

legislation which will in any way reduce or adversely affect the importation of sugar from the Philippine Islands into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

87. Also, petition of the Children's Welfare Federation of New York City (Inc.), favoring the proposed Federal legislation required for the continuation of a child-welfare extension service similar to that provided for under the Sheppard-Towner Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

88. Also, petition of the American Legion of the State of New Mexico, opposing plan toward the abandonment of the United States Veterans' Bureau hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

89. Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, strongly urging the Members of Congress from the State of New York to take such prompt and effective measures as will insure the enactment of a rivers and harbors bill at the special session of the Seventy-first Congress which will be a most effective means of providing that relief for the agricultural interests of the country to which the administration is committed; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

90. By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Petition of Street & Smith Corporation, publishers, New York, proposing the striking out of "for use in the manufacture of newspapers" be stricken out in paragraph 1672 as substituted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

91. By Mr. GARNER of Oklahoma: Petition of William R. Vallance, president of the Federal Bar Association, in support of House bill 16643; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

92. Also, petition of the Surplus Control League of the Pacific Northwest, Garfield, Wash., urging legislation to make effective to the producer the 42-cent tariff on wheat, expressing faith in the principles of the original McNary-Haugen bill, and recommending that the proposed Federal farm board be invested with sufficient authority to make the tariff available to the producer, either through the disposal of the exportable surplus or any effective substitute therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

93. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, calling attention to the foreign-trade features of the chamber's seventeenth annual meeting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

94. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of citizens of McKeesport, Pa., protesting against national-origins provision of immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

95. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of N. L. Lederer (Inc.), New York, urging an increase in the rate of duty on glues and gelatines, inasmuch as imported products amount to only 6 per cent of domestic production and therefore can not constitute menace to American industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

96. Also, petition of Street & Smith Corporation, publishers, New York, proposing the striking out of "for use in the manufacture of newspapers" be stricken out in paragraph 1672 as substituted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

97. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Street & Smith Corporation, publishers, New York City, favoring certain amendment to paragraph 1672 of the tariff act, newsprint paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

98. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in its opinion that the Tariff Commission should be an important permanent bureau of the National Government of a strictly nonpartisan character; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

99. Also, petition of N. L. Lederer (Inc.), New York City, favoring an increase of duty on glues and gelatines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

100. Also, petition of the Monarch Lumber Co., Great Falls, Mont., with reference to the tariff on shingles, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

101. Also, petition of the Eastern Federation of Feed Merchants, Albany, N. Y., with reference to farm relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

102. By Mr. PRALL: Resolution received from the secretary of the Association of American Weighmasters (Inc.), 98 Front Street, New York, passed at meeting held on the 25th of March, 1929, whereas the Association of American Weighmasters is engaged in the business of weighing, marking and checking, counting, and identifying, among other things, imports of sugar, hemp, copra, kapok, shells, gums, and other products from the Philippine Islands, arriving through the ports of New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Boston, in which business there are many men employed, all of whom are dependent upon this occupation; and many will be seriously affected to

their detriment should there be any restriction in the importation of Philippine sugar into the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, April 19, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, as we walk the pathway of these days, may we bring helpfulness, brightness, and cheer to all who touch our lives. We thank Thee for the assurance, namely, in Thee we have adequate foundation for all our hopes, and we turn our faces joyfully to the high call of human service. As we give ourselves to Thee in the bonds of unfailing fidelity, iniquity is forgiven and sin is forgotten. Let us walk in Thy footsteps, for this aspiration will bring no disappointment; the triumph of this endeavor will always bless. O God, spare us from any blind selfishness which robs us of the satisfaction and joy of service, and fill us with that magnanimous spirit that ennobles and enriches life; thus we shall not live in vain. Through Jesus Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Members desiring to take the oath will please come forward.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINY and Mr. Cox appeared before the Speaker's rostrum and took the prescribed oath of office.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 26

Resolved, That HARRY C. CANFIELD, of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing House Committee on Ways and Means.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will recall that during the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Committee on Ways and Means devoted some 40 or 50 days to hearings upon the proposed tariff measure to be considered at this session of Congress. During those hearings it was distinctly stated and understood, and an agreement was reached between the majority and minority members, or I might say the entire committee, that when the hearings closed no more information would be given to the committee upon which they would base their conclusions. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], said they would reserve the right—very properly so, I thought—to call any Federal official for the purpose of getting such technical information as to drawing the bill as the committee's judgment might direct.

It seems that that went along very smoothly until a few days ago. We saw the information that the majority had and, so far as I know, the Republican members of the committee have been pursuing that policy. But information has come to a number of us that as a matter of fact that policy has not been pursued. We are informed by the press that the Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, appeared before the Republican members of the committee day before yesterday, not as a Federal official, as was stated by the Secretary, but as a citizen. Now, what his object was in appearing before the Republican members of the committee we do not know, but can only surmise.

But that is not so bad, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as some other matters that have attracted the attention of myself and others. The Tariff Commission, so the White

House gave out yesterday morning, has sent to the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means a proposed reorganization of the Tariff Commission. Immediately upon hearing of that I called up the Committee on Ways and Means and ascertained the facts, and they were to the effect that they had prepared quite a lengthy document, and the latter portion of it embraced a proposed change of the law. I asked for copies of it. They said, "All right; you can have the copy." Then I asked if it was public property, and they said, "Yes"; although it had been in the hands of the Republican members of the committee for a week, or, I presume, two or three days, no information concerning it had been given out to the minority members.

I think the House is entitled as quickly as possible to all information that the Committee on Ways and Means obtains concerning suggested changes in the law, and I want to protest, in the name of the entire membership of the House, against the action of the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means in getting public information, either from the inside or outside of the Government, and not giving it to the membership of the House, and especially to the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means. It is not fair. It is not fair to the country. It is not fair to the membership of the House. It is especially unfair to the minority members, whose responsibilities are the same as those of the majority.

Now, as soon as I got that document, of course, it was public property, but I said to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], "I will not give it to the country unless you say so." He said, "Go ahead." I did so.

That is not the worst part of it, however. The most damaging thing that I see coming out of the action of the Republican members of the committee is the fact that its proceedings are becoming known to the country when you can not know anything about it. I spoke to the gentleman from Oregon yesterday, and I told him I was going to make a statement, but he did not come over, and therefore I did not take it up yesterday.

Then when I talked with him about it yesterday afternoon he said, "Go ahead and make your statement." He said, "We are going to be busy to-morrow and I will not be over." I did not want to make my statement without notifying him about it.

I have in my hand communications from certain people, some of them supposed to be at least reliable, to the effect that certain provisions of the bill are known to the public. I assume you gentlemen are in the same position I am. I have had telegrams, letters, personal interviews, and personal requests from the membership of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, asking if I knew about certain provisions of the bill, or did I know anything about what is going into that bill. In each instance I have said, and have said truthfully, that I knew absolutely nothing about what was going into that bill or what the provisions would be.

It was understood it would be entirely executive. I felt a delicacy about asking a single member to give me any information; in fact, I did not want them to give me any information that they did not give to the balance of my colleagues or to the country, because if they gave it to me in executive session and it became known they might think that GARNER did the leaking, and I did not want that state of affairs to exist.

But here are suggestions that certain changes are to be made in this law which are very material, and in which business men are interested. For instance, a broker undertakes to describe a new section (b) of paragraph 402. He is very much concerned about the proposed language of that section. Now, I wonder if it is true that the proposed provisions of that bill are becoming known to the country and to certain special interests of the country, and that the House of Representatives and the balance of the country are kept in the dark. If that is so, it is wrong. It is indefensible. It enables men to make money by knowing the proposed changes in the law. So I think that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], or some Republican member of the committee, ought to tell us and tell the country whether these statements are true. I do not believe they have intentionally given out anything, because Mr. HAWLEY told me yesterday that the only man who was authorized to give out anything was the chairman, and he told me positively he had not told anyone about any provision in that bill, and I believe he told the truth. But somebody is getting the information. Somebody knows about the new section (b) of paragraph 402 and gives the language of it. This morning I received a copy of a communication sent to one of my colleagues asking this question:

We have just been advised that on April 9 the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and the American Pulp & Paper Association in agreement submitted to Hon. FREDERICK M. DAVENPORT, chairman of the committee on paper schedule, and Hon. R. S. ALDRICH, chairman of

the committee on free lists, the following definition for duty-free newsprint: "Machine-finished paper commercially known as newsprint, except paper commercially or commonly known as rotogravure paper, for use in the manufacture of newspapers."

I do not know whether that definition has been agreed on, and I do not presume any of you know about it. However, this man says it has been agreed upon and that he has been advised to that effect by his associates in the East. Now, if you know what a definition is to be, it is very important, because sometimes a definition is more important than the rate. If you are advised as to what the valuations are to be under the new section (b) of paragraph 402, it is important, and the membership of this House ought to have an opportunity to have that information, the same as these gentlemen who are specially interested in having it. So I ask the majority leader and his organization to tell the House of Representatives whether or not they are receiving, first, additional information upon which to base the bill and, second, are they giving to the country or to special interests information that might be beneficial to them which they are withholding from this House and the country. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] is not here, for undoubtedly if he were here he would make a clear statement showing the attitude of himself and his committee toward the matters referred to by the gentleman from Texas. As I understand the situation, nothing has yet been fixed definitely in the tariff bill which the members of the Ways and Means Committee are preparing. Everything thus far done is tentative; nothing definite has been given out and there has been nothing done that may not be undone by a vote of the committee. I am quite sure that any information, so called, that may have leaked out means only that the committee is considering something of this character. I am quite sure that nothing has been definitely and finally agreed upon beyond recall. I am sure that the members of the Committee on Ways and Means are working very earnestly upon a very difficult task. I believe that it is their intention, and that they have lived up to it, that until they have come to a definite conclusion they are not going to make any portion of their work public.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I take advantage of this opportunity to ask a question regarding a matter I did not mention in my remarks, because it was somewhat confidential, and I do not like to receive confidential communications about public affairs; but it has come to my ears that the Treasury Department has prepared a provision with reference to valuations and has sent it to the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee. Now, we had a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee at which Undersecretary of the Treasury Mr. Mills appeared, and at which time he undertook to give to the committee the viewpoint of the Treasury Department on the administrative features of the bill. I would like to know if there has been any supplemental report made by the Treasury Department to the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee of which the minority has no knowledge?

Mr. TILSON. I am not informed as to that and therefore can give the gentleman no information on the subject.

Mr. GARNER. Well, I am informed, or rather I am reminded by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that when Mr. Mills, Undersecretary of the Treasury, was before the committee, when queried about the matter, declined to express an opinion upon the subject. It seems that now, after the hearings are over, the Treasury Department has reconsidered its action and has arrived at some conclusions and has sent those conclusions to the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee and the minority has not had an opportunity to examine the suggestions. I repeat that it is unfair, it is unjust, it is not treating the minority members right and it is not treating the House of Representatives or the country right to have this kind of procedure.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ways and Means Committee, as I have said, are engaged in a very arduous and difficult task. In fairness to them, I hope that the gentleman from Texas and other Members of the House will possess their souls in patience for a few days until they can finish their task and then everyone will know the results of their labors. I think that they are entitled to the friendly forbearance of the House until they have had reasonable time to complete their work.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Might not the Committee on Ways and Means improve its method of procedure by following the example of the Committee on Agriculture in taking in the minority members?

Mr. TILSON. I suppose that the Committee on Ways and Means would be very much pleased to receive Mr. GARNER, Mr. COLLIER, and other minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means into the Republican fold, and under such conditions would doubtless welcome their aid in preparing this bill.

Mr. ASWELL. Why have they not been present at their sessions during the past month?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Before the gentleman from Connecticut takes his seat I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the gentleman's time continued one minute by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be of general interest to the House if the gentleman from Connecticut could give information at this time which would indicate at what time the Committee on Ways and Means will probably conclude its deliberations and be ready to report the bill.

Mr. TILSON. I am unable at this time to give the gentleman definite information. It has been the hope of the Ways and Means Committee that early in next week they will have their work in such shape that it can be given out as definitely concluded and reported to the House, but just how closely they will be able to live up to their own expectations I am not able to say.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. HAUGEN. 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. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries.

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. 1, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized at this time, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield two hours now to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be notified when I have used 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in the beginning that I do not think a committee has ever worked harder or more regularly or more loyally than the Committee on Agriculture has worked on this bill. It has been a problem fraught with extreme difficulties, sometimes seeming almost incapable of solution. To blend the conflicting ideas into a bill has been an almost insuperable task.

A polished essay may be called farm relief. But that does not make it so. The final test is whether it will be effective. The only reason I am making any suggestions is the fact that the President had indicated that he expected the Congress to write the farm bill. Being a member of the committee, I must share in that obligation.

If we pass this measure, we must naturally and necessarily give it a few years to be tried out. That would only be reasonable. This means, or, at least, I fear it means, the loss of any opportunity for the next few years to secure real, effective farm relief unless it is included within the four corners of this bill.

One of the best friends I have in the world indicated to me that he wished that I, after offering the amendments that I care to offer, would go along and make no objection to the bill. I shall make no objection to it. I shall only discuss the matters wherein I think it fails to meet the situation, and I shall only offer such amendments as will in my judgment tend to make it effective. I shall ask nobody to vote against it. If it is enacted into law, I hope it may be a great success, and I shall be happy to assist in any possible way in making it successful.

The proposed measure provides for the creation of a farm board. That term has been used so often that a great many

people have come to believe that there is some mystic charm about the expression.

The question is not whether we are to have a board, but what is that board authorized to do.

For many years agriculture has been at a low ebb. Farm mortgages have been foreclosed. Farmers have been unable to meet the rate of interest, much less to pay off the mortgage. A general depression in this line of industry has been the occasion of great hardships. It seems to be the theory of those who believe in the magic of the farm board that they can meet this situation by orderly marketing.

The trouble lies much deeper than this. It ties on to the tariff system which has lifted the price of the manufactured articles which the farmer must buy without any corresponding raise in the price of the products which he has for sale.

The question, therefore, is one of price. Any measure which gives him an increased price for his products will be an advantage. Any measure which fails to do so will be insufficient.

This board is authorized to do several things, most of which the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Commerce, or some other department of the Government, can now do. The main thing that this board is authorized to do that any of these departments can not now do is to make loans to cooperative associations or stabilization corporations owned exclusively by cooperative associations. That is the chief material thing that the board is authorized to do that may not now be done by some branch of the Government. The rate of interest which may be charged is left to the board. Some very able representatives of cooperative organizations testified before the committee. There were many stories of wrecks, by the way, of failure, some successes, but all delineated the same difficulties; they all said that the chief trouble with the present system—and any thinking man must know it is true—is the fact that the cooperative organizations must carry nonmembers on their shoulders; that the members of the cooperative organization must pay the expenses and bear the burden of its operation, and in so far as it stabilizes the market the other man, the nonmember who stays on the outside, secures the full benefits of the efforts of the cooperative organization. Mr. Stone, of Kentucky, one of the brightest men that we ever had before the Agricultural Committee, states that the failure of the tobacco association was for that very reason.

This bill perpetuates that same difficulty, or rather does not in my judgment offer a cure for it. The cooperatives have made progress. Under the proposed plan, it seems to me, they will still be carrying the same burdens that have handicapped them during these years. Whatever rate of interest the board charges must be borne by the cooperative association itself if it borrows the money and buys the commodity.

True, this bill authorizes a cooperative organization handling any commodity or who desires to handle any commodity, to organize a stabilization corporation. They may do that to-day. There is no reason why, without this law, they can not organize a stabilization corporation. The board may, under the proposal, advance money to such corporation. This is new.

Is that stabilization corporation to have any capital stock? If so, where is it to come from? The stock can be owned by no one but the cooperative organizations. They may borrow money but borrowed money does not create capital stock. Whether this borrowed money is to be the sole capital of these corporations is not made clear.

This measure may tend to stabilize prices, but this is not the big issue in the farm situation. The present farm problem arises from the fact that the farmer who produces the surplus of commodities can not secure the advantages of a tariff. That is elementary.

The tariff takes care of pig iron, but does nothing for the pig.

I am not going to discuss to-day the question of a high tariff or a moderate tariff or a low tariff. The farmer of this country will take his chances under any of these systems provided you give him a square deal.

Every thinking and reasonable person must admit that the tariff on general commodities increases the price of those commodities. Otherwise, there would not be such a scramble to get into the tariff bill. On the farm commodities which are on an importing basis—that is, which we do not produce in surplus quantities, the tariff may be effective along with other commodities; but on wheat, on cotton, and the other commodities of which we produce a surplus, the farmer can not get any direct benefit from the tariff. Yet at the same time he must buy his supplies on the increased price basis of a protected market. The debenture plan undertakes to equalize that advantage. Somebody said it was a subsidy. It is not a subsidy, it is merely returning to the farmer what is taken away

from him under the tariff system, in the form of increased prices for the supplies he must buy. If I have \$2 of your money and I return it to you, I am not giving you anything; I am merely paying back what belongs to you.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Under the debenture plan, how many agricultural commodities would be favored?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am going to reply to that question the way in which many of the witnesses and the different members of the committee have replied when that question has been asked. Just leave it to the board. When we had different witnesses before the committee and they were asked an embarrassing question about how this thing was going to operate, they would just say, "Well, that is one of the broad powers to be handled by the board."

Mr. CLARKE of New York. My question is not intended as an embarrassing question, but I want the membership of the House to be instructed as to whether the debenture is applicable in its scope and will apply to all agricultural products or whether it is applicable to one or two products that constitute but a fractional part of the agricultural products of this country.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Under the amendment which has been drafted for the Senate committee—and I beg my friend's pardon if I did not seem to answer him directly—which amendment I expect to follow in offering my amendment, and I hope the parliamentary sharks of the House will permit it to be voted upon—that matter will be left to the discretion of the board. The board may make the debenture effective on any agricultural commodity to an extent not to exceed one-half of the existing tariff rates on that particular commodity, with the exception of cotton, on which a specific debenture is named to be applied in the discretion of the board. Under the Senate bill the board may, when it deems advisable, put those rates into effect, and it may suspend them when in its judgment that action is warranted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would state to the House, if he can, upon what commodities other than wheat and cotton the debenture plan is workable, and where the producers of other commodities would receive any benefit.

Mr. JONES of Texas. In my opinion it would be workable, and the producer of any commodity would be benefited if we produce a surplus of that commodity, which normally tends to go into foreign channels.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. That is an exportable surplus.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. But of those commodities of which we do not produce an exportable surplus none would be benefited.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman is correct; but I am not seeking to take away any of the other powers of the board which the gentleman thinks would be effective on the nonsurplus commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. And that comprises about 80 per cent of the products of the farm.

Mr. JONES of Texas. How much?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. The commodities of which there is an exportable surplus comprise about 15 to 20 per cent of all of the agricultural products.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I think the percentage is higher than that; but, at any rate, the surplus problem is the heart of the farm question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. So the debenture plan, if it has any merit and is helpful to agriculture, at best would not benefit over 15 to 20 per cent of American agricultural products.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Whatever the percentage is it largely governs the price of the commodity that is produced in surplus quantities. If the gentleman's bill has the merit that he claims it has, it will take care of the other commodities by giving them stabilized marketing conditions. If you simply add this optional feature to the powers of the board, we will have a bill that will take care of all of them. The debenture plan will supplement the other and not interfere with it in any way.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman is about the best-posted man in the House on the debenture plan.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHREVE. I wish the gentleman would give the House a little synopsis of it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. The debenture plan, or the draw-back plan of the tariff, if it is applicable to agriculture, ought

to be made applicable to every other industry that is suffering the same way that agriculture is, ought it not?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am not trying to solve all of the problems that are before us. We have been stating here for six or eight years that agriculture generally is on a substrata basis, as compared with industry. We are trying to get a bill that will solve the problems that confront agriculture. I do not think export premium principle will do any harm to industry, because it does not interfere with any tariff schedule or rate. I do not think that anybody can gainsay the fact that agriculture is not on a basis of equality with industry—that is, speaking generally. Of course you may pick out isolated items which are exceptions. But the gentleman must admit that they are not on a parity generally. I do not think that stabilizing marketing conditions will put them on that parity. Does the gentleman?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes; I do. Let me state further to the gentleman that the bituminous-coal industry in this country has been in a worse condition than, or as bad condition as, agriculture, caused by the same reasons.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I do not want to go into that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Would the gentleman subsidize that industry? I have 6,000 coal miners in my district. Suppose one man owned all of the cotton produced in the United States, could he market it?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Of course, if you have a 100 per cent organization of cooperatives, that would be fine, but the gentleman is now going into the land of dreams. Of course, everyone admits that if we had a 100 per cent organization of cooperatives the marketing problem would be solved beautifully in and of itself, and we would not need any legislation for stabilization purposes, but the trouble has been that the farmer in this far-flung country with its products scattered from ocean to ocean, and from Lakes to Gulf, has been unable to become organized, and has been at the mercy of organized groups that have gotten, in many instances, what they want out of the Government. The prices of their products, freight rates, and supplies have been increased at the farmers' expense.

Here is the debenture plan in the simplest way that I can express it. When a farmer or a cooperative organization of farmers or any exporter exports a farm commodity, he is issued a certificate at the port of export measurably equivalent to the tariff, or in this instance one-half of whatever the tariff may be. He may take that certificate, which is made negotiable, and pay any customs duty with it, or he may sell it to an importer for cash. To give a concrete illustration, say that a man ships abroad 1,000 bushels of wheat. He would be given a certificate for \$210, at the rate of 21 cents per bushel. That \$210 certificate would be acceptable in payment of tariff duties. It would be readily salable for cash. There is something like \$600,000,000 collected in tariff duties. These debenture certificates might probably amount to \$148,000,000. But if the board is given optional power, it would use that remedy only in a time of stress, and no doubt in practice it would require much less than that amount.

This plan simply gives the surplus farmer who can not get the benefit of the tariff an advantage which fits in with whatever tariff there may be. If the administration changes, or if a new application of tariff rates is provided, the debenture would be automatically changed, and it would simply put the farmer into the picture as a part of the tariff system.

I am not arguing a theory to you. I am not arguing an untried proposal. This plan is in operation in four different countries to-day, and the principle of the plan was in effect in England, one of the greatest nations in the world, more than 200 years ago. It is now in effect in Czechoslovakia, in Belgium, in Germany, in Sweden, and in modified form has been used in other countries. One of the first instances we know of in history is that the plan in principle was adopted in England in 1673. A tentative plan had been introduced in 1663. I have photostatic copies of those laws. It was enacted in England in 1673, and remained in effect through the years 1674 and 1675. On barley there was placed an export premium of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel, on rice 10 cents a bushel, on wheat 15 cents a bushel. The depression in the price of those commodities is cited as the reason for the enactment of the law. By its terms it was to be effective for only three years. In 1685 another depression came, and they enacted another law, of which I have a photostatic copy. Here is the preamble to that law:

For as much as it has been found by experience that the exportation of grain when the price thereof is at a low rate in the Kingdom has been of great advantage not only to the owners of the land but to the trade of the Kingdom in general: Be it therefore enacted—

And so forth. Similar rates were reenacted in the new act and one or two other farm commodities were added to the list.

If we place agriculture, which is the one great independent industry of this country, on a parity and basis of equal rights with every other industry, it will not only injure to the benefit of agriculture, but to the benefit of trade in general.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not true that the same principle, in a crude way, was first put into operation in England in the reign of Edward III?

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is correct, but the first law I discussed was in the reign of Charles II, I believe.

This thing has been a growth of many years. The Emperor Diocletian about 1,500 years ago issued a decree fixing the prices of practically all commodities. But history laughs at price fixing and mocks the price fixer. It soon fell by the wayside, although its purpose was benevolent. In the light of the experience of a great many countries this debenture plan has been worked out.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BURTNES. I would like to find out the real reason why you would like to attach a so-called debenture plan to this bill. Is it because of the fear, in so far as this legislation is concerned, that there may be a danger of the so-called export surplus crop being let out of the picture? That is, that this bill and the administration under it would be very helpful with respect to crops of which we do not raise an exportable surplus, but it would be very difficult for the board so to manage the surplus export crop as to obtain a very substantial benefit?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Exactly. I will say to the gentleman in that connection that if I read the wording of the pending bill right, all that it can possibly do is to give us a stabilized and orderly marketing system. But the trouble with this bill is that agriculture would be left on the same basis as it is now. Of course, the expression has been used frequently that we want a board that is sympathetic with the farmer. I agree to that. I think the board should be in sympathy with the farmer, but the farmer must have something besides sympathy. I am trying to get an amendment adopted that will bring his surplus commodities into the picture. As the gentleman suggests, I do not believe that this bill brings them in, at least not to a proper degree.

Mr. BURTNES. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] called attention to the fact that 80 per cent or more of the agricultural products do not come under the exportable surplus class, and presumably this bill should be very helpful to that big aggregate of commodities.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Practically everything along that line that is authorized in the proposed law can now be done under existing law. I want the farmer given equality all along the line.

Mr. BURTNES. I am quite concerned with the question as to whether the export surplus crops are really within the picture.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not think they are.

Mr. BURTNES. Let me ask this question. Whether the export surplus crops do not also happen to be those crops which have needed help the most during the past 10 years?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. Of course, if a commodity is produced in quantities less than the needs of this country require, they can be brought into any tariff system. Then through organized effort or through the efficient marketing that situation can be handled. But that is not true of crops which are produced in surplus proportions.

Mr. BURTNES. The gentleman has emphasized the fact that even if the debenture plan were put into effect, in accordance with the provisions of the proposed amendment, the total amount which would be kept out of the Treasury would probably not be more than something like 25 or 30 per cent of the proceeds that go into the Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Texas. There probably would not be more than that kept out of the Treasury. Possibly much less.

Mr. BURTNES. If that is the case why, in any of these so-called debenture plans, is it necessary to provide for a debenture? Why go through a complicated system? Why not simply provide for a direct payment out of the Treasury? Why not be entirely frank about it and provide for a payment out of the Treasury?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I undertook to explain that to the gentleman last year when he asked me practically the same question. There are several reasons why it is better to do it the other way. The first bill I introduced did just what the gentle-

man suggests. It provided for the issuance of a certificate and for the payment of the certificate by the Treasury. I introduced that bill in 1925, but we have to deal with other countries. The payment of a bounty in cash might encourage retaliation.

Mr. BURTNES. But in substance it is a bounty, is it not?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Let me answer one question before I am asked another. We do not want to make it an outright subsidy, except in so far as the tariff is a subsidy. If you make it a direct bounty it is likely to become a subsidy independent of the tariff system. I want to hitch it onto the tariff system, so that the farmer will have restored to him that which is being taken away from him under that system, and that is the right thing to do. In other words, let simple justice be done.

Mr. BURTNES. But, ultimately, is there any difference between it and an export bounty?

Mr. JONES of Texas. What difference does it make whether there is any difference or not?

Mr. BURTNES. I say it does not make any, and therefore why not ask for an export bounty in the first instance?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman, but the experience of history has shown the indirect system to be more desirable.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understand the debenture theory, does it apply to any commodities except those upon which an import duty is charged?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It applies to none other, except on cotton, which is specifically named, because of the fact that there is no tariff on cotton.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The general theory of the debenture proposition is that it only applies to those commodities upon which an import duty is charged?

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is the general theory.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And cotton is made an exception under the proposed Senate plan?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the export bounty plan is in existence in Great Britain today?

Mr. JONES of Texas. No. I was going to finish. It is not in existence to-day, and I want to explain why.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. I wish the gentleman would state why he fixes the drawback at 50 per cent of the tariff rate rather than the entire tariff rate?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It is a practical proposition. Besides, those who have studied the rates seem to think that amount would in large measure offset the disadvantage which the surplus-producing farmer suffers under any tariff system.

Now, let me answer the question asked by the gentleman from Vermont. He wanted to know if it was in effect in England to-day. It is not. I read you an account of one bill. I wanted to call attention to another bill which was later introduced. This bill had a 10-year limitation. It was so satisfactory that still another law was enacted, which remained on the statute books, with varying terms, for more than 100 years. It remained in effect until 1815, when England so expanded industrially that her limited acreage was unable to furnish enough farm products to supply the needs of her great and growing industrial business. So she ceased to be an exporter of agricultural products because of her great increase in population and industry. The law fell into disuse and was repealed, that reason being assigned for the repeal. In 1773, they made one change. Knowledge is born of experience. Law is based on human experience; it is based on reason; it is based on the experience of people as they unfold the problems that arise and confront them. They adopted a system of putting an export premium into effect when there was a depression in the price of farm commodities, then taking it off when prices became satisfactory and then putting it on again when prices reached another low ebb.

In 1773 Burke wrote an amendment to the law in reference to wheat which contained the stipulation that when the price of wheat was less than \$1.32 per bushel the premium should go on, and when it reached a price of \$1.45 a bushel it should automatically go off.

Mr. Burke stated in discussing it that he hoped this would be permanent law, as it would care for the wheat growers in

depressions and automatically be lifted when prices were higher. It did remain in effect until the time came when England was no longer an exporter of farm commodities.

The premium plan is in effect in Germany. In Germany it covers rye, wheat, spelt, barley, oats, and legumes, and it is called the *einfuhrschein*.

It was first enacted in the last part of the last century in a very modified form. It was then reenacted in 1902 and again enacted in 1925, and is now in effect. It has worked rather differently in Germany. In the northeastern part of Germany they grow a surplus of these grains and in the southern and southeastern part they frequently have a shortage. There is a market just across the line in the one and a supply just across the line in the other. They issue the *einfuhrschein* where there is a surplus and usually use it for importation of similar products in the other part of the country where there is a shortage. In this way they save the freight rates across the country of Germany.

It is also in effect in Sweden on rye and wheat. They issue premiums. They call them certificates, by the way, in Sweden. They issue these certificates, making them tenderable in payment of customs duties, largely on similar commodities or their products. The Government of Sweden has put in a provision that answers the objection we sometimes hear made that the farmer might not get the benefit of the premium. Once in a while some man makes that statement. They discussed this for 15 years in Sweden before they adopted it. It takes a long time to sell a new idea or a new thought to a people, even though it has merit. In order to be sure that the farmer would receive the benefit of this premium, the Government stipulated, "We will buy any of these certificates at 98 cents on the dollar." They have never had to buy any appreciable amount of them, because the importers buy them at 99 cents or 100 cents, frequently paying the 100 cents rather than go to a bank for a draft. They sell practically at par in Sweden.

Czechoslovakia, which is a very small country, has a similar plan. The certificates cover a number of farm commodities, entitling the possessor to import certain named commodities or their products.

The plan has been tried out in one of the smallest and in one of the greatest nations in the world. Of all the countries that have tried it, not one of them has ever pronounced it a failure.

By the immutable facts of history it has proven successful. I want to read you what Doctor Grunzell, of Germany, said about the effect of this plan:

These import certificates were extensively employed in grain exportation. The immediate effect was that the prices of grain in those parts of the country which depended on exportation for their market and which formerly had to contend with depressed prices rose to a point higher than the general world market by approximately the amount of the import duty.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COX. I am, of course, interested in the gentleman's proposal, and if I understand his statement, it is that this is simply a reverse of the tariff?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COX. Instead of putting money in the Treasury, you take it out?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Or, rather, you trap it on the way to the Treasury.

Mr. COX. I disagree with the gentleman's statement that it is not a subsidy, because I think it is a subsidy, but that is not what I wished to ask the gentleman about.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman thinks the tariff is a subsidy, too?

Mr. COX. Yes; I do.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It is a subsidy in the same sense that the tariff is a subsidy.

Mr. COX. Yes; except that it is the reverse of it; but this is what I wish to ask the gentleman: How do you propose that the benefits of the legislation shall be extended to all of the producers of the commodity rather than to the producers of the exportable surplus?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Let me answer the gentleman's question by asking a question or by stating it in question form. What gives him his present price? The buyer does not pay any more for the commodities of the farm than he has to or than competition forces him to pay. It is competition between the exporter and the domestic buyer which gives him his present price. If you give the exporter the increased bounty he can bid that much more and the domestic buyer must meet the price. It has been the experience in every country that the price of the whole domestic commodity, that which is not exported as well

as that which is exported immediately responded to the increased level. If it were not lifted or if the buyers combined to deprive the farmer of some of the benefits, would not that be the greatest inducement in the world for the farmers to go into cooperative organizations?

Suppose the exporters tried not to give the farmers the benefit of any of this 20 cents a bushel on wheat. The man on the inside of the cooperative—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MICHENER). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes more.

Those inside the cooperative organization would be able to get 20 cents a bushel more for their wheat than those outside; would not that bring in a lot of new members?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. And that would be an inducement.

The trouble with most bills presented to the Agricultural Committee—and there are hundreds of them—is the fact that they sought to provide remedies through cooperative marketing and yet offered no inducement to get farmers into cooperative organizations. The cooperative organizations had to bear the expense and the burden of stabilizing the market. I am afraid this bill will not heal that trouble.

Among the ablest witnesses who appeared before the Agricultural Committee was the representative of a tobacco cooperative which is defunct, and a receiver for a cooperative in another section, both of whom told the story and painted the picture of failure for the reason that cooperative organizations must carry the whole load. There have been only two bills presented to the Agricultural Committee which recognize that fundamental difficulty. To be sure of success you must either have some method of getting the money from outside sources or apportion the expenses over the whole industry outside and inside. So long as you perpetuate the system that forces the cooperatives to bear the burden of the noncooperatives, in my judgment you will have difficulty.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Taking the case of cotton where you have not only an exportable surplus in this country but you have a world surplus, would your scheme be any aid to the situation?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I think so. We would have more difficulty with that commodity than with one that has a tariff schedule.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In England at the time the gentleman speaks of there was a world market for those commodities. Now we are confronted with a world surplus.

