered homes, mills, shops, and dwellings. Then came the school for the children, then the church for religious worship, then the cemetery for the sacred dead, until organized community life was complete.

THE MERCHANT-LED COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

In all of these public or community steps taken, the merchant was the prime mover, whether to build a schoolhouse or a church or plan a diagram for a cemetery, the merchant led the movement. He made his storeroom the town hall. He took part in the affairs of all the people.

The merchant grew up with his customers, with their full knowledge and confidence in him. His business developed with their business. His interest was identical with their welfare. He prospered as they prospered. He suffered with their misfortunes, and he rejoiced with their bounty and abundance. The people came to the merchant to exchange, trade, and buy their supplies, to cash checks, orders, or to borrow money, or to ask and be assured of credit until their first crops were made, or the goods in the making were sold. This confidence and good will were equal and assuring.

Wherever the pioneer merchant opened his store enterprise and industry sprang to life, like the touch of a magic hand, and the spirit of cooperation and good will cemented the ties between neighbors and made the community growth and development permanent, continuing, and enduring.

THE COMMUNITY FAMILY

There is something beautiful, inspiring, in the organized country community, with its stores, shops, and business affairs; with its high schools and auditoriums; with its church spires and well-kept cemeteries, all standing out in the atmosphere of neighborhood friendship and good will.

There is something hopeful, looking forward, in the peals of the school bells blending with the voices of many children, and the church spires pointing heavenward, their chimes ringing out on the clear Sabbath morning calling the community family to worship in grateful recognition of bountiful nature.

There is something beautiful and sacred in the doors of stores and shops closing on the death of a neighbor in the community, the saw and hammer laid aside and businesses suspended, the reapers silent, standing idle in the field, as the people gather in the churchyard for the funeral, as the bell tolls the hour.

There is something touching to the human heart to witness the concourse of friends and neighbors silently and solemnly wending their way from the church or the community chapel to the cemetery for the rites of burial, in recognition of the solemnity of death, and standing at the grave with bowed heads in solemn, impressive respect for the departed.

PASSING WITH THE INDEPENDENT MERCHANT

But this is all passing or due to pass with the going of the independent merchant and the community retail store, around which the community grew up and clustered like a flowering plant or vine upon and around the trunk and branches of a sturdy tree and then falling, perishing and dying with the death, decay, and fall of the tree.

To say nothing of other individual men who have been driven from their independent business to become dependent clerks or employees, 300,000 independent merchants have been driven from their counters and stores and 500,000 more are due to follow to live in dependency and a precarious existence.

Under the tyranny of a few brokers and manipulators compelling certain discounts and rebates, manufacturers and wholesale houses are being coerced to make sale and price discriminations favoring chain-store corporations and against the independent merchants. Under the withering blight of unfair discrimination, the independent merchants are driven out to become wavering, dependent clerks assured of a place only from day to day, with little to work or hope for and with less to defend and fight for.

LIKE A BANQUET HALL DESERTED

The independent merchants' homes are being closed and are ultimately to be deserted. Their seats in the church are empty. Their children are not in the schools. The cash proceeds from retail sales are no longer left in the local bank, but are in drafts fleeing in the mails to an unknown owner in some far-away city.

As the community grew up and developed, clustering around the local retail store, so the glory of the community is to fade with the passing of the independent merchant, and in time will be left as sad and silent as a banquet hall deserted.

It is a damning charge and indictment against Congress and many administrations that the Government has been left standing by while the vandals of industry have been tearing down and destroying the organization of community life for sordid profit and gain.

THE INDIVIDUAL MAN

But there is something more vital, something more basic, substantial, fundamental, involved in this bill to safeguard economic justice, to safeguard the independent merchant, and assure him of equal industrial opportunity. Something more than secret prices, secret rebates, and secret discriminations to monopolize the retail trade of the people. It is the problem of maintaining and upholding the independent character and stability of the individual man. The cause for this legislation reaches back farther than the individual and the community. It goes back to the stability of the Nation, to the preservation and security of our free institutions.

It is the individual man who makes up and gives character to the organized communities of the country. It is the character of the organized communities that makes up and gives strength to the State, and in turn the strength and character of the State that gives stability to the Nation.

THE STABILITY OF THE NATION

Our whole political or fundamental structure is based upon and founded upon the independent character and stability of the individual man, reaching up from the community through the powers and processes of the State and giving stability to the Nation. Without such independence of the individual, our institutions of peace and civil life would be as wavering and unstable as the house built upon the sand, when the winds blow and the rains descend, in the storms of disorder and revolution.

THE GIBRALTAR OF THE STATE

In granting the general right of suffrage and placing the ballot in the hands of the people, and in laying the foundations of our political or governmental house, our forefathers recognized this basic, fundamental principle and rested all upon the individual man and made him the strength of the State, the bulwark, the Gibraltar of the Nation.

And the Constitution was framed and declared to uphold, maintain, and safeguard the independent character and stability of the individual man, holding and exercising the power of the ballot, all to guarantee, maintain, and vindicate the endurance, strength, and stability of our systems of free institutions.

WHAT OUR FOREFATHERS FAILED TO REALIZE

But our forefathers in that early day could not realize, foretell, foresee, the new and changed economic conditions coming, the growth of great corporations, the superpower, coercion, and tyranny of the artificial man created by law and the concentration of great wealth in the hands of a certain, special few.

Our forefathers did not and could not realize that the equal rights and opportunities, the independent character and stability of the individual man of the population included more than his political and religious rights, more than his personal and civil rights to maintain which the Constitution was written and declared.

Our forefathers overlooked and failed to safeguard the economic rights of the people, the business and industrial rights of the people, the equal right and opportunity of men to labor upon the earth to live, their right to pursue their trade and calling, free without discrimination against them.

And by reason of such oversight and failure, the individual man was left subjected to economic and industrial slavery and under which new and changed conditions, the superpower of great corporations, he has been driven from his trade and avocation, denied the right to labor, and reduced to dependency.

ANTITRUST LAWS TO SUPPLEMENT THE CONSTITUTION

And it was left to this day and generation, in the face of stern realities and the bitter experience of time, to safeguard the individual rights of man, his equal economic and industrial rights, by the enactment of antitrust laws against monopolies in restraint of trade.

It was because of this oversight and failure to safeguard economic and business rights, the equal industrial opportunities of the masses, under the provisions of the Constitution adopted, that the Sherman antitrust law was enacted. And it was because of the failure of the administration and enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law, to remedy economic evils and safeguard the people, that the Clayton amendments were passed to supplement and strengthen its provisions.

And now we have considered another law to further amend and strengthen the antitrust laws, as the third attempt to

restrain monopoly, and if enacted will mark an epoch in the long struggle of the masses for economic and industrial freedom.

ALL DEPENDENT UPON ECONOMIC SECURITY

Time and experience have proven that until men are safeguarded in their economic rights, in their business and industrial rights, they cannot claim, assert, or enjoy their political and religious rights, their personal and civil rights, guaranteed to them under the Constitution.

Man, by nature born free, awoke to consciousness of his being only to find himself in slavery and shackled with the chains of bondage, in slavery under slave drivers and taskmasters, in slavery under kings and despotic rulers. Man, awakening to consciousness of his being, found himself confined and held like in a prison surrounded by inner and outer walls, all of which he must scale and overcome before he could win and enjoy his freedom.

Men fought for thousands of years to scale the first wall of their imprisonment—the wall of physical slavery under slave drivers and taskmasters—but which he overcame and scaled only to find himself still within the prison walls.

THE PRISON WALLS OF SLAVERY

Men battled their way for thousands of years to scale the second wall of their prison, political slavery under kings and despotic rulers, but only to find themselves still in prison without the enjoyment of their physical freedom which they had scaled the wall to overcome.

Now men are battling their way to scale the last wall of their imprisonment, the wall of economic and industrial slavery, and when they have won this last struggle and when they have scaled this last prison wall overcoming economic slavery and the tyrants of monopoly, they can then, and only then, enjoy their political freedom; they can then, and only then, enjoy their physical freedom; they can then, and only then, enjoy their religious freedom and the fruits of the other victories won. They will have at last won the freedom into which by nature they were born, and from which they have been held in slavery, shackled in bondage dating back beyond the pyramids.

A CRUEL AND RELENTLESS MONOPOLY

None of the combinations in restraint of trade which up to this time have challenged and defied the power and processes of State and Nation has ever rivaled in magnitude nor operated with more far-reaching power than these secret chain-store corporations. Other combinations defying competition have directly affected only certain classes of people or certain lines of commodities or services upon which they levied tribute and profiteered and took from a part of the people only or burdened only a part of the necessities.

But this secret trade pact or industrial conspiracy is organized to reach out and touch with its withering, blighting hand every man, woman, and child dependent for food and clothing and the absolute necessaries of life used in their everyday life.

HOW INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS ARE DRIVEN OUT

Under these gross, unfair, and criminal discriminations the chain-store corporations are enabled to sell to the people and consumers at a price lower than the price which the independent retail merchants under the unfair discrimination against them are allowed to buy in bulk at wholesale. It is in this secret and cruel way that these conspiring bankers and brokers behind and supporting the chain-store corporations are driving the independent merchants from the field of the retail trade and enthroning monopoly complete over the people.

A MERE HANDFUL OF MEN ENSLAVING THE MULTITUDE

The hearings held on this bill to outlaw sale discriminations shows that a mere handful of speculative bankers and brokers in three congressional districts in New York City are deliberately operating under a conspiracy to drive out the independent merchants and monopolize the retail trade of the country.

The hearings and inquiries held on this bill to prevent unfair wholesale practices reveals a remarkable secret trade pact of manipulating bankers and brokers operating only within a few blocks in a single city, but reaching out to every community in the land to paralyze competition in the retail trade.

By their system of secret trade operations, manufacturers and commodity sellers at wholesale have been and are being coerced, intimidated, bribed, and terrorized to make different prices to different buyers, low prices to chain-store corporations, and higher prices to independent merchants.

THE OBJECT OF THE LAW

This bill is to prevent discrimination in prices between chain-store corporations and the independent merchants and to relieve manufacturers and wholesalers from coercion and compel sales to independent merchants at the same wholesale price as sales to the chain-store corporations.

But we are told that this will operate to prevent chain stores from making low prices to consumers. It will not prevent such low prices, but it will make possible and compel the same wholesale price to independent merchants and enable the independent merchants to make the same low prices to their consumers, and this will make lower prices to all.

The secret rebates and unlawful discriminations in favor of chain-store corporations and against the independent merchants assuming consideration and concern for the consumers are always upheld and defended upon the ground of giving low prices to the people. But it is the history of all monopolies gained under pretense of serving the consumers that as soon as a monopoly is complete and assured and all independent competition is eliminated and out of the way prices will be raised back and kept higher.

THE LOBBY STRATEGY

In the execution of the plan and strategy to gain the object of the conspiracy organized, no means, methods, or course of dealing is too unscrupulous, dishonest, or unfair to be resorted to for the purpose. They include bribery and coercion and the corruption of public officials. This is not a mere suspicion or surmise, or a groundless charge of accusation. It is frankly and brazenly admitted and is pointed to with indifference and in defiance of the efforts made to curb and restrict their unlawful monopoly operations. This admission was made and appears in the evidence before the chain-store lobby hearings conducted by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, August 9, 1935, in Washington, D. C., and at the time generally shown and made public in the press reporting the hearings of that date.

HOW LAWS ARE MADE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Robert W. Lyons was a chain-store lobbyist and was questioned regarding amendments offered to make legislation unconstitutional. Lyons frankly and brazenly told the committee that he would not hesitate for a moment to amend a measure to make it unconstitutional, and that he considered that practice before committees perfectly fair in opposing legislation.

This bill we are passing here today following the experience and enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law, and the Clayton amendatory act, may contain such invalid amendments and provisions which will only be known and disclosed when the attempt is made for its administration. This is not the last word in legislation to safeguard the independent merchant. It is only a step in that direction. It must be followed up with further hearings and further laws providing for penalties for the violation and disregard for antitrust laws.

THE OPPORTUNE TIME FOR MONOPOLY OPERATIONS

Of all time this is the most opportune time for monopolies to gain a foothold. It is now when the people are thrown off their guard suffering from low and insufficient incomes and straining to make their scanty means go as far as they will

to provide the necessaries of life; it is now when they will be misled to sell their birthright of free competition in industry and leave their children and posterity in bondage and economic slavery under monopoly of the retail trade.

Under the economic strain and scarcity of income the people will not be in mind to realize that their own interests and welfare and the welfare of their children will be more assured and better safeguarded under the free competition of independent merchants than under a relentless mercantile monopoly.

THE GOAL AND WHAT IS AT STAKE

If these secret rebates and discriminations are allowed to continue on into the future as they have been carried on in the past, no independent merchant can stand the strain upon him and it will be only a question of time, brief time, when he must close his store and give away to the chain-store corporations.

Monopoly has come out into the open. The struggle, the contest is on. The goal to be lost or won is free competition in the retail trade. The independent store is at stake. The organized community is at stake. The individual man is at stake. The stability of the State and Nation is at stake. We have come to the parting of the ways. There can be no compromise or hesitation. Monopoly is everywhere destroying competition. The independent retail store is passing. The independent merchants are following. The tide must be stopped and turned back or monopoly will be entrenched complete.

It is time, far overtime, that Congress resent the delusive plea of "hands off of private business", and that we arise to the emergencies of the hour to safeguard the equal rights and opportunities of the independent business man. It is time, far overtime, that we safeguard the individual man from economic tyranny and unfair discrimination, driving the independent merchant from his place in the retail trade and restore him to his former position in the community life of the people.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to inquire whether the gentleman is going to answer the question of how the rest of the country is paying for the light being furnished Tupelo by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the special order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINNESOTA PUBLIC WORKS—FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS FOR THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—1933–36

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the record of the Government in State work in Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, after the adjournment of Congress I will remain in Washington for several weeks in order that I may give personal attention to Minnesota and Third Congressional District projects. For the past 3 years one of the major duties of myself and my office has been to obtain approval at Washington of numerous important and beneficial projects.

The citizens of Minnesota and the Third Congressional District are greatly interested in and vitally concerned with public works and projects. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks to include data and information on the record of State and Federal Governments in the matter of Minnesota projects, I am presenting my report on projects of all kinds for which Federal funds were obtained for Minnesota, and especially for each county of the Third Congressional District, which I represent. These counties are Anoka, Chisago, Hennepin, Isanti, and Washington.

Data included here were furnished on short notice by various Government agencies. Minor errors may have crept into some tables, and some statistics are more up to date than others.

While this information does not include all the Federal funds obtained for the Third District, it is as complete and accurate as we have been able to make it with limited time and office force.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

In 1933 I voted for the act to create the Public Works Administration (p. 4373, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, 1933). I have supported appropriations for public works. Since that time and up to April 30, 1936, non-Federal public-works projects in the amount of $42,949,373 had been approved for Minnesota. Of this cost the Federal Government paid $20,867,569. Minnesota also received $24,605,748 for Federal projects, of which no part was contributed by State or local funds. Non-Federal projects are those toward which the communities contribute a certain amount. The communities would have been unable to finance these projects without the aid of Federal funds.

Following are funds allotted for the Third Congressional District through the Public Works Administration:

Anoka County P. W. A. allotments

Docket no.	Location	P. W. A. allotment			Local funds provided	Estimated cost	Estimated average employment	Description
		Loan	Grant	Total				
W-1219	Anoka, Anoka County		$12,150	$12,150	$14,850	$27,000	33	1-story brick shop; enclosing 4 porches; addition to sewage disposal to provide for efficient and economical operation.

Chisago County P. W. A. allotments

W-1130	Center City, Chisago County.		$13,770	$13,770	$16,830	$30,600	24	Addition to grade and high school consisting of an auditorium and gymnasium to provide adequate facilities for physical education to meet State board of education requirements.
W-1087	Chisago City		18,197	18,197	22,241	40,438	40	Complete waterworks system to provide adequate water supply and fire protection.
			31,967	31,967	39,071	71,038		

Hennepin County P. W. A. allotments

Docket no.	Location	P. W. A. allotment			Local funds provided	Estimated cost	Estimated average employment	Description
		Loan	Grant	Total				
2616	Mound	$46,900	$14,100	$61,000		$60,650	30	New well, pumping plant, elevated steel storage tank and main distributing system. Necessary for adequate fire protection.
4360	Minneapolis	1,871,600	2,797,400	4,669,000	$6,855,157	11,524,157	1,000	Sewage collection and treatment system. To stop the discharge of raw sewage into the Mississippi River which in times of low river flow septic action occurs.
5630	do		214,400	214,400	687,600	902,000	250	Construction of modern fireproof armory. Present system of renting quarters inadequate to carry out proper program of training for National Guard Units.
W-1001	University of Minnesota		40,800	40,800	49,791	90,591	40	Fireproof concrete addition to women's gymnasium building, providing swimming pool, field house and related rooms. Present gymnasium inadequate for present enrollment. Will enlarge space for class and teacher training.
W-1045	Edina		46,899	46,899	57,320	104,219	52	Addition of 2-story brick structure to school and contruction of garage for school busses. Present building overcrowded and unable to adequately handle needs of increasing student body.
W-1057	Robbinsdale		135,000	135,000	165,000	300,000	170	Construction and equipping of junior-senior high school building. Badly needed because of growing population.
W-1068	University of Minnesota		33,260	33,260	40,652	73,912	69	Addition to indoor sports building. Increased interest in athletics requires additional room.
W-1143	Hopkins		32,850	32,850	40,150	73,000	38	Construction of addition to west wing of present school building. Present school overcrowded; need additional rooms and facilities to bring it up to standards of State department of education.
W-1246	Minneapolis		34,702	34,702	42,414	77,116	106	Construction of sewers. Section of city which project is to serve has no sewerage facilities.
W-1245	do		101,250	101,250	123,750	225,000	80	Public swimming pool for which there is an urgent need to provide children of district with supervised bathing facilities.
W-1244	do		61,200	61,250	74,910	136,200	60	Construction of complete garbage destructor plant. Will eliminate nuisance of hauling garbage through streets and save haulage costs.
W-1082	St. Louis Park		122,400	122,400	149,600	272,000	150	Construction of two-story high school building containing auditorium-gymnasium, etc. Due to rapid growth of this suburb of Minneapolis it is necessary to increase the educational facilities.
W-1066	Morningside		20,080	20,080	24,540	44,620	120	Construction of sewer system and pumping plant, grading, graveling, and oiling of a road. To provide modern system for disposal of sewage by removing the danger of water contamination.
2316	Minneapolis		84,000	84,000	256,000	340,000		Dormitory.
3055	do		86,000	86,000	264,000	350,000		Gymnasium.
3121	do		9,000	9,000	26,019	35,019		Clinic building.
	FEDERAL PROJECT							
FP-240	Hopkins		58,000	58,000		55,210	40	Post office.
		1,918,500	3,891,431	5,809,891	8,856,900	14,663,694		

Isanti County P. W. A. allotments

W-1055	Isanti County		$21,735	$21,735	$26,565	$48,300	39	Removal of old bridge and construction of new bridge as the heavier traffic of the present day is imperative for the maintenance of public safety.
W-1146	Cambridge, Isanti County		113,625	113,625	138,875	252,500	150	Construction of 2 cottages and colony for epileptics to care for crowded conditions of present facilities.
W-1090	Cambridge		50,850	50,850	62,150	113,000		School addition.
W-1147	do		26,100	26,100	31,900	58,000	70	Construction of warehouse and root cellar to provide needed storage space for vegetables grown on the grounds.
			212,310	212,310	259,490	471,800		

Washington County W. P. A. allotments

W-1096	St. Paul Park, Washington County.		$49,500	$49,500	$60,500	$110,000	50	16-classroom school building of fireproof construction, as present building is inadequate for educational facilities.
W-1221	Stillwater		26,982	26,982	32,978	59,960	90	Extension of water mains and construction of sewage-disposal plant to provide needed additional water mains and discontinue the discharging of raw sewage into the river.
			76,482	76,482	93,478	169,960		

SOME HENNEPIN COUNTY P. W. A. PROJECTS

NORTH MINNEAPOLIS HIGH SCHOOL

North Minneapolis needs a new high school. The Minneapolis Board of Education is sponsoring the construction of a new high school for North Minneapolis. Federal funds are needed. In cooperation with North Minneapolis civic organizations and school officials, we are endeavoring to make this hope of North Minneapolis a reality. We must put an end to the overcrowded condition at North High.

