

PAGE 2

THE SOUTHERN WATCHMAN

AUGUST 21, 1943

## The South Isn't Anti-New Deal---The New Deal Is Anti-Southern

That anti-Southern magazine published in New York, "The New Republic," issued a special section a few days ago entitled "Reaction in Congress," and this special section has been receiving a good deal of attention down here.

Among other things, The New Republic compiles the voting records of all members of the House and Senate, and it sets forth to the manner in which each member of Congress supported or opposed the administration. In the House, twenty votes were selected, and on each issue The New Republic made it plain as to whether the representative voted "for the administration" or "against the administration."

### The Issues

Here are the selected issues, and the administration position on each:

1. The Hobbs anti-racketeering bill, introduced by Rep. Sam Hobbs of Alabama and passed April 9, 1942 by a vote of 270-107. Opposed by administration.

2. The Smith-Connelly anti-strike bill. Passed by the House on June 4. Opposed by the administration.

3. Overriding of the president's veto on the Smith-Connelly bill. This took place June 25, and was carried, 244-108. Opposed, of course, by the administration.

4. The Ranspock federal pay bill. This is a bill to increase the income of federal employees during the war to compensate them for the increased cost of living. Passed by the House May 5 by a vote of 273-119. Favored by the administration.

5. Lifting the \$25,000 net ceiling placed on salaries by the president. This roll call is on the final passage of the bill raising the debt limit of the United States government, which carried a rider canceling the president's administrative order limiting net salaries after deduction of income tax to \$25,000 a year. Passed by the House on March 12 by the vote of 268-129. Opposed by administration.

6. Federal income-tax bill. This is the final vote in the House on the current tax bill. "As finally drawn down by the Conference Committee of the Senate and House," says The New Republic, "it placed a proportionately much heavier burden of taxes on those with small incomes." Passed by the House June 1 by a vote of 256-114. Opposed by administration.

7. No incentive payments to farmers. The Cannon amendment to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture forbids the use of any funds provided by this bill as "incentive payments." It was passed by the House April 20 by a vote of 229-90. Opposed by administration.

8. Increased appropriation for soil conservation payments by \$100,000,000. This was the vote on the conference report of the Senate and the House on the appropriation bill for

the Department of Agriculture. The motion to concur with the conference report was carried June 22 by a vote of 185-175. Favored by administration.

9. No incentive payments to farmers on certain crops. Later the same day the House refused to concur with the Senate on the conference report allowing any of the funds which they had earlier appropriated to be used as incentive payments on certain crops, so continuing their support of the Cannon amendment. The motion to concur, favored by the administration, was lost on June 22 by a vote of 166-177.

10. No funds for crop insurance. On June 23, the next day, the House again took up the consideration of the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture and refused to concur with its recommendation that funds be provided in this bill for crop insurance on certain crops. The motion to concur, favored by the administration, was lost on June 23 by a vote of 160-208.

11. Refusal to appropriate \$10,000,000 more for the Rural Electrification program. Later the same day, June 23, the House again refused to concur with the recommendation of the conference report that funds for the Rural Electrification Program be increased from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000. This motion to concur, favored by the administration, was lost in the House by a vote of 167-193.

12. Liquidation of the Home Owners Loan Corporation. The bill providing the appropriation for the Independent Offices carried the Dirksen amendment providing for the liquidation of the HOLC. Passed by the House February 17 by a vote of 224-159. Opposed by the administration.

13. No funds for roll back of prices. The bill for the appropriation for war agencies in the executive office of the president was considered June 18 in the House. An amendment was offered which forbids any funds appropriated in this bill to be used for the roll back of prices. This amendment was carried in the House June 18 by a vote of 229-97. Opposed by administration.

14. Reduce funds for Office of Price Administration. Another amendment to the same bill was to reduce the funds for the enforcement division of the OPA from \$165,000,000, recommended in the bill, to \$130,000,000. This amendment was carried in the House June 18 by a vote of 185-147. Opposed by administration.

15. Regulating those who may serve as policy makers of price regulations. Another amendment to the bill specified that all the personnel of the OPA in policy-forming positions with relation to the fixing of prices must have at least five years continuous service in the business for which they were engaged to regulate prices. This representative from one Southern

amendment was passed in the House June 18 by a vote of 188-144. Opposed by administration.

16. Abolish the domestic branch of the Office of War Information. Amendment adopted by House June 18 by vote of 218-144. Opposed by administration.

17. Create the Smith committee. This House resolution authorized the creation of a committee headed by Rep. Howard Smith of Virginia, a foe of the administration, to investigate any division of the executive branch of the government which seemed to the committee to be overstepping its authority. This resolution was passed by the House February 11 by a vote of 259-50. Opposed by administration.

18. Continue the existence of the Dies Committee. This resolution was passed by the House on February 10 by a vote of 302-94. Opposed by administration.

19. Dismissal of the three left-wingers, Watson, Dodd and Lovett. Representative Taber of New York offered an amendment to the urgent deficiency-appropriation bill for 1943, which forbade the use of any of the funds provided by this bill for payment of the salaries of Watson, Dodd or Lovett. The amendment was passed by the House May 18 by a vote of 278-60. Opposed by the administration.

20. Anti-poll tax bill. This bill abolishes the requirement of a poll tax for the privilege of voting in the election of any federal position as prescribed by state law. This bill was passed by the House May 25 by a vote of 265-110. Favored by the administration.

### The South's Position

We transmit this information to you for the purpose of showing accurately just what it takes to make an administration congressman or an anti-administration congressman, or more accurately, just what it takes to make a New Dealer or an anti-New Dealer. This compilation, as we pointed out, has been cited by a number of Southern newspapers within the past few days to show that, as far as the records are concerned, the majority of Southern negroes are anti-New Deal. The logical conclusion is that, in being anti-New Deal, they are also anti-Roosevelt and anti-Democratic. They stand in the strange position of being Democratic almost to the man, as far as the label is considered, but in being decidedly anti-Democratic as far as the voting record is concerned.

The truth of the matter is that our Southern representatives in Congress are not necessarily anti-Roosevelt or anti-Democratic; they are merely pro-Southern, and the national administration itself is guilty of being anti-Southern. Consider two or three of the issues selected by The New Republic for this test—among them being the anti-poll tax bill. Only one Democratic

poll tax state voted for this legislation which would put the federal government in charge of our elections, precisely as it had charge of them during the First Reconstruction—and yet we are depicted as anti-New Deal, anti-Roosevelt, anti-Democratic for opposing this measure which is aimed directly at the very states which have been the most consistent in supporting the New Deal, Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party.

The Dies Committee is strongly favored by Southern men. Its chairman, Martin Dies, has been vilified by the radicals from one end of the country to the other, and some of our own "liberal" sheets have joined in the cry against him, but Martin Dies is a Southern man, with a Southern outlook, speaking for the Southern people. He stands for the same things for which we stand, and his work is approved by the white people of the South. Yet, when Southern Democrats give a vote of approval for this fellow Democrat from the South, they are branded as anti-Democratic.

The Hobbs anti-racketeering bill was introduced and sponsored by a Southern Democrat, Rep. Sam Hobbs of Alabama; and it had the overwhelming support of the Southern people—yet Southern congressmen, when they supported this measure, found themselves branded as anti-New Deal, anti-Roosevelt, and anti-Democratic. Every single congressman from Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, North Carolina, Virginia, Texas, and South Carolina (there are only two Republicans in that whole lot) has been branded as anti-New Deal, anti-Roosevelt, and anti-Democratic for having supported this Southern Democratic measure. The same thing goes for the Smith-Connelly anti-strike bill—a bill sponsored by two Southern men, Rep. Howard Smith of Virginia and Senator Tom Connally of Texas. Almost unanimously, the South supported this Democratic measure, yet in so doing it has been branded as anti-New Deal, anti-Roosevelt and anti-Democratic.

Thus with the majority of the other test issues selected by The Republic—with the result that we can reach only one conclusion: Something is definitely screwy when the most Democratic section of America is the most decidedly anti-Democratic. This condition cannot continue to exist. We cannot run with the hare and hold with the hounds. We may remain "loyal" to the National Democratic Party in the next presidential election, or the next after that, but this business of fighting it with one hand and befriending it with the other cannot go over forever. The South cannot continue to support, year in and year out, the party which at this moment is as radically anti-Southern as was the Republican Party in Grant's day. We have got to recapture the Democratic Party, and reconstitute it as a party which respects the South, or we have got to disown it completely.