Mr. JONES of Texas. There is not always a world surplus of cotton. It is all used in the course of the years.

I want now to discuss another—one of the chief objections—and that is that it keeps the money out of the Treasury. Is that fatal? If so we have done many fatal things, for we have frequently done that. The 42-cent tariff on wheat is an illustration. We have the 99 per cent drawback provision, by the terms of which when a man who imports wheat from Canada and mixes with it 30 per cent of American wheat and exports it, he gets 99 per cent drawback—that takes money out of the Treasury, does it not?

Sometimes the changes in rates or the increase of tariff rates keeps money out of the Treasury. From January 1, 1923, until April 1, 1926, there was an 8-cent tariff on butter. Fifty million pounds of butter were brought into the country during that period, paying duties to the amount of \$4,000,000, or \$103,000 a month. In the early part of 1926 the rate was raised from 8 cents to 12 cents a pound, and for the next 21 months only 11,000,000 pounds of butter came in, on which we collected in duties \$1,400,000, or only \$68,000 per month. In other words, the increased rate kept \$34,000 per month out of the Treasury.

I am not arguing the merits of the increase or decrease, but when you vary the rates by increasing you frequently keep money out of the Treasury, just the same as you would keep money out of the Treasury by paying the extra premium to give the farmer a square deal.

Take the case of aluminum hollow kitchen ware. During the last three years under the old law the revenue collected from duties on such aluminum amounted to \$619,149. During the three years under the present tariff law the duty collected was \$228,146. Hence, the present tariff law kept out of the Treasury \$391,000. Is that a subsidy? Is that a subsidy to the Aluminum Co.? Is it any more unhygienic to keep money out of the Treasury in behalf of the farmers of America than it is in behalf of the Aluminum Co.? In its essence, is one any more of a subsidy than the other?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does the gentleman mean to state that the result of the change of tariff on aluminum did not result in a benefit to the men producing the mineral, the aluminum from the mines?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am not discussing the merits; I am using it simply as an illustration, answering the objection that some think is supreme that we can not do this act of justice simply because it may keep money out of the Treasury. We have kept money out of the Treasury in the interest of some of the wealthy men of this country by increasing the tariff rates. We have kept money out of the Treasury in favor of the millers, through the drawback provisions. There is no reason, there is no sound argument, why, if we are to have a tariff bill which increases the price of the commodities to some of the people who live in this country, we should not in a measure restore to such a one who lives under the flag and is loyal to the flag the rights that are his even though it keeps money out of the Treasury.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HAMMER. Before the gentleman concludes, I hope that he will give some expression of opinion as to whether the debenture plan would increase overproduction.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Of course, any plan that will increase the price will have some tendency that way. The same argument may be used against any tariff system that might be inaugurated.

There may be some little tendency toward overproduction, but most of the land which the farmers care to farm is being farmed now, and if all surplus commodities are treated on the same basis, I do not think much more land will go into those commodities. However, in order to safeguard that situation we provided that a certain percentage of increase of acreage should measurably reduce the premium certificate. Under the plan that will be offered the board would be able to take the premium off when it finds it necessary and put it on when it finds it is needed. I am happy to know that the Senate has put this plan in as an optional feature on the part of the board in the measure that has been prepared in that body. I should be most happy to support this measure with that addition. Gentlemen talk about the broad powers of the board. Why do you want to talk about broad powers of the board and then restrict those powers? If we are going to enact a measure which has for its purpose the solving of the problem of the inequalities between agriculture and industry, I think we should give that board broad and liquid powers. We can always take away those powers. Do not let us hamstring and handicap the board. Let us give the board every opportunity to make good on this program.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. RAGON. I am much interested in the question put by the gentleman from Illinois a while ago. It seems that there is very little doubt in the minds of the committee that this would work practically on cotton and wheat.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. RAGON. What is the reason it would not be practicable on other things?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It will be practicable on everything of which we produce an exportable surplus.

Mr. RAGON. It is the gentleman's plan then to write into the present bill the debenture idea that this board may exercise at its option through the methods laid out in this present bill.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Exactly. That is the way the Senate plan is worded. I expect to follow that just as nearly as I can make it applicable to this bill. It will not in any way interfere with the powers of the board. It will merely supplement them.

Mr. RAGON. My attention was distracted a moment ago and I did not get the details of what the gentleman said about curbing overproduction. If I understand this bill correctly, the board has the right to arbitrarily of its own motion set in action some plan that would curb overproduction.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. They have that authority. They would have the right, as they see fit, to withdraw any of the privileges of this bill in the event of danger of overproduction.

Mr. RAGON. If I understand the bill, there is no particular plan laid out for limiting production, but they may resort to anything that will limit production.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. I want to call attention to one other item, because I do not want to leave the matter with just aluminum. Take the item of pocketknives and penknives. During the last three years, under the old tariff law, there was collected \$1,278,652 in

import duties. In the new law, the law now in effect, during the first three years, the same period, there was collected under a higher rate only \$923,868, showing a net loss to the Treasury of \$354,784 on that item. That also kept money out of the Treasury.

Mr. RAGON. Is there anything inconsistent in the insurance provision of the Haugen bill and the gentleman's debenture plan?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Not at all. There is not anything inconsistent in this bill in any fashion with any of the provisions or powers granted to the board. Everyone who has explained the present bill has urged that this board be given broad powers. In that statement I heartily concur, but do not let us make it a matter of lip service, let us not make it a matter of sympathy, but let us make it a matter of justice. If you are going to have confidence in your board, and I think great care should be used in the selection of a board, that board should have all the powers necessary to handle its problems.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not contend, in his reply to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON], that under the broad, blanket powers of the board in the present bill, it would have authority to put into effect the debenture plan.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Oh, no. I want the bill amended giving them that authority.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would these debenture certificates be applicable for the payment of duties on agricultural imports only, or to all duties?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It would not make any difference. The bill does not so limit it. We bring into this country and collect more than \$200,000,000 each year in duties on what are classed as farm products. This would more than cover any debenture issue.

I have listened for six or seven years to the hearings of the agricultural committee. The members of that committee have worked earnestly and diligently. They have provided for the establishment of a board. I want that board to have the broad powers that they have talked about to work exact justice as between industry and agriculture. We have had two great political campaigns in which this has been an issue. Both political platforms contain a promise to place agriculture on a parity with industry. The President of the United States has not stated, so far as I have been able to find out, that he will not approve a debenture plan. Let us write a bill that will put agriculture on a basis of equality with industry. That is all that the farmer asks and that much he has a right to demand.

I thank the House for its attention and I reserve the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 63 minutes remaining.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the debenture plan; but I went to Europe and studied it for several months in the countries of Germany and Belgium and Sweden, and also in Czechoslovakia. The conditions in those countries are vastly different from conditions in the United States. When I left that study I was convinced that the debenture plan will not work in the United States, for the reason that we are so large and have so many commodities and such a large acreage. It applies, for instance, in Germany to wheat and rye, and the return applies to the products of wheat and rye and nothing else in Germany. It has been abandoned in England completely, and in the little country of Belgium it works on only a few articles. I would never vote for any plan that would bring the farmers of the United States into the state of poverty that the farmers are in in Czechoslovakia. In my humble judgment I will say that I have no objection to the debenture plan as such. It would apply to two commodities, wheat and cotton, and perhaps tobacco; but I would have Members of this Chamber remember that the commodities of cotton and wheat constitute less than 18 per cent of the products of the United States, and we would have the other products of the United States paying tribute to these two commodities. It would not work in the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have some convictions with regard to the farm relief

problem and some in regard to the bill we have drawn and presented to the House for its approval. I voted to report out this bill, not because I believe that the measure proposed is an adequate remedy that should be applied for the relief of agriculture, because I do not believe that any other man who is willing to study and consider the problem and to study the piece of legislation which has been submitted for your approval would reach the conclusion that it would cure the ills from which agriculture suffers. But I do believe, gentlemen and ladies of the House, that it forms a basis for legislation. It has some good provisions. It is so drawn that I believe it could be amended, and I think it will be amended if enacted into law, so that it will eventually, in part at least, remedy the evils which are now almost destroying that great industry.

Everybody knows that there is something radically wrong with agriculture, but I doubt whether the average person knows just what the difficulty is, and I do not claim by making this assertion that I myself know wherein the trouble lies. I know that there are a great many difficulties, and I believe that many of the supposed difficulties are really not of a very serious nature.

I think we might profitably ask ourselves, What is the farm problem? Is it occasioned by reason of the fact that the farmer is incapable of producing the commodities? Is it because he is lacking in thrift? No; I think not. The American farmer has always shown ability to produce, and he is to-day producing more per man than any other man on the face of the continent engaged in a like pursuit. He is as thrifty as any other man; and yet, notwithstanding these facts, he is in about as bad an economic condition as any man or any class on the globe.

Is there a demand for the products which he produces? If a man manufactures an article for which there is no demand, of course it is wasted effort. Nobody uses it, and it is that much effort thrown away. But every product produced by the farm is consumed, and therefore we must admit that there is a demand for each and every article that the farmer produces. It is true that sometimes he produces it in such great quantities that there is a temporary or seasonal surplus; but eventually it is all consumed; and when in those periods we fail to consume it is not because there is no demand for it but it is usually occasioned by reason of the fact that there is underconsumption.

There is underconsumption in my locality to-day. There are thousands and thousands of men, women, and children engaged in producing cotton who are unable to hide their nakedness. Why? Because, although they produce the product, they are not able to sell it on the market at a price which enables them to purchase back manufactured products in an adequate quantity to supply their actual needs. There are men, no doubt, engaged in producing grain who have children going hungry, not because they do not produce in sufficient quantity but because the price they receive for their commodity is not sufficient to enable them to feed their children or feed their stock as they should be fed.

So long, however, as people are clothed and fed there will always be a demand for what the farmer produces. There may be times, and I am afraid there always will be, when they will not be able to consume in the quantities which they should consume.

Now, we might ask ourselves the next question. Are we really in trouble because we have not produced enough, because we have produced too much, or because we are importing too much? It has been said by others—and I think it is the truth of the situation—that the farmer in this locality is very largely suffering by reason of the fact that we are importing and that the surplus in this country is an imported surplus rather than a produced surplus. Had you thought about the amount of food products imported into this country each year? Well, let us see. Here are figures which I obtained from the Agricultural Department.

In 1924 we imported into the United States \$1,717,000,000 worth of food products. In addition to that we also imported forest products, lumber, and so forth, of which our forests are full, to the amount of \$528,000,000, or a total of \$2,240,000,000. Last year, 1928, we imported \$1,280,000,000 of agricultural products and \$374,000,000 of forest products, or a total of \$2,254,000,000. Imports for the three intervening years, 1925, 1926, and 1927, were approximately the same.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Those imported food products could have been produced on the farms of this country, could they not?

Mr. LARSEN. Everyone of those articles could have been produced and would have been produced except for the fact that we have a class of people in this country who live by importing

products rather than growing them. Right on this point I would say that when our Great War occurred 10 years ago we had foreign investments in Central and South America amounting to about \$1,000,000,000. What are our foreign investments to-day? Five and a half billion dollars. What are those investments? They are investments in the production of bananas, in the growing of hogs and cattle, and importing them into this country. All of those commodities could be produced here. They are coming in absolutely tariff free and competing with the food products and other products that are grown from one end of this country to the other.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I would suggest to the gentleman that we can not produce bananas or coffee, so that they must be imported.

Mr. LARSEN. I am not speaking of coffee, but I would suggest to the gentleman that he go to Florida. If he would do that he would find bananas being produced in a great area of that State. I have eaten them there myself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And citrus fruits.

Mr. LARSEN. That is true.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Even if we can not grow bananas, yet when we buy bananas we do not buy apples, peaches, and other fruits which can be produced here.

Mr. LARSEN. Of course not; and those bananas compete with the products we can produce. Bananas are produced in my own State, in the middle part of Georgia, and they are produced in the southern portion of Florida. Bananas would be produced in Florida in large quantities if the conditions were such as to permit of it. Whether we could produce any of them or not, they are not a necessary diet, but they are brought in here and compete with the products that are produced on the farms in almost every section of our Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would ask the gentleman to kindly include in his speech the commodities that are imported which formed the figures he gave, so that we may be informed.

Mr. LARSEN. I will attempt to do that. Let me tell you about the production of bananas and what it means to men in New York, Pennsylvania, and other sections of this country. The United Fruit Co. has gone down into Central America and bought up cheap lands at something like \$2 an acre. They go and cut down the brush and then put out banana plants, about 10 feet apart in a square. Then they go back and cut down the heavy timber. The logs fall across the banana plants, but the banana plants come up around the logs, and in 10 months' time they are producing bananas. Then, in about two years' time, owing to the heavy rainfall in that climate, the logs and stumps are all rotten, so that they can go in with their tractors and break up the land. They are building up towns and villages at our expense. Five and a half billions of dollars have been invested by the patriotic consumers of this country in competition with the farmers here who are trying to produce in competition with such methods and such financing upon the part of men of wealth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And there labor is about one-fifth as expensive as it is here.

Mr. LARSEN. The gentleman is about right. On this point I want to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Durst.

Mr. Durst is secretary of the National Horticultural Council at Chicago, Ill., and here are some of the things he said about bananas when he was before the committee:

In the fruit industry the import situation is very serious. We imported 3,300,000,000 pounds of fruits in 1927. The imports exceed our exports of all fresh, dried, and canned fruits by 1,200,000,000 pounds, or about 92½ per cent of the fruit imports entered the country absolutely free. So you can imagine the serious effects of the imports on the fruit industry.

Now, what section of this country is it that is not in competition with these imports? New York, California, Pennsylvania, Florida, Georgia, and almost all the States of the Union grow fruit and are in competition with the cheap labor down there, and our imports are far exceeding our exports.

Here is the testimony of Doctor Colter, another eminent gentleman, and let us see what he said on this subject:

We are importing to-day the equivalent of 2,000,000 acres of corn in the forms of molasses and other corn substitutes, and we are importing the equivalent of 3,000,000 acres of flaxseed. We are importing the equivalent of 1,000,000 acres of feed for poultry, and we are at the same time importing eggs by the tens of thousands of dozens from China, Siberia, and Russia in competition with our poultry business. At Christmas time we import boatloads of turkeys and frozen fowls. We are importing the equivalent of three or four million acres of livestock and livestock products, and we are importing 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 acres of other vegetable oils and fats. In other words, all together we

are importing the equivalent of some ten or fifteen million acres of farm products, and therefore we have the surplus from the ten to fifteen million acres.

Now, gentlemen, there are your surplus products. That is why the farmers of this country are suffering. The wealth of the country has been carried to foreign countries and we are more interested in the foreigner than we are in the man at home. We are more interested in getting a market for our manufactured products than we are in giving the farmers at home a market for the products they produce.

I think another great difficulty is that the farmer does not get a proper price for what he produces. As a matter of course, he can not get it when this surplus is imported into this country, and the farmer is put in competition with the cheap labor of some of the other countries.

Still another difficulty lies in the fact that transportation charges are too high.

The President in his message the other day spoke of this problem. If he recognizes it as a problem, I think we might also recognize it. I have a letter from a gentleman in my district that I want to read just a few paragraphs from in order that you may see how it affects the territory which I have the honor to represent. He says:

Cut the freight rates by at least 50 per cent on all farm products on which the producer pays the freight. Increase them as much as may be necessary on all other products. On the latter the consumers pay the freight which divides the charges so gradually as to fall heavily on none.

Now, listen! This is a Georgia farmer, but it would apply just as well to the farmers in California or in other sections of this country:

The ordinary farmer in this county pays \$3,000 a year freight on his peaches to the market. The same thing is true as to watermelons. If that is cut in half, he can very well pay 10 per cent more for freight on the things that he buys. Increase it on the products he buys. What city men do not seem to understand is that they never pay any part of the freight on farm products. Take peaches, for example. The price is fixed by the supply and demand in the place of sale, and has no relation whatever to the cost of production or the cost of transportation to the market. From this price, whatever it is, the freight is deducted, and the farmer gets only what is left. In other words, the farmer pays the freight, and when it is high it falls too heavily on him to be borne. The farmers in this section made money on peaches and were gradually building valuable homes until the freights were increased following the passage of the Adamson and the Esch-Cummins laws. For the past 10 years the peach crop has not averaged selling for enough in the market to pay the transportation costs and the expense of picking and packing, part of which costs and all of the production cost have been covered by mortgages on farms and incomes from sources other than farming.

Now, gentlemen, I know this is literally true, because I am as familiar with that section as I am with the streets of Washington, and I have been here a number of years. I have seen the changes that have been wrought in the conditions there, and the same changes that have been wrought in conditions there have no doubt been wrought in many other sections of the country by reason of the same facts.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. In regard to the reduction of transportation charges, I look at it in this way. The consumer wants the products just as cheap as he can get them and the middleman wants to sell all that he can. The middleman wants to handle all the farmers' products he can and the middleman knows that the cheaper he can get the products the more of them he can sell, and if a reduction were made in freight rates, do you not figure that the middleman would take advantage of that reduction?

Mr. LARSEN. I figure, as a matter of course, the middleman would get all out of this he could and he usually gets enough, according to my experience.

Mr. ALLGOOD. And the middleman would perhaps get the benefit of it instead of the farmer.

Mr. LARSEN. I do not think he would get all the benefit of it, but some of it, of course. Take, for instance, the man who ships a carload of watermelons from my State, which is one of the greatest watermelon-producing States in the Union. Frequently it happens that he does not even get the freight. Occasionally, he may get a check for a few dollars, but within the last few years he has never received enough to make a living profit. When a man makes a little profit that is published to the world. That is the way the gambler succeeds. When a man wins it is placed before the public, but the man that loses keeps his mouth shut. One man makes a little profit, and the next year they all go in and plant again. I say that if the freight

rates were put on a proper basis the man who produces the crop would get a fair profit.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The point I wanted to impress was that the middleman is to be reckoned with.

Mr. LARSEN. Yes. But now I want to discuss the bill, which I think is a middleman and consumer's bill, to a great extent.

The next thing the farmer might be aided in is the fertilizer proposition. A few days ago I addressed a letter to President Hoover, in which I stated that the organization of the House with only four committees—Ways and Means, Agriculture, Rules, and Accounts—would not give the farmer adequate relief. One of the greatest problems that confronts the farmer in the South, and especially on the Atlantic seaboard, is that of fertilizer. Some method must be found whereby the cost of this commodity can be reduced.

What happened when the \$6,000,000 appropriation was recently made for the relief of the farmers in the flood area? The men who hold the fertilizer waited until the farmers got the money and then in some cases raised the price of fertilizer \$3 a ton, because they knew that the farmers had to have it. Now they are paying \$35 a ton. I asked the President to do exactly what the national defense act in 1916 provided, to develop Muscle Shoals in order to produce nitrates for defense of the country in time of war, and produce fertilizer at a reasonable price in time of peace.

The farmers' fertilizer bill amounts to approximately \$250,000,000 annually. It is costing the farmers of my State \$30,000,000. In one night last year the fertilizer men in caucus raised the price to the farmers of Georgia \$8,000,000. In one night—while they were ringing out the old year and ringing in the new, while the farmer had been going up and down the street with the flag of truce fluttering from his rear—the fertilizer men got together in caucus and put a tax of \$8,000,000 on the farmers of my State.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Is it not a fact that the fertilizer concerns have made no money until last year and that they were forced to raise the price?

Mr. LARSEN. I will take the testimony of Mr. Watson, president of the biggest company producing fertilizer. He gave out a statement which you will find in the Congressional Library, on February 13, of last year. You will find it in the Wall Street News, in which he said that business was good and fertilizer concerns expected to make great profits in 1928. He said in the January preceding that they had made money.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I happen to know that they have not made any money and that they had to raise the price.

Mr. LARSEN. The gentleman thinks he knows it—he does not know anything of the kind. The gentleman knows that the fertilizer men of this country have been living on the farmers that they helped to "bust."

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The fertilizer companies were "busted."

Mr. LARSEN. They were busted by the fact that they were paying large salaries. When they had gotten all that the farmers had and they could not pay any dividends they became busted—these officers who are drawing \$50,000 salaries at the expense of the poor, depressed farmers in your own State and my State and every State in the Union where fertilizer is used.

Not only that, but they stood here before Congress for more than seven long years, and every time we tried to put through a Muscle Shoals bill you voted it down. You can reduce the price of the farmer's fertilizer, say the experts, and so said the late Mr. Madden who introduced the bill. You could have saved them from 30 to 50 per cent, and if you and your men are in an unprofitable business, why don't you get out and let somebody operate Muscle Shoals who can make fertilizer? [Applause.]

When I asked the President to put that bill before Congress and to bring relief to the agricultural classes of the country by reducing the price of production by reducing the price to the consumer he failed to do it.

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

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Is there any fertilizer relief in this bill?

Mr. LARSEN. No; not much, except as Mr. Watson and his kind get relief.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Is there any chance to amend it so that we can get some fertilizer relief?

Mr. LARSEN. I do not think so.

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

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have been voting for farm relief all of these years, and I have been told that the only way that we can get relief is by what is called the equalization fee. What has become of the equalization fee?

Mr. LARSEN. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. We have had four bills, I believe, known as the McNary-Haugen bills, and for three of them I voted. I did not vote for the first one because it did not provide for any relief for a man living in the South. I voted for every one of the other bills containing an equalization fee, and I voted for an amendment to this bill trying to put it in, but the committee would not permit it. I voted for the Jones amendment, which would have included the debenture plan, but the committee voted that down.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Can the gentleman tell me any reason for this change from the last Congress? I do not know what to do. I am up in the air. These farm leaders told me that the only thing that would grant any relief was the equalization fee. It seems now to have been lost or buried or is strayed or stolen. Where is it?

Mr. LARSEN. We have changed the administration, but I do not think that we have changed the policy much. The gentleman will remember that the last administration vetoed the equalization-fee plan, and it was generally stated at that time that the gentleman who happens to be the head of the present administration was largely instrumental in having the then administration leader, the President of the United States, write that veto message.

It was therefore considered by a majority of the committee that the President of the United States was not in favor of the equalization fee. I do not know whether that is true or not. I regret it very much if it is. I wish there was something in the bill that would relieve the situation now. I voted to report out the bill, and in some respects it does very well. In other respects I think it falls far short. There is nothing in the bill that directs anything. There is a good deal in the bill that permits something. It first proposes to create a Federal farm board, and when the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee he said that he favored the creation of a board with "broad and comprehensive powers." So far as I was concerned then, and am concerned now, I am in favor of giving the board such powers, because, God knows, where a board is not directed to do anything it ought to be permitted to do a little of something. The bill says that it may do something. I think the board ought to be directed to do something. It is time that somebody was directed to do something to relieve the farmer.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be ex officio a member of the board and that there shall be five other members of the board appointed by the President at first for terms of 2, 4, and 6 years, but that thereafter they shall be appointed for a term of six years each. It also provides that there shall be a chairman, appointed by the President. No term is fixed for the chairman. He may be the chairman of that board for one day, or he may be the chairman for one year, or as long as the President of the United States sees fit to let him act as such. All of the members of the board except the chairman have a salary fixed at \$12,000 a year. The chairman of the board has no term of office and has no salary fixed, except by the good graces of the man in the White House. It may be \$5 or it may be \$50,000, and there are those who advocate that amount. When the bill was before the committee I offered an amendment to fix the salary, and I tried also to fix the term, but failed. I do not believe it is fair to the chairman of the board. He will have to go to the White House on Monday morning and get his orders from the President, and will not even know that he will serve until Saturday. The President will tell him, "Now, Johnnie, if you are a good boy and you are able to absolutely dominate every man on the board and make him do as I tell you to do, you will be chairman and you will get a nice little salary check at the end of the month."

I offered an amendment to fix the salary, and to fix the term of office. I would make him a free-born American citizen, to hold office on an equality with other men on the board, and save him from the embarrassing situation of sitting on a board with other men who would say, "We will get you by Saturday night, because we will go down and tell the President how you have acted, and how you did this and did not do that." When I offered that amendment what do you suppose they said to me? They asked me if it were not a fact that the President can remove anyone when he gets ready, and I said yes, that I think that under a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the wisdom of which I very much doubted, the President has a right to remove any of them whenever he sees fit, but if he has the right to remove them, why then hold this cudgel over the chairman's head? The committee voted down that amendment. I do not think the chairman of the board ought to be put in that position. I do not believe that you, as representatives of

the American people, representing constituencies at home who have confidence in your integrity, in your manhood, and in your ability, should delegate to the President of the United States, or any other man, the power to fix the salary of such an officer. If it is logical, why did you not do it when you created the Interstate Commerce Commission? Why did you not do it when you created your Federal Trade Commission? Why did you not follow that plan, if it is one dictated by wisdom and common sense, when you created all of the other boards? But no! This is to be made an exception. Are you so impotent that you are unable to legislate, or have you not the nerve to stand up and legislate for the American people in accordance with the commission that they have given you? I think it is an outrage, and I expect to offer an amendment to correct it. You may vote it down if you see fit, and probably you will. If so, it will be all right with me, for I will have discharged my duty.

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

Mr. LARSEN. Certainly.

Mr. LOZIER. The efficiency of the law, then, will depend upon the administration, and inasmuch as no specific power is conferred by the act upon the board is it not reasonable to suppose that the board will exercise no power and adopt no policy which has not the unqualified approval of the President? And judging it in the light of experience, does not this act provide for only such farm relief and such assistance as the President, in his judgment, may see fit to recommend?

Mr. LARSEN. I think that is the intention of it. But if I knew that the President of the United States himself was going to administer the law it would be a little more satisfactory to me. But the President of these United States has a thousand more duties than any one man can perform, and the result is that there are thousands and thousands of employees in Washington engaged each day in transacting matters for the Government which the people of the United States think the President is doing. You and I as Representatives know that he is not doing it.

Mr. LOZIER. My statement was not advanced as an argument in favor of the pending bill but rather as one of many objections against it.

Mr. LARSEN. Yes, I so understood; but we know that the President of the United States could not and would not do it. The circumstances surrounding his position are such that he can not do it.

Now, there are other provisions of the bill to which I want to call your attention. I think the caption of the bill should be amended so as not to restrict the board. I think that the committee ought to give to the board—and I can submit to you the testimony of prominent witnesses in support of it—the authority to aid production. We had before us a very prominent gentleman—Mr. Hull, I think his name is—from Indiana. He told us that he was at the head of a cooperative organization in that State and that the organization had enabled the farmers, by funds which it had loaned to them through the association, to buy machinery, livestock, and matters of that kind in the crop-production program. He said they had aided the farmers very much and had enabled the farmers to reduce the cost of production and to buy conveniently and cheaply.

That is not permitted in this bill. Yet the gentleman I referred to came all the way from Indiana and begged the committee to put a provision in there which would permit the board to aid the farm organization in purchasing seed, fertilizer, livestock, and machinery, and so forth, necessary for the production.

I am quite sure that a plan of that kind might be worked out and that millions of dollars might be saved thereby to the farmer. I offered such amendment, but it was voted down. There is another section of the bill which provides that the farm board may advance money to cooperative associations. For what? To build up cooperative associations. That is, to employ men to go out and preach to the farmers the wisdom and the desirability of forming cooperative associations. You know the farmer has been preached to so much along that line that he has gotten a little tired of such instruction. They are getting a little bit like "the man from Missouri." They want to be shown. If you will show the farmer that if he can get into a cooperative association and can get aid to buy the things necessary in the spring of the year, so that he can produce cheaply, then you will have in him a man who will join the association. We had an organization in my State a few years ago with 47,000 members, but it has only about 4,000 now. Why? The association was not able to help the farmer finance the cost of his production, and the association was only able to advance 75 per cent of the value of the product when it was delivered to the cooperative for sale. When a farmer produces a thousand dollars' worth of a commodity, he ought to have approximately \$1,000. He can not take \$750 and with it pay

off his debts or stand off creditors. He has to have it all. This bill permits the board to do an insurance scheme, advocated by Mr. Bledsoe, of Mississippi. It should, and if it works will, enable men to go in the cooperative association and to deliver products for sale, receiving about 97 per cent of the value when delivered, and any increase in price received when sold and no loss will come to the producer if the price declines.

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

Mr. LARSEN. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman has spoken in regard to the appointment of the members of this board. Do I understand they are all to be of the same party?

Mr. LARSEN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I asked the question of the Secretary of Agriculture. I asked if he thought the board ought to be regional and bipartisan. I thought it would be better for the board to be regional anyhow, because, with a small board of five members, if it is not regional, the chances are that some commodity will not be represented. It might not be out in the Wheat Belt, but I do think it will be. It might be down in the Cotton Belt, but I am afraid it will not be. I think the members of the board should represent those regions where the crops are grown. The trend of the argument was that the members should be familiar with the market, but I think it is just as important to get a man who is familiar with the crop. Therefore, we should have one from the Cotton Belt, and one from the Wheat Belt and one from the Fruit Belt and various other belts where the different commodities are produced, in order that the board may be representative of the different regional commodities. I do not think it is best to let any man or any one party run away with the proposition, either regionally or by party.

Mr. GREEN. I would suggest to the gentleman that if this board is to be made up of men who hold the faith of the party now in power, and they are as slow in bringing about farm relief as that party has been, we need not expect very much after the board is appointed.

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

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LARSEN. I think it would be better to have a bipartisan board. I do not think it is best to let any one party administer it all, but I did not offer an amendment on either one of those propositions, because I realized the Senate would have the opportunity and that probably the Senate would know more about fixing it than I do. I was unable to fix anything of the kind with the House committee, and I do not think it will be possible to fix it here. However, I do not know that it is absolutely necessary. As far as I am personally concerned, I will not be greatly disturbed if the bill is passed without providing for a regional or bipartisan board.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Does the gentleman think there can be any effective farm-relief legislation without an effective increase of the price which the farmer receives for his products?

Mr. LARSEN. As a matter of course there can not be.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Does the gentleman think this bill carries sufficient means for providing price elevation for the farmer?

Mr. LARSEN. I do not, unless it be through the creation of the farm board, and the board actually functions for the benefit of the farmer, which I hope they will, but I somehow doubt.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Certainly.

Mr. MANLOVE. Referring to cooperative associations and the gentleman from Missouri having to be shown, it may be interesting for the House and the gentleman to know that the Ozark Fruit Growers Cooperative Association has really saved the day for the strawberry growers of southwest Missouri, and it is growing stronger after 15 years of operation.

Mr. LARSEN. I am glad to hear such good news, although it is a long ways from where I live. It is a long way from Georgia to Tipperary. But I hope we in Georgia get some benefit under this bill. However, I doubt that very much, because I do not believe the farm board will function, and if it does function, according to certain information, it will function about 10 years from now, and that will be too late for the farmer in my country.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Inasmuch as there can be no stabilization of farm prices on a higher level without control of the surplus, does the gentleman think the surplus can be controlled without

an adequate revolving fund, and can there be any permanent stabilization of the price of farm commodities on a higher level without some method by which you can replete and refurbish the revolving fund?

Mr. LARSEN. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that. It is section 6, I believe, which provides that the stabilization corporation shall force these cooperative associations to sell their products when it is evident that the holding of the products tends to increase the cost to such extent that it becomes a burden on the consumers. Gentlemen, that ought to be stricken out of the bill. We are not here trying to draw a consumer's bill; we are here to draw something that will relieve the farmer. I told gentlemen on the committee the other day when I tried to strike that out that the preceding paragraph provided ample machinery for the purpose. I told them that language was pure and simple bunk; that it was sop thrown out to keep the consumers' or some big consumers' organization off until they could pass the bill. If we are coming here afraid of these middlemen's organizations, we had just as well adjourn and go home. We should strike out that language. Then I am not so sure about your stabilization proposition anyhow. Stabilization may be all right, but we used to get 40 cents a pound for cotton and you folks out in the West got \$3 per bushel for wheat; did you not? But you will never see any \$3 wheat if you have a stabilization board, because you will never get a high price, and there will not be any 40-cent cotton. At best it may be 20 cents, because they will stabilize it before it gets to that price. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I was very much interested in the comments of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] in which he said this was a polished essay. On the one hand we find it is not strong enough, and on the other hand we find a great many people saying it is tremendously drastic and far-reaching. We find also there are a great many people saying that the limitations on the board are too drastic, and they suggest that possibly only the commodities produced by cooperatives can be handled by this board. When that suggestion is made it convinces me they are not acquainted with the real purpose of this legislation.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the argument in favor of the debenture plan. I was interested in the observation of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. I think he exploded the whole theory of the debenture plan so far as its application to this great country of ours is concerned. On top of that I went to suggest this to you, that whenever you adopt a system of checks and balances and whenever you pay a bounty on one commodity and charge it against another commodity you are establishing a principle that will live to plague us economically as long as this country exists.

How long would it be before you would find that some one wanted a bounty on the export of an industrial commodity because some other commodity was seeking a profit or obtaining a profit in its operations here in the United States, and they would be entitled to the same bounty and the same consideration at the hands of this Congress as the farmers are for the reason they could show that economically they were not able to sustain themselves under existing conditions. If you could not help them with a protective tariff then they would say, "We are producing an export, therefore help us with an export bounty." You might ship some of your coal abroad and get a bounty on it, Williams; but in this way you will absolutely destroy the whole protective tariff system that we have spent all of these years building up in this great country of ours.