ENLARGEMENT OF NORTH HIGH ATHLETIC FIELD

A project for the enlargement of the North High Athletic Field is being considered by the W. P. A. An allotment of $6,903 has already been approved, and we are now endeavoring to secure an additional, more adequate grant. I hope the W. P. A. will approve this request.

LAKE MINNETONKA AND MINNEHAHA CREEK RESTORATION APPROVED BY P. W. A. EXAMINING DIVISIONS

The most important rural Hennepin County P. W. A. project is the restoration of Lake Minnetonka and Minnehaha Creek; Minnesota Docket No. 1263. This project has been on the firing line for the past 3 years and more. I am convinced that the Minnetonka project is now at last on the road to final approval. It has been approved by the examining divisions of P. W. A.

For a long time the Lake Minnetonka project was delayed because local officials and citizens could not agree on the

method of raising the lakes. Several methods were proposed, and in my speech of January 18, 1934 (p. 894, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), I dealt with some of these proposals.

SIX METHODS OF RAISING LAKE MINNETONKA

One method is to divert the South Fork of the Crow River (the "Little" Crow) so that the water would run by gravity flow from the Little Crow to Lake Minnetonka. Some engineers claim that sufficient water could not be obtained from this source.

A second method is to divert the Big Crow River, formed by the junction of the North Fork and the South Fork near Rockford, Minn. The water from the Big Crow would then run into Lake Sarah and Lake Independence, and finally into Lake Minnetonka, Minnehaha Creek and Falls. All three lakes would be raised by this method. It is this plan which has now been submitted to the Public Works Administration.

A third method, favored by many, is the diversion of flood waters from the Mississippi River, where there is an inexhaustible, never-failing supply of water. There is disagreement as to the point of the diversion of the necessary waters of the Mississippi River.

A fourth method is the diversion of the Minnesota River. Some experts claim that this, like the Little Crow, is not a sufficient source of water.

The fifth method is the construction of artesian wells, from which water would be pumped into the lake.

A sixth method has been suggested, whereby a large Minneapolis water main would be tapped during seasons when water usage in Minneapolis is at its minimum. This water would flow above a control dam through a large pipe line into Lake Minnetonka, and the sponsors of the project would pay the city of Minneapolis a minimum rate for a large volume of water.

BIG CROW RIVER DIVERSION APPROVED

This spring a united effort was made to secure approval of the Big Crow River diversion method, and we have made very definite progress. The Examining Divisions of P. W. A. have now approved the Crow River diversion project at Rockford and recommended a Federal grant of $259,200. The total cost is estimated at $576,000. The State of Minnesota is sponsoring the project. With the $300,000,000 of public-works funds soon to be made available we hope to obtain final approval of the Lake Minnetonka project.

Lake Minnetonka is now about 4 feet below the top of Grays Bay Dam, over which it should flow. The lake has been lifted about 10½ inches by rains since last September. But we cannot depend upon rainfall. Drought will come again, and the lake must be restored by giving it a steady source of inflow. Before the drought of recent years the lake had not been as low as 3 feet below the top of Grays Bay Dam since 1890. The levels began to fall rapidly in 1928 and continued to do so through 1934, reaching a 50-year low mark of almost 6 feet 6 inches below the top of the dam during the drought of 1934. Nearly a fourth of all the water had gone from the lake at that time.

COOPERATION OF HENNEPIN COUNTY CITIZENS

We appreciate the cooperation received from citizens of Hennepin County on the Lake Minnetonka project. Palmer Holman, editor of the Wayzata Herald, A. S. Brazeman, of the Mound Pilot, and Willard Dillman of the Excelsior Record have conducted a persistent campaign in their newspapers week after week for the restoration of Minnetonka. The Minnetonka Preservation Association, the Grays Bay Improvement Association, the Rural Hennepin Civic Association, the Hennepin County Commissioners, Ben B. Moore, Edina Village Recorder, the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, the Minnetonka Improvement Association, and many other citizens of Hennepin County have contributed to the progress that has so far been made on this project. They have finally brought about a united effort for one method of accomplishing the work that needs to be done, and final approval is in sight.

Personally I appreciate the confidence the good people of Hennepin County have expressed in my own efforts on the Minnetonka project. Mr. C. J. Skreen, president of the Minnetonka Preservation Association, Mound, Minn., has been kind enough to write me:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUNDEEN: Once again I want to thank you on behalf of our association and myself for the good work that you are doing in Washington, not only in behalf of our water level but other constructive legislation. We are entirely satisfied that the people at large are truly being represented by you and appreciate the honest efforts made in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. SKREEN,
President, Minnetonka Preservation Association.

FOURTEEN-THOUSAND-DOLLAR MINNETONKA MILLS DAM PROJECT APPROVED

Last October—1935—the Public Works Administration approved project no. 5101 for a $14,570 dam at Minnetonka Mills to control the outflow of Lake Minnetonka. We hope that the lake-raising project will also be approved and funds allotted from the $300,000,000 soon to be made available to the Public Works Administration.

MINNEAPOLIS PRODUCERS' AND CONSUMERS' MARKET

P. W. A. project no. 1247, the Minneapolis market project, was approved after many months of hard work. For many years I have been interested in a new municipal market.

Recognizing that proper distribution facilities are necessary for farm products, the Public Works Administration approved an application for a market in Minneapolis, November 18, 1935. This project, popularly known as the Farmers and Gardeners' Market, received a Federal grant amounting to $139,050. In addition, the applicant is furnishing, from local sources, $169,950, a total of $309,000.

The original market, occupying two-thirds of a city block in the downtown district of Minneapolis, is not easily accessible, and so crowded at all times during business hours that it is a menace to traffic in that portion of the city.

Most of the present facilities are occupied by commission merchants, and more than 500 farmers who come to market their products have no—or only temporary—facilities.

The new project is located at an advantageous central point near Sixth Avenue North and Lyndale on the north side, in the fourth ward, in the Third Congressional District easily accessible from every section of the city, and with little probability of traffic congestion. The new site is approximately two blocks long and a block wide. It will contain nine market sheds each more than 300 feet long and constructed of fireproof material.

In this project P. W. A. has responded to the demand for an open market where the producers of foodstuffs may sell more than $5,000,000 worth of produce to consumers and grocers annually. For more than a generation farmers, gardeners, and consumers have urged this fine development. I am happy to know that citizens of the third and fourth wards will have a fine, convenient market shopping center within walking distance of their homes.

SUMNER FIELD HOUSING PROJECT

Project H-4201 is the famous Sumner Field housing project which is now under way. This is one of the largest housing projects in the country, located in the center of the Third Congressional District. The project was to cost $6,000,000, but the original plans were curtailed by the Public Works Administration, and present plans are for a $3,500,000 project. We are endeavoring to enlarge the project to its original size. Eventually more than $6,000,000 will be expended on housing in this Third District area.

The Sumner Field housing project is bounded by Eleventh Avenue, Seventh Street, Aldrich Avenue, Eighth Avenue, Bassett Place, Sixth Avenue, and Emerson Avenue North. It will provide 2,247 rooms in 618 family units, in three-story fireproof apartments, and two-story houses and flats. There will be 112 garages and 16 stores as auxiliary buildings. Ample open space, landscaping, and playgrounds for young children will be provided. It is expected to employ 1,180 men during 1936.

EDINA-MORNINGSIDE PUBLIC-SCHOOL PROJECT

The Edina public-school project, listed as W-1045 and costing $104,219, was approved last fall. Superintendent O. S. Glover notified me on September 16, 1935, that the project had been approved by the State P. W. A. office at St. Paul, and forwarded to Washington for final approval. We immediately contacted the Public Works Administration, and were able to notify Mr. Glover by air mail on October 1, 1935, that the project had been approved, and an allocation of $46,899 made by the P. W. A. Approval was made public the same day. Work was provided for 52 people.

Upon receipt of our notification Superintendent Glover wrote me a letter stating:

DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very kindly for your letter of October 1 informing us that P. W. A. project W-1045 for the construction of our addition to the Edina school had been approved on the 45-percent basis. We very much appreciate your assistance in this matter. The addition will make a very substantial school plant at Edina and take care of a badly overcrowded school.

Again thanking you, we are,

Very truly yours,

O. S. GLOVER, *Superintendent.*

I am glad to have been of some service to the good people of Edina, where our own children go to school—a real home community; and the center of every such neighborhood is the school. We are now well provided for some years ahead.

ROBBINSDALE JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Edwin J. Cooper, superintendent of independent school district no. 24, Robbinsdale, Minn., notified me on August 20, 1935, that the application for a 45-percent P. W. A. grant for the Robbinsdale junior-senior high school had been transmitted to Washington by air mail on August 15, 1935. The estimated cost was $300,000, of which $135,000 was asked from the Federal Government through the Public Works Administration. In his letter Superintendent Cooper stated:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUNDEEN: Will you please do what you can to see that the hope and aspirations of the people of Robbinsdale are fulfilled as early as possible? We have never had a senior high school at Robbinsdale, being handicapped by the necessity of sending our pupils to Minneapolis schools, and everyone is now looking forward to having all 12 grades of school at Robbinsdale. * * * We now await a favorable reply and a maximum grant from Washington. You know best our ability, our loyalty, and your many friendships in this district. Will you do what you can to let us hear from you at an early date?

Most earnestly yours,

BOARD OF EDUCATION, INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 24,
Robbinsdale, Minn.
Per EDWIN J. COOPER, *Superintendent.*

Mr. Cooper's letter was placed before the officials of the National Emergency Council, then handling the matter, and we urged prompt approval.

We had some difficulty in securing approval of the Robbinsdale school project, for the reason that P. W. A. funds were exhausted in November 1935, leaving many valuable projects not included in the program. However, we were assured by Assistant Administrator Horatio B. Hackett on November 11 that delay in approval did not indicate rejection of the project, and that it would be given further consideration as soon as additional funds were made available. The project has now been approved and a full 45-percent grant made by the Federal Government. The Robbinsdale High School is now being built, giving employment to 170 people. We are glad to cooperate in all matters pertaining to improvement of Robbinsdale—a splendid home city, one of the very best in the Third Congressional District.

ST. LOUIS PARK HIGH SCHOOL

The St. Louis Park two-story high school building has recently been approved by the P. W. A. Final allocation of funds was made possible by the appropriation of public-works funds by Congress. I supported this appropriation.

We have been endeavoring to secure approval of this project for several months. The Examining Division of the P. W. A. approved the project this spring, and appropriation of funds by Congress now makes the construction possible without further delay. The new school building will include an auditorium, gymnasium, and other features of a modern up-to-date high school, for St. Louis Park. St. Louis Park has for some time been badly in need of a new school, and we are happy to know that construction of a new school has now been made possible. Federal funds amounting to $122,400 have been allocated, and 150 people are given employment by this project.

CAMBRIDGE EPILEPTIC COLONY

A great humanitarian purpose is being accomplished by the construction of two splendid buildings at the Cambridge Colony for Epileptics. These two additional buildings will take care of crowded conditions at the colony, one of the finest institutions in the entire United States. I was happy to have played a part in bringing about approval of this $252,500 project which employs 150 persons. Dr. D. E. McBroom, superintendent of the Minnesota Colony for Epileptics was kind enough to write me on January 7, 1936, as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUNDEEN: Several days ago I was informed that this institution had received a Federal grant amounting to a little over $113,000. This, of course, will mean an additional cottage, housing about 100 patients, which will help a great deal in taking care of our long waiting list.

I also understand that it is largely through your efforts that we received this grant. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the kind interest you have taken in us and let you know we appreciate this to the utmost.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

D. E. MCBROOM, M. D., *Superintendent.*

P. W. A. PROJECTS NOT YET APPROVED

There are many valuable Third Congressional District P. W. A. projects now under consideration which have not yet been approved. We are making every effort to secure approval of these projects. Sometimes it takes months, and even years, to obtain approval. We need the cooperation of State and local government officials, organizations, and individuals in bringing pressure to bear upon the proper officials in order that these worthy projects may be started.

I will be in Washington for several weeks after the adjournment of Congress for this purpose.

In order to bring about favorable action on a public-works project, it is necessary to secure the cooperation of Senators, Representatives, and Public Works Administrator Harold L. Ickes and his staff. We have had numerous conferences with Mr. Ickes and other Public Works officials. But even more important is the interest, the letters, the wires, and the personal calls of the folks back home. The united, persistent effort of citizens directly affected by the project is the determining factor. The same is true of W. P. A. projects, under the direction of Administrator Harry L. Hopkins, at Washington, and Victor Christgau, at St. Paul.

EDINA VILLAGE COMMUNITY HALL

One project for which we are trying to secure approval is the Edina Village Community Hall, project no. 1174.

The village of Edina, a rapidly growing suburb of Minneapolis, has submitted to the Public Works Administration an application for Federal funds to construct a community building and village hall. A requested amount of $43,636, consisting of a loan of $24,000 and a grant of $19,636, has not yet been approved.

There is no adequate community building of any kind and no place for village business. Records are kept in the homes of the village officers.

The new building for which funds are sought will provide an auditorium and meeting place for several village organizations, facilities for Boy Scout activities, administrative offices for village councils, and storage rooms for permanent village records.

We will continue our efforts on this project, and I am certain a real Edina community hall will be constructed.

CAMBRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION

The Public Works Administration approved the Cambridge school addition, project W-1090, at a cost of $113,000,

of which $50,850 is furnished by the Federal Government. Henry L. Soderquist, attorney at law, Cambridge, Minn., wrote me in Washington on March 24, 1936, concerning additional funds for this project. We have taken up the matter with Mr. Soderquist in person, and we are now bringing pressure to bear upon the Public Works Administration in an endeavor to secure an additional allotment.

EMANUEL COHEN CENTER

The enlarging and rebuilding of Emanuel Cohen Center, located at 909 Elwood Avenue North, Minneapolis, is another worthy project which ought to be considered by P. W. A. This center is now doing most valuable social-service work among people of all nationalities. Plans are being made for this project, and we have discussed the matter with P. W. A. and Federal Housing Administration officials. We will continue our efforts on behalf of Emanuel Cohen Center and cooperate with those who are backing the project.

MOOSE LAKE ASYLUM

A Federal grant of $981,675 has been approved by the examining divisions of P. W. A. for the $2,181,500 Moose Lake Insane Asylum, a great humanitarian project sponsored by the State of Minnesota. We believe funds will be made available in the near future.

OTHER P. W. A. PROJECTS OF WHICH APPROVAL IS EXPECTED

There are other Third District projects which have now been approved by the Examining Division of the Public Works Administration. Following is a list of these projects:

P. W. A. projects approved by examining divisions

Docket no.	Location	Loan	Grant	Total	Local funds provided	Estimated cost	Estimated average employment	Description
W-1179	University of Minnesota		$123,750	$123,750	$151,250	$275,000	165	Construction of adult education building. To provide a continuing program of instruction for persons engaged in professional services in State.
W-1180	do		58,590	58,590	71,410	130,000	79	Roof house addition to hospital. Present building overcrowded and lack of space for patients needing isolation or quietness.
W-1181	do		24,075	24,075	29,425	53,500	85	Fourth-floor addition to storehouse building. Necessary for efficient operation.
W-1200	Richfield		41,400	41,400	50,600	92,000	70	Addition to present school of gymnasium-auditorium and 4 classrooms. To provide facilities now lacking and to relieve overcrowded classrooms.
W-1241	Osseo		17,100	17,100	20,900	38,000	28	Addition to present high- and grade-school building of auditorium-gymnasium. Present school without facilities to provide adequate facilities for physical education.
W-1255	Minneapolis		60,855	60,855	74,145	135,000	136	Construction of school building to relieve overcrowded conditions in present building and to furnish facilities now lacking for district.
			325,770	325,770	397,730	723,500		

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

This is a picture of the Public Works Administration projects in Minnesota's Third Congressional District. The P. W. A. is under the direction of Harold L. Ickes at Washington and Capt. R. A. Radford at St. Paul. We have several other Federal agencies disbursing funds to Minnesota. One of the most important is the Works Progress Administration under the direction of Harry L. Hopkins at Washington and Victor Christgau at St. Paul. The W. P. A. is successor to the Civil Works Administration. This agency handles large numbers of projects. Its primary purpose is to give employment. It therefore approves projects which can be started quickly, will employ a large number of people, and will not take a large percentage of the funds for construction materials. Up to March 10, 1936, a total of $26,606,501.39 Federal funds had been allocated by the Works Progress Administration for Minnesota projects.

This includes some old C. W. A. and E. R. A. projects taken over by the Works Progress Administration. There were also many C. W. A. and E. R. A. projects completed before the W. P. A. was created. We do not have a list of these completed projects. Total Federal funds received by Minnesota for both W. P. A. and P. W. A. projects are approximately as follows:

W. P. A.	$26,606,501.39
P. W. A. (Federal projects)	24,605,748.00
P. W. A. (non-Federal projects)	20,867,569.00
Total	72,079,818.39

(Not including completed C. W. A. and E. R. A. projects.)

After projects are approved at Washington, it is the duty of the Works Progress Administration office in St. Paul to get the projects under way. Sometimes Federal funds are not available to complete all projects approved at Washington. However, our task at Washington is to secure approval of Works Progress Administrator Harry L. Hopkins, then the approval of the President, and finally allocation of funds by the Comptroller General. After that, constant pressure of State, county, city, and village officials, and interested citizens of the district is necessary to put the projects into action through the State administrator's office.

Up to February 29, 1936, good teamwork secured the approval of the Washington Works Progress Administration office, the President, and the Comptroller General for hundreds of Third District projects, including the following:

Anoka County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
*496	Anoka	Cemetery improvement	2	357	$880
497	do	Sidewalk construction	2	357	12,205
498	do	Curb construction	2	357	12,205
*1884	do	Book repair	2	570	528
*1885	do	Special survey	2	570	792
*2000	do	Park improvement	2	570	6,406
2001	do	Sewer construction	2	570	4,746
*2039	do	Park improvement	2	570	4,824
*3109	do	Street improvement	2	549	5,700
*3110	do	Courthouse	2	549	4,519
*3111	do	School repair	2	549	1,938
*3133	do	Drainage improvement	2	549	10,815
*3169	do	Drainage	2	549	24,450
*3178	do	Sewing project	2	549	18,642
4177	do	Road improvement	2	654	6,408
4377	do	Water main	2	654	2,259
*4590	do	Bridge improvement	2	654	5,543
4593	do	Road construction	2	654	14,500
4597	do	Road improvement	2	654	3,393
*4763	do	Conservation	2	641	21,762
*4804	do	Sewer improvement	2	641	1,030
*4815	do	Goods project	2	641	9,600
*4828	do	Sewer construction	2	641	1,675
4848	do	Grounds improvement	2	641	1,156
*4872	do	Flood control	2	641	1,930
*5232	do	Surveying	2	685	1,150
5397	do	Road improvement	2	770	57,540
*5674	do	Public building improvement.	2	783	25,992
*5702	do	Golf course construction	2	1413	12,230
*5702	do	do	2	879	13,684
5707	do	Navigation	2	879	9,508
*5862	do	Game conservation	2	1042	12,673
6228	do	Armory improvement	2	1174	7,085

Anoka County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
6702	Anoka	Tax maps	2	1254	$5,567
6793	do	Gaging station	2	1264	4,078
6906	do	Hot lunches	2	1334	1,056
4595	Bethel	Road construction	2	654	6,160
4596	Burns Township	Road improvement	2	654	899
*982	Centerville	School improvement	2	508	1,710
*4826	do	Sewer construction	2	641	1,545
*6318	Centerville Township.	School lunches	2	1174	1,056
*784	Columbia Heights	Road construction	2	441	3,009
*4376	do	Book repair	2	654	660
*499	do	Street improvement	2	1443	6,606
*499	do	do	2	357	10,506
*500	do	do	2	357	6,020
*501	do	Sidewalk construction	2	357	1,400
*1499	do	School-building grounds	2	480	5,009
1948	do	Walks, curbs, and gutters	2	570	11,609
*3112	do	Sewer construction	2	549	3,355
4375	do	Sidewalk construction	2	654	8,125
*4876	do	Street improvement	2	1362	7,428
*4876	do	do	2	641	2,450
*5873	do	Goods project	2	1042	47,218
*6340	do	Sewing project	2	1186	17,860
*6390	do	Educational project	2	1199	6,472
7001	do	Worker education	2	1439	1,085
*853	Ham Lake Township.	Road improvement	2	431	3,009
4594	Ham Lake	Road construction	2	654	968
4591	do	Road improvement	2	654	1,408
*852	Linwood Township	do	2	431	3,009
*855	Linwood	do	2	431	440
*4592	do	Road construction	2	654	4,050
*854	Oak Grove Township.	Road improvement	2	431	4,800
	Total				496,335

Chisago County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
260	Chisago	Municipal improvement	13	284	$1,365
*518	do	Road construction	13	357	3,378
2940	do	Sanitary privies	13	531	16,199
4184	do	Water conservation	13	654	264,390
*4264	do	Book repair	13	654	1,980
*4556	do	Bathhouse	13	641	2,834
*6411	do	School lunches	13	1206	3,080
*6484	do	Wood cutting	13	1206	8,685
6713	do	Tax maps	13	1254	5,567
6848	do	Recreational art	13	1269	7,710
*5148	Fish Lake Township.	Road improvement	13	651	1,416
*775	Franconia Township.	Road construction	13	441	5,178
5012	Grand Marais	Fre. St. construction	13	651	1,490
*520	Harris	Road fence	13	357	383
1075	do	Cemetery improvement	13	477	435
*1686	do	Road improvement	13	480	3,632
1850	do	Road construction	13	480	6,940
*5454	Hesset Township	Road improvement	13	770	4,008
1687	Lindstrom	Municipal improvement	13	480	10,464
*788	do	School building grounds	13	441	755
*59	do	Water main	13	181	2,325
262	do	Municipal improvement	13	284	1,365
1334	do	Road construction	13	480	5,540
4627	do	Roadside improvement	13	654	1,416
5424	do	Athletic field improvement	13	770	1,929
*196	North Branch	do	13	284	2,814
*521	do	Poor farm	13	357	623
1333	do	Swim pool	13	480	2,160
1849	do	Street repairing	13	480	508
*1688	Rush City	Playground construction	13	480	9,120
*1688	do	Park construction	13	1249	3,295
1689	do	Road construction	13	480	908
1690	Rushsba Township	Road improvement	13	480	1,176
4400	Shafer	Roadside construction	13	654	1,310
4557	Shafer Township	Road improvement	13	654	1,416
1187	Stacy	Roadside improvement	13	477	1,425
2012	do	Park development	13	570	2,352
*1539	Taylors Falls	Construction material	13	480	2,540
*132	do	Roadside improvement	13	239	1,600
132	do	Erosion	13	1431	3,455
1691	do	Water main extension	13	480	762
2013	do	School ground improvement	13	570	1,819
*451	Wyoming	Storm sewer	13	357	1,095
*519	do	Sidewalk curb	13	357	1,158
936	do	Swim pool	13	508	846
5033	North Branch	Landscaping	13	651	3,632
5259	do	Road construction	13	718	1,096
1367	Princeton	Road improvement	13	480	2,004
1857	do	Road construction	13	480	1,416

Chisago County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
1858	Princeton	Road construction	13	480	$2,004
1717	Springvale Township.	Road improvements	13	480	3,132
2023	Stanchfield	Swimming pool	13	570	1,764
938	Stanford Township	School building	13	508	2,204
4559	Amador Township	Road improvement	13	654	1,416
4558	Branch Township	Roadside improvement	13	654	1,416
261	Center	Municipal improvement	13	284	1,365
3115	Center City	Goods project	13	549	3,924
*4265	Center	Mapping	13	654	165
*4266	do	Clerical	13	654	165
*4555	Center City	Road construction	13	654	2,832
*5355	do	Sewing project	13	770	5,660
*6180	Chisago City	Education program	13	1150	2,234
130	Chisago	Recreation facilities	13	239	1,382
	Total				440,657

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington

RURAL HENNEPIN

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
6726	Hennepin	Tax map	27	1254	$11,390
*6894	do	Museum project	27	1308	4,431
6898	do	Statistical survey	27	1329	1,310
*7002	do	Professional, clerical	27	1439	13,815
*992	Hopkins	Street improvement	27	508	2,203
1268	do	Sewing project	27	480	49,840
4414	do	Sewer construction	27	654	7,890
*5026	do	do	27	651	11,375
5398	do	Canning	27	770	5,891
6836	do	Park improvement	27	1269	7,024
6837	do	Fairgrounds improvement	27	1269	3,437
4571	Independence	Roadside improvement	27	654	4,309
*993	Island Park	Freight-station construction	27	508	8,231
4217	Medicine Lake	Park development	27	654	156,684
287	Medina Township	Fish conservation	27	284	6,211
279	Bloomington	Street improvement	27	284	14,084
2020	do	Building grounds improvement.	27	570	2,423
4488	Champlin	Dam construction	27	654	10,320
5504	Countrywide	Building grounds improvement.	27	783	51,896
539	Crystal	Street improvement	27	357	8,075
4277	do	do	27	654	19,195
*4806	do	Garage construction	27	641	3,782
277	Crono Township	Street improvement	27	884	3,448
*276	Dayton	Sidewalk improvement	27	284	6,456
3172	Edina	General salvage	27	549	12,169
4785	do	Landscaping	27	641	9,320
4851	do	do	27	641	6,846
5028	do	Sewer construction	27	651	850
5476	do	Bridge construction	27	783	1,896
5645	do	Street improvement	27	817	19,746
6986	Excelsior	Athletic field improvement	27	1405	14,645
*1195	Golden Valley	Street construction	27	477	14,316
4839	do	Sewing project	27	641	13,394
5159	Hennepin	Road improvement	27	651	11,875
2937	do	Sanitary privies	27	531	23,717
2968	do	Weed control	27	531	2,000
5240	do	Park improvement	27	685	503,580
5245	do	Road improvement	27	685	274,778
*5246	do	Roadside improvement	27	685	844,925
*5283	do	do	27	718	411,385
5602	do	Mapping	27	817	55,405
*6242	do	Armory improvement	27	1174	7,208
5706	do	Navigation	27	879	6,656
6258	do	Rug weaving	27	1174	19,551
*6311	do	Recreational programs	27	1174	42,823
*6417	do	School lunches	27	1206	16,480
6423	do	Library improvements	27	1206	3,516
6575	do	School lunches	27	1237	16,480
6613	do	Library work	27	1283	2,574
*6614	do	do	27	1283	27,089
5158	Minnetonka Township.	Road improvement	27	651	11,515
3147	Morningside	Street improvement	27	549	3,630
3148	do	do	27	549	861
3149	do	Curb gutter	27	549	5,152
4761	do	Sidewalk construction	27	641	819
*6375	do	Sanitary sewer	27	1199	21,539
286	Plymouth	Road improvement	27	284	3,103
*6938	Plymouth Township.	Sewing project	27	1362	4,593
6387	Richfield	Park improvement	27	11999	1,672
94	Robbinsdale	Walk, curb, and gutter	27	239	3,171
284	do	Street improvement	27	284	22,497
1817	do	Recreational facilities	27	480	15,765
2056	do	Forestation	27	570	11,455
*4213	do	Street improvement	27	654	41,820
*4673	do	Sewing project	27	641	45,323
4759	do	Water main	27	641	14,669

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington—Con.

RURAL HENNEPIN—continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
4786	Robbinsdale	Sewer construction	27	641	$9,330
*5282	do	Landscaping	27	718	76,065
6264	do	do	27	1174	1,672
3132	St. Louis Park	Water main	27	549	985
152	do	do	27	239	1,734
*994	do	Street improvement	27	508	15,202
3186	do	Park development	27	1134	16,925
5029	do	do	27	651	19,569
5866	St. Paul	Statistical survey	27	1042	5,036
4871	Wayzata	Water main	27	641	2,414
	Total				3,133,370

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936 (city of Minneapolis)

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
*2114	Minneapolis	Building demolition	27	570	$29,976
*2115	do	Park development	27	570	69,560
2786	do	Street improvement	27	1206	1,328,950
*2962	do	do	27	531	902,310
*3029	do	Statistical survey	27	549	17,290
3194	do	Sidewalk construction	27	549	6,126
*3195	do	Library addition	27	549	8,959
*4129	do	School improvement	27	654	10,660
4172	do	do	27	654	15,834
4173	do	do	27	654	16,073
*4174	do	do	27	654	11,989
*4175	do	do	27	654	6,747
*4190	do	Goods project	27	654	286,445
4191	do	Road improvement	27	654	855,675
4214	do	do	27	654	17,781
4215	do	Surveying	27	654	32,862
*4216	do	Street construction	27	654	1,154,619
4233	do	Fire station improvement	27	654	71,897
*4234	do	Administration building improvement.	27	654	40,250
*4235	do	Road improvement	27	654	111,905
*4236	do	Surveying	27	654	57,516
*4340	do	Bridge construction	27	654	7,824
*4411	do	School construction	27	654	2,474
*4760	do	Road improvement	27	641	18,526
4783	do	Administration building	27	641	717
4850	do	Grounds	27	641	21,125
4965	do	Roadside improvement	27	651	29,520
4966	do	Road construction	27	651	57,655
*5024	do	Clerical	27	651	3,900
5025	do	do	27	651	2,340
5027	do	Goods project	27	651	13,750
*5123	do	Road improvement	27	651	17,781
5124	do	do	27	651	22,932
5125	do	Grounds improvement	27	651	102,273
*5126	do	Dump improvement	27	651	925,643
*5155	do	Recreation project	27	651	111,320
5156	do	Retaining wall	27	651	35,054
*5157	do	Swing project	27	651	235,675
*5228	do	Vocational rehabilitation	27	685	6,105
*5237	do	Medical project	27	685	62,988
*5238	do	Clerical	27	685	7,356
*5292	do	Auditorium construction	27	770	27,090
*5364	do	Clerical	27	770	73,458
*5373	do	do	27	770	22,244
*5422	do	Experimental station	27	770	80,204
*5431	do	Street improvement	27	770	1,472,480
5527	do	Airport improvement	27	879	78,850
*5728	do	Park improvement	27	879	65,228
*5729	do	School improvement	27	879	34,002
5733	do	Road improvement	27	879	40,944
*5735	do	Swimming pool	27	1446	13,514
5735	do	Special school construction	27	879	50,101
*5736	do	School building grounds	27	879	16,835
*5737	do	do	27	879	19,208
5738	do	School improvement	27	879	8,754
*5739	do	School building grounds	27	879	12,960
*5743	do	Bridge construction	27	879	16,645
*5748	do	School improvement	27	879	10,512
*5752	do	Clerical	27	879	23,249
*5841	do	City hall improvement	27	1042	38,469
*5863	do	Cemetery improvement	27	1042	31,524
*5876	do	Planning	27	1089	234,616
5888	do	Clerical	27	1134	14,013
*6072	do	Recreation project	27	1134	94,381
*6073	do	do	27	1134	32,868
*6100	do	Clerical work	27	1169	620
6101	do	do	27	1169	620
6102	do	do	27	1169	3,366
6103	do	Professional	27	1169	620
6104	do	Clerical work	27	1169	858
6105	do	Professional	27	1169	1,240
6106	do	do	27	1169	3,305
6107	do	Clerical work	27	1169	1,122

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936 (city of Minneapolis)—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
6108	Minneapolis	Professional	27	1169	$4,317
6109	do	do	27	1169	1,669
6110	do	do	27	1169	620
6111	do	do	27	1169	620
6112	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,478
6113	do	Professional	27	1169	1,240
6114	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6115	do	Clerical work	27	1169	1,122
6116	do	do	27	1169	561
6117	do	Professional	27	1169	620
6118	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6119	do	Clerical	27	1169	561
6120	do	Professional	27	1169	661
6121	do	do	27	1169	620
6122	do	do	27	1169	620
6123	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6124	do	do	27	1169	4,635
6125	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,122
6126	do	Professional	27	1169	1,122
6127	do	do	27	1169	620
6128	do	do	27	1169	1,029
6129	do	do	27	1169	3,412
6130	do	Clerical	27	1169	561
6131	do	Professional	27	1169	1,240
6132	do	do	27	1169	1,122
6133	do	do	27	1169	620
6134	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6135	do	do	27	1169	620
6136	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6137	do	do	27	1169	661
6138	do	do	27	1169	1,122
6139	do	do	27	1169	539
6140	do	do	27	1169	1,122
6141	do	do	27	1169	620
6142	do	do	27	1169	1,861
6143	do	Clerical	27	1169	4,911
6144	do	do	27	1169	1,716
6145	do	do	27	1169	2,574
6146	do	do	27	1169	8,437
6147	do	do	27	1169	3,432
6148	do	do	27	1169	860
6149	do	do	27	1169	6,006
6150	do	do	27	1169	3,722
6151	do	do	27	1169	529
6152	do	do	27	1169	620
6153	do	do	27	1169	620
6154	do	do	27	1169	858
6155	do	do	27	1169	1,907
6156	do	do	27	1169	1,861
6157	do	do	27	1169	1,419
6158	do	do	27	1169	1,090
6159	do	do	27	1169	8,580
6160	do	do	27	1169	7,062
6161	do	Professional	27	1169	3,103
6162	do	do	27	1169	620
6163	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,122
6164	do	Professional	27	1169	3,339
6165	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,683
6166	do	do	27	1169	5,610
6167	do	Professional	27	1169	2,362
6168	do	Clerical	27	1169	5,049
6169	do	Professional	27	1169	620
6170	do	Clerical	27	1169	561
6171	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6172	do	do	27	1169	1,742
*6201	do	Educational project	27	1265	19,759
6201	do	do	27	1150	64,599
6219	do	Street improvement	27	1150	7,053,810
6268	do	Park improvement	27	1174	27,785
6326	do	Clerical	27	1186	12,168
6398	do	Library project	27	1199	20,270
*6518	do	City survey	27	1220	59,400
6566	do	Clerical	27	1237	6,240
6567	do	do	27	1237	12,168
*6568	do	Social service	27	1237	22,150
6572	do	Electrical survey	27	1237	13,110
6573	do	Clerical	27	1237	3,900
6586	do	do	27	1237	3,542
6605	do	Book repair	27	1264	20,400
*6679	do	Clerical	27	1254	29,000
6885	do	do	27	1298	70,745
6893	do	Government survey	27	1308	26,115
*6905	do	Sanitation	27	1329	158,251
*6909	do	Technical project	27	1344	5,373
*6920	do	Clerical	27	1344	42,678
6994	do	Sewer project	27	1402	25,422
7009	do	do	27	1432	18,140
153	do	Road improvements	27	239	18,803
*243	do	do	27	284	880,000
*244	do	Sewer improvements	27	284	89,505
*245	do	Water supply	27	284	218,288
*278	do	Electric utility	27	630	5,115
280	do	Road improvements	27	284	5,375
*282	do	Street improvements	27	284	131,030
*283	do	do	27	284	441,743
*285	do	Street construction	27	284	658,217
*288	do	Street improvements	27	284	326,781
349	do	Hospital improvements	27	279	4,970
*350	do	Park improvements	27	279	2,063,565
*354	do	Library project	27	279	91,620
*372	do	Grounds improvement	27	630	16,902

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936 (city of Minneapolis)—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
*420	Minneapolis	Medical	27	344	$165,972
538	do	Hospital improvements	27	1389	2,927
538	do	Hospital construction	27	357	8,275
749	do	School improvements	27	441	2,579
794	do	Building razing	27	441	4,337
886	do	School improvements	27	431	6,168
*914	do	do	27	431	40,352
918	do	Road improvements	27	508	15,762
*1044	do	Library improvements	27	431	31,083
*1055	do	Nursing project	27	508	30,600
1065	do	Road improvements	27	477	10,421
1094	do	Navigation improvements	27	477	5,234
1196	do	Building grounds improvements	27	477	18,883
*1267	do	Library improvements	27	480	25,749
*1355	do	Clerical work	27	480	17,540
1356	do	Water conservation	27	480	9,650
*1563	do	Library work	27	480	7,261
*1564	do	Park improvements	27	480	14,681
1565	do	City hall improvements	27	480	5,312
1566	do	Roadside improvements	27	480	23,373
*1567	do	School sanitary systems	27	1389	2,166
1567	do	Sanitary privies	27	480	5,365
1568	do	Salvage	27	480	8,308
*1711	do	Fire station	27	480	21,344
1712	do	Building grounds improvements.	27	480	20,887
*1713	do	School building grounds	27	480	4,719
*1815	do	Library improvements	27	480	19,869
*1879	do	Special survey	27	570	64,397
*2098	do	Road improvements	27	570	25,768
2099	do	do	27	570	29,238
*2112	do	Culvert improvements	27	570	85,202
*2113	do	Work, curb, gutter	27	570	73,522
	Total				22,862,376

Isanti County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
*5681	Isanti	Public building	30	783	$33,850
*454	do	Road improvement	30	357	2,560
1363	do	do	30	480	2,352
2992	do	do	30	549	30,100
3116	do	School-building grounds	30	549	1,795
*4526	do	Road improvement	30	654	16,452
*5337	do	Library project	30	770	1,980
6729	do	Tax map	30	1254	5,567
6847	do	Recreational art	30	1269	7,710
5276	Braham	Street improvement	30	718	870
*6432	do	School lunches	30	1206	385
*197	Cambridge	Park development	30	284	4,654
540	do	Street improvement	30	357	190
*1096	do	Clerical	30	477	270
*1097	do	Courthouse improvement	30	1283	220
1097	do	Courthouse	30	477	110
1365	do	Road improvement	30	480	1,989
1366	do	do	30	480	1,869
1572	do	Grounds improvement	30	480	465
1716	do	Road improvements	30	480	1,406
1935	do	Recreational facilities	30	570	5,280
3114	do	Goods project	30	549	2,724

Isanti County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
4738	Cambridge	Sewing project	30	641	$5,660
6483	do	Wood cutting	30	1206	8,695
6538	do	Road improvement	30	1232	915
	Total				138,068

Washington County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
*5108	Newport	Street improvement	82	651	$6,499
5421	Point Douglas	Roadside improvement	82	770	24,744
4837	St. Paul Park	Building demolition	82	641	3,318
*4838	do	Street improvement	82	641	8,996
*475	Stillwater	Road improvement	82	357	5,324
*1170	do	Street improvement	82	477	17,700
*1171	do	Park improvement	82	477	11,802
*1468	do	Clerical work	82	480	9,540
*1469	do	Public-building improvement.	82	480	13,248
*1470	do	Construction material	82	1389	11,764
1470	do	do	82	480	7,352
*4240	do	Roadside improvement	82	654	25,082
*4454	do	Sewing project	82	654	15,304
*4455	do	Library project	82	654	21,520
5404	do	Street improvement	82	770	22,052
*615	Washington	Road improvement	82	357	21,066
2946	do	Sanitary privies	82	531	16,199
*6251	do	Armory improvement	82	1174	8,582
6476	do	Relief fuel	82	1206	9,318
6781	do	Tax maps	82	1254	7,935
*6851	do	Recreational program	82	1269	8,058
6947	Bayport	Street improvement	82	570	14,139
4844	Birchwood	Town hill improvement	82	641	206
5608	Denmark Township	Road improvement	82	817	5,556
*1806	Forest Lake	Street improvement	82	480	8,527
*2081	do	Park improvement	82	570	3,148
*6214	do	Educational program	82	1150	2,807
*2035	Marine	Roadside improvement	82	570	6,100
*2080	Hugo	Water conservation	82	570	1,731
614	Lincoln	Road improvement	82	357	7,808
*1664	Mahtomedi	Street improvement	82	480	11,304
2034	Newport	Grounds improvement	82	570	1,646
	Total				338,375

W. P. A. PROJECTS IN OPERATION—THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

On the above list we have indicated by an asterisk (*) sign which approved W. P. A. projects have been put in operation or authorized for work on a certain future date by the State administrator, Victor Christgau. It may be that by this time some projects not indicated by this sign have been put in operation. Minor clerical errors may possibly have been made, but our information is as correct and up to date as it has been possible to make it.