There is another thing about the export bounty plan and that is as you maintain stability of price you increase the amount of the commodity by the promise of a reward.

Let me tell you the only bounty plan I know of that is working successfully. It is described in the Country Gentleman. It is on dairy commodities in Australia, and they levy against every pound of dairy commodities produced an assessment of 3 cents a pound, which goes into a sinking fund to pay a royalty of 6 cents a pound on every pound of dairy commodity that is exported out of the country, and they have automatically raised the domestic price of butter, for instance, 6 cents a pound while there is only charged the producers 3 cents a pound. This is a good example of the old equalization fee in combination with the debenture plan, but the funds are charged against the producer of the commodity.

Now, as a matter of fact, the debenture plan ought not to be considered by this House. The equalization fee is past history. The reason it is past history is because in carrying out the campaign pledges that we made during the fall of 1928

and in the conventions of 1928, we fixed certain policies that should be included in this bill and this bill is the reflection of those policies so fixed in that campaign, and this House ought to maintain its pledge to the voters of this country by writing the law on the statute books of the United States in the form directed by the voters in that campaign. [Applause.]

In other words, I think this last campaign was sufficiently far-reaching that this House ought to take advantage of every parliamentary practice that is permitted by the rules of the House to confine this bill and the amendments to it to the exact provisions of the bill and the campaign pledges as reflected in the bill. Therefore, I expect to see some points of order made if some of these amendments are offered that are now being talked about on the floor of this House.

It is interesting to see the difference in the atmosphere in the House from what it has been for the past six years. Well can we remember when the old farm relief bill would come on the floor of this House, and we would have a parliamentarian here watching every parliamentary tactic that could be taken advantage of. We found a constitutional law man on the floor and we had a man here to answer the economic arguments, and now we find a bill here with some passing criticism, but with practically unanimous support all along the line, and we are going to pass a bill that in my judgment will become the law.

I want to compliment the farm organizations of this country, however, for the fight they have made. It was only six or seven years ago, when we started on the farm relief fight, that farm relief was taken almost as a passing joke. As a matter of fact, the farm organizations kept up a persistent fight and you can say all you want to about the old McNary-Haugen bill, it was the vehicle around which this economic cause was sold to the country, so that now we are here with practically a unanimous opinion as to about how far we can go, about what we can do, and what should be done.

I want to say to you that in my judgment this is a good bill, and will be very far reaching in its economic effect, so far as the farming interests of this country are concerned.

I am pleased to read the report made by the committee—and I want to state to the Members of this House that it is one of the best documents on economics I have ever seen presented to this House in support of any legislation that has ever been presented to the House since I have been a Member of it for more than 10 years. It discusses this question intelligently, it reflects sincere judgment, it reflects caution, it reflects the very purpose for which this bill is presented to the House, and for that reason I hope you will take this report home with you at night and read it, because it deserves the careful study of every Member of this House before voting on this bill during the coming week.

It also suggests another thing, and that is that the present administration is not committed to a single piece of legislation. It has the suggestion that this committee is going to give further consideration to the farm cause. It is going to bring in a research bill. They are going to be interested in other forms, if you please, of farm relief; legislation that will establish a comprehensive agricultural policy for this great country of ours, and it is only by this dedication of our service to this cause that we will be able to really work out a program that is going to be not only effective but also permanent in behalf of the producers of food in this great country of ours.

The present proposed legislation approaches this problem from an entirely different angle. This legislation approaches the problem from a stabilization angle and not from the angle that we have heretofore approached the problem, either with the equalization-fee machinery or the debenture-plan machinery. This is a stabilization program. This tries to fit the farm problem into the economic equation of this great country of ours on a parity and with an equal chance to work out its future in competition with the other interests of the country.

This is a long-time program, not an automatic program. The old equalization fee was an automatic program by which, with a cogwheel system, you absolutely locked the commodity within the provisions of the bill itself. Of course, the debenture plan would be of no benefit to any article except those in export, and that relates to only 15 per cent of the food products of this country. It would not affect any commodity unless you had a surplus. So the debenture plan can not be a substitute for this bill. In my judgment, it would be impracticable to try and hook it up with the machinery of stabilization, for the reason that you would have a complicated system, and would be trying to work out the problem from two different angles, which is never successful.

Now, with reference to the power of this board. As a matter of fact, a great many people said, "What we want is a farm board"; and yet there is some objection that the President

is going to name the chairman and fix his salary. Why should not he? The board is going to be responsible for the successful administration of the legislation. If it is responsible for the legislation, tell me why it is not a part of caution to say to the President of the United States go over the country and out of the 120,000,000 people select a man who in your judgment can take this supreme, economic responsibility on his shoulders and do his best to work out the problem that confronts agriculture and determine the agricultural policy of the country.

Now, I think I know something about how they are providing the machinery through which the bill shall operate. I am a believer in the cooperative marketing system. Well do I remember when the first cooperative marketing system was proposed as a basis for farm relief, and as the agency through which the board should work. I am a believer in that, and through this cooperative producers' association or agency we are going to have the board function in behalf of the producer.

Let me suggest that here is a comment which I took from the Chicago Tribune of April 18, 1929, of these two problems:

The great virtue of the debenture plan in the eyes of its friends is that it may be expected to achieve results without the conscious co-operation of the farmers themselves. The President's plan depends entirely upon the cooperation of farmers. If they will not join forces and remain united, the fund can not conceivably help them.

Let me suggest to you that unless the farmers are willing to go in and help in this systematic work in working out the economic features, then it is going to be hard to do much for them.

On the other hand, take the debenture plan, and here is the difficulty: You ship wheat abroad, and you can have a bounty paid on that. But it does not take the farmer into their confidence at all—the machinery is far outside of the farmer and he is not a part of it. If you think that the farmer does not want to be a part of his own machinery you are wrong.

I want to state to you that one of the great underlying principles of the bill is the fact that it is going to function through the farm cooperative association. Oh, but you say you have not any farm cooperative on some commodities. We have not a cooperative association on corn but you pass this bill and most of the corn that goes into the Chicago market from northern Illinois and Iowa will have a cooperative organization that will comply with the provisions of the bill and will be effective.

Not only that, but we go further than that. They have a right so to designate a marketing agency, but before I get to that I want to take up the advisory council committee. This board is not going to sit down here in Washington and say, "We are going to do all this ourselves; we are not going to consult anybody; we are not going to become acquainted with the country and the conditions surrounding the production of a commodity." This bill provides for the selection of commodity committees, and it is the old advisory counsel idea in the old McNary-Haugen bills. It is to represent the producers themselves. They are the men who represent the producers, and they will be brought in to sit down around the table, and they will say, "Here is the corn condition for the future. What are we going to do about it and what is the best price obtainable?"

Mr. Chairman, I am a great believer in the stabilization plan. When we stabilize the price, once you fix a price where you can carry it through from one end of the season to the other, once you determine there is machinery enough in this law whereby there will not be a speculative fluctuation up and down, then you have established the next step that can be taken following that; and what is it? Once you have the stabilization machinery fixed in this country, you at once give that machinery a bargaining power—that is, a right to put that commodity on an equality in return for labor with the other commodities of the country. You say there is nothing in this bill that will help advance the price. Oh, no. All it does is to stabilize the price, but once you get stabilization, then you have a bargaining power whereby you can advance the price as economic conditions will permit you to advance it; and there is the underlying principle of this bill, which will give you the remedy for the situation that is complained of. A great many people are saying, "What are you going to do with all of the independent agencies now in existence in this country engaged in the marketing of these various commodities?" I have had numerous telegrams from many from my own district, from elevator concerns that are independent of any connection with a cooperative organization, saying, "Have we not a right to exist?" Why, yes; and there is nothing in this law that will prevent their continuing in business, because if you have a stabilized price, any elevator concern, whether it is cooperative or independent, will be able to deal with greater certainty on a commission turnover for a service rendered, and they will not be compelled to face the

fluctuations they are compelled to face now. It would stabilize their business rather than drive them out of business. Therefore, this machinery heads up this whole proposition exactly in the control of the centralized market, where it will be effective not only for the cooperative organizations engaged in the production and handling of those commodities but also those independent concerns that are doing a like business, providing their service is a legitimate business rather than a speculative business.

As a matter of fact, I know that there is going to be a great deal of criticism brought to the attention of this House about the terms of this bill, and the complaint is not going to be that it does not go far enough. The complaint is going to be that it goes too far, and there will be a lot of independent agencies that will say that they are fearful of being driven out of business if compelled to face the competition that this bill provides.

If they are doing a service business, handling grain through their elevator for a commission charge of 1 cent to 2 cents a bushel, or whatever it may be, they need have no fear concerning their being able to continue in the future, so far as the terms of this bill are concerned.

A great deal is being said about the losses, and one of the arguments for the old equalization fee was the loss question. One of the arguments we had was that you would have no way by which you could absorb the losses. There seems to be a growing confidence in this country that if you will organize under the provisions of this bill, if you will meet the requirements all along the line as required in your board and corporation and cooperatives, if they will go into the market and there make themselves known as they should and say to those engaged in the handling of that commodity, "in view of the production, in view of the world condition, in view of processing, in view of consumption of this commodity we believe that the corn crop or the wheat crop or the cotton crop can be absorbed for this year with a reasonable carry-over for next year at a certain price," you will have done no one any harm. They will ask whether this particular agency is willing to help cooperate with the Government board in the matter of maintaining the price. If they will, then, in my judgment, it would not be necessary for the stabilization corporation to buy a single bushel of corn or wheat or a bale of cotton. If, on the other hand, the marketing machinery of this country will set itself in opposition to this bill, then, in my judgment, it will be necessary for the board to go into these markets and absolutely carry out the provisions of this bill with reference to the right of storage and of carrying a commodity in order to maintain and stabilize that price. I do not think anyone can dispute that. If the board has sufficient influence, and I believe it ought to have, if it has sufficient authority and I believe it has, then they can go in and make their influence felt in the centralized markets of the country to where they will not have to go in and either process or carry commodities. In other words, we are finding this as we go on in this country.

When we once realize it is necessary to absorb the commodity at a certain price it is simply taken for granted, and they go right along, and absolutely no one knows very much about it. It will not make much difference to you people who eat bread whether wheat is maintained within 25 cents or 50 cents of either its maximum or minimum price. As a matter of fact, the amount of wheat in a loaf of bread is so small that its cost should not be reflected in the price. What I think is this: When this bill is passed it will be sufficiently sold to the country and to the marketing machinery that has to do with fixing the price in our centralized markets that action on the part of the board will not have to be drastic and never far-reaching. If they can do that there will never be a sale of a commodity at a loss at all. Oh, but you say, what about wheat? All right, let us talk about wheat. Suppose there are a hundred million bushels of wheat that have to be marketed in a foreign country. Suppose we wanted to determine the price here that would give us the machinery whereby we could export that wheat without loss. Suppose you had this board in action, with wheat cooperatives and a stabilization corporation such as I have suggested, and you say, "In order to prevent this slump in the price of wheat we must go in here and take care of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat." If I were a member of that board, if I were representing one of those agencies, one of the first things I would do would be to get in touch with the Canadian wheat pool. And I want to say to you that if the wheat producers of this country through this agency created here would join with the Canadian wheat pool they will not be compelled to sell any wheat either in this country or in Canada at a loss, because they will have a controlling influence on the world's price, as you will find if you study wheat production and wheat marketing.

Not only that, if you will take the export portion of our wheat and gradually draw it out of the market in order to stabilize the price, you would be able to market that wheat at the end of the crop season at more than the average price. The danger of a loss is very remote. In my judgment you could successfully carry out the provision even on wheat.

It has been stated here that 85 per cent of the food products of this country are consumed in our domestic market, and therefore this is a stabilizing and price-improving bill, which in my judgment will be of far-reaching effect, and in my judgment it will give the farmers a better return, because they will be able to carry their surplus into the season of the year where the price usually reflects a higher figure.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. My people are much concerned about these little private elevators that you mention, and, in fact, some of the larger elevators. What is the objection to making laws to such concerns as those, as applied in section 3 of the bill, on page 7?

Mr. DICKINSON. When you render assistance to people under this bill other than an organized agency, you are going to do a very dangerous thing. The reason why I contend it will benefit the independent man is that under this bill we shall have a steadier market, and the independent man will get his turnover commission, and not suffer from the decline of price such as he faces at the present day. The wheat producers of this country will have a great deal more confidence in this farm board if it functions through the producers of the commodities rather than through independent or grain elevator concerns that are not directly connected with the grain producers of the country.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Do you think it will lessen the speculation in grain?

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes; absolutely. In my judgment the great benefit of this bill is that it will take out the sharp ups and downs in the market. For illustration, I will mention the fact that when coming to Washington in the fall of 1927 there was not sufficient crib room on our farm to crib all the corn and we sold 2,000 bushels in December, 1927, for 55 cents per bushel. Two thousand bushels were placed in good crib and carried until June, 1928. Following the adjournment of Congress I was able in the closing days of June to sell that corn for the July 1 closings, netting me 95 cents a bushel. A break, if you please, between the marketing season when corn is harvested to the following mid-summer season of 40 cents a bushel. It would be a good deal better for the corn producers if they could get 75 or 80 cents a bushel the year through, rather than receive only 55 cents at the harvest time and 95 cents on corn stored and carried into the next season. What happens under the present system? The producer gets the low return for the most of his crop, which goes into the hands of the speculator and the commission concerns, who carry it for a higher price the following season. The processor pays above the average price, and, therefore, the consumer pays above the average price, while the producer sells for less than the average price, and the benefit goes into the hands of the speculator and the manipulator.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is it the gentleman's belief in regard to these elevator people that they will become commission men instead of producers?

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. Do they come under subparagraph (b) of section 8?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am not certain about that. I do not remember that subdivision.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. As I understand it, there are over 4,000,000,000 bushels of wheat produced all over the world. In the United States we have 800,000,000 bushels and 500,000,000 bushels in Canada. How would the pooling of the interests of the wheat growers of the United States and Canada affect over 4,000,000,000 bushels of wheat produced by Russia, Argentina, and India?

Mr. DICKINSON. Only about 20 per cent of the total wheat crop ever gets into the international trade, and therefore if you take the amount that we send and which Canada sends you have got about 35 per cent of the wheat that goes into the world trade. Give me 35 per cent of the wheat that goes into the world trade and I will be more successful in fixing the price of wheat than John D. Rockefeller has been in fixing the price of oil.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it the gentleman's understanding that no financial aid shall be extended by the board, as provided in this bill, to corporations not organized by producers?

Mr. DICKINSON. There is no provision in the bill for loaning to independent concerns for either equipment or marketing.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman explain this language in section 8, paragraph (b), which provides—

No such association or corporation shall be held to be producer owned and producer controlled unless owned and controlled by cooperative associations as above defined—

So far all right, but—

and/or by individuals engaged as original producers of the agricultural commodity?

If that option is possible how is the gentleman going to prevent one large gentleman farmer, if you please, from getting control of a stabilization corporation to the disadvantage of every other smaller farmer in that locality?

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit, I will state the committee's attitude to the gentleman from New York. That particular matter was gone into very carefully and there was probably as much discussion over that particular section as any other single section in the bill. The language we have drafted here we believe will prevent any such arrangement as the gentleman has suggested. The gentleman will note that the language provides that the real thought back of the particular kind of an organization to which he refers is not the fact that the man is engaged in the business of trading in grain, but he must be the original producer of that particular article. That is as close, I think, as the definition can be made, and it was made with the very condition in mind and the exact illustration the gentleman gives.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would not the bill be stronger if you struck out the "and/or," the alternative provision? Would not the bill then do the very thing you are all trying to do?

Mr. KETCHAM. This was given a great deal of thought and discussed pro and con, and the view the gentleman has advanced—

Mr. DICKINSON. I would suggest that the gentlemen delay their argument about "or" and "the" until the bill is taken up under the 5-minute rule, because they are taking up my time.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes.

Mr. MANLOVE. Some previous speaker has made the statement that he was fearful, if certain conditions should arise under which the price of wheat would actually go to \$3 a bushel, that under the stabilization plan of the board the farmer would never be able to reach the price of \$3 a bushel, which he actually would under conditions that now exist. Reference was also made to the conditions under which wheat sometimes sold at 40 cents a bushel. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think the wheat growers of the country are more fearful of a 40-cent price than they are of a \$3 price.

Mr. DICKINSON. They have had a great deal more experience with the price of 40 cents, because they have seen their product decline toward the 40-cent price, although it may not have reached that price, and they have never had any experience with the \$3 price except under war conditions.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. I would like to ask the gentleman the following question: This bill, so far as I see it, takes care of over 85 per cent of all the agricultural commodities that are produced in our country. About 15 or 18 per cent of them have an exportable surplus. When there is that surplus does this bill permit the Federal farm board, with respect to the two commodities that produce an exportable surplus—cotton and wheat—to go over the 4,500,000 farms of our country and find out which have been working on the basis of economic loss and put them out of business because they have been losing anyway? If that were done, it would seem to me you would do away with the exportable surplus and relieve the congestion you have been finding in the cotton industry and wheat industry.

Mr. DICKINSON. This bill does not provide any machinery except machinery for advice and suggestions as to whether or not a man can make money operating at a certain price. [Applause.]

As an outline of various features of the farm-relief question and of this bill I submit the following statement:

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

What a change in the atmosphere of the House with reference to the farm legislation since the last time the farm cause was on the floor. No longer are the parliamentarians watching the rights of the farmer and his legislation on the floor; no longer is he being denounced as some one asking for a privilege to which he is not entitled. Apparently the last campaign has converted everyone to the farmer's cause. There are still those who think his cause should be ignored; there are still those who believe that the present bill does not go far enough. But in the main it is very apparent that the farmer is here among friends and that his cause is to be heard in open court and that a bill will be passed and will be agreed upon that will be signed by the President and become a law.

FARM ORGANIZATION

Regardless of the criticism that comes to many farm organizations by reason of the lack of harmony among their members, and regardless of the fact that the farm organizations have not heretofore entirely agreed upon a program of legislation, it is certainly true, however, that the farm organizations have been the backbone of the farm-relief fight and have presented it to the country so effectively that it could no longer be ignored.

M'NARY-HAUGEN BILL

It is also true that the McNary-Haugen bill made a national reputation, and regardless of the viewpoint that many Members of the House have heretofore held with reference thereto, it must be acknowledged that this form of legislation was the vehicle through which the farm cause has been sold to the country, to where it is appearing on this floor to-day, with friends from the East, West, North, and South.

ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

Nor will the present administration be satisfied with the passage of a mere marketing bill. This special session of Congress has been called to consider farm relief legislation. In my judgment, the next regular session and those to follow will consider legislation almost as important to the farming interests of this country as the marketing bill and the tariff revision that are to be considered at this special session. This is not the end but the beginning. It is a determination on the part of the present administration to formulate an agricultural policy for this country that will be enduring in the future. The interest of 30,000,000 people and the tremendous investments in farm lands, farm livestock, and farm equipment can not be ignored in the development of this country in the future. Therefore the most encouraging sign of to-day is the fact that this is the beginning and not the end of a determined effort on the part of this Government to firmly fix agriculture as a future industry in this country and to place the same on equality with other industries. This administration program will include practically all of the following suggested remedies:

First. An effective merchandising program as contained in this bill, the details of which I will discuss within the next few moments.

Second. A determined effort on the part of this Government to do sufficient research work in a Government laboratory to utilize the farm waste that is now considered worthless. This is involved in the provisions of H. R. 194, that I hope may be brought to the consideration of this House at an early date. This would include the use of our cornstalks, our oat hulls, our skim milk, our cotton stems, our cottonseeds, and numerous other waste products that at the present time are not utilized in any way.

Third. The tariff revision that will soon occupy the attention of this House. Had it not been for the farm cause there would have been no special session of Congress. Tariff revision can therefore be justified only from one viewpoint, and that is that the revision must be made in the interest of agriculture. Many industries will seek to eliminate competition; many industries will ask for more protection in order that profits may be more easily made; but in the main, if the present tariff revision does not properly reflect protection to the interests of the farm, then the efforts of this special session so far as tariff revision is concerned will be largely in vain.

Fourth. It is more than pleasing to those of us living in the Middle West to see the commitment of this administration to the inland waterway improvement. The Canadian treaty should not only provide for the division of water at Niagara

but also should provide for the diversion of water from Lake Michigan to insure water transportation from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi River. Lake improvements should be commenced that will maintain the lake levels at the normal or highest possible point. This is an engineering matter, the facts are known, the conclusions can be agreed upon, and the legislative authorization made. The inland waterway system should be one system. A barge drawing 9 feet should be able to leave Pittsburgh and proceed either to the Twin Cities on the Mississippi or to Sioux City on the Missouri. It is estimated that the differential in freight rates when this system is inaugurated will return a material profit to the farm interests and industrial interests of the Mississippi Valley in every annual turnover.

Fifth. A warehousing act was introduced by Congressman LETTS, of Iowa. It expands the present facilities for warehousing. This is another improvement that will come with the use of our rivers for the purpose of navigation.

EQUALIZATION FEE

In the last campaign the equalization fee was a subject of keen discussion. The equalization fee does not appear in this farm relief legislation presented for the consideration of this House. Legislation including this provision has twice been vetoed. It seems but a safe conclusion that we are justified in making an initial effort to pass a substitute for such legislation.

DEBENTURE PLAN

It is my hope that this House will not agree to an amendment to this bill including the debenture plan. It is my judgment that the debenture plan would bring to this legislation such severe criticism and would tend to commit us to a policy that in the future would be dangerous and the effect of which might tend to destroy the present protective system under which our country has prospered for more than 100 years.

THE PRESENT LEGISLATION

Coming now to the legislation being considered by the House, permit me to suggest that the first observation of anyone familiar with the terms of farm relief legislation can not help but be to the effect that this legislation is an approach to the solution of the farm problem from a different direction than any heretofore suggested. It is an effort to adopt in our present marketing machinery the principle of centralized control as exercised by the wheat pool in Canada. The basis of the machinery is a Federal farm board. No one can read this bill with any fear that the Federal farm board will not have sufficient authority to take the steps and do the things required to protect the producers of farm commodities in this country. The declaration of policy is far-reaching; it is definite; it suggests the way; it tells what must be prevented; it is a responsibility such as no board has been charged with since the formation of the Federal Reserve Board under the present banking law.

MARKETING AGENCIES

Some fear has been expressed that this board would not be authorized to protect the interests of the producer. No language could be more definite and no principle could be more clearly defined in any law than the charge to this board that it must function through cooperative producers' organizations and that the stabilization corporations are merely subsidiaries of these producer organizations.

ADVISORY COMMODITY COMMITTEES

Nor is the board to assume all the authority and to determine all the policies under the provisions of this legislation. Commodity committees are agreed upon to be designated by the board and to join with the board in working out the necessary marketing machinery to protect the producers of any commodity.

FINANCING

The financing machinery is a revolving fund of \$500,000,000 under the control of the board and with the approval of the advisory commodity committee. Stabilization corporations can have the use of this fund to enable them to purchase and store merchandise and otherwise dispose of any given commodity.

LOSSES

It is my judgment that if the program sufficiently impresses the commission concerns and the present established marketing machinery of farm commodities that it will be effective. The final effect would be to permit a declaration or suggestion as to a minimum price below which a commodity would not be permitted to go. Once this principle is established and the Government machinery put behind it, I believe that the price of that commodity can be maintained at that price or a higher price. This program would naturally be a long-time program. It would not automatically bring a commodity within its control like an equalization-fee bill or a debenture plan. However, it would have the authority of the Government with the whole

organization behind it, federally financed, in its effort to make its decision the controlling influence in the low-price level of that commodity.

STABILIZATION

In my judgment, this machinery would therefore bring about stabilization of price at the best possible level at which a commodity could be merchandised in view of the world production, the world consumption, the domestic demand, and the economic condition generally. Once the machinery is put into motion and the price is stabilized there is an implied authority of bargaining power involved and an adjustment of price level will be brought that will place the farmer on an equality with other industries of this country and permit him to enjoy equal privileges with other interests.

EXISTING FACILITIES

Many inquiries are now being made concerning the effect of this legislation on the independent grain operator. His field of operation will not be involved unless he is a speculator on the board of trade. The real purpose of this legislation will be to prevent the violent fluctuation of the market, the seasonable slump, and stabilize the price throughout the crop year. This will not be conducive to excessive speculators who are attempting to secure additional profits by reason of extreme fluctuations. But the elevator man, the country grain dealer, the man owning independent facilities will be able to buy his grain on a steadier market and sell it on a surer market and accept his commission. Therefore the independent grain dealer rendering a service for a commission charge will continue in his line of business just as at present. The anxiety being created by those interested in centralized markets in requesting their independent country merchant to show his anxiety as to the effect of the bill is ill founded. This bill will tend to stabilize the price of the commodities that are brought within its control.

EFFECT ON CORN

The view of the effect on corn is well set out by Harvey Ingham in his first report to the Des Moines Register under date of April 16, as follows:

As a matter of fact, there is no corn surplus running over a period of four years. In these later years we have not been having much of a surplus in any year. It will not require so much organization nor so big a fund to insure stability for corn marketing. The growing uses for corn, the fact that the corn area is limited, all the conditions work to favor the corn grower. If corn can be kept off the market at husking time so the price can not be broken then it is almost sure that the year's price from now on will be fairly satisfactory.

Of course, the farm problem can not be handled in Washington solely with reference to corn, nor ought the corn areas to be satisfied with legislation that will stabilize them but does not go far enough to stabilize some of the bigger and more fluctuating crops. But it is well to have in our thinking just the advantage the Corn Belt has, for the legislation as planned in both houses of Congress will unquestionably give corn a stable market.

WHEAT

The suggestion on corn will not apply to wheat for the reason that wheat is a surplus crop. However, it does present this possibility: Suppose the wheat pool of Canada and the farm board with wheat under its control could reach an understanding as to the possible price levels of wheat. There could be no question but what such an arrangement would have an influence on the world price, although it might not specifically dominate the same. These two commodities are among the commodities that will probably be under the control of this board. With reference to cotton, it would be a matter of efficiently marketing the crop at the best obtainable terms rather than in the haphazard speculative way that the same is marketed at the present time—bought low by the dealer for the purpose of reaping unearned profits.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAPES). The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. BRIGHAM]. [Applause.]

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying that after eight years of discussion, both in the Congress and in the country, the time has arrived when conflicting opinions have been harmonized and we may confidently predict that upon the basis of the bill now under consideration a farm relief measure will be enacted into law. And as the time for its enactment draws near I wish it were possible for every farm family in this country to know what the attitude of the Congress has been toward this problem. In my experience here of four years I have found the Members of this House from every section of the country, regardless of whether they represent farm districts or city districts, earnestly seeking some remedy within

the legitimate field of governmental activity, some remedy within the limits prescribed by the Constitution, which will afford permanent and lasting relief for agriculture. This is in keeping with what has been called the American ideal of equality of compensation among the different occupations by which our people earn their livelihood and it indicates a determination on the part of the American people that the millions who supply our food and clothing shall not sink to the level of a peasantry and be denied the benefits of an American standard of living.

The bill presented by the committee creates a Federal farm board and gives to it broad powers and ample funds. Some of us who have opposed the farm relief measures heretofore proposed had hoped that the operation of natural forces would bring about an adjustment between agriculture and industry and that it would not be necessary to create a new agency for agriculture in view of the very excellent work which has been and is now being done by our national Department of Agriculture with its cooperating agencies in the several States. We were told of the movement from the farms to other industries of half a million farmers annually. We were told also of the abandonment of great tracts of land. Surely this seemed to indicate a reduction in supply of the products of the farm. Moreover we were told of the demands of our increasing population and of the rapid recovery of the war-stricken countries of Europe with the consequent prospect that there would be a revival on their part of the pre-war demand for our products. It was hoped and we believed that by the operation of these forces supply and demand would come into such a relationship as would mean prosperous times for those employed on our farms, and in this way achieve a prosperity which would be much more permanent and lasting than a prosperity dependent upon any governmental action, which, of course, could last only as long as the public opinion which controls the Government permitted it to last.

However, this natural solution of our agricultural problem is to-day seriously retarded, if not made impossible, by other forces new in origin and wholly different in nature, operating in another direction to counteract the alleviating factors I have stressed. These factors and forces have been clearly explained by the economists of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. For instance, since 1918 we have substituted tractors and automobiles for some 6,000,000 head of horses and mules and with this number of work animals and their consequent forage need eliminated there has already disappeared the market for some 6,000,000 acres of corn, 6,000,000 acres of oats, and 8,000,000 acres of hay, with a continuance of this substitution going forward at a rapid rate. Following the Civil War we established land grant colleges and experiment stations in each State and strengthened the Department of Agriculture in the Federal Government. As a result of the work of these institutions there has been brought about improvement in methods of farming, the use of better seed and better animals, and a much greater production which has gone far to offset any decrease in production caused by the movement of farmers to the city. Again, we can hardly keep pace with the increase in production per man employed in agriculture which has followed the development of the tractor and machinery adapted to its use. Furthermore, the development which has taken place upon the agricultural frontiers of other countries, notably in Canada and South America, has produced new competition for our farmers in the world market, particularly for corn and grain.

I trust that we all are agreed that under what were normal conditions the pressure of population upon food supply would have restored prosperity to agriculture. But in view of these new forces, which bid fair to almost revolutionize the farming industry, the necessity is apparent for the creation of a farm board which can command a better hearing than our Department of Agriculture and which, if made up in personnel of active, sympathetic, fearless men, can make an appraisal of the operation of these new forces and their effect upon supply, can develop for agriculture a better merchandising system, and enable the industry to adjust itself to the demand for its products with a consequent improvement in its financial condition.

The witnesses who appeared before the committee, and whose testimony makes a record well worth the study of any Member of this House, were men of great experience both in the production and the marketing of farm products. They told the committee of the need for adjustment of the tax burden, of the need for better credit facilities, for lower transportation charges and for cooperative organizations. They told what, in their opinion, a Federal farm board could do for agriculture. I was impressed, and I think you will be if you read the testimony, with the unanimity of opinion that the farm board should draft a new policy for agriculture. I think I am stating the

matter correctly when I say that it was the prevailing opinion that, apart from revision of the agricultural schedules of the tariff, the benefits which agriculture could derive from legislation would come more from the results of a long-time policy than from temporary expedients of relief. It is of this phase of the board's work that I shall speak in the time allotted to me.

Why do we need a new policy for American agriculture? In order to answer this question we must discuss what has been our policy and what have been its results.

First of all, what has been our conception of agriculture? Until recently in many sections of the country the farm was looked upon as a self-sufficing unit which could supply the farm family with food and clothing and enable it to exist without dependence upon the outside world. Agriculture was a manner of life.

It became a fixed idea that we could not have too many farms or too many farmers, and our Federal Government encouraged the rapid settlement of our public domain, first, by sale to settlers at a low price and later by gift to those who would become cultivators. This led to a rapid extension of our farm area. In the years from 1870 to 1880 we added to our cultivated area 297,000 square miles, a territory equal in extent to Great Britain and France combined.

The result was the disturbance of the farming industry in the older sections of the United States and in the whole world. The present depression is less severe than that suffered by eastern farmers from 1870 to 1900. Still believing that there could not be too many farms or too many farmers, agriculture was not given time to recover from the effects of free land distribution before the Federal Government began a program of reclamation of waste lands by irrigation, which is still bringing about the addition of lands at public expense to our tillable area.

Following the same policies as the Federal Government, the States have entered into land-settlement activities of a similar nature. Many States have immigration departments for the purpose of encouraging the movement of settlers to new and cut-over lands. The Federal and State activities have in turn been supplemented by the work of chambers of commerce, bankers, real-estate operators, and other private agencies interested in the development of particular regions.

Furthermore, the work of our experiment stations and of our United States Department of Agriculture was concerned with problems of production. It was not until 1922 that a Bureau of Agricultural Economics was established in the Department of Agriculture to study economic problems.

I think we may say that the agricultural policy of this country has been centered upon rapid land settlement and increased production, with no serious thought until recently directed toward the market for this produce.

While this policy was being carried out a change has also been taking place in the manner of life of the farming people. They are no longer content to live upon the produce of their own land, but demand and justly so, those improvements and inventions such as the telephone, the radio, and the automobile which have done so much to relieve the isolation of rural life and which now are within the reach of other classes of workers. In other words, the farm family to-day demands a money income. If this demand is fulfilled agriculture must take its place in the commercial world and must of necessity become subject to the same laws of economics which bring success to other industries. A satisfactory agricultural policy to-day must be drafted from this viewpoint regardless of the fact that it runs athwart booster programs and the popular conception of the beneficence of making two blades of grass grow where one grew before.

We need a new policy for agriculture, then, which will reckon with all the instrumentalities of production, available land, machinery to work it, efficient methods of production, the demand for food and clothing for our own people, the prospect of production for the world market and aim to develop our agriculture upon a basis which will provide the consumer with the necessities of life at a reasonable price and at the same time yield to the producer a fair return for his investment and for his labor. In other words, the new policy should aim to make agriculture a good business as that term is used in the commercial and industrial world.

The eight years of discussion of the farm problem have brought forth many phrases to illustrate what farmers are looking for in the way of farm relief. The farm bill now under consideration has adopted one of them, and in the enacting clause it is declared to be the policy of Congress that certain things be done, "so that the industry of agriculture will be placed on a basis of economic equality with other industries." It would seem fitting then to inquire how other industries have found or have failed to find prosperity. The iron and steel industry is the third largest in point of value of product of the great indus-

tries of the country. It was an essential industry during the war and its productivity was greatly increased. Since the war the hours of labor of its employees have been decreased and their wages have been increased, while the earnings per share of stock have been satisfactory to those who have invested capital in the enterprise. The steel industry then has accomplished what we are desirous of accomplishing for agriculture. How did the steel industry bring this about?