Victor Christgau, Works Progress Administrator for Minnesota, has furnished me with the following list of Third District W. P. A. projects which have actually been authorized for work by his office:

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work

ANOKA COUNTY

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Percent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-501	6-441	596	Sidewalk	Columbia Heights	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Feb. 6, 1937	$1,540	
65-71-2141	6-604	2873	Park improvements	do	May 21, 1936	14	Nov. 21, 1936	39,585	$15,238
65-71-5702	6-483	2621	Golf course	Anoka	Apr. 6, 1936	15	Jan. 6, 1937	27,282	10,040
65-71-4763	6-444	1844	Constructing buildings, game refuge	do	Jan. 15, 1936	50	Dec. 21, 1936	23,938	3,100
65-71-3112	6-459	1694	Sewers	Columbia Heights	Jan. 21, 1936	0	Mar. 21, 1937	3,910	
65-71-1885	6-454	1268	Clerical	Anoka	Will not start	0		871	
65-71-6318	6-552	2049	Hot lunch	Centerville	Jan. 30, 1936	20	Feb. 6, 1937	1,161	320
65-71-1884	6-448	1202	Book repair	Anoka	Nov. 15, 1935	80	Sept. 6, 1936	580	15
65-71-4376	6-449	1669	do	Columbia Heights	Nov. 30, 1935	100	June 21, 1936	726	25
65-71-5232	6-485	1212	Survey	Anoka	do	40	Dec. 6, 1936	2,861	25
65-71-6390	6-548	2173	Recreation	Columbia Heights	Jan. 30, 1936	65	Aug. 28, 1936	7,119	
65-71-3178	6-481	910	Sewing	Anoka	Nov. 15, 1935	50	Mar. 6, 1937	20,506	660
65-71-6340	6-534	2101	do	Columbia Heights	Jan. 15, 1936	65	Sept. 21, 1936	19,646	280

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work—Continued

ANOKA COUNTY—continued

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Percent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-4815	6-466	1225	Wood cutting	Anoka	Jan. 15, 1936	20	Feb. 21, 1937	$10,560	$2,150
65-71-5873	6-434	1884	Tanning hides	Columbia Heights	Dec. 15, 1935	60	Nov 6, 1936	51,939	
65-71-5674	6-601	1648	Road construction	Anoka	Nov. 30, 1935	65	Dec. 21, 1936	28,591	
65-71-854	6-432	732	Road repairs	Burns and Oak Grove Townships.	Nov. 15, 1935	20	Mar. 6, 1937	5,280	7,140
65-71-855	6-433	1219	do	Linwood	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Jan. 6, 1937	484	
65-71-4592	6-464	1683	do	do	do	0	Apr. 6, 1937	4,444	
65-71-784	6-429	334	do	Centerville Township	Nov. 15, 1935	33	Feb. 21, 1937	3,309	473
65-71-853	6-431	749	do	Ham Lake Township	Jan. 21, 1936	0	Apr. 21, 1937	3,309	
65-71-852	6-430	770	do	Linwood Township	Nov. 15, 1935	45	Feb. 21, 1937	3,309	348
65-71-499	6-459	359	Street repairs	Columbia Heights	Oct. 31, 1935	75	July 21, 1936	18,162	1,905
65-71-500	6-440	360	do	do	do	55	Sept. 21, 1936	12,370	2,565
65-71-3109	6-474	691	do	Anoka	Nov. 15, 1935	50	Oct. 21, 1936	6,270	304
65-71-4826	6-478	1204	Laying tile	Centerville	Jan. 15, 1936	85	Dec. 6, 1936	1,699	420
65-71-4872	6-468	1216	Laying concrete pipe	Anoka	Jan. 6, 1937	0	Mar. 6, 1937	2,123	
65-71-4590	6-462	1719	Bridge repairs	do	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Apr. 6, 1937	6,097	
65-71-3110	6-482	2424	Courthouse addition	do	Feb. 15, 1936	80	Aug. 6, 1936	4,970	2,711
65-71-1499	6-445	662	School repairs	Columbia Heights	Nov. 15, 1935	70	July 21, 1936	9,368	2,264
65-71-982	6-443	641	School painting	Centerville	Nov. 21, 1936	0	Jan. 21, 1937	1,881	
65-71-3111	6-461	778	School repairs	Anoka	do	0	Feb. 21, 1937	2,131	
65-71-2039	6-456	1304	Park beautification	do	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Apr. 6, 1937	5,306	
65-71-2000	6-450	1338	do	do	Jan. 15, 1936	75	Jan. 6, 1937	7,046	2,432
65-71-5862	6-452	2788	Power line	do	May 21, 1936	32	Mar. 6, 1937	13,940	3,351
65-71-4804	6-484	1218	Sanitary sewer	do	Jan. 21, 1937	0	Mar. 21, 1937	1,133	
65-71-4828	6-472	1684	Storm sewer	do			Completed	1,842	998
65-71-496	6-435	399	Cemetery repairs	do			do	968	1,362
65-71-4876	6-479	1221	Street repairs	Columbia Heights			do	10,865	355
65-71-3169	6-458	777	Clean ditches	Anoka			Discontinued	26,895	
65-71-3133	6-476	895	do	do			do	11,896	

CHISAGO COUNTY

65-71-520	2-98	576	Painting snow fence	Rush City, Center City, Harris 6.			Completed	$421	$508
65-71-451	2-139	2358	Storm sewer	Wyoming			do	1,204	99
65-71-4555	2-597	2256	Road construction	Center City			do	3,115	2,250
65-71-519	2-89	472	Sidewalk construction	Wyoming	July 2, 1936	45	Sept. 30, 1936	3,182	49
65-71-1688	2-374	709	Park construction	Rush City	Open	25	June 30, 1937	13,656	725
65-71-59	2-7	284	Water main	Lindstrom			Completed	2,557	343
65-71-6180	2-858	1900	Educational	Center City	Open	50	June 30, 1937	2,457	
65-71-4265	2-599	1515	Clerical (county maps)	do	Oct. 30, 1936	60	Dec. 30, 1936	315	
65-71-4266	2-600	2435	County surveyor records	do			Completed	181	
65-71-6411	2-830	2180	Hot lunches	do	Oct. 15, 1936	35	Apr. 30, 1937	3,388	332
65-71-4264	2-598	1560	School library book repair	do	Open	60	Dec. 30, 1936	2,178	44
65-71-5355	2-716	1564	Sewing	Lindstrom	do	50	June 30, 1937	9,751	
65-71-1539	2-388	2071	Sand pit	Taylors Falls			Completed	2,794	60
65-71-6484	2-842	2185	Wood cutting	Center City			do	9,553	300
65-71-5454	2-517	2258	Culverts on roads	Rush City	Dec. 28, 1936	50	Feb. 28, 1937	4,408	51
65-71-775	2-172	2334	Road repair	Franconia	Sept. 31, 1936	62	Dec. 31, 1936	5,695	260
65-71-4556	2-628	2701	do	Chisago City	Sept. 30, 1936	65	Oct. 30, 1936	1,416	49
65-71-5148	2-604	2702	do	Grandy	Sept. 15, 1936	90	Sept. 30, 1936	1,416	49
65-71-132	2-40	289	Roadside beautification	Taylor Falls	Open	50	June 30, 1937	5,215	1,808
65-71-518	2-88	1163	Road repair	County-wide			Completed	3,715	263
65-71-1686	2-372	1205	do	Harris	Oct. 1, 1936	97	Oct. 15, 1936	3,995	243
65-71-521	2-99	616	Poor farm building repair	North Branch	Open	75	July 1, 1936	685	572
65-71-788	2-173	542	School ground repair	Lindstrom			Completed	830	442
65-71-196	2-32	148	Athletic field construction	North Branch	Open	90	July 7, 1936	5,681	355
65-71-1264	2-336	2295	Repair buildings, State park	Taylors Falls	do	12	June 30, 1937	30,059	480

HENNEPIN COUNTY

65-71-2962	5-58	1767	Street repairs	Minneapolis, city-wide	Dec. 17, 1935	71	Discontinued	$992,541	$15,000
65-71-276	5-5	226	do	do	Oct. 14, 1935	80	August 1936	10,464	2,655
65-71-1195	5-97	608	do	Golden Valley	Nov. 6, 1935	75	December 1936	15,747	850
65-71-992	5-44	2825	do	Hopkins	Apr. 28, 1936	95	July 1936	2,423	115
65-71-5431	5-169	1733	do	Minneapolis	Nov. 26, 1935	19	Will not be completed.	1,619,728	
65-71-288	5-32	250	Repair of street, curb, street and traffic signs	Minneapolis, throughout city.	Oct. 9, 1935	62	Nov. 1936	359,459	6,300
65-71-2113	5-111	2878	Construction of curb and sidewalks	Minneapolis	Not started		Jan. 1937	80,874	4,693
65-71-5743	5-102	1773	Constructing new bridge over Minnehaha Creek	do	Dec. 19, 1935	85	July 1936	25,173	1,377
65-71-243	5-18	1076	Grading trunk Highway No. 100	Hennepin County	Oct. 31, 1935	50	November 1936	968,000	368,946
65-71-5246	5-203	2266	Grading and graveling county roads	Minneapolis	Jan. 10, 1936	30	July 1937	929,417	45,790
65-71-5123	5-164	2844	Grade road no. 17	do	Apr. 27, 1936	100	June 1936	19,559	1,100
65-71-4760	5-205	2845	Grading town roads	Minnetrista	do	35	December 1936	20,378	3,330
65-71-4235	5-163	2245	Grading county road no. 18	Minneapolis	Jan. 21, 1936	95	July 1936	235,119	21,873
65-71-283	5-23	258	Relaying wood-block pavement	do	Oct. 21, 1935	99	do	485,917	5,000
65-71-2112	5-108	1772	Installing culverts	do	Dec. 9, 1935	66	October 1936	93,722	
65-71-285	5-25	89	Relaying brick pavement	do	Oct. 21, 1935	85	August 1936	724,038	10,000
65-71-282	5-20	249	Relaying granite pavement	do	Oct. 17, 1935	85	do	144,133	3,000
65-71-4216	5-216	1760	Street repairs	do	Nov. 26, 1935	25	Suspended	1,270,080	15,000
65-71-994	5-92	2246	Grade and gravel streets	St. Louis Park	Jan. 13, 1936	75	August 1936	26,124	1,971
65-71-4213	5-212	2693	Street repairs	Robbinsdale	Mar. 23, 1936	85	August 1936	46,002	3,755
65-71-261	5-17	247	Roadside development	Minneapolis to Excelsior	Oct. 25, 1935	60	October 1936	121,480	46,682
65-71-5283	5-213	1718	Beautification of county road	Minneapolis	Nov. 19, 1935	60	December 1936	452,523	6,070
65-71-2098	5-107	1984	Ditching and widening county road	do	Dec. 6, 1935	75	August 1936	28,344	1,716
65-71-2115	5-114	2267	Road repair	do	Jan. 21, 1936	60	January 1937	76,516	
65-71-275	5-1	212	Repair concrete arch bridge	do	Oct. 7, 1935	100	Completed June 1936.	12,715	7,671
65-71-4340	5-103	1867	Bridge repair at Portland and Minnehaha	do	Dec. 19, 1935	80	July 1936	12,869	592
65-71-5642	5-51	1613	Street repairs and guard rail construction	Edina Village	Dec. 11, 1935	75	November 1936	21,720	5,181
65-71-1711	5-64	1002	Repairs of fire station	Minneapolis	Nov. 7, 1935	70	Funds exhausted.	23,478	4,200
65-71-5422	5-230	2603	Construction of hydraulic laboratory	do	Mar. 13, 1936	40	Oct. 1, 1936	88,224	15,000
65-71-993	5-89	1880	Construction of fire hall and community hall	Island Park	Dec. 2, 1935	60	September 1936	14,820	3,345
65-71-4806	5-204	2876	Construction of brick warehouse	Crystal	May 11, 1936	60	August 1936	4,160	1,988

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work—Continued

HENNEPIN COUNTY—continued

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Percent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-5841	5-56	2037	Reconstructing offices, city hall	Minneapolis	Dec. 23, 1935	75	January 1937	$42,315	$1,500
65-71-4235	5-77	1774	Remodeling and redecorating fire stations	do	Dec. 12, 1935	60	December 1936	79,086	5,000
65-71-4234	5-78	1776	Remodeling and redecorating engine department	do	do	80	November 1936	44,275	2,500
65-71-866	5-62	767	Painting walls, Madison School	do	Nov. 4, 1935	100	Completed June 1936.	6,784	1,215
65-71-914	5-61	808	Refinishing blackboard surface, 51 schools	do	Nov. 12, 1935	99	June 1936	44,387	
65-71-1713	5-86	966	School, repair and painting	do	Nov. 8, 1935	100	Completed May 1936.	5,190	946
65-71-4175	5-84	1478	do	do	Nov. 15, 1935	100	do	7,421	957
65-71-4174	5-83	1483	do	do	Nov. 18, 1935	100	do	16,018	2,454
65-71-5748	5-88	1641	do	do	Feb. 18, 1936	100	do	11,563	
65-71-5736	5-87	1642	do	do	Jan. 6, 1936	100	do	21,975	
65-71-5739	5-73	1649	do	do	Dec. 12, 1935	100	Completed June 1936.	14,256	2,754
65-71-4129	5-86	1609	do	do	Mar. 10, 1936	98	Completed July 1936.	11,726	
65-71-1567	5-113	981	do	do	Nov. 8, 1935	98	do	8,067	5,718
65-71-5737	5-76	1640	do	do	Dec. 31, 1935	100	Completed May 1936.	26,649	3,962
65-71-5729	5-71	1643	do	do	Nov. 25, 1935	100	do	42,611	6,900
65-71-5735	5-63	2536	Construct swimming pool	do	Feb. 27, 1936	55	October 1936	68,625	1,250
65-71-2114	5-112	2600	Wrecking school building	do	Mar. 19, 1936	80	August 1936	32,975	200
65-71-1044	5-57	834	Repairs in and to main library	do	Nov. 5, 1935	60	Suspended	34,191	1,750
65-71-1815	5-80	1055	Repair and rehabilitate branch library	do	Nov. 12, 1935	60	do	32,830	2,000
65-71-1267	5-91	1098	do	do	do	50	do	35,900	975
65-71-3195	5-34	1838	Addition to Central Avenue library	do	Dec. 6, 1935	95	July 1936	13,628	1,862
65-71-5292	5-94	1810	Repairing booths, used for election	do	Dec. 6, 1935	90	August 1936	29,799	800
65-71-1777	5-65	993	Completing remodeling detention home	do	Nov. 4, 1935	90	July 1936	33,470	1,700
65-71-278	5-8	1854	Revamping boilers and electric lights	do	Dec. 2, 1935	100	June 1936	5,626	38,021
65-71-1198	5-98	617	Paint city-engineer oil plants	do	Nov. 15, 1935	65	November 1936	20,771	900
65-71-5155	5-167	1751	Maintaining recreational facilities	do	Nov. 22, 1935	43	March 1937	122,452	4,860
65-71-5504	5-208	2779	School-grounds improvements	do	Apr. 30, 1936	10	November 1936	57,085	42,357
65-71-4411	5-66	2780	do	do	May 4, 1936	60	September 1936	2,721	1,053
65-71-5728	5-109	2884	Installation of sprinkling system	do			Not started	71,750	8,418
65-71-350	5-26	90	Beautification of parks	do	Sept. 22, 1935	75	December 1936	2,269,921	40,500
65-71-1564	5-99	1636	Road repairs	do	June 8, 1936	20	September 1936	16,149	300
65-71-245	5-30	291	Repair and extension of waterwork project	do	Oct. 14, 1935	50	February 1937	240,116	5,750
65-71-6375	5-247	2847	Sewer construction	do	May 4, 1936	2	March 1938	23,692	24,539
65-71-5282	5-186	2125	Installation of sewers	do	Dec. 30, 1935	55	February 1937	83,671	5,002
65-71-244	5-22	292	Sewer and drain repair	do	Nov. 4, 1935	80	October 1936	98,455	3,025
S-26 U-6242	5-260	2446	Repairs and beautification of armories	do	Feb. 3, 1936	95	June 1936	7,928	796
65-71-5228	5-161	1293	Operate a project for "shut-ins"	do	Nov. 12, 1935	98	Suspended June 1936.	6,715	500
65-71-6201	5-246	1918	Educational	do	Dec. 2, 1935	75	August 1936	92,793	
65-71-3029	5-198	771	Analysis of all pay rolls	do	Nov. 4, 1935	36	May 1937	19,019	3,500
65-71-5238	5-69	946	Revision of lists of tuberculosis cases	do	do	58	December 1936	8,091	2,275
65-71-1563	5-95	949	Transcription of musical scores	do	Nov. 18, 1935	43	February 1937	7,987	100
65-71-1355	5-39	951	Modernization of records department of hospital admission, division of relief.	do	Nov. 6, 1935	56	December 1936	19,294	650
65-71-5026	5-143	1296	Clerical, Hennepin County probate office	do	Nov. 13, 1935	63	October 1936	2,574	347
65-71-5024	5-142	1367	Clerical and stenographic	do	Nov. 12, 1935	60	do	4,290	372
65-71-4236	5-178	1528	Clerical, modernizing maps, etc	do	Nov. 25, 1935	23	September 1937	63,267	453
65-71-5752	5-130	1765	Clerical, board of park commissioners	do	Nov. 26, 1935	98	July 1936	25,573	1,392
65-71-5373	5-168	1766	Clerical, bring records up to date	do	Nov. 25, 1935	39	March 1937	24,468	2,160
65-71-5364	5-158	1781	Indexing and cataloging city comptroller's accounts.	do	Dec. 3, 1935	50	December 1936	80,803	15,260
65-71-6679	5-70	2269	Modernizing relief department files	do	May 11, 1936	4	June 1937	31,900	2,575
65-71-8885	5-59	2393	Inventory of educational equipment	Minneapolis public schools	Feb. 13, 1936	21	do	77,819	14,350
65-71-6100	5-48	2440	Clerical, research, main campus at university	Minneapolis	Feb. 6, 1936	30	March 1937	151,737	
65-71-420	5-45	323	Augmentation of service rendered to indigent sick.	Minneapolis General Hospital.	Oct. 21, 1935	35	July 1937	182,669	
65-71-1055	5-93	1389	Nursing, free and indigent patients	Minneapolis	Nov. 19, 1935	86	July 1936	33,680	
65-71-5237	5-13	1782	Laboratory work and other public-health research	Minneapolis	Nov. 25, 1935	50	December 1936	69,286	30,280
65-71-354	5-36	91	To extend the facilities for Central Library	do	Sept. 24, 1935	61	September 1936	100,782	2,000
65-71-6396	5-151	2268	Library extension work in 8 rural Hennepin	do	Feb. 10, 1936	9	June 1937	22,297	230
65-71-6614	5-251	2270	Library extension work in settlement houses	do	Mar. 23, 1936	10	September 1938	29,797	280
65-71-6894	5-253	2449	Museum project, Minneapolis Public Library	do	do	1	June 1937	4,874	100
65-71-5876	5-236	1968	Statistical	do	Dec. 6, 1935	84	July 1936	258,077	17,700
65-71-6518	5-135	2823	Survey of major land-line boundaries	do	May 12, 1936	4	June 1937	65,340	
65-71-1879	5-47	1763	Analysis of traffic survey	do	Nov. 25, 1935	65	September 1936	70,836	2,300
65-71-6417	5-219	2250	Hot lunch for school children	Hopkins	Jan. 13, 1936	30	April 1936	18,128	4,940
65-71-4216	5-215	1784	Resurvey of rural Hennepin County	Minneapolis	Nov. 27, 1935	50	July 1937	36,148	5,600
S-98-7002	5-279	2773	Research and placement for handicapped persons	do	Apr. 13, 1936	26	December 1936	13,815	
65-71-6920	5-255	2827	Comprehensive compilation of records of the division of relief.	do	May 1, 1936	17	June 1937	46,945	2,800
65-71-2144	5-254	2843	Gathering historical data	do	do	1	do	6,989	200
65-71-6072	5-243	1969	Recreational facilities	do	Dec. 2, 1935	78	July 1936	103,819	
65-71-6073	5-242	1975	Public school recreational facilities	do	Dec. 13, 1935	70	August 1936	36,154	
65-71-6311	5-244	2072	Recreational project	County-wide	Dec. 20, 1935	84	July 1936	47,105	
65-71-6568	5-43	2265	Home demonstration	Minneapolis	Jan. 28, 1936	58	September 1936	24,365	375
65-71-6909	5-257	2695	Transcribe Braille for use of blind	do	Mar. 26, 1936	29	December 1936	5,910	
65-71-4839	5-228	1300	Sewing center	Golden Valley	Nov. 18, 1935	70	August 1936	14,733	360
65-71-4673	5-137	1315	do	Robbinsdale	Nov. 12, 1935	41	May 1937	49,855	1,200
65-71-5157	5-183	1356	Sewing center board of public welfare	Minneapolis	Nov. 25, 1935	75	November 1936	259,242	
65-71-6938	5-258	2694	Sewing center project	Plymouth Township	Mar. 23, 1936	87	June 1936	5,052	
65-71-4190	5-140	1154	Establish sewing control	Minneapolis	Nov. 4, 1935	76	August 1936	315,089	5,243
65-71-5126	5-172	1812	Clean and grade Bassett Creek	do	Nov. 26, 1935	60	December 1936	1,018,207	4,500
65-71-6905	5-155	2557	Cut weeds on city dumps	do	Mar. 6, 1936	40	January 1937	174,076	312
65-71-372	5-9	1622	Beautification of grounds, State soldiers' home	do	Nov. 15, 1935	85	July 1936	18,592	450
65-71-5863	5-222	2824	Grading, filling, and surfacing cemetery grounds	do	Apr. 27, 1936	30	November 1936	34,676	1,500

ISANTI COUNTY

65-71-197	2-35	158	City park	Cambridge	Open	30	June 30, 1937	$8,091	$2,506
65-71-1097	2-229	534	Courthouse painting	do			Completed	333	168
65-71-4526	2-704	1845	Road construction	County-wide	Open	78	Mar. 31, 1937	18,097	3,250
65-71-938	2-214	1605	School building construction	District no. 49, Stanford Township.	do	94	July 7, 1936	4,035	3,184
65-71-5681	2-959	2028	Irrigation system	Epileptics Colony, Cambridge.	July 30, 1936	22	Nov. 30, 1936	37,235	1,064

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work—Continued

ISANTI COUNTY—continued

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Percent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-6038	2-406	2363	"C" type dam	Green Lake, Cambridge	Open	77	July 22, 1936	$7,740	$727
65-71-6432	2-837	2252	Hot lunches	Braham			Completed	385	126
65-71-1572	2-293	674	Courthouse lawn repairs	Cambridge			do	511	517
65-71-454	2-108	1635	Road repairs	Dalbo Township			do	2,816	890
65-71-1096	2-228	833	Clerical, registrar of deeds office	Cambridge			do	297	
65-71-5337	2-611	2837	School library book repair	do	Oct. 1, 1936	0	May 30, 1937	1,980	104

WASHINGTON COUNTY

65-71-614	4-65	426	Road repairs	Lincoln	Oct. 24, 1935		Completed	$8,588	$2,014
65-71-475	4-74	369	do	Stillwater	do	79	July 2, 1936	5,856	2,321
65-71-1806	4-102	828	Street repairs	Forest Lake	Nov. 4, 1935	65	Sept. 2, 1936	9,379	1,670
65-71-1664	4-103	1579	do	Mahtomedi	Jan. 1, 1936	31	Apr. 2, 1937	12,434	3,299
65-71-2035	4-185	2000	Retaining wall	Marine	Dec. 23, 1935	40	Oct. 2, 1936	6,710	180
65-71-4240	4-223	1417	Roadside beautification	Stillwater	Nov. 11, 1935	62	Aug. 2, 1936	27,590	10,597
65-71-615	4-75	427	Road repairs	do	Oct. 24, 1935	58	Feb. 2, 1937	23,172	5,744
65-71-4838	4-267	1509	Sidewalk and streets	St. Paul Park	Nov. 26, 1935	61	Oct. 2, 1936	9,895	500
65-71-5108	4-174	1580	Street repairs	Newport	Dec. 23, 1935	42	Jan. 2, 1937	7,148	450
65-71-1469	4-141	846	Courthouse repairs	Stillwater	Dec. 2, 1935	55	Nov. 2, 1936	14,572	535
S-26-6251	4-402	2856	Armory repairs	do	May 18, 1936	22	May 2, 1937	9,440	870
S-26-1171	4-108	627	Park improvements	do	Nov. 6, 1935	55	Nov. 17, 1936	12,982	675
S-26-2081	4-181	2553	do	Forest Lake	Apr. 1, 1936		Completed	3,462	549
S-26-1468	4-140	945	Clerical, county records	Stillwater	Nov. 4, 1936	43	Jan. 2, 1937	10,494	200
S-26-4455	4-184	1542	Clerical	do	Dec. 2, 1935	7	June 30, 1937	23,672	
S-26-6851	4-393	2606	Recreational	do	Mar. 16, 1936	24	Feb. 2, 1937	8,863	
S-26-4454	4-78	1462	Sewing project	do	Nov. 15, 1935	75	Sept. 2, 1936	16,834	200
S-26-1170	4-107	636	Oil treating of gravel	do	Nov. 4, 1935	62	do	19,470	1,175
S-26-1470	4-146	729	Crushing gravel	do	Nov. 26, 1935	62	Aug. 2, 1936	8,087	3,190
S-26-6214	4-360	1917	Educational	Forest Lake	Dec. 2, 1935	25	Closed, not to reopen.	3,087	

DESCRIPTION OF SOME THIRD DISTRICT W. P. A. PROJECTS

I wish to describe briefly some of the W. P. A. Third District projects approved at Washington.

Anoka County

State serial no. 2-668.
Official project no. 5397.
Federal funds, $57,540.
Sponsors' contribution, none.
Total funds, $57,540.
Location: Anoka, Anoka.
Total man-years of work, 91.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 175.
Total paid from Federal funds, 182.
Federal expenditure, $632.31.

General repairs and improvements to town roads, none of which are Federal-aid highways or State highways, Anoka County, exclusive of that work which has been requested on individual project proposals submitted by the following: Burns, Ramsey, Bethel, Linwood, Ham Lake, and Grow Townships.

Streets, Columbia Heights

State serial no. 2-94—not a new project.
Supplement no. 1—original official project no. 499.
Federal funds, $6,606.
Sponsors' contribution, none.
Total funds, $6,606.
Location: Anoka County, Columbia Heights.
Total man-years of work, 6.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 33.
Total paid from Federal funds, 33.
Federal expenditure, $1,201.

This application supplements official project 65-71-499. Approved on Presidential Letter No. 357, described as follows: "Subgrading Forty-second Avenue West, Central Avenue to University Avenue."

Columbia Heights Tannery

State serial no. 2-64.
Official project no. 5873.
Federal funds, $47,218.43.
Sponsor's contribution, none.
Total funds, $42,218.43.
Location, Anoka County, St. Paul.
Total man-years of work, 46.16.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 43.16.
Total paid from Federal funds, 46.16.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $1,022.76.

Tanning of F. S. R. C. cowhides to be carried on in an abandoned tannery located at Columbia Heights, Minn. There is an apparent need for this tannery, as there is only one other cowhide tannery within the State of Minnesota. This is an emergency in order to preserve hides on hand and is a continuation of an existing E. R. A. project.

Anoka County Ditches

State serial no. 2-642.
Official project no. 3169.
Federal funds, $24,450.
Sponsor's contribution, none.
Total funds, $24,450.
Location, Anoka County, Anoka.
Total man-years of work, 47.5.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 56.
Total paid from Federal funds, 57.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $514.73.

Regrade, excavate, and clean out county ditch no. 44 and lateral ditches nos. 1 and 2.

Anoka Game Refuge

State serial no. 2-337.
Official project no. 4763.
Federal funds, $21,762.18.
Sponsor's contribution, $3,100.
Total funds, $24,862.15.
Total man-years of work, 16.60.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 48.91.
Total paid from Federal funds, 49.81.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $1,310.84.
Carlos Avery Game Refuge:

Construction of one addition to warden's cottage 14 by 24 feet, one 2-car garage 20 by 26 feet, one 5-room house 22 by 26 feet, one 3-room cottage 24 by 30 feet, one 4-car garage 26 by 45 feet, one storage building and workshop 20 by 80 feet, one incubation building 150 by 30 feet, 200 brooder coops, weeding around young trees, construction of new firebreaks and reconstruction of old firebreaks, collection and distribution of bird food. This work to be done on Carols Avery Game Refuge located in N½ of SE¼, sec. 6, T. 32 N, R. 22 W., in Anoka County.

Chisago County

State serial no. 2-336.
Official project no. 1264.
Federal funds, $27,327.
Sponsors contribution, $1,366.66.
Total funds, $28,693.66.
Location: Chisago, St. Paul.
Total man-years of work, 51.33.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 77.
Total paid from Federal funds, 77.
Federal expenditure, $532.34.

(1) Reroof eight cottages; (2) rebuild over porches on cabins; (3) move two buildings to South Park; (4) make shutters for eight buildings; (5) construct Imhoff tank and tile disposal line; (6) paint eight buildings; (7) grade parking area in North Park, also in South Park; (8) construct guard rail around parking area and pot holes; (9) plant trees and shrubs in South Park picnic area; (10) construct foot trails.

Lindstrom Parks

State serial no. 2-373.
Official project no. 1687.
Federal funds, $10,464.
Sponsors contribution, $506.50.
Total funds, $10,970.50.
Location: Chisago County, Lindstrom.
Total man-years of work, 21.33.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 31.
Total paid from Federal funds, 32.
Federal expenditure, $490.50.
Construction of three parks and playgrounds, and landscaping, leveling, and improving a municipally owned cemetery in the village of Lindstrom.

Chisago Chain of Lakes

State serial no. 2-728.
Official project no. 4184.
Federal funds, $264,390.
Sponsors' contribution, $5,000.
Total funds, $269,390.
Location: Chisago County, St. Paul.
Total man-years of work, 416.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 414.
Total paid from Federal funds, 416.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $635.52.
This project proposes to divert water from the Sunrise River, near Kost, to the Chisago chain of lakes. This will require the construction of a channel and pumping plant.

Hennepin County

State serial no. 5-184.
Official project no. 5029.
Federal funds, $19,569.
Sponsor's contribution, $5,117.
Total funds, $24,686.50.
Location: Hennepin, St. Louis Park.
Total man-years of work, 24.61.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 96.43.
Total paid from Federal funds, 98.43.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $795.22.
The village of St. Louis Park desires to provide a public park and recreational facilities. The work will consist of grading, driveway construction, drainage, planting of trees and shrubs and the building of tennis courts, field house and athletic fields. This is known as project A and is located on Brunswick Avenue, 1,200 feet north of Excelsior Boulevard.

St. Louis Park Recreational Facilities

State serial no. 5-209.
Official project no. 3186.
Federal funds, $16,925.
Sponsor's contribution, $6,790.50.
Total funds, $23,715.50.
Location: Hennepin, St. Louis Park.
Total man-years of work, 20.8.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 86.
Total paid from Federal funds, 88.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $812.08.
The village of St. Louis Park desires to provide recreational facilities for the public use. The work will include grading, drainage, planting of trees and shrubs, walk and drive construction, etc. This is known as project B and is located on the new State Highway No. 7 and Minnesota Boulevard.

Hennepin County Lake Shore Lines

State serial no. 5-217.
Official project no. 5240.
Federal funds, $503,580.60.
Sponsor's contribution, none.
Total funds, $503,580.60.
Location: Hennepin County, Minneapolis.
Total man-years of work, 600.1.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 705.
Total paid from Federal funds, 721.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $838.14.
The cleaning up of approximately 365 miles of public shore line on 58 lakes in rural Hennepin County, as said cleaning to consist of cutting and burning of brush and noxious weeds and trimming of trees under direction of competent landscape engineers. The work herewith contemplated specifically excludes any and all work included on applications previously submitted.

Elm Creek, Champlin

State serial no. 5-224.
Official project 4488.
Federal funds, $10,320.
Sponsor's contribution, $4,119.50.
Total funds, $14,439.50.
Location: Hennepin County, Champlin.
Total man-years of work, 13.25.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 52.
Total paid from Federal funds, 53.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $778.86.
Replace dam on Elm Creek at Champlin and clean out creek and lake bed for a distance of 2 miles above the dam.

Robbinsdale Parks

State serial no. 5-117.
Official project no. 2056.
Federal funds, $11,454.50.
Sponsor's contribution, $3,709.50.
Total funds, $15,164.
Location: Hennepin County, Minneapolis.
Total man-years of work, 15.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 43.
Total paid from Federal funds, 45.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $763.63.
This project consists of trimming and planting of trees along all the village streets and parks of the village of Robbinsdale.

Hopkins Storm Sewer

State serial no. 5-147.
Official project no. 5026.
Federal funds, $11,375.
Sponsor's contribution, $14,220.
Total funds, $25,595.20.
Location: Hennepin County, Hopkins.
Total man-years of work, 15.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 33.
Total paid from Federal funds, 36.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $758.33.
Hopkins storm sewer on following streets: Intersection of Excelsior Avenue and Seventh Avenue, on Seventh to First Streets south to Thirteenth Avenue, south thence through open ditch to Ninemile Creek.

Isanti County

State serial no. 2-801.
Official project no. 2992.
Federal funds, $30,100.
Sponsor's contribution, $2,500.
Total funds, $32,600.
Location: Ramsey County-Isanti County.
Total man-years of work, 28.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 50.
Total paid from Federal funds, 56.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $1,075.
Reconstruction of Highways Nos. 56, 95, 118 in Isanti County, not on Federal-aid system.

Washington County

State serial no. 5-92.
Official project no. 994.
Federal funds, $15,202.
Additional amount approved, $9,402 on supplement no. 1.
Sponsors' contribution, $1,971.
Total funds, $17,173.
Location: St. Paul Park.
Total man-years of work, 19.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 54.
Total paid from Federal funds, 56.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $822.
Grade 1 mile and gravel 23 miles of streets in St. Louis Park, per appendage attached to application.

Mahtomedi Streets

State serial no. 4-103.
Official project no. 1664.
Federal funds, $11,304.50.
Sponsor's contribution, $3,299.95.
Total funds, $14,604.45.
Location: Washington County, Mahtomedi.
Total man-years of work, 20.33.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 19.
Total paid from Federal funds, 20.33.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $21.33.
Village street improvements and repairs in village as listed on proposal.

Bayport Street Improvements

State serial no. 4-186.
Official project no. 1947.
Federal funds, $14,139.
Sponsor's contribution, $2,802.
Total funds, $16,941.
Location: Washington County, Bayport.
Total man-years of work, 23.3.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 22.25.
Total paid from Federal funds, 23.30.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, $605.95.
Street improvements: Grade and gravel streets as designated and located on W. P. A. form 301; gravel balance of streets as graded on S. E. R. A.; enclose creek bed on Third Avenue between Third and Fourth Streets, a distance of 167 feet, with reinforced concrete slat on concrete footings, surfacing over same; grade and fill area at foot of Central Avenue and construct stone and concrete retaining wall at end, size 8 by 500 feet.

W. P. A. EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL, AND RECREATION PROJECTS

Some fine service has been rendered by the Federal W. P. A. cultural projects, such as the Federal music project, recreation projects, adult and workers' education.

FEDERAL MUSIC PROJECT

The Federal music project was created to employ, retrain, and rehabilitate those musicians who because of the depression faced loss of employment and resulting deterioration of skill. By March 21, 1936, 15,639 of such people were on W. P. A. pay rolls in the United States.

This is truly a cultural reclamation project. It includes instrumentalists, vocalists, composers, teachers, librarians, copyists and arrangers, tuners, and music binders. There have been 163 approved symphony and concert W. P. A. orchestras, 51 bands, a composers' project, 15 chamber music ensembles, 22 choruses and quartets, 69 popular orchestras, 146 teachers' projects; opera and operetta projects, and 1 folk-song project to preserve early Kentucky hills music. State universities and local boards of education cooperate with the W. P. A. in this work.

MINNESOTA W. P. A. MUSIC PROJECT

As of May 28, 1936, there were 269 people working on the Minnesota W. P. A. music project, 244 of these from relief rolls. There were 52 teachers giving 307 classes weekly, with an enrollment of 3,439 pupils. There were 33 performances during 1 week, at which an attendance of 13,875 was reported. A series of concerts was being planned at the University of Minnesota sponsored by the Federal music project. A composers' forum laboratory was to be organized. We must not permit the depression to demobilize American culture.