If we look back over the history of the past 10 years, we find that the steel industry suffered severely from the depression of 1921. Even though this industry is controlled by a few great corporations, the depression forced a price cut equal to that of many classes of agricultural products. The price, for instance, of steel beams, Pittsburgh basis, fell from \$2.95 in 1920 to \$1.94 in 1921, or a drop of 34 per cent. The earnings of the United States Steel Corporation per share of common stock fell off from \$16.62 per share in 1920 to \$2.24 per share in 1921. How did the steel industry meet this situation? It operated its plant at less than 45 per cent of its capacity, reaching less than 20 per cent at one time for a short period, and instituted every possible economy to cut the cost of production. The policy of the steel industry, the policy which has brought prosperity, has been to feed in the amount of its product which the market would take, and it has aimed at economy of production so that the price could be as low as possible.

The steel industry has an organization known as the American Iron and Steel Institute. At the annual meeting of this organization, held last October, Charles M. Schwab, its president, gave the industry some good advice, which might be well heeded by agriculture to-day. He said:

There are apparently three ways in which the stabilization of the iron and steel industry on a prosperous basis can be legitimately maintained. These are (1) by stimulating the demand for steel; (2) by discouraging by every lawful means the construction of additional capacity at times when the capacity is already overexpanded; and (3) by the avoidance of uneconomic price cutting.

I wonder how far a Federal farm board of able and farsighted men in drafting a program to bring prosperity for agriculture will come from embodying in it the principles above laid down for the steel industry?

But, we are told, agriculture is made up of thousands of independent producers, and the productive capacity of the land is subject to the vagaries of the weather, and that it is impossible to do in agriculture what has been done in steel. In this connection let me read further from Mr. Schwab's address. He said:

The law of supply and demand is inexorable, and if the producers of steel in this country do not voluntarily refrain from expanding capacity beyond the needs of the country they can expect only one consequence. The law of supply and demand will promptly operate, reducing profits to the extent necessary effectively to discourage new construction, and that condition will continue until demand has increased sufficiently to take up the excess capacity.

When the postwar deflation came agriculture tried to maintain its production in the face of lessened demand and lowering prices. But, as Mr. Schwab states, the law of supply and demand promptly operated, and when producers of farm products failed to contract their production to meet the reduced demand disaster came upon many in the industry. It seems to me that it is not entirely a question of how difficult it is in agriculture to make the adjustment of supply to demand, but rather it is a question of whether there is any other way to meet the situation and how we can best make this adjustment.

In the oil industry we have conditions somewhat similar to those in agriculture in that the crude oil is supplied by numerous producers. Notwithstanding the great increase in demand for gasoline and oil, production has increased faster than demand and the industry is in a demoralized condition. Recently some steps have been taken to limit production. The President for one thing has put a stop to the policy of developing new oil wells upon the public domain, a policy which I hope he will follow with respect to reclamation. Sir Henri Deterding, managing director of the Dutch Shell companies, came to this country for a conference and upon his departure for home, in discussing general policies for the curtailment of oil production, he said:

The oil producers of the world could leave the price situation to take care of itself if they would work out a plan to prevent overproduction.

The president of the International Paper & Power Co., in reporting a large deficit for his company in 1928, said:

Since the beginning of 1928 the company has made substantial reductions in the price of newsprint in order to meet competition, as the market was seriously weakened by overcapacity of the industry. Lower

prices and increasing consumption have created a more stable market, and it is expected that there will be no further price reductions pending the restoration of a balance between supply and demand.

I have referred to these three great industries to show that industry is trying to control prices by controlling and adjusting productive capacity to demand. The steel industry has prospered in proportion as it has succeeded in doing this, while the oil and paper industries have failed and are suffering the same disastrous consequences as have befallen agriculture. The policy for agriculture which the farm board can adopt after a careful survey will of necessity aim at adjusting the productive capacity of the agricultural industry to the demand for its products.

There are many thoughtful farm leaders who sincerely believe that by a system of export bounties or by other means the Federal farm board which we are creating in this act can maintain the price level in this country at a level which is higher than the world price by an amount equal to the tariff, and that this can be done regardless of how much we produce. I have myself been for many years a member of some of the farm organizations whose leaders hold these views, but I am compelled to disagree with them. You will find in the hearing the testimony of many witnesses who advocated the so-called export bounty plan. I asked each such witness if he would advocate the application of this plan to each industry which should suffer from depression and low prices, and the answer in each instance was in the affirmative. This can mean but one thing—that we adopt a new policy, and when we impose a duty upon an article under our tariff law we must set in operation the machinery not only to see that this duty be levied upon each unit of the commodity imported into this country, but also to increase the price of each unit of the commodity produced and sold in this country by the amount of the duty. Under this theory we need, then, not a farm board to do this for agriculture, but a tariff-effectuating board to make the tariff effective for every industry.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRIGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KETCHAM. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that some farm-organization leaders with whom he had talked upon this subject said they believed in setting up an organization that would pay the difference he has referred to and continue to pay that difference notwithstanding the over-production that might follow. I caught that as the gentleman's general statement.

Mr. BRIGHAM. I do not recall that any leader of a farm organization provided any remedy for overproduction. If the gentleman can cite me to the testimony, I will appreciate his doing so.

Mr. KETCHAM. I will be very pleased to cite the gentleman to the definite testimony of the leaders of the National Grange, which organization was the sponsor, of course, of the export debenture plan, and if the gentleman will read the terms of that proposed bill he will find they took into consideration that very question and put in a very drastic penalty clause for overproduction.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Does the gentleman think the penalty would be effective?

Mr. KETCHAM. I was not saying whether it would or not; but I am simply saying that that indicated the attitude and the mind of those gentlemen. They recognize that no plan of this sort would be effectual in the face of continued and increasing overproduction.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Furthermore, we must not forget that our country is not the only one which is facing the problem of farm depression. When the Hon. Stanley Baldwin, Premier of Great Britain, visited Canada in 1927 he said in a speech in Montreal:

I can see as the years go by that the highest test of statesmanship will be called for in reconciling the interests of agriculture and industry.

When Australia placed an export bounty of 6 cents per pound on butter the answer of Secretary Mellon was to add the amount of this bounty, as the law authorizes him to do, to our tariff upon butter, thereby rendering the Australian bounty inoperative as far as our country is concerned. If we should adopt the policy of the export bounty or the dumping abroad of subsidized surpluses, we could expect nothing but retaliatory measures on the part of other countries to protect their producers. Premier Mussolini has declared it to be his policy to make Italy self-sustaining in the production of wheat and has levied a high tariff to protect the Italian producers. Is it reasonable to expect that he will allow this program to be thwarted by an export bounty paid by this country?

In all the plans which have been discussed for the relief of agriculture and in all the debates concerning them there has been general recognition of the need for a penalty in case the

operation of these plans should raise prices and result in over-production. Surely the penalties of bankruptcy and general suffering in the past eight years should have been severe enough without thinking of others. We have seen the results of a policy of overdevelopment and overstimulation of production. Why should not the farm board attack the problem now at its source and try to secure the cooperation of the farmers of America on the basis of a plan of production and distribution which will do for agriculture what has been done for other industries? This is a sensible way of bringing about equality between agriculture and industry. [Applause.]

Mr. SNOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRIGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. SNOW. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. The first one that I would like to ask the Representative from Vermont is this: Many farmers in New England fear that the only possible effect of the passage of this bill upon them would be that it would simply raise the price of grain in New England, without any compensating features following. Knowing the situation of the New England farmer as the gentleman does, in your opinion is that fear well grounded?

Mr. BRIGHAM. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Maine that the dairy industry is now on about a 1 per cent import basis. Therefore the tariff is effective on dairy products. But I have had some experience in the West, and I know that it is being generally advocated as a solution of the farming problem in the grain-growing sections that they go into dairying. Now, if the farmers of the West should go into dairying to any great extent, there could be only one result. We would soon be on an export basis, and therefore I believe that it is to the interest of the farmers of New England to restore prosperity to the grain-growing farmers of the West; and if that is done, on the basis of this bill, and we go into a general program of adjustment of supply to demand, I believe it will apply to the dairy industry as well as to the other industries of agriculture, and prosperity will result to them all, and there will be better hope of prosperity in the future than there will be if we go on as we are going at present. The gentleman from Maine represents Aroostook County, one of the greatest potato-growing sections in this country. Several witnesses appeared before the committee who were familiar with the condition of the potato industry. They testified that there resulted from the 1928 crop a surplus of 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and that there was no export outlet, no opportunity to market them at a profit—in fact, nothing could be done except to feed them to livestock or destroy them. The only thing, then, that can be done for the potato growers is to help them market efficiently and try to secure their cooperation on a program which will result in planting an acreage which will produce on the average the quantity consumers will buy at a fair price. The outlook report of the Bureau of Economics is helpful. The board set up in this bill can go further and make it more effective. [Applause.]

Mr. SNOW. You have answered the second question I had in mind, so I will not ask it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNES] such time as he may use.

Mr. BURTNES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: Great confusion seems to exist among the membership as to the price of spring wheat at Winnipeg, which means delivery at Port Arthur or Fort William, as compared with the price of similar wheat at Minneapolis.

A year ago, on May 2, I inserted in the RECORD a number of tables giving the exact price of certain kinds of wheat in the Winnipeg market and in the Minneapolis market from July 7, 1923, down to that time.

I rise at this time simply for the purpose of offering similar tables, brought down to date as nearly as can be, by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture.

I hope later on to get some time to discuss these tables with you and to draw conclusions from them, both as to the value of the tariff and the problem of controlling the exportable surplus. I want to get the tables into the RECORD at this time so that anyone who may hear my discussion later can turn to them and follow the discussion with the tables at that time, so that we may all draw more intelligent conclusions from them. The information given in the tables will take the discussion out of the realm of guesswork and give us the real facts in the case, on which much confusion exists.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNES. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Do the tables include the high gluten content wheats of our section of the country?

Mr. BURTNES. The tables I offer do not give what you might call the base price or the card price, neither do they give the highest price of any wheat. They give what I regard as the only sound economic information to furnish, namely, the

average price per bushel of the wheat actually sold at the markets in question; or, in other words, the weighted average cash price for No. 1 northern at Minneapolis, for, after all, that is the only fair figure to compare with the prices that may be paid in the Winnipeg market, the average actually produced at the sales in the terminal markets, and, of course, such average includes both the wheat which carries no premium with it and the wheat that does carry a premium with it; and it becomes not an average of the prices themselves but the actual average realized by the seller upon every bushel of wheat that is sold.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Of course, there is a great difference in the character of wheat produced throughout the United States. The States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana produce an entirely different kind of wheat from the rest of the United States.

Mr. BURTNES. The gentleman is correct, but that wheat happens to be more or less of the same quality as the wheat that is sold in the Winnipeg market.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is true.

Mr. BURTNES. If anything, in so far as protein content is concerned, the advantage is with the Canadian wheat rather than ours, but on the whole the grains are, of course, fairly comparable, and that is why I wanted to put the figures in the RECORD at this time. The study of them will, I think, be helpful in clarifying the situation.

The tables as to wheat price to which I referred in my speech and which have been furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture are as follows:

Weighted average cash sales No. 1 dark northern spring wheat in Minneapolis, and average cash closing No. 1 and No. 3 Manitoba northern wheat in Winnipeg, July, 1923—April, 1929

Crop year	Minneapolis dark No. 1	Winnipeg		Difference between No. 1 dark northern Minneapolis and No. 1 Manitoba northern Winnipeg
		No. 1	No. 3	
1923				
Week ending—		Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel
July 7	119.0	111.9	106.4	7.1
July 14	118.3	108.2	101.9	10.1
July 21	115.0	106.8	99.6	8.2
July 28	120.0	107.6	100.4	12.4
Aug. 4	120.4	106.9	93.7	13.5
Aug. 11	120.6	108.0	101.1	12.6
Aug. 18	123.3	111.5	104.4	11.8
Aug. 25	122.3	118.5	110.2	3.8
Sept. 1	125.3	117.5	107.5	7.8
Sept. 8	129.4	116.3	106.9	13.1
Sept. 15	127.2	109.3	99.1	11.9
Sept. 22	123.8	101.1	95.8	22.7
Sept. 29	124.5	97.9	92.1	26.6
Oct. 6	124.8	98.9	93.5	25.9
Oct. 13	127.0	99.1	93.0	27.9
Oct. 20	125.3	96.5	89.0	28.8
Oct. 27	126.2	96.7	88.7	29.5
Nov. 3	123.8	97.8	89.8	25.0
Nov. 10	118.7	97.5	89.5	21.2
Nov. 17	117.0	97.5	89.3	19.5
Nov. 24	118.2	97.8	89.5	20.4
Dec. 1	118.6	95.6	87.1	23.0
Dec. 8	121.5	95.7	87.0	25.8
Dec. 15	120.8	92.4	84.5	28.4
Dec. 22	117.3	92.1	84.1	25.2
Dec. 29	116.0	92.3	84.4	23.7
1924				
Week ending—		Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel
Jan. 5	121.2	94.2	86.2	27.0
Jan. 12	123.5	96.6	88.7	26.9
Jan. 19	124.2	96.9	89.3	27.3
Jan. 26	123.8	96.8	89.2	27.0
Feb. 2	126.0	98.3	91.1	27.7
Feb. 9	127.3	99.9	93.0	27.4
Feb. 16	126.0	99.4	92.5	26.4
Feb. 23	127.4	100.0	92.7	27.4
Mar. 1	126.0	99.9	92.3	26.1
Mar. 8	127.7	100.0	92.5	27.7
Mar. 15	127.0	97.9	90.8	29.1
Mar. 22	126.7	98.1	91.2	28.8
Mar. 29	123.7	96.1	88.9	27.6
Apr. 5	124.7	96.7	89.5	28.0
Apr. 12	124.5	97.7	90.4	26.8
Apr. 19	124.6	98.9	91.7	25.7
Apr. 26	128.2	99.0	91.8	29.2
May 3	126.5	101.0	94.2	25.5
May 10	130.0	102.8	96.2	27.2
May 17	129.2	103.0	96.3	26.2
May 24	130.8	105.7	99.1	25.1
May 31	131.2	106.9	100.3	24.3
June 7	128.5	106.9	100.2	21.6
June 14	133.7	110.5	103.5	23.2

Weighted average cash sales No. 1 dark northern spring wheat in Minneapolis, etc.—Continued

Crop year	Minneapolis dark No. 1	Winnipeg		Difference between No. 1 dark northern Minneapolis and No. 1 Manitoba northern Winnipeg
		No. 1	No. 3	
July 19	148.7	136.0	128.0	12.7
July 20	150.2	144.4	131.0	5.8
Aug. 2	151.8	150.8	141.9	1.0
Aug. 9	150.2	148.5	139.1	1.7
Aug. 16	141.5	146.7	136.7	-5.8
Aug. 23	138.7	140.0	132.8	-1.3
Aug. 30	134.3	136.6	128.3	-2.3
Sept. 6	132.2	136.1	127.6	-3.9
Sept. 13	132.7	138.7	132.1	-6.0
Sept. 20	137.5	142.8	137.2	-5.3
Sept. 27	139.5	146.6	141.5	-7.1
Oct. 4	148.5	156.6	148.9	-8.1
Oct. 11	138.7	164.2	154.3	-10.5
Oct. 18	155.0	163.3	153.6	-8.3
Oct. 25	150.2	156.9	148.0	-6.7
Nov. 1	146.3	153.0	143.3	-6.3
Nov. 8	148.0	159.7	147.4	-11.7
Nov. 15	160.0	168.4	156.7	-8.4
Nov. 22	148.2	166.3	155.6	-8.1
Nov. 29	160.2	165.4	155.3	-5.2
Dec. 6	162.5	162.3	151.3	+2
Dec. 13	167.7	167.9	157.0	.2
Dec. 20	176.5	175.0	165.0	1.5
Dec. 27	179.6	182.3	172.1	2.9

1924

Week ending—	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel
June 21	143.5	117.5	110.5	26.0
June 28	143.8	119.1	111.5	24.7
July 5	145.0	122.9	115.2	22.1
July 12	142.2	123.2	115.3	19.0
July 19	148.7	136.0	128.0	12.7
July 26	150.2	144.4	131.0	5.8
Aug. 2	151.8	150.8	141.9	1.0
Aug. 9	150.2	148.5	139.1	1.7
Aug. 16	141.5	146.7	136.7	-5.8
Aug. 23	138.7	140.0	132.8	-1.3
Aug. 30	134.3	136.6	128.3	-2.3
Sept. 6	132.2	136.1	127.6	-3.9
Sept. 13	132.7	138.7	132.1	-6.0
Sept. 20	137.5	142.8	137.2	-5.3
Sept. 27	139.5	146.6	141.5	-7.1
Oct. 4	148.5	156.6	148.9	-8.1
Oct. 11	138.7	164.2	154.3	-10.5
Oct. 18	155.0	163.3	153.6	-8.3
Oct. 25	150.2	156.9	148.0	-6.7
Nov. 1	146.3	153.0	143.3	-6.3
Nov. 8	148.0	159.7	147.4	-11.7
Nov. 15	160.0	168.4	156.7	-8.4
Nov. 22	148.2	166.3	155.6	-8.1
Nov. 29	160.2	165.4	155.3	-5.2
Dec. 6	162.5	162.3	151.3	+2
Dec. 13	167.7	167.9	157.0	.2
Dec. 20	176.5	175.0	165.0	1.5
Dec. 27	179.6	182.3	172.1	2.9

1925

Week ending—	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel
Jan. 3	186.6	184.0	173.1	2.6
Jan. 10	188.5	186.7	174.8	1.8
Jan. 17	192.0	193.0	181.3	-1.0
Jan. 24	196.0	197.4	185.9	-1.4
Jan. 31	207.0	211.5	200.1	-4.5
Feb. 7	196.5	200.6	189.5	-4.1
Feb. 14	188.4	191.9	182.1	-3.5
Feb. 21	189.3	194.1	186.4	-4.8
Feb. 28	196.8	199.2	190.9	2.4
Mar. 7	198.5	197.6	188.9	.9
Mar. 14	184.8	184.4	175.0	.4
Mar. 21	165.7	165.7	155.8	.0
Mar. 28	167.5	166.7	157.0	.8
Apr. 4	152.8	145.6	136.6	7.2
Apr. 11	161.2	156.5	146.5	4.7
Apr. 18	166.3	159.0	148.9	7.3
Apr. 25	160.8	158.9	150.2	1.9
May 2	161.2	161.9	153.4	-7.7
May 9	170.2	176.4	168.4	-6.2
May 16	170.0	178.0	170.0	-8.0
May 22	177.2	187.6	179.6	-10.4
May 30	177.8	192.7	183.9	-14.9
June 6	176.0	180.8	170.5	-4.8
June 13	175.2	177.2	168.7	-2.0
June 20	166.7	165.9	159.9	+4.8
June 27	166.7	165.5	156.3	+1.2
July 4	157.6	158.9	149.4	1.3
July 11	159.8	160.9	150.9	1.1
July 18	172.0	166.8	158.7	5.2
July 25	170.3	161.9	154.1	8.4
Aug. 1	169.8	160.9	152.9	8.9
Aug. 8	175.7	171.2	164.4	4.5
Aug. 15	169.2	168.8	162.9	.4
Aug. 22	168.7	170.7	162.3	-2.0
Aug. 29	166.2	163.2	154.7	+3.0
Sept. 5	163.0	152.2	146.6	10.8
Sept. 19	160.2	135.6	130.2	24.6
Sept. 26	156.2	128.4	123.2	27.8
Oct. 3	151.5	121.0	116.1	30.5
Oct. 10	155.5	124.0	118.9	31.5
Oct. 17	159.5	126.2	119.0	33.3
Oct. 24	160.5	128.2	120.0	32.3
Oct. 31	162.7	133.4	125.3	29.3
Nov. 7	163.7	136.1	129.4	27.6
Nov. 14	163.8	137.0	130.5	26.8
Nov. 21	167.3	141.9	134.7	25.4
Nov. 28	171.0	151.3	144.8	19.7
Dec. 5	178.8	161.5	155.2	17.3
Dec. 12	177.8	159.4	150.6	18.4
Dec. 19	173.5	152.1	143.8	21.4
Dec. 26	173.5	149.6	141.5	23.9

1926

Week ending—	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel
Jan. 2	184.8	159.9	151.5	24.9
Jan. 9	183.3	158.7	149.0	24.6
Jan. 16	177.0	155.2	144.7	21.8
Jan. 23	176.0	155.4	144.9	20.6
Jan. 30	177.0	156.6	145.5	20.4
Feb. 6	180.2	159.9	148.9	20.3
Feb. 13	170.8	154.7	144.1	16.1
Feb. 20	171.0	153.3	143.3	17.7
Feb. 27	173.6	150.9	141.1	22.7

Weighted average cash sales No. 1 dark northern spring wheat in Minneapolis, etc.—Continued

Crop year	Minneapolis dark No. 1	Winnipeg		Difference between No. 1 dark northern Minneapolis and No. 1 Manitoba northern Winnipeg
		No. 1	No. 3	
1926	166.7	144.2	134.6	22.5
Mar. 6	170.3	147.5	137.3	22.8
Mar. 20	169.5	150.6	139.5	18.9
Mar. 27	161.5	149.6	138.1	11.9
Apr. 3	162.8	151.2	139.2	11.6
Apr. 10	163.5	153.2	141.3	10.3
Apr. 17	169.7	157.4	146.2	12.3
Apr. 24	169.7	160.9	150.0	8.8
May 1	167.0	158.6	148.0	8.4
May 8	165.0	154.2	144.5	10.8
May 15	164.8	154.0	144.7	10.8
May 22	163.7	152.9	143.6	10.8
May 29	163.7	153.7	145.1	10.0
June 5	163.4	151.0	141.9	12.4
June 12	173.8	154.7	145.7	19.1
June 19	171.5	154.8	145.6	16.7
June 26	162.7	152.2	142.9	10.5
June 30	161.0	151.8	142.2	9.2

Week ending—	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel
Feb. 11	146.0	139.0	126.0	7.0
Feb. 18	146.0	139.0	127.0	7.0
Feb. 25	146.0	140.0	127.0	6.0
Mar. 4	146.0	143.0	130.0	3.0
Mar. 11	146.0	145.0	133.0	1.0
Mar. 18	142.0	143.0	130.0	-1.0
Mar. 25	138.0	141.0	128.0	-3.0
Apr. 1	139.0	143.0	130.0	-4.0
Apr. 8	140.0	145.0	132.0	-5.0
Apr. 15	139.0	143.0	131.0	-4.0
Apr. 22	142.0	146.0	133.0	-4.0
Apr. 29	144.0	147.0	135.0	-3.0
May 6	149.0	151.0	141.0	-2.0
May 13	152.0	153.0	144.0	-1.0
May 20	153.0	153.0	144.0	0
May 27	159.0	161.0	151.0	-2.0
June 3	161.0	164.0	152.0	-3.0
June 10	159.0	161.0	149.0	-2.0
June 17	158.0	162.0	149.0	-4.0
June 24	157.0	161.0	150.0	-4.0
July 1	153.0	159.0	149.0	-6.0
July 8	158.0	163.0	153.0	-5.0
July 15	160.0	163.0	153.0	-3.0
July 22	156.0	162.0	154.0	-6.0
July 29	161.0	162.0	154.0	-1.0
Aug. 5	155.0	157.0	145.0	-2.0
Aug. 12	160.0	163.0	150.0	-3.0
Aug. 19	154.0	163.0	145.0	-7.0
Sept. 30	136.0	142.0	130.0	-6.0
Oct. 7	133.0	142.0	129.0	-9.0
Oct. 14	136.0	147.0	130.0	-11.0
Oct. 21	137.0	147.0	127.0	-10.0
Oct. 28	131.0	141.0	122.0	-10.0
Nov. 4	132.0	141.0	121.0	-9.0
Nov. 11	135.0	141.0	122.0	-6.0
Nov. 18	133.0	148.0	120.0	-15.0
Nov. 25	134.0	150.0	128.0	-16.0
Dec. 2	134.0	144.0	125.0	-10.0
Dec. 9	13			

Weighted average cash sales No. 1 dark northern spring wheat in Minneapolis, etc.—Continued

Crop year	Minneapolis dark No. 1	Winnipeg		Difference between No. 1 dark northern Minneapolis and No. 1 Manitoba northern Winnipeg
		No. 1	No. 3	
Week ending—	1928	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel	Cents per bushel
Apr. 20	167.0	159.0	146.0	8.0
Apr. 27	171.0	159.0	144.0	12.0
May 4	174.0	163.0	147.0	9.0
May 11	168.0	162.0	145.0	6.0
May 18	160.0	155.0	140.0	5.0
May 25	161.0	157.0	141.0	4.0
June 1	161.0	151.0	136.0	10.0
June 8	156.0	146.0	134.0	10.0
June 15	151.0	143.0	131.0	8.0
June 22	151.0	139.0	127.0	12.0
June 29	152.0	139.0	128.0	13.0
July 6	153.0	139.0	129.0	14.0
July 13	149.0	136.0	125.0	13.0
July 20	146.0	130.0	120.0	16.0
July 27	138.0	124.0	113.0	14.0
Aug. 3	141.0	125.0	112.0	16.0
Aug. 10	127.0	120.0	108.0	7.0
Aug. 17	125.0	119.0	107.0	6.0
Aug. 24	123.0	116.0	106.0	7.0
Aug. 31	122.0	117.0	108.0	5.0
Sept. 7	125.0	116.0	107.0	9.0
Sept. 14	123.0	114.0	105.0	9.0
Sept. 21	126.0	116.0	105.0	10.0
Sept. 28	130.0	121.0	109.0	9.0
Oct. 5	125.0	124.0	110.0	9.0
Oct. 12	124.0	127.0	113.0	-3.0
Oct. 19	121.0	124.0	111.0	-3.0
Oct. 26	119.0	122.0	109.0	-3.0
Nov. 2	124.0	122.0	112.0	2.0
Nov. 9	122.0	121.0	110.0	1.0
Nov. 16	123.0	123.0	112.0	0.0
Nov. 23	125.0	122.0	112.0	3.0
Nov. 30	125.0	118.0	110.0	7.0
Dec. 7	124.0	117.0	109.0	7.0
Dec. 14	121.0	117.0	109.0	4.0
Dec. 21	123.0	117.0	109.0	6.0
Dec. 28	120.0	118.0	109.0	2.0
Week ending—	1929			
Jan. 4	123.0	116.0	107.0	7.0
Jan. 11	125.0	117.0	109.0	8.0
Jan. 18	130.0	121.0	112.0	9.0
Jan. 25	132.0	124.0	116.0	8.0
Feb. 1	131.0	124.0	116.0	7.0
Feb. 8	134.0	125.0	117.0	9.0
Feb. 15	136.0	128.0	120.0	8.0
Feb. 22	139.0	130.0	122.0	9.0
Mar. 1	136.0	129.0	121.0	7.0
Mar. 8	132.0	127.0	119.0	5.0
Mar. 15	132.0	129.0	121.0	3.0
Mar. 22	135.0	127.0	120.0	8.0
Mar. 29	128.0	124.0	116.0	4.0
Apr. 5	129.0	124.0	116.0	5.0
Apr. 12	130.0	124.0	116.0	6.0

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I did not vote to favorably report the pending bill from the Committee on Agriculture. Believing that it falls short of what it should be, and of what the average farmer had expected, I feel and still feel that changes should be made.

I want the best bill possible. If we can make it so good that it helps President Hoover, all well and good, just so it helps the farmer. Then, as a farmer owner and operator, I will stand a show to gain in the bank, if not by the ballot.

The fault is not so much with what this bill proposes to do as with what it would leave undone. Possibly it is all right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. To illustrate: A 100-foot rope is thrown full length toward a man struggling downstream for his life, 200 feet from shore, in the turbulent waters of the Great Falls region of the Potomac River above Washington. Exhausted as a result of the long fight for his life, the swimmer, unable to reach the rope, goes down. The rope is all right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

For eight years the American farmer has been battling for his life. Individualist as he is, hater of paternalism, proud of his profession and of his people, pleader for no special privilege, weakened, this man, sun tanned, and silent, looks toward Washington. He asks no special consideration—only justice. Reluctantly, but finally he is forced to confess that unless he is given a life line, a line long enough to reach him, he is

lost. And when he goes down he will not go alone. The city, as well as the country, is deeply concerned.

No; the bill is not altogether bad; it is disappointing. Before it proves effective, if ever, many more farmers will have lost their homes, and hundreds of rural banks will have been added to the long list of those that have failed. Secretary of Agriculture Hyde comes from Missouri, and it would be a pleasure to go along with him in this program. But I know farmers. I am one of them. So I know that this bill is not all that had been hoped for. I feel sure also that it is not what most of us, deep down in our hearts, would like to have.

Pessimistic as my position may appear as regards the effectiveness of the measure, I do note progress. One obstacle is of the past. It is no longer necessary to prove the nonexistence of farm prosperity. President Hoover in his message to Congress speaks of "the difficulties of the agricultural industry," and adds that this industry "has not kept pace in prosperity or standards of living with other lines of industry." Secretary of Agriculture Hyde, in his opening statement before the House Committee on Agriculture, said, "The necessity for farm relief is no longer debatable."

The foregoing frank confessions of fact, so long denied by others, mark real progress. So, as to the farmer's plight, it is not necessary for us to offer further proof. We may devote all our efforts to a solution of the problem—the greatest problem, save none, ever faced by our people. Upon its proper solution depends the future of America. It is for us to prove the exception among all the great nations that have been and demonstrate that as the population changes from rural to urban the producer is not necessarily impoverished.

In connection with every discussion of the farm situation there is heard tariff talk. The subjects seem inseparable. Everybody believes, and President Hoover in his message indicates, that a tariff bill is to be passed in the present session of Congress. All the tariff advances will not be for the farmer. The President speaks "of tariff for other industries than agriculture." Some of us represent agricultural districts. We are thinking first of all of the farmer. We know that any tariff increases made for the manufacturer will prove effective. We want to know also that any tariff increases made for the farmer will prove equally effective.

I have said that the present bill is disappointing. In it there has been provided no vehicle to make effective the tariff on a staple crop, such, for instance, as wheat, of which we produce an exportable surplus. Without some such set-up the producer will not receive full tariff benefits on what he sells, but will be compelled to pay full tariff increases, where levied, on what he buys. If the tariff is greatly increased on much that the farmer must buy and not correspondingly increased and made effective on what he sells, his condition will thereby be made worse rather than better.

For some two weeks immediately preceding the convening of this session of Congress the House Committee on Agriculture held important hearings, having before it some of the best agricultural minds in America. I asked a number of witnesses as to the effect of the present tariff on wheat, a staple farm crop of which we produce an exportable surplus. The hearings as printed are lengthy and may not be read by all. For this reason I quote briefly, and in part, from a few of the witnesses, as follows:

(John W. Black, professor of agricultural economics, Harvard University. Professor Black was reared on a farm in southern Wisconsin, was educated at the University of Wisconsin, and, before going to Harvard two years ago, was professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota.)

Mr. NELSON. Then, really, the prime object is to make effective the 42-cent tariff on wheat which is not now effective?

Professor BLACK. Absolutely; and this plan—the allotment plan—does it in a more direct sense than any of the plans that have been presented, with the possible exception of the McNary-Haugen arrangement.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What plan was that?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. The allotment plan, fully explained in the hearings.

(John Vesecky, Timken, Kans., representing Kansas Cooperative Wheat Marketing Association)

Mr. NELSON. And really the Canadian wheat grower is receiving more by a few cents a bushel than the American wheat grower is receiving, notwithstanding we have a tariff of 42 cents a bushel?

Mr. VESECKY. You are right.

(Hon. Dudley G. Roe, of Maryland)

Mr. NELSON. Senator Roe, I assume from what you have said that you feel the farmer is not getting the benefit of the 42 cents per bushel tariff?

Mr. ROE. I know he is not.

(J. W. Brinton, of Lincoln, Nebr., representing the Nebraska Wheat Growers' Association, its members, and other citizens of Nebraska)

Mr. NELSON. Do you think the present tariff is effective? Is the farmer getting the benefit of the 42-cent tariff?

Mr. BRINTON. Just in a few isolated cases; so few that they are not worthy of mention.

(Rudolph Lee, Long Prairie, Minn., representing rural newspapers in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota)

Mr. NELSON. You have referred to wheat. Do you think the tariff on wheat is effective to-day?

Mr. LEE. Well, I do not believe it is.

Mr. NELSON. While this committee is not empowered to establish rates, if we are going to have a tariff on wheat it should be effective, should it not?

Mr. LEE. Yes.

(W. H. Settle, Indianapolis, Ind., representing Indiana Farm Bureau Federation and Central States Soft Wheat Growers' Association. Mr. Settle is president of the Indiana Farm Bureau Federation, general manager of the Central States Soft Wheat Growers' Association, and president of the Indiana Farm Bureau Purchasing Department)

Mr. SETTLE. The first requisite, as I see it, to any sound farm relief solution is to make the American tariff effective. That is the trouble with agriculture to-day; we have been paying the tariff and we have not been getting it. Under the present system of distribution a 15-cent tariff on wheat would be just as adequate as a 42-cent tariff. It would not make a penny's difference to the farmer of America.

(L. J. Taber, Columbus, Ohio, master of the National Grange)

Mr. NELSON. In other words, you feel that to-day the American farmer is not getting the benefit of the tariff on wheat?

Mr. TABER. Only in part. There have been times when the tariff on wheat amounted to 1 or 2 cents, and there are times in the past when it has given a return of about 40 cents.

Mr. NELSON. But generally speaking, they do not get the benefit of the 42 cents?

Mr. TABER. No, sir.

Mr. NELSON. And that applies to all crops of which we are producing an exportable surplus?

Mr. TABER. Yes; you are correct.

(A. J. MacPhail, president of the Saskatchewan Cooperative Wheat Producers and the Canadian Cooperative Wheat Producers)

Mr. ADKINS. How does the grain price in Winnipeg compare with the price at Duluth and Chicago, or the leading grain centers in this country, with a daily market?

Mr. MACPHAIL. I think that on an average we (in Canada) have been higher during the last three or four years.

Such is the testimony to the effect that the tariff does not do for the wheat grower what it is supposed to do. My contention is that if this tariff is to be continued or increased, it should be made to work. This is the first suggestion contained in recommendations joined in by the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, the National Grange, and the American Farm Bureau Federation, yet this bill contains no such provision. I care not as to name, but some effective machinery should be set up.

If legislation will work only when there is a shortage there is no need for such legislation. If, for instance, the farmers of the country should plant the same acreage which had the year before, an average year, produced no crop surplus, and should, because of a better season, produce a surplus, they should not have to sell this below the cost of production. The public good demands a reasonable carry-over of staple crops. This is a guaranty against famine, should a poor season follow. This safe surplus is the big cities' assurance of food, and the farmer should not have to suffer because of it. These same cities would not be willing, were it possible with the farmer, to have him plant crops sufficient to meet only the minimum needs of the Nation. The danger from the consumer's viewpoint would be too great. Yet under conditions as they have existed and as they must continue without proper legislation, every better-than-average crop will represent a loss rather than a gain to the farmers as a whole.

Soon, at least during this session, there will come from the Ways and Means Committee a bill increasing the tariff and possibly suggesting the American valuation plan, with its assurance of very much higher prices for much that the public purchases. This bill will contain no provision by which the tariff can be made effective on wheat or similar crops. If written into any legislation it must be done now.

One object as set forth in the title of this bill, H. R. 1, is "To place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries." Think what a "boost" this would be.

Without pausing to paint the plight of agriculture, with its some thirty billions of dollars in farm losses since the World

War, let us take note of a few increases having to do with other industries. The caption on a current news item reads: "Steel Corporation cuts stock melon, offer of 1,016,605 additional shares at 1 for 7 involves \$40,000,000." The net operating income of class 1 railroads for 1928 was \$1,193,000,000. A recent statement shows the net income of the Pennsylvania Railroad for 1928 as \$82,507,613, equivalent to 13.65 per cent upon present capital stock outstanding. While country merchants as well as independent operators in larger cities were being driven out of business, the larger chain, mail order, and department stores were piling up profits, one with net earnings of \$15,643,000, another in 1928 of \$17,704,000, another \$26,908,000, and another with \$35,386,000. Corporation earnings for 1928 were up 17 per cent, 1,042 companies showing total earnings of \$3,748,000,000. Iron and steel showed a profit of a little more than \$200,000,000 for the year. Aggregate payments for Standard Oil were \$218,740,000.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight, while prosperous for industry, was not the only prosperous year. The biennial census of manufactures, just made public, shows that products of the American factories during 1927 reached the tremendous value of \$62,721,300,000. This wealth was created in 191,866 factories. The value of the agricultural harvest for the same year, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, was \$8,522,562,330. Of the vast income from industry more than 60 per cent was contributed by seven States. Putting it in another way, slightly more than 8,000,000 workers in factories produced more than \$62,000,000,000 in wealth, while some 6,000,000 farms grew crops worth \$8,500,000,000.

Reference has been made to what seems the greatest shortcoming of the bill. It does not take care of the surplus. Let it be understood that the terms "surplus" and "overproduction" are not synonymous. A reasonable and seasonable surplus is always to be desired. It was true in Joseph's time; it is true to-day.

I have referred to the "negative faults," so to speak, of this measure. While conscious of the fact that proceedings under new legislation may arouse misgivings, I am especially anxious that we do not take from the individual farmer the independence of action which he has enjoyed; that we do not too greatly centralize power over production of farm products, thus favoring large agricultural interests, perchance big corporations with absentee landlordism but no home ownership.

Stabilization of prices is proposed. Desirable as this is, it, in itself, is not enough. Prices must be above the cost of production. Farm prosperity is measured not solely by the price received for the product but by the purchasing power of the profit. If there is no profit there is no purchasing power, no prosperity.

At the proper time I shall, unless convinced that to do so would be useless, propose amendments, at least one of which I regard as of vital importance to this measure. I now merely refer to four provisions in the bill. The chairman of the board (section 2) serves at the pleasure of the President, who also fixes the salary, which is not limited by law. An advisory committee as established by a cooperative association—section 3—can not consist exclusively of producers of the commodity, but "at least two shall be experienced handlers or processors." Section 5 (e) authorizes the board to refuse a "loan or advance or agreement" in case of certain commodities, which, it has been suggested, may include such surplus crops as wheat and cotton. Section 6 (c), in forbidding the stabilization corporation to hold for higher prices commodities, under stated conditions, is clearly written for the city consumer instead of the farm producer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is no provision to enforce that mandate. It seems to me that it would be desirable if we provided something to give that assurance and guaranty to the city consumer.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. In reply to my colleague from New York I call attention to one sentence in the report, page 7, where this statement is made, "With 6,000,000 men engaged in independent farming operations, the probability of a successful monopoly to the public injury is very slight." My principal concern is not in that direction.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Ours is.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. I feel it unfortunate that the farm-relief question should be considered at this time, when under the legislative program as announced, Congress must go along wearing legislative "blind bridles," lest we shy at something. I would like to see the whole road, choose the path that seems best, then go all the way for the farmer.

In addition to the passage of a farm relief bill, framed to promote cooperation, bring about orderly marketing, and care for a reasonable surplus, much more must be done if the farmer is to come into his own.

Here are 16 suggestions:

First. Hasten development of inland waterways.

Second. Provide no further appropriations for reclamation projects until lands now under cultivation have become profitable.

Third. Put Muscle Shoals to work.

Fourth. Strengthen and enforce antitrust laws, and discourage rather than encourage consolidation of great corporations.

Fifth. Revise the tariff to include lowering of schedules on much that the farmer buys, and increase tariffs on various competing agricultural products from other countries.

Sixth. Revise the intermediate credits act, and provide more thorough examination and safeguarding of joint-stock land banks.

Seventh. Prevent any additional Government competition with local banks as would result should proposed increase of maximum individual deposits in postal-savings banks be authorized.

Eighth. Develop plan for planting of trees on unprofitable lands now under cultivation.

Ninth. Amend pure food laws to require more general use of fruit juices rather than substitutes, as in many flavoring extracts and soft drinks.

Tenth. Curb the growing power of privilege.

Eleventh. Regulate grain exchanges.

Twelfth. Safeguard and protect against exploitation valuable water-power sites.

Thirteenth. Provide, in addition to present appropriations for agriculture, funds for mechanic-arts experiment stations in connection with land-grant colleges and universities, to the end that studies may be conducted for the utilization of agricultural wastes and the finding of new uses for agricultural products.

Fourteenth. Authorize a reduced parcel-post rate, including special-delivery charge, on parcels originating on rural routes, thus encouraging from-farm-to-consumer trade.

Fifteenth. Revise revenue system by putting into practice views expressed by Woodrow Wilson, who, in a message to Congress, said: "We have found the main sources from which it (our taxation) must be drawn. I take it for granted that its mainstays will henceforth be the income tax, the excess-profits tax, and estate tax." Thus would those most able to pay, pay most.

Sixteenth. Give the livestock industry a square deal by lessening competition at home and enlarging our foreign markets.

Before taking up more specifically some of the items having to do with the last suggestion, I would say that, to make use of a phrase heard during the last campaign, these 16 points in an agricultural-betterment program, when considered in connection with a proper farm relief bill, might be referred to as a "long-view farm policy."

Without livestock—and I see in this bill but little for the livestock farmer—there can be no permanent agriculture. Agricultural progress wherever found has been among meat-eating peoples. The great nations of the world, those which have left their impress upon civilization, that have shaped history, and have continued through long periods as dominant forces, that have produced men and women of strong bodies, fine mentality, and high character, have not been meatless. Ancient Egyptian records tell of the ox plowing the fields or treading out the grain. Virgil, Pliny, and Cato spoke of the agriculture of their times, an agriculture in which livestock history figured extensively. Even if we go back to the dawn of history in Asia we find there domestic animals, including sheep, goats, oxen, buffalo, and camels. When Columbus discovered America there were no domestic animals on this continent, yet the native American, the Indian, was a meat eater, while game was abundant and great herds of buffalo roamed west of the Mississippi River. The colonists when they landed in what is now Virginia appreciated the value of domestic animals, and by 1627 there were nearly 5,000 cattle in the Colonies.

In Massachusetts, land of the Pilgrims, a special provision was made for cattle, and the hog was successfully introduced. In this connection it is interesting to note that it was in New England that the idea of branding hogs by slitting the ears had its beginning. It is told that the Indians had the habit of stealing hogs from the colonists, butchering them, then selling the meat to the rightful owners. Tiring of this, the ears of all hogs owned by the colonists were marked, perhaps with a "crop and slit" or "underbit." The order then went out that no Indian should be allowed to sell pork unless the entire carcass, including the head, was brought in.

Mr. MANLOVE. I would like to ask my colleague from Missouri if he is intimating that it was the Indians that stole the hogs out in Missouri that made it necessary for us to crop their ears there?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. In the beautiful Ozarks of southern Missouri, where formerly there were great, wide, open ranges, it was necessary to so mark the hogs.

As years went by and the star of empire took its course westward, the path of the pioneer, as Dr. Henry van Dyke has put it, "was greased by the bacon fried on the way." Following the buffalo came great herds of longhorns, cattle with bodies scarcely big enough to bear the brands. Gradually the great ranges were cut up, the blood of Hereford, shorthorn, Angus, and other breeds was introduced, and the longhorn—unwept, but not unhonored and unsung—disappeared. The range-cattle business is no more. It has been said, "It has seen its inception, zenith, and partial extinction within half a century."

Speaking of changes in the cattle business, my mother, who has just celebrated her eightieth birthday anniversary on the old home farm in Missouri, treasures a faded daybook, which was the property of her father, who, while living in what is now West Virginia, drove a herd of some 200 cattle from Hampshire County into New York City, where they were disposed of on foot. These cattle were crossed at Lynchburg, Va., February 23, 1839, which year, it so happens, marked the establishment of the Ravenswood herd in Cooper County, Mo., this herd now being the oldest herd of Shorthorn cattle in America. From Lynchburg the Virginia cattle referred to were driven to Philadelphia, and it is recorded that the expense for lotting and feed was \$390.35. New York was reached on April 1. The last notation of expenses, made one week before, shows \$481.13.

Again I say that there can be no permanent agriculture without livestock. So it will be a dangerous day if the time comes when we exchange prod poles for chopsticks and roasts for rice. In this connection it is encouraging to note that a great chain of restaurants in the United States which sometime ago started in to popularize meat-substitute products has just been forced to change its program.

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague again yield?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MANLOVE. The gentleman referred to his grandfather at one time having driven cattle from Virginia to New York City, but leaves the House, I am sure, in a state of curiosity as to certain details. I think the Members would like to know, if the gentleman can give the information, what those cattle he speaks of sold for.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. I regret that I can not.

About half a dozen years ago the bottom dropped out of the cattle market, and millions of head had to be disposed of at a loss. Referring to the present cattle situation, especially as it relates to the farm question, the Kansas City Star says: "Using cattle alone as an example, there has been a reduction of more than 15,000,000 head in the last 10 years. If sufficient land were taken out of the production of cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco, the four crops which cause distress, to graze 15,000,000 cattle, it would require at least 60,000,000 acres of land for pasture, forage crops, and grain. To handle 15,000,000 cattle would not only bring about a reduced acreage of crops but would furnish a further market for the crops produced on the remaining acreage."

What can be done for the livestock industry?

First. I would render no further aid to what might be referred to as a "fool fad." I refer to the encouragement on the part of the Federal Government of the raising of reindeer in Alaska. To do so is to bring about added competition to livestock growers in the States with the danger that it may further decrease our herds and thus add to the acreage of wheat and other crops. A recent press item is to the effect that high officials connected with the United States Army are studying a proposal to add reindeer meat from Alaska to the Army ration, the claim being made that it apparently can be delivered at the Army posts at less cost than beef.

Second. Legislation looking to livestock markets should be carefully considered. "Hog prices," we are told, "are now controlled by a dual marketing system, about 41 per cent classed as directs, and 59 per cent through the open market." The same writer comments, "The hog market has become about the most elusive thing in livestock channels; it is up one day and down the next. Shipping and order buying trade is the only source of strength. Packers seem to be indifferent buyers on the open market but continue to keep a large number moving directly from concentration yards." This brings up the entire question of order buying, which must be considered in connection with livestock market legislation.

Third. Somewhere in this bill, or in separate legislation, there should be a provision for livestock representatives in foreign countries, just as commerce now has its representatives. This has special reference to the registered or purebred livestock business. In addition to representatives, our Government should

maintain in Brazil, the Argentine Republic, and perhaps in other countries view herds of the best animals obtainable in the United States. These suggestions if followed should result in prospective buyers of breeding stock coming to America instead of purchasing elsewhere.

As to foreign competition in the livestock industry, it has been held that but for present quarantine regulations further legislation would be necessary. If so, such legislation should be provided.

Finally, the influential metropolitan press could go far toward bringing about a better understanding between agriculture and industry. The two great groups are not necessarily antagonistic; rather are they dependent one upon the other, yet lack of understanding has led to lack of sympathy, if not to positive antagonism. Too frequently the farmer is misrepresented and held up as a chronic kicker, when the facts are that of all the men in the world he is the most optimistic. He plows on, plants on, cultivates on, and hopes on.

A syndicated newspaper article is typical of the kind I have in mind as misrepresenting the farmer. It is headed "The Chronic Bear." I quote but three or four sentences:

The farmer is a chronic bear, habitually selling his own market short. He begins with a morning grouch and ends with an evening growl. He kicks at the winter chores when he should be contrasting the short trip to the barn with the long trudge to the subway. He spreads revolt and must expect rebellion.

Repeatedly and almost constantly since farm legislation first claimed the attention of Congress the position of agriculture has been misunderstood, if not actually grossly misrepresented. I suggest that the situation is so serious, as it affects both city and country, that all of us should strive to bring about a better understanding.

This is the task of the farmer,
Would he be nobly great;
To yield to the dreamer's fancy,
And keep his furrows straight.

This is the task of the dreamer,
Be he a master, too;
To follow the farmer's furrow,
And keep his fancy true.

[Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

MR. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I can not, of course, in 15 minutes, attempt reply to all of the various statements with which I differ embodied in the speech of the gentleman who has just preceded me. No one in this House would go further than I toward the enactment of legislation which would be beneficial to the farmers of this country. That much of what the gentleman has proposed would be beneficial is unquestioned; but to take the position that the bill now before us should not be supported by the Members of this House because it does not embody everything in my judgment not in the interest of the farmers of this country, but against their interests.

We have arrived at a situation when a bill has been presented to us coming out of the Committee on Agriculture with a favorable vote of 19 of the 21 members of that committee, and with a report containing this statement:

It is the best program that has yet been offered for the relief of agriculture not only from temporary emergencies, but from the threat of future disasters.

That committee report, as I am informed, was prepared by a subcommittee of five members, and of those five members four, during all my service in the House, have been staunch supporters of the various pieces of farm legislation brought before us.

Now, whether we agree with this bill in every detail and direction is not the point with me. I do believe in it. It is the best bill that has been before the House in one thing at least, viewed from a practical standpoint, and that is, that it is a sound, constructive bill that we know can be enacted into law and put into effect for the benefit of the American farmers this year.

Who can raise any question as to its value in its intended field, although some do claim that it does not go as far as they would like? It does not claim to solve the problem of the farmer in its entirety. If you will carefully read the report

of the committee you will find that they say that it is not intended to solve every problem of the farmer. They agree in their report with the statement made by the President in his message to the House and Senate the other day, to the effect that there are still other directions in which we must move in order to bring about a more complete solution of this farm problem. They agree that there should be progress in reducing the cost of transportation by the development of our inland waterway systems, the great Mississippi Valley system, and the great waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea. They agree that an advantage should be given to agriculture in the adjustment of the tariff and advancement along other lines specified in the statement of the President in his special message. Nobody, least of all the committee, is presenting this bill as a panacea intended to solve all the problems confronting the farmer. It does propose to do one thing, and that is to furnish the means of helping the farmers to solve their own marketing problem so far as the Government can cooperate with the farmer in that solution.

That is what this bill proposes to do. In listening to the debate during the last two days I have been greatly interested in seeing how completely this bill as it has been brought out squares with the statements and the promises made during the campaign by President Hoover at the time of his acceptance speech. I want to quote to you two or three things which have not been put in the RECORD in connection with this debate. He said this:

An outstanding proposal of the party program is the whole-hearted pledge to undertake this reorganization of the marketing system upon sounder and more economical lines.

And that is provided in this bill.

We have already contributed greatly to this purpose by the acts supporting farm cooperatives, the establishment of intermediate credit banks, the regulation of stockyards, public exchanges, and the expansion of the Department of Agriculture. The platform proposes to go much further. It pledges the creation of a Federal farm board of representative farmers to be clothed with authority and resources with which not only to still further aid farmers' cooperatives and pools and to assist generally in solution of farm problems but especially to build up with Federal finance, farm-owned and farmer-controlled stabilization corporations which will protect the farmer from the depressions and demoralization of seasonal gluts and periodical surpluses.

Now, surely I do not need to go into details in a repeated discussion of the provisions of the bill to show that the bill does exactly that thing, the bill as it is now before the House. It creates this farm board; it gives it these broad powers and makes it possible to create that board with a personnel that will be competent, experienced, and able to meet the situation so far as human judgment can meet it.

Then the stabilization corporations. I am pleased by the fact that that has been so fully written into this bill, because I recall that in the first speech I delivered when I was a new Member in my first term I was one of the first ones to call attention to the soundness of the idea of export corporations. These stabilization corporations, approaching the matter from a different angle than was under discussion and consideration at that time, build up the machinery to do that very sort of a thing. Perhaps they do it in a more constructive way than we were able to conceive then, because that was at the beginning of a long national study and discussion, which, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON] so well said, began with a question raised here on the floor as to whether or not there was any farm problem. I remember statements being made here in 1924 that there was no farm problem and that all we had to do was to leave the farmer alone and the thing would work itself out. So the fight that has been made by those of us who have been in this farm fight from the beginning has at least helped to convince the country that there is a farm problem to be met and that it ought to be met constructively. We now have here a sound and constructive bill, which will be accepted by this Congress and which can be enacted into law. It makes the start which must be made.

MR. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. LEAVITT. Yes.

MR. LINTHICUM. I am anxious to get all the information I can on this subject, representing a city district. I want to know how you are going to prevent increased production? As soon as you have set up a board which stabilizes the price of the crops and insures the farmer a high price for his products, how are you going to prevent overproduction?

MR. LEAVITT. You are not going to prevent it by any law which makes overproduction a crime except by the economic law. Of course, we must not have overproduction too extensively. I am not saying that this bill will regulate all overpro-

duction or that this bill alone will necessarily prevent that, but I do believe this, that overproduction will be reduced to the minimum by the formation of these cooperative organizations. Two million farmers are now in cooperative organizations. They are very largely educated along the lines of the damage that comes to them from overproduction. The enactment of this bill into law will enable the more complete organization and extension of these cooperatives and through those organizations much more educational work will be carried on. That is provided for in this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I read in the press this morning where the farmers of Iowa, I think it was, believing that this bill would pass and that prices would be better, were already putting in larger crops than they had ever put in before. How can they take care of that large increase in production. I am very anxious to help the farmer as well as the gentleman is. I was a farm boy myself, but I would like to know how that can be worked out.

Mr. LEAVITT. I am telling the gentleman how it can be worked out to the best advantage; that is, to enact this bill and make it possible to bring about these cooperative movements, have them properly financed, so as to enable them to sell their products in a seller's market, rather than in a buyer's market. All of that can be done without increasing the price to the consumers in the cities, and at the same time, by shortening the spread between the producer and the consumer, it will be greatly to the advantage of the producer. That is what we are hoping to do.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. HUDSON. With these cooperative organizations well managed and with these stabilization corporations, will not the farmers receive information as to what crops to plant and what crops not to plant?

Mr. LEAVITT. That is just the point I have been trying to make.

Mr. HUDSON. If that will not do it I do not know anything that will.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not true, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Maryland, that acreage does not determine the question of surplus; that frequently on a small acreage you will have a larger surplus than you will get in some years on a large acreage because of seasonal and climatic conditions, and that the farmer is unable to regulate definitely just what his production will be; is not that true?

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course, that is true.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But if you plant more acres you will have a greater production.

Mr. LEAVITT. I can not yield further, or my time will be gone. Another thing that was said by the President in his speech of acceptance was this:

Objection has been made that this program—

Referring to the program that we are writing into this bill—as laid down by the party platform may require that several hundred millions of dollars of capital be advanced by the Federal Government without obligation upon the individual farmer. With that objection I have little patience. A nation which is spending ninety billions a year can well afford an expenditure of a few hundred millions for a workable program that will give to one-third of its population their fair share of the nation's prosperity. Nor does this proposal put the Government into business, except so far as it is called upon to furnish initial capital with which to build up the farmer to the control of his own destinies.

Now, without going further into quotations from that speech, this idea is thoroughly carried out, in my judgment, in this bill. It gives to this industry the support it needs in a way that will enable the farmer to control his own destinies. I like particularly that statement of the committee in reporting this bill where they say:

We feel very strongly that the United States both wants and needs an agriculture based upon small farms independently managed so far as possible by their owners.

This is what we are trying to accomplish. We are not trying to build up under this bill simply large food factories that will produce food for the feeding of our population. We are trying to produce food, of course, by making farming profitable, but at the same time I think it equally important in any farm legislation to preserve the individual opportunity of the farmer to make out of his farm his own home.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. LEAVITT. The farmer can come under this bill and secure the benefits, as I firmly believe, that will be brought to him without at any time losing complete control of his own organization, or his own business, or of his own destiny.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. ROMJUE. Does the gentleman see anything in the bill that may discourage men from joining cooperative associations? I noticed in the discussion yesterday that some of the Members on the committee said that the farmer who did not join the cooperative would benefit when the surplus was taken off the market just as much as the farmer who did join the cooperative. I think this is true, and I notice that one of the provisions of the bill provides that wherever they set up machinery for handling the surplus, that loans shall be made by the board not to exceed 80 per cent of the value. If the extent of the loan is only 80 per cent of the value, in case of a loss somebody has to lose the 20 per cent. If I understand the bill correctly, when the limit of the security is reached, if it goes further than the 80 per cent of the actual value of the machinery set up, nobody can suffer that loss except the members of the cooperative, because the other men are not members. I am wondering when the men go into the cooperative and there is a loss in taking care of the surplus, whether the members are to lose the \$20 on the \$100, and whether that will not discourage the men on the outside and cause them to say, "Well, we can get the benefits without suffering any loss and we will stay on the outside and not join."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois rose.

Mr. LEAVITT. A member of the committee has risen and if he desires to answer the gentleman, I will yield to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that the 80 per cent limitation applies to loans for the construction of facilities and not to loans to market crops. That is the only limitation. The board will not lend money to these organizations to construct storage houses and other facilities in excess of 80 per cent of the value.

Mr. ROMJUE. Who puts up the other 20 per cent?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. They will have to get that in some other way.

Mr. ROMJUE. That is the point I am getting at.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. You would not expect the Government to advance the entire 100 per cent for putting up the equipment?

Mr. ROMJUE. I am not quibbling about it, but I am trying to find out who loses. The Government does not lose that 20 per cent because it does not put it up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Then nobody will lose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I can not, of course, yield during this one minute. I simply have asked for it in order to bring my own remarks to a close. I have been very pleased to yield, because I feel this should be a discussion of questions and answers, as well as statements coming as the opinion of some Member; but in closing I want to make this statement:

We understand fully in the State of Montana, where we produce more wheat than any other State in the Union with one exception, where we produce a higher quality of wheat than is produced in any other State—that is, a greater percentage of our wheat is of high enough protein content to bring a premium on the market, and where we do secure a very definite benefit from the tariff to the extent of the protein premium because of the kind of wheat we produce, which is not in surplus but is in shortage—we understand this bill is not intended to solve every problem, but it is intended as an honest effort to enable the farmers to build up their own organization, to carry on their own business more successfully and profitably in the future than in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am authorized by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] to yield 20 minutes out of his time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, we have been here a long time talking about agriculture. Some of us from A. D. 1923 have been urging a relief bill for agriculture.

I came before the Congress at the last session and I urged the Congress to leave out the equalization fee. I urged this because I believed it was expedient at that time to give us a bill.

I want to state to the committee and to the House that this bill is an improvement, a material improvement, upon the other bill; and I want to compliment the chairman by saying that this is one of the most adroitly written reports that has been filed in this House since I have been a Member of the House. I want to say it is a peach of a report—please excuse the slang. [Laughter.] I take it that the chairman wrote the report, and I want to give him proper credit for it, because it is certainly a good one.

I know that the gentleman from Louisiana, Doctor ASWELL, a member of the Committee on Agriculture, used to stand here and fight the equalization fee, and I used to fuss with him and we used to row about the equalization fee; but I want to say to his credit that he has stood four square for a bill without an equalization fee, and he ought to be complimented for his good judgment. As a matter of fact, when I look at his bill and look at this bill, in some of its particulars, I am reminded of what an Irishman said about the trouble at Casey's house. He said, "It is too bad the trouble there is over at Casey's house." The other Irishman said, "What is it?" He said, "One of the twins is dead and they can't tell which one it is." [Laughter.]

There is a lot of psychology, gentlemen, in this country about farm relief. The demagogue and the real statesman have both been talking about helping the farmer so long, until now he is in the situation where he is expecting to be helped.

I tell you that after this special session was called there was a better morale. There is a better morale to-day out in the farming sections of the country than there was before. There is some hope; they are feeling better. They have confidence in view of the fact that the President kept good his promise and called this extra session. They actually believe that they are going to get some relief. I hope they do, and I think they will.

The truth about it is—and the whole truth has not been told about this farm relief business—there are some fellows out in the farming districts that you can not relieve because they are not working enough. [Laughter.]

Here is the situation: There are many fine, splendid, hard-working farmers who on account of the economic situation have not been able to make any money. As a whole the agricultural situation is bad. Why? Because since the war there has been economic changes of world conditions and in this country. Inventions and machinery have changed, and are changing, the economic conditions. You can not make a progressive farmer out of men who are lagging behind and not trying to take hold of modern methods by legislation. You can not make him progressive by economic plans through legislation. You have got to give him a chance and then educate him how to change his whole method of farming to meet new conditions. The boys will not stay at home on the farm any more because it is unprofitable. You talk about the high cost of living in the city—there are too many people in the city and they will not live at home and cook. The women all stay in apartment houses and eat at the restaurants and that makes the high cost of living in the city. [Laughter.]

A few of the farmers in this country are sitting down by the roadside waiting for this legislation thinking that it will come along and give them some money. They are going to be woefully disappointed.

Now what does this bill do? It does many things. The main thing that the bill will do will be to assist to educate the farmer into the necessity of joining the cooperative organizations. You have a lot of farmers in this country who would not join any kind of an organization because they are independent; they can not be forced to join, and they will not, no matter if it is for their own benefit. But you can educate them to the necessity of joining cooperative associations for marketing. The farmers are isolated—they are not like business men in the cities. The trouble is when the farmer joins the association, as they say, he will not stay joined. You can organize a farmers union and establish a gin at the cross roads. The farmers will join and every one will promise to gin his cotton at the gin. But some independent fellow establishes a gin right across the road and cuts the price 10 cents a hundred. Then the farmers will go to the other gin and leave the farmers' gin.

There is no more a spreading chestnut tree under which the smithy stands. That has gone now and its place has been taken by the garage or the oil station and the automobile.

What does this bill do? I want to give it to you just as the man on the farm or on the street would see the bill. I was invited by my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] to come before this committee, but I was so busy that I did not have a chance to get here, and I left it to the committee to write the bill, and here is the way the bill looks

to me. First, there is paragraph (b) of section 3, and that defines a single commodity. Cooperatives in handling that commodity are invited to establish a committee of seven, two of whom must be experts in processing or experienced in processing and handling that product. That is in order to give them some experienced men. Section 4 is the educational program, to study matters of supply and demand both foreign and domestic and to study overproduction and its prevention.

This bill has to go hand in hand with a tariff bill that protects agricultural products as against those that are imported into this country. The bill is designed to go hand in hand with a tariff bill of that kind, and whenever you put a tariff on agricultural products that are imported into the country and protect the price so that the farmer can make a profit in raising those products, then your overproduction is going to be diminished, because he will take his land and produce those things made possible by reason of protection under the tariff.

Mr. RANKIN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that in order to make this bill effective you would have to have a tariff on those commodities?

Mr. McKEOWN. This bill goes hand in hand and anticipates that there must be a protective tariff on agricultural products that are imported into this country; that is what I say.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose there is not such a bill, then would it be effective?

Mr. McKEOWN. If there is not, of course, it is going to be a disappointment in the matter of overproduction, because the fellow who raises cotton will still have to raise cotton until he learns common sense, like your people down in Mississippi, and goes to raising hogs and cows and selling milk.

Mr. RANKIN. At the very best the bill would not benefit the man who raises cotton.

Mr. McKEOWN. He can benefit even under this insurance plan, and I will show you how.

Mr. STEVENSON. If they begin to raise cows in Mississippi, and we are raising hogs in South Carolina, as well as mules, what is going to happen to the fellow who raises mules in Missouri and cows in Kansas? He will have competition.

Mr. McKEOWN. Oh, yes; but you are not going to raise as good mules down there as they do in Missouri and Kansas.

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, I heard talk here a little while ago about this bill taking the kick out of the Missouri mule.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. I want to know what the effect will be upon the farmer who owns cotton, who joins this association. We will presume that the gentleman is a farmer, although that may be a violent presumption, and that he has 10 bales of cotton that he wants to enter this association with. What will he receive on those 10 bales of cotton that are worth \$1,000 when he puts it in this marketing association?

Mr. McKEOWN. He will receive perhaps \$900.

Mr. GLOVER. Is there a provision in the bill to that effect?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; he will receive probably 90 per cent of the market price of the cotton on the day of delivery.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman please turn to that provision in the bill?

Mr. McKEOWN. This is my construction of the way the insurance feature of the bill will work out. First, I want to say that to the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Bledsoe, is due the credit for this insurance feature. One of the chief objections to the cooperative marketing of cotton to-day is the fact that when the farmer takes his cotton into the market to deliver it to the association, the association is not able to pay him enough money on the cotton that day, and he has to carry too much margin in his cotton. Under this bill he would be permitted to get at least 90 per cent of the market price on that day.

Mr. ARENTZ. Oh, this bill does not give 80 per cent of the value of the product at all. The stabilization corporation will be financed by this board, and the board will advance 80 per cent of the cost of merchandising facilities, but not on the product itself.

Mr. McKEOWN. Let us have an understanding about this.

Mr. ARENTZ. The cooperative associations will be financed for marketing facilities, but they will not be financed on the product itself.

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not want any misunderstanding, because I am taking the bill as you introduced it here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. The 80 per cent provision here applies to loans made by the board to cooperative associations

for the construction of facilities, and there is no provision as to what per cent the association itself may advance to the growers.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I understand your 80 per cent provision, but here is a proposition: If this insurance feature is to be worth anything at all you must be willing to give them the market price, or at least 85 or 90 per cent, at time of delivery. What is the use in insuring it at all if you do not do that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Bledsoe, who is the man most responsible for that feature in this bill, said the corporation should advance 90 per cent of the value of the cotton.

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

Mr. MCKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. What assurance has the cotton grower that they will advance any specific amount on that?

Mr. MCKEOWN. This is the provision: The Government will make the insurance. If private individuals will carry the insurance the Government will not have to carry it. The insurance would be the price it would bring that day on the market.

Mr. PATTERSON. Suppose the cooperative association should decide on the specific amount they would loan.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Suppose you sell a bale of cotton, 500 pounds. They pay you \$100. They have got to be sure that they will get 20 cents a pound, otherwise they could not pay you the whole amount. They could pay you \$90 and hold \$10. They insure a bale of cotton at 20 cents a pound. They carry it for six months and sell it for 22 cents a pound. Then they will take out the carrying charges and pay you the difference between the increased amount and the original amount. On the other hand, if cotton went to 18 cents you would get only \$100.

Mr. PATTERSON. The producer gets \$100?

Mr. MCKEOWN. Yes; less the cost.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MCKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If all the agricultural producers in the country would try to get 80 per cent of the value of their products, how long would this \$500,000,000 last? They would have to go out of business in a week.