I was happy to aid in securing approval of the Federal music project. For some time the project was held up in Washington. I received a wire from the St. Paul Musicians' Association asking assistance. We kept in constant touch with the W. P. A. at Washington until the project was approved. The St. Paul Musicians' Association, Mr. Edward P. Ringius, secretary-treasurer, wrote me a letter with reference to this project, in which he stated:

DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: I read your circular letter to our local at their monthly meeting held Saturday, June 9, and I was instructed to acknowledge receipt of same and to let you know that our organization appreciated this information and commends you very highly for your work. With best wishes for your future success, we are,

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

ST. PAUL MUSICIANS' ASSOCIATION,
By EDW. P. RINGIUS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

STILLWATER MUSIC PROJECT

During February there were W. P. A. piano classes at Stillwater and Mahtomedi. An address on music, at Stillwater High School, regarding the value of rural music education, was given; 300 persons were present. A chorus was formed at Stillwater, Welander, and Marine. A community music meeting was held at Stillwater with 200 people present.

DOWLING SCHOOL SWIMMING POOL

One W. P. A. project of which we were very pleased to receive approval is the swimming pool at the Michael Dowling School for Crippled Children, in Minneapolis (project 5735).

We had difficulty in obtaining approval of this project. The W. P. A. at first considered the cost per man-year too high. On September 30, 1935, I received a letter from Mrs. George B. Palmer stating: "It looks as though you will have to be our savior if anything is done about getting a swimming pool for these poor little fellows who really need a helping hand."

Original plans called for a total cost of $51,351 for the swimming pool. As finally approved, we will have a $69,875 project. Construction was begun on February 27, 1936. There was a celebration at Dowling School when the work got under way. I received an invitation on February 25, 1936, stating:

The culmination of the individual and collective efforts of the large number of friends of the crippled children in Minneapolis, in the procuring of a swimming pool and therapeutic center at the Dowling School for Crippled Children, Thirty-ninth Street South, and River Road West, will be realized by the breaking of ground for the construction of this center on Friday morning, February 28, 1936, at 10 o'clock.

You have taken such a personal interest in this project that it gives us great pleasure to extend to you a most cordial invitation to be present at this momentous ceremony.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. DRAKE,
President, the Board of Education,
Minneapolis, Minn.

WORKERS' EDUCATION

Minnesota educators and labor organizations are tremendously interested in having the workers' education project continue. This year there was a long delay in getting the project started. This was true in every State with the exception of Wisconsin. We protested against the delay and assisted in bringing about approval of the Minnesota workers' education project. The project was finally started, giving employment to teachers and new educational opportunities for workers. The Minnesota State Department of Education, under the able direction of Dr. John G. Rockwell, has cooperated in every way to make the program a success.

We are assured by the W. P. A. officials at Washington in charge of this splendid program that it will be continued next year. Plans are being made to enlarge and improve the program, and there is every indication that next year's workers' education project will be even more beneficial than before.

THIRD DISTRICT W. P. A. PROJECTS APPROVED AT WASHINGTON BUT NOT YET STARTED

The W. P. A. projects listed above as approved at Washington is longer than the list of projects authorized for work by the W. P. A. administrator for Minnesota. This means that we have secured approval of a large number of projects at Washington which have not yet been started by the Minnesota W. P. A. office. In order to start these projects, the W. P. A. must be granted sufficient funds by Congress. We have now appropriated a large sum for the continuation of W. P. A. activities. In addition to funds, we need the cooperation of local, county, and State officials, and other interested citizens. Let them express an interest in these projects, and see that they are started. Local and county officials, and other citizens at home must cooperate with the Representatives and Senators at Washington in order that projects may be started. The Congressman's main service on projects is to secure approval at Washington.

CHISAGO CHAIN OF LAKES PROJECT

One of these projects approved at Washington, but not yet started, is the Chisago chain of lakes. Citizens of Chisago County are greatly interested in the raising of beautiful Chisago chain of lakes. In my speech on the floor of the House on January 18, 1934, I gave full information concerning this project. The lakes are less than half the size they were 15 years ago. The cost of raising them to their former level is estimated at about $320,000.

Last fall we secured approval of the W. P. A., President Roosevelt, and the Comptroller General at Washington of the Chisago chain of lakes project, and it appears on the list of approved projects furnished us by the W. P. A. at Washington. The Federal funds are available. The matter of funds for upkeep is still in debate. It is possible that an appropriation might be obtained from the State legislature to cover this cost.

This is again a case where the cooperation of local, county, and State government officials is badly needed. Federal funds have been set aside for the Chisago chain of lakes project, and we hope that the difficulties preventing work on this project will be removed in the near future.

On March 10, 1936, we received a letter from Walter S. Olson, director of the Division of Drainage and Waters of the Minnesota State Department of Conservation, to whom the Minnesota W. P. A. office has referred the Chisago chain of lakes project for recommendation. Mr. Olson stated:

Some 2 months ago a delegation of 10 or 15 men from this district called on Mr. Willard with regard to this project, and at

which conference I was present. The project as presented stipulated that the control, operation, and maintenance of the project after its completion by W. P. A. was to be taken over by some local governmental agency. This is in accordance with the procedure of W. P. A.

When it was called to the attention of these people at the conference that the pumping costs alone on this project would run to approximately $10,000 for every foot of water placed from the proposed diversion, no one indicated a willingness or authority to assume this responsibility. It was suggested at that time by them that the State take over the operation of the project. However, we know of no means whereby the State could do so unless the legislature appropriated sufficient funds.

Since that time there has been no evidence of local interest in the project. There will be many things to clear up before it can be in such shape as W. P. A. could start construction, such as obtaining commitments, and also field works and design, and possibly some legal phases such as satisfying the power interests on the Sunrise River below the point of diversion.

The matters to be "cleared up" in order that construction on the Chisago chain of lakes project could begin are matters handled successfully in connection with numerous other water projects.

CHISAGO CHAIN OF LAKES WILL BE RESTORED

Personally, I see no difficulties which cannot be overcome. Right now the local officials, organizations, and other citizens of Chisago and neighboring counties would do much to advance this project by calling on the State division of drainage and waters, and the officials of the State department of conservation, proving that Chisago County is interested in this project. Federal funds have already been approved. Our work in Washington on this project has been done, and we are going to continue working with State and county government officials so that this project may be started. There is no good reason why the Chisago chain of lakes cannot be restored to their original state.

FEDERAL RELIEF IN MINNESOTA

Federal funds have also been disbursed to Minnesota through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. We do not have the amounts provided by the Federal Relief Administration to the Third District counties, but we do have the total amounts for the State during the years 1933, 1934, and 1935.

Amount of obligations incurred for emergency relief in Minnesota

States and quarters	Obligations incurred for emergency relief						
	Total amount	Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
MINNESOTA							
1933							
First quarter	$2,316,259	$1,427,008	61.6	$1,834	0.1	$887,417	38.7
Second quarter	2,078,065	1,143,127	55.0	6,760	.3	928,178	44.0
Third quarter	2,043,555	935,181	45.8	5,353	.2	1,103,021	54.5
Fourth quarter	2,613,903	1,291,085	49.3	5,217	.2	1,317,601	50.3
Total 1933	9,051,782	4,796,401	53.0	19,164	.2	4,236,217	46.8
1934							
First quarter	3,126,537	1,990,767	63.7	454,015	14.5	681,755	21.8
Second quarter	7,872,735	6,780,033	86.1	350,271	4.5	742,431	9.4
Third quarter	9,912,601	8,830,105	89.1	136,228	1.4	946,268	9.5
Fourth quarter	14,281,099	10,945,333	76.7	1,004,122	7.0	2,331,644	16.3
Total 1934	35,192,972	28,546,238	81.1	1,944,636	5.5	4,702,098	13.4
1935							
First quarter	14,839,210	11,617,115	78.3	1,222,030	8.2	2,000,065	13.5
Second quarter	14,648,329	12,279,877	83.8	963,639	6.6	1,404,813	9.6
Third quarter	8,483,167	6,826,865	80.5	380,526	4.5	1,275,776	15.0
Fourth quarter	6,440,943	3,711,277	57.6	932,097	14.5	1,797,569	27.9
Total 1935	44,411,649	34,435,134	77.5	3,498,292	7.9	6,478,223	14.6
Total 1933, 1934, and 1935	88,656,403	67,777,773	76.4	5,462,092	6.2	15,416,538	17.4

The above figures include obligations incurred for relief extended under the general relief program under all special programs, and for administration. Beginning April 1934 these figures also include purchases of materials, supplies, and equipment, rental of equipment (such as team and truck hire), earnings of nonrelief persons employed, and other expenses incident to the emergency work relief program.

HOUSING

There are many Federal Government agencies concerned with homes and housing. I have already mentioned the work of the P. W. A. in connection with the Sumner Field housing project in North Minneapolis. Other agencies dealing with homes and housing are the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Following are the amounts of Federal funds obtained for Minnesota and the Third Congressional District through the Federal Housing Administration:

Volume of Federal Housing Administration business in the State of Minnesota

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Modernization notes insured through Apr. 30, 1936		Mortgages accepted for insurance through Mar. 31, 1936	
Number	Amount	Number	Amount
14,337	$5,457,343.12	797	$2,625,684

FOR THE FOLLOWING COUNTIES

	Modernization notes insured through Apr. 30, 1936		Mortgages accepted for insurance through Mar. 31, 1936	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Anoka	68	$17,127.86	9	$24,285
Chisago	16	5,244.03	2	3,800
Hennepin	4,915	2,040,160.75	369	1,367,371
Isanti	9	6,327.24	1	2,500
Washington	105	40,977.48	3	12,225
Total	5,113	2,109,837.36	384	1,410,181

The funds advanced were made available entirely through private banking and lending institutions. The release of such a large volume of credit has directly stimulated modernization, repair, and construction activity, thereby giving employment to thousands of workers in Minnesota. In addition, through the instrumentality of the Federal Housing Administration, substantial progress has been made in building a sounder and more economical structure of mortgage loans, enabling an increasing number of individuals to own homes of their own.

WORKERS' HOUSING PROJECT

Another project now under consideration by the Federal Housing Administration is the so-called workers' housing project for 500 low-cost dwellings, sponsored by several Minneapolis cooperative and labor organizations, including the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, the City Planning Commission, the Northern States Cooperative League, the Junior Association of Commerce, the Building Trades Council, the Mayor's Housing Committee, and other citizens of Minneapolis interested in constructing a low-cost non-profit housing project for the city of Minneapolis.

We have discussed this project with Mr. Miles L. Collean, Director of the Low Cost Housing Division of the Federal Housing Administration, and many other Government officials and have been given encouragement for the project. At the present time the sponsors of the project are having difficulty in procuring the site and furnishing the sponsor's share

of funds. We hope these difficulties can be worked out and that north Minneapolis and the Third Congressional District will have another large housing project in the not distant future.

EMPLOYMENT IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Often there were times when pressure was needed at Washington to release Federal Housing Administration funds for Minnesota. Mr. Albert O. Larson, president of the Minnesota Association of Architects, who also had charge of the Housing Corporation office in Minnesota, has written me:

As president of the Minnesota Association of Architects I wish to express appreciation for your stand in behalf of the building trades in the support of legislation designed to help the building industry. So far the New Deal has helped this industry but little, and it is our hope that the work of the Housing Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration may proceed effectively and immediately.

Your realization that the construction of better housing, hospitals, and schools not only provides much needed employment but adds to the capital wealth of the country should bring you satisfaction when this program is actually under way.

Your part in this program should bring you loyal support from those who appreciate the importance of building activity to business recovery.

Sincerely,

ALBERT O. LARSON,
President, Minnesota Association of Architects.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

I voted to create the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and provide it with funds to help save the American home—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2584, April 28, 1933.

During the past 2 years we have handled hundreds of Home Owners' Loan cases, and sometimes we were able to save the homes of people who were about to lose them. Following are the number of home loans to citizens of the Third Congressional District:

Refinancing operations completed by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as of Jan. 2, 1936

TOTAL LOANS CLOSED FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Number	Amount
20,163	$46,042,849

TOTAL OF LOANS CLOSED FOR THE FOLLOWING COUNTIES

	Number	Amount
Anoka	280	$483,677
Chisago	57	103,164
Hennepin	7,100	18,817,589
Isanti	57	93,662
Washington	249	420,325
Total	7,743	1,991,847

These loans, representing long-term obligations, were granted at low rates of interest to those who were in urgent need of funds for the protection and preservation of their homes, and who were unable to procure the needed credit through the normal channels. A great majority of the distressed individuals, taking advantage of the assistance offered by this Federal agency, were helped to refinance defaulting mortgages and save their homes from foreclosure.

RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Another Government agency through which Federal funds have been obtained for Minnesota and the Third Congressional District is the Resettlement Administration. Following are the amounts received from this source:

Loans and grants made by Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Resettlement Administration as of Apr. 30, 1936

FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Families receiving farm management loans		Families receiving emergency rehabilitation loans		Families receiving emergency grants		Total amount of loans and grants
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	
Total	5,324	$3,924,129.00	1,729,218	$2,284,114.23	7,528	$513,411.12	$6,721,654.52
TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES							
Anoka	51	$21,399.00	348	$19,149.00	127	$9,492.00	$50,040.00
Chisago	45	19,859.00	281	8,168.60	45	2,923.00	30,950.60
Hennepin	56	25,904.90	589	24,489.66	131	9,561.20	59,955.76
Isanti	69	26,279.73	798	56,161.76	115	7,658.77	90,100.26
Washington	54	31,234.87	123	7,257.80	66	5,060.00	43,552.67
Total	275	124,677.50	2,139	115,226.82	484	34,694.97	274,599.29

This Federal money was distributed throughout the State in an effort to restore farm families, in the destitute and low-income groups, to a self-supporting basis; to reestablish their credit so that loans could be secured from commercial banks and the Farm Credit Administration; to improve their standards of living; and generally to increase their value to the communities as self-respecting citizens. Guidance in carrying on approved farm practices, provided for in the farm-management plans, also helped considerably toward improving the status of rehabilitation clients.

The distress of the recipients of these loans and grants was caused by circumstances beyond their control, such as war, drought, crop failure, and generally depressed agricultural conditions.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Many Third District farmers have applied for loans from the Farm Credit Administration. Following are the total amounts received from this source:

Number and amount of crop and feed loans and drought-relief loans made by the Farm Credit Administration, Jan. 1, 1933, through Sept. 30, 1935

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Crop and feed loans		Drought-relief loans	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total	35,776	$4,050,638	[1] 27,111	[1] $6,677,890
TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES				
Anoka	649	$65,960	229	$42,596
Chisago	375	23,290	166	22,384
Hennepin	443	41,930	237	31,376
Isanti	1,441	130,908	560	98,559
Washington	214	19,605	133	24,876
Total	3,122	281,693	1,325	219,791

[1] 1934–35.

Other Farm Credit Administration loans were made through the Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner.

Number and amount of Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans closed, by counties, in Minnesota, by the Federal land bank, for the period May 1, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1935

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Federal land bank		Land Bank Commissioner		Total (bank and Commissioner)	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total	22,143	$88,086,300	24,866	$52,738,000	47,009	$140,824,300
TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES						
Anoka	212	$409,400	315	$432,900	527	$842,300
Chisago	327	831,565	347	538,600	674	1,370,165
Hennepin	378	975,765	400	741,500	778	1,717,265
Isanti	370	761,065	446	665,600	816	1,426,665
Washington	259	831,165	239	453,800	498	1,284,965
Total	1,546	3,808,960	1,747	2,832,400	3,293	6,641,360

PRODUCTION CREDIT CORPORATION

Another Farm Credit Administration agency is the Production Credit Corporation. This Corporation made loans totaling $8,497,001 to Minnesota from May 1, 1933, through December 31, 1935. We do not have the separate figures for the Third Congressional District.

A. A. A. PAYMENTS

As a result of participation in A. A. A. contracts, Minnesota and Third District farmers received the following amounts:

Rental and benefit payments made by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to Minnesota farmers from May 12, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1935

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Total	Wheat	Tobacco	Corn-hogs	Sugar
Total	$32,817,104	$4,900,723.80	$93,080.07	$26,890,577.67	$932,722.46
TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES					
Anoka	$51,259.56	$1,584.02		$49,675.54	
Chisago	37,921.17	2,866.11		35,055.06	
Hennepin	104,420.89	16,444.12		83,158.93	$4,817.84
Isanti	32,255.83	792.68		31,463.15	
Washington	82,057.13	25,235.64		56,821.49	
Total	307,914.58	46,922.57		256,174.17	4,817.84

GRASSHOPPER-CONTROL APPROPRIATION

These are the Federal agencies which have disbursed funds to Third District and Minnesota farmers. In order for these payments to be made it was necessary for Congress to appropriate funds. Special appropriations have been made by Congress from time to time for farmers. For instance, there were the grasshopper-control funds which had to be appropriated in an emergency. Congress passed a special grasshopper-control bill, appropriating funds for eradication of grasshoppers menacing the crops of Minnesota and other States. This bill had to be rushed through without delay, and cooperation of many Congressmen and Senators was needed. I supported the grasshopper-control appropriation. After the bill was passed I was pleased to receive a letter from Mr. A. G. Ruggles, State entomologist, and Minnesota's representative on the Northwest Grasshopper Control Committee, stating:

DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: I am writing this letter to express the appreciation of myself and all of us here with your efforts to secure the Federal grasshopper appropriation. Although you had so many other matters of importance on hand that at times must have seemed of greater significance, I can assure you that your efforts in behalf of this particular appropriation are very deeply appreciated.

We already have the organization under way in Minnesota, and the passing of the grasshopper bill has given the workers in Montana and the Dakotas heart to carry on the control campaign * * *.

Very truly yours,

NORTHWEST GRASSHOPPER CONTROL COMMITTEE,
By A. G. RUGGLES.

In connection with this and other farm measures, Mr. M. W. Thatcher, legislative representative of the Farmers National Grain Corporation, wrote me:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am very grateful for your kind letter of March 27 in which you renew your assurance of support to the Farmers Union and our cooperative grain corporation.

We have always received militant and intelligent support from you, and it is profoundly appreciated. I only wish your constituents understood your high degree of service and the great energy which you consistently devote to the interests of the masses.

Sincerely yours,

M. W. THATCHER,
Farmers National Grain Corporation.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LOANS

Another Federal agency making loans to Minnesota is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Following are the amounts loaned to Minnesota and the Third Congressional District by this agency:

Loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Minnesota as of Feb. 29, 1936

LOANS MADE TO ALL COUNTIES IN MINNESOTA

Amount authorized $37,026,235.12
Amount disbursed 31,279,329.62

TOTAL LOANS MADE THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES

	Amount authorized	Amount disbursed
Anoka	$108,000.00	$73,300.00
Chisago	275,000.00	177,400.00
Hennepin	10,552,600.00	9,926,831.49
Isanti	129,000.00	128,200.00
Washington	31,000.00	31,000.00
Total	11,095,600.00	10,336,731.49

C. C. C. CAMPS

As of June 10, 1936, it is estimated that the Emergency Conservation Work will have spent $43,554,000 on C. C. C. camps in Minnesota. Up to April 30, 1936, it is estimated that Minnesota boys had sent home to their dependent relatives approximately $8,877,000.

From the beginning of Emergency Conservation Work through June 30, 1936, it is estimated that 43,297 Minnesota men have been enrolled in the C. C. C., and that approximately 4,993 additional men have held jobs for varying periods of time as camp commanders, camp superintendents, technical men, educational advisers, skilled and unskilled laborers, and so forth. During the month of May 1936 an average of 10,047 enrolled men were working in C. C. C. camps in Minnesota.

HENNEPIN COUNTY C. C. C.

We have C. C. C. Camp SP-8 in Hennepin County. This camp started operations during the summer of 1935 and is still operating. Camp Army-1, Fort Snelling, Minn., started operations in the summer of 1934 and ceased operating about October 1, 1935.

RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

The two most important river and harbor projects affecting the Third Congressional District of Minnesota are the North Minneapolis Harbor and the Red Wing Dam, which will give a 9-foot channel on the St. Croix River to the city of Stillwater. These are both connected with the Mississippi River 9-foot channel project now under construction.

RED WING DAM UNDER CONSTRUCTION

The lock at Red Wing, Minn., is already under construction. It is expected to be completed by about the end of this year, 1936. A sum of $2,496,000 was allotted for the lock in 1935, and recently an additional $3,000,000 has been allotted to complete the dam. On July 31, 1936, the War Department will advertise for bids for construction of the dam.

In my speech of January 18, 1934, on the floor of the House of Representatives I stated:

Dam no. 3 on the Mississippi River, above Red Wing, will give the beautiful city of Stillwater a 9-foot channel to the center of that industrial city. This dam must be constructed, and we mean to see that it is constructed. There is plenty of money available for this and other Minnesota projects, and we demand our full share for the North Star State. We want shipping up the St. Croix River with a 9-foot channel, there being no locks necessary between the third dam mentioned above Red Wing until shipping reaches the city of Stillwater. What a splendid thing this will be for Washington County and Stillwater, the county seat.

Well, we won our fight for Stillwater, Washington and Chisago Counties, in the great, friendly valley of the

beautiful St. Croix. Six million dollars was expended among our citizens, and in a few months barges and shipping will move into Bayport, Stillwater, and other Washington and Chisago County points, and harbor facilities will be improved. We aim to have a perfect channel; commerce and prosperity will bring happiness and health to our people.

The St. Croix River Improvement Association, under the leadership of Ira C. King, Edward Thelen, and other citizens of Washington County, have cooperated with us in every way in bringing pressure to bear upon Congress and the War Department at Washington, to the end that the Red Wing Dam is now being constructed.

NORTH MINNEAPOLIS HARBOR

For many years public-spirited organizations of Minneapolis have worked for the construction of a harbor on the Mississippi River at North Minneapolis. This fine harbor will serve Minnesota and the Northwest. On more than one occasion we have had the pleasure of arranging appointments with the War Department engineers for delegations of Minneapolis officials. I will continue my fight for this great Northwest project.

In the recent hearing on the North Minneapolis Harbor before the Board of Engineers at Washington every objection of the engineers was answered by capable representatives of the Minneapolis city government and Minneapolis industry. The War Department engineers are at the present time giving serious consideration to this project. They have requested further data and are making a restudy of the proposal. We are expecting to have their report in the near future. There are no objections from an engineering standpoint. By persistent, organized effort we will obtain a great harbor for Minneapolis.

MINNEAPOLIS NEEDS A HARBOR

The completion of the 9-foot channel to the door of St. Paul will not benefit Minneapolis unless we have a 9-foot channel and adequate harbor facilities in Minneapolis. The present Minneapolis terminal does not provide adequate space even for existing industries. Minneapolis is the metropolis of the Northwest and the greatest railroad center in the Northwest. It is the largest center for storing grain in the United States. It is the greatest milling center in the country. Minneapolis has diversified industries of many kinds. Savings of water transportation are of vital importance to the entire city. The cost of constructing the North Minneapolis Harbor is estimated at around $5,000,000.

STANDARD OHIO LOCKS NEEDED

When the North Minneapolis Harbor is constructed we must demand that standard Ohio locks, 110 by 600 feet, be constructed at St. Anthony Falls. Engineers have stated that the pool above St. Anthony Falls has possibilities of being the finest inland harbor in the United States. We must have adequate shipping facilities to the north limits of Minneapolis, and in time the harbor can be extended to Coon River Dam, north of Minneapolis. A 9-foot channel to Minneapolis means to the north limit of Minneapolis, and we cannot permit any other construction.

SUPERIOR-ST. CROIX CANAL

Twenty-five years ago, when a member of the Minnesota State Legislature, I voted for a resolution authorizing a survey of the proposed Superior-St. Croix Canal, to extend from Lake Superior down the St. Croix River. After the Red Wing Dam is completed, there will be a 9-foot channel to Stillwater, and the Superior-St. Croix Canal will continue this 9-foot channel from Stillwater to Lake Superior. This project deserves the consideration of Washington County residents and the War Department at Washington. All of Minnesota and the Northwest will be made prosperous by the flow of commerce through this trade artery of the future. We need intelligent national planning, and the Superior-St. Croix Canal must hold a prominent place in any great Northwest plan.

LAC QUI PARLE PROJECT

There are many projects outside the Third Congressional District which benefit the entire State of Minnesota. My speech of January 18, 1934—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 894—mentions many of these projects.

The Lac Qui Parle Reservoir project, which is now under construction in southwestern Minnesota, is one that took years to put in operation. Even citizens who would directly benefit by the project at times became discouraged to the extent that they ceased to make an effort for it. In November 1933 supporters of the project were greatly discouraged. On November 19, 1933, I wrote a letter to Mr. Elwood Mills, editor of the Montevideo American, and many other Minnesota editors, as follows:

DEAR MR. MILLS: The Flood Control Committee of Congress is very much interested in the Lac Qui Parle project, and I wish to assure your community, as a member of the Flood Control Committee, that I am entirely at your service and will aid in every possible way the promotion of this great project which means so much to your community and Minnesota.

I have already discussed the matter with the Public Works Administration, and will do so again in the future. Should you send individuals or committees to Washington to present this matter, these gentlemen are welcome to use my office, 1022 New House Office Building, and I will join any group that comes to Washington to put over this very important and commendable enterprise.

Will be pleased to hear from you as to developments in your neighborhood, and any resolutions and message you wish communicated to the Public Works Administration or any other department I will be glad to communicate, and will appreciate a duplicate for my files.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST LUNDEEN.

I wrote letters to the press in the vicinity of this project, and I appealed to the officials of the various counties to go forward in spite of all, to the end that Minnesota might profit from the construction of the great Lac Qui Parle Reservoir.

In my speech of January 18, 1934, I devoted considerable attention to the Lac Qui Parle project. Through the combined cooperation of Minnesota citizens and public officials at Washington, the Lac Qui Parle project is now under way. It will prevent floods and maintain water levels in Minnesota, where this work is badly needed.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The St. Lawrence waterway is a major project of utmost importance to the North Star State. It will bring ocean-going vessels to Superior and Duluth, and connect Minnesota with the great Atlantic. It will furnish an ocean of light and power, which power will be thrown into the superpower system that some day will interlace the entire country.

From the very beginning I have supported and fought for the St. Lawrence waterway. I have joined with any and all organizations supporting the project, and will continue my efforts until we accomplish the digging of this great canal and make possible hydroelectric energy for millions of people. Minnesota produces an abundance of raw materials and finished goods which must be shipped great distances. The St. Lawrence waterway will be one great outlet for the energy and goods of our people.

VETERANS' PROJECTS

During the present session of Congress we passed a bill which will create a national cemetery for the State of Minnesota. Veterans' organizations have for years been working on this project. They secured the cooperation of Senators and Representatives at Washington. Hearings were held by congressional committees, and, as a result of recent legislation, Minnesota will have a national cemetery to be located near the Twin Cities.

Upon sending a copy of the national cemetery bill to National Commander Samuel R. Van Sant, of the Grand Army of the Republic and twice Governor of Minnesota, I received a post card stating:

DEAR FRIEND: Thanks for copy of bill on more cemeteries for ex-soldiers. More are needed. You have always favored legislation for the ex-soldiers. With best wishes,

Cordially yours,

S. R. VAN SANT.

Dr. John E. Soper, chairman of the Minnesota National Cemetery Committee, wrote me on May 26, 1936:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for your wonderful help in appearing before both committees of Senate and House and making a splendid talk for

our bill. It is only by a united action that we can hope to attain its final passage. You have always stood by my buddies when called upon for help, and I trust we can always have your valuable help.

Yours most sincerely,

JOHN E. SOPER,
Chairman, Minnesota National Cemetery Committee.

There are other veterans' projects pending in the Veterans' Administration and the W. P. A. We are endeavoring to obtain additional construction and improvement of facilities at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Snelling.

VETERANS' BONUS

The greatest sum of Federal money going to Minnesota and the Third Congressional District is in the form of adjusted-service certificate payments. The Veterans' Administration informs me that the face value of certificates held by 83,619 World War veterans of Minnesota as of March 31, 1936, is $81,230,321. The amount due on these certificates, as estimated by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, is approximately $52,789,520.36. Amounts for the Third Congressional District counties are divided as follows:

Anoka	$381,374.65
Chisago	273,144.19
Hennepin	10,723,327.35
Isanti	250,197.51
Washington	512,634.63
Total	12,140,678.33

FIRST BONUS BILL IN 1919

It was on the Lundeen motion that the bonus bill passed the House on March 12, 1934. The first bonus bill ever presented to Congress was brought to my congressional office in 1919 by representatives of the Private Soldiers and Sailors Legion. I placed the first bonus bill before the Speaker of the House and the Vice President of the United States, who presided over the House and Senate, in 1919.

In this connection I wish to insert a short editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Minneapolis Labor Review:

VETERANS WON'T FORGET LUNDEEN

One man the veterans who are now receiving the bonus will not and should not forget is Farmer-Labor Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN.

When the enemies of the Patman bill and even the author himself thought it was buried forever in committee, it was LUNDEEN who resurrected it through a petition for action, and who kept hammering until names enough were obtained to compel Congress to act.

So, through the determination of this Farmer-Laborite, himself a veteran of the Spanish-American War, the bonus bill was kept alive and finally passed.

The bonus bill was not a grandstand measure with Congressman LUNDEEN. It was something to be worked for in silence of oblivion as well as when the bands were playing.

Just as he worked and worked until the bonus became a reality, so LUNDEEN will work until his measure for social security for all is enacted into law.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS GIVE COOPERATION

Federal emergency agencies have done a great deal to alleviate distress in Minnesota, and in the Third Congressional District we have been able to secure the cooperation of Government officials in Washington as well as the folks back home. We have been extended every courtesy by Works Progress Administrator Hon. Harold L. Ickes and his staff of workers. They have cooperated with us in the matter of arranging appointments for Minnesota delegations who have come to Washington in the interest of some project. We have also been able to secure from them prompt information and reports on a score of projects. They have given courteous and prompt attention to our requests, whether by letter, telephone, or personal call. They have furnished us with complete, up-to-date information on our Third District projects, and that information has been included in my remarks here.

Captain Radford, in charge of Minnesota's P. W. A. office, has given us like cooperation at all times.

Hon. Harry L. Hopkins, Works Progress Administrator, in spite of his multitude of heavy responsibilities, has always given myself and my office his prompt cooperation and careful attention to Third District projects. He has furnished information and reports whenever requested. Mr. D. W. Beman and other officials under Mr. Hopkins have given us much of their time to prepare the information needed for this report, keeping us informed at all times on Minnesota projects.

I have always found both Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Ickes willing to open their offices for appointments with only a few hours' notice. On numerous occasions we have received personal attention to our more urgent requests for action or information. We also appreciate the complete information recently received on short notice from Minnesota Works Progress Administrator, Hon. Victor Christgau. We wired Mr. Christgau for this information, telling him we must have it by a certain date. He immediately put his office force to work on a Third Congressional District report, and we received it by air mail on the date set.

The same prompt, courteous service was received from Mrs. Anna Dickie Olesen, Minnesota's director for the National Emergency Council, who furnished us by air mail much information concerning funds disbursed through Federal agencies to Minnesota and the Third Congressional District.

TEAMWORK NEEDED

At all times local government bodies, organizations, and other individuals should keep their representatives at Washington informed of projects being started locally, so that these projects can be followed up by the Congressmen and Senators from the very first. No one official and no one organization can accomplish what has been accomplished and what will be accomplished in Minnesota and the Third Congressional District in the way of utilizing the funds made available by Congress to alleviate unemployment, build useful public projects, and carry on educational and cultural activity. Experience and teamwork count.

EXPERIENCE COUNTS

Government at Washington is complicated. There is much red tape to unwind and much to learn about Federal agencies before the proper method of securing action can be learned. An individual who comes to Washington endeavoring to secure action on some project unaided finds himself in a maze of offices. He is passed from one clerk to another and often leaves the city with practically nothing accomplished. Congressmen and Senators and their office forces are here to serve, to advise, and to guide citizens in these matters; to make appointments for them; to secure the information needed.

Congressmen and Senators must study and learn the best ways of securing information and action. This knowledge comes after years of intensive application to the job. I have learned much along this line in dealing with these numerous projects. The more we learn the more effective we become in dealing with these matters. This applies to legislative matters as well as public projects. With this added experience, my office at Washington is now able to serve more effectively than ever before. We welcome inquiries and requests for assistance. I will remain in Washington for several weeks, so that I may give personal attention to these matters.

ORGANIZATION AND PRESSURE NEEDED AT HOME

Whenever we have been able to secure approval of some large Government project or grant, we have had the cooperation not only of Government officials at Washington but of public-spirited, active citizens of Minnesota and the Third District. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of cooperation of city, county, and State officials on these matters. The Hennepin County commissioners and the Minneapolis aldermen have held conference after conference with Congressmen, Senators, and other Federal Government officials during the past 3 years.

Congressmen and Senators at Washington act as a continuous moving force behind these projects. Interested citizens at home must make their pressure felt through their local and county officials, and their own letters, wires, committees, and personal calls. Local organizations and local institutions play a great part in bringing to the North Star State her just share of these Federal funds.

Federal funds obtained for Hennepin County and Third Congressional District
[Estimated, 1933–36—not complete]

Third District counties	P. W. A. allotments as of May 1936	W. P. A. allotments as of Feb. 29, 1936	F. C. A. crop, feed, and drought loans (Sept. 30, 1935)	F. H. A. modernization notes, Apr. 30, 1936	H. O. L. C. loans as of Jan. 2, 1936	Resettlement Administration loans as of Apr. 30, 1936	R. F. C. loans as of Feb. 29, 1936	Adjusted-service certificates	Federal land bank loans as of Dec. 31, 1935	A. A. A. payments to Dec. 31, 1935	Total for each county
Anoka	$12,150	$496,335	$108,556	$17,127.86	$483,677	$50,040.00	$108,000	$381,374.65	$842,300	$51,259.56	$2,550,820.07
Chisago	31,967	440,657	45,674	5,244.03	103,164	30,950.60	275,000	273,144.19	1,370,165	37,921.17	2,613,886.99
Hennepin	9,618,891	25,995,737	73,306	2,040,160.75	18,817,589	59,955.76	10,552,600	10,723,327.35	1,717,265	104,420.89	79,703,252.75
Isanti	212,310	138,068	229,467	6,327.24	93,662	90,100.26	129,000	250,197.51	1,426,665	32,255.83	2,608,052.84
Washington	76,482	338,375	44,481	40,977.48	420,325	43,552.67	31,000	512,634.63	1,284,965	82,057.13	2,874,849.91
Total	9,951,800	27,409,172	501,484	2,109,837.36	19,918,417	274,599.29	11,095,600	12,140,678.33	6,641,360	307,914.58	90,350,862.56

PATMAN-ROBINSON ANTI-CHAIN-STORE BILL—PROTECT INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS AND INDEPENDENT BANKERS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Patman-Robinson anti-chain-store bill. The independent merchant and the independent banker must be protected against the growing menace of chains. Chain stores and chain banks transfer local funds to great financial centers. We pour billions of dollars of relief into local communities, and through chain stores these funds are poured back again into financial centers of the East. Losses are suffered not only by the local banker and the local merchant, but also by the whole community.

The people of this country cannot be prosperous and happy if chains are permitted to drain local communities of their wealth. The independent merchant and the independent banker are only pawns in the game. They do not suffer alone from the effects of monopoly. The whole Nation becomes impoverished.

PREVENTS DISCRIMINATION

A few rich, powerful corporations have forced manufacturers to sell goods at a lower price than sold to independent merchants. The purpose of this bill is to prevent price discrimination in favor of these monopolistic corporations. It prohibits, under certain conditions, the payment of brokerage fees to dummy brokers. It prohibits pseudo-advertising allowances. It gives the Federal Trade Commission additional powers in order that discrimination against independent dealers may be prevented. There is nothing in the measure to penalize, shackle, or discourage efficiency or to reward inefficiency. There is nothing in it to fix prices or limit the freedom of price movements in response to changing market conditions. It strengthens existing antitrust laws and preserves competition in interstate commerce. No business institution conducting its business honestly and without the use of unfair trade practices has any reason to fear the anti-chain-store bill.

HUGE SALARIES OF CHAIN-STORE OFFICERS

A few powerful organizations, by reason of their size, have forced manufacturers to give them special prices for the same quantities of goods. With the profit made by unfair trade practices these huge corporations are able to pay their executive officers million-dollar salaries and bonuses. Underpaid employees of these great corporations do not profit from price discriminations. The chains are the worst exploiters of labor that we have. Labor unions know that.

Evidence has been brought out in the committee and on the floor of the House to show that one large corporate chain paid a comparatively few of its officers and directors $1,996,000 a year, paid several of them over $100,000 a year, one of them $180,000, another $140,000, another $52,000, and another $25,000. The same concern received $8,000,000 during the same year in secret rebates and in special discounts that the independent merchants of this country did not receive. They must keep their rebates secret in order that these huge salaries can be paid.

Chain stores undersell independent merchants in order to drive them out of business; then boost their prices again when the independent merchant is destroyed. To make up for losses incurred by underselling, higher prices are charged in areas where the chains already have a monopoly.

GROWING MONOPOLY

In the District of Columbia in 1933 the chains did 96.1 percent of the variety store business, 60.6 percent of the shoe store business, 79.9 percent of the grocery store business, 56.1 percent of the filling station business, and 62.7 percent of the drug store business. In every line of business, there was an increase from 1929 in the percentage done by chain stores, according to the figures of the United States Census Bureau.

At first, variety stores were the principal line of chains. Then came groceries, shoes, drugs, and others. When a chain is successful in one line, it expands into others. The continued growth of chains means absentee ownership of business throughout America. Some of our prominent economists estimate that the present rate of concentration by 1970 all business in this country will be controlled by 200 giant corporations. Already 200 corporations control the financial life of this Nation. These 200 corporations are controlled by a few superfinanciers.

CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH INCREASING

When the United States was first organized as a nation 2 percent of the people owned only 5 percent of the wealth and the other 98 percent owned 95 percent of the wealth. (Farmers' Union Herald, July 1935, quoting Hon. Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr.) Today it is estimated that 2 percent of the people own 80 percent of the wealth, instead of 5 percent at the beginning. We, the people, are beginning to lose the ownership of our country. We must prevent the spread of absentee ownership. Government is instituted among men to protect the weak and restrain the strong. Chain stores have been made strong by price discriminations and other unfair practices. Underpaid clerks receive no advantages from the huge profits of chains.

INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS AND INDEPENDENT BANKERS MUST BE SAVED

I am glad to serve on the steering committee of the Patman-Robinson anti-chain-store bill. I have always maintained that the independent merchant and the independent banker must be protected against the menace of chains.

Chain banks threaten to make character loans to merchants a thing of the past. The independent merchant today must deal with the agent of some huge banking chain. Chain banks have no personal interest in the needs of the local merchant. There is no bond of sympathy there. The independent merchant and the independent banker are facing the same enemy, monopolistic control. Chain monopolies are fast reducing them to the rank of clerk. Labor knows that the chains are notorious exploiters of labor. Labor unions are joining with independent merchants and independent bankers in their fight against monopoly.

I will support any organized effort to curb the chains, and I am glad to see some action taken in Congress to help the corner grocery, the drug store, the small merchant in general, and the independent banker. These men have helped

build our communities. They have extended a helping financial hand to deserving debtors. To eliminate them from American life would end a mighty chapter of community building and strike down a sturdy, independent American character.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 262, granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission. A similar House joint resolution was passed a moment ago, and I shall ask that the proceedings by which it was passed be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into the amendatory agreement executed on April 1, 1936, by the commissioners duly appointed on the part of such States, amending the original agreement entered into by such States for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, which original agreement was consented to by Congress by Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, approved February 16, 1928, and every part and article of such amendatory agreement is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of such amendatory agreement; which amendatory agreement is as follows:

Whereas the States of New York and Vermont heretofore and on the 11th day of May 1927, entered into an agreement or compact, duly authorized by law, creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; and

Whereas the legislatures of said States have authorized their respective commissioners to enter into an agreement of compact amending said existing agreement or compact: Now, therefore,

The said States of New York and Vermont do hereby enter into the following agreement, to wit:

The agreement heretofore made between the State of New York and the State of Vermont, pursuant to chapter 321 of the Laws of 1927 of the State of New York, entitled "An act authorizing designated authorities in behalf of the State of New York to enter into an agreement or compact with designated authorities of the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, the establishment of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, and the defining of the powers and duties of such commission and making an appropriation for such purposes", and no. 139 of the acts of 1927 of the State of Vermont entitled "An act ratifying a proposed agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission and providing for carrying out the provisions of said agreement or compact", as the same was amended by the agreement or compact entered into the 30th day of March 1935, by and under the authority of chapter 201 of the Laws of 1933, as amended by chapter 355, of the Laws of 1935 of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of no. 209 of the acts of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont of 1935, entitled "An act authorizing an agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York to amend the existing agreement or compact between said States creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, in relation to the construction of a new bridge across Lake Champlain, the issuance of bonds by said Commission, and providing for the payment of said bonds", approved by the Governor February 27, 1935, as amended by no. 210 of the acts of 1935 of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, approved by the Governor March 21, 1935, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following articles:

ARTICLE XXXVI

The Lake Champlain Bridge Commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to issue its negotiable bonds in addition to those issued prior to March 1, 1933, for the purpose of refunding its bonds issued before said date: *Provided, however*, That the aggregate principal amount of such bonds so issued to pay off and refund its bonds issued before said date shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of the bonds so retired.

ARTICLE XXXVII

Such commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to call for payment and to pay its bonds issued before March 1, 1933, in accordance with the terms under which said bonds were issued and for such purposes to use any funds which it has or shall have in reserves and sinking fund and investments at the time said bonds are called for payment, notwithstanding any provision heretofore set forth in this or any previous compact or agreement.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

The bonds issued under authority of article XXXVI shall be authorized by resolution of such commission and shall bear such date or dates, mature at such time or times, not exceeding 50 years from their respective dates, bear interest at such rate or rates, not exceeding 5 percent per annum payable semiannually, be in such denominations, be in such form, either coupon or registered, carry such registration privileges, be executed in such manner, be payable in such medium of payment, at such place or places, and be subject to such terms of redemption as such resolution or resolutions may provide. Said bonds may be sold at public or private sale for such price or prices as such commission shall determine, provided that the interest cost to maturity of the money received for any issue of said bonds shall not exceed 5 percent per annum.

2. Neither the members of such commission nor any person executing said bonds shall be liable personally on said bonds or be subject to any personal liability or accountability by reason of the issuance thereof.

3. The bonds issued under the authority of article XXXVI shall constitute a first lien upon the property, tolls, and revenues pledged to secure the bonds issued by such commission prior to March 1, 1933, and subject to the terms of any agreement made or to be made with holders of bonds issued by such commission under article XXVI of the amendments to this compact shall be a lien upon the tolls and revenues of the bridge referred to as the Rouses Point Bridge, and in accordance with subdivision 4 of article XXVI of the amendments to this compact any of such tolls and revenues which would otherwise have been payable into the State treasuries of the two States may be pledged to the payment of said bonds.

4. Said bonds shall not be a debt of the State of New York or of the State of Vermont and neither State shall be liable thereon, nor shall they be payable out of any funds other than those of such commission.

5. Said bonds shall be exempt from taxation and are hereby made securities in which all public officers and bodies of each State and of its municipal subdivisions, all insurance companies and associations, all savings banks and savings institutions, including savings and loans associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees, and all other fiduciaries in each State may properly and legally invest the funds within their control.

6. Such commission shall have power out of any funds available therefor to purchase any bonds issued by it at a price not more than the redemption price thereof at the time of such purchase with accrued interest.

ARTICLE XXXIX

Such commission shall have the power to apply to the Congress of the United States or any department of the United States for consent or approval of this compact as amended, but in the absence of such consent by Congress and until the same shall have been secured, this compact, as amended, shall be binding upon the State of New York when ratified by it and the State of Vermont when ratified by it without the consent of Congress to cooperate for the purposes enumerated in this agreement and in the manner herein provided and for all purposes that it legally may be.

In witness whereof, by and under the authority of chapters 73 and 219 of the Laws of 1936, of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of Public Act No. 19 of the acts and resolves passed by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont at the special session 1935–36, approved by the Governor December 14, 1935, we have signed this compact or agreement, in duplicate, this 1st day of April 1936.

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

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which House Joint Resolution 582 was agreed to will be vacated.

There was no objection.

House Joint Resolution 582 was ordered to lie on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the so-called chain-store bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DR. TOWNSEND—MY VIEWS—REASON FOR VOTE AGAINST ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, frequently important matters are voted upon in the House without a record vote. In such cases, where the question is decided by voting without a roll call, there is no record that will indicate the manner in which any particular Member of the House has voted.

Realizing that there are a great many interested in the matter of how Members of Congress voted with respect to the resolution holding Dr. Townsend to be in contempt of the House of Representatives for having allegedly refused to testify before a special committee of the House investigating the so-called Townsend plan for old-age pensions, I have deemed it proper to make known my vote upon that occasion and the reason therefor, as no record vote was had.

I voted "no." My reason for having done so was based upon the thought that Dr. Townsend had not been treated fairly nor as considerately as he should have been by the committee when he appeared before them.

I am well aware that the dignity and the orderly procedure of the House requires that individuals, when properly summoned, must submit themselves before the House or any committee authorized and appointed by the House for the investigation of any particular matter. In the case of Dr. Townsend there was no refusal upon his part to appear before the duly authorized committee of the House that had been charged with the duty of investigating the so-called Townsend plan. In fact, he testified before the committee for 2 or more days. During this time he answered questions in a frank and straightforward manner. There was no attempt to hide, conceal, or evade anything that had a direct or indirect bearing upon the subject. The same was equally true of other witnesses who testified before the committee.

After Dr. Townsend had submitted himself for a long time before the committee and had answered innumerable questions addressed to him by committee members and the attorney representing the committee, he asked the privilege of reading into the record a prepared statement that would present in full his views and opinions, the aims and objects sought by the movement of which he is the head, and also information of a general character that would enable the committee to have full, complete, and comprehensive information on the subject. Dr. Townsend was of the opinion that such a plan of presentation would provide a more intelligent view of the entire matter than could be obtained by answering every conceivable question propounded by different members and which often had no relationship to one another. This method of examination produced a disjointed, disconnected, and necessarily incomplete and certainly unsatisfactory presentation.

I am of the opinion that the plan of procedure suggested by Dr. Townsend would have proved much more helpful in gaining accurate and complete knowledge than the course pursued by the committee. The adoption of the suggestion made by Dr. Townsend would not have prevented the committee from conducting a cross-examination after he had completed his prepared statement. Furthermore, the request that was made by Dr. Townsend was no different from that frequently made by witnesses appearing before congressional committees who desire to present a complete statement before interruption. I have never known such a request to be refused by any committee of which I have been a member. Dr. Townsend did not refuse to testify. He had already done so for a long time extending, if I remember correctly, into and possibly beyond a period of 2 days. It was only after having done so and having seen how unsatisfactory the procedure was in obtaining the real information sought that he made his request. It was reasonable from every standpoint. It should have been granted. If the committee had done so, there would have been no such issue as was presented to the House.

I am, therefore, of the opinion that even though there may have been, technically speaking, no legal right for Dr. Townsend to leave the presence of the committee without its consent; yet I am convinced that there was no wrongful intent upon his part in doing so. I can readily understand that he was exasperated at what he considered the unfriendly attitude of the committee and a procedure that prevented a full and intelligent expression of his views, and that he took the course which he did only as a last resort. Again, I repeat that if the committee had granted his request it would not have curtailed its right to question Dr. Townsend after he had completed his statement; and if the committee had done so, the dignity of the committee and of this House would not have been detrimentally affected but, in fact, greatly enhanced.

It was for these reasons, which to me seemed fair and just, when the resolution to hold Dr. Townsend in contempt and authorizing and directing the United States District Attorney for the District of Columbia to institute legal proceedings therefor was brought before the House I voted "no."

PETITION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

Furthermore, I wish to take this means of making known the fact that I signed the petition on the Clerk's desk of the House to discharge the committee of the McGroarty bill (Townsend plan) in order that the same might be brought before the House for consideration and vote.

As a Member of the House I have always been strongly of the opinion that any legislation that has a considerable number of citizens interested in its enactment should be brought upon the floor of the House for decision. To me, it seems fundamentally wrong that a few members of a committee should have the power to withhold action upon important matters of legislation and thereby preclude the membership of the House from the right to record its vote in favor of or against the proposed legislation.

This shall continue to be my course of action. It is based upon a principle of representative government that should find expression in all matters of legislation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRISCOLL, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. POWERS (at the request of Mr. BACHARACH), for 3 days, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4511. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4512. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city and county of San Francisco to construct a causeway and highways on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 11108. An act to advance a program of national safety and accident prevention.

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. 11108. An act to advance a program of national safety and accident prevention.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 29, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

855. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of a ship canal connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan from Lake Au Train in Lake Superior to Little Bay de Noc in Lake Michigan, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

856. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cedar Run Creek, N. J., from the Main Channel to Wire Creek, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

857. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Obion and Forked Deer Rivers, and South Fork of Forked Deer River, Tenn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

858. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of, and review of reports on, Greens Bayou and Pass Palacios (Cotton Bayou), Tex., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, and requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 21, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

859. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Goldsborough Creek in Mason County, Wash., with a view to the control of its floods, authorized by act of Congress approved August 22, 1935; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2833. Report from the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Department of the Interior (Rept. No. 2833). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 6731. A bill to create a United States Board of Awards and to provide for the presentation of certain medals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1995. A bill to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California State park system; with amendment (Rept. No. 2840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11176. A bill increasing the penalty for making false oaths for the purpose of bathing at the Government free bathhouse at Hot Springs, Ark.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12426. A bill authorizing the payment of certain salaries and expenses of employees of the General Land Office; without amendment (Rept. No. 2842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEARIN: Committee on the Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 496. Joint resolution for the erection of a memorial to Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd; without amendment (Rept. No. 2843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1871. An act granting certain public lands to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the Northern Montana Agricultural and Manual Training School; without amendment (Rept. No. 2844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONTET: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 4252. An act to provide for the modification of the contract of lease entered into on June 12, 1922, between the United States and the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 608. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission, and extending until March 10, 1938, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbiter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Roads. H. R. 12745. A bill to aid the several States in making certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 554. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Indians of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 557. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Gros Ventre Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 12870. A bill to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 2866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12604. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the journey and explorations of Francisco Vasquez de Coronado; with amendment (Rept. No. 2867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 606. Joint resolution amending section 5 of Public Resolution No. 6, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 4, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 2869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to divide the eastern district of South Carolina into four divisions and the western district into five divisions" by adding a new division to the eastern district and providing for terms of said court to be held at Orangeburg, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No.

2870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. Senate Joint Resolution 229. Joint resolution providing for the contribution by the United States to the expenses of the celebration by the State of Arkansas of its admission to the Federal Union; with amendment (Rept. No. 2871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FREY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6612. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the payment of claims of certain foreign governments under the circumstances hereinafter enumerated; with amendment (Rept. No. 2872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6743. A bill for the relief of Mojo Schey Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. David C. Stafford; with amendment (Rept. No. 2846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9006. A bill for settlement of claim of Allen Holmes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9008. A bill for the relief of Milo Milliser; with amendment (Rept. No. 2848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9111. A bill for the relief of Evanell Durrance; with amendment (Rept. No. 2849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10258. A bill for the relief of A. D. Hampton; with amendment (Rept. No. 2850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10277. A bill for the relief of George E. Wilson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10916. A bill for the relief of Carl Hardin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10995. A bill for the relief of Elbert Arnold Jarrell; with amendment (Rept. No. 2853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11262. A bill for the relief of Brooks-Callaway Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11861. A bill for the relief of Cleveland L. Short; without amendment (Rept. No. 2855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12166. A bill for the relief of Mary Daley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. S. 3770. An act to award a special gold medal to Lincoln Ellsworth; with amendment (Rept. No. 2859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12388. A bill to provide for the recognition of the heroic conduct and devotion to duty of Matthew A. Hensen, one of the survivors of the polar expedition of Admiral Peary, and to provide a life pension for the said Matthew A. Hensen; with amendment (Rept. No. 2860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. House Joint Resolution 123. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in commemoration of the achievements of Amelia Earhart Putnam; with amendment (Rept. No. 2861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 4641. A bill authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10440. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the Foreign Service of the United States, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war or other causes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7244. A bill for the relief of John E. T. Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 2874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8330. A bill for the relief of William Blakley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10330. A bill for the relief of the estate of John E. Callaway; with amendment (Rept. No. 2876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10746. A bill for the relief of Matt Burgess; with amendment (Rept. No. 2877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11597. A bill for the relief of L. A. Peveler; with amendment (Rept. No. 2878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 3080. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John W. Hubbard; without amendment (Rept. No. 2879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3600. An act for the relief of S. C. Eastvold; without amendment (Rept. No. 2880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3768. An act for the relief of E. W. Jermark; without amendment (Rept. No. 2881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3850. An act for the relief of Mrs. Foster McLynn; without amendment (Rept. No. 2882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3956. An act for the relief of Jacob Kaiser; with amendment (Rept. No. 2883). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 4116. An act for the relief of Grant Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 4119. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Hickey; without amendment (Rept. No. 2885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 4542. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2886). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. Senate Joint Resolution 61. Joint resolution to repeal an act approved February 17, 1933, entitled "An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works", and to provide for the relief of William Saenger, chairman liquidating committee of the Beaumont Export & Import Co. of Beaumont, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2887). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 12884) to repeal the Silver Purchase Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 12885) to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL: A bill (H. R. 12886) to provide for the award of an air-mail service medal of honor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MERRITT of New York: A bill (H. R. 12887) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the world's fair to be held in the city of New York, State of New York, in 1939, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States of America and of the establishment of the Federal Government in the city of New York; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12888) to provide for the erection of a building to be used exclusively for the recorder of deeds; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHANDLER: A bill (H. R. 12889) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal section 76 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER: A bill (H. R. 12890) extending the benefits for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the China Relief Expedition, to contract veterinarians; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12891) granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARMICHAEL: A bill (H. R. 12892) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Lawrence County, Ala., to wit, all of fractional section 25 which lies south of the Elk River Shoals Canal and the northwest quarter of section 36, township 3 south, range 7 west, Huntsville meridian; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 12893) for the protection of oyster culture in Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: A bill (H. R. 12894) to transfer the duties, powers, and functions of the Secretary of Commerce under the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12895) to authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of certain facilities for navigation on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 12896) to provide for the transfer of the surplus decommissioned Lightship *No. 82* to U. S. S. Constitution Post No. 3339, Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAIN: A bill (H. R. 12897) providing a special tax on retail liquor sales in the District of Columbia to establish there a suitable home for inebriates; to maintain dependent wives and minor children of inebriates; to provide home relief for widows and orphans of inebriates; and to pay adjudicated claims for injury or death caused, in part or major degree, by persons under the influence of intoxicating liquors within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12898) granting the consent of Congress to the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the lower peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 12899) to authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of certain facilities for navigation on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request): A bill (H. R. 12900) to amend section 4898 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 12901) to grant United States mail franking privilege to Reserve officers in official correspondence; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 12902) to provide a commissioned strength for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the efficient performance of military and other statutory duties assigned to that corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 533) providing for the consideration of House Resolution 49, a resolution requesting the Secretary of Labor to compile a list of the labor-saving devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Resolution (H. Res. 534) to authorize payment of expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 527; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LUCKEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 609) to establish a policy of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 610) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1936, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILCHRIST: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) providing for the printing as a House document of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States (including dissenting opinions and separate concurring opinions) on various cases; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KRAMER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 52) creating a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives to determine the practicability of the purchase of Lower California from the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BERLIN: A bill (H. R. 12903) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12904) validating a town-lot certificate and authorizing and directing issuance of a patent for the same to Ernest F. Brass; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DEROUEN: A bill (H. R. 12905) for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida, and for the relief of the heirs of Lewis G. Norton; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 12906) granting a pension to Mary Averbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12907) for the relief of Paul Glick; 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:

11005. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by the San Pedro Civic Council, of San Pedro, Calif., urging the appropriation or allocation of funds for the construction of the proposed Great T Tunnel for the purpose of connecting the highways of the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor districts, shortening distances and speeding up and facilitating

traffic between points in said districts now isolated by water, and to and from communities adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Roads.

11006. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of Council No. 15, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, deploring existing conditions which if not curbed threaten the very existence of our American Republic, opposing enactment of the Kerr bill and favoring the Reynolds-Starnes bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

11007. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, International Falls, Local No. 159; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

11008. Also, petition of Mother's Day, Inc., Philadelphia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11009. Also, petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local No. 1445; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11010. Also, petition of the city of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 29, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 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, May 28, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wikerson's Ferry, Miss.; and

S. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8442. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes;

H. R. 11916. An act to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., to the State of Kentucky; and

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 255)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1937, amounting to $50,000 (salaries and expenses, General Committee of the Accident Prevention Conference), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 256)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to remain available until June 30, 1937, for the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, amounting to $100,000, for the purchase of land and equipment and construction of buildings required in connection with sugarcane investigations, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture to liberalize the terms of the National Soil Conservation Act so as to permit farmers in areas wherein drought has prevented germination or growth of their principal money crop until it is too late to produce such crops, even if rain should come, to withdraw a greater percentage of such soil depleting crops from cultivation and to plant same to soil building or soil improving crops as outlined in the terms of said act

Whereas there is now and has been for well-nigh 2 months a serious drought affecting certain States of the Nation, particularly South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, and portions of Alabama, Florida, and other States so vitally and adversely as to make the growing of certain crops, such as cotton, tobacco, corn, and so forth, almost impossible for the year 1936, due to the lateness of the season; and

Whereas these crops are largely the money crops of the affected areas and vitally influence the business life of the said States and the individuals dependent upon them for sustenance, as well as the economic life of the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas, if some measure of relief is not devised for the farmers of the affected areas, the likelihood is that the relief rolls in these areas will be greatly augmented this fall as a result of money crop failures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina hereby strongly petitions, urges, and recommends to the national Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture that the National Soil Conservation Act be so liberalized or amended as to allow a greater percentage of soil depleting crops to be withdrawn from cultivation and planted to soil building and soil improving crops than is now allowable under the said act, such increased percentage of soil depleting crops to