Mr. MCKEOWN. They can get all the money they want now. These cooperative associations pay 6 per cent and issue certificates each month. You would not have to borrow any from the Government. The Government would not get hurt.

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

Mr. MCKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. To clear up the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] when he spoke about the depression of the price on the New York Cotton Exchange by certain people in New York in order to deflate the insurance loans, it should be remembered that there will be millions of dollars back of the board. They will increase the price to the point they think it should be. The cotton grower will be benefited. The stabilization corporation would be spending \$500,000,000 for boosting the price rather than the Government.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I can not yield further. Here is what takes place when they go into insurance. Suppose the exchange in New York does as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] suggests it might do, cut the price down to 15 cents. What will happen if you insure this cotton at 15 cents and it goes to 25 cents, as it ought to go? The farmer will get the difference between 15 cents and 25 cents less carrying charges.

Mr. PATTERSON. Suppose the insurance organization insures it and it drops 2 or 3 cents less a pound?

Mr. MCKEOWN. The insurance company pays the loss. The insurance comes out of the cooperative company that has insured the cotton. The Government does not lose anything.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. TILSON as Speaker pro tempore having assumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDRESS OF HON. FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA, OF PORTO RICO

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a speech delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA] at the Conference on International Relations at Elmira, N. Y., on April 16, 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PORTO RICO AND ITS RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Porto Rico was discovered and named by Columbus in 1493. Ponce de León explored and colonized it in 1508. It is the fourth largest of the Greater Antilles, with the Atlantic Ocean on the north and the Caribbean Sea on the south. It has an area of 3,435 square miles and is larger than the State of Delaware but not so large as Connecticut. The climate is ideal, being the most healthful of the Western Hemisphere in the Tropics. Through the middle of the island, from east to west, runs a range of mountains with an altitude of from 1,500 to 3,750 feet, and is cultivable to the summits.

The story of Porto Rico is a narrative of centuries of historical events and romance. San Juan, the capital, was a settlement half a century before St. Augustine, Fla., the oldest town in the United States, was founded. When the English settled at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, the residents of San Juan were preparing to celebrate their first centennial. More than two and a half centuries before the United States began to build the White House in Washington, there was started in San Juan the construction of the governor's palace.

For more than 400 years the island remained under the rule of Spain. As the result of the Spanish-American War, Spain ceded Porto Rico to the United States. At the commencement of the American occupancy, the population of Porto Rico was about 900,000. It now is about 1,500,000, three-fourths of which are white, mostly of Spanish descent.

In a decree of November 25, 1897, Spain granted self-government to Porto Rico. The King appointed the governor who had very limited powers. He reigned, but did not govern. This governor ruled through a cabinet which was composed of Porto Ricans. The members of the Senate and House were also Porto Ricans, and the administration in its entirety was in the hands of natives of the island. Sixteen representatives and three senators, having voice and vote, and elected by the people, represented the island in the Spanish Parliament.

In July 25, 1898, the American forces took possession of the island, and after two years of military rule, the United States Congress in 1900 passed the Foraker Act, which temporarily provided revenues and civil government for Porto Rico. This act, however, did not grant the Porto Ricans a government as liberal as the one given them under the Spanish decree of 1897.

The executive power was vested in a governor, a secretary, an attorney general, a treasurer, an auditor, a commissioner of the interior, and a commissioner of education, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The six officers last named, together with five other persons appointed by the President, constituted an executive council.

The legislative power was vested in a legislative assembly, consisting of two houses, one of the executive council appointed by the President and the other a house of delegates, consisting of 35 members, elected from seven districts, each district having five members. The legislative authority vested "shall extend to all matters of a legislative character not locally inapplicable." All laws enacted were to be reported to Congress, "which reserves the power and authority, if deemed advisable, to annul the same." The whole administration was controlled by a governor appointed by the President.

And it is since the enactment of the Foraker Act that the status of Porto Rico has been a subject of discussion and still remains unsettled to the present day.

The treaty of Paris of 1899, in article 11, provided that "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by Congress."

For the first time in the history of the United States the civil rights and political status of the inhabitants of the ceded territories were expressly left to the determination of Congress. Former treaties of cession all provided that the inhabitants of the ceded territories should ultimately become citizens of and be incorporated into the United States. The treaty contained no promise or declaration regarding the political status of the inhabitants of the country affected by the cession, but left the matter entirely to be decided by Congress.

As an explanation of this provision, without precedent in the history of the nation, and therefore unique in its character, the American representatives at the peace negotiations, leading to the treaty of Paris, in replying to the representatives of the Spanish Kingdom, said:

"The Congress of a nation which never enacted a law oppressive or detrimental of the rights of residents within its dominion and whose laws guarantee the greatest liberty compatible with the conservation of property, surely can be trusted not to depart from its well-established practice in dealing with the inhabitants of these islands."

But Congress, far from definitely determining the status of the inhabitants of the island, as contemplated in the treaty of peace, refrained from granting American citizenship to Porto Rico, and under the Foraker Act created a political body, composed of American citizens residing in Porto Rico, and citizens of Porto Rico owing allegiance to and entitled to the protection of the United States. The creation

of this body politic, of a purely local character, without international signification and deprived of American citizenship, placed Porto Rico in a peculiar and anomalous position and left her inhabitants without a fatherland and with a citizenship unrecognized by the law of nations.

Although constantly exposed to the humiliation of being considered as a man without a country, the citizen of Porto Rico, while traveling abroad, was entitled to the protection of the United States and had no difficulties from an international point of view. The treaty of peace made Porto Rico foreign to every nation but the United States. The island was under the sovereignty of the United States and our citizens were protected abroad in their individual rights just as if they were members of the American family.

It was not in an international sense but in a constitutional or domestic sense that Porto Rico has been daily confronted with a series of complications in her relations with the United States.

The construction of the Foraker Act was the cause of constant discussions and conflicting opinions regarding the scope of some of its provisions. The United States Supreme Court was finally resorted to and a decision was rendered in the case of *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U. S. 244, of far-reaching effect and importance in the creation of a governmental policy for the newly acquired territories.

Section 3 of this act providing for the payment of certain duties, both on goods coming into the United States or from the United States into Porto Rico, was vigorously assailed as unconstitutional, on the ground that it was in conflict with Article I, section 8, of the Constitution. It was argued that this section, which provides that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States," was applicable to the territories as well as to the States and that Porto Rico, being an integral part of the United States could not be excluded from its effects.

It is obvious that there were two fundamental questions presented to the court in this exceptionally important case: First, whether the section of the Constitution quoted above was applicable to the territories; and, second, whether Porto Rico was an integral part of the United States.

Had the first question been answered in the negative, no further consideration of the case would have been necessary. But only Justice Brown seemed to hold that this particular section of the Constitution did not extend to the territories. The other justices did not share the same views and the question of the status of Porto Rico was elaborately discussed in the conflicting opinions handed down in this case.

Justices White, Brown, and Harlan were prominent in the expression of their views. Justice Harlan's dissenting opinion was particularly notable for the vigor of its arguments and the courage of his convictions.

The constitutionality of the Foraker Act was maintained by a majority of the judges, but not following the same line of reasoning adhered to by Justice Brown in delivering the opinion of the court.

Justice Brown held that "the island of Porto Rico is a Territory appurtenant and belonging to the United States, but not a part of the United States within the revenue clauses of the Constitution." He seems to hold that the island, like other Territories, is not a part of the United States because our country was not a State of the Union, but merely a Territory. His opinion maintains that "upon the ratification of the treaty with Spain, Porto Rico ceased to be a foreign country and became a domestic Territory of the United States," as was held by him in *DeLima v. Bidwell* (182 U. S. 1). He expresses his inability to acquiesce in the assumption that a Territory may be at the same time both foreign and domestic, but in *Downes v. Bidwell* it seems that he departs, to a certain extent, from his own expressed views. The least that can be said, not to blame him of inconsistency, is that he amplifies his conclusions in this case in an attempt to clarify his position. His opinion was a decisive factor in the final determination of the case, as the court was divided in two equal groups of judges, with Mr. Justice Brown holding the balance of power. In joining the group which followed the views of Mr. Justice White he was practically responsible for the establishment of a doctrine with which he was not entirely in accord. I refer to the doctrine of nonincorporation, first enunciated by Mr. Justice White and now a settled doctrine, as evinced by subsequent decisions of the court.

This doctrine of Mr. Justice White is not easy to define. It classifies Territories into incorporated and unincorporated. Mr. Justice Brown seemed to think in his concurrent opinion in *Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 516, 531) that an accurate definition of the phrase "incorporated territory" has never been formulated. The same applies to the even more complicated phrase "unincorporated territory." It may be said that incorporated Territories are those which have become part of the United States proper, and not merely a part of its domain, and which are entitled to the benefits of the Constitution, and held to be as much a part of the United States as the several States of the Union, while unincorporated Territories are those which have not been made part of the United States and to which Federal legislation does not uniformly extend.

In the opinion of Mr. Justice White the treaty-making power has been always deemed to be devoid of authority to incorporate Territories

into the United States without the assent, expressed or implied, of Congress. When the treaty of cession stipulates for incorporation and citizenship under the Constitution such agreements by the treaty-making powers are only promises depending for their fulfillment on the future action of Congress.

The learned judge holds that "the expressed purpose of the treaty of Paris was not only to leave the status of the Territory to be determined by Congress, but to prevent the treaty from operating to the contrary."

In his judgment, the expressed or implied acquiescence by Congress in the treaty in adopting the Foraker Act "can not import that a result was brought about which the treaty itself could not produce." In addition he says, "The provision of the act by which the duty here in question was imposed, taken as a whole, seemed to me plainly to manifest the intention of Congress that for the present, at least, Porto Rico is not to be incorporated into the United States."

In conflict with the views of Mr. Justice Brown, Mr. Justice White considers Porto Rico to be American in an international sense but foreign to the United States in a domestic sense. The following are the conclusions arrived at by the eminent judge in his concurring opinion:

"The result of what has been said is that whilst in an international sense Porto Rico was not a foreign country, since it was subject to the sovereignty of and was owned by the United States, it was foreign to the United States in a domestic sense, because the island had not been incorporated into the United States but was merely appurtenant thereto as a possession."

Justices Shiras and McKenna concurred with Mr. Justice White. Mr. Justice Gray seemed to hold the same views, but although only three if not four of the judges accepted the doctrine expounded by Mr. Justice White, the case of *Dorr v. United States* (195 U. S. 138, 143) shows that his opinion has become the settled law of the court.

In *Kopel v. Bingham* (211 U. S. 468, 477) the Supreme Court, speaking by Chief Justice Fuller, said: "It may be justly asserted that Porto Rico is a completely organized Territory, although not a Territory incorporated into the United States." This doctrine was reaffirmed in the case of *American Railroad of Porto Rico v. Didricksen* (227 U. S. 145) and in *Porto Rico v. Rosaly* (227 U. S. 270, 274).

This is the position which Porto Rico occupies in her relations with the United States according to the decisions of the Supreme Court in construing the Foraker Act. No final determination of our status was contemplated by the law. The transitory character of the act shows very plainly that it was the intention of Congress to establish a provisional government in Porto Rico pending the decision of the final status of the island.

The temporary character of the law was emphasized by its closing section. It provided for the appointment by the President of a commission to compile and revise the laws of Porto Rico, and to frame and report "such legislation as may be necessary to make a simple, harmonious, and economical government; establish justice and secure its prompt and efficient administration; inaugurate a general system of education and public instruction; provide buildings and funds therefor; equalize and simplify taxation and all the methods of raising revenue; and make all other provisions that may be necessary to secure and extend the benefits of a republican form of government to all the inhabitants of Porto Rico."

But the Foraker Act was in force in Porto Rico for a period of 17 years, notwithstanding its title and its purpose "temporarily to provide a civil government for Porto Rico." In 1917 a new organic act was adopted by Congress in substitution for the Foraker Act.

The most important changes in this law were the election by the people of all the members of the legislature, the appointment by the governor of four members of his cabinet, with the advice and consent of the insular senate, and the granting of American citizenship. The faculties of the executive were increased under this law, as he was invested with the absolute veto power not granted in the Foraker Act. The governor has entire control in the preparation of the budget and can eliminate any item approved by the legislature, his decision being final.

The granting of American citizenship to Porto Rico was interpreted by many as an expressed determination by Congress of the final status of the island. The Porto Ricans being American citizens, it was argued, can not be foreign to the United States in a domestic or constitutional sense. The doctrine expounded by Justice White in *Downes v. Bidwell* can not be applied any longer after the granting of American citizenship. The Federal court of Porto Rico in an elaborate decision held that the island was incorporated into the United States. The Supreme Court of Porto Rico arrived at the same conclusion in a similar case. Both cases were decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, reversing the judgment of the Federal and Supreme Courts of Porto Rico upon the authority of Mr. Justice White's doctrine in *Downes v. Bidwell*.

In accordance with this decision the status of Porto Rico under the Foraker Act did not suffer any modification or alteration under the new law. We still remain a possession foreign in one sense and domestic in another. The most important case to be considered by the

Supreme Court after the repealing of the Foraker Act was that of *Balzae v. Porto Rico*, which was decided in October, 1921. In this case, Chief Justice Taft, in delivering the opinion of the court, adhered to the doctrine of Mr. Justice White in *Downes v. Bidwell*, which had become the settled law of the court. Speaking of the rights of the Porto Ricans to the protection of the United States, the Chief Justice said:

"They had a right to expect, in passing under the dominion of the United States, a status entitling them to the protection of their sovereign. In theory and in law they had it as citizens of Porto Rico, but it was an anomalous status, or seemed to be so, in view of the fact that those who owed and rendered allegiance to the other great world powers were given the same designation and status as those living in their respective home countries, so far as protection against foreign injustice went."

Referring to the incorporation of Alaska, Chief Justice Taft said:

"But Alaska was a very different case from that of Porto Rico. It was an enormous territory very sparsely settled and offering opportunity for immigration and settlement by American citizens. It was on the American continent and within easy reach of the then United States. It involved none of the difficulties which incorporation of Porto Rico presents."

It seems clear in the mind of Chief Justice Taft that Alaska offers opportunities for settlement by Americans which Porto Rico does not. But is not Porto Rico settled by American citizens since the enactment of the new organic law? Is there any difference between Americans born in Porto Rico and Americans born in the mainland? The meaning of the language used by Chief Justice Taft is easily understood, but it is not so easy to explain from a legal point of view. There is some difference between mental equality and legal equality. Under the law, an American citizen born in Porto Rico enjoys the same rights as an American citizen born in the mainland. But there exists, and probably always will exist, a mental disposition to differentiate between American citizens of continental United States and Porto Rico. I mention the words of Chief Justice Taft with the only purpose of adducing an additional argument to show the peculiarity of our position, but not as a criticism of the reasons he assigns for the nonincorporation of Porto Rico.

Let us further quote from the opinion of the Chief Justice:

"We need not dwell on another consideration which requires us not lightly to infer from acts thus easily explained on other grounds, an intention to incorporate in the Union these distant ocean communities of a different origin and language from those of our continental people. Incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood. Without, in the slightest degree, intimating an opinion as to the wisdom of such a policy—for that is not our province—it is reasonable to assume that when such a step is taken it will be begun and taken by Congress deliberately and with clear declaration of purpose and not left a matter of mere inference or construction."

This is the position we are in after 31 years of American administration. The failure of Congress to determine the status of Porto Rico at the time of the enactment of the Foraker Act was a sort of disappointment to the people of the island, but the injustice that such failure involved was ameliorated by the transitory character of the act. There may be some excuse or justification to postpone temporarily the determination of the status of a newly acquired territory, as it was done with Porto Rico under the Foraker Act, but there is no justification to indefinitely keep a country in such anomalous and arbitrary position as is being done under the Jones Act. Because of the temporary character of our first organic law we were justifiably in expecting at any moment complete justice at the hands of Congress. But now under the Jones Act it is not easy to predict when we will be able to convince Congress that the time has arrived to right this wrong.

The solution of this problem should not be delayed any further. The continuance of this situation only creates confusion, misunderstanding, misgiving, animosity, prejudice. Just at this time when the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is considering tariff legislation, powerful interests have appeared before this committee urging discrimination against Porto Rico because we are simply a possession of the United States. The American Farm Bureau Federation, through its representative in Washington, asked that Porto Rico be treated as foreign for tariff purposes. The Legislatures of Wisconsin and Wyoming adopted resolutions indorsing the views of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The Delegate from Hawaii claimed that the sugar from Porto Rico is not domestic but foreign. Even in Congress, when legislation for our country is considered, there are some Members who do not hesitate to apply the word "foreign" to the island.

The suggestion that Porto Rico be treated as a foreign country for tariff purposes shows complete ignorance of our condition and of our legal relations with the United States. Porto Rico has no right to enact her own tariff laws. Our organic law is different in this respect from that of the Philippine Islands. The Filipino Legislature may, with the approval of the President, enact its own tariff law. Porto

Rico, deprived of this right, has to abide by the provisions in the tariff law in force in the United States. We are paying the high prices prevailing in the United States on account of the tariff. We are the largest consumers in this country among the outlying Territories and possessions. Our commerce is almost exclusively with the mainland. This Nation, being rich and prosperous, can bear the high cost of living, but the poor people of Porto Rico are unable to meet the burdens of an expensive life. There is no reciprocity in the tariff relations of our island with the United States. It is true that sugar and tobacco are protected, but it can hardly be said that the country is benefited by a tariff system which has encouraged the creation of big corporations controlling thousands of acres of land and whose absent stockholders draw heavy dividends from their Porto Rican estates.

Economically, we are practically slaves. Under the present system of government Porto Rico may become in a not distant future a factory controlled by one or several industrial monarchs residing on the continent.

We are asking protection for our products, including sugar and tobacco. This protection should not be denied by Congress, especially when our hands are bound by the tariff system of the United States. I believe that this economic problem of Porto Rico deserves most serious consideration, and some plan must be worked out whereby the benefits derived by protection will accrue to all the people of Porto Rico and not to a favored few, as is now the case.

I honestly believe that the determination of our status is a necessary step, both politically and economically, for the solution of the problems of the island. It will be remembered that the Foraker Act in its closing section provided for the appointment of a commission to investigate the several activities of the government of Porto Rico, "and make all other provisions that may be necessary to secure and extend the benefits of a republican form of government to all the inhabitants of Porto Rico."

This provision is very important because it embodies a promise which is still unfulfilled. Congress has neither decided the status of the island nor granted to her inhabitants the republican form of government contemplated by our first organic law.

Under the Jones Act the Governor of Porto Rico, appointed by the President, enjoys extraordinary powers. It is true that we have a legislative assembly elected by the people, but this legislative body can be converted by the executive into a mere debating society, as he has the absolute power of veto, prepares the budget, and can eliminate any item approved by the legislative assembly. As the decision of the executive is final, he practically makes the budget and controls all the finances of the government of Porto Rico. In addition to his executive authority he has extraordinary powers to prevent legislative action. The attorney general, appointed by the President, is the head of the administration of justice, and the justices of the supreme court are also presidential appointees. The auditor, who has also extraordinary powers, is appointed by the President, as well as the commissioner of education. The people of Porto Rico have no voice in the selection of the heads of the executive and judicial departments, and the legislative body, which is the only one elected by the people, has very limited powers. Is this a republican form of government? Let us quote from the opinion of Mr. Justice Brown in the case of *Downes v. Bidwell*:

"Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government,' Article IV, section 4, United States Constitution, by which we understand, according to the definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by them,' Congress did not hesitate in the original organization of the Territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican State of America, and to vest the legislative power either in a governor and council or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by vote of the people."

Justice Harlan, in his dissenting opinion in the same case, says:

"Monarchical and despotic governments, unrestrained by written constitutions, may do with newly acquired territories what this Government may not do consistently with our fundamental law. To say otherwise is to concede that Congress may, by action taken outside of the Constitution engraft upon our republican institutions a colonial system such as exists under monarchical governments. Surely such a result was never contemplated by the fathers of the Constitution. If that instrument had contained a word suggesting the possibility of a result of that character it would never have been adopted by the people of the United States. The idea that this country may acquire territories anywhere upon the earth, by conquest or treaty, and hold them as mere colonies or provinces—the people inhabiting them to enjoy only

such rights as Congress chooses to accord them—is wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius as well as with the words of the Constitution."

It is unnecessary to cite any other authority to prove that the government established in Porto Rico is not republican in its form. The supreme power does not reside in the whole body of the people and is not exercised by representatives elected by them. We are still expecting the fulfillment of the promise contained in the Foraker Act. We are waiting for the final definition of our status. We are incorporated and unincorporated. Incorporated in an international sense, unincorporated in a domestic sense. Statehood seems an impossibility. Yet no responsible government is granted by Congress to the people of Porto Rico. As there are no probabilities of statehood if we continue indefinitely under the present status, the enjoyment of an elective government will never be secured by the people of the island.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not criticizing the doctrine on nonincorporation. I am not prepared to deny or admit the wisdom of such a policy. But it seems to me that we are entitled to know what Congress has in mind regarding the future of our country. If Porto Rico is going to be a State of the Union, or a full self-governing dominion, or an independent nation, it should be so stated in plain and common language. We do not know the position we at present occupy. We are ignorant of our fate. We are unable to foresee what the future has in store for us, what is the path we are going to tread. It is hard to understand how the citizens of Porto Rico can be individually domestic and collectively foreign. Individually the Porto Ricans are American citizens, both at home and abroad, and enjoy all the rights inherent to American citizenship throughout the United States. But once these individual unities join the Porto Rican family and form a collective body this aggregation composed of American citizens becomes foreign to the United States in a domestic sense.

The British Dominions are part of the British Empire. They enjoy full self-governing powers. They are their own sovereigns, control their own affairs, and feel happy and satisfied. They are not discriminated against. This is the policy established and developed in outlying dominions by an old monarchy of Europe. Can not the great Republic of America, or the American empire, as it was called by Chief Justice Marshall, formulate and establish in the outlying territories a policy which will be in harmony with the principles of democracy and justice, and secure for these territories a republican form of government? Does the Constitution prevent the adoption of such a policy? It does not seem fair to use the Constitution as a block to deny what is right and as an arm to do what is wrong. The power to acquire territory does not authorize the United States, under the Constitution, to keep the countries acquired indefinitely under the flag without giving them a permanent and decent status and a government republican in its form. Notwithstanding, it has been done in utter disregard of the spirit of the fundamental law of the land. Why not work out a constructive policy which will secure a stable and free government in these outlying territories within the jurisdiction of the United States? Is this impossible?

Let me quote, in conclusion, from Hon. John K. Richards, Solicitor General of the United States under President McKinley's administration:

"Is the Constitution a stumblingblock or a trap, caught in which we shall excite the pity of our friends and the derision of our foes? I refuse to believe so. The Constitution is not a mere declaration of denials. It creates a Nation to which was intrusted the full power asserted in the Declaration of Independence—to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." When it conferred power, it took care not to cripple action. It still remains the most perfect instrument ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man, under which we are armed for every emergency and able to cope with every condition."

The path of duty is plain. May we not walk in it?

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN H. KERR

MR. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and print in the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague Judge JOHN H. KERR, of North Carolina, at the annual meeting of the North Carolina Pine Association, held in the city of Norfolk, Va., on the 21st day of March, 1929. The subject of this address is The Conservation of Our Natural Resources, and is a subject of both political and economic significance and should engage the attention of every lawmaker and every intelligent citizen of the Republic.

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

CONSERVATION OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, the subject which you have allowed me to choose and discuss before you to-day is one which, in the light of history, necessarily engages the serious thought and the su-

preme intelligence of this and all other nations. Civilization demands greater comforts for human life and as our standards of living and dealings with each other approach our higher ideals we necessarily draw larger upon our material and spiritual resources. It is in respect to the conservation of these natural resources, both material and spiritual, that I use this opportunity to address this body which so well represents the true conservators of America's power and who are the very actors or should be in its accomplishment.

I know very well that what I shall say will run parallel with the thought of each of you, and I doubt if I shall be able to uncover any new territory in this problem which wraps up our national destiny.

The miraculous growth of the United States of America should not only stimulate our pride but it should arouse our sense of responsibility. Ours is a nation which has for 150 years been organized under one form of political entirety, it is a pure democracy, its laws are made and are executed by the consent of the governed, its success is vindicated in the fact that although it covers but 6 per cent of the area of the world and has but 7 per cent of the world's population, it controls more than one-half of the world's business and economic activity and its political power is almost as great. The time has arrived when no international question is finally determined unless it has the approval of this Nation, and what is even more significant, the moral attitude of every other civilized nation is determined by the standard of this Republic. Our assets exceed the assessed worth of the whole British Empire with France, Germany, Italy, and Russia thrown in for good measure. And almost every penny of it was created by the descendants of European refugees whom necessity introduced to opportunity—a lady of many aliases, including "natural resources," "inventiveness," and "perseverance," and this lady is still making dates at the old stand with ambition, with shrewdness, and with confidence. And I am happy to inform you that in our endeavor to minimize ignorance and bring our civilization to higher standards we have eliminated the problem of race assimilation, and we are nationally committed to the sole problem, in so far as this question is concerned, of bringing those who are now American citizens to higher standards of human life and activity. This is based upon the assumption that national integrity must precede world redemption.

Let us not forget that as men become more intelligent the future means more to them, and as they become more moral it means self-control and ability to sacrifice the present for the future. Every step forward in civilization means increased regard for the interest of the future.

When we recount the courage, the audacity, and the accomplishment of this Nation, the spirit of which is indefinable, I think I can put my finger upon the source of this inspiration. For centuries the human race believed that divine inspiration rested in a few only; the result was blind faith in religious hierarchy, the divine rights of kings. Disillusioned of this belief, Americanism insists upon the firm faith that there is a divine spark in every human heart and that this can be awakened. It is the awakening of this spark and the truth of this assumption which, in my opinion, largely accounts for our position in world affairs. And may we now venture to hope that this divine spark in every American which has stimulated us to unparalleled material achievement has also sounded the alarm and reminded us that we are also consuming resources which are exhaustible, and when these are gone we may yet come to a period of national decadence, such as befell Greece, Rome, Spain, and Italy, and which is attributable to the failure to practice conservation. You have only to go to the ruins of the ancient and rich civilizations of Asia Minor, Northern Africa, and elsewhere and there to look upon the unpeopled valleys and the dead and buried cities and then decipher what the law of soil exhaustion, deforestation, national indifference, and exploitation holds in store for every nation which neglects to care for its natural resources. Conservation is not only an economic issue, it is a moral issue; it is sinful to waste and this indulgence will lead inevitably to reckless disregard of all human and divine law. And it is equally sinful not to equip the coming generations with power to produce wealth; we are charged with a dual duty both to care for what we have and to provide for another generation to make further improvements, and unless the intelligent business man and the man who has profited because of his opportunities make good his responsibility, then society acting through its State or Government must take care of the future. The *laissez faire* doctrine is destructive.

I would impress upon you that a nation may cease to exist as well by the destruction of its natural resources as by the extinction of its patriotic spirit. When the questions of tariff, taxation, and prohibition which are incidental to a nation's existence and which concern our temporary convenience and which will no doubt be finally adjusted to the satisfaction of a great majority of our people, have been pushed to the background, the question of the economy of our natural resources which constitute and sustain the political, commercial, and social, as well as moral, power of this Nation will still claim attention, for only those nations which develop their natural resources economically and

avoid wanton waste of that which they produce can maintain their power and make secure the continuation of their separate existence.

We have within recent years become to realize that our soil, our coal, our petroleum, our minerals, and our forests are fast becoming depleted. It did appear that they were inexhaustible for a long time, and like the person who never knew the value of that which some one else provided for him we thoughtlessly appropriated everything we could lay our hand to and never stopped to think that we were wasting our national heritage and creating a spirit which would undermine our moral stamina and wreck our Nation upon the seashore of time. I think I can best impress this thought upon you by repeating what a German commissioner, sent by his government to one of our great expositions, said when asked by an American what most impressed him about the United States, was that we were a "nation of butchers," slaughtering the gifts of nature, wasting our forest resources, our mineral treasures, and our soil.

This observation of the intelligent German was inevitable in the light of his teaching: For years the German nation, realizing that its increasing population must be provided with resources through which it could direct and enlarge its economic activities, has taught each generation to "look and see," and a thorough organization, under the direction of the government and in cooperation with every landowner, has cultivated the forest of Germany so as to get a maximum yield, and the reforestation of this nation has been extended suitably in proportion to the arable farm lands and in such compact areas as will best subserve the public interest, and every mineral resource has been exploited in accordance with economic principles. Germany, as well as several other progressive European nations, has for many years been making a sincere endeavor to conserve their natural resources and establish a proper proportion between public and private interests. To draw the line of demarcation between the public and private interests in the gifts of nature has been, and will always be, a serious problem in the matter of national conservation. It will no doubt be more troublesome in America than elsewhere, for the reason we, here in the United States, have always been averse to any effort on the part of our Government to interfere with private business; and then, too, our natural resources have been so great that it is even now hard for many to understand that it has become imperative for us to at once begin the wise and scientific conservation of these resources. Our national existence, as well as our moral influence, in my opinion, rests upon our ability to successfully deal with this ever-outstanding problem.

There are two phases of this subject which I most respectfully submit to your intelligent and patriotic consideration: First, the imminent necessity for a scientific and industrious care for and promotion of every useful natural resource; and, second, a well-defined policy of both private interests and Government activity which shall cooperate in such a way as to secure the very best economic as well as the greatest political and spiritual result.

You can appreciate that I am limited, because of the propriety fitting this occasion, to discuss fully the facts in respect to our waste—yes, the wanton waste of our natural material resources. As I have aforesaid, the question of the conservation of natural resources has long been a matter of necessity in progressive European countries, but in the United States it has not been seriously considered for more than 10 or 12 years. It is true that some of our economists who had studied in Europe have been for many years attempting to direct our attention to the facts that we were ruthlessly destroying our forests and our minerals, and this influence sufficiently alarmed our Government to cause it to create in the Department of Agriculture a Division of Forestry; this was done in 1882, and that distinguished pioneer in this work, Doctor Fernow, was put in charge of this division. Doctor Fernow had studied practical forestry in Germany, and it is largely due to his influence that there was a real awakening to the importance of national conservation in the United States.

Three hundred years ago, when this country began to be settled, there were 800,000,000 acres of standing virgin forest in this area which now constitutes the United States. Of this vast forest 80,000,000 acres have been denuded and now produce nothing whatever, about 150,000,000 acres of this virgin forest still stands and grows unharmed, and about 250,000,000 acres are regrowing a crop of timber. We are now consuming more than three times the growth of our timber each year, and if this continues the complete destruction of our forest is but a matter of a few years.

From available data checked by European experience, under an intense reforestation cooperation we can produce annually as much timber as we consume. This estimate, of course, involves the matter of carefully cutting over our forests and the protection of small growing timber from fire damage and disease, as well as the reforestation of our denuded area, which once grew a magnificent forest and is practically fit for no other purpose. In the United States each year there are more than 50,000 forest fires, and these fires annually burn over more than 16,000,000 acres of forest lands; we actually burn up more than one-seventh of the amount of timber we cut and consume, and almost every one of these fires is started by ignorance and carelessness and is preventable.

We can and doubtless will provide speedily for the conservation of our forests and the production of timber necessary to maintain our present standard of living in the future, and so we can protect our soil and preserve its fertility. These resources can be replaced by the proper cooperation of private and public agencies; the inventive genius and industry of the average American will assist nature in the rehabilitation of these natural resources. We only need to approach the problem at once and lay hold with a proper sense of our duty to our country and our responsibility to mankind. But what of our coal, our iron, our petroleum, and our copper? A scientific survey of these resources discloses that they will soon be exhausted. I use the word "soon" in respect to a nation's life and not the life of an individual or generation, and when these resources are exhausted they can not be replaced. It is estimated that our present consumption of coal will consume our supply within 200 years and that our available iron ore will last from 85 to 150 years and our copper reserve from 40 to 100 years. Of course, these estimates are more or less problematic, and our supply of crude petroleum is even more problematic, but this can be asserted without fear of successful contradiction: That the need for conserving in the ground our natural petroleum deposits was never more apparent than now. The protection of this natural resource is now engaging the attention of the Federal Government as these matters never did before, and well it may, for it is estimated that selfish competition is removing from the earth more than 1,000,000 barrels of oil each day than is necessary to economically supply the legitimate needs of business. This industry has been speeded up to the peak of disastrous overproduction. Measured by the standard of use, as well said by Doctor Work, "the products of this industry have now become the lifeblood of transportation—on the surface of the earth, in the air above, and in the waters beneath." To protect this industry calls for every ounce of human wisdom in this Nation, and to neglect this obligation is stupidity unexpressible.

Let me impress upon you this fact, if no other, that what we call life interest of the individual in our natural resources is short in comparison with the interest of society or the anticipated interest of the State; and may I not venture to say, in my opinion, the best way for us to "lay up treasures in heaven" is to build and plan for future generations and make secure a civilization expanded by unselfishness.

In the discussion of this subject the question naturally arises, How can we best conserve our natural resources? I anticipate it and offer you a comprehensive way to master this all-important problem. These remedies must be all invoked. A full discussion would not be practical here to-night. A suggestion will suffice to arouse your reflection and stimulate your interest.

- (a) Restriction to an economic basis our production.
- (b) Intelligent restoration where possible.
- (c) Elimination of wasteful competition.
- (d) The regulation of capitalization.

(e) The cooperation of private and corporate ownership with the Federal and State governments to the end that the general welfare of business and society as well as private gain may be subserved.

I respectfully submit that if this Government can be justified in engaging in any private business, certainly it can be in an effort to conserve the natural resources of this Nation.

We may resent being called "a nation of butchers," but can we escape the indictment that we are a nation of wasters, and that to the point of criminality? A few facts will confirm the truth of this statement.

(1) Fire kills 15,000 Americans each year and destroys more than \$600,000,000 worth of our property.

(2) Ninety-five thousand Americans are killed by industrial and traffic accidents each year and two and one-half million more are injured by accidents, and more than \$700,000,000 worth of property is destroyed.

(3) In the preparation of our food and the careless conservation of our foodstuffs we waste and destroy more than \$700,000,000 worth thereof.

These three items of preventable waste, when we consider the value of the human lives destroyed and the loss of wealth-producing power and time incident to these accidents, not to speak of our loss because of preventable diseases, total a sum greater than that collected for the purpose of running this Government, and this sum approximated \$4,000,000,000.

Now, I would not have you understand that the balance is against us on the subject of national waste. American enterprise exploring the realm of science has turned to use and value much property which was just a few years ago considered useless and allowed to go to decay. We are now making more than 50 by-products and some of them of much value from sawdust and wood shavings; we are getting 100 chemical derivatives from cottonseed, and these products are worth many millions of dollars. What I wish to impress is that preventable waste in American life should be minimized, not to seek to do it is a reflection upon our intelligence and a serious blow to our vaunted pride; it is a national sin, and a nation is no surer than an individual who violates the law of God.

It is impossible to discuss the matter of the conservation of our material resources without weaving into this discussion the spiritual

attitude of the Nation to the problem, for, after all, it is the spiritual equation of a nation which determines its greatness, the spiritual, the emotional, and the sentimental side of human life far outweighs the material side thereof. It is safe to say that any capable race of men who will economize, conserve, and wisely utilize its fund of human energy with due regard to the welfare of others will be able not only to extract a living but to actually prosper in the midst of poor natural surroundings. And it is equally true that nature's bounty alone can not make a nation great. It is the unselfish use of what men acquire which determines human greatness. When we rehearse our individual memories of success we find that none give us such comfort as the memory of service given. When we traverse the glorious deeds of our fathers, we never enumerate those acts that are not rooted in the soil of service. God never gave any other nation such an opportunity to serve the world as He has given our own United States. Let us not forget that it is not physical force and material wealth through which the world can perfect its civilization and secure peace and happiness, these things alone have proven to be most destructive and destruction of life and property is sin. Even now the world has doubled its armament since the World War ended, and the cry is abroad—that preparedness is the only guaranty of peace; this theory that a readiness to fight will prevent fighting has kept the world saturated in blood since the dawn of history. Nations were superbly prepared for the last Great War, and the graves of 9,000,000 slain testify that their preparedness was no guaranty of peace.

It is with peculiar delight that I present these facts to you and beg for your earnest cooperation in a national endeavor on the part of this United States to vouchsafe for us and other generations to come a position which shall be worthy to lead the world into higher ideals and make just contribution to the glory of God.

FREE PILGRIMAGE OF MOTHERS AND WIDOWS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES TO VISIT GRAVES OF THEIR LOVED ONES IN EUROPE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the free pilgrimage of mothers and widows of deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines to visit the graves of their loved ones who are buried in Europe.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress we made provision to enable the mothers and widows of members of the military and naval forces of the United States who died in the military or naval service at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 1, 1921, and whose remains are now interred in cemeteries of Europe, to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries at the expense of the Government.

The bill, which was passed, is as follows:

PUBLIC—NO. 952—SEVENTIETH CONGRESS
(S. 5332)

An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to arrange for pilgrimages to cemeteries in Europe by mothers and widows of members of the military or naval forces of the United States who died in the military or naval service at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 1, 1921, and whose remains are now interred in such cemeteries. Such pilgrimages shall be made at the expense of the United States under the conditions set forth in section 2.

SEC. 2. The conditions under which such pilgrimages may be made are as follows:

(a) Invitations to make the pilgrimages shall be extended in the name of the United States to the mothers and widows for whom the pilgrimages are authorized to be arranged under section 1.

(b) Upon acceptance of the invitation the mother or widow shall be entitled to make one such pilgrimage; but no mother or widow who has previous to the pilgrimage visited cemeteries described in section 1 shall be entitled to make any such pilgrimage, and no mother or widow shall be entitled to make more than one such pilgrimage.

(c) The pilgrimages shall be made at such times during the period from May 1, 1930, to October 31, 1933, as may be designated by the Secretary of War.

(d) For the purpose of the pilgrimages the Secretary of State shall (1) issue special passports, limited to the duration of the pilgrimage, to mothers and widows making the pilgrimages and to such personnel as may be selected to accompany and/or arrange for the pilgrimages, if such mothers, widows, and personnel are citizens of the United States, and (2) issue suitable travel documents, if aliens. No fee for either of such documents or for any application therefor shall be charged. Such alien mothers, widows, and personnel shall be permitted to return and be granted admission to the United States without regard to any law, convention, or treaty relating to the immigration or exclusion of aliens, if the return is made within the

period covered by the pilgrimage of the particular group, or in the case of personnel, within such times as the Secretary of War shall by regulation prescribe; except that in any case of unavoidable detention the Secretary of War may extend in such case the time during which return may be made without regard to such laws, conventions, or treaties.

(e) The pilgrimages shall be by the shortest practicable route and for the shortest practicable time, to be designated by the Secretary of War. No mother or widow shall be provided for at Government expense in Europe for a longer period than two weeks from the time of disembarkation in Europe to the time of reembarkation in Europe. In the case of any mother or widow willfully failing to continue the pilgrimage of her particular group, the United States shall not incur or be subject to any expense with regard to her pilgrimage after such failure.

(f) Vessels owned or operated by the United States Government or any agency thereof shall be used for transportation at sea wherever practicable.

(g) Suitable transportation, accommodations, meals, and other necessities pertaining thereto, as prescribed by the Secretary of War, shall be furnished each mother or widow included in any pilgrimage for the entire distance at sea and on land and while sojourning in Europe and while en route in the United States from home to port and from port to home. Cabin-class accommodations shall be furnished for all transportation at sea. No mother or widow shall be entitled, by reason of any payment made by or for her, to be furnished by the Government with transportation, accommodations, meals, and other necessities pertaining thereto different in kind from those prescribed by the Secretary of War for the pilgrimage of the particular group.

(h) All pilgrimages shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of War may from time to time prescribe as to the time, route, itineraries, composition of groups, accommodations, transportation, program, arrangements, management, and other matters pertaining to such pilgrimages.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act. The Secretary of War is directed to make an investigation for the purpose of determining (1) the total numbers of mothers and widows entitled to make the pilgrimages, (2) the number of such mothers and widows who desire to make the pilgrimages and the number who desire to make the pilgrimages during the calendar year 1930, and (3) the probable cost of the pilgrimages to be made. The Secretary of War shall report to the Congress not later than December 15, 1929, the results of such investigation.

SEC. 4. As used in this act—

(a) The term "mother" means mother, stepmother, mother through adoption, or any woman who stood in loco parentis to the deceased member of the military or naval forces for the year prior to the commencement of his service in such forces.

(b) The term "widow" means a widow who has not remarried since the death of the member of the military or naval forces.

Approved, March 2, 1929.

This action on the part of Congress, to my mind, was most appropriate, and the bill passed both branches of Congress without a dissenting vote. These pilgrimages are to be made at such time during the period from May 1, 1930, to October 21, 1933, as may be designated by the Secretary of War.

Shortly after the passage of this act, looking toward notifying those of my district and section who would come within the provisions of this bill, I had the following correspondence with Maj. Gen. B. F. Cheatham, Quartermaster General of the Army, receiving also a list of the American forces enlisted from North Carolina whose remains are interred in the cemeteries of Europe.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, March 13, 1929.

Hon. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ABERNETHY: In connection with the recently enacted legislation (S. 5332) "to enable mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," you are advised that a list of the deceased members of the American forces from North Carolina who are buried in the cemeteries in Europe is being compiled and will be furnished you at the earliest possible date.

This office maintains no authentic record of the names of mothers and widows of deceased service men, as upon enlistment the only requirement is that the name of a person to be notified in case of an emergency be given. This may be the name of a relative or not, as the man may choose, but no record is made of a mother or wife. In view thereof, it will be necessary for this office to work out some method of obtaining the desired information, and plans are being formulated at

the present time with a view to compiling accurate lists showing the names and addresses of the mothers and widows who will be entitled to make the pilgrimages authorized by law. It will be appreciated that some time must elapse before these lists can be completed, hence the list which will be furnished you will show only the names of service men from North Carolina buried overseas and their respective grave locations.

Very truly yours,

B. F. CHEATHAM,
Major General, the Quartermaster General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, March 21, 1929.

Hon. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ABERNETHY: Supplementing my letter of March 13, 1929, please find inclosed herewith a list containing the names of the members of the American forces, enlisted from North Carolina, whose remains are interred in the cemeteries of Europe.

Very truly yours,

B. F. CHEATHAM,
Major General, the Quartermaster General.

KEY TO NAMES OF PERMANENT AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

FRANCE

No. 1232. Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, Meuse.

No. 1764. Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, Belleau, Aisne.

No. 34. Suresnes American Cemetery, Suresnes, Seine (near Paris).

No. 636. Somme American Cemetery, Bony, Aisne.

No. 608. Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, Seringes-et-Nesles, Aisne.

No. 1233. St. Mihiel American Cemetery, Thiaucourt, Meurthe-et-Moselle.

BELGIUM

No. 1252. Flanders Field American Cemetery, Waeraghem, Belgium.

ENGLAND

No. 107-E. Brookwood American Cemetery, near London, England.

Burial places in Europe of deceased soldiers from North Carolina

Name	Title and service	No.	Grave	Row	Block
Adams, Alfred H.	Pvt. Co. I, 120th Inf.	34	4	5	C
Adger, Luther	Pvt. 828th Co. Transp. Corps	34	15	19	A
Alexander, Virgil V.	Cpl. Co. B, 120th Inf.	636	4	21	A
Alired, Geo. W.	Pvt. Co. D, 320th Lab. Bn.	1232	19	39	C
Alston, Lewis	Pvt. Co. D, 323d Lab. Bn.	34	36	9	A
Anderson, Edward	Pvt. Co. D, 330th Lab. Bn.	608	7	21	C
Anderson, Elbert	Pvt. Co. K, 324th Inf.	1232	27	22	F
Arrowood, Jas. W.	Pvt. 1 c. Sup. Co. 60th Inf.	1232	14	18	B
Ashworth, Junius G.	Pvt. MD 317th Inf.	636	15	14	A
Ayscue, Albert G.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	4	26	A
Bailey, Earnest C.	Mech. Co. C, 321 Lab. Bn.	608	32	34	B
Baldwin, Geo. R.	Pvt. Co. H, 119th Inf.	636	15	8	D
Ball, Geo. A.	1st lt. Co. G, 30th Inf.	1764	53	9	A
Ballance, Lucian	Pvt. Bty. D, 317th F. A.	1232	40	10	C
Barber, Herbert H.	Pvt. Co. L, 165th Inf.	1232	20	18	C
Barby, Frank	Sdir. Bty. E, 349th F. A.	608	14	10	C
Barham, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. G, 167th Inf.	1232	17	32	D
Barnes, Sol.	Pvt. Co. F, 167th Inf.	1232	32	15	B
Batts, Kelly E.	Pvt. Co. D, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	9	4	D
Baughan, Jas. Henry.	Sgt. Escad. 98				
Bazemore, Wm. M.	2d lt. Co. G, 23d Inf.	1232	35	45	B
Berry, Geo. E.	Pvt. Co. B, 348th Lab. Bn.	1233	17	15	A
Bethua, Willie	Pvt. 1 c. Co. B, 344th Lab. Bn.	1232	11	21	F
Bishop, Simpson S.	Pvt. 396th Cas. Co.	107-E	5	11	B
Bissett, Wiley C.	1st lt. Co. D, 119th Inf.	1252	22	1	B
Bizzell, Bud.	Pvt. Co. C, 347th Lab. Bn.	608	13	30	B
Blackwell, Robt. L.	Pvt. Co. K, 119th Inf.	636	2	20	D
Blackwell, Carl.	Pvt. Co. H, 38th Inf.	1232	33	41	G
Blalock, John F.	Pvt. 49th Co. 5th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1764	41	11	A
Bond, Lynn	Pvt. Hq. Det. 344th Lab. Bn.	1232	37	38	C
Bonner, Theodore P., Jr.	Sup. Sgt. Bty. D, 316 F. A.	1232	19	10	C
Boyd, David H.	Pvt. Co. E, 119th Inf.	636	10	30	B
Boyd, Simon	Cpl. Co. D, 344th Lab. Bn. ¹				
Brady, Wm.	Pvt. Co. C, 120th Inf.	636	11	20	D
Branson, Levi C.	Pvt. Co. K, 118th Inf.	636	8	13	A
Brewer, Frank J.	Pvt. Co. F, 119th Inf.	636	3	11	A
Brickhouse, Jas. M.	Pvt. Co. A, 165th Inf.	1232	9	30	A
Bridgeman, John	Pvt. 312 Fld. Rem. Sqdn.	1233	33	29	A
Brinkley, Elbert	Pvt. Co. D, 538th Engrs.	34	13	1	B
Brooks, Ben. F.	Pvt. Co. G, 4 Pion. Inf.	608	29	31	A
Brooks, Chester A.	Cpl. Co. A, 11th Inf.	1232	14	24	A
Brown, Pressey R.	1st lt. M. D., 23d Inf.	1764	43	9	A
Bryant, Early	Cpl. M. G. Co., 6th Inf.	1232	32	8	A
Bryant, Irwin	Pvt. Co. H, 365th Inf.	34	27	3	D
Buck, Charlie	Pvt. Co. B, 120th Inf.	636	14	14	D
Bullock, Henry	Pvt. Co. D, 344 Lab. Bn.	107-E	11	2	B
Bumpus, Jos. J.	Pvt. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	1	26	A
Burris, Jas. B.	Pvt. Co. A, 119th Inf.	636	13	11	B
Butler, Levi H.	Cpl. Co. E, 118th Inf.	636	1	25	A
Butler, John	Pvt. Co. D, 532d Engrs.	1232	32	7	A
Cahoon, David L.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	13	24	B
Calvert, Harry L.	Pvt. Co. I, 119th Inf.	636	9	10	A
Campbell, Samuel	Pvt. Co. E, 365th Inf.	1232	11	9	D
Campbell, Wm. W.	Pvt. Co. C, 369th Inf.	1232	24	22	H

¹ Escadrille Lafayette Memorial.

² Everton Cemetery, Liverpool, England.

Burial places in Europe of deceased soldiers from North Carolina.—Con.

Name	Title and service	No.	Grave	Row	Block
Capps, Calvin L.	2nd Lt. Inf. Att. 6 Regt. U. S. M. C.	1764	45	11	B
Carlton, Lee	Pvt. Co. A, 543d Engrs.	34	6	15	A
Carr, Elbert F.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. C, 306th Fld. Sig. Bn.	1233	9	14	B
Carroll, Charlie W.	Mech. Co. G, 120th Inf.	636	7	19	A
Carroll, Willie Jas.	Pvt. Co. E, 306th Inf.	1233	26	1	A
Carter, Jas. A.	Pvt. Co. E, 119th Inf.	636	16	4	A
Case, Louie McD.	Pvt. Bty. C, 316th F. A.	1232	24	11	C
Casey, Fred'k L.	Pvt. Co. L, 54th Inf.	1233	26	12	B
Carpenter, Thaddeus C.	Pvt. Bty. A, 121st F. A.	1232	3	11	A
Cathay, Joe	Pvt. Co. A, 321 Lab. Bn.	1233	25	5	A
Chambers, Sam	Pvt. 1 c. Co. B, 330th Lab. Bn.	608	36	15	C
Chapman, Jas. B.	Pvt. 1 c. MG Co. 16th Inf.	636	13	8	A
Civils, Dennis O.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. F, 119th Inf.	636	10	5	A
Clanton, Richard M.	Pvt. Co. H, 119th Inf.	636	1	7	C
Clark, Elijah	Pvt. 2d Co. 302 Stev. Regt.	34	38	5	A
Clark, Walter A.	Pvt. Bty E, 316th F. A.	1232	39	28	A
Cofield, Willis	Pvt. Co. D, 532d Engrs.	1233	7	20	A
Colston, John Q.	Pvt. Co. M, 365th Inf.	1232	24	21	D
Colville, Thos. H.	Pvt. Co. I, 120th Inf.	636	11	8	D
Conley, Roy P.	Pvt. Co. F, 603d Engrs.	1233	3	20	D
Connelin, Horace B.	Sgt. Bty F, 317th F. A.	1232	27	4	B
Cook, Charlie C.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. L, 120th Inf.	636	9	15	A
Cook, Grover C.	Pvt. Co. D, 118th Inf.	636	11	1	B
Corbett, Walter H.	Pvt. Co. F, 324th Inf.	1233	31	9	D
Corey, Ben. J.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. E, 6 Amm. Tn.	1232	18	10	C
Corite, Tony	Pvt. Co. G, 60th Inf.	1233	27	17	C
Craven, Floyd F.	Pvt. Co. H, 323d Inf.	1233	32	27	B
Crews, Wm. S.	Pvt. Co. K, 119th Inf.	636	14	7	D
Crisp, Lester M.	Pvt. Co. B, 47th Inf.	1232	24	38	B
Cromartie, Godfrey	Pvt. Co. D, 538th Engrs.	608	6	22	B
Crowder, John W.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. D, 39th Inf.	608	12	37	B
Culpepper, Arthur B.	Pvt. Co. K, 113th Inf.	1233	16	19	C
Daly, Harry	Pvt. Co. F, 28th Inf.	636	13	7	A
Davidson, Wm. C.	Pvt. Co. G, 119th Inf.	636	9	20	B
Davis, Alfred G.	Pvt. 3d Prov. Co. S. A. R. D.	608	26	40	D
Davis, Charley	Sgt. Co. B, 7th Inf.	1764	18	11	A
Davis, Herman	Pvt. Co. A, 305th Lab. Bn.	1233	14	23	C
Deans, Jas. Benj.	Pvt. 49th Co., 5th Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	7	43	F
Deese, Melvin Mc.	Capt. Co. K, 120th Inf.	636	9	16	A
Deshazo, Arthur	Pvt. 1 c. Co. G, 371st Inf.	1232	38	3	B
Dillingham, Ernest J.	Pvt. Co. D, 115th M. G. Bn.	636	6	5	C
Dixon, Ben F.	Capt. Co. K, 120th Inf.	636	14	25	B
Dixie, Gaston L.	Ist lt. Co. B, 119th Inf.	636	4	12	D
Doty, John S.	Pvt. Co. M, 6th Inf.	1232	28	16	F
Dudley, King	Dunham, Thos. P.	608	30	24	D
Dupree, Henry	Dupree, Roy	107-E	17	3	C
Dupree, Roy	Pvt. Co. C, 344 Lab. Bn.	107-E	1	2	B
Durham, Jess C.	Pvt. Co. K, 120th Inf.	636	11	29	A
Dysart, Chas. E.	Pvt. Co. C, 7th Inf.	1764	33	11	A
Eckard, Robt. L.	Pvt. Co. D, 120th Inf.	1252	11	3	C
Elkins, Jos. M.	Pvt. Co. C, 324th Inf.	1232	27	26	D
Felton, Flavel L.	Pvt. Co. G, 119th Inf.	636	6	11	A
Fleming, Vincent A.	Pvt. Co. F, 119th Inf.	636	2	11	A
Forrester, Wm. O.	Pvt. Co. D, 330th Lab. Bn.	608	16	26	A
Foster, Mann	Pvt. Co. K, 119th Inf.	636	6	12	A
Foster, Walter L.	Pvt. Co. D, 119th Inf.	636	12	28	B
Fowler, Robt. A.	Pvt. Co. D, 330th Lab. Bn.	107-E	7	2	D
Fraday, Geo. H.	Pvt. Co. K, 119th Inf.	636	6	12	A
Frazier, Jas. C.	Pvt. Co. D, 347 Lab. Bn.	608	34	30	B
Frears, Richard	Pvt. Co. I, 120th Inf.	636	12	16	D
Fuller, Roy H.	Pvt. Co. B, 329th Lab. Bn.	1233	2	20	A
Fuqua, Claude	Sgt. Co. A, 55th Inf.	1233	9	15	C
Gardner, Jas. H.	Mech. 7th AA Bty. C. A. C.	1232	25	40	B
Gardner, John Martin	Sgt. Co. K, 120th Inf.	636	2	16	B
Gardner, Wayland S.	Pvt. Co. A, 542d Engrs.	1233	21	23	D
Garrison, Chas.	Pvt. Co. B, 119th Inf.	636	12	28	B
Gentry, Bud.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. F, 119th Inf.	636	15	9	D
Gillis, Fred D.	Pvt. Co. B, 324th Engrs.	608	24	5	D
Goddard, Walter S.	Sgt. Co. I, 119th Inf.	1252	12	3	C
Goodman, Holly L.	Pvt. Co. L, 38th Inf.	608	19	10	B
Graham, David Sloan	Pvt. 8th Co. 5th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1232	4	35	D
Gardner, Wayland S.	Pvt. Co. E, 168th Inf.	1232	1	6	D
Garrett, Chas.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. F, 119th Inf.	636	15	9	D
Gentry, Bud.	Pvt. Co. D, 344th Lab. Bn.	1232	13	20	F
Gillis, Fred D.	Pvt. Co. B, 324th Engrs.	608	24	5	D
Goddard, Walter S.	Pvt. Co. B, 119th Inf.	636	9	9	A
Goodman, Holly L.	Pvt. Co. L, 119th Inf.	636	3	16	A
Graham, David Sloan	Pvt. 7th Co. 6th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1232	15	43	A
Grant, David S.	Pvt. Co. E, 119th Inf.	1232	4	35	D
Green, Hubert M.	2nd lt. Co. F, 39th Inf.	1764	11	12	B
Greene, Milton A.	Musn. 3 cl. Hq. Co. 323d Inf.	1232	19	20	F
Gregory, Thurman M.	Pvt. Co. A, 119th Inf.	636	9	9	A
Griffin, Jimmie	Pvt. Co. C, 119th Inf.	1233	24	15	A
Haithcock, Sidney A.	Pvt. Bty. B, 2 Trn. Mtr. Bty.	1232	27	40	A
Hancock, Robt. H.	Pvt. Co. H, 54th Inf.	1232	34	16	D
Hall, Collier	Pvt. Co. L, 118th Inf.	608	28	5	D
Hardwick, Clinton J.	Pvt. Co. C, 119th Inf.	608	26	22	D
Harper, Don V.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. E, 118th Inf.	636	13	1	A
Harris, Andrew J., Jr.	Pvt. Co. H, 54th Inf.	1232	21	21	D
Harris, James	Pvt. Co. D, 330th Lab. Bn.	608	18	21	D
Harris, Sandy	Pvt. Co. A, 323d Lab. Bn.	1233	10	3	A
Harrison, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. B, 167th Inf.	1233	22	28	D
Hart, Ernest F.	Pvt. Co. B, 2d Fld. Sig. Bn.	1232	21	8	D
Harwood, Walter M.	Pvt. Co. D, 113th F. A.	608	33	13	D
Harwood, Walter M.	1st lt. 14th Evac. Hosp.	1232	33	32	A
Hawes, Stephen J.	Pvt. Co. G, 165th Inf.	1232	18	8	C

Burial places in Europe of deceased soldiers from North Carolina.—Con.

Name	Title and service	No.	Grave	Row	Block
Hayes, Claude L.	Pvt. Co. M, 166th Inf.	1232	6	38	C
Hayes, Frank Bryan.	Cpl. 75th Co. 6th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1232	39	41	C
Hedrick, Jas. H.	Pvt. Ft. Screvens S. A. R. D.	107-E	7	6	C
Helms, Clifford.	Cpl. Co. C, 16th Inf.	1232	36	29	A
Henderson, General H.	Sgt. Co. D, 9th Inf.	1232	28	42	D
Henderson, Harlie.	Pvt. Co. M, 119th Inf.	636	12	27	A
Henderson, Paul M.	Pvt. 118th Amb. Co.	636	1	27	A
Henry, Cecil E. G.	Pvt. 96th Co. 6th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1232	34	37	F
Higgins, Jim.	Pvt. Co. D, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	4	4	B
Hill, James.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. H, 365th Inf.	1233	21	5	D
Hinton, Sherwood.	Mts. Att. 3 c. U. S. Navy.	608	33	20	D
Hodge, Monroe C.	Pvt. Bty. E, 58th C. A. C.	34	37	8	B
Holcombe, Lynne S.	Cpl. Co. C, 6th Engrs.	1764	60	7	B
Holder, Jos. L.	Pvt. Bty. D, 318th F. A.	1232	37	10	C
Holl, George.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 60th Inf.	608	1	19	D
Hensley, Robt. J.	Pvt. Co. L, 120th Inf.	636	7	1	A
Holmes, Alex. A.	Cpl. Co. F, 120th Inf.	636	2	9	C
Horne, Victor H.	Pvt. Co. B, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	11	2	D
Houston, Leopold H.	Pvt. 1st Co. Cp. Hancock S. R. D.	1232	32	24	D
Howard, Oler.	Pvt. Co. A, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	1	3	D
Hoyle, Amberst W.	Wag. Co. B, 105th Engrs.	636	14	10	D
Huff, Jim.	Pvt. Co. E, 322d Inf.	1233	35	3	B
Huffman, John D.	Sgt. Hq. Co. 105th Engrs.	1252	8	4	C
Hunter, Jones W.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. G, 9th Inf.	1764	31	6	A
Hyatt, Stanley A.	Cpl. 141st Adm. Lab. Co.	1233	11	6	A
Ingram, Andrew.	Pvt. Co. B, 330th Lab. Bn.	608	11	41	D
Inscor, John P.	Mech. Bty. B, 60th C. A. C.	608	34	30	D
Jackson, Howard J.	Pvt. Co. I, 116th Inf.	1232	38	13	D
Jacobs, West.	Pvt. Co. C, 167th Inf.	1233	21	17	C
Jensen, Aston.	Mess. Sgt. 117th Fld. Hosp.	1764	46	10	B
Johnson, Richard.	Pvt. Co. H, 119th Inf.	636	12	21	B
Johnson, Samuel.	Pvt. Co. C, 313th Lab. Bn.	608	3	15	C
Johnstone, Jos. H.	1st Lt. 322d Inf.	1232	23	26	D
Jones, Carl O.	Pvt. Co. E, 118th Inf.	636	5	20	A
Jones, Leander.	Pvt. Co. B, 323d Lab. Bn.	1233	14	5	A
Judkins, John N.	Pvt. Co. H, 120th Inf.	636	4	24	A
Kendall, Jean.	Cpl. Co. A, 7th Inf.	1764	79	1	A
Kincaid, Bruce H.	Pvt. Co. A, 167th Inf.	1233	2	29	D
King, Cecil F.	Pvt. Co. C, 323d Inf.	1232	25	34	D
King, Robt. B.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. E, 105th Amm. Tn.	1233	12	20	D
Kivett, John H.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. K, 120th Inf.	636	2	30	B
Laney, John C.	Pvt. Co. A, 119th Inf.	636	11	12	A
Langley, Henry.	Pvt. 1 c. Sup. Co., 119th Inf.	636	7	24	A
Lawson, Lemuel.	Pvt. Co. A, 313th Lab. Bn.	608	10	14	C
Lee, Dave.	Pvt. Co. F, 105th Engrs.	1252	22	2	B
Lee, Wilton H.	Pvt. Co. M, 119th Inf.	636	8	21	A
Lentz, Chas. G.	Pvt. Co. E, 105th Engrs.	636	15	6	B
Lineberry, Cyrus.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. A, 119th Inf.	636	6	29	A
Lusk, Carl.	Pvt. Co. D, 119th Inf.	1252	9	2	B
Livingston, Willie.	Pvt. Co. D, 330th Lab. Bn.	608	10	26	A
Lofton, Preston B.	Pvt. Co. K, 323d Inf.	1233	8	22	D
Long, Ralph P.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. I, 321st Inf.	1232	26	17	E
Lopp, James.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. G, 365th Inf.	608	36	37	D
Loring, David W.	2nd Lt. Co. C, 115th M. G. Bn.	1252	4	3	D
Lovin, Fred B.	Capt. Co. A, 322nd Inf.	1233	25	11	D
Lumsden, John Cooper.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. L, 323rd Inf.	1232	38	30	C
Lynch, John E.	2d Lt. 12th Aero Sq.	608	27	8	B
Macon, Willie G.	Pvt. Co. D, 321st Inf.	1232	18	15	H
Mahala, President L.	Cpl. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	12	18	B
Malloy, Fred'k Fagg.	Pvt. Co. E, 120th Inf.	636	4	5	C
Mangum, Harrison F.	1st Lt. Hq. Tp. 32d Div.	1232	35	13	H
Manigo, Fred.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. D, 119th Inf.	636	11	5	A
Marshall, Lee.	Pvt. Co. D, 541st Engrs.	608	36	31	D
Marshburn, Djalma.	Pvt. Co. B, 348th Lab. Bn.	1233	28	28	A
Q. M. 2 c. U. S. Navy.	Q. M. 2 c. U. S. Navy.	636	9	3	D
Martin, Marvin B.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. M, 120th Inf.	107-E	6	7	C
Martin, Mitchell.	Pvt. Co. M, 802nd Pion. Inf.	1232	27	2	E
Martin, Frank R.	Pvt. Co. M, 34th Engrs.	1233	17	16	E
Mashburn, Ernest L.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	14	5	C
Massera, Angelo.	Pvt. Co. A, 39th Inf.	1232	8	31	C
Mayes, Ivan S.	Pvt. San Det., 109th Inf.	1232	9	30	F
Maynard, Ernest M.	Pvt. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	14	4	A
Mayo, Ezra A.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. L, 11th Inf.	1233	21	4	C
McCall, Claudia H.	Pvt. Sup. Co., 120th Inf.	608	30	37	C
McConnell, Jas. R.	Sgt. Lafayette Escadrille.				
McCoury, Zeb.	Pvt. Co. A, 11th Inf.	1233	6	14	B
McCoy, Oscar L.	Pvt. Co. K, 118th Inf.	636	15	25	D
McCoy, Joe.	Pvt. Co. D, 344th Lab. Bn.	1232	3	5	C
McCullen, Wm. L.	Ist. Lt. Co. H, 120th Inf.	636	14	20	D
McEntire, Ezor.	Sgt. Co. H, 11th Inf.	1232	34	30	E
McIntyre, Roy S.	Cpt. Co. I, 118th Inf.	636	2	14	A
McKinnie, Richard.	Pvt. Co. G, 542nd Engrs.	1233	30	15	B
McLean, Thomas.	Pvt. Co. D, 344th Lab. Bn.	1232	38	13	H
McNeill, James.	Pvt. Co. C, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	8	11	D
McRae, Henry R.	Pvt. Co. C, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	12	5	F
Melton, John W.	Pvt. 1 c. Bty E, 113th F. A.	1232	17	8	F
Melton, Wm. B.	Pvt. Bty. E, 113th F. A.	1233	30	8	D
Miller, Clint B.	Mech. Co. M, 59th Inf.	1232	3	45	B
Milliken, Elijah.	Pvt. Co. D, 55th Pion. Inf.	1233	21	1	A
Mitchell, Frank B.	Pvt. Co. H, 321st Inf.	1233	10	18	D
Mitchell, Robt. L.	2nd Lt. Co. K, 114th Inf.	1232	13	13	A
Monday, Thomas.	Sgt. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	7	6	A
Montague, John M.	Pvt. Co. A, 47th Inf.	1232	30	1	C
Moore, Leonard N.	Cpl. Co. D, 322nd Inf.	1233	36	19	D
Moore, Marvin C.	Pvt. Co. M, 4th Pion. Inf.	608	32	25	D
Morgan, Ernest.	Pvt. Co. M, 365th Inf.	1233	11	16	D
Morris, John H. W.	Pvt. Co. D, 105th Engrs.	107-E	10	3	B
Morrison, Alex. S., Jr.	Cpl. Co. A, 322nd Inf.	1233	13	14	B

1 Escadrille Lafayette Memorial.

Burial places in Europe of deceased soldiers from North Carolina.—Con.

Name	Title and service	No.	Grave	Row	Block
Morrison, Carson K.	Pvt. Co. C, 320th Lab. Bn.	1233	3	14	C
Moss, Arthur M.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 28th Inf.	1232	36	16	E
Moss, Charlie.	Pvt. Co. A, 313th Lab. Bn.	608	34	15	A
Murphy, Claude.	Pvt. Co. A, 302nd Steve. Regt.	34	21	6	A
Neal, Algernon S.	Cpl. Co. E, 2nd Engrs.	1232	30	26	B
Nelson, August.	Pvt. Co. D, 58th Inf.	508	22	28	C
Nelson, Oscar E.	Pvt. Co. E, 18th Inf.	1232	35	16	C
Nixon, Lester G.	Pvt. Co. G, 323rd Inf.	1233	35	23	B
Norman, Isaac C.	Pvt. Co. A, 119th Inf.	636	10	11	A
Norton, Eli.	Pvt. Co. B, 56th Pion. Inf.	34	23	5	A
Norton, John A.	Pvt. 1 c. Hq. Co. 117th Inf.	636	12	6	D
Odom, Arcy R.	Pvt. Co. C, 306th Fld. Sig. Bn.	1232	27	10	D
Outland, Cecil P.	Pvt. Co. K, 117th Inf.	636	11	25	D
Page, Allison M.	Pvt. 47th Co. 5th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1764	45	3	A
Paisley, John Cannon.	1st Lt. Co. A, 7th Inf.	1764	53	7	A
Parker, John T.	Pvt. Bty. C, 316th F. A.	1232	16	10	C
Parker, John W.	Pvt. Co. A, 119th Inf.	636	11	17	D
Parker, Will.	Pvt. Co. C, 544th Engrs.	1232	8	33	H
Parrish, Geo. W.	Pvt. Co. M, 120th Inf.	636	11	6	C
Parrish, Harry A.	Pvt. Co. G, 39th Inf.	1232	37	42	A
Pate, Clarence R.	Pvt. Hq. Det. 304th Amm. Tn.	34	10	16	B
Patillo, Roy A.	Pvt. Icl. 416 Mtr. Sup. Tn.	608	3	18	C
Pearce, Jos. L.	Pvt. Co. F, 119th Inf.	636	2	1	A
Pearson, Dillard S.	Pvt. Co. F, 119th Inf.	608	11	3	D
Peel, Boss.	Pvt. Icl. Co. C, 3 M. G. Bn.	608	17	19	D
Peeler, Lawrence T.	Pvt. Co. A, 339th Lab. Bn.	636	11	9	A
Peloubet, Wm. Francis.	Pvt. 74th Co. 6 Regt. U. S. M. C.	1764	84	4	A
Perry, Jesse.	Pvt. 21st Co. ARD Med. Cps.	608	23	34	A
Petteway, Claude.	Pvt. Co. B, 365th Inf.	1232	37	4	H
Petty, Stowe.	Pvt. Co. B, 117th Engrs.	1232	39	12	H
Pfaff, Carl C.	Pvt. Co. M, 18th Inf.	636	11	10	A
Phillips, Isaac C.	Pvt. Co. K, 11th Inf.	1233	21	5	B
Pierce, Chas. R.	Sgt. Co. G, 119th Inf.	636	7	34	A
Pitt, Edward C.	Pvt. Icl. Co. E, 28th Inf.	636	5	22	D
Poole, Wm. E.	Pvt. Co. K, 120th Inf.	636	4	3	A
Poplin, Daniel C.	Pvt. Co. K, 4th Inf.	608	31	4	A
Porcelli, Robert.	Bugler Co. H, 119th Inf.	1252	11	2	B
Price, Walter H.	Cpl. Co. D, 324th Inf.	1233	23	25	D
Ramsey, Harvey J.	Pvt. Co. L, 120th Inf.	636	3	15	A
Ransom, John Oliver.	1st Lt. 31st Inf.	1232	16	2	A
Rasberry, Archie C.	Cpl. Co. F, 119th Inf.	107-E	6	9	C
Ratcliff, John.	Pvt. Co. G, 333d Lab. Bn.	1233	4	12	B
Ray, Bert.	Pvt. Co. G, 11th Inf.	1232	11	21	C
Rhodes, Gordon L.	Pvt. Co. F, 119th Inf.	636	7	10	A
Rhyme, Geo. W.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. M, 11th Inf.	1232	3	18	D
Richardson, Cofield.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. A, 320th Lab. Bn.	1233	26	16	D
Richardson, Hal E.	2d Lt. Co. I, 322d Inf.	636	7	30	D
Riggs, Robt. H.	2d Lt. Co. C, 371st Inf.	1232	17	30	D
Rigsbee, Ike J.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. K, 120th Inf.	1252	8	3	C
Rosch, Robt. N.	Sgt. Co. A, 18th Inf.	1232	14	38	C
Roberson, Annanias.	Pvt. Co. D, 336 Lab. Bn.	608	10	18	C
Roberts, Jas. A.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. A, 105th Sup. Tn.	1233	5	20	D
Roscoe, Jos. E.	Pvt. Co. I, 119th Inf.	1262	9	3	C
Ross, Ben.	Pvt. Co. C, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	13	5	B
Rouse, Pinkey.	Pvt. Co. B, 365th Inf.	1233	1	11	D
Sanders, Ozie T.	Pvt. Co. D, 119th Inf.	636	7	9	D
Saunders, Rowan D.	Pvt. Co. C, 119th Inf.	636	4	6	D
Sawyer, Anderson M.	Pvt. 997th Cas. Co.	608	31	39	D
Shankle, Willie W.	Cpl. Co. L, 16th Inf.	608	19	13	D
Shaw, Colin C.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 120th Inf.	636	11	19	A
Sills, Wm. G.	Col. Hq. 141st Inf.	1232	31	10	H
Simmons, Geo. W.	Pvt. Co. B, 323d Lab. Bn.	1233	14	5	A
Simpson, Ed.	Pvt. Co. B, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	8	1	D
Slagle, Alfred M.	Cpl. Co. G, 119th Inf.	636	8	10	A
Small, Isham E.	Pvt. Co. I, 119th Inf.	636	10	2	A
Smith, Carl W.	Pvt. Co. C, 116th Inf.	1232	15	38	H
Smith, Edward D.	Pvt. Co. H, 365th Inf.	1233	5	27	D
Smith, Fred J.	Pvt. Co. D, 165th Inf.	1232	33	22	B
Smith, Hubert M.	Pvt. Co. E, 324th Inf.	1233	9	24	C
Smith, Spencer.	Pvt. Co. E, 117th Inf.	636	1	22	A
Smith, Vernon.	Pvt. 302d Co. 801 Stev. Bn.	608	12	30	A
Sneed, John A.	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	12	33	E
Snell, Harry E.	Pvt. Co. I, 125th Inf.	1232	9	30	D
Spainhour, Rober L.	Pvt. Co. K, 324th Inf.	1232	61	12	B
Sparrow, Paul E.	Pvt. Co. B, 47th Inf.	1232	10	40	F
Spear, Geo. W.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. C, 119th Inf.	1232	6	2	B
Speight, Samuel.	Pvt. Co. A, 346th Lab. Bn.	608	1	26	B
Spencer, Dwight L. M.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. M, 120th Inf.				

Burial places in Europe of deceased soldiers from North Carolina.—Con.

Name	Title and service	No.	Grave	Row	Block
Thomason, Jasper W.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. C, 5th Fld. Sig. Bn.	1764	43	7	A
Thompson, Frank M.	1st Lt. Co. A, 14th M. G. Bn.	1233	28	4	D
Thompson, Robt.	Pvt. Co. G, 371st Inf.	1232	2	16	A
Thornton, Nathaniel K.	Pvt. Co. H, 324th Inf.	1233	23	22	D
Thorpe, Henry Toto, Giovanni.	Cpl. Co. H, 813th Pion. Inf.	34	8	10	B
Triplett, Eliza.	Pvt. Co. K, 39th Inf.	1232	21	27	C
Tucker, Willie M.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. M, 120th Inf.	636	10	24	B
Turner, Robt. L.	Pvt. Bty. B, 318th F. A.	1232	11	41	B
Turner, Willie M.	Pvt. Co. C, 105th Fld. Sig. Bn.	636	12	24	B
Turner, Willie M.	Pvt. Co. M, 167th Inf.	1232	21	7	G
Twine, Ernest L.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. F, 120th Inf.	636	1	1	A
Tyner, Ellis.	Pvt. Co. D, 16th Inf.	1232	26	26	A
Vestal, Frank H.	Cook, Co. D, 306th Amm. Tn.	1232	2	7	B
Vestal, Minor M.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. A, 350th Inf.	1232	6	45	B
Vester, Jas. B.	Pvt. Co. B, 119th Inf.	636	16	5	C
Wade, Bryant.	Pvt. Co. A, 545th Engrs.	608	25	33	A
Waldroop, Robt. V.	Pvt. 1 c. M. G. Co., 26th Inf.	1232	5	36	H
Wall, Jos. W.	Pvt. Co. F, 168th Inf.	1232	2	26	A
Wall, Clane.	Pvt. Co. K, 324th Inf.	1233	38	41	D
Walls, Jas. T.	Pvt. Co. I, 120th Inf.	636	15	9	A
Walser, Albert H.	Pvt. Co. G, 167th Inf.	1232	3	6	A
Walston, John F.	Pvt. Co. C, 117th Inf.	608	5	19	A
Warren, Wm. E.	Pvt. Co. D, 323d Lab. Bn.	608	30	42	D
Watkins, John H.	Cpl. Co. H, 120th Inf.	636	5	23	A
Wearn, John M.	Pvt. 10th A. A. Bty. C. A. C.	34	11	12	B
Weaver, Dee.	Pvt. Co. M, 369th Inf.	1232	16	28	D
Webb, Eddie.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. E, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	16	32	G
Webb, Oscar.	Pvt. Co. C, 120th Inf.	636	10	4	A
Westmoreland, Haymore.	Pvt. Co. L, 120th Inf.	1232	17	3	A
Wethington, Howard.	Pvt. Co. M, 118th Inf.	636	8	7	C
Wheeler, Commie D.	Cpl. Co. B, 18th Inf.	608	7	17	B
Whitley, John C.	Cpl. Co. A, 120th Inf.	636	9	6	A
Wiggins, John W.	Pvt. 1 c. Co. D, 120th Inf.	636	9	11	A
Wilcox, Robt. E.	Cpl. Co. K, 28th Inf.	636	8	18	C
Williams, Dennis J.	Pvt. Co. C, 344th Lab. Bn.	107-E	6	4	D
Williams, Earnest W.	Pvt. Co. M, 120th Inf.	636	16	8	C
Williams, Frank B.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 365th Inf.	34	8	5	A
Williams, Herman.	Pvt. Co. A, 305th Lab. Bn.	1233	14	23	C
Williams, Horace.	Pvt. Co. M, 808th Pion. Inf. ¹				
Williams, Rodgers.	Pvt. Co. D, 320th Lab. Bn.	608	35	8	D
Wilson, Ewart V.	Pvt. Co. F, 7th Engrs.	636	1	13	A
Wilson, John B.	Sgt. Co. C, 315th Engrs.	1232	37	32	A
Winstead, Guy J.	1st Co. C, 38th Inf.	608	20	15	B
Winters, Arthur.	Pvt. Co. E, 117th Inf.	636	2	22	A
Woodard, Jacob.	Cook, 308th Mil. Police	608	2	5	D
Woodlief, Jos. B.	Pvt. Co. F, 165th Inf.	1232	37	38	A
Woodard, Lafayette H.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 33d Pion. Inf.	1233	36	10	D
Woolie, Bill.	Pvt. Co. C, 802d Pione. Inf.	1232	14	38	G
Wright, Edward.	Pvt. Co. D, 333d Lab. Bn.	1233	1	17	B
Yates, Chas. C.	Pvt. Co. C, 120th Inf.	636	15	18	B
Young, Harmon G.	Pvt. 1c. Co. C, 312th M. G. Bn.	1232	6	5	A
Yow, Eleanie.	Pvt. Co. I, 166th Inf.	1232	4	37	B
Winn, Danzie.	Pvt. Co. B, 344th Lab. Bn. ²				

¹Kerautras Cemetery, Brest, France, grave 71.

²Southern Cemetery, Manchester, England.

The War Department up to this time has been unable to furnish me with a list of the mothers and widows who would be entitled to make this free pilgrimage. I had thought that in view of this inability of the War Department to get this information that it would be desirable that I print the names of the American forces from North Carolina whose remains are interred in the cemeteries of Europe to the end that those who are entitled to make this pilgrimage can make application to the War Department so that the War Department can be enabled to ascertain just who is entitled to make the pilgrimage. While the pilgrimages can not begin until May 1, 1930, it is highly desirable that the War Department should know the names and addresses of those persons from North Carolina who are entitled to take the trip. Furthermore, it is desirable that the various posts of the American Legion should aid in securing this necessary data for the War Department. Information seasonably transmitted by those entitled to the benefits of this bill will enable them to make an early choice of convenient times of transportation. Thus travel will be equalized and the congestion otherwise resulting from a selection of departures at the peak of European travel will be avoided.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the bill H. R. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas already has that privilege under the leave granted in the House.

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Speaker, upon this special session of Congress devolves the imperative duty of responding to an equalization of the economic conditions in this country that have for several years deprived the farmers of reaping the results of their industry and toil.

The farmers have patiently awaited legislative relief, firm in their conviction that those who have been delegated by the people of the United States to carefully scrutinize the needs of legislation would recognize their unfortunate situation and legislate accordingly.

This session of Congress has been called for the specific purpose of enacting such legislation.

The crystallized wisdom accumulated through years of investigating the farm problems by the Agricultural Committees of Congress have been productive, and legislation seeking to remedy existing conditions, which have heretofore been beyond the power of accomplishment by the farmers of this country, will soon place into operation a system supported and encouraged by governmental assistance.

The first legislative step in this direction may contain imperfections which tried policies will amply demonstrate and which may be cured by future enactments.

The necessity for farm relief is no longer a mooted question, but an accepted fact. This unfortunate economic condition has been reflected in all the economic arteries of the business world, and while its influence may be postponed for a time, eventually it is manifested to an alarming degree.

Year after year the farmers of this country have bravely struggled on, but conditions which compel them to sell their products below the cost of production will eventually result in financial ruin.

Governmental aid in the disposal of surplus products when markets are congested, so that such surplus may reach the demands of consumers when there is existing need for the same, will give to the farmers that aid which shall enable them to secure such price for their products as they are reasonably worth when actually needed for consumption.

The speculator who has profited at the time of congested markets will to a great extent be relieved of his rewards, and the farmers will reap their merited results.

The young men on the farms during the last few years have struggled against adversities, with all the energy so characteristic of the American youth, imbued with the feeling that eventually conditions would change, and that they would then be seasoned by experience and training to reap the results of their industry and toil. Their hopes and aspirations did not materialize, and the dreams of youth were shattered by cold facts unfolded through the years.

Many farmers of former years who had attained a comfortable allowance for the declining days of life have been saddened by exacting conditions of the last few years which has consumed the results of their frugality, and now, with their shoulders burdened with the weight of years and as they are rapidly approaching the setting sun of life, they find themselves enslaved by poverty and despair.

May the Congress of the United States through legislative channels extend to this basic industry a helping hand in the hour of alarming distress, and such relief will brighten the homes now filled with gloom and disappointment, and there will radiate from such homes new life and new inspirations to combat the problems of the farm, with a feeling of satisfaction that they shall reap the reward of honest industry and toil.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. TEMPLE) was granted leave of absence, for two weeks, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 20, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1381) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bingham Canyon, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1382) granting the consent of Congress to the Jerome Bridge Co., a corporation, to maintain a bridge already constructed across the Gasconade River, near Jerome, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 1383) to provide for a survey of a route for the construction of a highway connecting certain

places associated with the life of Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 1384) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands bordering on and adjacent to Summit Lake, Nev., for the Paiute, Shoshone, and other Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) for the relief of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) providing for the exchange of lands within the limits of railroad grants and within the exterior limits of stock driveways; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) for the construction of an irrigation dam on Walker River, Nev.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Sparks, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal Building at Yerington, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Ruth, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Gardnerville, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1392) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Lovelock, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon at Ely, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) to reestablish and reopen the United States land office at Elko, Nev.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CAREW: A bill (H. R. 1395) to validate devises, bequests, and gifts from alien enemies to American citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 1396) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at De Witt, Arkansas County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1397) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at McGehee, Desha County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1398) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Lonoke, Lonoke County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 1399) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 1400) to amend the national prohibition act, as amended, and as published in Title 27 of the Code of Laws of the United States of America (44 Stat. L. 1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1401) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Marquette County, State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) permitting landowners who have suffered damages on account of prosecution and maintenance of the improvement of the Wisconsin and Fox Rivers, in the State of Wisconsin, to institute action in the Court of Claims or the United States district court for the recovery of such damages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 1403) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1405) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1407) to provide for preparation of a design or designs and estimates of the cost of a bridge to supplant the Chain Bridge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1408) to provide for the study, investigation, and survey, for commemorative purposes, of the Bull Run and second Manassas battle fields, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 1409) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Hillsboro, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1410) to provide for the aiding of farmers on wet lands in any State by making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, levee and drainage districts, counties, boards of supervisors, and/or other political subdivisions and legal entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 1411) to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 1412) making appropriations for certain expenses of the legislative branch incident to the first session of the Seventy-first Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 1413) to provide for the election of a board of education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 1414) to establish two United States correctional institutions for the confinement of persons convicted of offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) to provide for the refitting of the frigate *Constitution*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 1416) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 1417) to authorize the acquisition for forestry purposes of lands within the Territory of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 1418) to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) to establish a national military park to commemorate the Battle of Kings Mountain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 1420) to authorize the Secretary of War to loan aeronautical equipment and material for purposes of research and experimentation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 1421) to aid the University of Maryland in the instruction of students of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 1422) authorizing the purchase of certain lands to enable the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to harvest wild rice; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) to promote civilization and self-support among the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota and to carry into effect the agreement with said Indians under the provision of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L. 642); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 1424) to provide for the eradication of Mediterranean fruit fly in certain infested areas in the State of Florida, and authorizing appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) providing for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the founding of the city of Nashville by Gen. James Robertson; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROMJUE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) calling upon the President of the United States to reduce the tariff on materials and commodities essential to and generally used by the agricultural population of the United States in carrying on the farming industry, and for lessening the burdens now imposed upon agriculture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. KVALE: Memorial of the State Legislature of Minnesota, relative to the investigation of livestock marketing by the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Minnesota, favoring the enactment of legislation prohibiting the importation

into the United States of any meat originating in any country in which foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Minnesota, inviting the President to come to Minnesota during the summer of 1929, and extending the freedom of the State of Minnesota for use as the summer Capital of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Minnesota, urging Congress to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee battle field in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELVIG: Memorial of the State Legislature of Minnesota, directing attention to the necessity of maintaining an embargo on the importation of livestock, meat, and animal products from countries where the foot-and-mouth and other dangerous and fatal contagious diseases exist; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 1425) granting an increase of pension to Anna Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) granting a pension to Albert O. Yonaka; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 1427) granting a pension to Frances Bull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 1428) for the relief of Thomas Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1429) for the relief of Thomas Barrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) for the relief of Alexander C. Doyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1431) for the relief of Thomas Gaffney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) for the relief of John D. O'Connell, first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 1433) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Turtle Bayou, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1434) to authorize a survey of West Galveston Bay and adjacent waters, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 1435) granting a pension to Louisiana J. Swearingen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 1436) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Mae Yurasko; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1437) granting a pension to John W. H. Deal; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 1438) authorizing the appointment of William H. Armstrong as captain of Infantry, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 1439) for the relief of Sucs. de L. Villamil & Co., of San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 1440) for the relief of John B. Evans; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 1441) granting a pension to Isaac M. H. Fletcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1442) granting a pension to Reuben R. Sanchez; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 1443) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda McChesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 1444) for the relief of Marmaduke H. Floyd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 1445) granting a pension to John W. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1446) granting a pension to James A. Chaffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1447) granting a pension to William McDermott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 1448) granting a pension to Max Shar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1449) for the relief of Paymaster Charles Robert O'Leary, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1450) granting a pension to Martha Jane Misner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1451) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Wilkie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 1452) for the relief of Francis Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1453) for the relief of Charles Clarence Schilling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1454) granting an increase of pension to Mary Wiley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1455) granting a pension to Lucy J. Goodrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1456) granting a pension to Mary Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1457) granting a pension to Elizabeth Perryman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1458) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1459) granting a pension to Jane Kinney Rittenhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1460) granting a pension to Ellen Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 1461) granting an increase of pension to Candace J. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1462) granting a pension to Annie P. Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1463) granting a pension to Georgia Cayinus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 1464) granting a pension to Sarah Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1465) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Short; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 1466) granting a pension to Mary L. Hagerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 1467) granting a pension to Ella May Chappell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1468) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Tetzwiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1469) granting a pension to Blanche Hollingshead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1470) granting a pension to Susanna Brubaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1471) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hammer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1473) granting a pension to Elizabeth G. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1474) granting a pension to Elizabeth Gummo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1475) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1476) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bowser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1477) granting a pension to Margaret Roush; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 1478) granting an increase of pension to Emelia Retzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) granting a pension to Mathilda H. Byrnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1480) for the relief of Theresa Scherer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of James C. Fritzen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) for the relief of Paine Lumber Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) for the relief of Maj. Lester L. Lampert; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1484) for the relief of the late George W. Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of Arthur H. Thiel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) for the relief of William J. Sachse; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1487) to correct the military record of Frank Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) providing for the examination of Manitowoc (Wis.) Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) providing for the examination and survey of Two Rivers (Wis.) Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1490) granting a pension to Charles A. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) granting a pension to Mary Ann Webb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of the widow and minor children of Raymond C. Hanford; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) for the relief of Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1494) for the relief of Maj. O. S. McCleary, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1495) granting a pension to Alma S. Kendall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1496) granting an increase of pension to Susan T. Sailor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1497) granting a pension to Maria Morton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Frederick Richards; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) for the relief of C. O. Crosby; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 1500) for the relief of Gaston M. Janson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of William H. Connors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Arthur Daniel Newman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1503) granting an increase of pension to Addie R. Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1504) to provide for the retirement of August Wolters as a first sergeant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1505) granting a pension to Luella H. Schreiner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1506) granting a pension to James A. Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) providing for the advancement of Robert G. Dickson on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of Maude L. Duborg; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1510) for the relief of Thomas T. Grimesley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1511) for the relief of Thomas Finley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1512) for the relief of J. Linwood Johnson; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of Edward B. Fox, administrator of the last surviving partner of the firm of Child, Pratt & Fox; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1515) for the relief of C. N. Knight, administrator of John Ridout MacGregor; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of Anna Volker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1517) for the relief of James W. Rollins; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1518) for the relief of J. W. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 1519) granting a pension to Stanley Eugene Spear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 1520) for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Brennan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 1521) granting a pension to Mary E. Dutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1522) granting a pension to Ann C. Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1523) granting a pension to Martha Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1524) granting a pension to Jennie Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 1525) to correct the military record of James H. Overbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1526) to change the military record of Thomas J. Hayden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) for the relief of Edna B. Erskine; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) for the relief of Sophie Caffrey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1529) for the relief of Sophie K. Stephens; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1530) for the relief of Aaron Freilich; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1531) for the relief of Margaret Constable; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1532) for the relief of the estate of William Bardel; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1533) for the relief of Joseph J. McCallister; to the Committee on Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1534) granting a pension to Rebecca H. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 1535) granting a pension to Otho W. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1536) granting a pension to William A. Finley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) granting an increase of pension to Belle McCaw Alston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 1538) granting a pension to Rosa Ann Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1539) granting a pension to Mary D. McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 1540) for the relief of R. A. Chambers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1541) granting an increase of pension to Emma B. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) granting a pension to Louemma Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1543) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Hertzler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1544) granting a pension to Caroline W. Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1545) granting a pension to Mary E. Schmidt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) for the relief of Thomas Seltzer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) for the relief of William Michael McMahon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) granting a pension to Virginia Ogden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 1549) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1550) granting an increase of pension to Minerva J. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1551) granting an increase of pension to Leah Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1552) granting an increase of pension to Belle E. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Stoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1554) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Trimble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1555) granting a pension to Annie Brubaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) granting a pension to Annie M. Kinsel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1558) granting an increase of pension to Susan Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1559) for the relief of John T. Painter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) for the relief of John R. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1561) for the relief of R. C. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) for the relief of M. R. Welty; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) granting a pension to Aileen Oakley Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YATES: A bill (H. R. 1564) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Fred W. Boschen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 1565) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1566) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. A. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1567) granting an increase of pension to Ann M. Kisner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1568) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Crabtree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1570) granting an increase of pension to Lillie S. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) granting a pension to Amanda E. Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) granting a pension to Alice Wisener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1573) granting a pension to Ella E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) granting a pension to Mamie Hershberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1575) for the relief of Anthony Schiartzberger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

103. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of residents of Escanaba, Mich., expressing opposition to the operation of the so-called national-origins plan on the ground that it is unscientific, untenable, and un-American; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

104. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Resolution of the California Development Association, urging means for the control and eradication of the European larch canker; to the Committee on Agriculture.

105. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Tiff Thomson, Texoma, Okla., protesting against tariff on hides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

106. Also, petition of the Monarch Lumber Co., in regard to tariff on shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

107. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of J. O. Ash, manager of Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Madisonville, Tex., opposing increased tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

108. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of members of the Central Cooperative Association at their eighth annual stockholders' meeting at the Hotel Lowry, St. Paul, Minn., opposing any tariff on Canadian lumber, logs, and shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

109. Also, petition of the Farmers' Cooperative Shipping Association, Wheaton, Minn., urging legislation providing for Government supervision of the weighing and grading of livestock at private concentration points; to the Committee on Agriculture.

110. Also, petition of the Freeland Farmers' Union, Local No. 108, of Lac qui Parle County, Minn., urging passage of the McNary-Haugen bill or some bill of similar nature for immediate farm relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

111. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Eastern Federation of Feed Merchants, Albany, N. Y., concerning farm relief legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

112. Also, petition of N. L. Lederer (Inc.), New York City, regarding the tariff duties on glue, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

113. By Mr. MENGES: Petition of Col. Edwin B. Watts Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of York, Pa., signed H. C. Weller and others, favoring the passage of House bill 14676, granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, marines, and nurses of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

114. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and Ann Arbor, Mich., protesting against calling of international conference by the President of the United States, etc., for the purpose of revising the present calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

115. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Hutcheson & Co. (Inc.), New York City, with reference to Schedule 7, agricultural products and provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

116. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of 90 adult residents of Nielsville, Minn., urging the repeal of the national origins provision of the immigration act and support to the opinion of the President; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

117. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions of Cumann Bhreandain, the St. Brendan Society, urging the repeal of the national origins clause of the immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

118. By Mr. YATES: Petition of National Biscuit Co., of Evanston, Ill., urging support of tariff on pecans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

119. Also, petition of Carnegie Institution of Washington, urging support of census amendment; to the Committee on the Census.

120. Also, petition of I. E. Seymour, secretary-treasurer D. D. Corporation, Batavia, Ill., opposing bill increasing tariff on blackstrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

121. Also, petition of Mrs. Gilbert W. Kelly, 412 Cumnor Road, Kenilworth, Ill., urging support of Newton bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

122. Also, petition of Miss Elizabeth Pratt, 718 Clark Street, Evanston, Ill., urging support of bill increasing tariff on pecans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

123. Also, petition of Harry Motsinger, the past senior vice commander of Illinois Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging increase of pensions to nurses, soldiers, and sailors of the war with Spain, Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

124. Also, petition of B. B. Russell, of Russell Automotive Products, 2019 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging repeal of national-origins provision of immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

125. Also, petition of Cora L. Holinger, 617 Fullerton Parkway, Chicago, Ill., urging defeat of bill to provide child-welfare extension service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

126. Also, petition of Miss Inger M. Schjoldeger, 426 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging support of repeal of national-origins provision of the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

127. Also, petition of Vernon Rogers, 4830 Kammerling Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging support of tariff on pecans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

128. Also, petition of Frank P. Mitchell, 21 Fourth Street south, St. Charles, Ill., urging support of tax on pecans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

129. Also, petition of Jacoby Art Glass Co., St. Louis, Mo., urging support of bill increasing tariff on art glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

130. Also, petition of Harry Motsinger, of Anna State Hospital, Anna, Ill., urging passage of bills increasing pensions of certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

131. Also, petition of Dr. Arthur G. Falls, 309 East Forty-seventh Street, Chicago, Ill., opposing passage of Newton bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

132. Also, petition of Alfred Granger, president the Architects Club of Chicago, Ill., urging passage of a bill to purchase of additional land four blocks north of Pennsylvania Avenue; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

133. Also, petition of Mrs. Frederick C. Grant and Helen Grant, secretary, 2145 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill., urging support of bill establishing Federal department of education; to the Committee on Education.

134. Also, petition of Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Springfield, Ill., urging enactment of legislation necessary to locate a United States district court at Rockford Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. Also, petition of Grand Lodge of Independent Order of Vikings, of Chicago, Ill., opposing "national-origins clause"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

136. Also, petition of Miss Elizabeth B. Dodge, 4015 North Hermitage Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging support of Welch-Smoot Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

137. Also, petition of Dr. James A. Harvey, 25 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill., and Dr. James H. Hutton, secretary Chicago Medical Society, urging defeat of Newton bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

138. Also, petition of Fred. L. Formento, quartermaster, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Cantigny Post, No. 367, Joliet, Ill., and John V. Egan, Joliet, Ill., urging support of war veterans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

139. Also, petition of Albert F. Harnecke and M. M. Green, Joliet, Ill., urging support of war veterans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

140. Also, petition of Leo M. Arms, 4225 Addison Street, Chicago, Ill., opposing "national origins clause"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

141. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles H. Parkes, president, the Woman's Auxiliary to the Chicago Medical Society, opposing Newton bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

142. Also, petition of Victor Cypher, 3209 East Ninety-second Street, Chicago, Ill.; Charles Gestner, 10725 Avenue O, Chicago, Ill.; Frank Sprowling, Rock Island, Ill.; and Veterans Spanish-American War of Charleston, Ill., urging support of bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors,

and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

143. Also, petition of H. W. De Jarrette, 3615 Byron Street; Peter O'Reilly, 5450 South La Salle Street; John J. Brasham, 702 North Waller Street; and Albert J. Ballard, 820 East Ninetieth Place, all of Chicago, Ill., urging support of bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

144. Also, petition of William A. Fortune, 175 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of bill increasing pension of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

145. Also, petition of Mrs. Sophia Schmitt, 10215 Avenue M; J. P. Lownsbury, 5728 South Green Street; member of Bob Evans Camp, No. 76; and Mrs. William Schaub, 3841 North Western Avenue, all of Chicago, Ill., urging support of bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

146. Also, petition of committee of J. R. Tanner Camp, No. 11, Hines, Ill., John W. Schreter, commander, and Father Ed. Kelly Camp, No. 113, United Spanish War Veterans, Chicago, Ill., urging support of bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

147. Also, petition of Charles E. Rudy Camp, No. 67, United Spanish War Veterans, Mattoon, Ill., and Charles J. Nelson, 860 Longwood Drive, Blue Island, Ill., urging support of bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

148. Also, petition of James W. Freeman, 3139 West Thirty-ninth Place; S. R. Higgins, 7638 Lawrence Avenue; Mrs. Bertha Schmitt, 10215 Avenue M; and Emess J. Arnold, 3428 West Sixty-second Place, all of Chicago, Ill., urging support of bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

149. Also, petition of Dr. E. L. Benjamin, M. D., 5934 Winthrop Avenue, Chicago, Ill., opposing Newton bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

150. Also, petition of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Chicago Medical Society, 1910 Lincoln Avenue, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the Newton bill and Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

151. Also, petition of A. W. Burnhorn, 3641 East Ninety-ninth Street; Ernest W. Woods, member Bagley Camp, No. 11, Department of Illinois, United Spanish War Veterans; and Mrs. H. Schmitt, 10215 Avenue M, all of Chicago, Ill., urging support of bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

152. Also, petition of members of Mary J. Brainard Tent No. 57, Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Rockford, Ill., urging support of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, April 20, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Because of Thy mercy and compassion, our Heavenly Father, our grateful hearts run out toward duty and the future. This divine endowment makes man the favorite of heaven and earth. Do Thou enthroned in all our breasts a love for Thy law and clothe us in the garments of Him who glorifies our God across the centuries. We thank Thee for the countless manifestations of divine love. It glows in the sunlight; it breathes in the morning air; it blossoms in the landscape; it gleams in the radiant sky; and it gives courage and comfort in the hours of loneliness and sorrow. Glory be to Thy name, O Lord most high! Thy name is love! We praise Thee for its power and for the glory and beauty of Thy holiness. Blessed Lord, cheer the common heart of our country and of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a request of the House, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLLIER asks leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Merrill Engineering Co., Seventieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SWARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Members desiring to take the oath will please come forward.

Mr. MOONEY, of Ohio, and Mr. PARKS, of Arkansas, appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 1412, making appropriations for certain expenses of the legislative branch incident to the first session of the Seventy-first Congress. I will say to the Members that this bill is for the miscellaneous expenses of this Congress, including mileage of the Members of the House and the Senate. The bill also includes the annuities to departed Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray certain expenses incident to the first session of the Seventy-first Congress, namely:

SENATE

For mileage of Senators, \$51,000.

For 21 pages for the Senate Chamber at the rate of \$3.30 each per day from April 15, 1929, until the end of the first session of the Seventy-first Congress, such amount as may be necessary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

To pay to the widow of Royal H. Weller, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of Charles W. Roark, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, \$10,000.

For the benefit of Robert C. Martin, , minor, son of Whitmell P. Martin, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, \$10,000, to be paid to the legal guardian of Robert C. Martin.

The three foregoing sums shall be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

For mileage of Representatives and Delegates and expenses of Resident Commissioners, \$175,000.

For stationery for Members and Delegates and Resident Commissioners, at \$125 each, \$55,000.

For 41 pages, including 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at \$3.30 each per day, from April 15, 1929, until the end of the first session of the Seventy-first Congress, such amount as may be necessary.

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of salaries and labor unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, and including reimbursement to the official stenographers to committees for the amounts actually and necessarily paid out by them for transcribing hearings, fiscal year 1929, \$25,390.43.

For expenses of special and select committees, fiscal year 1929, \$4,424.65.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. HAUGEN. 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. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries.