

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 24), 1924

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Mary T. Jacobson, Blakesburg.
Claude M. Sullivan, Cherokee.
Orpha M. Bloomer, Havelock.
Wilbert W. Clover, Lohrville.
Benjamin R. Mowery, Maquoketa.

MASSACHUSETTS

Roland M. Baker, Boston.

NEBRASKA

Walter G. Mangold, Bennington.

NORTH CAROLINA

Annie L. Stanton, Stantonsburg.

OHIO

Ralph B. Troyer, Continental.
George F. Burford, Farmdale.
Michael J. Meek, McDonald.

TEXAS

Arthur E. Davis, Blue Ridge.
Sol D. Smith, Granbury.
Duane B. Scarborough, Oakwood.
Thomas B. Higgins, Reagan.
Othello Lewin (Mrs.), Remlig.
Clarence V. McMahan, Waco.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Trusting in Thy loving providence, our heavenly Father, we seek to bring to Thee our devout expressions of gratitude. Remember us, O Lord, and cause us to keep Thy commandments willingly and faithfully. Define for us each day the pathway of duty and give us deep desire to obey its obligation. Inspire and bless every movement throughout our country that means the advancement of the social, political, and Christian life of our fellow men. O hear us, help us, bless us, and forgive us, for Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journals of Saturday, April 26, 1924, and Sunday, April 27, 1924, were read and severally approved.

CHANGING NAME OF THIRTY-SEVENTH STREET BETWEEN CHEVY CHASE CIRCLE AND RENO ROAD

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate bill 1932, to change the name of Thirty-seventh Street between Chevy Chase Circle and Reno Road, and ask that it be taken from the Speaker's table, an identical House bill being on the calendar with a favorable report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts calls up for consideration Senate bill 1932, an identical House bill being on the calendar and having been favorably reported. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the name and street now known as Thirty-seventh Street between Chevy Chase Circle and Reno Road be, and the same is hereby, changed to Chevy Chase Drive, and the surveyor of the District of Columbia is hereby directed to enter such change on the records of his office.

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of child labor, with special reference to the amendment that was passed Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman already has that privilege and all Members of the House have that privilege.

READING OF RESOLUTION

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution and ask that it be read to the House for its information.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FOOD CONTROL AND THE DISTRICT RENTS ACT

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, House Resolution 270.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the resolution is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly. Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to have the resolution reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the House proceeds in Committee of the Whole to the further consideration of H. R. 7962, entitled, "A bill to create and establish a commission as an independent establishment of the Federal Government to regulate rents of the District of Columbia," it shall be in order at any time to offer the following as a substitute for the text of the bill:

"Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That it is hereby declared that the emergency described in Title II of the food control and District rents act still exists and continues in the District of Columbia, and that the present housing and rental conditions therein require the further extension of the provisions of such title.

"Sec. 2. That Title II of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, as amended, is reenacted, extended, and continued, as hereinafter amended, until the 22d day of May, 1926, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to extend for the period of two years the provisions of Title II of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, as amended," approved May 22, 1922.

"Sec. 3. That subdivision (a) of section 102 of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, as amended by section 4 of such act of May 22, 1922, is hereby amended by striking out the figures "1924" in said subdivision and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "1926".

Upon the offering of the substitute there shall be not to exceed two hours general debate, one-half to be controlled by those favoring the substitute and one-half by those opposing.

At the conclusion of the general debate the substitute shall be considered under the five-minute rule, and during that consideration it shall be in order to offer an amendment to the substitute providing for the reduction of number of commissioners provided for in said bill.

At the hour of 4 o'clock, if the consideration of the substitute shall not have been sooner completed, the committee shall vote upon the substitute as amended, if any amendments have been adopted, and immediately upon the conclusion of that vote the committee shall automatically rise and report the bill and any amendments, or the substitute and any amendments, to the House; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments for final passage.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] deserves the credit for first calling attention to this point of order. I did not care to be in the attitude of trying to take his point of order away from him, but I thought it should be made at the time it was offered as a privileged resolution.

I do not think the resolution is privileged at all, and there are at least two decisions of the Speaker of the House clearly covering the question.

If the Rules Committee can substitute a bill for a bill that a committee has reported, it can take any bill on which they are asked for a rule, or whether they are asked for a rule or not, and take the power away from the legislative committee to consider such bills.

The SPEAKER. They could suggest that the House do it, but the committee itself can not do it.

Mr. TINCHER. I understand; but here is the point—

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to have the gentleman state his point of order.

Mr. TINCHER. The point of order is that the resolution is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. Why not?

Mr. TINCHER. Because the Rules Committee has reported a resolution containing legislation over which the District Committee had jurisdiction and the bill has not been considered by the District Committee. For that reason I believe the resolution is not privileged.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes; I would like to have the gentleman from Texas present this point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas briefly.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have spent quite a lot of time looking up this question. The rules of the House, as

the Speaker knows, prescribe the jurisdiction of every committee of this House. They give to the District of Columbia Committee jurisdiction over all matters affecting the District of Columbia and prescribe the limitations and jurisdiction of the Rules Committee. The Chair will note that section 56 of Rule XI prescribes that the only jurisdiction which the Committee on Rules has is on rules, joint rules, and procedure; in other words, it fixes the procedure of the House, but nowhere has it ever been held that it can propose legislation to the House which belongs to the jurisdiction of another committee.

I want to cite the Chair to four precedents and they have never been overturned. First, I want to cite the Chair to the precedent of August 15, 1912. Mr. Henry, of Texas, who was then chairman of the Committee on Rules, presented to this House a Senate resolution as privileged to create a committee looking to the purchase of Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson. Our distinguished former colleague from Illinois, than whom there never has been a better parliamentarian in this House, Mr. Jim Mann, made a point of order that it was not privileged under the rules, notwithstanding its coming from the Committee on Rules. The Chair will note that Mr. Mann there stated what the rule was. Let me read what Mr. Mann said:

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to hear that.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to have it go into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has control of the time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to put in the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Mann's statements and position, which were sustained by Speaker Cannon, in connection with this matter, and other excerpts from other Members on the same point? May I have unanimous consent to do that?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss further this point of order for a moment, if I may.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mann called attention—

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes the gentleman to confine himself to this point.

Mr. BLANTON. This is the point: Part of this resolution is privileged in that it fixes the order of procedure of the House. There is no question about that. The first seven or eight lines of the resolution are clearly privileged, and the latter part of the resolution is privileged under the rules because it fixes procedure, but the part of the resolution which sets up three different sections as a proposed substitute is legislative matter and is clearly not privileged because the Committee on Rules has no authority under its jurisdiction, under the rules, to propose to the House legislation. The Committee on Rules clearly attempts to make in order a three-section bill of its own prescribing it as a substitute for the Lampert measure. It clearly has no right to make in order legislation of this nature.

I want to call the Chair's attention to what happened the other day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to hear anything further on that. The Chair will hear the gentleman if he has any further precedents.

Mr. BLANTON. I cite the Chair also, as a precedent, what happened on January 11, 1918. The Speaker will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date on page 833. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POT] brought in a resolution to create a new committee, which the Rules Committee clearly had the right to do, but incidental to that rule he attempted to give that committee a clerk, and Mr. SANFORD, of New York, made a point of order that they had no right to give the committee a clerk, because that was beyond its jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is familiar with that decision.

Mr. BLANTON. And over some of the best parliamentarians on this floor, including the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POT], including the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and including the former Member from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], Mr. Speaker Clark held that the Committee on Rules had no authority to present legislation that properly belonged to another committee, and on the mere fact alone that it attempted to grant a clerk, which was in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Accounts, Mr. Speaker Clark held that was out of order.

Applying this present rule, here is the Lampert measure of 35 pages which has been considered by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Committee on Rules attempts by this resolution not only to prescribe procedure for the Lampert bill, which it has the right to do—it has a right to do anything it wants to with the Lampert bill, but it does not stop there. If the Speaker pleases, it attempts to provide a substitute for the Lampert bill, an entirely new piece of legislation, and legislation

that is foreign to the provisions of the Lampert bill, and clearly that is legislation and you can not get around it, Mr. Speaker. It is legislation that properly belongs to another committee. It goes beyond the jurisdiction that the House has conferred upon the Committee on Rules. Mr. Speaker, if we were to permit the Committee on Rules to offer this as a substitute for the Lampert bill; it could come in here and offer a substitute for every bill that comes from every committee of this House. It would destroy the integrity and the stability of the jurisdiction of every committee of this House, and I submit this to the Speaker in all earnestness, believing that this Committee on Rules should be held within its jurisdiction and not be permitted to report as privileged legislation of its own to this House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, from Illinois desire to be heard?

Mr. MADDEN. I simply wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules to report legislation and to make that legislation privileged. I believe the Committee on Rules has the right and the power to report any legislation that may be referred to the committee, but when they do report it, it must take its place on the calendar as any other legislation would. The only thing the Committee on Rules would have the power to report and make privileged would be a resolution making in order the consideration of pending legislation.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What else is done by this present resolution except to make in order pending legislation? This is purely a proposition for order of business.

Mr. MADDEN. This resolution provides for a substitute resolution.

Mr. SNELL. If it is adopted, it shall be in order to be offered by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. It would be the privileged order of business. I maintain that any resolution or any bill referred to the Committee on Rules may be reported by the committee, but the mere fact that the committee does report it gives no privilege whatever.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose the Ways and Means Committee should report a revenue bill. The Rules Committee could come in here, if this is held in order, and report an entire substitute for the revenue bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course. The Committee on Appropriations, for example, is authorized to report privileged appropriation bills. A privileged appropriation bill, under the rules, is a general appropriation bill. The Committee on Appropriations frequently comes in with resolutions, but the Committee on Appropriations recognizes as well as anybody else that such resolutions are not privileged, and to show you that we do not think they are privileged we always ask the House to give us unanimous consent for the consideration of such bills or resolutions.

On the other hand, the Ways and Means Committee has the right to report a revenue bill, but nobody will argue that the Committee on Ways and Means has the right, under the rules of the House, to report any kind of a resolution merely because it comes from the Ways and Means Committee and make that privileged. Further, the only reason why the Committee on Rules can make certain things privileged and give them immediate consideration is that they are the medium through which this House desires to give early consideration of measures that are pending. They are not pending if they are referred to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules may report them out and put them on the calendar.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. MADDEN. Later on, if the Committee on Rules chooses to report a rule making that privileged, I think they may do so, but, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has gone beyond their privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. There is pending before the Rules Committee the Begg resolution, which embraces this identical substitute. The Committee on Rules would not have any authority to report the Begg substitute, and it is an attempt to evade the rules of the House by proposing legislation.

Mr. WINGO. Will the Chair hear me?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. I want to suggest to the Chair that at first blush I thought the point of order was good. I am not in-

terested in the merits of the controversy, but I am interested in preserving the orderly procedure of the House. It is in order to-day, being District day, to consider the so-called Lampert bill. The rule presented provides that when the House proceeds in Committee of the Whole to the further consideration of the rent bill it shall be in order to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

What is the legislative matter before the House? Under the rules it is a bill regulating and affecting the rent law. It provides not only for its extension but the terms on which it will be extended and the jurisdiction of that Rent Commission during the extended term.

What is the substitute proposition? If it was offered on the floor it might go out on a point of order, but the rule of the Rules Committee does what it has done in many cases. It says that in the consideration of the bill before the House an amendment to that identical subject and that identical organization shall be in order in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Because the Committee on Rules frequently does what the gentleman says, unless somebody makes a point of order, it prevails, but in this case the Members of the House have exercised their privilege and made the point of order against the thing the Committee on Rules has no authority to do.

Mr. WINGO. The House considered the bill the other day, and there are some gentlemen who are in favor of rent legislation different from that provided in the bill, and others who are opposed to any legislation.

The whole question is before the House, and there is a question whether the proposed substitute would be in order; but there is no question that it refers to the Rent Commission, which is the substantive part of the bill. It refers to the extension that is brought before the House, and the committee simply cuts down the proposal to a simpler proposition that will meet the objections of some.

It occurs to me that it is a proper exercise of the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee to do that for which the Rules Committee exists—to present rules to enable the House to proceed in an orderly way in the situation in which the House finds itself to consider the subject before the House.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, the only thing I see that the resolution does is not to displace the measure, but simply to make the offering of a substitute in order at any time.

Mr. WINGO. It makes the substitute in order as an amendment to the bill, which the Rules Committee does quite frequently. If the House does not want it to be in order it can vote it down, but it can consider a proposition covering the Rent Commission and the terms under which it shall act in the future judgment of the House. In other words, the rule will enable the House to express its judgment; it may vote it down, but if it wants to consider the amendment it can do so. It is all a matter of procedure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. It seems to the Chair, as has been stated by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo], that this is one of the functions which the Rules Committee is constituted to exercise. It is preparing the way for the House to express its will on the pending bill. The Rules Committee very often makes provisions in order which otherwise would not be in order, it sends bills to conference, and provides for legislation, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution has been pretty thoroughly discussed, and I shall take very little time of the House. It makes it in order during the consideration of the bill H. R. 7962 to offer a substitute, which has been explained. It further provides that on the offering of that resolution there will be at least two hours of general debate, one-half to be controlled by those favoring the substitute and one-half by those opposed. At the conclusion of the general debate the substitute shall be considered under the five-minute rule, and during that time it shall be in order to offer an amendment reducing the number of commissioners. The reason that was provided for was because the Committee of the Whole expressed itself accordingly two weeks ago, and the Committee on Rules thought that that was in accordance with the expressed will of the House at that time. The rule further provides that at 4 o'clock, if the consideration of the substitute shall not have been concluded under the five-minute rule, the committee shall vote upon the substitute. The Rules Committee is divided upon the merit of the legislation, but they felt that they were doing what was one of the real functions of the Rules Committee, and that is provide a way for the consideration of legislation that they

believe the majority of the Members desire to take up and have concluded at this time.

Mr. JOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOST. Under this rule would any amendment other than that provided in the rule be in order?

Mr. SNELL. I think any amendment that pertains to the substitute proper, like changing 1926 or something of that kind, would be in order. Any amendment germane to the substitute would be in order.

Mr. JOST. Specifically, does the gentleman think that a substitute altering the proposition entirely would be in order under this rule?

Mr. SNELL. No; I would not think that a substitute altering the proposition entirely or presenting an entirely new proposition would be in order under the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has provided for two hours of general debate upon the substitute. Suppose after the time is used up in debate the substitute should be voted down. Then there would be no time whatever left to debate a 35-page bill.

Mr. SNELL. If the substitute be voted down, the committee will report it back to the House as having been voted down, and that would be the end of it, and that is what the gentleman wants.

Mr. BLANTON. But the committee would have to report the bill with a favorable report under the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, no; it does not provide that at all.

Mr. BLANTON. It says the bill. Suppose we vote down the substitute.

Mr. SNELL. Then the bill is before the House the same as if the substitute had not been offered, but if you vote down the substitute the bill is virtually killed.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is reported to the House for passage if the substitute is voted down. The original bill would then be before the House. We would either have to vote it up or vote it down.

Mr. SNELL. Not necessarily. If the substitute is defeated, you can go on and consider the original bill if the House wants to.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to yield me three minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, lest by silence my attitude be misunderstood, I avail myself of the brief time yielded to me by the chairman of the Committee on Rules to say that I am opposed to this rule, and that I am opposed to this legislation. I think the time has come when the property of the people of the District of Columbia should be returned to the rightful owners, to be controlled by them without further interference by the Federal Government. [Applause.] More than five years have elapsed since the armistice was agreed to. How long is this control of private property in the District by the Government to continue? It is now proposed to extend the operation of the rent control act for two years, and I predict here and now that when two years have passed the demand to extend the law will be just as great as the demand is to-day. Every time any legislation of this kind is enacted by the Congress in time of peace, in my humble judgment, it is a step in the direction of socialism, and this is quite a considerable step in that direction. As I have said, I shall not vote for either the rule or the legislation to which the substitute is offered.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 67, noes 32.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7962) to create and establish a commission, as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to regulate rents in the District of Columbia. Pending that, can we not make some agreement in respect to the control of the time?

Mr. BLANTON. Under the ordinary rules the gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to control half the time and I would be entitled to control the other half; but I would want to yield half of the time that I control to the gentleman from Massachu-

sets [Mr. UNDERHILL] because he represents one phase of this case.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time taken in opposition to the resolution be divided equally between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I suggest that the gentleman just fix the time, and I shall yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BEGG. Is that satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. That half the time be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT] and half the time by myself.

Mr. BEGG. Then I modify my unanimous-consent request so that it will leave the time in the control of the gentleman from Texas against the measure and in control of the gentleman from Wisconsin in favor of it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, in the event that the gentleman from Texas should yield one-half of his time to the gentleman from Massachusetts, would the gentleman from Massachusetts in turn have the right to yield portions of his time?

The SPEAKER. He would not; except by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I want that to be provided for.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests it would be better to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I be permitted to yield half my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] and that he may yield to others.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] had better make his original request.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I make the unanimous-consent request that the time against the measure be in control of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts equally, and that the time in favor of the resolution be in the control of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7962) to create and establish a commission, as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to regulate rents of the District of Columbia, with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7962, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7962) to create and establish a commission, as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to regulate rents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAMPERT: Strike out after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That it is hereby declared that the emergency described in Title II of the food control and the District rents act still exists and continues in the District of Columbia, and that the present housing and rental conditions therein require the further extension of the provisions of such title.

"Sec. 2. That Title II of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, as amended, is reenacted, extended, and continued, as hereinafter amended, until the 22d day of May, 1926, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to extend for the period of two years the provisions of Title II of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, as amended, approved May 22, 1922.'

"Sec. 3. That subdivision (a) of section 102 of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, as amended by section 4 of such

act of May 22, 1922, is hereby amended by striking out the figures '1924' in said subdivision and inserting in lieu thereof the figures '1926.'

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion, from reading the rule, that it would be conducive to more orderly procedure that the general debate should be concluded before substitutes were offered.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer a substitute, to have it pending after the general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the substitute of the gentleman from Texas will be reported for the information of the committee.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. LAMPERT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "It shall be unlawful for any corporation, firm, or individual to enter into or become a party to any contract, agreement, or understanding, or in any manner whatsoever to confederate, combine, or act with another or others, for the purpose and with the design of lessening or preventing, or tending to lessen or prevent, full and free competition in the renting of real estate, or to fix rents within the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 2. Any corporation, firm, or individual convicted of violating the provisions of this act shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$500, or by imprisonment not less than 30 days nor more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I simply want to make an observation before starting with a brief discussion of what I think the debate will hinge around to-day, namely, the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court.

The argument was offered the other day that the operation of the rent law increased the rents and made rents higher than if we had no rent law. Now, I just want to submit to the common reason of all the Members of the House that if that were true, it would seem rather out of the ordinary to have all the tenants, generally speaking, in favor of the Rent Commission and have all the opposition to this law come from the renting or the landlord side of it.

Now, it would seem to me that the mere statement of that ought to be rebuttal enough to any argument that might be made that the rent law does not function. If the rent law does not function, then why do the tenants want it and the landlords want it repealed or killed?

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

Mr. BEGG. I yield at this time to my good friend.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I think the gentleman is mistaken in saying that the tenants want this law continued.

Mr. BEGG. In a general sense I used that expression.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Not generally.

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BEGG. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, just what did the Supreme Court do in handing down that decision the other day? According to the best information available to me, the Supreme Court handed down a decision, or remanded the case, as it were, back to the lower court with instructions for it to ascertain whether or not the emergency on which the law was originally founded still existed.

I shall set up the premise that the Supreme Court of the United States is not interesting itself necessarily and of itself in the fact as to whether or not an emergency does exist, but on the contrary that court is interesting itself, when appealed to, as to whether or not the legislative body has exceeded its right to legislate in violation of the Constitution under the emergency which, according to my belief, is solely of legislative jurisdiction and function.

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

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield until I am through. I shall be delighted to yield when I am through.

Mr. MADDEN. I will not embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. BEGG. Oh, no; the gentleman could not. He belongs to my class. And I could not be insulted by anything he would say.

Mr. MADDEN. Therefore the gentleman can not yield.

Mr. BEGG. Now the Supreme Court has held repeatedly that a legislature in a State has a right to determine and as-

certain, and that the statement by the legislature that an emergency does exist is bona fide, and they have so held repeatedly in cases to which I will call attention of the committee. And I am going to show further that what the Supreme Court of the United States has held as being within the jurisdiction and power of the legislative body as to a State lies more powerfully with the National Congress in its jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, because the power of the Congress over the District is even greater than the power of the legislature over a State; and if the Supreme Court has held, as I will point out to you, continuously, regarding the action of the legislature of a State, who is there among the eminent lawyers in this House that wants to hazard his reputation as a lawyer by saying that the Supreme Court will override the findings of fact? I submit that the mere declaration of this body is an ascertainment of a fact, even though we err on the side of truth, and that the only ground that the Supreme Court has as to the overthrowing of a fact regarding the emergency by the National Congress would be on the bona fide submission of evidence of fraud or some wrongdoing on the part of the legislature coming to that decision on the findings of fact as to the emergency.

Now, when the Supreme Court, in the case of *Block v. Hirsh* (256 U. S. p. 135) held the rent act of October 22, 1919, constitutional and valid it necessarily decided that when the same or similar conditions exist, either of a temporary or permanent nature, the Congress has the constitutional right to pass that kind of a law. Certainly nobody will maintain that the Supreme Court has a right to challenge the finding of the Congress on any fact.

Suppose that because we declare an emergency exists the Supreme Court overturns that finding? Suppose that the National Congress and the Chief Executive find that there is an emergency of war already in progress? Somebody could carry an appeal of that finding of the fact to the Supreme Court of the United States and there would be precedent for that court to rule that the Congress had made a mistake in the finding of the fact that there was a national calamity or a war against this great domain. Personally I am not a bit embarrassed nor worried that the Supreme Court will overrule the finding of the fact. They did uphold the constitutionality of this law during an emergency and I will guess they will uphold it a second time so far as any facts are furnished them regarding the violation of the Constitution in the passage thereof.

Now, I would like to emphasize that in the finding of that opinion there was no decision contrary to the finding of that fact by the Supreme Court, and Mr. Justice McKenna, in delivering his dissenting opinion, assents to the view and uses the following language:

If this (the rent act) can be made to endure for two years, it can be made to endure for more.

Acting upon this constitutional right, the Congress, by act of August 24, 1921, first extended the rent act for seven months, and by the act of May 22, 1922, extended it for two more years—that is, to May 22, 1924.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Now, in the case of *United States v. Des Moines Navigation Co.* (142 U. S. 510) the court, speaking through Mr. Justice Harlan, at page 543, said:

That act is beyond challenge.

Now, I wish you would get this, you members of the committee who are going to argue the question of constitutionality.

The knowledge and good faith of a legislature—

Which was a State institution—

are not open to question.

Mr. CARTER. What was the question there?

Mr. BEGG. The question as to whether the Supreme Court could take cognizance of the finding of the fact of the emergency.

It is conclusively presumed that a legislature acts with full knowledge and in good faith. It is true the bill alleges that its passage was induced by the navigation company, by false representations and threats of suits; but such an allegation amounts to nothing.

So says the Supreme Court. It was argued before the court that the law was passed through fraudulent means and not in good faith, yet the Supreme Court says it is not within its province to take notice even of that kind of a charge.

Mr. KUNZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield.

From what examination has been given to this subject, it appears that whether a statute is constitutional or not is always a question of power.

That is the Supreme Court. Does any man maintain that this Congress does not have the power to extend a law that it itself has passed and that the Supreme Court has held constitutional? Certainly the gentleman from Kansas, who made such a blustering speech the other day on the fifth amendment to the Constitution, would not care to put himself in the ridiculous position of saying that the Congress has not the power to do what it did do and that which the court maintained.

Oh, men, it is time we got a little reason, and it is time we got a little bit of good sense into some of our practices and some of our arguments on the floor instead of attempting to win by sarcasm and satire.

They must assume that legislative discretion has been properly exercised. If evidence was required, it must be supposed that it was before the legislature when the act was passed.

And not before the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, then, it says:

And although it has sometimes been urged—

It does not say held—

at the bar that the courts ought to inquire into the motives of the legislature.

And so forth.

But remember, men, that the precedents have always held that the legislative body had the power to ascertain the facts.

Now, in *Fletcher v. Peck* (10 U. S.), in *Ex parte McCordle* (74 U. S.), in *Doyle v. Continental Insurance Co.* (94 U. S.), and in *Powell v. Pennsylvania* (127 U. S.), the position I am taking on the floor this afternoon has been sustained, namely, that the Congress has the power to ascertain the facts of an emergency, and any other position is not only hazardous but any other position than that is dangerous to the future welfare of the American Government.

Mr. KUNZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield. Now, then, there are other cases where the same principle is involved and those cases have the approval of the Supreme Court. In the case of *Moeschen v. Tenement House Department and Jacobson v. Massachusetts* (197 U. S.) the court sustained a law compelling vaccination. The same principle was at stake, men, and it was held in every single instance by the Supreme Court that the jurisdiction of the court did not extend far enough—

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

Mr. LAMPERT. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BEGG. That the jurisdiction of the court did not extend far enough to find out whether or not there was an epidemic of smallpox, but that it lies solely within the legislative power of the State to ascertain the facts, and the mere statement that the health and general welfare of the State at large was menaced unless the children were vaccinated was sufficient. The Supreme Court upheld that decision and said the State legislature had the right to compel the vaccination of the children.

Now, in the case of *Holden v. Hardy* (169 U. S. 391) the court sustained a law of Utah prohibiting laborers from working more than eight hours a day. Why, men, if a legislature can prevent an adult man from working more than eight hours a day, even though he enters into a contract so to do, and if a legislature can stop that on the ground that the general welfare of the whole people and the morals of the State are greater than individual rights, where do you have a leg to stand on when you say the Supreme Court will not sustain the finding of a fact by this body that an emergency does exist.

Also, my friends, the case of *Gardner v. Michigan* (199 U. S. 323), citing with approval *Du Pont v. District of Columbia* (20 App. D. C. 177), involving criminal municipal regulations, is clearly in point.

A lot has been said about private property. Now, get this decision of the Supreme Court, involving criminal municipal regulation, providing for the removal of garbage, even though the garbage had a practical, pecuniary value to the owner thereof.

If anything I have on my premises has a financial value to me, if that is not private property, then you can not establish private property under the laws of the United States, and yet

the Supreme Court held in a case involving criminal liability that it was not the province of the Supreme Court to ascertain the fact as to whether or not the declaration in the law that it was a nuisance to let this man continue to own that garbage and keep it on the back of his premises was true. The Supreme Court again held that the general welfare of the whole people was greater than the individual rights in private property of any single individual, and that case in point is more identical with the present situation than any of the cases cited, and every one of them sustains the position which the gentleman from Ohio takes.

In conclusion, I want to leave this for my concluding thought with you. Every one of these cases, practically, has been a State case. I made the statement a while ago that the National Congress had greater power over the District of Columbia than did any State legislature over its own State. Let us read that part of the Constitution:

Congress shall have power . . . 17. To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other needful buildings.

I want to submit to you that if you want to be guided by the precedents of the Supreme Court of the United States, I have cited a dozen where the jurisdiction of the United States, by their own decisions, denies to them the right to inquire into the finding of the fact on which an act is passed.

If this Congress should fail to incorporate in this bill the statement that there was an emergency here growing out of the war, I would concede the argument immediately, but if we incorporate in this legislation that statement, that a national emergency in housing in the District does exist as a result of the war, I will prophesy that the Supreme Court will never inquire into the finding of the fact. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER].

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have no interest in this matter except I think it would be unfortunate if the House of Representatives should decide to follow the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] instead of the Supreme Court and the law.

If his legal propositions were sound, I do not think I would take the floor this morning on this matter.

The Supreme Court has decided this case. It is all right to say that the issue was not before it, but let us see what the issue was. The owners of the Chastleton Apartment appealed from an order of the lower court denying them the right to challenge the constitutionality of this act, in that they set up there was no emergency in existence at that time. That was sometime in 1922. The lower court held with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], that the Supreme Court, having upheld the constitutionality of the law, the courts were precluded from inquiring into whether there was an emergency. So the case went to the Supreme Court of the United States and the same justice delivered the opinion that had written the opinion upholding the constitutionality of the law. The court reversed the case and sent it back and directed the lower court to inquire into the facts. What facts? As to whether an emergency actually existed.

Mr. BLANTON. In 1922.

Mr. TINCER. Yes; in 1922. Now, what do they say about the emergency on the 21st of April, 1924? I do not want you to follow the great lawyer-cattle-raiser-and-so-forth Mr. BEGG, of Ohio, unless he is in accord with the court.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order. I think the gentleman in referring to the gentleman from Ohio should use the usual parliamentary language.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman himself said he was a class A hog raiser.

Mr. TINCER. I do not yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I raise a point of order. I do not think one Member of the House should refer to another Member in that way.

Mr. TINCER. This is what the court says with reference to their power, and so forth, to go into the facts:

We need not inquire how far this court might go in deciding the question for itself, on the principles explained—

Then the court cites *Prentiss v. Atlantic Coast Line Co.* (211 U. S. 210), *Gardner v. Barney* (6 U. S. 499), and several other cases, and then says:

These show that the court may ascertain as it sees fit any fact that is merely a ground for laying down a rule of law, and if the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate.

What law? The very law they are talking about reenacting here to-day. Let us see if they agree with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], further on:

Here, however, it is material to know the condition of Washington at different dates in the past. Obviously the facts should be accurately ascertained and carefully weighed, and this can be done more conveniently in the Supreme Court of the District than here. The evidence should be preserved so that if necessary it can be considered by this court.

According to the arguments you just listened to, the courts have nothing to do with the facts. The only trouble with that argument was that it is in direct conflict with the decision of the Supreme Court. The only trouble with this act is that the court has said that they judicially find that on the 21st day of April that the law is not in effect, and the trouble about reenacting it is that you invite hundreds and hundreds of lawsuits, every one of which will be decided against the Government by the court upholding itself, and the United States Government pays 40 per cent of the expenses of those cases.

I say to you that this legislation is unfair to the renter. It is unfair to the people of the District, and it is unfair to Congress to ask us to stultify ourselves and pass a law in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States after the court has said that it would be unconstitutional.

They decided this matter on the 21st day of April. What has happened since? Has there been any emergency since? I do not believe any man that is versed in law will argue that the Supreme Court has not told us to not pass these laws, not to cite these facts and ask them to be bound by it. I think that is the province of the court and that we can not make an emergency by simply declaring that one does exist. [Applause.]

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have been opposed to the rent law since the emergency has ceased to exist. I have been opposed to it because I did not think that we have a constitutional right to take over the regulation of rents except as a war-time power. I have been opposed to it because I think if we did have the constitutional right it would not be a wise exercise of that constitutional power to interfere in the District of Columbia with the ordinary business transaction of renting buildings to individual tenants, any more than I think it would be wise for the States throughout the country to take that socialistic course in dealing with the question. [Applause.] I think it is a hardship on the tenants to do so, not that in an emergency it ought not to give relief to the tenants, but to pursue that course is to discourage investment of capital in rental buildings and the ultimate effect will be a shortage of housing in Washington, D. C., and consequent increased rents. The United States Supreme Court has plainly spoken on the subject and has said that in its opinion the emergency has passed, and it seems to me it would be utter folly and would throw the whole thing into chaos and confusion if we report and pass as a valid law what we know is an invalid law. This bill should be defeated, substitute and all. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the majority of this committee has used wise judgment in one particular. They have chosen as their generalissimo to pass this bill the only man in this House who could pass it, who has the ability to pass such a bill, and that is our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. He is not a member of the District Committee. The majority of that committee could not find one of its own members, I presume, to handle this intricate question, so they sent out and got Mr. BEGG, and they got the best ability that was available. He will pass this bill. If any man in this House can do it, Mr. BEGG can perform it.

But this bill ought not to be passed. Neither the proposed Lampert substitute proposing to extend the present law two more years nor the Lampert bill ought to pass. We ought to

let this war emergency commission expire May 22, for the war is over.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER], when discussing this subject in the Record last week, claimed that this law is not based upon emergency, and that the recent decision of the Supreme Court holding the act unconstitutional should be disregarded by us.

Likewise the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT], author of the bill, proposing to extend this act two more years, claimed the other day that such act was not based on "emergency," and I quote from page 6334 his exact statement, to wit:

Another false cry which has been raised is that this is a war measure; that we are now at peace; and that the law should therefore be repealed. You know that this is not so. You know that the original act, of which this is in effect an extension, was not passed until more than 11 months after the armistice had elapsed.

Surely these gentlemen must not have read section 122 of the original act of October 22, 1919, which I quote as follows:

Sec. 122. It is hereby declared that the provisions of this title are made necessary by emergencies growing out of the war with the Imperial German Government, resulting in rental conditions in the District of Columbia dangerous to the public health and burdensome to public officers and employees whose duties require them to reside within the District, and other persons whose activities are essential to the maintenance and comfort of such officers and employees, and thereby embarrassing the Federal Government in the transaction of the public business. It is also declared that this title shall be considered temporary legislation, and that it shall terminate on the expiration of two years from the date of the passage of this act, unless sooner repealed.

Thus, it is stated just as plainly as the English language can make it that it is a war emergency, and shall be considered as temporary legislation, and shall terminate in two years. The foregoing was Title II of the act of October 22, 1919, entitled "The food control and the District of Columbia rents act." And the first section of Title I of said act has the following recitation:

That, by reason of the existence of a state of war, it is essential to the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, and for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, to assure an adequate supply and equitable distribution, and to facilitate the movement of foods, feeds, wearing apparel; containers primarily designed or intended for containing foods, feeds, or fertilizers; fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas; and fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, and fuel, hereafter in this act called necessities; to prevent, locally or generally, scarcity, monopolization, hoarding, injurious speculation, manipulation, and private controls affecting such supply, distribution, and movement; and to establish and maintain governmental control of such necessities during the war. For such purposes the instrumentalities, means, methods, powers, authorities, duties, obligations, and prohibitions hereinafter set forth are created, established, conferred, and prescribed.

Now, keep in mind that the above act became effective October 22, 1919, nearly a year after the armistice, yet nevertheless it was a war emergency measure just the same, and specifically declared to be a war emergency.

And when Congress last extended this act to May 22, 1924, by the act of May 22, 1922, it specifically recited in that act:

That it is hereby declared that the emergency described in Title II of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act still exists and continues in the District of Columbia, and that the present housing and rental conditions therein require the further extension of the provisions of such title.

Hence it is astonishing that any person who is posted on the subject would contend that such law was not based on emergency.

CONGRESS SHOULD FOLLOW SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Supreme Court without question held that no emergency now exists warranting the operation of such a law, and that it has ceased to operate, thus holding it unconstitutional. Then why should Congress waste its time attempting to pass another such law, when the Supreme Court has definitely stated that it judicially knows that the declaration of emergency which Congress intends to make is untrue, and will not be accepted by the Supreme Court, as it has judicial knowledge to the contrary?

MR. HAMMER DESIGNATES IT "OBITER DICTUM" AND WORTHLESS

He will be able to obtain very little consolation from that contention. This decision is the latest expression from the Supreme Court on the subject, delivered April 21, 1924. The exact question before the court was whether this exigency, or war emergency, still existed in 1922. The court said:

It is a matter of public knowledge that the Government has considerably diminished its demand for employees that was one of the great causes of the sudden afflux of people to Washington, and that other causes have lost at least much of their power. If about all that remains of war conditions is the increased cost of living that is not in itself a justification of the act.

And the court specifically held:

If the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate.

But because the court held that it was necessary to know whether the emergency existed back in 1922 it sent the case back to the lower court to ascertain such facts.

Only one member of the Supreme Court in any way questioned the above decision, and that was Mr. Justice Brandeis, who protested that the Supreme Court should thus decide on the constitutionality of the law, as he claimed that the case should be reversed without it. And he did not claim that the law was constitutional, but claimed merely that the question of constitutionality was not involved. Mr. Justice Brandeis said:

If protection of the rights of the Chastleton Corporation and Hahn required us to pass upon the constitutionality of the District rent acts, I should agree also to the procedure directing the lower court to ascertain the facts. But in my opinion it does not. For (on facts hereinafter stated, which appear by the bill and which were also admitted at the bar) the order entered by the commission is void as to them, even if the rent acts are valid. To express an opinion upon the constitutionality of the acts or to sanction the inquiry directed would therefore be contrary to a long-prevailing practice of the court.

Hence you will observe that the Supreme Court did pass upon the question of constitutionality and did hold this Rent Commission act inoperative at the present time, in that it is not in accord with the provisions of the Constitution, which prevents property from being taken from its lawful owner without due compensation, except in emergencies.

What is Mr. HAMMER going to do? What is Mr. LAMPERT going to do? And what are the members of the Rules Committee going to do? And what is the Congress going to do relative to passing another emergency rent law next Monday, when on last Monday the Supreme Court of the United States said:

If the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate.

Are we Members of Congress going to respect the decision of our Supreme Court, or are we going to ignore it and disregard it just because a demand has been made upon us to do it? Are we going to make a foolish legislative declaration that a war emergency still exists on April 28, 1924, and that it will continue to exist until May 22, 1926, when the war has been over since November 11, 1918, and the Supreme Court solemnly held only last Monday that its nine members judicially know that such legislative declaration is not true, and that they would be compelled to say that the law is unconstitutional and not operative?

WHAT THE SUPREME COURT JUDICIALLY KNOWS

It knows that the war is over; that the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918; that practically all of the war laws have been repealed; that the country is fast getting back to normalcy; that the country must get back to normalcy; that this was an emergency law; that this was a temporary law so declared by Congress; that it has been extended several times; and that only a question of high living costs is now involved.

WHY THE SUPREME COURT HOLDS SUCH EMERGENCY LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. Alfred B. Moore, who made a survey of housing conditions for the Senate, in his report dated April 3, 1924, reported to the Senate the following vacant houses and apartments now being offered for rent in the city of Washington, to wit:

	Apartment	Dwellings
Schedule A, up to \$24 per month	10	38
Schedule B, \$25 to \$50 per month	221	76
Schedule C, \$51 to \$75 per month	335	87
Schedule D, \$76 to \$100 per month	189	71
Schedule E, \$101 to \$150 per month	36	63
Schedule F, \$151 to \$200 per month	10	21
Schedule G, \$201 to \$250 per month	2	18
Schedule H, \$251 and upward per month	3	17
Total	806	391

I quote the following from our recent hearings:

NINE HUNDRED VACANT ROOMS IN YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION
THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Washington, February 25, 1924.

HON. FLORIAN LAMPERT,
Chairman of the Rent Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The social department of the Young Men's Christian Association has maintained for the past 15 years a department of employment and room exchange. For the services of the room exchange a nominal fee of \$1 per house was charged for listing for the period of one year.

At the present time we have on our files a listing of approximately 900 vacant rooms.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK E. SUTCH,
Director of Employment.

MR. HAMMER. Did he state what price they are?

MR. MCKEEVER. No.

MR. HAMMER. I have been sending boys down here to get accommodations, and they have been charging them the same that they did at hotels.

A FEW DAYS LATER

MR. MCKEEVER. I have only one or two matters here. I stated last night that the Young Men's Christian Association had 900 rooms, and you questioned the rent. I have received the following letter from Mr. L. W. De Gast, associate general secretary, which I will not read but will submit for the record.

The letter is as follows:

THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION
OF THE CITY OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1924.

MR. R. L. MCKEEVER,
Chairman of the Washington Association of
Building Owners and Managers, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCKEEVER: My attention has just been called to certain statements made by Congressmen at a hearing of the subcommittee sitting on the housing situation in the District of Columbia in which it was stated that we were charging from \$3 to \$4 per day per person for the rooms in our dormitories.

I am taking this opportunity to give you the following information: We have in our central main building and boys' building, 1732 and 1736 G Street NW., 135 rooms, most of them used as double rooms; that is, for two persons. Our lowest rate for the double rooms—that is, two persons in each room—is \$13.50 per person per month. A few of our single rooms—one person in each room—are rented out at the rate of \$24 per month. The average amount paid by the young men living in our dormitories is approximately \$15 per month.

In addition to the above rooms rented out on the monthly basis, we maintain approximately 18 rooms in the building known as the Y. M. C. A. Annex, 1704 G Street, for transients. The rental charged for these is \$1 per person per night for those occupying double rooms and \$1.50 per person per night for single rooms.

In addition to the rooms rented by the Young Men's Christian Association in its own building we have a list of approximately 1,500 rooms in Washington and of that number there are now 900 vacant. The general prices charged by the persons conducting these rooming houses are from \$15 to \$20 per person for single rooms and from \$12.50 to \$15 per person per month for double rooms.

Trusting this information will aid you in getting a proper understanding of the situation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. W. DE GAST,
Associate General Secretary.

MR. HAMMER. The only reason I suggested that was because two disabled World War veterans came here from my district and wanted to get an apartment for a week and they had no money, and I sent them down there and they came back and told me that they could not get any rooms for less than \$1.50 a day. That is all I know about it.

SOME VACANT APARTMENTS

MR. DEAN. But what we are after is apartments at \$50 and under.

MR. HAMMER. I think I should have set a little higher figure.

MR. DEAN. We could have put in a few more, I think. It would have helped us. However, this shows a total of 141 vacancies at \$50 and less.

MR. LAMPERT. You mean 141 apartments.

MR. DEAN. Yes; I might say, because I wish to be perfectly fair, in this statement there appear five which will run more, because here and there I find a one-room apartment, kitchenette, and bath, which, I assume, Mr. HAMMER thinks will not solve the problem. There are 141 apartments, some of them running as high as nine rooms, a number of five rooms, and a number of four rooms, more of three rooms, and a cer-

tain number of these one-room apartments, which Mr. Wardman described last night. I want to submit that list.

The list referred to is as follows:

A summary of vacant apartments reported by 50 real-estate firms as renting for \$50 or less per month, showing a total of 141

1 apartment, 1321 Belmont Street NW., 1 room, kitchen, and bath.....	\$50.00
2 apartments, 1448 Girard Street NW., 1 room, kitchen, and bath, each.....	50.00
1 apartment, 1030 Seventh Street NW., fourth floor, 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 1329 G Street NW., third floor, 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath.....	27.50
1 apartment, 2800 Connecticut Avenue, 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, C Street, 52 to 56, 4 rooms, kitchen, and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, C Street, 52 to 56, 5 rooms, kitchen, and bath.....	40.00
8 apartments, 1717 R Street NW., 1 room, d/a, and bath.....	45.00
7 apartments, 1717 R Street NW., 1 room, d/a, and bath.....	47.50
6 apartments, 1717 R Street NW., 1 room, d/a, and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 1712 Sixteenth Street NW., 1 room and bath.....	40.00
2 apartments, 2200 Nineteenth Street NW., 1 room and bath, each.....	45.00
2 apartments, North Capitol and Randolph Streets, 3 rooms and bath, each.....	50.00
1 apartment, 114 Quincy Street NE., 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 1003 K Street SE., 4 rooms and bath.....	22.50
1 apartment, 737 Fourth Street SE., 3 rooms and bath.....	25.00
1 apartment, 638 North Capitol Street, 3 rooms and bath.....	37.50
1 apartment, 428 Thirteenth Street SE. (furnished), 4 rooms and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 5946 Georgia Avenue NW., 5 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 490 Virginia Avenue SW., 9 rooms and bath.....	35.00
1 apartment, 809 North Capitol Street, 3 rooms and bath.....	32.50
1 apartment, 527 Twenty-first Street NW., 4 rooms and bath.....	35.00
1 apartment, 503 B Street SE., 3 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 1006 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., 4 rooms and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 452 New Jersey Avenue SE., 3 rooms and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 124 D Street SE., 3 rooms and bath.....	30.00
1 apartment, 238 1/2 Twelfth Street SE., 5 rooms and bath.....	47.50
1 apartment, 335 C Street SE., second floor, 6 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 200 Kentucky Avenue SE., second floor, 4 rooms and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 1378 L Street SE., 4 rooms and bath.....	22.50
1 apartment, 813 Q Street, second floor, 5 rooms and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 4799 Conduit Road, 4 rooms and bath.....	32.50
1 apartment, 1218 Ninth Street, 3 rooms and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 3333 N Street, 4 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 727 Twelfth Street, second floor, 2 rooms, kitchenette, and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 212 C Street NW., 3 rooms, kitchenette, and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 725 Twelfth Street, 4 rooms, kitchenette, and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 302 S Street NE., 4 rooms, kitchenette, and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 720 Twelfth Street NW., 2 rooms, kitchenette, and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 1624 Nineteenth Street NW., 1 room and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 1624 Nineteenth Street, 1 room and bath.....	55.00
1 apartment, 713 Princeton Street NW., 2 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 713 Princeton Street NW. (furnished), 2 rooms and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 301 C Street NW., 3 rooms, kitchenette, and bath.....	50.50
1 apartment, Ambassador, 1 room and bath.....	47.50
1 apartment, Florence Court, No. 401, 2 rooms, kitchenette, and bath.....	50.00
1 apartment, 1151 New Jersey Avenue NW., 5 rooms and bath.....	42.50
4 apartments, The Como, 15 Grant Place, 3 rooms and bath, each.....	50.00
1 apartment, 2416 Fourteenth Street, third floor, 3 rooms and bath.....	50.00
3 apartments, 1614 Seventeenth Street NW., 1 room, kitchenette, and bath, each.....	35.00
2 apartments, 1624 Nineteenth Street NW., 1 room and bath, each.....	50.00
1 apartment, 1106 Vermont Avenue, third floor, 1 room and bath.....	45.00
2 apartments, 607 O Street NW., 4 rooms and bath, each.....	35.00
1 apartment, 2004 Eye Street NW., 4 rooms and bath.....	35.00
1 apartment, 64 Randolph Street, 3 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 1526 Seventeenth Street, 1 room and bath.....	40.00
1 apartment, 1826 M Street NW., 5 rooms and porch and bath.....	50.00
3 apartments, 1725 Seventeenth Street, Rutland Courts, 1 room, kitchenette, and bath, each.....	50.00
1 apartment, Cavanaugh Courts (furnished), 1 room and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, Rutland Courts (furnished), 1 room and bath.....	45.00
2 apartments, 149 Rhode Island Avenue NE., 3 rooms and bath, each.....	45.00
1 apartment, 306 Second Street SE., 4 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 306 Second Street SE., 2 rooms and bath.....	35.00
2 apartments, 1863 Newton Street NW., 3 rooms and bath, each.....	50.00
2 apartments, 615 E Street NW., 4 rooms and bath, each.....	45.00
1 apartment, 617 E Street NW., 4 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, The Congressional, 2 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 1636 Kenyon Street NW., 2 rooms and bath.....	42.50
1 apartment, 747 Tenth Street SE., basement, 3 rooms and bath.....	21.50
1 apartment, 306 Seventh Street SE., 4 rooms and bath.....	45.00
1 apartment, 121 Sixteenth Street SE., 4 rooms and bath.....	42.50
1 apartment, 318 South Capitol Street, 3 rooms and semiprivate bath.....	18.00
1 apartment, 310 South Capitol Street, 3 rooms and semiprivate bath.....	15.00
1 apartment, 1218 B Street SE., 3 rooms and bath.....	30.00
1 apartment, 2013 Fourth Street NE., 4 rooms and semiprivate bath.....	37.50
15 apartments, 1321 M Street NW. (new), 1 room, kitchen, and bath, each.....	45.50
1 apartment, 3401 O Street NW., 3 rooms and bath.....	22.50
1 apartment, 1517 Wisconsin Avenue, 5 rooms and bath.....	40.00
2 apartments, 1521 Wisconsin Avenue, 2 rooms and bath, each.....	40.00
1 apartment, 1524 Wisconsin Avenue, 5 rooms and bath.....	50.00

1 apartment, 3215 O Street, 5 rooms and bath	\$35.00
1 apartment, 3401 Wisconsin Avenue, 5 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 3708 New Hampshire Avenue, 2 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 1907 Pennsylvania Avenue, 4 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 2707 Eleventh Street, 5 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 404 Thirteenth Street NW., 3 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 701 Park Road, 7 rooms and bath	35.00
1 apartment, 634 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., 3 rooms and bath	40.00
1 apartment, 634 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., 1 room and bath	20.00
1 apartment, 1807 H Street, 2 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 1417 U Street NW., 3 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 1415 U Street NW., 3 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 665 C Street SE., 4 rooms and bath	28.00
1 apartment, 2205 Champlain Street, 4 rooms and bath	40.00
1 apartment, 2201 Champlain Street, 4 rooms and bath	40.00
1 apartment, 829 Sixth Street SW., 4 rooms and bath	25.50
1 apartment, 621 Four-and-a-half Street SW., 6 rooms and bath	45.50
1 apartment, 239 Four-and-a-half Street SW., 2 rooms	12.00
1 apartment, 904 Fourth Street SE., 4 rooms and bath	27.50
1 apartment, 401 Sixth Street SW., 6 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 464 E Street SW., 5 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 812 Eleventh Street SW., 2 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 526 Eleventh Street SW., 3 rooms	12.00
1 apartment, 406 Seventh Street SW., 4 rooms	39.00
1 apartment, 215 Fifteenth Street NE., 4 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 509 E Street SW., 4 rooms, bath, and kitchen	30.00
1 apartment, 424 Seventh Street SW., 3 rooms and bath	40.00
1 apartment, 508 Eighth Street SW., 3 rooms	25.00
1 apartment, 306 Tenth Street SW., 3 rooms	35.00
1 apartment, 497 C Street SW., 5 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 213 Fifteenth Street NE., 4 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 419 Ninth SW., 4 rooms and bath	25.00
1 apartment, 241 Virginia Avenue SE., 4 rooms and bath	25.00
1 apartment, 624 Eye Street NW., 3 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, southeast corner Twenty-seventh and P Street NW., 3 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, southeast corner Twenty-seventh and P Street NW., 2 rooms and bath	40.00
1 apartment, 523 Eleventh NW., 4 rooms and bath	40.00
1 apartment, 3331 M Street NW., 4 rooms and bath	30.00
1 apartment, 2923 M Street, 5 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 1301 C Street SW., 4 rooms and bath	32.50
1 apartment, 1544 D Street SE., 5 rooms and bath	15.00
1 apartment, 1809 Seventh NW., 3 rooms and bath	37.50
1 apartment, 2010 Fourteenth NW., 4 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 727 H Street SE., 5 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 2013 Fourteenth Street, 5 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 121 Sixth Street SE., 4 rooms and bath	42.50
1 apartment, 146 Central Avenue NE., 3 rooms and bath	20.00
1 apartment, 1517 Maryland Avenue NE., 2 rooms and bath	25.00
1 apartment, 1215 Morse Street NE., 3 rooms and bath	30.00
1 apartment, 3335 M Street, 4 rooms and bath	80.50
1 apartment, 716 E Street NE., 4 rooms and bath	37.50
1 apartment, 1301 H Street NE., 6 rooms and bath	42.50
1 apartment, 819 Eye Street NE., 5 rooms and bath	42.50
1 apartment, 24 Eye Street NE., basement, 2 rooms and use of bath	25.00
1 apartment, 24 Eye Street NE., basement, 3 rooms and use of bath	30.00
1 apartment, 24 Eye Street NE., basement, 4 rooms and use of bath	35.00
1 apartment, 419 Eye NE., 6 rooms and bath	45.00
1 apartment, 424 Fifteenth Street NE., 3 rooms and bath	45.00
3 apartments, 1113, 1115, 1117 Maryland NE., 3 rooms and bath, each	50.00
3 apartments, 1113, 1115, 1117 Maryland NE., 4 rooms and bath, each	50.00
1 apartment, 625 Third Street NE., 6 rooms and bath	50.00
1 apartment, 1612 H Street NE., 3 rooms and bath	55.00
1 apartment, 3510 Sixteenth NW., 1 room, kitchen, and bath	45.00

Mr. McKeever also sent a list of vacant houses reported by 50 real-estate owners renting for less than \$50 a month. These are dwelling houses. This list consists of the smallest, four rooms and bath, and the largest on the list nine rooms and bath, renting for \$50 or less. This is exclusive of colored property, I might say. The total is 43.

List of vacant houses reported by only 50 real estate brokers renting for less than \$50 per month, exclusive of colored properties

179 Seaton Place NE., 6 rooms, no bath	\$40.00
121 Seaton Place NE., 6 rooms, no bath	40.00
64 Virginia Avenue, Clarendon, 4 rooms and bath	50.00
3214 Hyatt Place, 6 rooms and bath	50.50
3216 Hyatt Place, 6 rooms and bath	50.50
243 Seventh Street SE., 4 rooms and bath	42.50
715 Twentieth Street NW., 7 rooms and bath	35.00
114 Fifth Street NE., 6 rooms and bath	40.00
1519 Second Street NW., 10 rooms and bath	50.50
642 G Street SE., 5 rooms and bath	40.00
1613 New Jersey Avenue, 7 rooms and bath	40.00
151 Carroll Avenue SE., 7 rooms and bath	35.00
225 Tenth Street SE., 6 rooms and bath	30.00
3214 E Street SE.	30.00
902 Ninth Street SE., 6 rooms, no bath	18.50
530 Ninth Street NW., 6 rooms and bath	45.00
1123 C Street SE., 7 rooms and bath	50.50
819 Fourth Street, 6 rooms and bath	35.50
912 1/2 Twenty-sixth Street, 5 rooms and bath	35.00
Twenty-second and Taylor Streets NE., 7 rooms	25.00
1127 First Street SE., 6 rooms and bath	45.00
536 First Street SE., 6 rooms and bath	45.00
409 Ninth Street NE., 6 rooms and bath	35.00
3312 Dent Place NW., 6 rooms and bath	50.00
3847 Emory Place, 6 rooms and bath	50.00
1624 Thirtieth Street, 6 rooms and bath	50.00
3206 Boulder Place, 8 rooms and bath	50.50
1214 Twenty-fifth Street NW., 7 rooms and bath	50.50
1123 C Street SE., 6 rooms and bath	30.00
3402 Georgia Avenue NW., 5 rooms and no bath	50.00
114 Atlantic Avenue, 6 rooms, no bath	30.00
1302 Eye Street NE., 7 rooms and bath	55.00

458 M Street SW., 8 rooms and bath	\$35.50
478 F Street SW., 8 rooms and bath	55.00
117 Sixth Street SW., 6 rooms and bath	50.00
497 O Street SW., 6 rooms and bath	25.00
807 Seventh Street SW., 6 rooms and bath	30.00
714 F Street SW., 9 rooms and bath	55.00
818 Seventh Street SW., 9 rooms and bath	40.00
822 Seventh Street SW., 6 rooms and bath	35.00
1010 Wisconsin Avenue, 8 rooms and bath	30.50
Wisconsin Avenue and Volta Place, 7 rooms and bath	45.50
645 H Street NE., 4 rooms and bath	45.00
Total, 43.	

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Data from the yearly reports of the building inspector

	Buildings	Repairs
June 30, 1900 to July—		
1901	\$5,106,031	\$894,467
1902	6,787,403	1,374,261
1903	9,796,069	1,737,333
1904	12,033,916	2,231,901
1905	11,134,515	1,274,670
1906	10,519,962	1,210,291
1907	11,375,089	1,273,433
1908	6,978,340	1,674,117
1909	13,268,868	1,457,916
1910	13,384,774	2,980,837
1911	11,840,800	2,857,225
1912	14,540,240	2,231,937
1913	8,256,912	1,957,841
1914	7,830,583	1,687,489
1915	6,948,871	1,623,186
1916	11,791,431	1,686,689
1917	13,477,938	2,103,682
1918	8,179,715	1,975,272
1919	8,386,720	2,121,571
1920	10,126,906	3,511,953
1921	14,881,517	4,118,409
1922	31,678,105	4,518,954
1923	52,071,502	
January to June, 1918	3,897,675	
July to December, 1918	1,488,750	
January to June, 1919	6,888,970	
July to December, 1919	10,911,490	
January to June, 1920	8,442,571	
July to December, 1920	7,024,392	
January to June, 1921	7,862,125	
July to December, 1921	12,178,253	
January to June, 1922	19,499,862	
July to December, 1922	24,454,291	
January to June, 1923	27,617,211	
July to December, 1923	17,140,998	

Amounts expended annually in the erection of buildings in the District of Columbia

[Data from the yearly reports of the building inspector]

1901	\$5,106,031
1902	6,787,406
1903	9,796,069
1904	12,033,916
1905	11,134,515
1906	10,519,962
1907	11,375,089
1908	6,978,340
1909	13,268,868
1910	13,384,774
1911	11,840,800
1912	14,540,240
1913	8,256,912
1914	7,830,583
1915	6,948,871
1916	11,791,431
1917	13,477,938
1918	8,179,715
1919	8,386,720
1920	10,126,906
1921	14,881,517
1922	31,678,105
1923	52,071,502

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN E. BOWIE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BOWIE, I wish to state to the committee and to hold myself closely to facts, leaving out as far as possible matters of opinion and speculation.

No emergency exists at the present time, for the reason that there are ample accommodations, housing facilities to take care of the people of the District of Columbia.

Our firm is in the rental business to quite an extent, and we have for rent a total of 42 properties; that is, houses and apartments, the list of which I will read, giving the location, the size, and the price asked.

These are vacant apartments for rent:

"Apartment 5, 2301 Connecticut Avenue NW., 2 rooms, kitchenette, \$60.

"Apartment, 301 C Street NW., 3 rooms and bath, \$50.50.

"Apartment 22, 2106 N Street NW., 4 rooms and bath, \$75.

"Apartment 22, 3126 Sixteenth Street NW., 4 rooms and bath, \$65.

"Apartment 23, 3126 Sixteenth Street NW., 3 rooms and bath, \$55.

"Apartment 31, 3126 Sixteenth Street NW., 3 rooms and bath, \$70.

"Apartment 108, the Ambassador, Sixteenth and S Streets, 3 rooms, reception hall, bath, and porch, \$75."
This is a fireproof building, containing 2 elevators, where telephone service is supplied to the tenants.

"Apartment 301, the Ambassador, 2 rooms, reception hall, and bath, \$62.50.

"Apartment 303, the Ambassador, 1 room and bath, \$47.50.

"Apartment 402, the Ambassador, 2 rooms, reception hall, and bath, \$65.

"The Ricardo, apartment 1, 4 rooms, bath, and porch, \$110."

These apartments are new and have never been occupied. The building was finished about three months ago.

"Apartment 6, the Ricardo, 5 rooms, bath, and porch, \$135.

"Apartment 41, the Ricardo, 4 rooms, bath, and porch, \$115.

The next building is a high-class building, with large apartment units, that is also new and never has been occupied:

"Apartment 1, 2500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., 10 rooms, 4 baths, and garage, \$250.

"Apartment 4, 2500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., 10 rooms, 4 baths, and garage, \$300.

"Apartment 212, 3800 Fourteenth Street NW., 6 rooms, 2 baths, inclosed porch, \$125.

"Apartment 8, 1829 G Street NW., 5 rooms and bath, \$50.

"Apartment 1, 3801 Macomb Street, 6 rooms, bath, and garage, \$150.

"Apartment 2, 3801 Macomb Street, 4 rooms, bath, and porch, \$90.

"Apartment 44, the Observatory, 5 rooms and bath, \$65.

"Apartment 401, Florence Court W, 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$50.

"Apartment 3, 3801 Macomb Street NW., 4 rooms, bath, and garage \$90."

The three apartments to follow are apartments to become available shortly:

"Apartment 4, the Myrene, 6 rooms, bath, and porch, \$55.

"Apartment 83, 2301 Connecticut Avenue NW., 5 rooms, reception room, 2 baths, and porch, \$150 (March 1, 1924).

"Apartment 303, 1302 Elgthteenth Street NW., 7 rooms, 3 baths, \$250 (April 1, 1924)."

The ones that I first read are all actually vacant now and all are vacant except these three.

Furnished apartments, now vacant:

"Apartment 41, bachelor, 2 rooms and bath, with service, \$100.

"Apartment 315, 3800 Fourteenth Street, 3 rooms and bath, inclosed porch, \$115.

"Apartment 316, 3800 Fourteenth Street, 3 rooms and bath, inclosed porch, \$95.

"Apartment 7, 2500 Massachusetts Avenue, 10 rooms, 4 baths, and garage, \$300.

"Three four-room houses located on Colonial Terrace, right across the bridge in Georgetown, from Rosslyn, that have never been occupied, are new, at \$60 apiece.

"No. 1827 Riggs Street NW., 12 rooms and bath, \$100."

Percentage of increase in cost of rents from December, 1914, to December, 1923, as compiled by United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, for following cities

Baltimore, Md	71.9
Boston, Mass	47.0
Buffalo, N. Y.	71.8
Chicago, Ill.	95.4
Cleveland, Ohio	78.7
Detroit, Mich	107.5
Houston, Tex	36.4
Jacksonville, Fla	33.4
Los Angeles, Calif	100.9
Mobile, Ala	42.6
New York, N. Y.	62.4
Norfolk, Va	67.0
Philadelphia, Pa	66.9
Portland, Me	31.7
Portland, Oreg	42.7
San Francisco, Calif	86.0
Savannah, Ga	47.5
Seattle, Wash	62.9
Washington, D. C.	34.2

"The percentage of increase for 32 cities from 1913 to September, 1923, for housing is 66.5 per cent. Therefore, it would appear that rents in Washington, D. C., with an increase of only 34.2 per cent, are cheaper than of the 32 cities except Portland, Me., and Jacksonville, Fla., and that the increase is only one-half of the average for 32 cities."

PORTY APARTMENTS VACANT FOR RENT

Mr. DEAN. Have you apartments vacant now?

Mr. BOWLING. Yes.

Mr. DEAN. Have you a list of your vacancies?

Mr. BOWLING. I think I have.

Mr. DEAN. Do you deal in all classes of real estate?

Mr. BOWLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEAN. How many vacant apartments have you for rent at present?

Mr. BOWLING. Forty.

Mr. DEAN. You have 40 apartments vacant? What do those apartments rent for?

Mr. BOWLING. They vary from \$50 to \$100—from \$40 up to \$100.

I quote the following from Mr. McKeever's testimony:

New apartments

Ready—	Location, owner, and description	Apartments
May 1.....	21 C Street NW., F. S. Haskins..... 1 room and bath, \$40 to \$60; 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$75.	112
July 1.....	1317-23 Connecticut Avenue..... 2 and 3 rooms, \$65.	8
Apr. 1.....	921-23 Nineteenth Street NW., Howard Etchison. 2 and 3 rooms and bath and kitchen, \$55 to \$75 per month.	7
June 1.....	3016-30 Porter Street, M. R. & B. Warren..... 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$65 per month; 4 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$75 per month.	72
Aug. 1.....	2630 Adams Mill Road, Howard Etchison..... 3 and 4 rooms and kitchen and bath (prices not fixed).	36
July 1.....	2500 Second Street NE., J. B. Shapiro..... 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath (price not fixed).	6
Oct. 1.....	Thirteenth and Buchanan Streets, J. B. Shapiro. 3, 4, and 5 rooms, kitchen, and bath (price not fixed).	8
May 1.....	1701 Lanier Place, M. R. & B. Warren..... 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$63; 4 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$75.	80
Aug. 1.....	2901 Connecticut Avenue, Kennedy Bros..... 1 to 6 rooms (price not fixed).	69
May 1.....	1818 Vernon Street NW., E. G. Walker..... 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath; 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$55 to \$67.50.	15
Jan. (1925).....	Nineteenth and R Streets NW., Howard Etchison. 6 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$150.	24
June 1.....	1321 M Street, H. R. Howenstein..... 1 room, kitchen, and bath; 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$50 to \$75 per month.	45
May 1.....	2526 Q Street NW., Harry Kite..... 2, four-room, d/a, kitchen and bath, and porches, \$125; 12, 2-room, k, d/a, and bath, \$50 per month; 3-room, as above, \$72.50.	22
Aug. 1.....	2520 Q Street NW., Harry Kite..... Arranged as above.	22
Oct. 1.....	2516 Q Street NW., Harry Kite..... Arranged as above.	22
July 1.....	Sixth and A Streets SE., Harry Kite..... 1 room, k, and d/a, and bath, \$45 per month.	20
Oct. 1.....	No. — New Hampshire Avenue NW., Victor Cahill. 1 and 2 rooms, with kitchen and bath, to rent from \$45 to \$65 per month.	72
Do.....	No. — Twenty-first Street NW., Victor Cahill..... 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$65 per month.	8
Apr. 1.....	1445 Oak Street NW., Charles Segar..... 2 rooms, kitchenette, and bath, \$62.50 to \$65.	8

In considering rental values in the District of Columbia we must consider the increased value based upon the cost of reproduction, which is approximately 100 per cent, the far greater value of the ground on which they stand, as shown by the increased tax assessment, which is 40 per cent, in confirmation of which I submit the following statement of figures secured from the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia.

The increased cost of production, as shown by the monthly report of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics—October, 1923—for the six-room brick house is, on all materials weighted as they go into the structure, 103 per cent; for frame houses, 107 per cent; this fluctuates to January, 1924—general increase—to 81 per cent. The increased cost of labor as shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in their monthly report for the years 1915-1923, bricklayers, 91 per cent; carpenters, 104 per cent; all trades combined, 107 per cent, which shows that the increased cost of labor carries on with the increased cost of materials relatively.

373 APARTMENTS FOR \$50 OR LESS

Mr. SHEA. We have 721 apartments, 373 of which rent for \$50 or less; 216 of which rent for \$50 to \$75, and 89 of which rent from \$75 to \$100, and 43 of which rent above \$100. That is, 52 per cent rent for \$50 or less; 30 per cent rent for between \$50 and \$75, while 12 per cent rent for between \$75 and \$100, and 5 per cent rent for above \$100.

Mr. HAMMER. About how many apartments have you for rent?

Mr. SAUL. We have 494 apartments, and about 40 vacancies.

LABOR COST ABOUT 50 PER CENT

Mr. Harry Wardman has built in Washington over 4,000 residences and over 300 apartment houses. On page 380 of the hearings he testified that the labor cost went as high as 57 per cent of the cost of the building. And Mr. Wardman, whom Chairman Whaley of the Rent Commission said was

absolutely reliable and honest, assured our committee positively that he would eject no tenants for refusing to pay higher rents should the Rent Commission be abolished.

NEW BERNE APARTMENTS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE AGAINST BILL

With the evidence given on this New Berne apartment alone, I can convince any fair-minded person that the Rent Commission causes rents to be advanced, and should be abolished. Now, let me take the witnesses up one after another, and give you pertinent excerpts from their testimony. And in this connection, remember that the Rent Commission began functioning October 22, 1919. Then rents were materially raised in September, 1920, such material raises continuing on to February, 1924, when notice of another raise was given, right in the teeth of the Rent Commission. Now, what caused this last raise:

MR. HARRY WARDMAN

Mr. BLANTON. You acquired this Berne apartment about three months ago, did you not?

Mr. WARDMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, you have been in Washington for a long time, haven't you?

Mr. WARDMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You know rental conditions; you know property as well as any man in Washington?

Mr. WARDMAN. I think so.

Mr. BLANTON. When you bought that Berne apartment you knew what the tenants were paying?

Mr. WARDMAN. Yes. I knew all about that.

Mr. BLANTON. You knew if you were going to increase their rentals you were going to have trouble, didn't you?

Mr. WARDMAN. Why, I didn't really expect to have any trouble with them.

Mr. BLANTON. But you knew what they had been paying for the last 10 years?

Mr. WARDMAN. Yes; and I knew the return the man who owned the apartment was getting. That was practically nothing. When he paid the interest on the mortgage and the taxes there was scarcely anything left. He got disgusted and let the building go at a sacrifice.

Mr. BLANTON. And you thought there would be a chance to take over the building and increase the rentals and make money, didn't you?

Mr. WARDMAN. I took it over to put it on a business basis.

Remember that Mr. Whaley, chairman of the Rent Commission, testified that Mr. Harry Wardman was one of the most responsible realtors in Washington, that he had implicit confidence in him, and that Mr. Wardman had been before the commission time and again, and they had found him absolutely honest and straightforward in his testimony, which was that of a man in whom he had every confidence.

Mr. Wardman found out that suites in the New Berne were renting for only \$12.50 per room, and he knew that such suites of like standard had had a much larger rental adjudged to them by the Rent Commission, and he knew that he could safely raise such rents up to the amounts fixed by such decisions, so he bought the New Berne with the express intention and purpose of raising the rents just as high as the decisions of the Rent Commission would authorize. Now I quote from the hearings excerpts from the testimony of New Berne tenants:

MR. LOUIS GOUBEAU

Mr. GOUBEAU. My wife and myself. Four rooms, bath, and kitchen.

Mr. HAMMER. What do you pay?

Mr. GOUBEAU. \$60 at the present time. I came in when they made the raise three years ago last July.

Mr. HAMMER. Have you received notice to increase your rent?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAMMER. How much?

Mr. GOUBEAU. From \$60 to \$80.

Mr. BLANTON. Did I understand you to say you had four rooms, kitchen, and bath?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You are working for the Government?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. What salary do you receive?

Mr. GOUBEAU. I work at night, and I receive approximately \$2,500.

Mr. BLANTON. \$2,500?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Does your wife work?

Mr. GOUBEAU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. She has no position?

Mr. GOUBEAU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Has she ever had a position?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. She has had a position in the Government?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Up until last August. She is a right sick woman and unable to do anything now.

Mr. BLANTON. Up to last August she did have a position with the Government?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes; for several years.

Mr. BLANTON. At what salary.

Mr. GOUBEAU. Nine hundred plus the bonus of \$240.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you rent any of these rooms out?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes, sir. At the present time I am obliged to.

Mr. BLANTON. How many do you rent out?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Two.

Mr. BLANTON. To how many people?

Mr. GOUBEAU. One to two different gentlemen; that is, two rooms, one gentleman in each room.

Mr. BLANTON. You rent one room to each man?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. What do they pay you?

Mr. GOUBEAU. One gentleman pays me \$30 and the other \$25.

Mr. BLANTON. Then for the apartment that you pay \$60 for you get \$55 back?

Mr. GOUBEAU. Yes; but it is no pleasure for me to rent rooms. It is a great sacrifice of comfort.

Mr. BLANTON. But you get \$55 back.

Mr. GOUBEAU. Very likely.

EXCERPTS FROM MRS. WHITE'S TESTIMONY

Mr. HAMMER. What do you pay?

Mrs. WHITE. \$60.

Mr. HAMMER. Do you rent to anybody else?

Mrs. WHITE. I rent one room.

Mr. HAMMER. What do you get for that?

Mrs. WHITE. \$35.

Mr. HAMMER. Do you furnish it?

Mrs. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAMMER. And pay for the gas and light?

Mrs. WHITE. And the washing and laundry, the upkeep of the room, and all those things.

Mr. HAMMER. How long have you been there?

Mrs. WHITE. Seven years.

Mr. HAMMER. What did you pay prior to 1920?

Mrs. WHITE. From 1917 to 1920 we paid \$47.50.

Mr. BLANTON. I suggest that the lady be seated. She does not have to stand.

Mr. HAMMER. Did you receive any notice of increased rent?

Mrs. WHITE. Yes; I received one from Mr. Wardman. I have it if you would like to see it.

Mr. BLANTON. She can just tell what the increase was.

Mr. HAMMER. What was the increase?

Mrs. WHITE. To \$80.

Mr. BLANTON. You have been there how long?

Mrs. WHITE. Seven years.

Mr. BLANTON. You and your daughter?

Mrs. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You have four rooms and kitchen?

Mrs. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Four rooms besides your kitchen?

Mrs. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And you have a bath?

Mrs. WHITE. Yes, sir.

EXCERPTS FROM MRS. KENNEDY'S TESTIMONY

Mr. HAMMER. How many in your family?

Mrs. KENNEDY. I am the only one.

Mr. HAMMER. You live at the New Berne?

Mrs. KENNEDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAMMER. How long have you lived there?

Mrs. KENNEDY. Ten years in October.

Mr. HAMMER. How many rooms do you occupy?

Mrs. KENNEDY. Four rooms, kitchen, and bath.

Mr. HAMMER. You pay what?

Mrs. KENNEDY. On the fifth floor, \$70. Well, I pay for the phone, too.

Mr. HAMMER. How many rooms do you rent out?

Mrs. KENNEDY. I rent out three.

Mr. HAMMER. What do you get for them?

Mrs. KENNEDY. I get \$40, \$30, and \$25.

Mr. BLANTON. You are paying \$70 and you are getting back \$95?

Mrs. KENNEDY. Well, I pay \$5 for my phone. I pay \$75 really.

Mr. BLANTON. But you use the phone, do you not?

Mrs. KENNEDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You get \$5 worth a month out of the phone? I pay \$5 for my phone.

Mrs. KENNEDY. Well, that goes into the rent, does it not, \$75?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, you pay \$75 and get back \$95?

Mrs. KENNEDY. Yes, sir.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF MISS MALONEY

Miss MALONEY. Maloney.
 Mr. HAMMER. How many in your family?
 Miss MALONEY. Two; my father and myself.
 Mr. HAMMER. You live where?
 Miss MALONEY. Apartment 43, the New Berne.
 Mr. HAMMER. What floor?
 Miss MALONEY. The fourth floor.
 Mr. HAMMER. How many rooms?
 Miss MALONEY. Five rooms and bath.
 Mr. HAMMER. You pay about what rent?
 Miss MALONEY. \$80.
 Mr. HAMMER. Increasing it to what?
 Miss MALONEY. \$80.
 Mr. BLANTON. You have been in this apartment how long?
 Miss MALONEY. I think it is 16 years.
 Mr. BLANTON. Sixteen years?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. How much did you pay there during the war year, say April, 1917?
 Miss MALONEY. I think it was \$47.50.
 Mr. BLANTON. Since 1920 you have been paying \$60?
 Miss MALONEY. \$60.
 Mr. BLANTON. And you have five rooms and bath?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. Occupied by two people?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. You will pardon a personal question, but do you mind stating what salary you get?
 Miss MALONEY. I get \$1,740.
 Mr. BLANTON. \$1,740?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. And your father is a retired employee? He has his retirement pay?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. What is the amount of his retirement pay?
 Miss MALONEY. \$60 a month.
 Mr. BLANTON. Your aunt stayed with you?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. And she was working for the Government?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. Getting a salary?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did anybody else stay with you during the war?
 Miss MALONEY. Of course, we had the whole family there once.
 Mr. BLANTON. How big a family?
 Miss MALONEY. I had a sister.
 Mr. BLANTON. Your sister?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. She was working for the Government?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. And who else?
 Miss MALONEY. That was all that was there regularly.
 Mr. BLANTON. Your sister has married off?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. And your aunt died?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. And you are to pay \$80?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. Now, you understand that I do not believe this rent is reasonable; I think this increase is unreasonable; but don't you think it is so remarkable that so many of these tenants show that they have been there for 12 to 16 years in one place; they must have been satisfied or they would not have stayed there that long?
 Miss MALONEY. Well, we were satisfied for the time.
 Mr. BLANTON. And you have been there 16 years yourself?
 Miss MALONEY. Yes, sir.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF MRS. GRAHAM

Mr. HAMMER. You live at the New Berne?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. No. 23, second floor.
 Mr. HAMMER. How many rooms have you?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. We call it five rooms, four rooms and kitchen and bath, or five rooms and bath.
 Mr. HAMMER. What do you pay?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. I pay \$60 now.
 Mr. HAMMER. Have you received any notice?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. I received a notice for \$80.
 Mr. BLANTON. You have been there how long?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. Well, we went there when the house was first built.
 Mr. BLANTON. In 1905?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. Were you here during the war period from April, 1917—

Mrs. GRAHAM. Yes, I came in from the country and put my little girl in school.
 Mr. BLANTON. You have no connection with the Government at all?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. No.
 Mr. BLANTON. You just like to live in Washington?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. No, I am not employed. My little daughter is at school here and I am trying to make a home.
 Mr. BLANTON. But you like Washington and you like to live here?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. I have lived here since I was married.
 Mr. BLANTON. What is your native State?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. I came from Maryland.
 Mr. BLANTON. You prefer to live in Washington and send your daughter to school and give her the advantages of the city?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. You see I would like to keep her with her grandfather. Her grandfather is a physician and has been practicing here over 50 years, and it means a great deal to him and for her.
 Mr. BLANTON. He is living with you?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. No, not with me, but near me.
 Mr. BLANTON. He is living near you?
 Mrs. GRAHAM. Yes, sir.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF MRS. MANSFIELD

Mr. HAMMER. How many rooms do you occupy?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. I have four rooms, kitchen, and bath.
 Mr. HAMMER. What do you pay?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. I am paying now \$60.
 Mr. HAMMER. You sublet two rooms for how much?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. I get \$30 for one, and I can only rent the other one part of the time, and I get \$25. But I have not had that rented very often. In fact, I ought to have that for myself and my daughter to live decently, but I have to rent it.
 Mr. BLANTON. Are you employed by the Government?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. No, sir; I am not employed at all, just to take care of the apartment, and I do sewing whatever time I can.
 Mr. BLANTON. Your daughter is going to school?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. She is 16 years old.
 Mr. BLANTON. And going to school?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. And going to school.
 Mr. BLANTON. You are educating her here in Washington?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. Washington is quite a desirable place to educate a young lady in? It gives them a great many advantages?
 Mr. BLANTON. How long have you been there?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. Sixteen years.
 Mr. BLANTON. Most of the people who are there have been there a long time?
 Mr. LAMPERT. How much rent are you paying?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. \$60.
 Mr. LAMPERT. And you received one of these celebrated notices?
 Mrs. MANSFIELD. Yes; for \$80.
 Mr. HAMMER. Now, the other lady; there is just one more. What is your name, madam?

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF MISS PAULINE HAMMETT

Mr. HAMMER. What apartment do you live in?
 Miss HAMMETT. The New Berne, second floor.
 Mr. HAMMER. How many in your family?
 Miss HAMMETT. Nobody but myself.
 Mr. HAMMER. How many rooms in that apartment?
 Miss HAMMETT. Four rooms, kitchen, and bath.
 Mr. HAMMER. Do you sublet any of those rooms?
 Miss HAMMETT. Yes, sir.
 Mr. HAMMER. What do you get for them?
 Miss HAMMETT. \$30, furnished.
 Mr. HAMMER. How much do you pay for the four rooms?
 Miss HAMMETT. Four rooms, kitchen and bath, I am paying \$70 now.
 Mr. HAMMER. Did you receive any notice to increase your rent?
 Miss HAMMETT. Yes; to \$90.
 Mr. BLANTON. During the 17 years that you have been there, you have been reasonably satisfied?
 Miss HAMMETT. Yes; but not always with the service.
 Mr. BLANTON. Have you ever rented out more than one room?
 Miss HAMMETT. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. How many?
 Miss HAMMETT. Two, since my father's death.
 Mr. BLANTON. What did you receive for the two?
 Miss HAMMETT. \$30 for one and \$35 for the other.
 Mr. BLANTON. That was \$65, and you are paying \$70?
 Miss HAMMETT. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. So, not considering overhead expenses—
 Miss HAMMETT. It is not rented now. I have only one rented now.

Mr. BLANTON. But you could rent two?
 Miss HAMMETT. Yes; I have only myself.
 Mr. HAMMER. Well, the next meeting is to-morrow morning, is it?
 Mr. BLANTON. Probably the Post and the Herald would notify them.
 Mr. HAMMER. You would have to pay for it.
 Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, the newspapers are pretty good about giving people information.
 Mr. HAMMER. They may be working people who can not come to-morrow.

RENT COMMISSION ALONE RESPONSIBLE FOR NEW BERNE RAISE

I submit that no fair-minded person can read the testimony of these witnesses from the New Berne Apartments, in connection with Mr. Wardman's evidence, and escape the inevitable conclusion that decisions of the Rent Commission were responsible for these recent raises by Mr. Wardman in the New Berne. Why, he bought it for the purpose of raising the rents to correspond to decisions of the Rent Commission. If we had had no Rent Commission, there would have been no raises there. The raises made in September, 1920, were not made until certain decisions of the Rent Commission warranted it for suites with rooms of certain standards.

GETTING BACK APPROXIMATELY WHAT THEY PAID OUT

Examine the above testimony and you will note that many of these tenants are subrenting enough rooms from their suite to take in almost as much as they pay out. I challenge any man to read the evidence of all the witnesses in this New Berne and say that it warrants the extension of this war-emergency Rent Commission.

HARRY WARDMAN SOLEMNLY AGREES NOT TO EJECT TENANTS

I quote the following from page 81 of the hearings:

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask you this question? It will have a very large effect on my attitude toward this bill. Suppose the Rent Commission is not kept alive and expires on May 22, and these people say that they will not pay the increase in rent: Do you expect to have them put out of the building?

Mr. WARDMAN. No, sir; I do not expect to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. What I mean is this: Suppose they say, "We can not pay these increases and we are not going to give our apartments up."

Mr. WARDMAN. I would not insist upon them getting out.

The largest colored newspaper published in the United States exclusively for colored people is the Washington Tribune. It has a large circulation and goes into almost all of the States. Covering a large part of three columns of its front page last Saturday, April 12, 1924, was a demand from the 110,000 colored people of Washington to give them representation upon this Rent Commission by appointing thereon one colored man and one colored woman. Let me quote the following excerpt from this article:

The progressive group of colored people of the District of Columbia are now preparing for a fight to a finish for representation on the District of Columbia Rent Commission. A bill is now pending in Congress making this body a permanent one. As now constituted, the commission is composed of five white and no colored.

Attorney Thomas L. Jones addressed a letter to Senator BALL, chairman of the District Committee, asking the Senator to propose an amendment to this bill providing for negro representation on the commission. Attorney Jones suggests that a man and a woman be appointed as representatives of the Negro race.

Attorney Jones makes a forceful argument in his letter, which was as follows:

Hon. H. L. BALL:

I desire to call your attention to the condition of things bearing on the question of the extension of the Ball Rent Commission law. In doing so, I desire to say that, notwithstanding the fact that the colored people constitute one-fourth of the population of the District of Columbia, 90 per cent of whom are rent payers, they have no representation on the Rent Commission, and, so far as I know, and have been advised, very little attention has been paid to them when they did make a complaint.

As a lawyer, I very seriously doubt the advisability of such laws. In my opinion, they have a tendency to increase rent instead of diminishing it. At least, they prevent the erection of small houses that would relieve my class from poor conditions in living quarters. This is borne out by the fact that I see by the report of your investigation committee, in regard to the subject, there is a scarcity of houses for living quarters in the District of Columbia renting for less than \$50 a month, in spite of the fact that these laws have been in existence for six or seven years.

However, I do not want to get away from my object, and that is, if the Ball rent law is to be extended, a hundred and ten thousand colored people of the District of Columbia, 90 per cent of whom

are rent payers, demand that they shall have a representation of at least two members on said commission—one man and one woman.

In order that there shall be no mistake or failure in regard thereto, I respectfully request you, as chairman of said committee, to propose an amendment to said bill in such behalf and to urge its adoption.

If you desire me to do so, I shall be glad to prepare a form for such amendment and mail a copy to you.

Hoping this letter will receive your early and favorable consideration, I am,

Yours very respectfully,

THOMAS L. JONES.

And on the editorial page there is an extended double-column editorial from Editor J. A. G. LuValle demanding that there shall be placed on this Rent Commission one colored man and one colored woman. And their demands are such that if this Rent Commission is extended neither the President nor Chairman MADDEN nor the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] can turn them down, hence it will mean an increase to seven commissioners, any one of whom is authorized under the present law to sit and determine rents and service.

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY

Let us remember for a moment the history of this rent legislation.

During the war the Sixty-fifth Congress passed a resolution which became effective May 31, 1918, titled "To prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia." It recited that it was a war-emergency act and should terminate when a treaty of peace was signed between the United States and Germany, and it prevented a landlord from dispossessing a tenant. It was a war emergency. The Government had brought to Washington about 75,000 additional employees. Housing facilities were inadequate. Numerous business interests sent representatives to Washington. Some avaricious rent profiteers doubled and trebled their rents overnight. But the resolution did not stop profiteering. Tenants would sublet at big profits. Subtenants would in turn sublet at additional profits. On one occasion I found eight girls occupying a large room on a third floor, with four double beds and little else in the room, and all eight were paying \$25 per month for such miserable accommodation. One died at a time when others in the room were sick. The poor girl, being from my district, brought this situation to my attention.

Then, after the armistice, Congress passed an act, becoming effective July 11, 1919, extending the life of said "antirent-profiteering resolution" for a period of 90 days following the definite conclusion of peace between us and Germany.

And then in 1919 Congress passed the Ball Rent Act, which was never considered by any committee of the House but was put on another bill by conferees of the Senate as a rider while another piece of legislation was in conference. It was worse than a rider put on by the Senate. It was a rider put on another bill in conference by Senate conferees. Thus it had no consideration by either body. It did not come regularly from a committee to one body and then receive consideration by both. It was the idea of certain conferees.

And let me remind you of what occurred when this conference report came back to the House. It was no other than the genial and able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] who threw several legislative spasms because the matter had not been considered by a committee. And he made the strongest speech against such rent legislation and against such a Rent Commission that you ever heard. Let me quote from the RECORD of October 4, 1919:

RENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill H. R. 8624, to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supplies, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up a conference report upon the bill H. R. 8624, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the bill and each section thereof.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio reserves all points of order.

I quote certain excerpts from positions then taken, illustrative of the fact that not only the winds, but statesmen from Ohio as well, radically change from straight ahead to right about face.

WHAT MR. BEGG SAID IN OCTOBER, 1919

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, * * * I have had some experience in going about this city in trying to find a home in which to keep my little family. I visited no less than 50 or

60 apartments. The prices that they ask for a little four or five room apartment is twice as much as it is in New York City or Chicago, and on investigation and in going to the bottom of the thing I have discovered in every single instance it is not the individual who has his dollars invested in the property with whom you deal, but almost always some irresponsible agent who has leased the property prior to this time and now he is holding it out for subleasing. I should like to pass this bill with an amendment so as to kill the sublessor of this city instantaneously. [Applause.] As this bill is drawn the sublessor has tenure of life for three more years. As this bill is drawn the owner of the property surrenders his control as to who shall occupy it; and I do not believe this Congress has gone so far astray or has become so blinded to the sacredness of property rights that it is willing to surrender a man's control of his property to an irresponsible sublessor for a period of three years. I can cite you instances in this town where I tried to find a home for myself where the owners of the property have had arbitrarily taken over from them the control of their property, and have had arbitrarily forced upon them a contract of lease to an irresponsible sublessor for 30 apartments in this apartment house, and this sublessor is paying \$85 a month and has furnished those apartments with a lot of cheap furniture, and I will guarantee to furnish every single apartment she has in there at \$500 per apartment, and I will make money, and this woman is subleasing those apartments for \$175 a month and is having them filled by transients.

I know that the proponents of the bill will come in and say to us, well, this commission and this bill prevents subleasing for any more than the amount paid by the lessor unless you get specific permission of the commission. Now, I grant that is true in this bill, but I ask you men, most of whom are attorneys, how long will it take the legitimate owners of this property of which I am speaking—and it is only a specimen of a condition—how long do you think it will take them to get control of their own property away from this sublessor if they have to go through the hands of the commission and then it is carried on appeal to the courts of the District of Columbia?

Why, they will be in control of that property for a longer time than this law is written for—three years. * * * If I rent a property for a family residence, and the man converts it into a boarding house, I maintain that the sacredness of property rights ought to permit me to dispossess him at the end of the contract period I have rented it for.

Let me show you what happens when a sublessor has control of a number of apartments against the owner's will, if you please. The contract being forced upon the owner of the property is not a contract, according to the definition given to us in all the books of law, to the effect that a contract means the mutual agreement of two minds getting together on a proposition for a specified time. That is not the condition in this city to-day with these subletters under the law as it is written, because the owners of the buildings do not want to sublet; they do not want to dispossess the bona fide people that are in there, if they are the right kind of people. But I maintain, * * * we are going too far when we say to the property owner "You shall have no right to discriminate as to the kind of people that live in your building."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, may I have a couple of minutes more?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would be very glad to grant it, but there is such a demand for time—

Mr. BEGG. I would like to have two minutes more.

Mr. HAUGEN. Go ahead.

Mr. BEGG. Here is what happens: The sublessors are not caring at all about the damage to the property. All they are after is the rent. In order to keep every one of those apartments full all the time, they will rent to anybody who comes along. Now, if you have rented property at home, you know that some tenants will turn that property back to you in as good repair as it was in when given to them, while other tenants will take that property and the damage they will do to it will offset all the income that you have received from it. * * * I am after cases where the owners of the property have had the control taken away from them by the sublessor, and who is in control of a number of new houses in this town, and is filling them with all kinds of riffraff just so they pay the rent. The moral tone of some of these apartments has been lowered, and the caliber of the house has been degraded, and all because the owners have no redress or recourse. If they take it up with the occupants, they say, "We are not renting from you. What are you going to do about it?" I say that it is a pernicious proposition to take the control of the property away. You are not dispossessing the rightful occupant, but the man who has got his dollars invested and who ought to have something to say if property rights mean anything in this country any more.

BEGG POINT OF ORDER

And the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] made a point of order against the entire conference report:

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the conferees have gone outside of their jurisdiction and have included new matter, in that they have taken in rents of lands and services.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman specify in what particular?

Mr. BEGG. I will take first section 118. They have absolutely taken away all control of the individual over his property, and they so admit in their statement, in which they say:

"This section prohibits subletting at an advanced rate of charge without the consent of the commission. This varies the Senate amendment, which prohibited all subletting without the consent of the owner or of the commission."

They have absolutely taken away all the rights of the owner in this bill that they are submitting, and it is not the result of a compromise or a conference.

SPEAKER SUSTAINED POINT OF ORDER

From the extended debate that followed, let me quote the following excerpts from Mr. Walsh, than whom there was no better parliamentarian in the House.

Mr. WALSH. * * * It is hitched up and conjoined with the service agreed to be furnished therewith or required by the commission. I read further:

"The term 'service' includes the furnishing of lights, heat, water, telephone or elevator service, furniture, furnishings, window shades, screens, awnings, storage, kitchen, bath and laundry facilities and privileges, maid service, * * * making all repairs suited to the type of building or necessitated by ordinary wear and tear."

Clearly under that definition where the "rental service" means not only the land, buildings, and services, vacant land can not be included, and neither can agricultural land be included, because under the definition, which includes lands, building, and service, they do not need maid service for agricultural lands nor elevator service.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman mean to indicate "service" necessarily means all of those?

Mr. WALSH. All or any of them.

The SPEAKER. Suppose it is water. Vacant land might need water.

Mr. WALSH. But, Mr. Speaker, it says—

* * * "and any other privilege or service connected with the use or occupancy of any rental property, apartment, or hotel."

If the Chair will read the entire Senate amendment and the entire report which the conferees have submitted upon that amendment, he will see that the whole purpose of this is to control and regulate the use of property for dwelling purposes.

MR. BEGG FORCED SPEAKER TO SEND BILL BACK TO CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Then to save time the Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair appreciates the importance of sustaining a conference report, and the Chair has been anxious from the beginning here to be able, preserving his mental integrity, to rule that this conference report was in order. But presuming the authority of the rules of the House is more important than the inconvenience of sending a bill back to a conference, the Chair stated in the beginning of the discussion the difficulty which occurred to the Chair, hoping that that difficulty would be met and removed by argument. The Chair regrets to say that that difficulty still confronts him and seems insuperable. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Walsh] stated correctly that the question at issue is whether the conference report has gone beyond the subject matter of the Senate amendment. * * * It broadens the scope of the Senate amendment by an entirely distinct subject matter, it seems to the Chair; and so the Chair feels constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of ascertaining the judgment of the House, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Walsh and Mr. Campbell of Kansas moved to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The motion is made to lay the appeal on the table. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

BECAUSE HOUSE HAD NOT HAD CHANCE TO PROPERLY DEBATE IT

Thus it will be observed that because a proposition was put on a bill by the Senate which the gentleman from Ohio believed was taking away the rights of property owners and which the House had not had time to properly debate, Mr. BEGG tied up the whole proceeding with a point of order and forced the bill to be ordered back to conference by the Speaker.

AND THEN WHAT HAPPENED

The committee did just exactly what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] is now doing; it went before the Rules Committee and persuaded the Committee on Rules to grant it a rule to make the conference report in order despite Mr. BEGG's point of order. And the Rules Committee granted the rule, for let me quote from the RECORD of October 11, 1919, to wit:

FOOD PRODUCTS, FUEL, AND RENTS (H. RES. 329)

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

"House Resolution 329

"Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed with the consideration of the conference report agreed upon by the managers on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. R. 8624, being an act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel,' approved August 10, 1917. That all points of order on said conference report shall be considered as waived. That there shall be one hour of debate, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the conference report. That at the conclusion of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the conference report, without intervening motion except one motion to recommit."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Campbell] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the rule I have submitted makes in order the consideration of the conference report on the bill from the Committee on Agriculture. * * *

LEADERS PLEDGED THAT NO OTHER SUCH RULE WOULD EVER BE GRANTED AGAIN

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. * * * I do agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and with others that this is not the proper way to legislate, and that conferees should not be encouraged to bring in legislation in conference reports that has not been considered by either House. * * * We are all almost worn to a frazzle. The House is tired; the Senate is tired; and if we keep on the country will be tired of what we are doing. It is important that we conclude our business at the earliest date possible, and it is important that the subject matters considered in this conference report be adjusted before Congress takes a recess or adjourns.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Assuming that what he has just said is exactly the truth, is that any justification for passing legislation at this time and at this moment?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not justifying the passage of the legislation. I am justifying the right of the House to dispose of the matter one way or the other, and do it finally.

SOUND POSITION OF PRESENT MINORITY LEADER

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, * * * for the convenience of the conferees we are asked to take this extraordinary method of passing a rule which prevents the House from considering legislation, in any proper sense of that term, that the conferees have themselves put into this bill. I am opposed to that. It involves a dangerous principle of legislation, and in this particular matter, as a practical proposition, it is worse than even that of yesterday, and for this reason: Let gentlemen recall the history of the legislation which is really in dispute here, namely, the rent legislation applying to the District of Columbia. That has not been before this body in any form for actual consideration. What occurred? The food bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture and passed by the House was sent to the Senate. There, under some sort of peculiar rules, which I do not understand—the gentleman from Missouri, the former Speaker of this House, once expressed it, probably very accurately, when he said that that body had no rules and did not observe what they did have—but under some sort of rule they take up a bill concerning rents in the District of Columbia and put it on an agricultural bill. That comes back to this body. And what occurs? The amendments are disagreed to informally, theoretically considered, but practically never read to the House. No chance to amend, no opportunity to perfect that legislation. And in that crude form it goes to conference, and the conferees find themselves in a condition where to give vitality and vigor to the very purpose or supposed purpose of the other body they must change the language of that particular bill or that particular part of the bill that was in dispute. * * * I am pleading for the integrity of legislative procedure; I am pleading for the opportunity of this House to pass upon this legislation in a way that it would have the opportunity to amend it if in its wisdom it thought it was desirable to amend it. That opportunity does not exist here now, because this conference report must be voted up or down as a whole, and there is no chance to place upon this legislation any amendment, however germane it may be or however desirable it may be. Against this sort of policy I protest. I realize that it is futile now, probably, so far as this particular rule is concerned; but I desire to give my

support to the notice which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Campbell] served upon the House yesterday, which he has reiterated again to-day, and I desire to assure him that he will have my support in the future against rules of this character.

MR. BEGG CONTROLLED TIME OF OPPOSITION

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Accordingly the Clerk will report the conference report.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak in opposition to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman. The rule provides that there shall be one hour's debate, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposed to the report.

Mr. BEGG. May I inquire for what time the Speaker recognizes me?

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] may control 30 minutes in favor of the report and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] 30 minutes against it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] control 30 minutes in favor of the report and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] control 30 minutes against it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, * * * I think I have possibly been misunderstood in my attitude in opposing what I believe to be vicious legislation. * * * Under the guise of the emergency that seems to exist, I honestly fear that instead of alleviating the conditions that confront us in the District of Columbia to-day they have only created the machinery that will either cause this law to be declared unconstitutional by the courts of the District of Columbia—which I am very frank to say, not as a lawyer but as a layman, I think will happen—or else I can see nothing other than the creation of the machinery to prolong in power the subletter, who is the very individual that is the curse of the District of Columbia to-day. In spite of all that has been claimed for this act, you have not given the subletter the death blow which he so richly deserves. You have created the machinery whereby you have robbed the legitimate, honest, bona fide investor in real estate in this town; and if you can do it in the city of Washington, you have certainly set a precedent that is going to confront you in other cities in the United States. You have robbed the legitimate owner of property, whether he be the owner of a thousand-dollar cottage or a million-dollar apartment house, of the control of his own property. You have taken it away from him and given it to the subletter.

WILDEST-EYED BOLSHEVIST WOULD NOT ADVOCATE WILDER DOCTRINE

What is a lease? The word "lease" is used repeatedly in this bill. Now, if it is anything, it is a contract. I will submit to the lawyers of this House if that is not a fair statement that will stand in any court. A lease is a contract. Any contract, in order to get recognition in any court, must be founded on the fundamental and basic principle of a coming together of two minds on some subject for a consideration, for a limited time. That is a contract; and if this bill does not destroy the contract and give the lessee unlimited time, in violation of the will of one party to the contract and the mutual agreement with the lessor, then I can not read the English language. Why, the wildest-eyed Bolshevist that ever spoke from a soap box in the city of New York never advocated any wilder doctrine than this; and I want to say to you men that you will be confronted with this same proposition when you go to your homes, with having set up a precedent for taking away from a property owner the right to determine who shall live in his house. * * * In the name of God, men, does the property right founded in the Constitution and the bill of rights of the Constitution mean anything, or can you legislate it away? The only excuse that the proponents of this bill have is that they say the property owners of the District of Columbia are a bunch of thieves and robbers, and that they do not deserve any consideration or any rights. I challenge you men who are in favor of this bill in this form to go back home and pass such a bill for your State. If you do, you will never get another vote from any man who owns property valued at as much as \$500. If there is a thing that America is going to be confronted with—and it is going to be the dead line inside of five years' time—it is a showdown between the man who through industry and perseverance and economy has saved out of a mere pittance enough to acquire something, and the prodigal and the waster who has spent his all and to-day has nothing. I know what it means to be poor. I have always been poor, and I have rented nearly every year of my life. I expect to rent every day that I live in Washington, and I have not a dollar to-day other than that which I have earned by hard work and the economy of my wife and my children and myself. But do you think I will stand on the floor in the Hall of the United States Congress, or any other spot, and vote away the sacredness of the interest of the man who owns his house as to who shall occupy it? * * *

I submit to every fair-minded man if that is asking anything more than is guaranteed by our Constitution. I stand here to prophecy

that the courts will call this law unconstitutional; but, if they do not, I have lost my confidence in the old teaching of the sacred protection that is thrown around every man by that old mantle, the Constitution of the United States. I want to say to you that the fear of being punished does not deter me from defending the sacred principles that I believe made this country what it is to-day.

I want to submit this final question and then I am willing to turn over some time to some other gentleman: Who made this country to-day what it is, from the time of the adoption of the Constitution until now? Was it the man who was industrious, the man who saved, the man who acquired, or was it the other element of society? Think it over. Now, will you take away from him one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and make that first step in the Capital?

NOT AFRAID OF VOTELESS WASHINGTON, BUT WOULD NOT VOTE IT ON HOME FOLKS

The reason, and I do not have any hesitancy in saying it, why some of you are so ready to take it away from the people of the District of Columbia is because you think they can not get after you. They do not have a vote. You will not go back to your homes and talk that kind of stuff that you are now talking on the floor of the House.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In line with what the gentleman has just said, permit me to call his attention to the fact that the Committee of the Whole House in considering this bill originally voted by a vote of seventy-odd to about sixty to incorporate an amendment to apply this same principle against which the gentleman complains to the whole United States. That is to say, we adopted an amendment which included rentals and made it a crime for the tenant or owner to charge more than a reasonable rate for the premises, and it was applicable to the whole United States.

Mr. BEGG. I have no quarrel with the man who wants to fix a price where the law of supply and demand can not function properly. But when it comes to saying to the owner you shall let John Jones occupy your premises instead of Sam Smith, you are transgressing the sacredness of property rights.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But the gentleman said we would not dare to go home and make that kind of talk. I want to call his attention to the fact that the majority of the Committee of the Whole did do it.

Mr. BEGG. But it is not on the statute books.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No; it did not pass in the House, but at least 79 Members of the House were willing to "talk that kind of stuff" with reference to the people at home.

Mr. BEGG. I would suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he go home and work for that in his legislature and see what happens after the public understands what he is doing.

MR. BEGG'S SUPPORTING SPEECHES

Now, remember that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] controlled the entire time in opposition, although he was not a member of the committee. He could yield his time to such Members as he wished to speak. It is presumed that he would yield to those who most strongly supported his position. Now let me quote a few excerpts from the remarks made by some of Mr. BEGG's supporters, to whom he yielded:

MR. BEGG YIELDED TO MR. HERSEY, OF MAINE

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House. * * * I do not understand how it was possible for the conference committee to secure from the Rules Committee the necessary power to deprive the House of the right to give proper consideration to new and important legislation. It will not happen again, we are informed, for the able chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Campbell], in presenting the rule apologized for the rule and said he would never do it again. This is his statement from the RECORD:

"Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRATT] and with others that this is not the most desirable procedure on a conference report, and I want to serve notice now upon conferees that they must not bring conference reports to the Committee on Rules with a request that their provisions be made in order contrary to the ordinary rules of the House."

Mr. Speaker, in the few moments I have remaining I want to bring before you some of the features of this vicious and unconstitutional rent bill. What does this "Ball rent bill" propose?

It provides a court composed of three commissioners, to be known and called "the rent commissioners of the District of Columbia," to be appointed by the President, to hold office for three years, and receive each a salary of \$5,000 a year. The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive a salary of \$3,000 a year, payable in like manner; it may appoint and remove such officers, employees, and agents and make such expenditures for rent, printing, telegrams,

telephone, law books, books of reference, periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, and other supplies and expenses as may be necessary to the administration of this Ball rent bill.

The assessor of the District of Columbia shall serve ex officio as an advisory assistant to the commission, but he shall have none of the powers or duties of a commissioner. The assessor shall receive a salary of \$1,000 per annum, payable monthly, in addition to such other salary as may be prescribed for his office by law.

The only qualifications required of these commissioners is that none of them "shall be directly or indirectly engaged in, or in any manner interested in or connected with, the real estate or renting business in the District of Columbia." In other words, this court shall be made up of renters; owners of real estate are disqualified. I would like to have a photograph of this bunch of irresponsibles that exercise arbitrary power and control over all private property in the District of Columbia.

Now what is the jurisdiction and power of this Rent Commission? I have only time to call your attention to a few of the many arbitrary and unconstitutional powers granted to this court over the 470,000 persons that live in the District of Columbia.

These rent commissioners have by this Ball rent bill full control and authority over all the rental property, land or building or part thereof, in the District of Columbia, rented or hired and the service agreed or acquired by law or by determination of the commission to be furnished in connection therewith, hotels or apartments. Also over the tenant, subtenant, lessee, sublessee, or other person, not the owner, entitled to the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment. Also over any hotel or apartment, or part thereof, in the District of Columbia, rented or hired, and the land and outbuildings appurtenant thereto, and the service agreed or required by law or by determination of the commission to be furnished in connection therewith. Also over the owner, lessor, or sublessor, or other person entitled to receive rent or charges for the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment, or any interest therein or his agent. Also over the service, furnishing of light, heat, water, telephone or elevator service, furniture, furnishings, window shades, screens, awnings, storage, kitchen, bath and laundry facilities and privileges, maid service, janitor service, removal of refuse, making all repairs suited to the type of building or necessitated by ordinary wear and tear, and any other privilege or service connected with the use or occupancy of any rental property, apartment, or hotel.

Further, the commission or any officer, employee, or agent duly authorized in writing by it, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy, any books, accounts, records, papers, or correspondence relating to any matter which the commission is authorized to consider or investigate; and the commission shall have power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all such books, accounts, records, papers, and correspondence relating to any such matter. Any member of the commission may sign subpoenas, administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

This new court for the District of Columbia provides and furnishes an attorney free of charge for the benefit of the tenant and pays all his costs in the lawsuits in all matters of rents and real estate and contracts with real estate owners; but the owners or landlords get no free services or benefits, but pay the costs of the proceedings before a court organized to look after the interests of the tenants only.

This prejudiced court has the power and authority to make its own rules of procedure, and at the hearing or trial they are not even bound by the usual and ordinary rules of evidence. Trial by jury, provided and guaranteed by the Constitution, is denied to the owners of real estate. They are to be robbed of their property without a jury trial and in total disregard of the rules of evidence.

From the decision of these autocratic commissioners on a question of fact there is no appeal. They shall fix and determine the amount of rent charges and services and all the terms and conditions of a lease or other contract for the use or occupancy of any rental property, hotel, or apartment, and from their decisions there is no appeal. They can change all contracts and leases of real estate in the District, permit the tenant to sublet in violation of his contract, and when the lease has expired and the tenant, under his contract, has no further right to occupy the premises this commission is authorized and empowered, against the wish of the landlord, to extend the lease for two years more, and from this decision there is no appeal.

And this is not all. This unconstitutional commission shall make all contracts between landlord and tenant in the District of Columbia; they draw the forms, agreements, covenants, and terms between the parties and provide that no other forms shall be used and no other contracts or agreements made by the owners of real estate under a penalty of a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not exceeding one year, or by both.

Under this Ball rent bill these commissioners have power and authority within the District to demand that the owner of every hotel or apartment shall file with the commission plans and other data in such detail as the commission requires, descriptive of the

rooms, accommodations, and service in connection with such hotel or apartment, and the commission shall determine and fix the rates and charges for such rooms, hotel or apartment, for two years, and from this decision the owners of the real estate shall have no appeal.

Such a despotic use of unbridled power is clearly unconstitutional, and the authors of this so-called Ball rent bill know it; but they seek to escape by invoking the war powers of the Constitution after the war is ended. They say:

"SEC. 122. It is hereby declared that the provisions of this title are made necessary by emergencies growing out of the war with the Imperial German Government, resulting in rental conditions in the District of Columbia dangerous to the public health and burdensome to public officers and employees whose duties require them to reside within the District and other persons whose activities are essential to the maintenance and comfort of such officers and employees, and thereby embarrassing the Federal Government in the transaction of the public business. It is also declared that this title shall be considered temporary legislation, and that it shall terminate on the expiration of two years from the date of the passage of this act, unless sooner repealed."

In the meantime the courts will declare this vicious Ball rent bill unconstitutional. These three wise commissioners will lose their jobs and salaries and be forced to seek some honest employment and pay a reasonable rent and be bound to keep their contracts. Property rights will still be held sacred at the Capital of the Nation. Congress will recover from its hysterical condition and legislate in a sane and lawful manner, and the good people of the District of Columbia, although they have no vote, will still be entitled to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

QUOTED JUDGE MOON, OF TENNESSEE

And in the time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Begg], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Henssey] then quoted the remarks made a few days previous by one of the wisest sages then in the House of Representatives, our former lamented colleague, the very distinguished jurist, parliamentarian, and statesman, Judge Moon, of Tennessee, whose sound speech Mr. Henssey offered in support of Mr. Begg, to wit:

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned in the ad hominem arguments that have been made to-day. But I believe this bill to be thoroughly unconstitutional in every way, and therefore I would not support it under any circumstances. It is an invasion of the rights of property that the Constitution does not authorize. To say that Government employees must be housed does not carry with it the right to say to the citizen that he shall furnish the housing at such figures as a commission may fix. You may take private property for public uses and public purposes, but I deny the right under the Constitution of this Congress to take private property of a citizen and turn it over at figures fixed by a commission in the interest of another citizen.

When you have said that the man who owns a piece of property has no longer the right to control it, has no longer the right to say who shall occupy it, no longer the right to say what the price shall be, it is such an invasion of the private rights and interests of a citizen as comes directly in conflict with the provision of the Constitution that guarantees the protection of property in this country.

It is a beginning of that system of legislation, the fixing of rates and prices about everything, that you will find the most dangerous and pernicious that has ever been undertaken. There should be general laws controlling all things, but when the Congress goes down to the private citizen and says you shall handle your property this way, that you shall fix this price and no other, Congress has assumed an undertaking that it can not very well carry out.

I insist, Mr. Speaker, that the best interests of this country require that life, liberty, and property under the Constitution shall be protected by the Congress, and you shall not pass any of these Bolshevik laws affecting the property rights of the people of this country. If I own a house, have I not the right to say who shall go into it; if I want to rent it, shall I not have the right to say what the price shall be; if I want to leave it vacant, have I not the right? What right have you under the Constitution to destroy the rights of property which the law gives the citizen? It is an infamous suggestion. [Applause.]

In the three minutes I have I can not discuss this bill nor the constitutional limitations on the powers of Congress in time of war or peace on the questions involved. The mere statement that no power can be found in the Constitution to force the citizens of the District of Columbia to make unwilling contracts as to the use of their property ought to be sufficient for all just men to oppose this measure. Congress can not impair, by express terms of the Constitution, the obligations of contracts in the State, and under the spirit of the Constitution it can not make contracts for the private citizen to accommodate another private citizen in the District of Columbia, however desirable it might be to reduce rents. If it can be done as to rents, it can be done as to all things; and you become the masters and not the servants of the people, and you rule the District as only masters can rule slaves.

FOUR MEMBERS OF DISTRICT COMMITTEE APPEARED AGAINST MR. BEGG

While not a single member of the District of Columbia Committee appeared before the Rules Committee, and Mr. Begg alone asked for his rule, four members of the District Committee unalterably opposed to the bill appeared before the Rules Committee, stating they were against this bill. And remember that 40 per cent of all of the expenses of this Rent Commission comes out of the Public Treasury, paid by the taxpayers of the whole United States.

PRESENT 60-40 FISCAL RELATION

Under the present system now in force the people of Washington pay a total tax of only \$1.20 on the \$100, on both real and personal property, with a personal property exemption of \$1,000 free of all taxation, and with their property assessed at about half valuation, and the whole people of the United States then pay all the balance of their expenses under this ridiculous 60-40 fiscal system, under which the Government makes numerous appropriations for the District of Columbia local civic matters, in numerous supply bills, where the appropriation is taken out of the United States Treasury 100 per cent.

AFFECTS ENTIRE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

This is not a bill that affects merely the people living in the District of Columbia. It affects all of the people in the whole United States, for the whole people of the Nation pay 40 per cent of all the salaries of the officers and employees of this Rent Commission and of all of the other expenses of the District of Columbia. And the people of Washington pay a total tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, assessed at about half valuation, while, counting the State, county, school, and other civic taxes, all of the other cities of the United States, both small and large, pay taxes running from \$2.75 to \$6 and \$7 per \$100.

THE OLD SLOGAN HAS WORN THINEADRE

Whenever a Member of Congress seeks to change the unjust system of allowing the people of Washington to pay the ridiculous tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, the newspapers and citizens' associations immediately resort to their old battle cry—

That Washington is the Nation's Capital and must be made the most beautiful city in the world; that the Government should pay a big part of the local city expenses because it owns so much property here.

Washington is the Nation's Capital and should be made the most beautiful city in the world, and I will go just as far as any other man through all legitimate and proper means to make it the most beautiful city in the world. Before the Government built all of its fine institutions here Washington was a mere village. Property here was of little value. It is because of the fact that the United States has spent its millions here that has caused some lots to jump in value from \$100 to \$100,000. Every piece of property owned by the Government in Washington is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington.

The local pay roll of the Government is a bonanza to the merchants and business enterprises of Washington. The Government pays its nearly 100,000 employees in Washington their wages promptly every two weeks in new money that has never been spent before. Chicago, or any other big city in the United States, would gladly exempt the Government from paying all taxes on its property to get it to move its capital to such city.

Because we want to make it the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for building million-dollar school buildings and employing 2,500 teachers and buying the schoolbooks for the 70,000 school children of the thousands of families living in Washington who have no connection whatever with the Government except to bleed it on all occasions and to grow rich on the Government pay rolls expended here.

Because we want to make Washington the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for the army of garbage gatherers, the army of ash gatherers, the army of trash gatherers, the army of street cleaners and sprinklers, the army of tree pruners and sprayers, and the street-lighting system for the several hundred miles of private residences owned by rich tax dodgers who have no connection whatever with the Government; nor is it any reason why the Government should pay for their water system, their sewer system, their police protection, their fire protection, for playgrounds for their children, for parks for their enjoyment, for their municipal golf grounds, for their numerous public tennis courts, for their bathing beaches, for their skating ponds, for their cricket grounds, for their baseball and football grounds, for their horseback riding paths, for paving the streets in front of their residences and maintaining and keeping them in repair, for building

their million-dollar bridges, furnishing million-and-a-half-dollar market houses, their municipal trial and appellate courts, their jails and houses of correction, their municipal hospitals, asylums for their insane, special asylum schools for their deaf and dumb, asylums for their orphans, a university for their 110,000 colored people, their municipal libraries, their municipal community-center facilities, salaries of all their municipal officers, employees, buildings, furnishings, equipments, sanitary and health departments, and the hundreds of other things that all other cities of the United States must furnish and pay for themselves, but a very substantial part of which the people of Washington have been getting out of the Federal Treasury for years.

The magnificent Capitol and its beautiful grounds are daily enjoyed by Washington people. The Congressional Library, which cost \$6,032,124, in addition to the sum of \$585,000 paid for its grounds, and for the upkeep of which Congress annually spends a large sum of money, is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington. The Government furnished and maintains the magnificent Botanic Garden here for the pleasure and enjoyment of Washington people. The Government furnished and maintains the wonderful Zoo Park with all of its interesting animals for the instruction and amusement of Washington children. The Government furnished and maintains the extensive and most beautiful Rock Creek Park, with its picturesque picnic grounds, its miles of wonderful boulevards, its incomparable scenery, all for the pleasure of Washington people. Congress has spent millions of dollars reclaiming and purchasing the lands now embraced in the Potomac Parks and Speedway, daily used and enjoyed by Washington people. The Government has spent several million dollars building the various bridges spanning the Potomac River and huge sums for the bridges spanning the Anacostia River, and spent \$1,000,000 building the beautiful "million-dollar bridge" on Connecticut Avenue. The Government has spent millions of dollars on the Lincoln Memorial, grounds, and reflecting pools, the Washington Monument Grounds, Lincoln Park on East Capitol Street, and the numerous beautiful little parks scattered all over the city, all for the pleasure and benefit of Washington people.

During the recess of Congress I wrote to the mayor of every city of any size in the United States and asked them to advise us of their local tax rate, of the charges for water, sewer, paving, and so forth, and what rate, in their judgment, they thought Washington people should pay as a minimum. I want to insert just a few in this report. The consensus of opinion was that the rate here should be at least \$2.50 per \$100, and there was a large per cent who were in favor of it being much higher, and the rates for taxation ranged from \$2.75 to over \$6.50, and in all these cities the people were charged more for water, sewer, and paving.

Let me again quote a few excerpts from the letter sent me by the mayor of the city of Peoria, Ill.:

[City of Peoria, Ill. Mayor's office, Edward N. Woodruff, mayor]

NOVEMBER 1, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Answering your questionnaire of October 15, concerning relative tax rates of the cities of Washington and Peoria:

The tax rates on each \$100 taxable valuation levied against the real and personal property of the citizens of Peoria for the year 1922 is itemize as follows:

City corporate tax, including library, tuberculosis, garbage, and police and fire pension fund	\$1.84
Street and bridge	.24
School district	2.70
Park district	.41
State	.45
County	.59
County highway	.25
Total, all purposes	6.58

Unless there is a tremendous revenue derived from sources other than from taxes, the rate of \$1.20 for Washington is ridiculous. While I have never had my attention called to this disparity, I am amazed that the light has not been let into financial affairs of the Capital City long before this time.

You should be supported by every colleague in your effort to compel the citizens of Washington to do theirs, even as every citizen outside the District is doing his.

Wishing you success, I am,

Very truly yours,

E. N. WOODRUFF, Mayor.

The foregoing statement from the mayor of Peoria, Ill., fairly indicates the sentiment of the people over the United States. It might be enlightening to quote from a few of the letters received

the tax rates of some of the cities over the United States as certified to me by the mayors of such cities.

When I speak of the tax rate of these cities I, of course, mean their total tax—State, county, school, and municipal—which is the total tax citizens of those respective cities have to pay on their property, as compared with the \$1.20 on the \$100 rate Washington people have to pay in the District of Columbia.

The tax rate paid by the people in Baltimore, Md., \$3.27 on the \$100; in New Orleans, La., \$3.16 on the \$100; in Portland, Oreg., \$4.52 on the \$100; in my birthplace, Houston, Tex., \$4.29 on the \$100; in Ogden, Utah, \$3.33 on the \$100; in Cheyenne, Wyo., \$3.75 on the \$100; in Fort Smith, Ark., \$3.32 on the \$100; in New Bedford, Mass., \$3.13; in Burlington, Vt., \$3.10 on the \$100; in Pittsburgh, Pa., \$3.22 on the \$100; in St. Louis, Mo., which is a distinct political subdivision of the State, the city tax is \$2.43 on the \$100; in Boston, Mass., \$2.47 on the \$100; in Rochester, N. Y., \$3.36 on the \$100; in Portland, Me., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Boise City, Idaho, \$4.29 on the \$100; in Mobile, Ala., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$2.75 per \$100; in Duluth, Minn., \$5.79 on the \$100; in Atlanta, Ga., \$3.15 on the \$100; in Kansas City, Mo., \$2.93 on the \$100; in Minneapolis, Minn., \$6.52 on the \$100; in Salt Lake City, Utah, \$3.18 on the \$100; in Oakland, Calif., \$4.02 on the \$100; in Austin, the capital of Texas, \$3.54 on the \$100; in Denver, Colo., \$2.76 on the \$100; in Trenton, N. J., \$3.22 on the \$100; in Racine, Wis., \$2.87 on the \$100; in Nashville, Tenn., \$2.80 on the \$100; in Charlottesville, Va., \$2.85. And let me illustrate as the tax rate runs generally over Texas: In Paris, Tex., \$4.10 on the \$100; in Port Arthur, Tex., \$3.54 on the \$100; in Tyler, Tex., \$4.61 on the \$100; in Denison, Tex., \$3.32 on the \$100; in Waco, Tex., \$3.63 on the \$100; in Amarillo, Tex., \$3.55 on the \$100; in Temple, Tex., \$3.15; in Wichita Falls, Tex., \$5.05 on the \$100; in Beaumont, Tex., \$4.04.

Mr. Edward F. Bryant, tax collector for San Francisco, Calif., has sent me a statement certifying that the following is the tax rate paid by the citizens in the following cities: In Seattle, Wash., \$8.80 on the \$100; Chicago, Ill., \$8 on the \$100; in Reno, Nev., \$7.38 on the \$100; in New York, N. Y., \$5.48 on the \$100; in Philadelphia, Pa., \$6 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$4.48 on the \$100; in San Francisco, Calif., \$3.47 on the \$100; in Los Angeles, Calif., \$3.89 on the \$100.

What excuse have we to offer to our constituents back at home who are paying the above tax rates for permitting by our votes here the 437,000 people in Washington, D. C., to continue paying the measly little pittance of only \$1.20 on the \$100, based on a half to two-thirds valuation, when our constituents have to pay all the balance of the expenses of this great city?

And with the armistice signed November 11, 1918, and the war now over nearly six years, we are asked by this measure to make another legislative declaration that a war emergency still exists, merely to extend this war emergency Rent Commission another two years to May 22, 1926, in order that these five Rent Commissioners and their employees may not lose their jobs. And our people back at home in the various 48 States of this Union are paying the expenses to the tune of 60-40.

The amendment prepared by Mr. Jost, and which I have offered, to prevent conspiracies to raise rents, and to prevent the crooks now operating here in the District selling second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and even seventh and eighth trusts on property mortgaged to several times its value, should be passed, which would put these crooks out of business.

And then let us obey the Supreme Court, and follow its decision rendered on April 21, 1924, and not try to hold this as a war emergency when the court said that it was not, and that it would hold, from its judicial knowledge, that no such emergency now exists. Remember, again, it was held in this Supreme Court decision—

if the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know, we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate.

That is the decision of the highest court of this Nation. That is the court whose decision you and I have sworn under oath to defend and uphold, and I hope you will defend them and say by your vote to-day that we will stop this unconstitutional law.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jost].

Mr. JOST. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I spoke my mind about this matter the other day as well as I could in the brief time allotted. Since that time the Supreme Court of this Nation has cleared up this situation. There can be no possible doubt as to what this House ought to do under the present situation. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Begg] took up 10 or 15 minutes here arguing this morning on a proposition that a legislative fiat, a legislative declaration, that an

emergency exists is binding upon the Supreme Court. He took up most of his time arguing that and in claiming the right upon the part of the House to say in this hour that an emergency exists for the passing of this law, and that our statement will bind the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said exactly the contrary, and I quote the language of the opinion:

We repeat what was stated in *Block v. Hirsh* (256 U. S. 135, 154) as to the respect due to a declaration of this kind by the legislature so far as it relates to present facts. But even as to them a court is not at liberty to shut its eyes to an obvious mistake when the validity of the law depends upon the truth of what is declared. And still more obviously, so far as this declaration looks to the future, it can be no more than prophecy and is liable to be controlled by events. A law depending upon the existence of an emergency or other certain state of facts to uphold it may cease to operate if the emergency ceases or the facts change even though valid when passed.

That knocks the argument of the gentleman from Ohio into a cocked hat. The legislative declaration that an emergency exists amounts to nothing in the face of that opinion, which I venture to say is in line with the weight of authority in every jurisdiction of this Union. There is no State court, except a very few, that will be bound by the declaration of a legislature that an emergency exists putting a statute in operation immediately upon its passage where the constitution of the State provides an operative date of another time. The court will look back of the declaration of the legislature and make its own finding of fact, as it did in this case, and that pronouncement knocks the bottom out of the argument of the gentleman from Ohio. The court in the instant case did more than that: It laid down the rule in this opinion that it will take judicial notice that this so-called emergency has ceased and that the law accordingly is at an end. The only thing that happened was that the case was reversed and remanded not for the purpose of ascertaining whether the emergency exists to-day, but whether it existed at the time that bill in equity was filed. That is what it went back to the lower court for. More than that, the court laid down the plain statement that if all there is to this case is that rent is high, there is no justification for continuing the act.

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JOST. Let me read to you the opinion of the court upon that point:

It is a matter of public knowledge that the Government has considerably diminished its demand for employees that was one of the great causes of the sudden afflux of people to Washington, and that other causes have lost at least much of their power. * * * If about all that remains of war conditions is the increased cost of living, that is not in itself a justification for the act.

Later in the decision the court says:

If the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know, we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate.

What more do you want? The justices say that on the facts as they exist to-day from what they judicially know they would declare the law to be at an end. The case was remanded for the purpose of ascertaining whether facts amounting to an emergency, such as first caused the enactment of the law, existed at the time the bill in equity was filed. This law is dead. There is no use wasting valuable time of this House in attempting to carry it forward.

The law is contrary and in opposition to the real facts. I picked up a copy of the *Evening Star* of Washington, of Saturday last, and find it contains eight full columns of houses and apartments offered for rent, averaging 60 to a column. Four hundred and eighty vacant houses are advertised in that issue and offered for rent. I now exhibit the paper if anybody wants to look at it. Then tell me that with that condition this House should go through the formality of establishing a paternalistic government here for tenants simply because there is a claim that rent is too high. Why men—and I am talking to you Democrats now, because you can expect those to the left of the Speaker to either underwrite business or to clothe unfortunates with the cloak of paternalism, because they have a habit of doing that; it is their principal occupation—but you men on the Democratic side who believe in the philosophy of Jefferson, who believe that that government is best that governs least, who believe that the field ought to be kept open, that statutes ought not to be thrust into private relations and affairs, you are the

last men in this splendid national council who ought to back a paternalistic and socialistic doctrine like this in time of peace. [Applause.]

Every time a pronouncement like this comes from the National Assembly at the seat of the Nation's Government its evil example spreads all over the Nation and plagues the whole country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is the third time I have been through a legislative fight for the enactment of a law regulating the rent of dwellings. In 1920 the Legislature of the State of New York passed the first State rent law. I appeared before the legislature at the time as the acting mayor of the city of New York and presented facts that justified the passage of that law. I heard in 1920 exactly the same argument as is presented against the extension of the rent law here to-day. I heard the same landlords crying for protection of the State in the exploitation of the tenants. I heard the same cry of their constitutional right to do anything they wanted with their own property and to fix, raise, and charge any rent without interference.

Last year the State legislature of my State, in anticipation of this very question, created a regional housing commission, and it, with the governor of the State, appointed commissioners to investigate the housing situation and to report its findings to the next legislature. I attended the hearings of this commission, and I heard the same landlords with the same attorneys, with the same old arguments, appear before the commission, argue, and plead that an emergency no longer existed. That commission investigated very thoroughly. It first heard the testimony of tenants; it then heard the testimony of landlords; it conducted its investigation and took a census of several typical blocks in the greater city. It made an investigation of available apartments and investigated the rentals per room in the various type of apartments and tenement houses in New York City. The landlord appeared before that commission with the best of legal talent and with professors of universities and experts on economics in an effort to prove that an emergency no longer existed; but, gentlemen, with all of their experts, with all of their professors, with all of their legal talent, there is no argument that can prevail when a man with a weekly income and a family to support is compelled to pay out of his income such a large proportion that there is not sufficient left to properly care and nourish his children. That is the condition in New York City; that is the condition in Washington, D. C.

What good is it that you bring here advertisements in papers showing that there are apartments vacant when those apartments are beyond the reach of the residents of the District of Columbia. The emergency exists because the people of the District of Columbia can not to-day any more find suitable apartments to live in than they could when this law was first passed by Congress. In the face of every constitutional argument that was presented here to-day, in the face of the opposition to this bill before the committee which investigated conditions in the District, the same as happened in New York, it remains a fact that 85 per cent of the residents of the District of Columbia are unable to avail themselves of the apartments that are vacant. That is the direct result of the original emergency. Rents became so high because property owners took advantage of the situation and buildings were constructed that were of the type demanding high rents which did nothing to relieve the situation and do away with the emergency. That is a matter entirely within our province. As practical men, we know, as men having had experience in our own home States, in our profession, or as city or State officials we know how to go about an investigation of this kind. I appeared before the District Committee. I happened to be there when a very prominent real estate man of this city told the committee that he himself had relieved the emergency by apartments which he was ready to let, two rooms and a closet at \$55 a month. Apartments at \$25 a room does not relieve the situation. It is not only a matter of price, as the court in its opinion indicated, it is a matter of availability, and as long as there are no apartments available that wage earners, working people, Government employees, business men, professional men can rent or lease, an emergency exists. As long as landlords are determined to exact a pound of flesh from their tenants, as long as landlords insist upon the right to increase rent, limited only by their own greed and in the failure to pay

an exorbitant increase to have the right to dispossess a family summarily, as enjoyed by the landlords under the old common law and under our statutes based upon the common law, as long as that condition exists, an emergency exists, and I for one do not hesitate to say, as I have stated before, it is part of the duty of the Government to protect its people in providing regulatory provisions for the people's shelter as we regulate their food, health, transportation, and safety.

Why, it is stated that no emergency exists. If this law fails to pass and the rent law lapses, nine families out of ten will receive an increase notice within a few hours after the expiration of the law. I believe it is absolutely necessary for the protection of the people of the District of Columbia that we extend the provisions of this beneficial law for two years longer. I believe that it is absolutely necessary as a matter of governmental policy that we devote time during these two years to the study of proper legislation for the regulation of the renting of houses for dwelling purposes. Changed conditions bring the need of new laws and necessarily changed construction of constitutional limitations to meet the requirements of the changed conditions.

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

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In a moment. The commission in New York reported to the State legislature that the emergency continues, and the State Legislature of the State of New York extended the emergency relief laws for two years, up to 1926. Our District Committee reports to this House that the emergency continues in the District of Columbia and it is our duty to extend the law.

Now, I know the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] wants to be fair.

Mr. KUNZ. What did the commission report?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The commission reported that an emergency existed in the city of New York.

Now, the gentleman from Texas stated that there were no hearings. I am sure he was referring to two years ago. But for the purpose of the Record let it be stated now that the committee did hold hearings on the bill now before us. It did investigate. The committee held hearings for weeks in the daytime and at night, and they went into this question thoroughly, and the action of the committee is the action of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I was talking about 1921, when this law was first passed. There were no hearings had then.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes. I want to make it clear that the District Committee hearings were held now.

Mr. KUNZ. In all the hearings what was the information developed? Was it a question of housing conditions or a question of combination among the real estate men?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The question of combination among the real estate men is so closely related to housing conditions that you can not separate them.

Now, then, the District Committee having investigated and having found as a result of that investigation that an emergency still exists that in itself warrants this House in extending this law for two years more, back of that investigation the Supreme Court of the United States dare not go.

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

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Not just now.

Gentlemen, when this bill was before us two weeks ago you had another situation. Since we were discussing this bill two weeks ago a new situation is created, a very important situation is created, and that is whether or not the judicial branch of this Government will dictate to the legislative branch what shall and what shall not be the law. That is the question before us to-day. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, you can not anchor legislation to the past. You can not stop legislation for the protection of the citizens of the District of Columbia or the citizens of any State in this Union. I refer you to the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the time we were first considering the regulatory powers of the Government over interstate commerce and transportation. Why, it was then urged that the railroads could not be deprived of their property and that they had the right to charge any rate for freight or passage that they desired. And yet we established an Interstate Commerce Commission which fixes the rates of the railroads. You say this property is sacred and that legislatures can not control the use of property. No such thing exists.

The trouble is, gentlemen, that real estate has been governed by the landlord-made law for centuries. The landlords made the laws which cover real estate to-day. Those laws were made at the time when only landlords could make law. Only landlords could elect lawmakers in England at one time; and we accepted the entire common law of England and engrafted it

upon our statute books. That is what regulated real estate up to the time of the war.

Gentlemen, the only blessing that came from the war is that it brought a condition which gave the legislatures of the various States sufficient courage to pass, for the first time in history, regulatory powers over dwellings in cities. If this emergency does not exist, why all this opposition against it? If it is not the intention of an organized system to bleed these tenants, why all this opposition in the District of Columbia and New York? This is a new policy. You can not get away from it—the right to live, the right to be sheltered, is just as necessary to the health and welfare, to the safety, of the community as the right to prevent disease, the right to prevent crime.

Why, what happens under the old common law? The landlord has the absolute right at any time to take a tenant and dispossess him. That is the complaint against the emergency relief law in the District of Columbia and elsewhere. They want the absolute right to take the tenant and the family and throw them on the street at any time; and it is high time, after five or six centuries, that the Government step in and say to the landlord, "You shall not put a tenant out upon your whim or upon any capricious notion or on the pretext that you want more than the premises are worth."

Mr. BLANTON. In Russia they put the landlords out entirely. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No; but I approve of the English common law as England itself has now modified it.

Why, gentlemen, in England they have more beneficial and advanced rent relief laws than we have here. Only a few days ago in the House of Commons a bill was up for the extension of the law, and in it you will find a provision that no rent shall be paid if the tenant is unemployed. An amendment was offered from the floor, and will be taken up, I believe, in a few days for consideration, providing for a partial payment to the landlord out of public funds. If we accept originally the common law from England governing real estate, the least we can do now is to follow the English method.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of the committee are advocating that right now, that the Government shall pay the rent.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We will come to that. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, in time. You can not keep back the progress of Government; you can not keep the Government for the landlords; you can not keep the Government for the monopolistic interests which control the necessities of life. We have taken the "lord" out of "landlord" and we are going to keep the "lord" out of "landlord."

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman was acting mayor of New York when they passed his law.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The legislature passed it.

Mr. BLANTON. And he properly belongs to this Wisconsin and Minnesota bloc that is behind this bill to-day.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And the gentleman from Texas belongs to the most standpat and monopolistic bloc that ever sat in the House. Either the gentleman from Texas is on the wrong side or I am on the wrong side.

Mr. WEFELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WEFELD. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that he need not be ashamed of that.

Mr. BLANTON. He is not, but I do not know about the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. LAMPERT. I yield the gentleman from New York two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that the gentleman from New York is not ashamed of the stand he takes on measures and refuses to stop thinking for himself even if in his city there is such a street as Wall Street.

But I submit, gentlemen, that the question before the House to-day is in response to the decision handed down by the Supreme Court a few days ago, and that as a result of the investigations of one committee of this House, with delegated powers, and a report from that committee that an emergency does exist, it is our duty to extend this law and then wait upon the decision of the Supreme Court. And in this day and age I respectfully submit—notwithstanding my training and education as a lawyer—that as legislators it is our duty to meet the defiance suggested in the opinion handed down. It is for the legislature to gather the facts and decide as to the existence of an emergency and not for the court to decide. That having been done in a proper manner, through the orderly

investigation of the committee and on the declaration of this Congress that an emergency exists, that can not be questioned by the court, and the statute is as good to-day as it was when it was first enacted.

I want to call the attention of the House to the case of *Commercial Trust Co. v. Miller*, reported in Two hundred and sixty-second United States, page 51. In that case the court had under consideration a statute which expressly declared its operation would cease at the cessation of hostilities; and notwithstanding the fact that hostilities had ceased, the court declared it was for the legislative branch of the Government to say when the emergency ended. [Applause.]

The question of how long the act would remain in force in view of the consequences of the war was brought squarely before the court. Permit me to read from the opinion of the court on page 57 of the report indicated:

The next contention of the trust company is that the act being a provision for the emergency of war, it ceased with the cessation of war, ceased with the joint resolution of Congress declaring the state of war between Germany and the United States at an end, and its approval by the President, July 2, 1921, and the proclamation of peace by the President, August 25, 1921. The contention, however, encounters in opposition the view that the power which declared the necessity is the power to declare its cessation and what the cessation requires. The power is legislative. A court can not estimate the effects of a great war and pronounce their termination at a particular moment of time, and that its consequences are so far swallowed up that legislation addressed to its emergency had ceased to have purpose or operation with the cessation of the conflicts in the field. Many problems would yet remain for consideration and solution, and such was the judgment of Congress, for it reserved from its legislation the trading with the enemy act and amendments thereto, and provided that all property subject to that act shall be retained by the United States "until such time as the Imperial German Government . . . shall have . . . made suitable provision for the satisfaction of all claims." See *Kahn v. Anderson* (255 U. S. 1) and *Vincenti v. United States* (C. C. A. 272 Fed. 114, and 256 U. S. 700).

It seems to me that the principle laid down in the *Commercial Trust* case, from which I have just quoted, is sound and is the law on the question. As it has been pointed out, and as I am sure will be again pointed out in the course of this debate, the court's declaration or expression of opinion, though unfortunate in its language, does not definitely say or purport to say that the extension of this law would be declared unconstitutional when submitted for the court's consideration. I am confident that in the face of the thorough investigation conducted by the committee, the opportunity for the property owners and opponents of the law to appear before it and bring their proof, and the fact that only after having heard such evidence the committee reported to this House that an emergency does exist, the court will not destroy an act of Congress based upon judgment of Congress after mature consideration and such thorough investigation.

On the other hand, I reiterate that if we have come to the time where the court indicates what the legislative branch of the Government should consider and what it should not consider, then we, too, have a solemn duty to perform. Reference has been made to our oath of office, and I agree that we have taken an oath of office, as has been indicated by the gentlemen in opposition to this bill, to uphold the Constitution of the United States. But in that Constitution we find that it is our duty to pass laws to meet requirements of government and it is our solemn duty to jealously guard the power of the people to make their own laws through their chosen elected representatives. No source and no power, no matter how great it may be or how exalted the court may be, should be permitted to interfere with our duty and with the powers of Congress as guaranteed to the people by the Constitution.

I feel that it is our duty and our oath of office leaves no choice to any Member but to resist to the very utmost any attempted encroachment upon the legislative powers of Congress. I want to say in closing that I am certain—in fact, I can say with certainty, if my colleagues from New York City were not in New York on a mission of sorrow to attend the funeral of Mr. Charles F. Murphy, the head of the Democratic organization, every Member would vote in favor of this bill. My colleagues from New York understand the situation, having had the opportunity to study it and see the beneficial results of curbing profiteering landlords. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore].

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

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any question of socialism involved here any more than there was when the Supreme Court decided the original cases involving the rent law of the District of Columbia and the rent law of the State of New York. Nor do I think there is any constitutional question involved. In those two cases and in subsequent cases the court has said in substance that when the legislative body finds the existence of a real emergency justifying the exercise of the police powers of the Federal Government with reference to the District of Columbia or of the States, those powers can be properly exercised.

Now, the other day a good many gentlemen talked about the constitutional aspect of the Lampert bill. But it is not worth while for anybody to say that our action now will pivot upon any constitutional question. All that the court did the other day in the *Chastleton* case was this: It took up litigation that arose with respect to conditions in 1922 and said it would not pass upon that litigation as it appeared before the court, but would send the case back for the ascertainment of the facts relative to the date when the case arose. It did not say—and it could not have said, because the question was not before it—that at this time no emergency exists. If it had undertaken to say that, its statement would have been what lawyers speak of as a mere obiter dictum, not binding upon the court itself and not binding upon the litigants or outsiders. The court did go on to say that it took judicial notice of certain facts, but it coupled that with this expression:

Here, however, it is material to know the condition of Washington at different dates in the past. Obviously the facts should be accurately ascertained and carefully weighed, and this can be done more conveniently in the Supreme Court of the District than here.

The proposition which I wish to submit to the gentleman from Kansas and others is that they are wrong in my humble judgment, in believing that the court has definitely held that no emergency prevails at the present time.

Now, what do we propose to do? I suppose there is no man upon this floor who would be more reluctant than I to infringe the philosophy of Jefferson, or any man who has a more profound respect for the Supreme Court than I. I am not going to deny that the Supreme Court can, in its wisdom, hold that it will not accept as final the declaration of a legislative body.

But on that point I wish now to speak as if I were addressing myself to that great tribunal. When it comes to pass upon congressional legislation it looks at the reports of the committees and in spite of any mere theory to the contrary, it looks to the debates. I am going to present this view to the court, that it ought to ascribe very great weight, if not final authority, to the declaration of Congress when Congress, acting with great deliberation, declares the existence of an emergency.

What did the court say in the New York case of *Levy v. Siegel*?

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

Mr. LAMPERT. I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The Supreme Court in that case said:

If this court were disposed, as it is not, to ignore the notorious fact that a grave, social problem has arisen from the insufficient supply of dwellings in all large cities of this and other countries, resulting from the cessation of building activities incident to the war, nevertheless, these reports and the very great respect which courts must give to the legislative declaration that an emergency existed, would be amply sufficient to sustain an appropriate resort to the police power for the purpose of dealing with it in the public interest.

I ask whether it is true that the large cities are in materially better condition than they were at the close of the war? They are not and that is a fact within general knowledge.

I would say this with submission to the court, that it should bear in mind that when a declaration of an emergency is made by Congress, it is not made by a legislative body of a State from which the court is far removed, but is a declaration made by one of the coordinate branches of the Government to which the court should be inclined to defer unless it be of the very inflexible opinion that Congress is wholly mistaken. The court knows, of course, that when Congress acts in this matter, it acts as the result of an examination made by the committees of the two Houses, upon a careful scrutiny of the facts. The court knows that it acts after debate in the two Houses by men who are assumed to know something about the situation; and the court knows something else of which it must take

judicial cognizance, namely, that the population of the city of Washington, congested during the war, is rapidly increasing.

Those who travel the streets of the city and pursue their way in vehicles about the city can not help knowing that to be the fact. The permanent population is rapidly increasing, the transient population is rapidly increasing, and thus the very condition, so far as Washington is concerned, that was pointed out by the court in the Siegel case is a condition that continues. And the court must in addition know, if it makes the same inquiry that you and I make, that with its population increasing, with all the activities of the city increasing, with all that occurring, at the same time the building operations as represented by the cost of construction are not abnormally increasing as compared with the pre-war period. We are not moved by any disrespect for the court in taking the step now proposed. We invite a further careful consideration of the question by the court as to whether it should defer to the declaration made by the legislative body.

I have no doubt this resolution should pass, and I am confident it is going to pass [applause], and I have such confidence in the great tribunal to whose views I bow that I believe when the court takes up the solemn declaration now to be made that there is an existing emergency, the court will not lightly disregard as without foundation the findings promulgated by Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I certainly can not be accused of approaching this question with a closed mind, having voted on both sides of this proposition in the past, and having changed my mind again in the last two weeks.

When I first came to Congress and this act was first extended I voted for it as an emergency growing out of the war. Two years later when it was presented I voted against it on general grounds as unwise legislation, but in the meantime the Senate of the United States ordered an investigation of the situation here, a committee had made a report that seemed to disclose a situation here that might call for the commission being prolonged, and so two weeks ago I announced to my associates on the committee that I would agree to extend the act until that situation was cleared and we knew the facts; but in the meantime the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a decision which, to my humble judgment, no man can approach with an open mind without feeling that an act passed by this Congress to this effect would be futile.

A moment ago when I attempted to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] a question it was to draw out some argument on a proposition that neither the gentleman from Ohio nor the gentleman from Virginia nor any of the other gentlemen who have argued in favor of this extension have touched upon, and that is the construction to be given to the word "judicial," which is certainly not meaningless in the opinion. The Supreme Court says:

We would judicially say that the act was not operative now.

The finding of a fact and judicial knowledge of a fact are entirely different, and if the committee should find that an emergency existed here that simply caused an increase in the price of rents, the court holds, as this opinion clearly shows, that that is not such a fact as would justify a commission. They say so in so many words:

If about all that remains of war conditions is the increased cost of living that is not in itself a justification of the act.

In other words, for Congress to create a commission to fix rents, or any such emergency legislation as that, the emergency must be founded upon some great and universal cause such as the war and its direct effects.

Of such an emergency the court may take judicial notice and this it takes to the effect that no such condition exists.

The gentleman from Virginia [Judge Moore] is right—there is an emergency here existing by reason of natural causes, but the Supreme Court itself shows that that is not the kind of emergency that it holds sufficient upon which to base an emergency. It says:

It is a matter of public knowledge that the Government has considerably diminished its demands for employees that was one of the great causes of the sudden afflux of people to Washington, and other causes have lost at least much of their power. . . . If about all that remains of war conditions is the increased cost of living that is not in itself a justification of the act.

Now, if an emergency grows out of causes arising from the war, this legislation is proper; but if it does not then the court says that judicially it has ceased to operate.

In view of that, it seems to me, although as I said two years ago I voted for it, it is nothing short of a crime on our part to hold out to two or three hundred thousand tenants of this District false hopes encouraging unrest and litigation, when, in my mind, we only bring them ruin. So, although I have no firm convictions on the situation here, I will not allow myself to be a party to holding out a hope that does not exist. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I voted with considerable hesitancy for the prior laws regulating the rent of property in the District of Columbia and particularly did the wisdom of the last extension create much doubt in my mind. At this time I find myself entirely unable to vote for any further extension of the so-called Ball Rent Act in the District of Columbia, not only in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court which has all the force and effect described by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] who just spoke—namely, that it will create a condition of chaos and litigation in the District of Columbia which will injure not only the landlords but the tenants throughout the District—

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am sorry but I have only three minutes. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore], than whom there is no more capable lawyer in this House, labored in his argument to defend this legislation in view of the present attitude of the Supreme Court. But with all his legal acumen and close analysis both of facts and the law, he was unable to give any assurance that the passage of this act would render any relief or security to the people of the District. We are facing a situation of uncertainty for months and perhaps years to come if we attempt to pass legislation now. In all times, and under all conditions, I deem it unwise to pass regulatory legislation unless absolutely necessary. Let the ordinary economic laws operate, let there be competition between landlords and building contractors and others who are able to furnish housing facilities for the people of the District. Let the business of the District proceed, and do not let the Congress of the United States be continually injecting legislation for the purpose of controlling the ordinary business activities and the ordinary economic conditions which arise in the District of Columbia or elsewhere. [Applause.]

[Mr. CHINDBLOM had leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 18 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Massachusetts has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. BEGG. I think the opposition had better use some of its time.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I want your attention, gentlemen, while I read something from this resolution. This is what they want you to say and what they want me to say under my oath of office:

It is hereby declared that the emergency described in title 2 of the food control and District of Columbia rents act still exists and continues in the District of Columbia.

I was in this Congress when that act was passed. It was during a time of war in the aftermath of that great World War here in Washington, when confusion and disorder existed everywhere. Business was unsettled, everything was unsettled, but since that time we have made peace with our enemy. We sent her the other day \$10,000,000 as a gift. We have signed treaties with our enemy. The war laws have all been repealed except this one. We attempt to hold it in force by stating something that we know is not true. There is no war emergency existing in the District of Columbia, and my conscience will not allow me to say that. I am not the keeper of your conscience; I am only the keeper of my own conscience, and I can not allow the RECORD to state that I said under my oath of office that a war emergency exists in the District of Columbia when no such emergency exists at all. There is no more war emergency existing in the District of Columbia than there is in any other city in the land. Rents have increased 45 per cent in all of the cities; and because they have increased is that a war emergency? We could not have enacted this law in the first place unless the World War existed. Now you want to extend it for two years definitely. If the war emergency still exists, when is it going to stop? The Supreme Court says in their

opinion that the war emergency no longer exists and that this rent law we seek to extend no longer exists; that it has become void. Let us respect the highest court in the land, and, above all, let us respect our conscience and our oath of office under the Constitution.

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I shall use five minutes of my own time. A number of years ago a Democratic candidate for President made the remark that the tariff was a local issue. At that time he was laughed at. Time has shown that his remark is more or less true. About the same time a certain gentleman from New York, the Hon. Tim Sullivan, made a remark which has gone down into history. He inquired, "What is the Constitution between friends?" I hope that that remark is not to become equally true with the remark of Winfield Scott Hancock regarding the tariff.

I never was so astonished in my life as I was to hear Judge Moore, of Virginia. I never expected to hear a man from the State of John Marshall make the speech that Judge Moore made here this afternoon. Virginia and Massachusetts have stood shoulder to shoulder in all matters concerning the Constitution and the welfare of the country as a whole. I was astounded when I heard as able a man as Judge Moore take the position he did in regard to the Constitution.

As a layman I am not competent to discuss the decision of the Supreme Court, but I can present to you a few common-sense facts regarding this bill. In the first place, it carries an appropriation of almost \$100,000. Do you suppose in the last two or three years that this commission has saved that amount of money to the people of the District of Columbia? I doubt if they have saved \$10,000 or \$1,000 to the people of the District. Then there is the cost of litigation, which is added to it, and your constituents and mine are paying 40 per cent of that cost. The owner's side of this question is not a popular one, but it is at least deserving of justice. Of course it would be delightful to go back to the time when we paid 12 cents a dozen for eggs, \$2.50 a pair for shoes, \$5 a ton for hard coal, and \$2.50 a ton for soft coal, to a time when you could hire a maid for \$2 or \$3 a week to come in and do all your housework, the washing included; but those days are past and gone forever, and you can not get at the situation to-day by fixing the price of rent. You have to go all the way down the line if you are going to correct it, and fix the price of everything, from the hat on your head to the shoes on your feet. It is a great pity that these conditions do prevail, but in order to approximate the old times we must get back to some of the old ideas, the old ideas of thrift and industry, and cutting your garment according to your cloth. If you want to live up northwest in some of these swell apartment houses, you ought to pay the price, but if you are willing like some of us to live on plebeian Capitol Hill, you can live for half the price that you would have to pay in the Wardman Park location.

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. I can not yield. I want to bring to your attention one thing which I hold most sacred and that is a portion of Article VI of the Constitution:

and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution.

You took that oath when you took your seat in this body, and it makes no difference whether you are actuated by motives of revenge or feel that you have been misused by some landlord or your seat in this House depends upon it, you ought to stand by your oath and support the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER].

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], when I came here from my home in North Carolina three years ago for the purpose of trying to assist in legislating for the best interests of all of the people of this country, I might have been called a conservative on questions of this kind. However, long before that I had ceased to conceal my opinion behind the gown of Thomas Jefferson and let the sweet will of the special interests of this country have their

way. I had long before that come to the conclusion that the trusts and combinations should not have the power that is claimed every time there is objection to their having that power. I had long before that come to the conclusion that we ought to legislate to restrain and curb organized greed in its efforts to rob the American people of all their rights. Our civilization has changed. Conditions are different from what there were. We have listened here to the lawyer from Kansas reply to the lawyer from Ohio, to the judge from Texas pass judgment on both their opinions, and since then we have heard the argument of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Missouri and others. I am deeply interested in the opinion of the Supreme Court which was handed down only last week.

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

Mr. HAMMER. I have only eight minutes and I can not yield, because I have so much to say and so little time in which to say it. The Chastleton case is one of those instances in which there has been skyrocketing in the arena of high financing.

The building, according to the testimony of the architect, including the grounds, cost only \$1,800,000, as appears in the testimony before the Rent Commission. At one time there were seven trusts on that building. There were six different conveyances in fee, and every one of those conveyances were among the 10 per centers and the skyrocketers, and those who were connected with the F. H. Smith Co., except one, and that was the Duponts. The property was sold to Mr. Dupont for \$3,000,000, and there was a dead loss of half a million dollars to Dupont when the property went back to the Chastleton Corporation. It is now owned by a gentleman named Stubblefield, who, when we began to bring out in the hearings before the subcommittee the activities of these financiers and their fictitious speculations betook himself to Florida along with Fall and McLean, to breathe the balmy air of that delightful climate. He is still there and can not be reached by a subpoena from the committee or by the Rent Commissioners, who desire to investigate other activities of the realtors in this District.

Referring to the Chastleton case, I agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] whose analysis, according to my view, of the opinion of the court last week was most accurate. The learned gentleman stated sound principles and deductions and a correct analysis of the opinion of the court. The landlords are attempting to make much capital out of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in this Chastleton case. The prevailing opinion, delivered by Mr. Justice Holmes, does not, so far as I can see, raise the question of the constitutionality of the present rent law. That law is founded on an emergency, according to the language of the statute, growing out of the war and the sole question raised by Mr. Justice Holmes is whether the emergency still exists and if it does, whether the law has ceased to operate.

The plaintiff alleged that the emergency had ceased to exist but produced no proof other than by affidavit. This was a legal conclusion of the plaintiff, for the opinion says:

Without going beyond the limits of judicial knowledge, we can say at least that the plaintiff's allegations can not be declared offhand to be unmaintainable, and that it is not impossible that a full development of the facts will show them to be true. In that case the operation of the statute would be at an end.

This is far from saying that the law is or has been unconstitutional. In my opinion as a lawyer, the court means that if the plaintiff can prove its allegation that the emergency has ceased to exist then the operation of the statute, which is based solely on an emergency, although in the Brock case it was indicated that the opinion was based on the police power in the Constitution, has ceased to exist. The court, therefore, referred the ascertainment of this fact to the Supreme Court of the District. This is solely a question of fact—has the emergency ceased? It is not a question of law; the question of constitutionality is not involved; nor of the validity of the original act. The whole question is, Does the emergency still exist?

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

You gentlemen, through your subcommittee, have made an investigation of this very fact. After numerous hearings, both morning and night sessions, covering a period of more than two weeks, and after hearing the testimony of many tenants, the testimony of several representatives of labor, representing tens of thousands of tenants and their families, a representative of the Federal Employees' Union, the commissioners of the Rent Commission, and landlords and their agents, a ma-

majority of your subcommittee was convinced that the emergency still exists and so reported.

Independently, a committee of the Senate undertook to make an investigation through the police department under an agent appointed by it. After a thorough survey by the Metropolitan police of Washington, covering a period of almost a month, this agent of the Senate committee reported:

In view of the disclosures of this survey of the present chaotic state of the housing situation in the District of Columbia, my opinion is that the emergency is as great for at least the temporary continuation of the Rent Commission as was the necessity during the war, inasmuch as during the period necessary for the situation to properly adjust itself it does and will require a body clothed with the proper authority to uphold its decisions, to determine right from wrong for the best interests of all, and protect those who to-day are unable to protect themselves from conditions over which they have no control.

In view of all this testimony and the testimony which can and will be adduced before the Supreme Court of the District, do you believe for one moment that that court will find that the emergency has passed?

THE TWO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Now, let me say a word with regard to the two proposed amendments. First, to limit the extension to a period of one year. This amendment, of course, is proposed by the landlords, for they well know that six months before the law expires only the boldest of tenants will venture to apply to the commission for relief. The termination of the act—the sword of Damocles—will be continually suspended over each tenant's head during the final six months of the act. Any tenant who applies to the commission or takes advantage of the protection of the law knows well that upon its expiration he will be ruthlessly evicted. Any tenant who, though his family may be shivering with cold during the winter months, applies to the commission for heat will face the same misfortune. Do not destroy the efficiency of the law by limiting its operation to the period of one year, which in effect means that the tenant will not be protected for more than six months. Vote for at least a two-year extension and vote down this destructive amendment.

The second amendment, to reduce the number of commissioners from five to three, is another proposition of the landlords, presented solely for the purpose of hampering and delaying the work of the commission. They know well that on the 1st of last July there were 700 cases pending before the commission undetermined. They know full well that the five commissioners who took office on July 1 last have considerably reduced this number. They also know that the commission is still five or six months behind in its work. Anything they can do to delay the hearing of cases and clog and congest the calendars will tend to destroy the efficiency of the commission and inspire the hope that cases against them may not be heard. This is the great drawback in a law with limitations. It is necessarily so in every law so limited.

Do not be prevailed upon to accept either of these amendments. Vote them down at once and pass the resolution of my colleague from Ohio extending the present law for two years more. The emergency still exists and will continue for at least that period.

The question is, Has the emergency ceased? Not whether it is constitutional or not. This whole opinion is an obiter dictum on the part of the courts as it relates to the constitutionality of the law.

Mr. KUNZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMER. I can not yield. I have only a few minutes, and I have an hour's speech to complete in that time. [Laughter.] Here is the great Supreme Court, composed of learned judges, nine of them, who live in one congested center of the District of Columbia, the northwest. Do you mean to say that that court, by reason of an affidavit attached to the petition, together with the little real actual knowledge that they have, is superior in knowledge to the knowledge that this House has, this House consisting of 435 Members, and a Senate consisting of 96 Members, and a subcommittee, composed of members living in all parts of Washington, north, south, east, and west—do you mean to say that those nine members of that court can with propriety say that they know more about it than all the Members of Congress put together? They do not mean to say anything like that. They mean to say merely that from the observation that they have, along with the admitted reduction in the number of employees of the Government, and the affidavit that was attached to the petition, from that showing there the law had ceased to be operative. That is all they mean in this opinion.

I call their attention to this man Stubblefield who owns the Chastleton, and the man who sold the property to Dupont, a gentleman whose activities are well known to the Members of this House, and the other gentleman who owns property and intends to exploit by fictitious inflation value the lot, the former home of President Buchanan, next to the House Office Building. He is the gentleman who is operating and dealing in millions of dollars, although he is a bankrupt and not worth a penny. Nearly 100 judgments stand on record against him, two of which are for \$1,000 and \$5,000, respectively, and he is bombproof and an execution could get nothing out of him. This is one of the men who is used by these exploiters, who load up these properties with mortgages and then unload them upon the public. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMMER. In the Chastleton case, recently decided by the Supreme Court, the court makes the following observation:

These cases show that the court may ascertain as it sees fit any fact that is merely a ground for laying down a rule of law, and if the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate.

Mr. Speaker, without any disrespect to the court, that is one of the most astonishing statements ever made by a judicial body. It is founded on observations of the justices' eyes and ears without the taking of a piece of testimony from disinterested parties who are well acquainted with the situation. The court says, "Upon facts that we judicially know." What facts do they know? Certainly no testimony has been taken before them, and therefore the only facts known to them are the facts which they have gathered from observation and conversation. What is the real situation? On the one hand, we have the nine members of the Supreme Court, able, learned, distinguished, and highly honored men who live in the city of Washington, but in only one section—the northwest section—where chiefly the wealthy, society people, and officials live. They may observe in riding about the city that there are rental signs out, but how can they know that those signs are not put out, as often is the case, to mislead the passer-by? With whom do they converse? Certainly not with the tenant class as a whole or generally. How many departmental workers do the members of the Supreme Court hold conversation with during a week, month, or a year? Do you suppose these tenants attend large banquets and social functions. The information which the Justices of the Supreme Court gather is from the landowner class and the wealthy people who own their own homes, maintain their handsome establishments, and entertain on a lavish scale. Do you think many of the tenant class ever attend these entertainments and have an opportunity to talk with these justices, or do you think that they have been attended by the wealthy lawyers who represent the wealthy landowners? Do you think that the members of this great court know anything about the southeast section or the northeast section or the southwest section? How many times during the year do you think they have visited these parts of the city of Washington? And yet this court says that from the "facts that we judicially know."

THE CONGRESS IS IN BETTER POSITION TO KNOW OF THE EMERGENCY

On the other hand, there are 435 Congressmen in the House of Representatives. These Members are scattered all over the city in every section, south and east, north and west, and even in the suburbs, Chevy Chase and other outlying sections. They have as constituents, friends, and acquaintances people in every walk of life, the wealthy and the poor, the high and the low, the departmental worker, the high-priced lawyer, the chauffeur, the street-car driver, and the wealthy diplomat.

All his friends who cater to his acquaintance pour their troubles into his ear. He lives in this environment and he is well acquainted with almost every apartment house in this city because of his sojournment here. He is well acquainted with the real estate man and his agent because he is a renter and he meets these agents. He knows the conditions which prevail in these apartments and is daily in contact with the services which are furnished. There are in addition to these 435 Representatives in the House 96 Senators who are

similarly situated, who live all over the city; some of them own their homes because of long membership in the Senate. But they are the few; some have expensive homes, and they are the exception. But the majority of the Senate as a whole is living in the apartment house of Washington and know of their own knowledge what the true situation is. These men also know that most of the signs are hung out on apartments where there are no vacancies; that the signs are placed there for psychological effect on the passer-by, for the Senators and Representatives in Congress.

In addition to this the House District Committee held hearings for almost three weeks, at which they took the testimony of the members of the Rent Commission as to what the conditions were from their observation and investigation. They had the owners and the tenants before them; the trade bodies of the city of Washington supplied information—every board or body representing the landowners of Washington had representatives present, and the labor unions also were represented. An open invitation was issued to all who wished to testify as to the need of continuing the commission, and whether an emergency still existed.

After a most exhaustive investigation on the part of the House subcommittee it was determined as their sound judgment that the emergency still exists and that the Rent Commission should be continued.

THE SURVEY CONCLUSIVELY SHOWS THE EXISTENCE

This seems almost conclusive and beyond question that the emergency does exist, but we need not stop there. The Senate of the United States through the Committee on the District of Columbia ordered a survey of the city to be made. This survey was conducted under the direction of the District Committee of the Senate with the aid of the police force of the District of Columbia. The policemen in all sections of the city, scattered from one end to the other, in the outlying districts, in the thickly populated districts, in the wealthy and in the poor sections. These men, who are paid to guard and protect the lives and property of the people of the District, and who know almost every man, woman, and child and every part of the city, have investigated the situation and reported to the Senate committee. The result of this survey was conclusive that the emergency had not ceased but still existed, and there was an urgent need of the Rent Commission.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you have the knowledge of the 435 Congressmen, the 96 Senators, the exhaustive hearing on the part of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and the survey made by the Senate committee at heavy expense assisted by the police force of the District of Columbia on one hand, and on the other hand you have the obiter dictum of the Supreme Court, who have made no investigation, who have taken no testimony, have had no survey before them, and who live in their own homes in one section of the city. Which are you going to take? Which do you think the Supreme Court should take?

Nevertheless, the expression used by the court in this case has given aid and comfort to those who want to tear down and destroy the great agency of the Government which guards and protects the man of reasonable means who is employed by the Government from being taken advantage of by those who want to exact extortionate rates and at the same time secure to the property owner at all times a generous return on his investment.

Let me call your attention to this parallel:

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,
APRIL 21, 1924.

Chastleton Corporation v. Sinclair

After referring to the original rent act and its extension on August 24, 1921, and its further extension with amendments until May 22, 1922, the Supreme Court, referring to May 22, 1922, the date of the extension, said:

"On that day a new act declared that the emergency described in the original Title II still existed, reenacted with further amendments the amended act of 1919, and provided that it was continued until May 22, 1924."

"We repeat what was stated in *Block v. Hirsh* (256 U. S. 135, 154), as to the respect due to a declaration of this kind by the legislature

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,
APRIL 23, 1923.

Commercial Trust Co. v. Miller

One year ago, on April 23, 1923, the court said in the case of *Commercial Trust Co. of New Jersey v. Miller* (262 U. S. 51):

"The next contention of the trust company is that the act, being a provision for the emergency of war, it ceased with the cessation of war, ceased with the joint resolution of Congress declaring the state of war between Germany and the United States at an end and its approval by the President July 2, 1921 (42 Stat. 103), and the proclamation of peace by the

President August 25, 1921. The contention, however, encounters in opposition the view that the power which declared the necessity is the power to declare its cessation and what the cessation requires. The power is legislative. A court can not estimate the effects of a great war and pronounce their termination at a particular moment of time, and that its consequences are so far swallowed up that legislation addressed to its emergency had ceased to have purpose or operation with the cessation of the conflicts in the field."

"We need not inquire how far this court might go in deciding the question for itself on the principles explained in *Prentiss v. Atlantic Coast Line Co.*" (211 U. S. 210, 227; other cases cited). "These cases show that the court may ascertain as it sees fit any fact that is merely a ground for laying down a rule of law; and if the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate. Here, however, it is material to know the condition of Washington at different dates in the past. Obviously the facts should be accurately ascertained and carefully weighed, and this can be done more conveniently in the Supreme Court of the District than here."

NATURAL LAWS HAVE CEASED TO FUNCTION

Natural laws have ceased to function in this great necessity of life—the housing of the population of the Nation's Capital City. The law of supply and demand no longer controls in the exigency which exists.

For tenants to be thrown upon the mercy of the combination existing here in bargaining with the landlords would be destructive and disastrous to living conditions except among the wealthy classes.

In this Capital City of a Nation looked upon as a glorious example of civilization we find daily deplorable and disgraceful living conditions, which are a menace to civilization. Insanitary, congested air permeated with the odors from cooking, from bathrooms, and numerous other offensive odors; lack of sun and ventilation; homes where privacy and modesty are of necessity unknown; grown children of different sex sleeping in one room, only a curtain drawn between; families forced into poor and smaller quarters; two families in quarters which under normal conditions would be occupied by one family—they are being forced to take in lodgers to pay the high rents. Such conditions can not but be conducive to ill health and immorality. Every fair-minded person will admit that people do not prefer to live under such conditions; they are compelled to because of the scarcity of available, reasonably priced dwellings for rent. Surely no one will claim that if dwellings were plentiful and reasonable the conditions would or could exist. Do not get the impression that such conditions exist only among the poorer classes. They exist among all classes except the wealthy.

By loading up with fictitious mortgages and by fake and dummy sales and inflated values, landlords have increased rents out of all proportion to the cost of the buildings. The ridiculously absurd contention is made that if the rent act expires rents will immediately drop and building will be greatly accelerated.

I was on the subcommittee two years ago when the present act was prepared with care, carefully guarding the rights of the landlord as well as the tenant. And again, in this Congress, I have been on the subcommittee and have attended all the hearings and given much study and careful attention to the question. Every time there has been rent legislation proposed we have been told that if we extend the law building would be retarded and it would be difficult to obtain financial assistance. In

answer to this attention is called to the unprecedented building in the past four years by giving the table prepared from the annual reports of the building inspectors, showing that in 1901 there were \$5,000,000 and a little more expended annually for building, whereas in 1923 there were more than \$52,000,000 expended for the same purpose. In 1921, the year that this law went into effect, there were \$14,881,517 expended for building. I call attention here to the hearings that we had two years ago, that a number of realtors testified that if the law were continued there would be no building operations. In 1922 the figures jumped from \$14,000,000, which I have just stated, to \$31,678,105 for the year 1922, and in 1923 the increases were \$52,000,000 and more. The table is as follows:

1901	\$5,106,031
1902	6,787,406
1903	9,796,069
1904	12,033,918
1905	11,134,515
1906	10,519,962
1907	11,375,689
1908	6,978,340
1909	13,268,858
1910	13,884,774
1911	11,840,809
1912	14,540,246
1913	8,256,012
1914	7,830,563
1915	6,948,871
1916	11,791,431
1917	13,477,938
1918	8,179,715
1919	8,386,720
1920	10,126,906
1921	14,881,517
1922	31,678,105
1923	52,071,502

The building inspector's estimate, based on the admission of witnesses testifying for the landlords, that there would be an increase in the class of property known as the better class—that is, in the 870 apartment houses in the District which contain 17,672 apartments—of 25 per cent in rents, would amount to more than \$4,000,000. This does not include small houses nor small two-story flats.

Wages have increased upon an average in the District of Columbia from 28 to 50 per cent above pre-war prices, while rent has increased from 50 to 100 per cent, although from the facts presented by the landlords of the District through the board of trade, rents have increased only 34.2 per cent since 1914, a most intelligent gentleman representing the Federation of Labor, of Washington D. C., one of the members of the Rent Commission, before our subcommittee stated that 60 per cent of wages in Washington were paid for rent. That some classes of workers get \$12 a week now when they received \$16.50 a week under the minimum wage commission. Women workers who were getting \$16.50 a week now receive \$9, \$10, to \$11 a week since the minimum wage commission was declared unconstitutional. When that law was in existence they told us the law was unnecessary, that without the law as much would be paid as with the law in existence. The 70,000 members of labor unions in Washington have requested that this law be extended.

You will find in the rent hearings this year (pt. 1, p. 78) that I stated in the examination of Mrs. Taylor that I heard Mr. Wardman say that—

he carried the second trust himself. Some of these gentlemen told me that the second trust does not cost anything at all. That it is pure velvet. That remains on it when they sell it, and that is why this cost is so enormous. They put on these trusts, which seem to be a system of high financing. I do not understand it at all, I admit, and when these gentlemen come on here we will try to find out more about it. We will try to find out what is the matter when they sell these properties and whether they actually sell and get this amount. One gentleman purchased three apartment houses the year before last and made \$120,000. They are making enormous profits.

Not one of the persons who composed the committee that made the survey for the realtors were before the committee, and of the big realtors only Mr. Wardman and Mr. Saul were there. They were as silent as the grave. Mr. Phipps and all the F. H. Smith & Co. witnesses who were expected to appear before the subcommittee suddenly decided to stay in close quarters. Those whose cases had been before the Rent Commission and the owners remained, as a rule, away from the hearings and no opportunity was presented for getting this most valuable information, much of which would have been done on cross-examination. But there were two intelligent real estate experts attending the hearings, and continued to attend for a few meetings after, until they saw that the realtors about whom enough had been brought out to get a toe hold in cross-examination, should the offending realtors testify, to bring out interesting facts. These two experts did not attend further hearings, but

through arrangements which were effected with the Senate committee they went to work digging up information which so amazed those who have seen it that it was decided not to make the evidence public for the present, at least, for reasons which will be obvious when the facts become public; yet the gentleman from Texas, if I am not mistaken, said that this was not the situation about second trusts—

That a man owns a piece of unencumbered property which is vacant, and in order to improve the property he borrows a certain amount of money, which the money lenders are willing to lend him. He says that a man borrows the money and constructs a building. He builds it to sell. When he sells it the buyer assumes this first trust and then, instead of paying cash for the difference he owes the man, for most of the difference, say, he makes a small cash payment and the balance then is covered by a second trust. Then, if that man sells again, the man he sells to assumes the first and second trusts, and in instances gives a third trust. (See hearings, pt. 1, p. 78.)

This explanation is quite different from the skyrocketing, fictitious inflations which result from these trusts; yet the gentleman from Texas has stated since these high financing methods have been looked into that he has known for a long while about the crookedness of these dealers; if so why should he have defended them by the explanation he made at the hearings as aforesaid, which explanation made their acts innocent and inoffensive.

The testimony of builders of the Chastleton Apartments was that the cost of building the entire apartment was \$1,800,000, including the cost of grounds. There have been six transfers of this property, of which were among them the grafters and skyrocketers, one of whom unloaded on the Du Ponts and for which they stuck the Du Ponts for half a million—a dead loss.

This property was sold at one time to Mr. Felix Lake, to whom I have heretofore referred, for \$3,000,000. He kept it six months and sold it at a loss of \$3,000,000. Revenue stamps on the deed when purchased showed that he sold it for \$900,000, and I assume that the \$1,200,000 were in trusts.

This man was comparatively a poor man as I stated heretofore, against whom something like 100 judgments were docketed in the District of Columbia, two of which are for \$1,000 and \$5,000, respectively. Those who are in position to know say that he is absolutely bombproof from execution. He is one of the members of Smith & Co., who inflate property by fictitious transfers and who practice the loading up with mortgages and unloading on the unsuspecting public such fictitious and fraudulent methods; this type of a certain kind of realtors who defraud the public and whose business is to inflate values and keep rents at a high and unreasonable price by their fraudulent and fictitious methods.

It has been stated by the gentleman from Texas that Mr. Wardman made a solemn promise before our subcommittee at the hearings that he would not evict the tenants on their refusal to pay the increased rent demanded. Mr. Wardman's statement in reply to the question, "Do you expect to put the tenants out?" was:

No, sir; I do not expect to do that.

But the gentleman from Texas did not give the Members of the House the benefit of the information that Mr. Wardman gave the committee that he disposed of this identical property. On page 82, part 1, of the hearings, I quote:

Mr. HAMMER. How much did the building [the New Bern] cost you?

Mr. WARDMAN. I would have to go into it in detail.

Mr. HAMMER. I thought you could give us the figures.

Mr. WARDMAN. I had a trade there. I gave a lot of property in return. It was a three or four cornered deal. It would be pretty hard to get it down to a cash basis. I have already traded this off to a firm.

FURTHER ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF TENANT

If the Rent Commission were to accept as the criterion of value sales of rental property based upon the monopolistic conditions existing in the District or were to follow the opinions of persons engaged in the real estate or renting business, the beneficial purpose of the rents act could not be accomplished.

The purpose of the rents act was to relieve a condition of monopoly in the District resulting from the suspension of the law of supply and demand and to substitute fair and reasonable rents for the high rents brought about by that condition.

In determining fair and reasonable rents, it is obvious that sales of rental property, or the opinions or estimates of experts, based upon the prevailing monopolistic situation, or upon the present high cost of reproduction of property, can not, in justice to the employees of the Government and other tenants, for whose protection the Rent Commission was created, be accepted as the criterion of value.

It is next to impossible for persons operating in the atmosphere of the exploitation of the present abnormal demand to lay aside their natural prepossessions and formulate opinions concerning rental property which would be of any assistance to the Rent Commission in the fixing of fair and reasonable rents.

Congress presumably had this in mind when it provided that none of the members of the Rent Commission "shall be directly or indirectly engaged in, or in any manner interested in or connected with, the real estate or renting business in the District of Columbia," and gave the Rent Commission the benefit of the expert, conservative opinion and judgment of the assessor of the District of Columbia, making that experienced public official "advisory assistant to the commission." (Rents act, sections 102, 104.)

The present owner of the Earlington Apartment House is claiming that there has been an enormous increase in the value of the property over its value before the war, and is seeking a return upon that value.

If the property has actually increased in value to any great extent, it is because of the shortage produced by the abnormal conditions which gave rise to the rent statute.

The owner is claiming the benefit of the abnormally enhanced values caused by the monopolistic situation which the statute was intended to remedy.

To give the owner that benefit would be to defeat the rents act and render it useless.

It may be argued that if the rents act is given this effect, it would result in taking from the owner a certain portion of the value of his property and in denying him a return upon that portion. But even that would not render the statute invalid.

In a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States it was said:

An appropriate exercise by a State of its police power is consistent with the fourteenth amendment, although it results in serious depreciation of property values, and the United States may, consistently with the fifth amendment, impose for a permitted purpose restrictions upon property which produce like results.

Calhoun v. Massie (253 U. S. 170, 175), where reference is made to several previous decisions by that court upon the same subject matter and to the same effect. This is one of the latest expressions of the Supreme Court of the United States on this question.

In *Newton v. Consolidated Gas Co.*, and so forth, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States March 6, 1922 (U. S. 258, p. 165), Justice McReynolds, speaking for the court, quoted from a master's report to the effect that a public-service corporation was not entitled to earn a return—

upon the present high reproduction cost of its property * * * but upon the actual reasonable investment in the property devoted to the service of the complainant's consumers.

While the court did not expressly approve this language, there is nothing in the opinion which shows its disapproval.

In the case of *Block against Hirsh*, in which the rents act was held to be constitutional and valid, the Supreme Court of the United States used this language:

Machinery is provided to secure to the landlord a reasonable rent.

"SEC. 106. It may be assumed that the interpretation of 'reasonable' will deprive him, in part at least, of the power of profiting by the sudden influx of people to Washington caused by the needs of Government and the war, and thus of a right usually incident to fortunately situated property—of a part of the value of his property. * * * But while it is unjust to pursue such profits from a national misfortune with sweeping denunciations, the policy of restricting them has been embodied in taxation and is accepted."

That there is a condition of practical monopoly in the District of Columbia can not be denied. In the able brief of the Attorney General of the United States in *Block against Hirsh* it was said:

It can not be disputed that the housing situation in a city like New York or Washington presents all the features of a practical monopoly. There is a house shortage which amounts to a fixed and inelastic limitation of supply. The demand, on the other hand, is intensified and rendered acute by the rapid increase in population, the conversion of residence into business property, and the practical cessation of building operations during and immediately after the war. This intensified demand, however, is an emergency demand. The present expansion is regarded as more or less temporary and subject to sudden and (economically speaking) unforeseeable change. The increased demand for housing, therefore, is not sufficiently stable and permanent to bring into play the private enterprise which would ordinarily respond by

increased construction. The natural flow of capital, through which the law of supply and demand is expected to relieve any unusual scarcity in a given commodity, does not take place. The result is that the bidding is all on one side. There is no competition between those who among them control the only available supply of habitation space. In short, so far as the housing situation is concerned, the normal competitive system has completely broken down. It is as truly non-existent as in the business of furnishing transportation, water, gas, electric light, and other facilities which are universally recognized as proper objects of regulation. By reason of the rigid limitation of supply in the face of a sudden, intense, and imperative demand, the business of renting out living space presents a state of virtual monopoly.

The same argument was made by the attorneys for the tenant in the case of *Block against Hirsh*. The attorneys for the tenant in their brief in that case used the following language:

In the District of Columbia there is to-day a virtual monopoly of real estate; the tenant is not on a parity with the landlord, but must pay whatever rent is demanded; guest never was more at the mercy of his host; and a fair distribution of shelter at a reasonable price in the District of Columbia is as important to the national and local governments as was ever the distribution of water, gas, electricity, or coal to the householder. An individual in Washington even to-day may walk; he may heat by wood or oil; he may read by lamp; he may wash his clothes at home; he may go without insurance—but he can not do without shelter, nor can he find any substitute.

REASONS FOR CONTINUING RENTS ACT

An emergency caused by—

1. Housing shortage.
2. Increase in population.
3. Increase in unemployment.
4. Attitude of the landlords.

1. There were 300,000 people in Washington in 1916, with a surplusage of houses.

The peak of the war population was 600,000.

There are now more than 500,000 people in Washington.

Owing to allocation of labor and materials to war needs, no residential building was done in Washington in 1917, 1918, or 1919 except that done by the Government. Prior to the great building program stimulated by the "own your own home" campaign begun in 1921 and in which program there were included no houses for rental purposes, there were homes in Washington for about three-fifths of the population, the pre-war surplusage having been offset by the total depreciation and condemnation of others.

During the war, when there were here more Government workers than there are now, private homes were opened all over the city. These homes were practically all closed to outsiders in the early days of 1920. Therefore we now have a population of at least 500,000 with homes for about 400,000.

2. The population of Washington is increasing daily, as is shown by reports from the gatemen at the Union Station. A canvass of business offices shows large staffs where prior to the war there was but one man to watch the so-called big interests of the country.

3. The civil service shows a falling off of several thousand employees, but there is nothing to show that these workers have left Washington. In fact, the secretaries of most of the Congressmen and Senators could tell of constant appeals from these discharged workers who are still attempting to find work in Washington. Most of these former employees are still in Washington, as I attempted to show in my remarks in this House on April 24.

4. The attitude of the landlord at the present moment shows conclusively that there will be a crisis in the affairs of tenants which can not but end disastrously were the rents act to go out of existence. This is evident in the hearings room in testimony which comes from both tenant and landlord. It is obvious that the minute the Rent Commission goes out of existence a large proportion of the more than 8,000 tenants who have appealed to the Rent Commission will be evicted. We have constant information to the effect that rents will be increased on the 22d of May, and the unemployment in the city shows conclusively that there will be many people facing actual starvation. It is true now that high rents are causing the heads of families to decrease the supply of food on the table until the workers go to their Government work underfed and little children go to school undernourished. This is a critical time in the affairs of the workers of Washington, a time when taking away the restriction from grasping landlords would mean tragedy and death. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if we do not legislate any more in connection with this matter the rent law will expire by limitation some time next month.

Why should we legislate any further upon it? Why not let it expire? The war is over, and it is time all the war laws were repealed. This was a war law. There is no longer any need for it. There are about 8,000 or 9,000 vacant apartments in the District of Columbia, and I believe that the rents are maintained higher than they should be by reason of the fact that we have a Rent Commission. Why should we continue to insist upon the control of the right of the people within the District of Columbia to trade with each other?

That is what we are doing. We are placing guardians over the right of people to make contracts. If somebody feels aggrieved as to a contract which he has made between himself and some one else, while this guardianship exists, he goes down there and makes complaint. Then we have all kinds of trouble. My own judgment is that the simpler you can make life, the better for everybody. The fewer laws we have to embarrass people, the better it will be for the people of the country.

We have reached the stage in life in the United States where life is so complicated that we never can tell from one moment to another whether if we start to go North we should go South if we do not want to violate the law; and it may be that while we are on our way North some governmental agency may come along and tell us that we ought to go East or West. Horace Greeley when he was alive used to say, "Young man, go West and grow up with the country." I think it might be wise for a lot of people in the District of Columbia, if they wanted to get acquainted with the United States, to go West and grow up with the country and see what is going on.

There ought not to be any doubt about what our attitude is to be in connection with the repeal of this rent law. We will not have to repeal it if we just stop right now. It will repeal itself. It has reached its end. It has no further useful purpose to perform and no further reason to exist. Why should not the people of the District of Columbia be free to rent or not to rent? Why should they not be free to make contracts or not to make them? Why should they be compelled to go to some governmental agency, paid out of the Treasury of the United States, to perform the ordinary functions which the citizen ought to be compelled to perform for himself? Why should we sneeze for everybody out of the Government Treasury?

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

Mr. MADDEN. In a moment. Everybody has reached the point now, particularly the people in the District of Columbia, where they think the Government owes them something. We ought to stop that. I am afraid that a good many of the Members of the House have been educated into the belief that we are the guardians of every piece of food that goes to the table out of the kitchen.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. There is nobody who understands this situation better than the gentleman and who is better able to answer the question I intend to ask. Will the gentleman advise the committee how many more people are in Washington by virtue of the Veterans' Bureau, by virtue of the Treasury Department, the War and Navy Departments, and by virtue of conditions brought about by the war?

Mr. MADDEN. I think there are 30,000 people here on the Government pay roll who ought not to be here. [Applause.] We have been trying to get them off but we have not been able to get them off. We have passed appropriation bills to pay their way home, but they will not even go home when you offer to pay their way. They want to stay on the Government pay roll, and then they complain because we do not give them a rent commission.

Mr. BLANTON. In the United States we have taken 300,000 off the pay roll.

Mr. MADDEN. Three hundred and sixty-nine thousand.

Mr. BLANTON. Three hundred and sixty-nine thousand since the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Luce].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for eight minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Chair to say eight minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I must have my record wrong; I have 11 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. I have kept the time since I came to the chair. During the interim that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] was in the chair he kept the time, and I think he will verify my statement. However, if there is an error the Chair will correct it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I think there is an error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have the official time-keeper confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Luce] is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. LUCE. The constitutional question directly involved here is so simple and narrow that one can hardly at this stage of the debate address himself to it without repetition. But should any gentleman still be uncertain as to the nature of this question a brief summary of the story may help him.

Under the Constitution as written and as interpreted there are two ways in which the fruit of a man's labor may be taken from him. First, by the recognized way of eminent domain, in which case he is to be compensated, and, secondly, by the inferential method of the use of the police power, in which case he is not to be compensated. The issue here is one of the exercise of the police power. The scope of this power has been discussed for many years and to great extent, and still is exceedingly uncertain. But the opinion handed down last Monday, coupled with the previous opinion in the same matter, goes so far toward clarifying and defining the problem that I can not agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] that no important constitutional issue is here concerned.

It is not easy at first sight to reconcile these two opinions of the Supreme Court, but a careful scrutiny will show you that in the first of these opinions, five of the justices of the Supreme Court held that the police power may be extended to meet any exigency. Mark you, I am using the word "exigency," which is to be discriminated from "emergency." Four of the justices denied that it would extend to any exigency. In the recent opinion, however, we find all nine of the justices agreeing, if I correctly interpret their words, that the existence of an emergency may be one of the tests of the exigency, and when the legislative branch has seen fit to rest its action on the basis of an emergency, as was done in this case, then it must stand by its declaration and prove the emergency.

Another step comes with the question of whether the decision of the legislative body as to the existence of an emergency is or is not final. In the opening of the debate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bregg] declared that it was, and he called attention to what is a fact, that there is a long line of argument and opinion in support of this view. Had he ventured beyond a very small excursion into the field of constitutional law he would have discovered a long line of argument on the other side, to which he did not call your attention. He spent his time on a task from which I would escape by telling you that no matter what have been the opinions of the jurists on this point for more than half a century—the leading decision in my own State dating from 1800—and in spite of all this argument and difference of judgment the proposition he puts forward no longer has any bearing.

What men may have thought the law is now of no consequence. We are dealing to-day not with history; we are dealing with what is now the law. The court spoke last Monday and said what is now the law, said it in a sentence that I think has not heretofore been cited and that seems to me to be the core of its position:

In our opinion it is open to inquire whether the exigency still existed upon which the continued operation of the law depended.

That settled it. Until you reverse the unanimous opinion of the nine justices (for Justice Brandeis, dissenting on a question of procedure, agreed on the main issue), it is idle to waste any time upon what their predecessors may have thought.

If you still want to raise the question of whether the emergency now exists, you have that right and the court will pay great respect to your view. But the court says it will hold the final authority in its own hands, and it has already foreshadowed to you what its final decision will be, for it says in effect that so far as it now has judicial knowledge the emergency did not exist even two years ago.

Let us, then, not waste time on the question as to whether in the past this thing might have been argued. Let us face

the situation as it is. If we care to, let us put ourselves on record as to whether we believe the emergency still exists, though knowing all the time that the court will in the end determine and in all probability will say it does not now exist.

One gentleman has shown to you the result of his examination of a newspaper of Saturday night. Following the same line of inquiry I took yesterday morning's Washington Post and discovered nearly 400 houses, apartments, and apartment houses for sale or to rent advertised in that one edition. Yesterday afternoon, in riding from here to Chevy Chase, I passed apartment house after apartment house with placards showing that apartments were to rent, and house after house for sale. No man's eyes will tell him that there is to-day any such shortage of living accommodations as to constitute an emergency. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Wolff].

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I have not taken any of the time of this House previously. I tried to get a little time to-day. I have heard the speeches made by the gentlemen against this bill. I have heard my colleague from Missouri defend his stand. I have heard the other gentlemen defend their stand from a constitutional standpoint, but I want to say to you that I defend my stand from the standpoint of a poor man. [Applause.] I believe I can defend it from that standpoint. I have only one minute to-day, but I want to say that the man who votes against this measure to-day is not right, I do not care who he is. I say, when you defend this thing from a constitutional standpoint and tell what the Supreme Court has done, give them a chance again. Law is a matter of opinion, and a matter of opinion only.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think we can all agree with the statement of the gentleman who has just preceded me that law is a matter of opinion, although the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States by virtue of the Constitution is the final opinion so far as we are concerned. Prior to the opinion of the Supreme Court handed down last week there seemed to be a great deal of speculation as to whether or not this law which we are now considering was or was not constitutional, and so far as I am able to judge from the disagreement manifested by certain distinguished lawyers who are Members of this body in the debate to-day there now seems to be a great deal of speculation as to what has been held by the Supreme Court. Regardless of the correct interpretation of the decision of the Supreme Court, one thing is certain, and that is that the court has not attempted to abrogate the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, six years before the armistice was signed, if any such legislation had been proposed in the Congress I venture to say it would be a fair prediction that no Member of this body would have voted for it, because they would have known and recognized the fact that it would have been beyond the constitutional powers of Congress. The Members of this House would have realized then, as they must realize to-day, that the creation of a commission with power to fix rents in the District of Columbia could be justified only under the police power of the legislative branch of the Government, and that its existence could be constitutionally defended only in the face of a serious emergency affecting the lives and health of the residents of the District. Such an emergency undoubtedly existed during the war, when it was vitally essential to the successful prosecution of the war that accommodations be secured for the housing of a vast army of Government workers in the Capital of the Nation. The demand for tenements greatly exceeded the supply, and the profiteering landlords in Washington took advantage of the necessities of the Government and its thousands of officers and employees who were compelled to find a place in which to live.

The fixing of rents in times of peace and in the absence of a great national emergency, simply because the rates are high and occasional suffering and hardship involved, is just as indefensible as the fixing of the prices which a purchaser shall pay for all other necessary articles of life, such as food, clothing, fuel, and so forth. We are asked to continue the Rent Commission in the District of Columbia. Six years after the armistice we are urged to declare the continued existence of a war emergency, which, if we are honest with ourselves, we know does not exist. The Supreme Court has well said in the Chastleton case that a law depending upon the existence of an

emergency may well cease to operate when the emergency itself ceases to exist. The court's declaration in this regard, while made in its discussion of a constitutional question, is in reality an outgrowth of the old common law maxim that reason is the life of the law and that *cessantis ratione legis cessat ipsa lex*.

This proposed legislation for the continuance of the Rent Commission is both unconstitutional and un-American. It has no more justification than laws providing for the regulation of the prices which we shall pay for the staple goods of any household, or for shoes, clothing, meat, fruits, vegetables, or any other article which is used in our common existence as a people. In nearly every community retailers can be found who are profiteering in all such articles. If it is conceded that rents asked in the District of Columbia are excessive, this fact does not constitute such an emergency as to justify the intervention of the police power of the Government, for in what growing village, town, or city in America can not the same thing be said? Such legislation as is here proposed if carried to its logical conclusion will destroy competition, wipe out the constitutional guaranties of our citizens to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the private ownership of property, and will ultimately set up in America a government based on socialism run mad. Again, we are asked to pass this law in the face of the assertion of the Supreme Court that the emergency which justified the original enactment has now disappeared. The court truly says that "if about all that remains of war conditions is the increased cost of living that is not in itself a justification of the act."

In the light of the foregoing extract from the opinion of the court, it is abundantly clear that we should refuse to permit political expediency to stampede us into continuing the existence of a commission the legal justification for which has long ceased to exist.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kunz].

Mr. KUNZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there has been a great deal of discussion upon the question of emergency in the District of Columbia, and the city of New York has been put on a parallel with Washington. The gentlemen who were present and heard the controversy on the question of immigration will remember that it was pointed out that there were 800,000 immigrants who immigrate into the city of New York every year.

During the war and just after the war, those of you who were here know that in some of the rooms they had four or five cots to accommodate those who visited Washington. To-day you walk along the streets of Washington and you find signs "Apartments for rent," "Buildings for sale." You did not see that three years ago. The trouble with a great many people who are trying to promulgate the idea of a salary grab bill is that they are afraid to tell you the conditions as they exist. During the war it was a question of housing conditions. Now it is a question of a combination of real-estate owners, and I defy the gentlemen who are on the committee to contradict my statement. The Rent Commission, under the law as it stands at the present time, can do nothing to prevent them from forming a combination. The substitute that was offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jost], provides a penalty against any such combination within the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNZ. I have not time. If you will give me some time, I will yield.

If you want to help the poor man, as my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Wolff] says, then amend this bill or adopt a substitute that will give protection to the poor men of the District of Columbia. This Rent Commission will simply take \$100,000—yes, an unlimited amount of money—out of the Treasury of the United States and compel the people of this country to pay these salary-grabbing people who are of no avail to the people of Washington. One of the members of the commission who was secretary to a former Senator is working in his State to elect his Senator and is drawing his salary out of the United States Treasury.

Gentlemen, the trouble is there are too many of us who are all the time in the air. Instead of having our ears close to the ground to hear the rumblings of the people, we are wandering far above, and in consequence when the election comes, some one else comes here and takes our place who does not understand the conditions as they are at the present time.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, with a normal committee of 21 members there has been but one member of the Committee

on the District of Columbia who has spoken for this Rent Commission. Just one member, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER], he being the only member of the committee who has spoken in favor of extending it.

DOES ANY WAR EMERGENCY STILL EXIST

If you pass this measure you will be declaring that it is based upon emergencies of the war, when the war has been over now nearly six years. You are asked to make a legislative declaration that war emergencies still exist, when, as a matter of fact, they do not. I have already quoted quite a large number of vacancies in the District of Columbia which are now offered for rent. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] mentioned the large number of properties advertised for rent yesterday in the Washington Post. Let me show you what has recently been offered in the Star:

The Washington Star for March 30, 1924, carried six and one-half columns, 74 advertisements to the column, offering rooms and suites of rooms for rent, and carried seven full columns of advertisements offering apartments for rent, and carried two full columns of advertisements offering vacant residences for rent.

The Washington Star for April 13, 1924, carried six full columns, averaging 75 advertisements to the column, offering rooms and suites of rooms for rent, and carried seven and one-half columns of advertisements offering apartments for rent, and carried nearly two full columns of advertisements offering vacant residences for rent.

EXISTING FACTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF COURTS

In view of the fact that this act will be passed upon by the courts of the country, and it will be a very material inquiry as to just what are the facts as to rental facilities now in the District, I will show exactly what was offered for rent yesterday in just one of the Washington newspapers:

ADVERTISEMENTS FOR RENT IN WASHINGTON STAR APRIL 27, 1924

The following advertisements offering property for rent appeared in the Washington Star yesterday, April 27, 1924:

RENT ROOMS—FURNISHED

One block of Chevy Chase Circle: Immediately available, in private home of adults, 2 furnished rooms, private bath, and rear porch; ideal arrangement for 2 gentlemen; instantaneous hot water, electricity, telephone; only \$50. Call Cleveland 855 after 6 p. m.

For two persons: Room with breakfast, in desirable suburban locality, 22½ minutes from heart of city; new home; all modern conveniences; private family; one block from car; will furnish to suit. Address Box 145-D, Star office.

1513 O Street NW.: Downtown; private bath, nonhousekeeping apartment, large studio room and small dressing room; must be seen to be appreciated; a. m. l.; telephone; maid service.

Close to 14th and Colorado Ave.: Detached private home, new, 2 rooms, with bath; single or suit; 26x12 and 15x13, closets of proportionate size; garage; no other roomers; price reasonable. Adams 4256.

1961 Blittmore St. N. W.: Large front room for two; sunny bay window; attractive neighborhood, convenient to both car lines, but away from noise. Single room facing south also available.

Chevy Chase, D. C.: Large furnished bedroom, second floor front; southern and western exposures; four windows; lavatory attached; detached house; half square car. Phone Cleve. 791.

759 Princeton Pl. N. W.: By May 1; front room for two employed men, next to bath; unlimited phone. Can be seen after 5 p. m. any evening, or call Adams 2771 for appointment.

1748 Q St. N. W.: Large front bedroom, twin beds; electric lights; next to bath; continuous hot water; maid and phone; suitable for two or three gentlemen; rent \$30. Phone North 9745.

1831 Monroe St. N. W.: Large front room, with large alcove, suitable for three or four; twin beds; phone extension in room; continuous hot water; garage; references. Adams 4850.

1734 Conn. Ave.: Remodeled, now ready to receive guests; one room or two and bath; semi-hotel service; best location; three car lines; references. Phone North 2937 or North 9725. Very convenient for Army or Navy.

818 New Jersey Ave. N. W.: Furnished rooms, convenient to Union station, Government Printing Office, within walking distance to Pension Office, Capitol, and downtown, on two car lines.

701 6th St. (cor. G St. N. W.): One large newly papered, nicely furnished, next to bath, 2nd floor; G St. view; \$4 a week or \$15 a month.

The Leumass, Yt. Ave. and Q St. N. W.: One room adjoining bath; modern apartment; one other roomer; unlimited phone; available May 1; \$20. Potomac 2845.

1225 Girard St. N. W.: Attractively furnished room, near two car lines; all modern improvements; unlimited telephone; \$15 per month; gentlemen. Col. 2874.

1614 Eye St., opposite Army and Navy Club: Large room, beautifully furnished; southern exposure; next to bath; 2nd floor; for 1 or 2 gentlemen.

1341 Clifton: Large, cheerful room, suitable for two, adjoining bath; three windows; home privileges; unlimited phone; ideal location, Adams 2874.

1727 F N. W.: Furnished rooms, single and double; single beds; electricity; instantaneous hot-water heater. Apply during week after 4.80.

The Montgomery, North Capitol and M Sts., Apt. 37: Large, nicely furnished room, next bath, electricity, continuous hot water. Frankline 8935-J.

417 11th St. NW.: (opposite Star office): Newly furnished outside rooms; electricity; continuous hot water, running water in rooms.

1723 G St. N. W.: Apt. 40: Nicely furnished, comfortable room; gentlemen only.

68 N. Y. Ave.: One large, nicely furnished room, next to bath; heat and electric light; suitable for one or two gentlemen or married couple; reasonable; private family.

1410 11th St. NW.: Nice room for 2 girls; girl wants roommate; parlor, piano, electricity, phone, l. h. k. and laundry privileges; \$12 per month. North 3734.

16th and You Sts.: Large, attractively furnished room for one or two ladies; every convenience; sitting room, kitchen privileges; elevator, café; walking distance of departments. Apply Apt. 53, the Balfour.

3731 Kanawha St., Chevy Chase: Large room, adjoining tub and shower bath; opens onto screened porch; 3 electric droplights; private family; near Chevy Chase car line; one fare, Cleveland 520.

Mt. Pleasant, 2040 Pierce Mill Rd. (4 squares from car line), facing Rock Creek Park: Large front, with or without sleeping porch, twin beds; next to bath, a. m. l.; home privileges; meals if desired; reasonable.

943 O St. NW.: Attractively furnished room, three large windows; another large room 2nd floor; hot and cold water in room; suitable for light housekeeping; bath same floor. North 4145-J.

1402 Delafield Pl. NW.: Beautifully furnished room, with or without private bath; continuous hot water, unlimited telephone; detached private home.

1330 Columbia Rd.: Handsomely furnished, single or en suite, three rooms; private bath; continuous hot water; clean; reasonable; transients, permanent.

Caravanaugh Courts, Apt. 211: Bed-sitting room, handsome new furniture; clean, comfortable; adjoins bath. Call Sunday or after 6 p. m.

620 H NW.: Second-floor front room, housekeeping; room first floor, housekeeping; large room first floor, sleeping; player-piano, electricity.

Mt. Pleasant: To gentleman; newly decorated and furnished bedroom; fine location; ready for occupancy May 1; adults only in family. For information call Col. 8981.

607 9th NE.: Two furnished rooms; private; refined family; employed couple desired; gas and electricity; bath on 2nd floor; l. h. k. Linc. 4448.

Near 14th and Buchanan: Attractive room, adjoining bath; opening on court; modern conveniences; breakfast privileges; reasonable. Adams 8189.

Adjoining Rock Creek Park: Bright, cool front room, next to bath, 2633 Adams Mill Road, Apt. 31, vicinity 18th and Col. Road.

2596 University Pl. NW.: Large furnished room, suitable for two; electricity and convenient to car and bus line; reasonable; l. h. k.

1718 Corcoran, Apt. 42: One or two young ladies to share apt. with another lady, employed; rates reasonable. Apply Sunday before 8.30 or after 6.

2532 14th, corner Clifton, Apt. 3: Private family offers large room, furnished in mahogany, next bath; southern exposure; Protestant preferred. Phone Columbia 55-W.

18th and K: Large, corner bed-sitting room, private bath, porch, modern apartment house; for gentleman, quiet tastes. Apply 4 to 5.30. Main 3994.

40 Channing St. NW.: Three furnished rooms for l. h. k.; first or second floor; board if desired; call between 7 and 10 p. m. Phone North 660.

Mt. Pleasant section: Well-furnished bed-sitting room and sleeping porch; one or two ladies; convenient. Telephone Adams 2041.

The Madrid, 2300 18th St. NW., Apt. 24: Couple will rent furnished front room, adjoining bath, to refined lady or gentleman; reasonable.

1238 Harvard St. NW.: Large, newly furnished, 2nd floor, front room, also 2nd floor back room, with sleeping porch; electric lights, l. h. k.

2810 Adams Mill Rd. NW.: Living room, bedroom, kitchen, porch, complete housekeeping; furnished; man and wife; no children; reference; \$50.

Portner, Apartment 154: Desirable, sunny single room; hot and cold water in room; electricity; attractive surroundings; to gentleman, \$30 month.

5610 Fourteenth: Three or four gentlemen accommodated in private home; large, airy rooms, sleeping porch; hot water, screens, phone; garage.

1430 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Apartment 26. Large, pleasant room, next bath, in modern downtown apartment house; references. Franklin 141.

1224 Eleventh Street NW. Furnished for light housekeeping; one large front room and kitchen; bath on same floor; newly decorated; \$40.

803 Mount Vernon Place (near Seventh and K Streets). Two large rooms and back porch, parlor floor; light housekeeping if desired; reasonable. Also sleeping room, next to bath, \$15 month.

1107 Seventeenth NW. Twin beds; large, clean, second front, next bath; outside balcony; continuous hot water; unlimited phone. Call Sunday after 1, week after 5.

1737 Seventeenth Street NW. Bed-living room on second floor, front; also room on third floor; convenient to bus and three car lines; electricity, phone service.

1757 Euclid Street (near Eighteenth and Columbia Road). Desirable room, single or double; convenient meals; two car lines; Protestants. Columbia 4855.

1440 Meridian Place NW., Apartment 5. Two well-furnished and comfortable rooms in modern apartment, suitable for one or two; rent, \$15 and \$25 per month.

Large room, choice, furnished as bedroom or bed-sitting room; 2 large closets, adjoining bath; convenient to downtown; no other roomers; \$15 monthly. Telephone Lincoln 9628-J.

Northwest. Large, attractive room, adjoining sleeping porch; new house; all modern improvements; ideal location; \$25 per month; garage if desired. Adams 3614-W.

806 Maryland Avenue NE., Apartment A. A large, comfortable room next to bath; electric light, hot-water heat, continuous hot water; suitable for one or two.

1656 Irving Street NW. Large single room, next to bath; porch; southern exposure; modern; private family; gentlemen; price, \$22 per month. Phone Col. 4268-J.

1723 G. St. NW., Apt. 40. Law student would like young man to share large front room; twin beds; reasonable. Call Sunday.

1204 Euclid Street NW. One or two nicely furnished rooms, with or without board.

1739 N. St. Room, with or without private bath; beautiful surroundings; excellent service; breakfast. Franklin 4816.

635 K. St. NE. One front room and kitchenette, furnished, second floor; electricity; \$32.50. Lincoln 7564.

Two nicely furnished rooms, convenient to street cars and in desirable location; rent singly or together. Phone North 9174.

1510 Columbia Road. Nicely furnished, cheerful room; electricity; instantaneous hot water; phone.

Lehigh Apartments, 2605 Adams Mill Road. Large front room, every convenience, reasonable. Adams 4531.

1322 L. St. NW. Roommate wanted, \$3.35 weekly; also basement room; twin beds; \$3 weekly.

3663 13th St. NW. Attractive front room; a. m. l.; one or two gentlemen. Phone Col. 1326-M.

2104 Eye St. NW. One single or double room with running water, hot and cold; electric lights; use of phone.

1610 1/2 Marion St. NW. (bet. 6th and 7th Q and R Sts.). Nicely furnished room, \$10 month (white).

4726 15th St. NW. Rooms for two gentlemen; all conveniences; sleeping porch. Call evenings.

1669 Columbia Rd. NW., Apt. 34. Large, desirable front room; suitable for two; reasonable.

418 6th St. NW. New tenant, just moved in, desires refined people to light housekeep; other rooms and back porches; will give board.

761 6th St. SE. Attractive furnished room; all conveniences; lady preferred; near navy yard.

Lady to share newly furnished apartment with another lady; convenient to cars. West 2810-J, after 6 p. m.

738 9th St. SE.: 1 large room, \$3.50 per week; 1 small room, \$1.50 per week; convenient to navy yard.

1839 Kalorama Rd. NW.: Front room, nicely furnished, southern exposure; men or women; \$25. Columbia 7545.

640 New York Ave. NW.: Two large, bright, cheerful, communicating front rooms; reasonable; \$2.50 up.

1930 Blinnmore St.: Pleasant rooms on 2nd floor; gentlemen; quiet home for students. Adams 4651.

If you would like a nicely furnished room in my detached home, near 14th and Colorado Ave., call Adams 609.

Bright room, southern and western exposure; 3 windows; private home; gentlemen; price, \$35; references. Frank. 6014.

1734 Corcoran St. NW.: 1, 2, and 3 furnished l. h. k. rooms; good neighborhood; very low rent. Mrs. Fletcher.

1323 Randolph St. NW.: Large front room, with private bath, continuous hot water, for lady in office.

625 Mass. Ave. NW.: Rooms, a. m. l., with and without l. h. k. conveniences; accommodations.

206 6th St. SE.: Nicely furnished front room, convenient to Capitol and Congressional Library.

Gentlemen only, large front room, adjoining bath; all modern improvements. Adams 8929.

1116 Columbia Road: Large, well furnished, with private bath, dining room; \$30, one; \$35, two. Columbia 2134.

1406 Ingraham St. NW.: Newly furnished, for lady, in new detached home; all conveniences. Col. 6022.

911 New York Ave. NW.: Clean, homey rooms, with and without housekeeping; living rooms, piano, telephone. Call.

2038 F. St. NW.: Single, next to bath; screened porch; a. m. l.; phone; gentleman; \$20.

Girl to share nicely furnished 2-room, kitchenette apt.; grand piano; three exposures; delightful for summer. Phone Cleve. 2116.

1515 Caroline St. NW., just off 16th: Room, 2d floor front, with or without garage; reasonable.

1417 Harvard St. NW.: Large 3d-story back room, running water, electric light. 2 large windows; phone.

1117 N. NW.: Two front rooms, large and small, \$20 and \$10; electricity, hot water; downtown; gentlemen. North 9933.

1035 New Jersey Ave. NW.: Two fur. for l. h. k.; newly papered; man and wife preferred; \$25.

1201 Clifton: Comfortable small room for young man desiring convenience and economy; \$15.

1020 Park Road: Two attractive single rooms, modern conveniences, private family, home privileges; reasonable. Adams 5528.

Large, cheerful 2d-story front room; use of kitchen if desired; garage in rear. Phone Linc. 5282-J.

640 6th St. NE.: Room, neatly furnished; elec. lights; gentlemen preferred. Saturday after 6 p. m.; Sunday after 1 p. m.

3642 Park Pl. NW., overlooking Soldiers' Home: 1 single, 1 double; a. m. l.; reasonable. Col. 3484-J.

Near Wardman Hotel: Large, second-floor front room, \$30. Also garage. Col. 4532.

71 N. Y. Ave. NE.: 2 large rooms and kitchen; heat and light and use of phone free. Fr. 7678-W.

1330 Mass. Ave. NW.: Comfortable furnished room adjoining bath; gentlemen only. Inquire first floor, elevator boy. Valeis.

2111 Pa. Ave. NW.: One furnished second-floor room; housekeeping if necessary. \$6 a week.

1981 Park Rd., Mt. Pleasant: Bright, nicely furnished front room, modern home, second floor, private family. Col. 1902-J.

1431 Chapin St. NW.: Large, six windows; ideal for summer; every convenience; adjacent park; one or two gentlemen.

1111 M. St. NW.: Downtown apartment; bright front room; gentleman. Call after 5.30 p. m. Tel. Franklin 3360-W.

2413 18th NW.: Private home; large front, couple or 2 gentlemen; modern conveniences; attractively furnished. Adams 5309.

Comfortable, homelike room; near cars; reasonable; breakfast if desired. Phone Clarendon 181-W-1.

1135 5th NW.: Entire third floor of 2 rooms; completely furnished for l. h. k.; heat, gas, water. Phone Frank. 1359.

2348 28th St. NW. (near Wardman Inn): Nicely furnished, airy rooms; modern improvements; double and single rooms. Columbia 7217.

Near 16th and U Sts.: Beautifully furnished; rent reduced. Phone N. 965 before 12 a. m.

1617 Hobart St. NW.: Nicely furnished, single or en suite; two rooms; front, southern exposure; private bath; electricity.

701 19th St. NW., apt. 32: Attractive bed-sitting room for lady; a. m. l. Call Sunday; week days, 4.30.

Best Mt. Pleasant section: Family of two; large front room, private bath; telephone and garage. Col. 2984-J.

2564 University Pl., vicinity 14th and Clifton: Comfortable 2d floor front; also one with inclosed sleeping porch; a. m. l.

1508 Ogden St. NW.: One large room with sleeping porch, \$25; also single room, \$12.50. Telephone Col. 10029.

Furnished room in apartment; meals if desired; reasonable for one or two persons. Phone Columbia 3872.

1636 19th NW., Dupont Circle: Large room, well furnished, for light housekeeping; electricity, hot water, and telephone; \$25 a month.

1833 Vernon NW.: Nicely furnished room, next to bath; newly papered; 3 windows; electric light. North 3966.

1523 Allison St.: Private bath, communicating, with attractive corner room, south and west exposure; also garage. Col. 3506-W.

1204 Irving St. NW.: Nicely furnished room for refined gentleman; all modern conveniences. Columbia 10232.

1323 10th St. NW.: Two furnished rooms, with or without l. h. k. privileges. Phone Pot. 2424.

1739 P. St.: Large, front, clean room; instantaneous hot water; gentlemen; permanent. Franklin 8321.

610 South Carolina Ave. SE.: Well-kept room, private home; conveniences; h-w. h., electricity.

1226 Mass. Ave.: Attractive second-floor single room; clean; electricity; central; no car fares; male Government employee preferred.

201 Wilson Boulevard, West Clarendon, Va.: Pleasant room for gentleman; garage if desired.

605 North Carolina Ave. SE.: Large front room, with or without l. h. k. Phone Lincoln 4391.

1236 11th St. NW., Apt. 1: Front bed-sitting room to lady; reasonable. Call after 7 p. m.

Petworth, 726 Taylor St.: Two nice housekeeping rooms; desirable; home privileges; adults; \$30.

3467 14th St. NW.: Nice room, suitable for 1 or 2 gentlemen; suburbs; board optional; by May 1.

Well-furnished rooms in private home; garage. Phone Cleve. 107-W, Sunday or evenings.

3316 Mt. Pleasant St.: Pleasant room, convenient to end of car line; bath with shower on same floor.

723 6th St. NW.: One large front room and kitchenette, first floor, and 2 rooms on second, for l. h. k.

1344 Spring Road: Nicely furnished 3 rooms and bath; electricity and gas; available May 1; \$50 month.

1115 East Capitol St.: Large front room facing Lincoln Park, three windows; twin beds; nicely furnished. Phone Linc. 6159.

217 East Capitol St.: Exceptionally attractive porch and room combined, for gentlemen; hot water always.

Potomac Heights: Large, new; accommodates two young ladies; board if desired. Cleve. 3238.

1337 22nd St. NW.: Nicely furnished front room, twin beds; French family; reasonable. North 2861.

1727 P. Dupont Circle: Large, bright front room, near bath; electricity; parlors; telephone.

1642 Newton St. NW.: Second floor, near bath; priv. getting breakfast; gas and electricity; very reasonable. Col. 8651.

1752 Corcoran St., Dupont Circle: Private family, extra large front double room, with balcony; board. North 7121.

1823 Eye Street NW.: Two furnished rooms; light housekeeping allowed; gas, electric lights; \$30 per mo.

Apt. 238, Klinge Mansions: Two large, beautifully furnished rooms; 2 windows, private bath; \$37.50. Col. 6797.

14th and Delafield Sts.: Beautiful corner room, next to bath; \$30 mo.; in detached house; every comfort. Phone Adams 5025.

933 N. Y. Ave.: Small, private family home, single room for rent; every modern convenience. Knight.

1716 Kilbourne pl., Mt. Pleasant: One room with private bath; elect. and hot-water heat. Col. 4225.

Two neat, l. h. k. rooms, completely furnished, a. m. i., for employed couple. Call 110 E St. NE. Lincoln 736.

Apt. No. 43, Ventosa: Wanted, one or two young ladies to share; may be seen Sunday after 1 p. m., or evenings after 5.30.

1013 M St. NW.: Large and medium, second floor, housekeeping; attractively furnished; electricity.

1831 Monroe St. NW.: Nicely furnished room, private home; continuous hot water; garage; references. Adams 4850.

2304 14th St. NW.: Apt. 6, desirable room in corner apartment for one or two gentlemen; \$18-\$25.

4 Iowa Circle: Bed living room, front, facing park; very attractive; walking distance; unlimited phone.

2022 University Pl. NW.: Two well furnished rooms, with board, \$7.50 per week up. Telephone Adams 719.

1483 Meridian Pl. NW.: Double and single rooms in detached house; large porch; l. h. k. if desired. Adams 1696-J.

1465 Girard St. NW.: Double room for gentlemen; opens on sleeping porch. Col. 5545-J.

1511 Vt. Ave. NW.: First or second floor, single and communicating; cheap; central; housekeeping.

1501 11th St. NW.: Two large front rooms and kitchenette, apartment, range; very desirable; \$40.

3151 Mt. Pleasant St., Apt. 31: Nice room, private family; May 1; gentleman. Col. 9381-W.

1021 20th St. NW.: 2 blocks from Penna. ave.; bay-window front; \$20 and \$22 monthly; daily and weekly rates.

1107 10th St. NW.: Two rooms and kitchenette, running water, housekeeping; couple. Call after 5 p. m.

1858 Columbia Rd., Apt. 46: Attractive room, southeastern exposure; two windows; lady; reasonable. Col. 7783-J.

1762 Columbia Road: Furnished room, next to bath; second floor; private home; reasonable.

Mt. Pleasant: Bright, attractively furnished; a. m. i.; \$15; gentleman; also garage. Phone Adams 2442.

1629 K St. NW.: Newly papered, painted, furnished; running instantaneous hot water; select down-town location; references.

300 N. J. Ave. SE.: Single room, suitable for gentlemen; one block from Capitol; \$5 per week.

214 K St. SE.: Suite of rooms for man and wife; also single rooms for gentlemen; reasonable.

Near Dupont Circle: Large, attractively furnished front room; twin beds; electricity; telephone. 1707 P st.; gentlemen.

1722 21st St. NW.: Desirable double outside room, handsomely furnished; a. m. i.; also lovely single room.

1703 Irving St. NW.: Front room, one block from Mt. Pleasant cars; gentleman; reasonable.

4407 8th St. NW.: Large front room; a. m. i.; close to buses and cars; board if desired. Col. 1028-W.

2011 Park Rd., large, airy room, facing park; all modern improvements; next to tiled bath; owner's private home.

4223 4th St., Petworth NW.: Iowa bus or Soldiers' Home car; 2 l. h. k. rooms, location high and dry; private family. Adams 4408-J.

815 Mass. Ave. NE.—Rooms with sleeping porch; 2 gentlemen or employed couple without children.

555 Randolph St. NW.—2 nicely furnished, bright, clean rooms; l. h. k. Col. 2383-J.

2 well furnished front rooms; a. m. i.; southern exposure; continuous hot water; reasonable; phone privileges. Pot. 2546.

1821 Vernon St. NW.—Room with porch, private family; gentleman; reasonable—Phone North 7764-J.

918 Eye NW.—Very attractive bedroom, second-floor front.

1441 Pa. Ave. SE.—Three front rooms; range; l. h. k.

1315 15th NW.—Lovely single front room; convenient home; transients.

1225 N NW.—Two front housekeeping rooms; water; electricity.

1214 K, Apt. 3.—Single room, a. m. i. Call after 4.

Takoma Park.—1 or 2 rooms, private bath; breakfast if desired. Adams 4258.

13th near Park Rd.—Two large rooms, private bath; continuous hot water. Adams 4553.

619 Eye St. NE.—2 clean furnished rooms; l. h. k.; \$22.

643 East Capitol.—Nice, bright room, near bath. Phone Linc. 3979.

1372 Harvard St. NW.—Three rooms, \$45; two front; housekeeping.

1321 Columbia Road.—Second floor front; two others: \$30; housekeeping.

1121 12th St. NW. (12th and Mass. Ave.)—Second-floor front: a. m. i.

131 A St. NE., Apt. 43.—Attractive room, a. m. i. Phone Linc. 6050-W.

1330 Mass. Ave. NW.—Large outside room; gentlemen only.

1306 Columbia Rd.—Double or single rooms; gentlemen or employed ladies.

Thomas Circle, 1418 M St.—Desirable sleeping and housekeeping rooms.

1433 Clifton St.—Very attractive 2nd-floor room; modern conveniences.

Nice front room, splendid location, private home; a. m. i.; reasonable. Pot. 1312-W.

1505 22nd St. NW.—Room and kitchenette, \$22.50.

Chateau Bonaparte, 1627 K St. NW.—Pleasant rooms for men.

1211 K St. NW.—Apt. of 2 rooms and kitchen. Other desirable rooms.

1012 10th St. NW.—One large front room for l. h. k.; electric lights.

317 A St. NE.—Comfortable room. Lincoln 4249-J.

4119 7th St.—Furnished, front, for middle-aged couple.

1743 Pa. Ave. NW.—Double and single; in private family.

2506 K NW.—Rooms with 2 beds, \$10 month. West 2689.

502 M St. NW.—With or without housekeeping.

1720 21st St. NW.—Semi-basement with bath; also front room; modern home.

521 2nd St. SE.—Two or three housekeeping; sink and gas range in kitchen.

1419 Chapin St. NW., apt. 2.—Double room, adjoining bath; furnished in walnut.

1322 L St. NW.—Large, front room, running water, electricity; three beds.

1758 Kenyon St.—Nicely furnished front room.

Mt. Pleasant—2nd floor room with porch, next to bath; all cars. Col. 8027.

In convenient NW.—Two desirable rooms. Phone Adams 1255.

1709 Irving St. NW.—Front room, private; twin beds.

1733 17th St. NW.—Two rooms, kitchenette and bath: \$35 per month. Call Col. 9503.

1830 Columbia Rd.—Attractive rooms, home atmosphere.

5038 Conduit Rd. NW.—3 rooms, bath, housekeeping; all conveniences; no children.

1330 Quincy.—Large front room, twin beds, shower bath, private home. Col. 7373.

108 C SE.—Two-room housekeeping apartment, completely furnished; a. m. i.

125 11th St. SE.—Two housekeeping rooms; a. m. i.; reasonable.

7 2nd St. NE.—Furnished room, heat, and light: \$15.

Apt. 510 Rutland Courts.—A large front room, southern exposure.

29 Eye St. NE.—Gentlemen preferred; clean and homelike rooms; cheap rates.

1223 Fairmont St. NW.—Large, 2nd-floor front room, southern exposure.

- 1500 1st St. NW.—Colored; nicely furnished room, splendid location: gentleman only.
- 1224 Conn. Ave., Apt. 41.—Two large, beautifully furnished rooms, exceptionally cool.
- 1436 Irving St. NW.—Large, sunny, first-floor front room; reasonable.
- 1448 Clifton St.—2 well furnished rooms; bright and sunny.
- 941 O St. NW.—2 or 3 rooms, second floor; heat, gas, bath; l. h. k.
- 2234 35th St. NW.—Bay-window front room; a. m. i.; use of kitchen.
- 1336 Meridian Place (near Park Road and 14th St.).—Comfortable room for rent.
- 2418 G NW., Apt. 10.—Housekeeping privilege; gentleman; \$2 week.
- 1220 Kenyon St. NW.—Third-floor front; gentlemen only. Col. 6120.
- 1230 Fairmont St. NW.—Large, first-floor front; sitting-bedroom. Phone Col. 5097.
- 120 5th St. SE.—Two partly furnished rooms on second floor for light housekeeping.
- 3 S St. NE.—Furnished room, adjoining bath; private family; near North Capitol St.
- 1211 Euclid St. NW.—Single room, next to bath; large closet; electricity. Col. 5043.
- 1228 Maryland Ave. NE.—Three rooms, entire first floor; a. m. i.; colonial porches.
- 822 K St. SE.—Large front room, 2nd floor, newly furnished, reasonable price; 1 or 2 men.
- 1217 Franklin St. NE.—Clean, quiet, well furnished room, \$20. N. 596 J.
- 1209 H St. NW.—Front room, second floor; one or two gentlemen.
- 214 B SE.—Room, kitchenette, third floor; \$25; adults. Garage.
- 1364 Girard St., Apt. 3.—Front room; a. m. i.; reasonable.
- 1024 8th St. NW.—Attractive second-floor room; electricity; downtown; \$15 per month.
- 707 22d St. NW., Apt. 10: Near G. W. U.; gentlemen.
- Chevy Chase: Furnished room; breakfasts and garage if desired. Cleveland 357 W.
- 2131 N St. NW.: Modera room, private family. Phone North 6454.
- 912 H NW.: Large room; also hall room; very reasonable.
- 2001 Kalorama Rd.: Large, so. front room; corner; fine location.
- 1217 Euclid: Front and back rooms, nicely furnished and newly decorated.
- 1515 Lament: Rooms, single and double; twin beds. Call Sunday.
- Berkshire, Apt. 47: Pleasant, nicely furnished room; young gentleman; \$20.
- 1416 Euclid St.: Sitting room, with inclosed sleeping porch; gentlemen.
- 1154 17th St. NW.: One double and single room, second-floor front; reasonable.
- 1102 Monroe NW.: Front, second; electricity; for one or two; reasonable.
- 1209 R. I. Ave. NW.: Two light housekeeping rooms, front; electricity; adults.
- 1376 Kenyon NW.: Large, attractive room, near bath; large closet.
- 1824 Monroe St. NW., Apt. 44: Double front corner room; electricity, elevator, café.
- Apartment 333, the Portner, 15th and U Sts. NW.: Comfortable room, adjoining bath.
- 403 2d St. SE.: Front room, suitable for couple or two gentlemen. Three rooms and bath, completely furnished. Key in barber shop, 525 11th St. NW.
- 1215 I St. NW.: Comfortable room, private apartment; electric light, large closet.
- 504 M St. NW.: Living bedroom, kitchen; next bath; \$28 month.
- 1021 8th St. NW.: Sleeping rooms, also front parlor; electricity.
- 419 6th St. NW.: Furnished, large room, \$3 week.
- 1266 Columbia Rd. NW.: Single and double room. Phone Col. 3996.
- 1113 11th St. NW.: Clean, comfortable rooms; electricity; light housekeeping.
- 1775 Massachusetts Ave.: Second-floor front; private family. Housekeeping rooms; excellent for children; \$7 week. Potomac 1788.
- 1210 25th St. NW.: Two bright, well furnished rooms and bath; reasonable.
- 1637 Webster: Nicely furnished room; private family; a. m. i.; \$15. Adams 736.
- 47 Brunswick Apts.: Room, reasonable. Call after 5 or Sunday.
- 1323 11th NW.: 2d floor front, with kitchenette, \$30.
- 23 S St. NW.: Room, hot water, elec. light, with garage for car, \$25; gentlemen only.
- 1209 L St. NW.: Front room and kitchenette, southern exposure; reasonable.
- 1260 Columbia Rd.: Two or more rooms, kitchen, second floor.
- 1342 R St. NW.: Second-floor room, next to bath; suitable for 2 persons.
- 1219 M St. NW.: Single and double, with large closets in each.
- 1843 Calvert NW.: Room for one or two gentlemen; a. m. i.
- 1336 11th NW.: Nice room, second floor; electric lights, gas, l. h. k.; \$5.
- 622 Eye St. NW.: Two rooms, l. h. k.; newly papered and painted; first floor.
- 1940 Calvert St. NW.: Room with porch; private home; lady. Col. 6018.
- 1404 M NW. (Thomas Circle): Large, clean room, twin beds; electricity.
- 1747 Pea St. NW.: Bright, attractive rooms, reasonable to permanent parties.
- 1361 A St. NE.: Large front rooms; a. m. i.; l. h. k.; adults.
- 930 Eye St. NW.: Housekeeping rooms, suitable for four adults; two rooms with bath.
- 209 Varum St. NW.: Front room, near bath, in new home.
- 1730 Q St. NW.: Bright, attractive, single or double room.
- 1408 21st St.: Large front room suitable two men.
- 1334 12th St.: Desirable room, kitchenette, h. w. h.; electricity, phone.
- 121 2nd St.: Clean front rooms, completely furnished for l. h. k.; all privileges.
- 2633 Garfield St. NW.: Three furnished rooms for l. h. k., near Wardman Park Hotel.
- 1315 N St. NW.: Third floor double room, adjoining bath; electric; board optional.
- Wanted: Young man to share room in apt. Address Box 351-C, Star office.
- 226 13th St. SW.: Large, nicely furnished room, arranged for light housekeeping.
- 1444 N NW.: Large front room and kitchenette; running water; gas range.
- 1402 16th St. NW.: Room with cooking accommodation; \$18 month.
- 1363 Euclid: First and part or all second floor, private home, for summer or longer.
- 1214 Mass. Ave.: Room, porch, and kitchenette, range, sink, downtown; also single room.
- 407 East Capitol St.: Room for light housekeeping; laundry privileges.
- 1254 Columbia Rd.: Nicely kept room, second floor, near bath.
- 937 L St. NW.: Two l. h. k. rooms, adults. Main 9265.
- 2427 18th St. NW.: Two large, second floor rooms furnished for housekeeping; reasonable.
- Single room, second floor; southern exposure; electricity; \$15. Adams 1402.
- 1226 16th St. NW.: Desirable rooms for gentlemen.
- Near Bureau of Standards: Room for young gentlemen; references. Cleve. 209.
- 731 6th St. NW.: Two nicely furnished rooms on second floor, near bath, for l. h. k.
- 947 Mass. Ave.: Four rooms, bath, second floor.
- 431 6th St. SW.: Neatly furnished room, near bath, \$12.50 month; gentleman.
- Lincoln Park: 2nd floor room, next to bath; electricity. 1122 East Capitol St.
- 2120 G St. NW., Apt. 204: Bright, airy room; reasonable.
- 917 K SE.: Double and single, in private family; elec.
- 331 H St. NE.: 3 rooms, furnished; gas, electricity; \$28.
- 1213 N St. NW., Apt. 4: Cozy bed-sitting room, next to bath; within walking distance.
- 103 2nd NE.: Parlor-floor room (2), second-floor rooms; housekeeping permitted.
- 1842 Park Road: One large room with private bath; gentlemen. Col. 9347.
- 1434 B St. SE.: Bed and sitting room combined, and kitchen.
- 314 6th NE.: Large front, private family; garage; reasonable. Lincoln 8943-J.
- 933 L NW.: Two large, bright rooms for l.h.k., 2nd floor; reasonable.
- 1223 K St. NW.: Clean, comfortable room; electricity; continuous hot water.
- 1316 New Hampshire Ave.: Two large, pleasant rooms; elevator. North 6143. Apt. 31.
- 2026 P St. NW.: Nice, clean rooms, with or without l.h.k.
- 716 Indiana Ave. NW.: Rooms for housekeeping; small rooms, \$2.50.
- 1631 R St. NW.: Front bedroom for two, \$25.
- 624 Kenyon St. NW.: 2 front rooms, h.w.h., electricity, l.h.k.
- 1108 D NE.: Two furnished rooms for l.h.k.
- We offer "inspected" rooms only. All prices, locations, details. Wash Service Bureau, District Nat. Bank Bldg. Main 2133.
- 1152 18th Street NW.: Two large 2nd-floor front rooms; also single and connecting; \$15 monthly up.
- Summer rates: 1408 8th St. NW.: 2-room housekeeping apt.; also single housekeeping rooms; near market and cars. Phone. Call after 4 p. m.

RENT ROOMS—FUR. OR UNFUR.

2217 H St. NW.: Five very attractive rooms with bath; hot and cold water on each floor; convenient to two car lines, Government buildings; reasonable.

Dupont Circle, 1400 20th St.: Second-floor front, furnished, \$20; unfur., \$17. Franklin 8729.

Several ladies or gentlemen desiring real home to take rooms; reasonable. Address Box 20-D, Star office.

2419 18th NW.: Two large rooms, l.h.k.; partly furnished, nice home; very convenient; with furnishings, \$35, or unfurnished, \$30.

1439 You St. NW.: On corner; single or double furnished room; entire second floor, unfurnished, \$45 a month.

3519 10th St. NW.: Furnished or unfurnished housekeeping rooms, second floor; reasonable. Columbia 4090-J.

1837 16th NW.: 2 large rooms, 3rd floor; housekeeping or non-housekeeping; gas, electricity and phone; \$40.

420 3rd NW.: 3rd floor, l.h.k., running water; adults only.

One or three rooms, l.h.k., garage; suburbs; couple or gentleman. Col. 8073.

Two attractive rooms, modern house, \$25 per month. Columbia 5272-R.

814 6th NE.: Two front l. h. k. rooms; reasonable; garage. Lincoln 8943-J.

1120 Park Rd. NW.: Second floor, l. h. k.; porch.

1730 N. Capitol St.: 2 rooms, furnished or unfurnished, for l. h. k.

2023 O.: Large front room and kitchen, gas range; a. m. l.; very reasonable.

1515 Upshur St. NW.: Two or 3 rooms in private, modern home; very reasonable.

317 C St. NW.: Nice, convenient rooms, with bath; reasonable.

1829 16th NW., apt. 6: Large room in apt. house.

638 E St. NE.: 3 large rooms, furnished or unfurnished; electric light, h. w. h. and l. h. k.

1412 Irving St. NW.: Furnished or unfurnished rooms; couple preferred.

1770 Col. Rd.: 3 rooms, kitchenette and bath; furnished or unfurnished.

204 9th St. NE.: Large front room; l. h. k.

1040 Otis St. NE.: Room for rent.

RENT ROOMS—UNFURNISHED

Three unfurnished rooms, new house; l. h. k.; closets, semibath, large porch and grounds; electricity; near car; 20 minutes to 12th and Pa. Ave. NW.; rent reasonable. H. H. Blandford, corner Shelley Road and Lattimer Ave., Arlington, Va.

Mt. Pleasant, 3345 17th St. NW.: Entire third floor, three rooms, unfurnished; porcelain sink in alcove, rear room, four large closets; one block from cars; rent, \$45 per month; including gas and electricity.

8 Ash Ave., Takoma Park: Three housekeeping rooms, sleeping porch, bath, first floor; new bungalow; a. m. l.; private front and back entrances; \$45; 3 minutes from 14th St. car; 35 minutes to Treasury.

1915 S NW., nr. Conn. Ave., walking dist. depts.; 2 large, clean, light, airy l. h. k. rooms; large closets, hall, and private bath. Pot. 1910.

413 2nd St. SE.: 2 communicating rooms, second floor, next to bath; bay window; across from park; convenient to cars; reasonable; l. h. k.

3 Rock Creek Ch. Rd., Petworth: 2 rooms, large glassed and screened sleeping porch; partly furnished if desired; l. h. k.; a. m. l. Col. 3877-W.

1136 8th NW.: Two large rooms, kitchen, bath, running water, gas range; cupboards in every room; every convenience; reasonable.

3426 13th St. NW., corner Monroe St.: Second floor; front parlor, bedroom, with kitchen and bath adjoining.

1518 K St. NW.: 3 unfurnished rooms; will rent separately if desired. Eugene H. Taggart (Inc.), 1518 K St. Main 5500.

1112 13th NW.: Basement, two rooms, running water; partly furnished; other desirable rooms.

616 Princeton Pl. NW.: Two rooms; l. h. k.; a. m. l.; sleeping porch; rent reasonable.

2413 18th NW.: Private home, 2 large front; l. h. k.; modern conveniences; very reasonable. Adams 5309.

2115 1st St. NW.: Two newly papered rooms adjoining bath, in private residence; a. m. l.

3443 14th NW.: One room, kitchenette, bath; 2nd floor; newly decorated; a. m. l.; unlimited phone; garage. After 5.

656 Hobart Pl. NW., corner Georgia Ave.: Three l. h. k. rooms with bath, heat, gas, electricity; also aerial service. \$45 month.

Near Lincoln Park: Three nice rooms, back porch, heat, gas, and electricity; adults. Phone Lincoln 7409.

208 4th SE. Entire second floor, two large rooms, kitchenette and bath; h.-w. h., elec. and gas furnished; adults. Lincoln 2060-W.

658 12th St. NE.: 3 large outside rooms; gas stove; semiprivate bath; \$35, gas included; adults.

Your trunks, etc., moved 50 cents and up: Always open. Phone Main 1005. District Express Co.

12 Eye St. NE.: Entire floor, 3 rooms and kitchen; gas, heat, electricity; \$35 month. Frank. 7116.

317 Varnum St. NW.: Two unfurnished rooms for l. h. k.; new home; southern exposure.

508 Kennedy St. NW.: Two large, unfurnished rooms and kitchenette; electric lights; \$35.

505 M St. NW.: Two large, bright rooms and kitchenette; gas range, electricity, and gas; walking distance of Govt. depts.

715 Princeton Place: Private apartment, 3 rooms, sleeping porch and kitchen; modern equipments.

57 New York Ave. NE.: 3-room apt., unfurnished; modern conveniences; reasonable.

3038 Cambridge Pl. NW.: 2 rooms, kitchenette, elec. light, heat, gas; phone service incl. West 1122.

1503 M St. NW.: Colored; living room, kitchenette; married couple; good condition; light, heat, fine location.

449 Newton NW.: Two large connecting l. h. k. rooms or large front room, kitchen, bath; a. m. l.

1246 Maryland Ave. NE.: Four rooms and bath; electricity; gas range; sink; large closets.

1514 9th NW.: Entire third floor of three rooms, large hall, water on floor; housekeeping; no children; \$35.

607 Columbia Road: 3 unfurnished rooms, light housekeeping; gas, electricity, heat; overlooking reservoir; reasonable.

1246 20th St., Apt. 3: Large front room, use of kitchen, for lady employed; reasonable. Franklin 7425.

634 L St. NW.: 3 rooms, kitchenette for l. h. k.; heat, gas, electricity; reasonable.

1008 Potomac Ave. SE.: 4 unfurnished rooms for l. h. k.; newly papered and painted; 2d floor; semi-bath; adults; reasonable.

604 F St. NW.: Two bright rooms; steam heat; \$20 month. Apply 422 6th St. NW.

1503 Vermont Ave. NW.: Light housekeeping 3 rooms and kitchenette.

52 V NW.: Two large housekeeping, gas, elec., bath and use of phone. Frank. 7660.

631 Otis Pl. NW.: Three rooms. h.-w. h., electric light, closed sleeping porch.

63 K NE.: Three rooms, private bath; range, sink; reasonable.

619 F St. NW.: One large room, l. h. k., elec., gas, and water; reasonable.

2134 P St. NW.: Two rooms, running water, semibath; housekeeping. Potomac 336.

604 Mass. Ave. NW.: Two or three rooms, kitchen, sink; employed couple.

634 Massachusetts Ave. NW.: 3 rooms, third floor; reasonable; no children.

717 Fairmont St.: Housekeeping; 3 rooms, first floor; 3 rooms and bath, top floor.

1303 9th St. NW.: Rooms for l. h. k.; newly papered; \$30 month.

1804 16th St. NW.: Large, newly decorated, unfurnished, l. h. k. rooms; reasonable.

41 R St. NW.: Two large rooms; light, gas; two car lines; reasonable.

Four rooms; a. m. l.; three adults, one child; limit, \$45. Address, Box 273-D, Star office.

100 W St. NW.: 3 third-floor rooms. North 10434.

1828 A St. SE.: 2 or 3 rooms; back porch; l. h. k.; new home.

1730 10th St. SE.: 3 unfurnished rooms for l. h. k.; adults only.

308 7th NE.: Entire floor of 3 rooms; sink and gas range.

In 16th St. apt.: Large room. North 8085-W.

318 E St. NE.: 3 rooms, bath, 2d floor; l. h. k.; electricity, h. w. h., gas; reasonable.

912 East Capitol: Bedroom, bath, kitchen, porch; reasonable rent; adults.

401 B St. NE.: 4 lovely rooms; electricity, heat, gas; adults.

474 Maryland Ave. SW.: 4 rooms and bath for l. h. k.; reasonable.

3618 13th NW.: Entire floor, 3 rooms, bath, heat, and gas; l. h. k.

3114 Wisconsin Ave.: 3 unfurnished h. k. rooms, opposite Cathedral, \$35. Cleve. 1145-W.

646 B St. SE.: 2 rooms, suitable for l. h. k.; adults.

44 K St. NE.: Four unfurnished rooms, first floor, \$30.

318 14½ NE.: Unfurnished rooms for l. h. k.

940 O St. NW.: 3 rooms and bath; very attractive; newly decorated; \$40 month.

3501 Kansas Ave.: Two front housekeeping rooms, a. m. l. Adams 5262.

1304 13th St. NW.: One front room, kitchen, bath, second floor; vacant May 1; \$35.

631 4th St. NE.: 2 unfurnished rooms; heat, gas, and bath; third floor; reasonable.

237 G St. NW.: 1 large front room; heat and electricity.
 1706 M St. NW.: Single second-floor room; gentleman.
 930 B St. SW.: Three rooms, l. h. k., heat, gas, electricity; \$35 per mo. Fr. 6523.
 1406 Hopkins St. NW., near 20th and P: Second floor, front; \$17, plus.
 1749 Pa. Ave. NW.: 3 l. h. k. rooms on third floor.
 Two front rooms, near Capitol; l. h. k.; adults; \$25. Lincoln 2494-J.
 1305 3d NW.: Colored; three, kitchen; heat, gas, semiprivate bath; \$60.
 829 Princeton: Three large rooms, kitchen; entire second floor; \$45. Col. 3862-W.
 914 Va. Ave. S. W.: Two unfurnished rooms, l. h. k.; no children.
 623 10th St. N. E.: 3 unfurnished rooms. Phone Linc. 7443-J.
 932 B St. S. W.: Two large connecting rooms, front; adults.
 1692 32d St. N. W.: Two front rooms, new home, \$25.
 1230 11th St. N. W.: Large room and kitchenette; next bath; electricity.
 613 B St. N. E.: Three unfurnished rooms; electricity and gas; h. w. h.
 736 3rd N. W.: Front apt., two large, airy rooms; reasonable.
 504 Kenyon St. N. W.: Two large front rooms for l. h. k.
 27 R N. W.: Two large, connecting rooms, second floor, l. h. k.; adults; reasonable.
 926 10th St. N. E.: 3 rooms, bath, elec., for l. h. k.; near 2 car lines; reasonable.
 3101 P St. N. W.: 3 rooms, l. h. k., \$40.
 Two rooms, private bath, either separate or suitable for bachelor apartment; quiet, private family, three adults; breakfast served; plenty hot water, home atmosphere; 16th St. Highlands, near 14th St. cars and bus route. Phone Adams 2435-W.
 One large room, beautifully furnished, next bath, in residence one block north Chevy Chase Club; garage optional; no housekeeping; \$50 month. Address Box 81-D, Star office.
 25 Poplar Ave., Takoma Park: One room, private home, near car line; modern improvements; meals optional; garage. Col. 7885-M.
 203 Park Lane Ave. (Park Lane, Va.): Large, attractive room, modern house; convenient to cars; ladies.
 Falls Church, Va., Box 92: Three or four rooms, furnished for l. h. k.; front and rear porches; shade; a. m. i.; adults.
 4 rooms and bath, electricity, near Wash. Country Club, Va. R. Bradley, 5719 Sherrier Pl., Wash., D. C.
 Park Lane Va., 408 Brown St.: Three housekeeping rooms; gas; some furniture; \$10 per month. Mrs. W. C. Kimbrell.
 Brentwood, Md.: 3 rooms, large bath, electricity, 2d floor. M. S. Pugh, Crook Ave., near P. O.
 Clarendon, Va.: Desirable room; reasonable; modern, garage. Phone Clarendon 121-W-1 or address Box 144-D, Star office.
 3502 37th St., Mt. Rainier, Md.: Rooms, furnished or unfurnished; board if desired.
 20 Columbia Ave., Takoma Park: Room and garage. Col. 5392-J after 4 p. m.
 Brother and sister desire married couple or two ladies to share new house, furnished at Lyon Park, Va. Expenses reasonable. 1750 S St., n. w.
 1024 Irving St. N. E.: Cool, comfortable, nicely furnished room; elec.; private porch; next to modern bath; no objection to l. h. k.; gas in room; ladies or gentlemen.
 15 Maryland Ave., Hyattsville, Md.: For rent, unfurnished, 3 rooms and bath on second floor; adults, or don't mind a young baby.
 Falls Church: Four large unfurnished rooms on 2nd floor; elec., semibath; within walking distance of car line. Phone, Falls Church 129-W-2.
 5005 Manning Pl. NW., Potomac Heights, D. C. (Chain Bridge stop): Two and 3 furnished housekeeping, one-half block from car line.
 2801 Channing St. NE.: Front room for two, with board; home comforts; in modern new home.
 Woodside, Md.: Room and board, modern, 1/2 block from car line; 30 minutes to city. Phone, Woodside 43-W.
 58 Linden Ave., Cherrydale, Va.: Two rooms, furnished light housekeeping; a. m. i.; ideal location.
 Two unfurnished rooms, kitchenette, bath, electric lights, gas; rent, \$25; Cherrydale, Va. Address Box 305-D Star Office.
 2954 Macomb St., Cleveland Park: Private home. Phone, Cleveland 3373.

ROOMS AND BOARD

Well, employed young women of good character can make reservations in girls' club opening about May 1. Beautiful surroundings, every privilege dear to a girl's heart, dances, music, etc., abundant carefully prepared food, best residence location; rates very reasonable. Address, Box 136-C, Star Office.

1222 New Hampshire Ave. NW.: Large, second-floor front room, five large windows, perch; overlooking a park; private lavatory, continuous cold and hot water, electric light, telephone, excellent meals; suitable for two or three persons; very reasonable; walking distance to all departments.

In Washington's most exclusive suburb, 16th St. Highlands, best car and bus service; close to Rock Creek Park; tennis court and band concerts; board in lovely detached home for a few people, at \$50 each; young employed folks only; 3-car garage; best home cooking. Call Col. 8131.

Excellent location for the summer; convenient to both car lines; bright, airy, well-furnished front room in private home; board optional; suitable for two young ladies. Phone, Adams 3735-W.

1123 13th St. NW.: One large room, first floor, with private bath, suitable for three or four; other double rooms, second and third floors; some facing Mass. Ave.; southern exposure.

Tired convalescents, elderly people who would appreciate a comfortable home; good food, wide porches, pleasant surroundings; 5 minutes from car. For particulars address Box 155-D, Star Office.

1969 Biltmore St. NW.: Overlooking Rock Creek Park; large front room; twin beds; convenient to two car lines; excellent meals. Col. 3029.

1948 Calvert St., vicinity 18th and Columbia Road: Private family; large second-floor front, with or without twin beds; home cooking.

1226 Euclid NW., May 1: To business couple or two business women, large, airy front room, near bath; continuous hot water, unlimited telephone; good table board. Adams 4255.

Large front room, three windows; breakfast; near both car lines; mod. improvements; in new section NW.; married couple preferred. Adams 5138-W.

Falls Church: Room and breakfast, man or man and wife; electricity; bath; within walking distance of car line. Phone Falls Church 129-W-2.

Attention: This is to you who wants a permanent home with two middle-aged married people; pleasant surroundings; home cooking; references exchanged. Col. 3796-J.

1124 12th NW.: Comfortable rooms; running water; good board; reasonable.

Lincoln Park, 149 Kentucky Avenue SE.: Room and board for two; bright, sunny room, next to bath; all conveniences. Phone Linc. 802.

1728 N. ST. NW.: Single or double rooms; beautiful home; excellent location; opportunity for music study and practice. Franklin 2593.

At Business Women's Council, 1229 Conn. Ave., for young ladies: Rooms with two meals per day, from \$45 to \$47.50 per month. Double rooms with twin beds. Phone Franklin 4094.

1516 Columbia Rd.: Clean single room near bath, second floor; always hot water; free phone; delicious home cooking; gentlemen only. Col. 5409.

Melrose, 1343 Clifton, Apt. 56.: Attractive room for two, with spacious porch; home privileges; practically private bath; reasonable. Col. 5928-W.

1708 Q St. NW.: With private family; rooms newly furnished; gentlemen preferred.

1334 Fairmont St. NW.: Large front room, second floor; home surroundings and cooking; reasonable. Col. 1561.

1431 33d St. NW.: Exceptionally bright, clean room in private family; suitable for two ladies; board optional. Keating.

1363 Fairmont St.: Large, well-furnished front room; southern exposure; continuous hot water; excellent table. Col. 1439.

Lincoln Park, 1327 East Capitol St.: Nice room; good board for two; a. m. i.; telephone; reasonable.

1231 Harvard St. NW.: Large, nicely furnished front room for two; corner house; best home cooking. Col. 5093.

1105-1107 13th St.: Single, double, front rooms with board; \$35 per month; no objection to children.

1824 New Hampshire Ave., cor. 17th: Three rooms, singly or together; closet for each room; attractive price.

1102 P St. NW.: May 1, nicely furnished room, first floor, with or without board. Phone Potomac 1838-J.

1325 M St. NW.: Desirable room, four windows; walking distance downtown; excellent table board; transients accommodated.

Scott Circle, 1230 17th St.: Single and double rooms in girls' club; splendid location; excellent meals. Franklin 10260.

Middle-aged lady: Employed; quiet home in private family; northwest section, west of 14th. Address Box 139-D, Star office.

1852 Biltmore St. NW.: Room with twin beds, suitable for two persons; continuous hot water. Columbia 10300.

1407 Delafield Pl.: Large room with sleeping porch, next bath; a. m. i.; also single room; use of phone.

2622 Conn. Ave. NW.: Attractively furnished 2nd-floor front room, with porch, 2 people.

314 A St. NE.: Desirable room for two, electricity, phone; fine home cooking; reasonable.

Dupont Circle neighborhood: Front southern room, twin beds; also single room; reasonable. N. 5816.

2800 Woodley Rd., half block Wardman Park Hotel—Front room in new home; couple or ladies. Adams 4697-W.

3615 McKinley St., Chevy Chase, D. C.: Single or double rooms, with or without board.

Single room, front, with excellent board, to lady. Col. 4431.

Iowa, Apt. 2: Bed living room; girls; meals optional. Frank. 2618.

1512 Lamont St. NW.: Nice front room; twin beds; private family. Adams 5099.

Cleveland Park: Single and double rooms; large porch; high and cool. Cleve. 1631.

In private home: Furnished room and good board, \$40. N. 596-J. Semi-invalid: Bright, cheerful room; moderate rates; lady. Phone Main 6986.

902 Pa. Ave. SE.: Front rooms, southern exposure; excellent table.

1933 Biltmore St. NW.: Nice, clean room; good meals, home cooked.

1729 Que St. NW.: Rooms and board; home cooking; hot bread; chicken dinners.

1716 Eye St. NW.: Delightful rooms for 2 or 3; every comfort; exceptional meals.

1120 Park Rd. NW.: Second floor front; also single room.

Tea House, 1711 De Sales St.: Rooms and board.

1603 K St.: Single and double room; excellent board.

1315 M St. NW.: Large, front, second-floor room, twin beds; with board; references.

1749 Q St. NW.: Furnished rooms with board; wrapped lunches.

1323 M St. NW.: Modern, well-furnished double room; excellent meals; \$35 month.

1230 Mass. Ave. NW.: Large front room for two.

1828 Col. Rd.: Large room, delicious meals. Phone Col. 10048.

1366 Columbia Road NW.: Private family.

1343 Girard St.: Pleasant room; all conveniences; good table.

1314 Park Rd.: Desirable front rooms for two persons; home cooking; references.

Glen Echo Heights, Stop 30—Room and board. Mrs. Moody.

3115 13th NW.: Nice rooms; reasonable.

Can accommodate one girl in 6-room house with 4 others. Col. 8703-J.

3505 18th St.: Rooms reasonable; young ladies or couple employed.

1515 L St. NW.: Convenient to down town with or without excellent board.

1426 21st, near Dupont: Nicely furnished room, excellent home cooking.

1406 Massachusetts Ave., NW.: Desirable double room, mod., excellent meals; walking distance gov't. depts.; reasonable.

The Fairmont: 14th and Fairmont Sts.—Desirable double and single rooms; excellent meals; telephone in every room; rates reasonable.

1323 Girard NW.: Beautifully furnished rooms, with or without private bath; ex. meals; summer rates.

Hillcrest: 2800 18th St. NW.—An ideal home for those away from the comforts of their own. Rooms with and without bath. Meals that satisfy.

The Colonial: 15th and M Sts. NW.; 200 rooms; American plan; hotel service; reasonable rates; single, double rooms and suites available. Dairy produce and vegetables supplied from our Virginia farm daily.

APARTMENTS—FURNISHED

Two rooms, inclosed sleeping porch, bath, porcelain sink, electricity; second floor, modern home. 227 S St. NE. Pot. 1051-J.

Five rooms and bath, large back porch. 811 Md. Ave. NE. Hall & Gray, 1204 H St. NE. Lincoln 1591.

Five rooms and bath, all outside rooms, second floor. Apply Apt. 6, or janitor, 1006 Webster St. NW.

3805 Kansas Ave. NW.—2 large, l.h.k. rooms, double inclosed porch; new house; a.m.i.; reasonable.

Five rooms, newly papered, \$32.50. Four rooms, electricity; rent, \$27.50. N. R. Marshall, 929 New York Ave.

Two very large, airy rooms, kitchen, bath, reception hall and balcony; attractively arranged apt.; reasonable rental. The Argonne, 1629 Col. Rd. Phone Col. 4630.

232 Upshur St. NW.—3 rooms and bath, 2 porches; heat, light, and gas. Open to-day, 1 to 6 p.m.

Furnished apt. of 3 rooms, large kitchen, back porch, pulley line; reasonable. 1126 8th St. NW.

Entire 3d floor room for 4 or 5 persons, in fine home; sink and gas range, private bath; price, \$100; h.w.h., elect.; also nice rooms. 1727 Col. Rd.

3160 18th St. NW.—Two rooms, kitchenette, bath, fully furnished, electric lights, continuous hot water, extension telephone; absolute privacy; good neighborhood, near Zoo; \$45. Wanted a couple, no children; clean, permanent. Columbia 8816.

Small apt., clean, convenient, comfortable, permanent and reasonable, for two or more. 1315 R. I. Ave. NW.

Three rooms, kitchenette, private bath, and porch on first floor, furnished. Apt. 2, 1440 R St. NW.

Greenwood Ave., Takoma Park, Md.—Apartment, furnished, 3 rooms, first floor; a.m.i.; \$30 mo.; garage, \$5. Adams 3568-W.

The Chastleton, Apt. 736; nicely furn. living rm., 2 bedrooms, glassed-in sleeping porch, kitchenette, bath.

Mt. Pleasant: 2 rooms, kitchen, bath, closets, second floor; all outside rooms; airy and cool; overlooks Rock Creek Park; excellent neighborhood; telephone; electric lights, gas, hot water included; rent reasonable. 1821 Kenyon St. NW.

Near 16th and Columbia Road: Two or three rooms, all outside; electricity, gas, piano. 3032 15th St. NW.

Near Dupont Circle: Attractive 2-room, kitchenette and private bath apt.; moderate rates. 2020 N St. NW.

412 Tenn. Ave. NE.: Apt. 4, 3 rooms, tile bath, porch, h. w. h., \$42.50.

1913 Pa. Ave. NW.: Two rooms, porch; elec.; gas range, porcelain sink and tub; hot water; \$40.

The Royden, R near 16th St. NW.: Four rooms and bath; nicely furnished; \$90.50. See manager.

1453 Fairmont: Third-floor apt., 3 rooms, bath, and porch completely furnished for housekeeping; light and airy; adults.

3 rms., private bath, a. m. i.; no children; call after 6 or Sunday.

1315 21st St. NW. Phone Potomac 2549.

June 1 to Sept. 31; seven-room triplex apartment, furnished, two baths, garage, \$300 month; references. Apply between 9 a. m. and 6 p. m., apt. 6, Meridian Hill Studios. 2633 15th St. NW.

1738 T St., apt. 3: Three rooms, kitchen and bath; back porch; apartment building; electricity, gas.

Iroquois, Thomas Circle, 1410 M; Attractively fur. 5-room south apt.; very little over rent. See elevator boy.

Bach apt.: 2 large rooms and semibath; nicely furnished; a. m. i.; rent reasonable. Phone North 9174.

Colored: Two-room apt. to let for l. h. k.; range in kitchen; other rooms furnished; fine location; good people only need apply; no children. Phone North 6078.

Girl to share apt. 311, Argonne, 16th and Columbia Road; 1 r., k., and b. and reception hall, or will sublet; reasonable.

Three large rooms, porch, bath, \$70; 3d floor. 1523 17th St. NW.

Down town, 809 21st St. NW.: 2 l. h. k. rms.; gas, elec., phone, \$27.50 and light services; 2 rms, porch, \$50. Ask 1908 Eye NW.

Nicely furnished 4-room apt. for housekeeping; running water; \$37.50. Apply Nelson's Pharmacy, No. 1 R St. NE.

3 rms, private shower bath, porch; highest location; completely furnished. 4024 Illinois Ave.

Room and kitchenette, completely fur. for h. k.; hot water, elec., unlimited phone. 605 Taylor St. NW., Col. 871.

Carlisle Apt., 1213 N St. NW.: Attractive 2 and 3 room, kitchen, and bath apts., \$75 and \$80. Ralph G. Robey, 405 Insurance Bldg., M. 7638 or see janitor.

Attractive 4-room and bath outside apartment; convenient locality. North 1421, apt. 150.

Desirable furnished apartment for couple, two rooms, adjoining bath, in modern suburban home; garage. Phone Clarendon 203-W-1.

Overlooking Rock Creek Park: Bedroom, dining room, kitchen, comb. large porch, 2d floor; range and sink; \$45. 1933 Calvert NW.

914 B St. SE.: Two large, bright rooms, kitchen, and bath; completely furnished; a. m. i.; adults.

Cool quarters for summer, Apt. 58, the Marlborough: 3 rooms and tiled bath, 2 bedrooms if desired; attractively and comfortably furnished; rent reasonable.

No. 9 Grant Place NW.: Downtown apt., front, well fur., large room, kitchen, electricity, adjoining bath.

1315 Clifton St. NW., 2d-floor front: Parlor, dining room, kitchen, bath, 2 bedrooms; all outside; well furnished; telephone service. Apartment 22.

Exclus. 16th St. apt. house, south of Scott Circle, offers an attractive apt. of 4 rms., rec. hall, and 2 baths. Frank. 5687.

Bachelor apt., 2 rooms, bath, well furnished, on 16th St., overlooking Rock Creek Park. Col. 10221.

The Kensington, 2501 14th, Apt. 3: Three large rooms and porch, for housekeeping.

Furnished apt. of three rooms, kitchenette, and bath, complete for housekeeping. Apply Apt. 210, 2138 Calif. St. NW.

For rent: Furnished apartment, six rooms. Woodward Apt. For appointment call North 1874.

1272 New Hampshire Ave. NW., corner N: 2 or 3 front rooms, kitchenette, bath, a. m. i.; contin. hot water; walk. dis. depts.

3-room apt., l. h. k., best NW. section, near Dupont Circle; price reasonable. Phone Potomac 2727.

Mt. Pleasant section: 1 room, dining room and kitchen combined, and bath, attractively furnished. Geo. W. Linkins, 1719 K St.

Down-town section: 1 room, dining room and kitchen combined, and bath, beautifully furnished. Geo. W. Linkins, 1719 K St.

1357 Euclid St. NW.: Two rooms, kitchenette, bath, electric light and gas; unlimited phone; cont. hot water; adults only.
2 girls to share apt. Reasonable. 16th St. Mansions, Apt. 636. Phone North 1000.

1950 Calvert St. NW.: Three large rooms and bath, completely and beautifully furnished for housekeeping; married couple.

2 rooms, large hall, 3 closets, bath, porch, entire apt., private detached home NW.; garage if desired; \$50. Col. 885.

52 T St. NW.: 2 or 3 communicating rooms, completely furnished for l. h. k., with gas, elec., and a. m. i.; no object to children.

1454 Euclid St., Apt. 4: Five rooms, bath, and porch; reasonable. Adams 2399.

3641 13th St. NW.: Three rooms, bath, sleeping porch, nicely furn.; exclusive residential section; ideal for 3 or 4 girls; a. m. i.

Wanted—Girl to share well furnished apartment with two others; reasonable. 1322 15th st., n. w., Apt. 41. Phone Franklin 9724-M.

By daughter of naval officer, for several months, 5-room apartment, attractively furnished, in good n. w. location, \$85. Tel. North 9386.

The Toronto, Dupont Circle—For married couple, housekeeping apt. on first floor, reasonable. P st. entrance. Ring bell first door to the right.

Nicely furnished three-room apt., hall, kitchen, porch, and bath, suitable for four or more girls; May 1; on R between 14th and 15th. North 5659.

29 Eye St. NE.—2 rooms and kitchenette, first floor front newly decorated summer rates.

2400 16th St.—Until Oct., 6 rooms, 2 baths, porch, south exposure; most attractive and comfortable; moderate rent. Col. 7200, Apt. 204.

123 10th NE.—2 large, newly furnished rooms, kitchenette and bath; 2nd floor, light housekeeping; hot-water heat, electricity; adults only. Linc. 7417-W.

Apt. 6, 1824 15th NW.—Sunny south corner, 2nd floor; cool summer apt., 3 rooms, k. b. h., completely furnished; sew. mach., victrola; \$50 two, \$60 three; ladies preferred. North 6588-J, Sundays and evenings.

1309 3rd St. NW.—Three rooms, porch, second floor, \$9 week; two rooms, running water, nicely furnished; \$9 week.

Attractive three rooms and bath (kitchen fully equipped), furnished apt., 2nd floor; in beautiful Cleve. Park. Cleve. 581-J.

R Street, near 21st—Most attractive housekeeping apartment of 3 rooms and bath in exclusive residential section; available May 1; no children. W. H. West Company, Wm. L. F. King, E. C. Perry, 815 15th St. N.W.

926 Ingraham St. NW.—Three rooms, second-floor front; hot-water heat, bath; \$50 monthly.

Apt. 45, 1489 Newton St. NW.—Newly papered, complete and beautifully furnished, 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath (2 bedrooms, dining, sitting room), electricity, gas; \$80 month. Call or telephone Col. 1015-J.

Parlor, bedroom, kitchenette, phone, piano, bath; handsomely furnished; rent moderate; 2nd floor. 3028 O NW.

Delightful h.k. apt., 5 r., 2 b., with balcony overlooking Rock Creek ravine at bridge, charmingly and completely furnished at unfurnished rental, until Oct. 1. Apply 403, the St. Albans, 2310 Connecticut ave.

2410 Ontario Road—Two large rooms, kitchen, bath; furnished for housekeeping; summer rates. Col. 4675.

Attractively furnished apt., two rooms and kitchenette, gas, electricity; \$50. 1917 Kenyon st. NW.

911 Webster St.—Four-room and bath apartment; reasonable. N. O. Holmes, above address.

Two rooms, bath, kitchenette; reasonable. Atlantic Apt., 10th and N sts. NW., Apt. 404.

3419 14th St. N.W.—Entire third floor, living room, bedroom, kitchen, bath, and large porch; couple only.

2 unusually large rooms, kitch. & bath, nicely fur., excellent service; poss. May 1, \$65 per mo.; convenient to churches, schools, market, and stores; near car lines and busses. Inq. at once, Apt. 11, the Ingle-side. Col. 8236-J.

Two rooms, kitchenette, and bath. Apt. 2, 3rd floor, 1739 F Street; \$40; can be seen Saturday and Sunday.

Conn. Avenue near S.: Unusually pretty, light apt., conveniently and attractively arranged; living room, 2 bedrooms, Pullman dining room, bath; reasonable. Col. 4187.

Apt. NW.: By lady; living room, bedroom, front, southern exposure; unlimited phone; very private; suitable for two ladies employed. Adams 4630.

44 New York Avenue NW.: Three rooms, kitchenette, and bath, first floor; all modern improvements.

Near Wardman Park Inn: 2 rooms, kitchenette, bath, and dining alcove, completely furnished; for summer months. Col. 338-W after 5 p. m.

238 Park Avenue, Takoma Park: Large front rm. and kitch., next to bath; a. m. i.; sink and gas range; garage, if desired.

Mt. Pleasant section: Beautiful apartment, 4 rooms, kitchenette, bath, porch; a. m. i. Phone Adams 1209.

407 Columbia Road NW.: 2 attractive rooms, small porch; a. m. i.; gas range; \$35. Columbia 7961-W.

4 and 5 rooms, bath, porch, and garage; a. m. i.; no objection to children. 7135 7th Street, Takoma Park. Adams 3887.

Wanted: Young girl to share lovely apt.; no work. North 4434.

One room, kitchen, and bath, attractively furnished. Conard, apt. 601. Main 9070.

70 North Spruce Street, Clarendon, Va.: 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath; 2nd floor; electricity, gas, hot-water heat; garage. Phone Clarendon 19-W-1; no children under 10. One-half hour to Treasury; \$65.

1323 Clifton Street, apt. 23: Rec. hall, living room, and dining room combined, two bedrooms, kitchen, and bath; \$85 per month. Adams 1232.

Attractive, comfortably furnished 2-room, kitchen, bath, outside apartment, overlooking million-dollar bridge; cafe, elevator, telephone service; available May 1 to October. North 7006, apt. 301 or manager. St. Albans apt.

1224 Mass. Avenue. NW.: Apartment of one room and kitchenette, gas range, running water, electric lights; adjoining bath.

Well furnished 5 r. and b. apt. across from Meridian Hill Park; available May 1 for 5 mos. or longer. Col. 1236-W.

Near Mt. Alto Hospital: A very desirable and well furnished apartment of 4 rooms, reception hall, and bath; 2 bedrooms; until October; rent, \$80. Apt. 22, 2716 Wisconsin Avenue. Phone Cleve. 3068-J.

Completely furnished, 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath apt., 1414 B Street NW.; rent, \$65 per month. See janitor or C. W. Simpson Co., 734 15th Street NW.

3508 16th St. NW.—Very attractive apartment, 3 rooms, kitchen, bath, sleeping porch; abundance hot water; reasonable.

Ideal, high-class 3-r., b. apts.—Glassed porches, ga., clean, sunny, quiet, exclu. apt. service. Rates till Sept. 1633 Q.

Two rooms, kitchen, bath; light, clean, cool; reasonable; well situated. 1740 T st., NW., Apt. 3.

Apt. 2, 1729 East Capitol—2 rooms, kitchenette, with Pullman diner and bath; completely furnished; 3d floor front; everything new and modern. Reasonable.

May 15 to June 30—Southern exposure, three rooms, kitchen, and bath; \$75 per month. 401 Carlisle Court, 1401 Columbia Rd.

2-room apartment, first-floor back. Elec., gas, sink in kitchen; completely furnished; \$30 month. 463 G St. NW.

Delightfully cool 6-rm. housekeeping apt.; 3 exposures; all rooms outside. June 1 to Sept. 1. The Kenesaw, Apt. 44.

1358 Fairmont—3 large rooms, private bath; entire 2d floor; nicely furnished; electricity, hot water, telephone. Rea.

Downtown, in new, modern apt. house; one room and bath. Address Box 100-D Star office.

5349 10th St. NW.—Newly papered; three rooms, bath, porch, large closets, elec.; gas range; adults only; reference.

1126 8th St. NW.—Convenient apartment, 3 rooms, bath, good order, for two people; reasonable.

One room and bath, available May 1; two rooms, bath, kitchenette and large porch, available June 1. Apply Sunday between 4 and 7, Apt. 807, the Ambassador, 1750 16th St.

4022 Georgia Ave.—Room, kitchenette, bath, \$37.50.

Cool, comfortable, 2 large rooms, kitchenette, new private home; good neighborhood; near cars and stores; hot-water heat, gas, electricity; rent reduced; adults. 500 Tulip Ave., Takoma Park.

Bach. apt.—2 large rooms and semibath; nicely furnished; a. m. i.; rent reasonable. Phone North 9174.

3 rooms, kitchen and bath. L. Vuesslein, 1119 14th St.

Desirable apartment, 3 rooms, bath, large screened porch, entire 2d floor, completely furnished for l. h. k.; new house; reasonable; adults. 910 Madison St. NW. Col. 4461-W.

Three large rooms, including inclosed sleeping porch, bath. Adams 5480.

Attractive 2 rooms, dining alcove, b., kit., for summer months; Cleveland Park, square from Conn. Ave. Cleve. 558-J.

To sublet for 6 months or longer—Beautifully furnished 2 rooms, k. and bath, Apt. 207, 1205 15th St. NW. Available May 1. Rent reasonable.

One room, kitchenette, bath; completely furnished, piano; vicinity Dupont Circle. Call West 2502-J.

Overlooking Lincoln Park—2 large, front, first-floor rooms, for light housekeeping, in strictly modern apartment house; unlimited phone; refrigerator; available May 1; \$42.50. 115 12th SE., the Stonehurst. Apt. 1.

Small apartment to party buying furniture. Phone between 10 and 4, Sunday, Main 9010, Apt. No. 503. Reasonable.

Wanted—One or two girls to share lovely apartment. Call 1829 16th St. NW., Apt. No. 5. Potomac 657-W.

Artistically furnished room, b., kit., and hall; 2008 16th st., apt. 35. Call between 5.30 and 6.30 p. m.

1712 Corcoran st. NW.—Liv. rm., bedrm., kit., and priv. b., porch; 2d fl.; well fur.; g. and elec. incl. in price; reasonable. N. 1331-J.

\$37.50—Room, bath, kit., to purchaser of furniture, \$350; open Mon. & Tues. nights, 7 to 9. Apt. 32, 1820 K st. NW.

Turn over lease to party buying furniture, 2-room apt., Wardman Park Hotel. Address Box 207-D, Star office.

412 H st. NW.—Large front room, dining room, kitchenette, porch, \$35. Frank. 486.

815 21st NW.—Attractive apartment, 1 room and kitchen, 2d-floor front, completely fur.; walking distance; near Pa. Ave.; \$35.

Near Dupont Circle—3 large, airy, attractive, fur. rooms, bath; also apt. with large screened sleeping porch; newly decorated; a. m. i.; adults. 1827 Corcoran, bet. Q & R sts.

Main 9265—Three l. h. k. rooms in apt.; Thomas Circle.

The Tuxedo, 1439 T st. NW.—Nicely furnished 3-room, kitchenette, and bath apartment; reasonable. Call 9.30 a. m. to 2.30 p. m.

2 rooms, kitchen, and bath. L. Vuesslein, 1119 14th st.

Beautifully furnished, 1 or 2 large rooms and kitchenette, in nice apartment house, near downtown; a. m. i.; very reasonable. West 804. 808 The Ambassador, 16th st.—Two rooms, reception hall, kitchen, bath, screened porch, \$100; one room, bath, \$50.

1806 Vernon st. NW.—Entire second floor, furnished; south porch, electricity, gas, private bath; adults.

The Cordova, apt. 352—2 rooms, bath apt.; bright and cheerful; fully furnished; reasonable.

1721 T NW., No. 2—Unusual value, desirable modern apt., 4 rooms, kitchen, bath, porch; well furnished; excellent janitor.

1511 Irving St. NE.—Entire second floor, modern home, furnished clean; a. m. i.; sink; running water; gas range; use piano, laundry; reasonable. R. I. ave. cars, 20 minutes Treasury.

307 Kentucky ave. SE.—Two or three rooms and porch; a. m. i.

Two rooms, kitchenette—Pleasant location for summer; no objection to infant; reasonable. 121 Carroll ave., Takoma.

28 Adams St. NW.—3 rooms, large sink, large closets, gas range, electricity; good location; newly papered and painted.

16th and P NW.—Reasonable rent; 3 rooms, furnished; tile bath. Phone Franklin 2557.

From May to September—One room, kitchenette; cheap to dependable person. Address Box 146-D, Star office.

2900 Que st., apt. 4—Will rent my 5-room and bath apt., furnished, for 3 or 4 months. West 1694.

129 Fourth Street SE., suitable for two; a. m. i. Ring basement bell.

Furnished apt. of 2 rooms, kitchen and bath. Call 2 to 6 p. m., 1401 Columbia rd. n. w. Apt. 120.

Living rm., bedrm., kit., bath; all outside rms; ex. furniture; \$65; settled couple preferred; garage. 1917 N st. n. w.

Beautiful apt. in the Toronto—Six rooms and bath, attractively furnished. Phone North 106 Apt. 44.

West Clifton Terrace—Girl to share lovely furnished front apartment; Government employee preferred. Phone Adams 3212.

417 11th St. NW., opp. Star Office—Four outside rooms, furnished complete for housekeeping; elec.; continuous hot water.

Near Dupont Circle—Second-story front; bay-window alcove; combined sitting and bedroom; unlimited telephone. Phone North 7183.

2151 California St., Apt. 401—5-room housekeeping; from May 15. Call or phone Col. 5085-W.

626 Eye St. N. E.—2 front rooms for l. h. k.; heat, gas, electricity; all new furniture; \$35 monthly.

Central—3 large, cool rooms, kitchenette, bath, linen, silver; from June 1 to Oct. 1; \$75. Frank. 9359.

2 rooms, inclosed sleeping porch, bath, porcelain sink, electricity; second floor; modern home. 227 S St. NE. Potomac 1051-J.

Wanted—Congenial young lady to share apartment. Phone North 3000.

1-room and bath apartments, 105 and 106 St. Nicholas, June 15-Sept. 15, \$40 to \$50 per month; references.

In Mt. Pleasant Apt. House—Large, 3-room h. k. apartment, handsomely furnished, fronting on 16th st.; second floor; light, airy; \$75. Adams 2018.

Jewish family will sublet upper floor new corner house, porch, new furniture; very cheap. 301 Kentucky Ave SE.

Three squares north Park Road—Small housekeeping apt.; reasonable. Columbia 4078-W.

One extra large, bay-window room, kitchen and bath; reasonable. 1673 Columbia Road. Phone Col. 8806. Ask for 206.

1249 Lawrence St. N. E.—2nd floor, 3 rooms, kit., b., sleeping porch and garden space; immed. poss.; reasonable. Pot. 2309.

208 9th St. N. E.—Tho large rooms with bath; light housekeeping; all modern improvements. Price, \$35.

1646 Park Road—3 rooms and private bath; every convenience; choice location; best street car lines; adults; reasonable.

Attractive and reasonable; 1 room, bath, kitchen, and dining alcove; 5 windows; newly furnished; conveniently located; cool; available immediately for long or short period. Apt. 208, 1609 81st St. NW.

Beautifully furnished apt., 6 rms.; moderate rental; located near Lafayette Sq. Phone Franklin 610, or the Rochambeau.

Apartment, furnished, for the summer; 5 rooms, b. (outside rooms), fur. porch; nr. the You St. car and 16th St. bus lines; \$70. Address Box 188-D, Star Office.

Two rooms, nicely furnished: Heat, gas, and elec.; adults preferred; \$25. 1429 C n. e. Lincoln 8939-J.

Furnished apartment: Three rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$115. Inquire 901 20th St. n. w., apt. 5.

Near 16th and W Sts.: One or two lovely rooms with kitchenette, to desirable couple. Call North 965 before 12 a. m.

Takoma Park: 1st-Fl. Apt.; 6 rooms, sleeping porch, tile bath, garage; new house; handy cars; available summer; adults only. Apply 217 Cedar Ave. Phone Adams 4885-J.

Cool, comfortable, front apt.: No 80, the Parkwood, or 1746 K St. N W.; very reasonable; references required.

1336 Eye St. N W.: 2 rooms and bath, beautifully furnished, including electricity, \$75 and \$85 a month.

Two rooms, kitchenette and bath. The Hillside. 1415 Chapin St. N W.

744 Park Road: Large room, kitchen, inclosed sleeping porch, or entire floor, 2 rooms, kitchen, sleeping porch; adults. Reasonable. Col. 6079-J.

1218 Euclid N W.: Three large rooms, bath, and porch; southern exposure; second floor; \$65 month.

Attractively and completely fur., 2 rms., kit., b., p.; for summer. Res. Adams 4588-J, eve. and Sunday. 18th and Col. Rd.

Attractive bungalows: 5 rooms and bath. 3 rooms and bath; a. m. i.; completely furnished; fireplaces; screened sleeping porches. St. James. Glen Eco, Md. Phone Bethesda 205-F-4.

Near Dupont Circle: 3 rooms, kit., bath apt.; small porch. Mahogany furniture. \$80. Address box 74 D, Star office.

1500 Columbia Road: 2nd floor. All outside: Three rooms and bath. Choice bright, cool, attractively furnished; suitable for three; no children.

Attractively fur. 2-room, kitchenette, and bath apt., during summer; near Rock Creek Park. 2308 Ashmead Pl. Tel. Potomac 270. Apt. 36. Sundays or after 6 week days.

For rent: Furnished basement flat, hot water, electricity. \$25. Phone North 3017.

424 East Cap. St.: 3 large rooms, h. k., large colonial porch, semi-bath, ready to occupy, elec., gas, h. w. h., continuous hot water; all included; rent very reasonable; adults; office in basement.

To colored: One room and kitchenette, furnished; no children. 1644 6th St. NW.

1732 Eye St. NW. Exceptional appointments. References required.

Copley Courts: 1 room, kitchen, and bath. Call North 4500.

Room and bath outside apt., to party buying furniture; owner leaving town. 409 Southern Apts., M and 15th. Main 8863.

1342 R St. NW.: Two large front and back communicating rooms, on main floor, furnished for light housekeeping; sinks and gas range.

2518 13th St. NW.: 3-rm. 2nd floor apt. for rent; a. m. i.; exclusively residential; ready for occupancy May 15th.

3 rooms with private bath, all modern conveniences; select location; adults; reasonable. 1646 Park Road.

May 1, 8 furnished rms., private bath and sleeping porch; electricity and steam heat. Apply at 311 1st St. SE.

1919 19th St. NW., Apt. 30: Attractively furnished front apt., large living room, bedroom, hall, private shower bath; heated garage optional. Can be seen any time after 3.30 p. m.

1323 Monroe St. NW.: Two rooms, kitchenette, bath, small porch, all front, southern exposure; adults; transients accommodated.

Meridian Hill Studio, 15th and Euclid Sts.: Center of diplomatic section; unusual and beautiful 4 and 8-room duplex apts.

Cavanaugh Court, 1526 17th St. NW.: Two rooms, kitchen and bath, nicely furnished at \$75 and \$80.

Rutland Court, 1725 17th St. NW.: One room, kitchen and bath, nicely and comfortably furnished, \$62.50 and \$65.

Avondale, 1734 P St. NW.: An excellently furnished apt. of 3 rooms, kitchen and bath, furnished in mahogany, linen inc.; may be seen by appointment. Allan E. Walker & Co. (Inc.), 813 15th St. NW., Main 2690.

Handsomely furnished apartment; cool in summer, three wide-open exposures; top floor overlooking beautiful Rock Creek Park; large living room with fireplace and porch, dining room, bedroom, tile bath and shower, kitchen, large closets; all-night elevator and telephone service; laundry trays in basement. Is a home apartment and will only be rented to very responsible people with no children. Lease for six or seven months. Telephone North 8846.

3 rooms and bath, in high-class apartment house, near New Hampshire Ave. and T St. \$75 per month. W. H. West Co., William L. F. King, E. G. Perry, 815 15th St. NW.

3 rooms, one porch. Phone Col. 1093.

1714 Corcoran NW.: 3 rms., bath; adults; reasonable. Pot. 1546.

3800 14th St. NW.: Attractively furnished apartment of one room and bath; rent \$55 per month. Attractively furnished apartment of three rooms, large inclosed porch, and bath. For inspection see resident manager. H. L. Rust Co., 912 15th St. NW., Main 6888.

601 Twenty-third Street NW.: One large room and kitchenette.

Six sunshiny rooms: Second floor. Tile bath; h.-w.-h., running hot water, gas, electricity; first-class condition; adults; references. Must be seen to be appreciated. Miss Ingraham, 12 S Street NE.

Benedick: For bachelors, 1808 Hye Street. 2 rooms and bath; single rooms; valet service; swimming pool; meal service to rooms; club service.

Very desirable furnished and unfurnished apartment, containing six rooms and two baths, inclosed sleeping porch. New Hampshire Avenue, near Dupont Circle. Immediate possession; reasonable rent. Boss & Phelps, 1417 K Street NW.; phone Main 9306.

Five rooms, reception hall, and bath. L. W. Groomes, 1416 F Street.

APARTMENTS—FURNISHED AND UNFURNISHED

2008 Klinge Road NW.—Two rooms, kitchen, and bath; Mount Pleasant; \$65 month. Call Adams 5372-J.

Three-room apartment; A. M. I.; porches, lawn, shade; 40 minutes from Treasury, in quiet and refined suburb of Riverdale; no objection to one child; \$45 monthly, including gas and elec. Phone 363-R, Hyattsville.

Woodridge—One room, kitchenette, semiprivate bath; gas range, sink, hot-water heat, elec.; laundry privileges; \$30 unfurnished, \$35 furnished. Address box 85-D, Star Office.

Delightfully artistic apartments, open fireplaces, light on all sides; charming old garden; rare antique fur. 1816 I Street. Bryant.

For rent—Two or three room apartment, furnished or unfurnished; on Fourteenth Street near Spring Road NW. Phone Col. 5771, or call 1869 Perry Place NW. Price reasonable.

1800 K Street, Bradford Apartment—Two rooms, kitchen, and bath, and one room, kitchen, and bath; modern downtown building; all-night switchboard and elevator service.

Apartment of 4 rooms (or smaller, if desired), in private home; heat; gas and electricity; \$50. Address Box 3-D Star Office.

1407 Fifteenth Street NW.—Two rooms, kitchen, bath; m. i.; cont. hot water; garage if desired. Phone Frank. 3878.

Apt. for rent—Two rooms, fur. or unfur., with private bath; modern conveniences. Pot. 2355.

Studio apt., bath, for music teacher, \$20; Steinway piano. 1731 E. NW., 3rd floor rear.

Inspected h. k. apts., furnished and unfurnished. Washington Service Bureau, District Nat'l Bank Bldg.

2 rms., kitchen, bath; h. w. h.; electricity; free use of phone; married couple or 2 refined gentlemen; reasonable. Adams 4216.

1724 A St. SE.—1 large room, kitchenette, and glass-inclosed sleeping porch; l. h. k.; new, modern home. Call Sunday—week days after 6 p. m.

238 Klinge Mansions, 3100 Connecticut Ave.—Unexpired lease, May to October; \$10 reduction; 3 large rms. & bath. Col. 6797, after 6.

922 17th NW.—Two-room housekeeping apartment.

238 Klinge Mansions, 3100 Connecticut Ave.—Unexpired lease, May to October; \$10 reduction; 3 large rms. & bath. Col. 6797, after 6.

Stoneleigh Court Apartments, Connecticut Avenue, corner I St. Amy Gordon, apartment specialist—4 to 6 rooms, fur. and unfur., month or year. 320 Colorado Bldg. Main 583.

APARTMENTS—UNFURNISHED

Two-room and bath apartment, overlooking Franklin Square, \$40. 932 14th St. NW.

Three beautiful rooms and bath; electricity and gas; reasonable. Phil Bobby Co., 725 7th St.

3 rooms, a. m. i., porch, garden, garage; desirable location, near stores, school; reas. 3321 18th St., Woodridge. Pot. 1554-W.

1125 14th NW.—3 rooms and bath, steam heat, hot water; reasonable, desirable couple.

2700 Connecticut Ave.—Two rooms, kitchenette, and bath and five rooms, kitchenette, and bath.

1869 Mintwood Pl., apt. 32—Very attractive 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath apt.; front; newly decorated; elevator.

5 rooms and bath, a. m. i.; free heat. Apply at 1911 Nichols Ave. SE.

3 rooms, kitchenette, bath, gas, elec., porch, large yard; immediate possession. Telephone Hyattsville 349-J after 5.30 p. m.

433 M St. NW.—4 rooms and bath; rent, \$40, including heat and light; janitor service. John Quinn Co. (Inc.), 704 13th St. NW. Main 435.

Suite of three rooms, bath, and sleeping porch, second floor; electricity, gas, range; adults; reasonable. 1304 R St.

62 V St. NW.—Desirable 3-room apartment, \$40; gas, electricity, heat, phone included. North 8449.

Three rooms and private bath, for housekeeping; modern conv.; \$60; heat, light, and gas included. 1450 Fairmont St. NW.

504 2nd SE.—2 rooms, kitchen, large back porch. Adults only. After 5 p. m.

1938 Pa. Ave.—2 and 3 rooms and bath; hot water and heat. Apply to E. M. Hodge Co., successors to Edward S. Wescott Co., 2006 Pa. Ave.

Three rooms, second floor, private porch, adjoining bath; gas, elec., h. w. h., laundry privileges; elec. washer; one car fare; near cars; \$35. 3617 Newton St., Mt. Rainier, Md.

Four rooms, kitchenette, and bath. Del Ray, Va. Phone Alex. 1111. 1224 Pa. Ave.

1837 16th St. NW.—Three or five rooms and bath, gas, electricity and phone, for \$30 or \$100.

712 A St. SE.—Three rooms, kitchenette, semibath; entire second floor; electricity; good neighborhood; both car lines; adults only.

4 rooms and bath, a. m. i., near Congressional Library, \$50. Apply J. P. Hassin, 934 New York Ave.

Apt. Clifton Terrace—3 large rooms and reception hall; dressing room, kitchen and bath; \$90. 2 porches; sunny exposure; occupancy May 1. Call any time.

The Northumberland, No. 604—Three rooms, kitchen and bath, \$100. Call North 3280.

1834 16th St. NW.—Four rooms and bath; 3rd floor, l. h. k.; gas, electricity, phone, hot water; available May 1.

634 F NE.—Five rooms, 2nd floor; h.-w. h.; electricity, gas, bath, back porch.

1200 Kennedy St.—4 outside rooms, private bath; front entrance and porch; adults.

5-room and bath apartment, with a. m. i., \$70. Phone Franklin 3789.

Four rooms, first floor; gas, hot-water heat, electricity; porch. Lincoln 1067.

Tacoma Park—Four 1st-floor rooms; every convenience; new house; near car lines; available May 1; rent, \$45. 506 Tulip Ave.

Two large rooms, private bath, gas furnished, \$25 month. 1311 7th St. NW.

Two rooms and kitchenette, all in best of condition; rent reasonable. Phone North 6545-W. Call evenings after 5.30, or Sunday.

1916 Lawrence St. NE.

1711 N. Capitol St.—Entire second floor, three rooms and bath; screened porch; gas, elec.; \$45 per month.

For rent—Desirable one-room and bath; elevator and telephone service; central location. 1507 M St. NW., Apt. 708.

2 apartments of 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath; near porch; near 18th and Col. Rd.; garage space available. Story & Co., 812 17th St. NW. Fr. 4100.

Large five-room and bath apt.; large glass-inclosed sleeping porch; in modern fireproof apt. building; 1635 R St. NW. Can be seen by appointment. \$190 per month. Potomac 1055 or Lincoln 1037.

1822 9th St. NW.—Two rooms and kitchenette; gas range, sink; third floor, balcony; \$25.

Mt. Pleasant, 1833 Ontario Pl. NW.—1st floor, 2 rooms, kitchen, porch, semiprivate bath, yard; laundry privileges; h.-w. h., gas and elec. included, \$45. Phone Adams 8745.

2158 California St. NW.—Two rooms, kitchen, private bath, electric lights, gas, steam heat.

2, 3, and 5 room apts. with bath, elevator and janitor service. Apply American Realty Co., 706 11th St. NW.

2 desirable apartments, 1139 9th St. NW.; 2 rooms and bath, immediate possession, \$35; 3 rooms and bath, possession May 15, \$45. See janitor on premises, or Davis & Steele, 1420 New York Ave. Main 5082.

3 large rooms, kitchenette, private bath and shower; hot-water heat, electric lights, telephone. 1009 Buchanan St. NW.

Apartment, 1635 Monroe St. NW.; 1 on first floor, 2 on second floor.

108 15th St. NE.—1 or 2 rooms and kitchenette; heat, elec. light, and bath; newly painted and papered; unfur. or fur.; adults only. Phone 9140-J.

914 Longfellow St. NW.—Very bright, second floor; 3 rooms, elec., bath, gas range; \$40. Adams 3590-W.

"2 Apt."—2 r. & bath, \$35; also 4 r. & b., \$45; newly painted and papered. 206 2d St. SE.

486 Louisiana Ave. NW.—4 bright rooms and bath; steam heat and electricity; \$40 month. Apply J. B. Stein, 482 Louisiana Ave.

1826 Calvert St.—Three large, airy rooms, kitchenette and private bath; a.m.i. near Rock Creek Park. Adams 5571.

36 G St. SW.—4 large, clean rooms and private bath; entire floor; gas, electric, and steam heat; \$35.

The Northumberland, New Hampshire at V—Apt. 304, three rooms, kitchen, bath, and shower; newly decorated throughout; \$100; elevator service; immediate poss. Phone North 3280.

Entire floor, three large rooms, hall, bath, 4 large closets, heat, light, and gas, continuous hot water, unlimited phone service; adults only. 2619 13th St. NW.

2 Unfurnished Apts. At 1830 16th St. NW., in perfect condition, finest location. Inquire at Apt. 22.

2574 University Place NW., cor. Euclid St.—3 rooms, kit., and bath; a. m. i.; entire floor; all outside rooms; adults; garage.

738 Rock Creek Church Rd.—3 rooms, sleeping porch and bath; gas and elec.; also garage.

The Von Courtland, 1417 Belmont St. NW.—Immediate possession, in first-class building, a desirable apartment of five spacious rooms and bath, also large pantry, reception hall and porch. For inspection see janitor. Lease, \$99.50 per month until October 1. Allan E. Walker & Co., Inc., 813 15th St. NW. Main 2690.

One room, kitchenette, tile bath; h. w. h.; elec.; gas; newly decorated; fine for couple; reasonable. 628 E SW.

One room, kitchenette, and bath, 1740 K St. NW.; \$50.50. See janitor. Walter A. Brown, 1400 H St. NW.

One large room, bath, kitchen, sleeping porch; gas, electricity, hot water; available May 1. 2026 Eye NW. West 3051; \$45.

Will share apt.: Cheerful room, large closet, sleeping porch, semipriv. bath, kitchenette; reasonable. Apt. 730, Chastleton.

1221 New Jersey Ave. NW.: 2d floor apt. of 4 rooms and bath; newly decorated; rent reasonable. Also 2 rooms.

1200 Kennedy St. NW.: 4 outside rooms; private bath; front entrance and porch; adults.

Two rooms and bath. Office or living purposes; rent, \$40. Call between 10 and 12 a. m. or 2 and 6 p. m. Hermitage Apts., 1117 Vt. Ave. NW., apt. 2.

2023 O: 3 rooms, bath, garage; a. m. i.; large closets; two exposures; gas, electricity, free continuous hot water; reasonable.

3 rooms and bath; large alcove; heat, gas, elec.; phone free; beautiful location, walk. distance. Phone Frank. 8717.

18th and Columbia Rd.: Six rooms and bath; a. m. i.; beautiful location; 1811 Adams Mill Rd.; \$80 month.

Two large outside rooms. Large kitchen, tile bath; redecorated and screened; elec. laundry and h. w. 1306 Belmont St.

4 rooms, bath, steam heat, elec.; abundance of light, air, and sunshine; near Capitol, Library. 215 East Capitol.

The Prince Karl, 1901 K St.; 5 rooms, kitchen, and bath. \$85. Union Realty Corp. Call Main 8415.

Three and five rooms and bath, with screened-in porches, in new building. Apply to janitor. 2026 Porter St. NW. or phone Franklin 8315.

2164 Florida Ave., The Newport: 4 rooms, bath, reception hall; also 3 rooms and bath; in perfect condition. F. H. Davis, Main 1640 or Col. 4482.

Two beautiful rooms, kitchenette, private bath; heat and light fur. 59 K St. NE.; 2 and 4; \$35. Adams 5476.

Excellent arranged apartment of 3 rooms, kitchen, bath, and porch; location convenient to stores and cars, etc. Newly papered and painted. Rental \$60 per month. Apply janitor, 1705 P St.

Nicely arranged apartment of 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath. Newly papered and painted. Location convenient to stores, cars, etc., \$37 per month. Apply janitor, 2207 Champlain St.

13th and Randolph: 2-room apartment, with inclosed sleeping porch; electricity, gas, and laundry privilege; all for \$50. Lyons-Lovegrove Co. Col. 10240.

Downtown: 1211 13th St. NW.: Two rooms, reception hall, bath apt. Suitable for couple or two girls; modern; \$40.

3 rooms and bath, electricity, and gas; fine location; close to all car lines. Apply 1664 Park Road, 1st floor.

Two rooms, bath, large sleeping porch, \$55. 1635 Conn. Ave. Randall H. Hagner & Co., 1207 Conn. Ave.

1261 Irving NW.: 3 rooms, private bath; continuous hot water; suitable for couple; reasonable.

3 rooms, kitchen, and bath. L. Nuesslein, 1119 14th St.

2 rooms, kitchenette, bath, gas, elec. light, telephone service, large grounds, detached house; \$45 per month. 6615 1st St. Col. 5589.

Two large rooms, kitchenette and bath, opposite new Walker Hotel; just remodeled; \$70. Phone Potomac 2347.

Entire 1st floor, 2 rms. kitchen, reception hall; a. m. i.; reasonable. 4027 Georgia Ave. NW. Adams 4287-W.

2300 18th St. NW.: Modern five rooms and bath. Vacant May 1. Georgetown, 2906 N St. NW.: 3 rooms, kitchen, bath, porch; overlooking gardens and Potomac; janitor; all conveniences.

1810 Ingleside Terrace: Overlooking Rock Creek Park. 5 rooms and bath. \$75; 4 rooms, \$50. Adams 2196.

New four-room apartment in exclusive section, near 16th and Newton. Price, \$75. Garage available. Phone Adams 2890.

3 rooms and bath, second floor; all modern improvements; h. w. h., electricity, gas. Reasonable. 18 14th St. NE.

2 large three-room apartments: All modern improvements. S. L. McLaurin, 2017 13th St. NW. Telephone North 7634.

2d floor, two large rooms, kitchen, and bath; a. m. i. For rent, reasonable. 3625 10th St. NW., near Otis.

Apt., 3 rooms; gas, heat, electricity, partly furnished. Rent, \$50 per month. 7237 Ga. Ave. NW. Phone Col. 7073-J.

1633 Newton NW.: Three large rooms, tiled bath; corner house; clean, quiet; a. m. i.

2912 17th St. NE.: Entire second floor of new detached home, private entrance; short block from car line.

F St. SW., near 6th, \$40; entire floor of 4 rooms, newly decorated; electric light. Harry Miller, 232 Bond Bldg., Main 6226.

No. 2, 2110 19th St. NW.: Three rooms, reception hall and bath. Apply Moore & Hill, 730 17th St.

1634 Riggs Pl. NW.: Housekeeping; 3 rooms and bath; third floor; gas and electricity; unfurnished; convenient to cars.

1358 Fairmont, 3 large rooms, private bath; entire 2d floor; electricity, hot water, telephone. Reasonable.

5 rooms and private bath apt., 2d floor. Gas, electric light, a. m. i.; everything new; \$50. 1627 17th St. NW.

Entire floor: 2 large rooms, kitchen, and private bath. 1802 Belmont Road. Col. 5222-W.

Takoma Park: Apartment, 3 rooms, kitchen, bath, large closets; new house; everything modern; near stores, street cars. Rent, \$45. 219 Willow Ave.

Takoma Park: 2d floor, a. m. i.; 3 large rms. and kich., 4 closets, semibath; delightfully cool; on car line; adults; \$45. 405 Carroll Ave. Adams 1699-R.

Northwest: 1919 19th, 8 rms., 2 bs., and garage, \$150; 3 rms., b., \$75. 913 9th, 6 rms. and b., \$50. 809 7th, 7 rms. and b., \$75. 905 D, 7 rms., \$75. 907 D, 10 rms. and b., \$125. Northeast: 1032 6th, 5 rms. and b., \$35. Southwest: 619 7th, 5 rms. and b., \$50. For colored: 4 rms. and b., 700 T NW., \$65; 5 rms. and b., 906 8th NW., \$40. M. 4639. R. B. Behrend, 1317 F NW.

514 11th St. SE.—3 rooms and bath; housekeeping; hot-water heat and electric lights; newly papered. Adults.

Entire second floor of new, modern home, 3 rooms and sleeping porch, \$35 month; no objection to one child. 203 16th SE.

5 rooms, kitchen, bath, electricity; redecorated; near 9th and F; \$40.

2 rooms, kitchen, semiprivate bath; electricity; \$20. 633 Keefer, near 3200 Georgia Ave.

2122 18th NW.—3 rooms, bath, inclosed porch; modern; all outside rooms; entire floor; reasonable. Harry Miller, 232 Bond Bldg. Main 6226.

2 rooms, kitchenette, sink; semiprivate bath; use of parlor. 818 Taylor St. Col. 305.

1507 M St. NW.—1 room & bath, front; southern exposure.

Petworth section, 3601 Ga. Ave.—Lovely apartment of three rooms and bath and large screened sleeping porch; heat, gas, electricity furnished; use of phone.

3 rooms, k. and bath; modern; 3d floor, outside rooms; newly furnished; no children. 211 9th SW.

Tudor Hall, 10th and Mass. Ave. NW.—Five rooms and bath, \$92.50. W. J. Pilling, 1416 F Street NW.

Tudor Hall, 10th and Mass. Ave. NW.—1 room, kitchenette, and bath, \$50. W. J. Pilling, 1416 F Street NW.

Cozy apt., consisting of 2 rooms, bath, electricity, and gas; reasonable. 3229 11th St. NW.

At 18th and Columbia Rd.—2 large, light, airy rooms, kitchen, and bath; a. m. i.; \$45; light and gas included. Telephone Columbia 3576-R.

Five large, bright rooms, bath, porch; newly decorated; to adults. The Manhattan, 1501 Park Rd. NW. See janitor.

Near Dupont Circle—Desirable five rooms and bath apartment; electricity and elevator; adults only. P. J. Walsh (Inc.), 1107 Eye St. NW., Washington, D. C.

For colored, 1315 You St.—3 rooms and bath, \$45. Affleck Realty Co., 607 15th St.

Petworth (high eleva.)—Entire 2d floor, 2 rooms, kitch., tile bath; screened porch; a. m. i.; no objection one child. 4625 8th NW.

One large room, alcove, reception hall, kitchenette, and bath, \$35. The Argonne, 1629 Columbia Road, apt. 210.

4 rooms and bath, a. m. i.; ideal place for children; 61 East Walnut St., North Rosemont, Va.

Lovely one-room apt., front; semiprivate bath; lady; reasonable; references required. Kedrick, 1801 K St. NW., apt. 505.

Entire second floor, corner house, overlooking Rock Creek Pk.; 5 rms., b., large inclosed porch; heat and electric light furnished; \$85 per month. Col. 2645.

4 rooms and bath, first-floor apt.; newly decorated. 468 Louisiana Ave. NW.

41 Quincy St. NW.—5 rms., bath, \$50; 30 Seaton Pl. NW.—5 rooms, bath, \$65. Thomas P. Brown, 617 4 1/2 St. SW.

Apartment for rent, sublease; 5 rooms and bath. Royden, 1619 R NW., Apt. No. 300. Phone North 5872.

1117 Vermont Ave., Hermitage—One room, reception hall, kitchenette, bath, \$42.50. Totten, 700 9th. Main 7625.

Colored—NW. section—apartments. People's Mortgage and Investment Co., 313 John Marshall Pl. Phone Fr. 970.

1900 H St. NW., Woodside—One room, dressing room, kitchenette, and bath, \$65; available at once; partly furnished.

1803 Conn. Avenue (Intersection of Fla. Ave.)—4 rooms, recp. hall, and bath, \$75. Ideal surroundings. Moore & Hill (Inc.), 730 17th St. NW.

Large room, kitchen, sleeping porch, semiprivate bath, \$37.50, including heat, gas, elec. 5829 Colorado Ave. NW. Adams 5230-J.

\$25 and \$30 month, summer rate, one and two rooms, with kitchenette, running water, including gas and electricity. Apply Cooper's, 820 11th St. Phone Main 1332.

Park View—4 beautiful rooms, bath, inclosed porch; a. m. l.; couple only. Owner. 435 Kenyon St. NW. Adams 3728-J.

Near Congressional Library: Four rooms, bath; h. w. h., electricity; \$60 month. 1624 19th St. NW.: One room, kitchenette, and bath; \$45 month. Petty & Petty, 1423 New York Ave. NW. Main 2437-38.

44 New York Ave. NW.—3 rooms, kitchen, bath, and porch; all modern improvements.

Near 14th and Park Rd.—Three nice, bright, clean rooms, a. m. l.; private bath. 3457 Holmead Pl. NW.

Unfur. basement apt., 2 rooms; gas and heat included; occupant to tend furnace. 1613 Mass. Ave. NE. Lincoln 2092-W.

1609 B St. NE.—Two large rooms, kitchenette, and bath; side porch; newly papered; near 3 car lines.

2304 H St. NW.—For rent, 3 nice second-floor rooms and bath; rent reasonable.

Partly furnished—English basement, kitchen, living room, bedroom; all improvements; very clean; private entrance; \$50, including elec., gas for cooking. 1843 S St. NW.

4 large outside rooms and kitchen proper; garage if desired; a. m. l. 200 9th St. NE.

1811 Adams MHI Rd. (at 18th and Col. Rd.)—4 rms., kitch., bath, and sun porch, \$80. Adams 8740-J until noon.

1414 Taylor St. NW.—3 rooms, kitchen, and bath. \$50, including gas, elec., telephone; vacant. Col. 9220.

1900 S St.—Attractive apt., three rooms, kitchen, and bath. Phone Cleve. 644 or North 4363.

1449 N—Franklin 5628—First floor, 4 large rooms, private bath, sunny yard, closets; summer rates, \$60 monthly.

Crescent Apartments, Crescent Pl. between Meridian Mansions and Henderson Castle: 3 rooms, kitchenette, bath; \$55. Apply janitor or Crane & Belt, Union Trust Bldg.

Near Dupont Circle: 4 rooms, Princess kitchenette, and bath; two exposures, \$80. Three rooms, bath, and kitchenette, elec., heat, gas furnished, \$50. 2035 P St. NW.

Two rooms, kitchen, and bath. 1706 G St. NW.

1325 Conn. Ave. NW.: 3 rooms and bath, with heat; \$70 month, in advance. Inquire at store on premises.

Colonnade, 1822 Vernon St.: 6 rooms, kitchen, and bath; extra lavatory; porch. Apply Union Realty Corp., 1410 G St. Main 8415.

Willard Courts: 3 rooms, kitchen, bath. Call North 3827.

Copley Courts: 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath. Call Main 4500.

Very desirable corner apartment, containing seven bright outside rooms and bath, elec. light, h. w. h.; immediate possession. Rent only \$70 per month. Boss & Phelps, 1417 K St. NW. M. 9300.

Two rooms, kitchen, extra large screened porch, and bath; electricity, gas, and built-in garage; use of laundry; near car line, two bus lines, and school; newly papered; exclusive white neighborhood; with or without garage. 717 Princeton Pl. NW.

1926 Kearney St. NE.: One room, dressing room, tiled bath, kitchenette with sink, \$35; or with extra room and large closet, \$50. Potomac 1773.

1321 Decida St. NW., Apt. 31: Four rooms and bath. McNey Realty Co. (Inc.), 726 14th St. NW. Main 3939-3920.

1220 H St. NW.: 2 flats of 3 and 4 rooms and bath, \$30 and \$35 per month. Jesse L. Henskel, 1115 Eye St. NW.

For colored: 726 6th St. NE., 2d floor; 4 large, bright rooms and bath; a. m. l.; vapor heat; back porch; reasonable.

1205 Emerson St. NW., Saul's Addition: Two 4 rooms and bath apartments, hot-water heat, electric lights, double garage, awnings, and screens; rents reduced. Consult Welch, realtor, 15th and New York Ave. Main 4346.

1011 H St. NW.: Good down-town location; 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath. Apply on premises.

33 M St. NW.: Entire floor, three rooms, bath, kitchenette; newly papered and painted.

Three rooms, kitchen, and bath; new apartment; \$80. Apply janitor or Apt. 3, 2145 California St.

Two rooms, front, large closets, sink, gas range; near cars; \$32. 517 14th SE.

815 Varvum: Second floor of home consisting of 3 rooms and screened sleeping porch; partly furnished if desired; reasonable.

1500 21st St. NW., Apt. 1: Second floor. Five bright rooms and bath. \$35. From May 1. Phone Potomac 785. Maj. Strong.

49 K St. NE.: Apartment for rent. \$34.

1918 Lawrence St. NE.: Two rooms, kitchenette, private bath. North 1484-J.

Park View Apt., 610 Irving St.: Three rooms, kitchen, rec. hall, bath, \$45.

1315 Belmont St.: One rm., kitchenette, dining alcove, b., \$50 mo. The Joseph Shapiro Co., 919 15th St.

The Radnor, 2901 16th St. NW.: Sixth floor, 5 rooms and bath; porch, modern and attractive; good value; inspect at once, before it is too late; rent reduced.

W. K. Hartung & Co., 1108 16th St. NW. Main 3277.

1205 15th St. NW.: Apt. 203, 4 rooms and bath, \$88. Apt. 308, 3 rooms and bath, \$66.

2500 Massachusetts Ave.: Ten rooms, four baths and garage, \$250.

2106 N St. NW.: Apt. 11, 3 rooms and bath, \$62.50. Apt. 33, 3 rooms and bath, \$62.50. Apt. 40, 4 rooms and bath, \$77.50.

1016 16th St. NW.: Apt. 44, 4 rooms and bath, \$105. Apt. 62, 4 rooms and bath, \$110.

1404 Columbia Road: Apt. 34, 2 rooms, bath, and Murphy bed, \$55. Apt. 35, 2 rooms, bath, and Murphy bed, \$55.

1612 14th St. NW.: Second floor, 5 rooms and bath, \$45.

3625 16th St. NW.: Apt. 1, 4 rooms, bath, and porch, \$110. Apt. 3, 5 rooms, bath, and porch, \$140. Apt. 35, 2 rooms, bath, and Murphy bed, \$57.50.

1475 Spring Place: Apt. 34, 3 rooms and bath, \$75.

3039 Macomb St.: Apt. 12, 3 rooms and bath, \$67.50. Apt. 36, 4 rooms and bath, \$85.

1750 16th St. NW.: Apt. 101, 2 rooms and bath, \$60. Apt. 203, 1 room and bath, \$47.50. Apt. 205, 1 room and bath, \$40. Apt. 404, 3 rooms, reception hall, and bath, \$77.50. Apt. 801, 2 rooms, reception hall, and bath, \$62.50.

1410 M St. NW.: Apt. 302, 5 rooms and bath, \$85.

2530 Wisconsin Ave.: Apt. 44, 5 rooms and bath, \$65.

1302 18th St. NW.: Seven rooms and three baths, \$250.

2222 Q St. NW.: Apt. 43, 4 rooms and bath, \$85.

1449 Oak St. NW.: Apt. 3, 4 rooms and bath, \$70.

1500 21st St. NW.: Second floor, 5 rooms and bath, \$85.

1420 Harvard St.: Apt. 31, 4 rooms and bath, \$65.

H. L. Rust Co., 912 15th St. NW. Main 6888.

Near Pension Office: Four rooms and bath, in the Pierpont, 217 F St. NW.; newly papered and painted; vacant, \$50.

Excellent location in Mt. Pleasant: Two rooms and bath; house-keeping; in modern apartment house, 1468 Harvard St., \$40.

Two-family flat: Five rooms and bath; elec., h. w. h.; 611 1/2 Park Road NW.; possession May 1, \$50.

The Kalorama: Six large rooms, bath and extra lavatory; excellent building; now vacant.

Reasonable rent: Four rooms and bath in 1818 Kalorama Road NW.; to be papered and painted; \$70 mo.

2221 35th Place NW.: Modern four-family apt.; three rooms, bath, and inclosed porch; h. w. h.; elec.; \$37.50 mo.

N. L. Sansbury Co. (Inc.), 1418 I St. NW.

Several desirable 3-room and bath apartments; heat and janitor service furnished. Rent, \$42.50 and \$45 per month. 17th and East Capitol Sts., Harry A. Kite (Inc.), 1514 K St. NW., Main 4846.

The Presidential, 16th and L Sts.: Five rooms, foyer, and two baths. The Jefferson, 1201 16th St.: Three rooms and bath; two rooms and bath. The Maycroft, 1474 Columbia Rd.: Five rooms and bath, \$135; three rooms and bath, \$75; two rooms and bath, \$60.

Potomac Park Apartments, 21st and C Sts.: Three rooms and bath, \$70 to \$77.50; two rooms and bath, \$60; one room and bath, \$40.

The Ashley, 2038 18th St.: Five rooms and bath, newly decorated, \$85. The Rodman, 3628 Connecticut Ave.: Four rooms and bath, \$87.50; three rooms and bath, \$65 to \$72.50. 3618 Connecticut Ave.: Three rooms and bath, \$65. W. H. West Co., Wm. L. F. King, E. G. Perry, 815 15th St. NW.

The Gotham, 1945 Calvert St. NW.: Apt. 23, desirable 5 rooms, kitchen, and bath apartment, overlooking Rock Creek; elevator; janitor service. Rent, \$102.50. B. F. Saul Co., 1412 Eye St. NW.

741 North Capital St.: 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$45; heat furnished. B. F. Saul Co., 1412 Eye St. NW.

900 19th St. NW.: New 8-story fireproof building, located within a few blocks of the shopping district and all the Government departments, with environments of refinement and comfort. Comfortable apartments of one and two rooms, with kitchenette and bath; some with porches; two high-speed elevators and telephone switchboard; reasonable rentals. Shannon & Luchs (Inc.), 713 14th St., Main 2345. Resident manager on premises.

1925 16th St., the Tiffany. An eight-story, fireproof building which will appeal to those seeking the comfort and convenience of this location at reasonable rentals. Apartment contains one bedroom and bath with built-in shower, living room, dining room, inclosed porch and kitchen. Newly decorated; now vacant. Shannon & Luchs (Inc.), 713 14th St. Main 2345.

3624 Conn. Ave., comfortable year-around location: 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath; 2 rooms, kitchen, bath, and porch; 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath; \$57.50 to \$82.50. Shannon & Luchs (Inc.), 713 14th St. Main 2345.

Attractive apts., new detached corner building, R and 32d Streets, opposite the magnificent Bliss estate; 3 and 4 rooms and bath each; \$57.50 to \$77.50; all outside rooms.

1419 N Street, near Thomas Circle: 3 rooms and bath, \$65 month.

1474 Chapin St. NW., near Meridian Park: 3 and 4 rooms and bath, \$60 to \$65.

1632 30th St. NW., near Montrose Park: 4 rooms and bath, front, \$65.

3432 Conn. Ave., opposite Rock Creek Park: 4 rooms and bath, \$80.

3712 Wisconsin Ave. NW., Mass. Ave. Heights: 3 rooms and bath, \$65. Moore & Hill (Inc.), 730 17th St. NW.

Conn. Ave., opposite new Walker Hotel: 4-room and bath apartment, 3d floor, in Cadillac Building; reduced rental during summer months. Apply 1140 Conn. Ave. Phone Franklin 3900.

We will have four 2-room and bath apartments, delightfully located downtown, ready for occupancy May 1, also two office suites. Location is 818 18th St. NW., within short walking distance of Government departments and downtown clubs. For price of rentals apply Bradley, Beall & Howard (Inc.), 1512 H St. NW., Wilkins Building.

1230 14th St., Apt. 33: 2 rms., reception hall, bath; \$40. Affleck Realty Co., 607 15th St.

3-room and bath apartment in new detached house; a. m. i. Rent reasonable. 3221 20th St. NE., Woodridge.

The Ohio, 1436 Meridian St. NW.: 4 rooms and bath, \$60.50. Available May 1. Swartzell, Rheem & Hensley Co., 727 15th St. NW.

The Cumberland, 14th St. and Thomas Circle: 2 rooms and bath, \$50. Immediate possession. Swartzell, Rheem & Hensley Co., 727 15th St. NW.

Three rooms, hot-water heat, electric lights and gas. 435 M St. NW.

1603 You Street: 3 rooms and bath, \$65. Call Main 2635.

2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$35. Call 608 Lamont NW.

14th and Girard, the Savoy: 4 rms., kitchen, bath; available May 1.

The Ardmore, 915 20th St. NW.: Four large rooms, kitchen and bath; in walking distance of downtown stores and business. Immediate possession. \$65 per month.

The Kelwood, 1821 Corcoran St. NW.: Cozy first-floor apartment in very good section of the city. Immediate possession. \$65 per month.

Studio Apartment, "Meridian Hill": Beautiful six-room apartment in modern building, recently completed in Washington's best residential section. Can be leased finely furnished for \$160 per month, or may be had unfurnished. E. Roy Lewis & Co., 1715 Connecticut Ave. NW. Phone Potomac 2131.

936 Madison St. NW.: 4 rooms, bath, and reception hall, \$62.50. Morris Cafritz Co. (Inc.), 1416 K St. Main 617.

The Everett, 2127 P St. NW.: 3 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$77.50; 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$65.

2116 Kalorama Road: 6 rooms and 2 baths, \$140.

1715 P St. NW.: 2 rooms, kitchenette, and bath, \$70.

3704 Macomb St.: 3 rooms, kitchen and bath, \$80.

1329 Belmont St.: 2 rooms, kitchen and bath, \$65.

1321 Belmont St.: 1 room, dining room and kitchen (combined) and bath, \$42.50.

3220-22-24 Wisconsin Ave., near the Cathedral: 2 rooms, kitchenette and bath, \$53; 1 room, kitchenette and bath, \$40.

740 9th St. NW.: 3 rooms, kitchenette, and bath, \$75; 2 rooms, kitchenette and bath, \$55.

802 19th St. NW.: 2 rooms and bath, with porch, \$50. Geo. W. Linkins, 1719 K St.

One month's rent free. 5-room-and-bath apartment, new building on Washington Heights; convenient to all activities; cheapest and best apartment in this section at \$85 per month. Eugene H. Taggart (Inc.), 1518 K St.

Madison Apartment's new building, NE. cor. 18th & Eye Sts.; 1 and 2 rooms and bath nonhousekeeping. L. W. Groomes, 1416 F St.

Beautiful new apartments: Will be ready for occupancy May 1. 3 and 4 room apartments. 1443 Oak St. NW. Open for inspection Sunday. Chas. D. Sager, 924 14th St. NW. Main 36.

2215 14th St., The Princeton: 2 rooms, kitchenette and bath, \$40.

3333 N St., the Potomac: 3 rooms, kitchenette and bath, \$40.

1529 14th St.: 2d and 3d floors; 6 rooms and bath, over store, \$40. Shannon & Luchs (Inc.), 713 14th St. Main 2345.

Cavanaugh Court, 1526 17th St. NW.: One room and bath, \$37.50. One room, kitchen, and bath, \$50. Two rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$67.50 and \$70.

Netherlands, 1860 Columbia Road NW.: Apt. 203—5 rooms, bath, and large foyer hall, \$125. Apt. 503—3 rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$90.

Dumbarton Court, 1657 31st St. NW.: Apt. 107—1 room, kitchen, and bath, \$40.

Parkwood, 1746 K St. NW.: Two apts., containing 7 very large rooms and bath, open fireplaces, \$165.

The Montclair, 1331 Belmont St. NW.: Apt. 31—4 rooms, bath, and porch, \$75.

Rutland Court, 1725 17th St. NW.: One room, kitchen, and bath, \$50 and \$60. Two rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$75.

Van Cortlandt, 1417 Belmont St. NW.: Five very large rooms, bath, porch, and hall, \$99.50.

Petworth Gardens: Apt. 5, 124 Webster St. NW.—4 rooms and bath, \$63.50. Apt. 10, 126 Webster St. NW.—5 rooms and bath, \$70.

The Biltmore, 1941 Biltmore St. NW.: Apt. 11—4 rooms and bath, available May 15, \$80.

1361 Girard St. NW.—Third floor, 2 very large rooms, kitchen, and bath, \$65.

Carleton, 1741 Lanier Pl. NW.: Apt. 23—3 rooms and bath, \$52.50. Allan E. Walker & Co. (Inc.), 813 15th St. NW. Main 2690.

Reduction in rent: 807 O St. NW. 3-room housekeeping apartment with bath; 2-room housekeeping apartment with bath. For inspection call 1253 8th St. NW., after 4 p. m.

The Conard, 18th and Eye Sts. NW., opposite Franklin Park, downtown. One room, kitchenette, bath, and closet. Apply at office, 1224 Eye St. NW. Geo. C. Altemus.

822 & 828 18th St. NW.: Central, downtown location. Two rooms, kitchenette, and bath, \$65 and \$75 per month. Remodeled, with oak floors. Sanitas covered walls. Never occupied. Large, bright rooms. Open for inspection. H. L. Rust Company, 912 15th St. NW.

No. 41, 1737 N. H. Ave. NW.: Four rooms and bath; garage space available in rear of building. Weaver Bros., realtors, 735 15th St. NW.

910 R. I. Ave. NE.: Modern new building. Occupancy May 1, 1924. 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath. Low rentals. \$45, \$50, and \$52.50. H. L. Rust Company, 912 15th St. NW.

138 V St. NW.: Flat for rent. Call North 8937.

915 New York Ave. NW.: Four rooms and bath; gas, electricity; heat furnished; \$75.

419 M St. NW.: Five rooms and bath; heat furnished; \$60.

1627 17th St. NW.: Five rooms and bath; electricity and gas; \$60.

607 New York Ave. NW.: Five rooms and bath; electricity; \$50.

419 M St. NW.: Two rooms and bath, second floor; partly furnished; \$45.50.

4114 Emory Place NW.: Three rooms and bath; h-w. h., electricity, laundry tubs; \$35 unfurnished, \$45 furnished.

1414 9th St. NW.: Four rooms and bath, second floor; h-w. h.; gas furnished; \$45.

607 New York Ave. NW.: Three rooms and bath, second floor, front; steam heat; \$40.

807 O St. NW.: Three rooms and bath, third floor; \$40.

807 O St. NW.: Three rooms and bath, second floor; \$40.

607 New York Ave. NW.: Three rooms and bath, third floor; steam heat; \$35. Caywood Bros. & Garrett, Inc., realtors, 915 New York Ave. NW.

The Monterey. Conn. Ave. and Porter St., 2, 3, and 4 rooms and bath; some with porches.

The Oakland. Columbia Road near Wyoming Ave., 6 rooms and bath.

The Woodland. Cathedral Ave. near Conn. Ave., 2, 3, and 4 rooms and bath.

1915 Sixteenth Street; 3 rooms and bath.

Twenty-ninth and M Streets; 3 and 5 rooms and bath; low rental.

1315 Clifton Street; 4 rooms and bath. Thos. J. Fisher & Co. (Inc.), 738 15th Street. Main 6830.

New buildings. Corner Connecticut Ave. and Tilden St. All outside rooms overlooking wooded park. Elevator and telephone service. Apartments of 2, 3, and 4 rooms with bath. Open evenings. Representative on premises. Thos. J. Fisher & Co. (Inc.), 738 15th Street. Main 6830.

3807 Connecticut Ave. Between Woodley Road and Cathedral Ave. New building. Apartments of 2, 3, and 4 rooms with bath. Elevator service. Thos. J. Fisher & Co. (Inc.) 738 15th Street. Main 6830.

2531 Que St. NW. New apartment building. Apartments of 2, 3, and 4 rooms, dining alcove and bath. Prices range from \$52.50 to \$97.50. Representative on premises. McKeever & Goss. M. 4752. 1415 Eye Street NW.

The Drury, 3121 Mt. Pleasant St. NW.: Apartment of 1 room and bath, \$40; apartment of 2 rooms and bath, \$50 month.

660 Kenyon St. NW.: 4 rooms and bath, \$60 month.

The York, 769 Quebec St. NW.: 3 rooms and bath, \$57.50.

Downtown apartment, 1221 New York Ave. NW.: 3 rooms and bath, \$65.

In Georgetown, 1305 Potomac St. NW.: Apartment of 3 rooms and bath, \$52.50; apartment of 4 rooms and bath, \$67.50.

3430 Connecticut Ave. NW.: 3 rooms and bath, \$65; 4 rooms and bath, \$80.

The Windsor, T St., near 15th: 6 rooms and bath, \$90 month; newly papered and painted. McKeever & Goss, 1415 Eye St. NW. Main 4752.

Fernbrook, 1441 Spring Rd.: Living room, dining alcove, kitchenette, dressing room, with two In-a-Dor beds and tiled bath, \$62.50; reception hall, living room, dining alcove, kitchenette, dressing room with double In-a-Dor bed, tiled bath and spacious bedroom, \$79.50. Apply to resident manager, apartment 101. Morris Cafritz Co. (Inc.), 1416 K St. Main 617.

Comfortable apartments: "Klingie Mansions," at Connecticut Ave. and Klingie Road, overlooking Rock Creek Valley, offer unusual induce-

ments to seekers of apartments where year-round comfort is demanded; all outside rooms, overlooking spacious lawns and wooded parks; exceptionally large rooms and generous closets; efficient service, consistent rentals. Wardman Construction Co., 1430 K St. NW.; real-estate department.

2151 California St. NW.: Four bright rooms, reception hall, bath, porch; newly decorated; fireproof building; night elevator service; \$100 month; see it now. Apply on premises or B. L. Simmons, 1108 16th St. NW.

Very attractive unfurnished apartment in London Hall, 18th and M Sts. NW., containing one room, dressing room, kitchenette, and bath, and In-a-Dor bed; immediate possession. Boss & Phelps, 1417 K St. NW. Main 9300.

1620 R St. N. W.: Available May 1. 2 rooms, reception hall, kitchen and bath; front apartment, \$85. 2 rooms, reception hall, kitchen, and bath apartment; southern exposure, \$77.50. 1 room, reception hall, kitchenette, and bath, \$55. 1 room, reception hall, kitchenette, and bath, \$45. Inquire resident manager, Potomac 1900.

APARTMENTS—SUBURBAN

Two rooms and private bath, 1 h. k., in Lyon Park, Va., one block from car line. Twenty minutes' ride from P. O. Dept. \$30 month. Phone Clarendon 239-J-2.

Takoma Park, Md., 217 Cedar Ave.: 2 r., k., and b.; furnished; until Sept. 1 or for shorter period; \$50 per mo. Possession at once.

3 unfurnished rooms, new house; 1 h. k.; closets, semi-bath; large porch and grounds; electricity; near cars; 20 minutes to 12th and Pa. Ave. NW.; rent reasonable. H. H. Blandford, corner Shelley Rd. and Lattimer Ave., Arlington, Va.

14 Ralston Ave., Hyattsville, Md.: Entire second floor of residence, 4 rooms and bath, just refurnished; on large lot with old shade trees; concrete street in front leads to Washington; 3 blocks from cars and train; \$50, with light and water. Phone Hyattsville 136-R after 5 p. m.

Modern apts., reasonable; first and second floors; train and bus service; 30 minutes to city; children welcome. Call Vienna, Va., 28-F-22, or see Mrs. Stuntz, Chilcott sta., on Wash.-Va. R. R.

Potomac Heights: Beauti. situated, high elevation; overlooking Potomac River; 3 large, outside rooms, bath, porch, etc.; new house. 5413 Hawthorne Pl. Cabin John or Chain Bridge Car. Get off at Jewett St.

Historic Alexandria, Va., 701 Prince St.; lower floor; 3 rms, kitch., b.; remodeled; piazza front; side yd.; trees; central.

RESIDENCES FOR RENT

RENT HOUSES—FURNISHED

1349 Penna. Ave. SE.: 4 bright, new rooms, private bath, large porch, electric lights, h.-w. h.; furnished, \$60 month.

Will rent for summer months: Chevy Chase, 7-room furnished house; adults only; \$125 month. 5604 37th St. NW.

Overlooking Rock Creek Park: Four bedrooms, 2 baths, sleeping porch; garage. 1833 Irving St. Col. 7314.

Six rooms, bath, modern, near car line; northwest, for summer or lease for year; \$65. Lincoln 6553.

May to October, then yearly; china, glass, linen, silver; two-car garage; twelve rooms, four baths, phone. North 782.

Nine rms, partly furnished, in Georgetown; \$75 month. Room 8, 1410 G St. NW.

9 rooms and bath; garage; May 1 to Nov. 1; near Dupont Circle; very reasonable to adults. Phone, North 5971.

Brookland: Furnished bungalow; 5 large, bright rooms; near churches, stores, and cars. North 6302. 3303 10th St. NE.

1716 Lanier Pl.: Until Nov. 1; owner reserving one bedroom; will let to responsible adults only his comfortable and attractive home of eight rooms for \$100 month. Col. 626.

Chevy Chase: Seven rooms, sleeping and sun porches; garage; lovely yard; season or permanent; \$150 monthly. Cleve. 908-W.

3235 R St., Georgetown: Nine rooms, two baths; large lot; very desirable location. Telephone, West 646.

Irving St., near 14th NW.: 9 large rooms, 6 large bedrooms, 2 baths; elegantly furnished; a. m. i.; \$160. Albert R. Calder, Woodward Bldg. Main 3973 or Col. 4308.

5-room bungalow, furnished, modern; June-Sept.; garage; fruit and vegetable garden. 234 Park Ave., Takoma Park.

Furnished, 3756 McKinley St., Chevy Chase; half block from Conn. Ave. cars; May 20 to October 15; 9 rooms, 2 bath rooms, sleeping porch; garage; small garden; \$150 per month. Inspection by appointment. Telephone, Cleveland 142.

Eight-room detached house, Cleveland Park, for summer; rent reasonable. Phone, Cleveland 675.

June 15 to Sept. 15, \$125 per month: Eight-room, completely furnished house; 4 bedrooms, sleeping porch; garage; overlooking Soldiers' Home grounds. Col. 6971-W.

Will transfer lease of 9-room house, completely furnished, to party buying furniture. 1731 De Sales NW. Franklin 6667.

First door off 14th and Euclid: 3-story and finished basement; 6 bedrooms; within one square of new legations, Central High; wonderful place for renting rooms, business, or private residence; reasonable. Col. 8059.

For rent: May 6 to October 1, \$200 a month; small, well-furnished house on 18th St. between P and Q, with upstairs living room, 4 bedrooms, 2 baths. Apply at 1526 18th NW.

Nicely furnished 5-room bungalow; hot-water heat, electric lights, open fireplace, large porches; cellar and attic; near bus line; \$75 per mo. by year. Address Box 198-D, Star office.

For rent: Exclusive home, richly furnished, suitable for Representative or foreign attaché; 3 bedrooms and inclosed sleeping porch; the last word in modern; built-in garage. Phone Adams 1831.

Chevy Chase: Nicely furnished 8-room house for May and June, \$100. Phone Cleveland 1901.

Modern 6-r. detached house; a. m. i.; grand piano; mahogany furnishings; latest electrical appliances; large trees; sleeping porch; garage; large attic and basement. 22 Denwood Ave., Takoma Park. Phone Col. 7290 W before calling for inspection. To October.

1302 Belmont St.: Six cheerful outside rooms, three large porches; high, healthy location; \$90 until Oct.

Party leaving city will give up lease of 7-room, semidetached, a. m. i., large yard, 2 garages (rented), n. w., with purchase of furniture at a sacrifice. Address Box 303-C, Star office.

For summer, in Cleveland Park, half of double house, seven rooms, large front and back porches; roomy sleeping porch. 360 Lowell St. Cleve. 312.

Six rooms, reception hall, bath; newly papered; elec.; back yard and porches; immed. possession; \$65 month; beginning Oct. 1, \$85. 1139 Harvard St. NW.

429 Randolph St. NW.: Seven large rooms, large attic, basement, servant's closet, sleeping porch, modern; now available; reasonable.

1302 Belmont St. NW.: 6 beautiful rooms, bath, 3 porches, high, healthy location; until October. Adams 2064.

On Argonne Pl., near 16th: 6 rooms and bath, built-in garage, beautifully furnished; \$150 mo.

On C St. SE. near House Office Bldg.: 6 rooms and bath, all modern improvements; reasonably priced; beautifully furnished.

McKeever & Goss, 1415 Eye St. NW., M. 7552.

Cleveland Park: 10 rooms, 3 baths and garage; nicely furnished; can be rented from May 15 for four months, at reasonable price.

3300 Newark St., Cleveland Park: A nicely arranged house of 10 rooms, 5 baths and 2-car garage, 2 sleeping porches; large and beautiful grounds; can be rented from May 15 to Sept. 15, at \$200 per month.

We have several other very desirable well furnished houses throughout the city at moderate prices.

Allen E. Walker & Co., Inc., 813 15th St. NW., Main 2690.

1306 13th St. NW.: Seven rooms and bath; gas, h. w. h.; \$100.75. Caywood Bros. & Garrett, Inc., relators, 915 New York Ave. NW.

1302 Belmont St.: Six cheerful outside rooms, three large porches; high, healthy location; \$90 until Oct.

2622 Woodley Place NW. Very attractive home for summer occupancy; 10 rooms, 3 baths, screened sleeping porches; garage; \$125 per month, including telephone service. Available May 15 to Sept. 15, 1924. For appointment telephone Col. 4708. H. L. Rust Co., 912 15th St. NW. Main 6888.

1821 Jefferson Pl. near Dupont Circle, attractive 14-room house, completely furnished; a. m. i. W. H. West Co., Wm. L. S. King, E. G. Perry, 815 15th St. NW.

511 Columbia Road NW. 6 rooms and bath, a. m. i., \$75. Morris Cafritz Co. (Inc.), 1416 K St. Main 617.

Gentleman's suburban estate. Unusually desirable home in Washington, D. C.; 50-mile view over three States; 1 block from cars; new, up-to-date tapestry brick house and garage; 4 public rooms, 6 master bedrooms, 4 baths, 14 service, 4 porches, conservatory; acre of lawn, garden, orchard, tennis court, etc. Lease or sale. Call Owner, Cleveland 607 or Franklin 6225.

Lease—bargain. 1846 16th St. NW. (corner); 11 rooms and 3 baths; h.-w. h., elec. and gas; completely furnished; front and back yards. Moore & Hill (Inc.), 730 17th St. NW.

RENT HOUSES—FURNISHED AND UNFURNISHED

Attractively furnished or unfurnished new bungalow; a. m. i.; exclusive in detail; yard; double garage, flowers; all-white section; reasonable; responsible adults; June 1. Address Box 189-D, Star office.

10 rooms, recep. hall, bath; elec., hot-water heat; partly furnished; reasonable; owner, a Govt. employee, to reserve one room. 430 M St. NW. Fr. 2059-J.

East Capitol St. Near Capitol; large rooms, newly papered and painted; elec.; house in fine cond. Call Owner, Lin. 619-W.

Conn. Ave. Near Wardman Park Hotel, 11 rooms, 2 baths, porches, servant's bath in basement; 2-car brick garage; a. m. i. Geo. W. Linkins, 1719 K St.

RENT HOUSES—UNFURNISHED

6-room detached house with large yard and 2 sleeping porches; all modern conveniences; near car line, churches, and schools. Apply 1022 Otis St., Brookland, D. C.

444 Mass. Ave. NW. 8-room frame; hot-water heat, electric light, gas. MHBs, 805 5th NW. Phone Main 4561.

635 H St. SW. Eight rooms, bath, \$35. Thomas B. Brown, 617 43 St. SW.

Handsome three-story and attic brick residence, 16th St., corner Irving; 14 large rooms, h.-w. h., 3 baths, 6 fireplaces, hardwood floors, back staircase, butler's pantry, completely modern; beautiful lawns and gardens; immediate occupancy. See owner, 3114 16th St., after 5, or any time Sunday.

Fine home, a. m. c., sun parlor, beautiful grounds; orchard; 2-car ga.; 10 min. walk from Chevy Chase Circle. Clev. 883.

108 2nd NE. 11 rooms, bath, 7 rooms, bath; \$80 and \$75 per month. Beautiful house uptown near 18th and Columbia Rd.; 12 rooms, 3 baths, newly decorated, electricity and h. w. h.; rent reasonable. W. R. Marshall, 929 New York Ave.

No. 230 11th St. NE.: Eight rooms, bath, and cellar; hot-water heat, electric lights. Consult Welch, realtor, 15th and New York Ave. Main 4348.

1347 Montague St. NW.: Det. semibungalow; 8 rooms and two tile baths; a. m. l.; large front and screened rear porch; good repair; \$110.

1028 26th St. NW.: 9 r., 2 baths, third floor; arranged for apt. \$75.

807 Carroll Ave., Takoma Park. Detached house; 5 rooms and bath; a. m. l. \$50.

3222 19th NW.: Beautiful home, semidet., 9r., 2 baths; porches. \$140.

William S. Phillips, 15th and K Sts. NW. Main 4600.

110 4th St. NE.: 10 rooms and bath, h. w. h., elec. lights, and garage; \$75 per mo.

226 2nd St. NE.: 10 rooms and bath, h. w. h., elec. lights, with 2-car garage; \$100.

Joe A. Herbert & Sons, 515 East Capitol St.

20 Sherman Circle: 6 r. & b., a. m. l., new, \$85.50; 4626 8th St. NW.: 6 r. and b., a. m. l., \$75; 916 Delaware St., 6 r. and b., a. m. l., \$70; new. Morris Cafritz Company, Inc., 1416 K St. Main 617.

48 Eye St. NW.: Twelve rooms and bath; electricity and vapor heat; \$100.

1626 Que St. NW.: Eight rooms and bath; steam heat, electricity, and gas; partly furnished; \$100.

815 New Jersey Ave. NW.: Ten rooms and bath; electricity, gas, h. w. h., and yard; \$100.

109 19th St. SE.: Four rooms and bath; electricity; \$52.50 unfurnished, \$60 furnished.

4163 11th St. SW.: Four rooms, \$20.50. Caywood Bros. & Garrett, Inc., Realtors, 915 New York Ave. NW.

1432 Florida Ave. NW.: Colored; six rooms and bath; latrine heat; rear yard; gas; \$85. Caywood Bros. & Garrett, Inc., Realtors, 915 New York Ave. NW.

Beautiful location; 8 large rooms, inclosed porch; inst. water heater; arranged for two families. Adams 5480.

453 M St., 8 r., b., h. w. h., elec., \$75 mo.; 2748 Woodley Pl., "new home," \$113 mo.; 22nd & N Sts., 18 r., 3 b., a. m. l., gar., \$135 mo.; 3225 19th St., 10 r., 2 b., a. m. l., \$140 mo. The Joseph Shapiro Co., 919 15th St.

1721 Willard St. NW.: 12 rooms and bath; electricity and hot-water heat; stationary tubs in cellar, with extra lavatory; \$90 per month. M. J. Raine, 934 New York Ave. Main 1051.

818 Emerson St. NW.: Modern, new semidetached 6-room brick; col. front porch; sleeping porch; a. m. l.; reasonable rent. Phone Main 6718 Monday.

Seven-room bungalow: H.-w. h.; garage; fireplace; oak floors; large lot; ideal location, 2637 4th NE. Potomac 2458. Will sell.

\$55 cash, \$55 monthly, (larger cash payment, less monthly), two-story, five rooms and bath; a. m. l.; \$5,800. 6 Allegheny Ave., near Elm Ave., Takoma Park. Col. 9472-W.

8628 12th NE.: Corner house, 6 large rooms, bath, h.-w. h., elec., double rear porches, rear porch glassed in, large front porch; built-in garage; reasonable rent. Thos. A. Jamieson & Co., 908 New York Ave. M. 5526.

Eleven rooms; h.-w. h., electricity, rear porches; best elevation. Capitol Hill. Linc. 9519.

637 Otis Place NW.: Six rooms and bath; garage, a. m. l.; \$75. F. L. Sandoz, 920 17th NW. Main 3343.

Colossal home, modern; within 10 minutes drive of city, on improved road; acre ground; large lawn; big trees; view over city and river. Fine for 2 couples; garage for 2 cars. Campbell, 734 8th St. NW., during office hours, or call 4th house beyond Hume School, on upper rd. to Alexandria, after 5.30.

Ten-room house, Mt. Pleasant; good condition; a. m. l.; near new Bancroft School; arranged for one or two families; rent reasonable. Phone owner, Adams 3446.

1919 K NW.: 13 rooms; a. m. l.; newly renovated throughout.

3498 Holmden Place, half block off 14th St.; six rooms, bath; a. m. l.; newly papered and painted; to responsible party only. F. H. Davis, 205-6 Continental Trust Bldg. Main 1640.

1400 Potomac Ave. SE.: 6-room brick; modern improvements. Owner, D. J. Waters, 621 4th St. NE. Linc. 1287-W.

13th and Irving Sts. NW.: 11 rooms and 2 baths; steam heat, gas, and electricity; garage room for 8 cars; house newly decorated; rent reasonable. Cassel, Taibott & Co., (Inc.), 1005 New York Ave. Main 1092.

Longfellow St.: 7 rooms, bath; h.-w. h., electricity, hardwood floors, large basement; conv. 14th St. cars; \$80. Linc. 5060.

Corner property: 6-room brick; large front and side lawn; 98 K St. NE.; \$55. Penn Realty Corporation, Main 6608.

Near 18th and Columbia Road: Nine rooms; just renovated; electricity; \$100 month. Petty & Petty, 1423 New York Ave. NW. Main 2437-38.

1425 You St.: Ten rooms; whole or part; suitable rooming. Apply premises.

Ten rooms, modern improvements, just renovated; near 14th and Park. Rent moderate. Seen by appointment. Phone Linc. 4097.

Attractive, 10 rooms and bath, near 2 car lines; can be seen until 4 Sunday. North 3126.

2121 H St. NW.: 10 rooms, 2 baths, hot-water heat, electricity; rent, \$125.

608 Rock Creek Church Rd.: 6 rooms and bath; h.-w. h.; electricity; garage; \$115. Geo. W. Linkins, 1719 K St.

Very desirable house, 3d and East Capitol Sts.: House contains 8 bright, desirable rooms; newly papered and painted. Rent, \$75.50 per month. Boss & Phelps, 1417 K St. NW.

On New Jersey Ave. near N. Y. Ave.: 9 rooms and bath, to be newly papered; possession May 15th; suitable for rooming house; \$75.00.

William S. Phillips, 15th and K Sts. NW. Main 4600.

801 Longfellow St. NW.: Eight rooms and bath, corner house, entirely modern; garage; inspect at any time. Reasonable rent. S. J. Solomon, 528 Bond Bldg. Franklin 5430.

12 large rooms, 3 baths; a. m. l.; newly decorated. 1364 Kenyon St. For keys, phone Col. 2270 before 5 or between 7 and 8 p. m.

For colored: Five rooms, no bath, gas light, water in kitchen; near 8th and K Sts. NE.; for sale, not for rent, but no cash payment required; \$42.50 per month covers all interest and principal payments.

John H. Wright, 1116 Vermont Ave. NW. Main 3397.

West Chevy Chase, on Ellicott St.; 6 rooms and bath; new homes; never been occupied; \$90 month.

Cleveland Park, on Rodman St. near 30th: 6 rooms and bath, \$105 month.

Detached house on Kennedy St. near 14th: 6 rooms and bath, \$110.

Near 16th and Spring Rd.: 8 rooms, and bath; glassed in sleeping and breakfast porches; built-in garage; \$125 month.

Oliver St. near 32nd: 8 rooms and 1 bath; 1-car garage; \$100 month.

On K St. near 14th: Large house of 15 rooms and 2 baths; hot-water heat and electric lights; \$200 month. McKeever & Goss, 1415 Eye St. NW. Main 4752.

1728 Wisconsin Ave.: Brick house, with large back yard, suitable for store and dwelling. Eugene H. Taggart, Inc., 1518 K St. NW. Main 5500.

1928 First St. NW.: Containing eight rooms and bath; h.-w. h., elec. \$85. N. L. Sansbury Co., Inc., 1418 Eye St. NW.

Six rooms, no bath, water in kitchen, gas light, on 6th St. near G St. SW., for sale, not for rent, but no cash payment required; \$39 per month covers all interest and principal payments. John H. Wright, 1116 Vermont Ave. NW. Main 3397.

Very desirable and well located property in down-town section, suitable for boarding and rooming purpose, containing 58 rooms and 12 baths, h.-w. h., elec. light. Immediate possession. Moderate rental. Boss & Phelps, 1417 K St. NW. Main 3606.

Colored: Modern 6-room house; h.-w. h., elec.; rent reduced. Real-Mann-Estate, 1114 N. Y. Ave. NW. Main 6863.

Lease-Bargain. Near New Hampshire Ave. and R St.—8 rooms and bath; handsome appointments; \$125. Moore & HHL, Inc., 730 17th St. NW.

Benning, D. C.: Detached home at 4133 Gault Place NE., of six rooms and bath; all modern improvements, with 3-car garage and additional lot on side. Possession in ten days and a very reasonable rental.

14th near Shepherd: Seven rooms and bath, with all modern improvements, and 2-car garage; \$110 per month.

N. H. Ave. & Park Road: Eight large rooms and reception hall and bath in good residential section. House is light and roomy and in good condition, with all modern improvements. Rent, \$100 per mo. E. Roy Lewis & Co., 1715 Connecticut Ave. NW. Phone Potomac 2131.

24 Eye St. NE.: House for rent. Apply 26 Eye.

New house in a newly developed northwest section; uniquely designed; 6 rooms and bath; complete in every detail; \$75. Shannon & Luchs, Inc., 713 14th St. Main 2345.

Six rooms, bath, pantry, gas light, latrobe heat; near 9th and F Sts. NE.; for sale, not for rent, but no cash payment required; \$67.50 per month covers all interest and principal payments. John H. Wright, 1116 Vermont Ave. NW. Main 3397.

I have encumbered the Record with all of the foregoing because it is the most pertinent argument I could make, for the main question here is whether an emergency in rental property exists. The foregoing advertisements from one paper show that it does not. Yet this committee, when they come before you, ask you to pass a bill six years after the war is ended and want you to say that the emergency exists. With all these conditions here they ask you to declare that a war emergency exists six years after the war and extend it two years more, making eight years after the war. I want to say if you do that you are doing it on some other theory than an emergency.

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

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] just enlightened the House with a comment upon the advertisements in one of the newspapers. I happened to be one of those who some five years ago was interested in trying to get a place in which to live. It is my recollection—I have not verified it—that the columns of the Washington papers at that time were filled with advertisements of places to let, some places for sale, and rooms to rent, but the price was such that a lot of people could not afford to take them and live decently and in comfort, and that was the reason for the legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I regret that I can not yield.

Mr. KUNZ. Is it not a question of combination instead of housing conditions?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The question of combination does enter into it. I think if we had some vigorous action in the office of the United States attorney we might get some results under the existing law. I am prepared, as the existing law is not what it should be, to vote, in addition to the remedy the committee proposes, for an additional remedy such as has been suggested by the gentleman from Texas; not to put his remedy in the statute alone, but in addition to the bill before us rather than in substitution for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me say that this is the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JOST], but I am for it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Regardless of the authorship, it would commend itself to me whether it came from the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from Missouri. If I had an opportunity to vote for that, not in substitution but in addition, I would support it.

Mr. Chairman, under the Constitution Congress has exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia. The grant of power carries with it an obligation to use it whenever the public good requires it. This is the seat of Federal Government. It was created for that purpose and that purpose should always be kept before us. We must always bear in mind that this Government, through its various branches, departments, bureaus, commissions, and its thousands of employees, functions from here. The fathers did not want these governmental agencies to be handicapped in the doing of their work. Hence, this grant of power providing that Congress and Congress alone should have legislative jurisdiction so as to prevent any condition arising which might interfere with the running of our Government. In so legislating the courts have held that Congress possesses police power to the same extent as the several States of the Union.

Up to the time of the Great War Washington was a reasonable place in which to live. Statistics prove this. Thousands came here during the war. Housing conditions became intolerable. Hostilities ceased in November, 1918. Conditions did not grow better. Congress finally took action and enacted the rents act the latter part of October, 1919, or nearly one year after the signing of the armistice. Congress in passing this legislation found as a fact, and so declared, that an emergency existed, growing out of the war. As to that declaration, in affirming the constitutionality of the law, the United States Supreme Court in *Block v. Hirsch* (256 U. S. 154) said:

But a declaration by a legislature concerning public conditions that by necessity and duty it must know is entitled at least to great respect. In this instance Congress stated a publicly notorious and almost world-wide fact. That the emergency declared by the statute did exist must be assumed, and the question is whether Congress was incompetent to meet it in the way in which it has been met by most of the civilized countries of the world.

In referring to the conditions prompting and justifying this legislation the court said, on page 4:

The provisions of Title II are made necessary by emergencies growing out of the war resulting in rental conditions in the District dangerous to the public health and burdensome to public officers, employees, and accessories, and thereby embarrassing the Federal Government in the transaction of the public business.

They find rental conditions "burdensome to public officers, employees, and accessories." Is there anyone who will say that the conditions cited do not exist here to-day? There are people working in the Government departments in the executive branch of the Government and in the legislative branch of the Government who are paying 45, 50, and even as high as 60 per cent of their income for a place in which to live. I say this is decidedly burdensome.

We all know too well by our own experience that Washington has become one of the most expensive cities of the country in which to live. This is especially true as to housing. Statistics compiled by the Department of Labor confirm this. The Supreme Court has held that this has "embarrassed the Federal Government." Has that condition changed? No. We all know that Congress has had to raise the salaries of the thousands of employees in the Government service in the District of Columbia largely as the result of this.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says the war is over. Well the war is over in a way, and yet the war is not over in a good many other ways. It is not over for the men who were wounded and who will carry the marks to their graves. It is not over for the taxpayer who will have to pay for years to come; it is not over here in Washington where as a result the emergency conditions arising out of the war still exist. We have in this city to-day over 100,000 people more than we had at the outbreak of the war. The war resulted in people coming to Washington, some in a governmental capacity and many more in other capacities.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman doubt that the economic conditions created by the war will continue for 20 or 30 years longer?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It probably will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman think that if they do continue, an emergency exists permitting this extraordinary legislation to be continued?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am interested only in this particular bill which assumes that the emergency growing out of the war will continue for two years. It is the duty of this Congress to correct it.

Mr. WEFALD. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. WEFALD. As long as the emergency exists does the gentleman think this should be continued?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If such a condition exists, why is it that only one member of the committee has spoken for the bill?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do not know that it is so, but I apprehend that the committee has spoken so much and so well that they decided to let somebody else have a chance.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. No; I do not yield. Here is what the Supreme Court said in the *Hirsch* case:

Congress has stated the unquestionable embarrassment of Government and danger to the public health in the existing conditions of things. The space in Washington is necessarily monopolized in comparatively few hands, and letting portions of it is as much a business as any other. Housing is a necessary of life. All of the elements of the public interest justifying some degree of public control are present.

That is what the court said. The committee held extensive hearings. A reading of those hearings will disclose that those conditions there set forth in that able opinion still exist. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] knows that monopolistic practices exist. He has tried in his own way to remedy them. The hearings will disclose, and the confidential report by the officers from the Senate committee will disclose, that property costing about \$230,000 inflated in value to over \$850,000, with a mortgage loan up to \$650,000 and a foreclosure under it at about \$315,000. That is a typical case showing the monopolistic practices. The hearings will show—page 221—that if this law is not continued it will result in increasing the rent of those paying \$50 a month or less. About 25 per cent of these renters will have their rent increased if we do not act. I quote from the testimony of Mr. Bowie to substantiate that fact:

Mr. STALKER. Do you think the rent will be raised if we discontinue this Rent Commission?

Mr. BOWIE. Some rents will, Mr. STALKER. I do not think there will be a general increase of rents. I think you can count pretty certainly on the rent in the Meridian Mansions being raised. I know that you can count on the rent being raised in the Lamont Apartment House, and there are probably going to be others.

Mr. STALKER. I prefer to talk about those under \$50. We will take the houses, \$35, \$30, and \$40; will they be raised, in your opinion?

Mr. BOWIE. Not generally; no, sir.

Mr. STALKER. What percentage would you estimate?

Mr. BOWIE. Well, that would be—I think the percentage would be very small. I would be very much surprised if it were 25 per cent of an increase over the present rates.

Mr. STALKER. Do you mean 25 per cent of the rental?

Mr. BOWIE. No; I mean 25 per cent of the whole.

Mr. STALKER. Of the tenants?

Mr. BOWIE. Yes.

Mr. LAMPERT. Do you mean that if this act goes out the rent on properties from \$50 down will be raised 25 per cent?

Mr. BOWIE. No, no.

Mr. LAMPERT. What do you mean?

Mr. BOWIE. Mr. STALKER asked me how many rents would be raised, how many I thought would be raised. I told him I would be very much surprised if as many as 25 per cent of them would be raised.

Mr. LAMPERT. Of these individual cases?

Mr. BOWIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. STALKER. If more than that were raised, we will say, if from 30 to 50 per cent of them were raised, providing this commission were discontinued, do you think we would have made a grievous error and that we were derelict in our duty?

Mr. BOWIE. Yes. I think you would be if as many as 50 per cent of all the rents less than \$50 a month are increased, and I think if Congress finds that as many as 50 per cent of them are raised you should as soon as possible pass another rent law restricting, however, the activities of the commission to properties renting for less than \$50 per month. I do not believe these other properties renting for more than \$50 a month should be restricted when it is apparent from the proponents of the bill that no emergency exists as to those properties.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made here that while a shortage did at one time exist, that there is no shortage in either apartments or houses to-day. That depends almost altogether on the price. There certainly is a shortage in the more modest and smaller homes. I know this—that prominent real estate operators have informed me that if they should cease building new homes there would be none of them unsold in the course of 80 to 90 days.

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

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I can not yield. The Chastleton case decided by the Supreme Court on April 21 has been much referred to. All the court did was to remand the case back to the trial court to take evidence to see whether the exigency which once existed still existed. The court took judicial notice of the fact that the Government had to an extent decreased its number of employees. The owners of the Chastleton submitted an affidavit setting up the fact that there had been a great increase in the number of apartments and houses since the act was originally passed, and that there was now no shortage warranting a continuance of the act. The Supreme Court sent the case back because the trial court had not gone into the facts. There can be no question but what the law will be sustained as to the Chastleton providing the court below considers the question and the Rent Commission or some other party appears representing the public and presents the true facts in reference to conditions existing when the last extension act was passed. I quote from the opinion:

In our opinion it is open to inquire whether the exigency still existed upon which the continued operation of the law depended.

It is material to know the condition of Washington at different dates in the past. Obviously the facts should be accurately ascertained and carefully weighed, and this can be done more conveniently in the Supreme Court of the District than here.

A committee of Congress ascertained the facts upon which Congress acted in passing the last extension act. A committee of Congress has conducted extensive hearings pertaining to the advisability of a further extension. They report to us that this emergency condition still exists to a very considerable extent. Now, then, if Congress relying upon this should pass this bill it would then be the duty of the court in the event of litigation testing its constitutionality to inquire into the facts and find out whether those conditions still continue. The court might find that there was no reasonable basis upon

which Congress acted, but if it found that Congress acted upon any reasonable basis at all it would have to sustain the extension, as I understand the law.

I hope that we will bear in mind the people who have been burdened by excessive rent rates in the District of Columbia, and continue this law for a period of two years more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the substitute that has been offered.

Mr. JOST. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jost: Page 1, line 10 of the amendment, after the word "it," strike out the remainder of the amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful for any corporation, firm, or individual owning, managing, or controlling premises devoted to dwelling purposes and offered for rental or rented to others for such purpose within the District of Columbia after the passage of this act to charge or exact therefor, either directly or indirectly, by any means, method, or device whatsoever, for and during the period for which the same is proposed to be or is rented, a rental in excess of an amount which, calculated on the basis of 12 consecutive months, will produce and yield the owner 12 per cent annually on the assessed value of said property for the purpose of taxation.

"Sec. 2. When such premises consist of two or more apartments or separate dwelling quarters, the amount of the rental therefor may be distributed at the discretion of the owner, and the amount of rental charged or exacted for any one such part or portion shall be such that when considered and taken with the total derived by way of rental from the whole of such premises as to not yield the owner thereof an amount in the aggregate annually exceeding that specified in section 1 hereof.

"Sec. 3. Any corporation, firm, or individual violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 or by imprisonment not to exceed six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"Sec. 4. This act shall be effective from and after the date of its passage and for a period expiring May 22, 1926."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane. This resolution that is before us is for the purpose of extending a law already in existence. The gentleman's substitute is the passage of a new law, and makes no reference whatsoever to the present law, which is before the House.

Mr. RAKER. It is also on a different subject.

Mr. BEGG. It is on a different subject entirely. I call the attention of the Chair further to the paragraph on page 2 of the rule adopted this morning, beginning with line 19:

At the conclusion of the general debate the substitute shall be considered under the five-minute rule, and during that consideration it shall be in order to offer an amendment to the substitute providing for the reduction of the number of commissioners provided for in said bill.

I make that as an added point of order, that this substitute would be out of order even though it were germane. I make the point of order that it is not germane to the bill that is being considered, which is the substitute now before the House—not the Lampert bill. The thing that is before the Committee of the Whole is the substitute amendment providing for the extension of the Ball Rent Act for two years. I make those two points of order.

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

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. In the early part of this discussion it was expressly stated that an amendment to limit it to the extension of one year would be in order, and in section 2, on page 2, it reads:

That Title II of the food control and District of Columbia rent act, as amended, is reenacted—

And that implies that we can amend it in any direction we see fit.

Mr. BEGG. I make the point of order that the rule prohibits that.

Mr. MADDEN. No. The rule says that at the conclusion of the general debate the substitute shall be considered under the five-minute rule, and during that consideration it shall be in order to offer an amendment to the substitute. It does not say you shall not offer any other amendment.

Mr. BEGG. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, if it is open to all kinds of amendment it would not have been necessary for the Committee on Rules to submit a specific amendment; and by the insertion of that provision as to a specific

amendment I interpret the section of the rule adopted as prohibiting any other amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman's interpretation is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair make a suggestion to the gentleman from Ohio that may bring the matter to a little closer issue, and that is that where it is proposed to reenact a specific law and a resolution is introduced for the purpose of extending the provisions of that act, is it in order then as an amendment to such an act to make provisions that amend the original act? That is the question that the Chair wants to hear about.

Mr. BEGG. I want to say to the Chair, if he pleases, that in the absence of a specific rule, yes. But we are operating to-day under a specific rule which specifically lays down the order of procedure, and that rule is what? It is that at the end of two hours' debate the substitute resolution which we have before us shall be considered under the 5-minute rule, namely, shall be read paragraph after paragraph, and debate had thereon. And then what does the rule do?

The rule goes on one step further than the ordinary procedure of the committee, and it says that during consideration at any time it shall be in order to offer a specific amendment cutting down the membership of the commission from 5 to 3. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the only interpretation that can be placed upon that paragraph is that the Committee on Rules by so doing eliminated all other amendments that could be offered.

Mr. KUNZ and Mr. JOST rose.

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

Mr. BEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KUNZ. If the gentleman will read down further, he will find—

Mr. BEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] and then he will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kunz].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to call the attention of the Chair specifically to the next paragraph in the rule, the one following that which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] read, and which he appears to have overlooked. It reads as follows:

At the hour of 4 o'clock, if the consideration of the substitute shall not have been sooner completed, the committee shall vote upon the substitute as amended, if any amendments have been adopted—

And I call attention to the fact that the word there is "amendments," plural, meaning more than one amendment. Then it proceeds further:

And immediately upon the conclusion of that vote the committee shall automatically rise and report the bill and any amendments.

So that at 4 o'clock we are to vote upon any other amendments adopted. Of course, a single amendment, as the only one to be offered, would not be sufficient to cover the language of the rule in that paragraph which refers to several amendments as having possibly been adopted during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If the Chair will permit, I still maintain that there is no ambiguity in the language of the paragraph to which the gentleman from Illinois refers. There might be a little careless use of the English, but no ambiguity. The rule provides specifically that an amendment is in order, and if the House refuses all amendments, then what would the committee do but report back with any amendment or amendments? But if they adopt one amendment, then they have complied with the requirements of the paragraph to which the attention of the Chair has been invited.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then, if the Chair pleases, I will proceed a little further. In the same paragraph you will find this language:

And immediately upon the conclusion of that vote the committee shall automatically rise and report the bill and any amendments, or the substitute and any amendments.

What does that mean? It means the original bill and amendments thereto. It means the substitute to the original bill and amendments thereto, "and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments for final passage." So that the language of this paragraph clearly shows what I maintain.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentlemen on the committee, Mr. Jost and Mr. Kunz,

are entitled to recognition. These other gentlemen are not on the committee, and yet here are these members of the committee vainly asking for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates, of course, that this discourse is for the enlightenment of the Chair.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing else to add.

Mr. BEGG. Let me add one word to what the gentleman has said, and then I shall be through. Now, to satisfy the word "amendments" in the last paragraph, it is in order under the rule to cut down by amendment the number of members on the commission from five to three, and that amendment is subject to another amendment, because otherwise you can not comply with the technical interpretation of the last paragraph.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state that on account of the peculiar language of this rule we must rise at 4 o'clock. Therefore, I wish gentlemen would abbreviate their remarks as much as possible.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I shall. But I leave it to any Member of the House who was here during the discussion of the rule whether the statement was not made either by the chairman of the committee or by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] that if the rule were adopted it would not preclude the offering and acceptance of amendments on the part of the committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the action of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], in shutting off all debate on this bill, necessitated the bringing in of a rule by the Committee on Rules in order that it might be considered at all. He is using the same tactics now in trying to prevent the amendment of a bill which ought to be amended.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it will not be necessary for the gentleman from Missouri to discuss this matter, because the Chair is ready to rule. This rule provides that it shall be in order at any time to-day to offer the Lampert substitute as a substitute for the text of the bill. This substitute, in effect, reenacts the present rent act of the District of Columbia.

You will observe the rule says:

It shall be in order at any time.

We might have read several sections of the original bill before this amendment was offered as a substitute, but we chose to go at it the other way. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT] offered his amendment and it was at once up for consideration.

Now, what else does the rule provide? That there shall be two hours general debate on the substitute. For the purposes of this argument the Chair considers that the several sections of the substitute constitute one amendment; that that amendment does not need to be read section by section under this rule because it is considered as one amendment. But it is subject to amendment.

The resolution then provides:

At the conclusion of the general debate the substitute shall be considered under the five-minute rule.

What does that mean? It means the substitute is subject to amendment, any proper amendment and any germane amendment.

The succeeding language, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], leads the Chair to the conclusion that any proper amendment can be made to this original substitute.

Now, then, the only remaining proposition is whether the amendment as offered is a proper amendment to the pending substitute. Chairman BURTON, in Committee of the Whole House on October 18, 1921, held that:

To a bill extending the operation of a certain act, an amendment excepting a certain portion of the act to be extended is germane.

In other words, that on a proposition which has to do with the reenactment or the prolongation of a pending act an amendment can be offered which amends the language of the original act. This amendment is germane to provisions of the present rent act. Aside from that, the Lampert substitute does more than to merely extend the provisions of the present law. It declares the continued existence of an emergency in the District of Columbia. There might be some doubt on the subject if this amendment did nothing but extend a certain act, but it does more than that. That being true, the Chair thinks the gentleman's amendment germane and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri an amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will let the gentleman from Missouri answer that.

Mr. JOST. Yes; it is a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a difference between the proposition of offering a substitute for the bill and a substitute for the amendment. The Chair takes it the gentleman from Missouri is offering a substitute for the pending substitute?

Mr. JOST. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That the gentleman is offering an amendment to the pending substitute in the nature of a substitute. That being true, a vote would first be taken on the gentleman's amendment to the substitute.

Mr. JOST. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman offers his amendment as a substitute for the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, then the approval of the gentleman's substitute would entirely overcome the substitute of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote would first be on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri; if that prevailed or if it failed there would then be a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. If it prevailed, then the vote would be on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin as modified.

The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jost].

Mr. JOST. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if the House really wants to control rents, if that is what you are after and you want to control rents in a legal, orderly way, this substitute will do it. If you really want a commission and want to continue an intermeddling governmental agency into private affairs, you ought not to vote for this substitute but you should vote for the original bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOST. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to know whether the gentleman's amendment limits the amount of rent that can be collected to 12 per cent gross of the value?

Mr. JOST. Yes; on the assessed value, for the purpose of taxation. So by that method we get them going and coming. If the owner raises the rent he will have to raise the value of his property for taxation.

Now, gentlemen, this is on the theory of the usury laws, the same kind of legal logic and principle that limits the interest charge for the loaning of money, and it has the merit of regulating the property—if you want to impress it with a public use—in the hands of the owner and letting him handle it and renting it to whomsoever he pleases without the intermeddling coercion of a Government bureau. I am striking at the governmental inquisitors and inspectors who stand at the elbow of a man with respect to everything he does in this country to-day. There is no longer any free labor, and business is no longer free in this Nation; it is all licensed, supervised, and controlled by the Government. You can not do a thing nowadays without having some Government agent or Government board at your elbow looking over your shoulder, and accounting to them at the end of the transaction as to what you did, how you did it, and what you can do again about it. I am striking at that kind of evil in this Government, and I am wondering if there is a disposition on the part of this House to continue to augment and increase bureaucracy in this Nation or whether there is to be free labor and free business under general law. That is the whole question you are here to answer.

I claim that if you really want to regulate rents, this will do it. If you want bureaus and an army of administrators to meddle in business, then you ought to be against my substitute.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why not have both?

Mr. JOST. Why do you want a multiplicity of government?

Mr. WEFALD. Who is going to enforce it?

Mr. JOST. How do you enforce any criminal law? Why do you not have a certificate of insurance from the Government behind every personal endeavor, if you want that kind of government.

Let me tell you something about the figure of 12 per cent in the substitute. The building department advises me that 5 per cent is required to maintain and bear the upkeep of

rental property in Washington. That is the rule out our way as developed by testimony in condemnation proceedings. So that 5 per cent of this return is needed to maintain the property and the owner really gets a 7 per cent return upon his investment, and the investment is measured by the value at which the property is assessed for purposes of taxation. I have a measure that will protect the Government, protect the owner of the property, and not allow tenants to take charge of a man's property under the coercion of the Government. I am pleading here for a return to business sanity in Washington, the seat of government. It will be a good example for the Nation. This is a good place to lose one commission. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition, as a member of the committee, to offer an amendment.

Mr. RAKER. I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. McKEOWN. I rise to offer a substitute for the pending substitute.

Mr. BLANTON. I rise to offer an amendment to the original Lampert substitute.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Would it be in order to move an amendment or a substitute to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to strike out that portion of his amendment wherein he attempts to strike out the substitute that is embodied in the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks that would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition to offer a proper amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is the ranking member of the committee, and the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer, as an amendment to the Lampert substitute, the amendment which is on the Clerk's desk as Title II to the Lampert substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON offers the following amendment to the Lampert amendment:

At the end of the Lampert amendment insert:

"TITLE II"

"It shall be unlawful for any corporation, firm, or individual to enter into or to become a party to any contract, agreement, or understanding, or in any manner whatsoever to confederate, combine, and act with another or others for the purpose and with the design of lessening or preventing or tending to lessen or prevent full and free competition in the renting of real estate or to fix rents within the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 2. Any corporation, firm, or individual convicted of violating the provisions of this act shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment not less than 30 days nor more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I have an amendment to this resolution already pending. Now the gentleman undertakes to offer another substitute that conflicts with the present substitute that is pending, and the gentleman does not offer it as a substitute to the pending amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, if there is any question in the Chair's mind, I think I can help him so far as the parliamentary procedure is concerned. The so-called substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is the original amendment. Its text can be perfected by amendments. There is also a substitute offered for it, and that substitute can also be perfected.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is what I was inquiring about a while ago. I wanted to offer an amendment to the substitute by striking out certain things in it.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order pending. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order—

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order if they are going to accept the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. On the perfecting amendment?

Mr. RAKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is entitled to recognition.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment, but I just wanted five minutes to say a word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened with much interest to this debate on the constitutional and legal features involved, and I want to say that if you will read this decision of the Supreme Court—the Chastleton Corporation and Felix Lake and Clark H. Hahn, appellants, against A. Leftwich Sinclair and others, decided April 21, 1924—you will find the court says:

A law depending upon the existence of an emergency or other certain state of facts to uphold it may cease to operate if the emergency ceases or the facts change, even though valid when passed (citing cases).

This is just a declaration as to what might be. The court proceeds to state:

In our opinion, it is open to inquire whether the exigency still existed upon which the continued operation of the law depended. * * * Without going beyond the limits of judicial knowledge, we can say, at least, that the plaintiff's allegation can not be declared offhand to be unmaintainable, and that it is not impossible that a full development of the facts will show them to be true. In that case the operation of the statute would be at an end.

We need not inquire how far this court might go in deciding the question for itself, on the principles explained in *Prentiss v. Atlantic Coast Line Co.* (211 U. S. 210, 227, cases cited). * * * These cases show that the court may ascertain as it sees fit any fact that is merely a ground for laying down a rule of law, and if the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate.

Now, what does the court say in concluding its opinion? It says we will not take that. It is not fair, it is not right. Look at every other case decided by the court. When the court thinks there must be a new trial, when the evidence is unsatisfactory, the case is reversed and remanded. If the act was unconstitutional, the court would have said so and would not have remanded the case for further proceedings, as it did. What does the court say? Here it is and it is the final word as to what should be done in this case:

Here, however, it is material to know the conditions of Washington at different dates in the past.

Obviously the facts should be accurately ascertained and carefully weighed, and this can be done more conveniently in the Supreme Court of the District than here. The evidence should be preserved, so that if necessary it can be considered by this court.

The Supreme Court has said nothing on earth except the fact that there is not sufficient evidence before the court to determine that the exigency now exists. No one can read this decision without seeing that it is sent back to the court for a new trial. In addition to that it tells the court to find the facts upon which the emergency exists. When it goes back to the lower court the lower court will take evidence from all sides and make its finding whether or not these facts exist which will constitute an exigency which will justify the court to pronounce judgment. If the lower courts say that the facts do exist the Supreme Court will be bound by those facts irrespective of conflicting evidence and determine that the act is in force by reason of such exigency as contemplated by the acts in question. It has already determined that the act is constitutional, it has already said that Congress has the power to pass the act, but the question involved is whether or not the exigency exists at the present time, and it has sent the case back to the court to determine that fact. This act, as provided by the rule, should pass. All the facts surrounding this controversy demonstrate the wisdom of favorable action by Congress.

Mr. KUNZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. No; I can not yield to the gentleman from Illinois. I have not got the time. You are too late, my friend.

Mr. KUNZ. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the amendment.

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Jost amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition some time against the Jost amendment, and I believe there has been no opposition to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts is that all debate on the Jost amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to that; I move to amend by making it 20 minutes. This is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to amend the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts by making it 20 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute that the debate close now.

Mr. BEGG. That is not a substitute.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the Chair to state a moment ago that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was an amendment to the Jost amendment. I understood it was an amendment to the Lampert amendment and was accepted by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that the present amendment was offered as an amendment to the Lampert substitute. The Chair was under the impression that it was an amendment to the Jost amendment, but he is now corrected.

Mr. LEHLBACH. And if a vote was taken on closing debate, they can still debate the Blanton amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Is not the parliamentary situation that the Blanton amendment is pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The matter pending is the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] to close debate on the Jost amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Is not the Blanton amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The Blanton amendment is pending.

Mr. RAKER. And it has been accepted by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] to close the debate in 20 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McKEOWN) there were 69 ayes and 7 noes.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma as amended by the substitute.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the original motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts as amended.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on the Jost amendment is now closed.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the vote to be taken now on the Jost amendment or later?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it should be taken at this time.

Mr. RAKER. That is a substitute. There is an amendment pending to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. Are we not entitled to have a vote upon that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds on close inspection that the Jost amendment is not a substitute. The Chair at first blushed thought it was, but on looking at it the Chair observed this peculiarity about the motion: It does not strike out all of the Lampert substitute, but says "after the word 'it' insert the following language." In other words, the amendment does not cut out the first two words of the Lampert substitute, and although that is extremely technical, yet at the same time it makes the Jost amendment a perfecting amendment.

Mr. JOST. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct the amendment so that it will read to strike out all of the Lampert amendment after the word "it."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to correct his original amendment by striking out the words "that it" and inserting them in the substitute and having his amendment considered as a substitute for the original measure. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The passage of the Jost amendment does away with the Lampert amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That kills the Lampert amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The passage of the Jost amendment simply amends the original proposition.

Mr. JOST. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the passage of this amendment now as it has been corrected eliminate the Lampert amendment entirely?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all. It simply operates as an amendment of it, and then the question will arise on the Lampert amendment as amended.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jost] inquired of the Chair the effect of his substitute. If the gentleman's substitute is approved by this committee, it takes the place entirely of the Lampert amendment, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair ought not to be called upon to pass upon the legal effect of it, but as a matter of parliamentary law when it is adopted it is simply adopted as an amendment and then a vote will come upon the original amendment. Of course, it is true that if it is adopted by the committee finally it takes the place of the original proposition.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What becomes of the point of order that the gentleman from Ohio made that this is not a substitute, which point of order was overruled, and then the Chair now comes in and admits he made a mistake and lets it come in?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will bear in mind that since the ruling was made there has been a unanimous-consent request preferred, which has been granted, and which changes the parliamentary situation.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Ohio did not care to object to the unanimous-consent request if the Chair was going to hold that even though the point of order was good an hour ago, the Chair was willing to rectify it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in no such position. The parliamentary situation has entirely changed. The Chair thinks his original decision was correct.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, there is some confusion, even in the mind of the gentleman from Missouri. The gentleman from Missouri intended to offer his amendment as a complete substitute for the entire Lampert proposition. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not do so, but since that time the committee has given him unanimous consent to do so and it now stands as a substitute.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, if this substitute is adopted, then it does do away with the Lampert proposition?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the Lampert substitute and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. UNDERHILL. And that shuts out all amendments?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; you can offer as many amendments as you desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves that all debate upon the Lampert amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to that motion. I move that all debate close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 61, noes 5.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, is my amendment reducing the number of commissioners now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the vote should be taken on the pending amendment. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas as a perfecting amendment to the Lampert amendment.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on the Blanton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to discuss the merits particularly, but to call the attention of the supporters of this legislation to the possible effect of accepting the Blanton amendment. This legislation is predicated upon the proposition—

That it is hereby declared that the emergency described in Title II of the food control and District rents act still exists and continues in the District of Columbia.

That emergency was described in that act shortly after the close of the war and arose from the war, and you are now proposing to extend the remedy which was at that time thought proper. If you now amend that by adding to it a new title, giving a remedy against a conspiracy among real estate operators that may now exist, you are undermining the very premise that is indispensable if you are to have successful legislation.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the so-called Blanton amendment do now close.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that motion by having it close in 23 minutes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. They are trying to cut out the real amendment to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that all debate upon the Blanton amendment do now close. As an amendment to that the gentleman from Ohio moves that it close in 23 minutes. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion as amended will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment, which is in the hands of the Clerk.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Would it not be more orderly practice to dispose of the pending amendments before accepting a new amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggested that, but many gentlemen are asking for recognition and attempting to offer amendments. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is out of order at this time. There is a perfecting amendment pending. Is the gentleman's amendment an amendment to the substitute?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman can offer it.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is to strike out "12 per cent" and insert "8 per cent net."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is already a substitute pending, and an amendment to the substitute, and this would be an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is in error. There is a perfecting amendment pending to the amendment, and a substitute, and a perfecting amendment to the substitute. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma to the Jost substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McKeown to the substitute offered by Mr. Jost: In the Jost substitute strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eight," and after the word "cent" insert the word "net," so that the line will read, "will produce and yield the owner 8 per cent annually."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is—

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the debate is closed on the Jost amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I rise in opposition to the Blanton amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the debate on the Blanton amendment has been exhausted, there having been five minutes' debate for and five minutes' debate against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

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

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

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

SEVERAL MEMBERS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. RAKER. I am going to insist upon it, too. A man has no right to sit in his seat and cry "I object" or "A point of order." He should be obliged to rise.

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

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 26, noes 59. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is in the hands of the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a perfecting amendment to the substitute?

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is a substitute to the Lampert amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very important amendment. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-six Members are present—a quorum. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UNDERHILL: At the end of the Lampert amendment insert: "The number of commissioners shall be reduced from five to three, one of whom shall be an attorney, and all of them shall devote their entire time to the duties of the office."

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, it is rather amusing to see the tactics adopted by some of the Members of the House and to recall how indignant those same gentlemen were two weeks ago when similar tactics were used by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. If ever a filibuster was justified, it was then.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment. I make a point of order.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Here is an amendment that will reduce the number of commissioners from five to three. The testimony shows that they are having one or two cases a day coming before them. My amendment also provides that they shall give their whole time to considering these measures of great importance for the salaries they receive, and it seems to me the amendment ought to be adopted, not only for the purpose of saving money but for the purpose of saving the time of the commission and of the people in the District. They pay \$5,000 a year to each of the five commissioners. This will save \$10,000 a year, and you will get just as much service and value and return as if you expended the other \$10,000. And besides that there will be a lot of expense accounts that will be wiped out. I hope the amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be in the third degree. There are now four propositions before the committee.

Mr. BEGG. I offer a substitute to the Underhill amendment, and I submit that that is not in the fourth or even the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment, a substitute to the amendment, an amendment to the substitute, and an amendment to the original amendment now pending.

Mr. BEGG. If the Chair will indulge me, I will submit to the Chair that I am offering an amendment to the Underhill amendment. It is not offered as a substitute or anything of the kind. Technically all that the Underhill amendment can be considered is an amendment offered for the information of the House. I am offering an amendment to cut that down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to offer a perfecting amendment to the Lampert amendment. No objection was made nor was any point of order interposed. That is the situation as the Chair understands it.

Mr. BEGG. I beg the Chair's pardon, and I certainly think that a clear consideration of the proposition would compel the Chair to reverse his holding on that.

The CHAIRMAN. If a point of order had been made the Chair thinks he might have sustained it, but it was not made.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the Chair please, the rule makes the Underhill amendment in order.

Mr. BEGG. Not as a substitute, but as a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It was offered in the other way, and the gentleman from Massachusetts offered it in that way. Now, the Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether he is wrong about that.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I offered an amendment to add a new section at the end of the Lampert amendment reducing the number of commissioners from five to three.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] offer an amendment to the Underhill amendment?

Mr. BEGG. Yes. The amendment is to strike out the word "three" in the Underhill amendment and insert "six."

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be in order.

Mr. BEGG. Will the Chair please advise the gentleman from Ohio what the Underhill amendment is? I thought it was to cut down the number of commissioners from five to three, but I may be in error.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman would now offer an amendment to the Underhill amendment, that would be offering an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. BEGG. Then I offer a substitute for the Underhill amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has offered an amendment to the Lampert amendment and that is now pending.

Mr. BEGG. I offer a substitute for the Underhill amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. That under the rules of the House a member of a committee is entitled to be recognized to debate an amendment which is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The matter of recognition is entirely in the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask recognition against the Underhill amendment.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the Underhill amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that is in order at this time. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. What we ought to do in this case is to vote down the Underhill amendment because the Rent Commission has never done anybody any good. These profiteers have been fleecing the people in spite of the Rent Commission.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield now.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I agree with the gentleman that it would be a good idea to abolish it.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; we ought to follow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] in his suggestion that we do away with this thing and let it die a natural death on May 22.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. What we ought to do is to vote down this Underhill amendment and vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JOST] and then vote down the Lampert amendment and then vote down the bill. Then we would get the matter where the people of the District of Columbia would get some benefit from it, for we would do away with a war bureau and get back to supply and demand.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's speech. He rose in opposition to the amendment, and he is now speaking for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am coming back on this side now to suggest what I suggested to the other side. This whole business ought to be defeated. We ought to stop this foolishness and get back to normalcy. It is six years after the war; let us defeat the Underhill amendment, let us vote down every one of the balance of the propositions, and let this Rent Commission die a natural death. It has never benefited the people one dollar. The rents are high now because, in my judgment, we have this institution, and they are higher, in my judgment, than if we did not have it. If you will let this Rent Commission expire in less than six months rents will automatically decrease 25 per cent. That is my honest judgment. [Hisses in the gallery.] You people in the gallery are there by the graciousness of this House, and if you can not behave I am going to ask that you be removed.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Members of this House have a right to address the committee without interruptions from the gallery.

The CHAIRMAN. The Doorkeeper will please see that order is kept in the galleries, and if there is any more disorder the persons committing it will be removed.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I object.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Begg], whom he promised to recognize.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, the English people have not hesitated since the war has been over to enact legislation to care for the people who were without homes and without housing facilities. Australia has not neglected to take care of her housing situation. They did not need any war emergency; neither does the Congress of the United States need any war emergency to enact rent legislation in the District of Columbia, a place where legislative control is placed with the Congress of the United States; but we should provide some sane rent legislation.

The English laws provide a standard rate of rent. This standard rent is the amount of money that was received per month for the house, room, or apartment on the day war was declared, and if it was not rented on that day, the day it was rented nearest to that time. What ought to be the standard rent in the District of Columbia? It would be the rent received for a house, a room, or an apartment on the 5th day of April, 1917.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I can not yield just now. I regret I can not yield to the gentleman.

France for years before the war made provision for housing her laboring people. There is no more serious problem before the American people to-day than the question of homes. [Applause.] I will say that upon the home is based the Nation's life and its ultimate prosperity. [Applause.] If you destroy the home, you destroy the Nation. The law of England provides that if a house is built since war was declared the standard rent will be a rental which in 12 months shall return an income not to exceed 15 per cent upon the amount invested, and it must be the true and real amount invested.

This is what you ought to do in the District of Columbia. You should extend this law until you can frame a real law and put it in effect in this District. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, consider for a moment the proposition of fixing a standard rental. You talk about constitutional law. You can draw a bill that will be constitutional and will be just to the landowner as well as to the tenant. I dislike any law that will give one man an advantage over another or one set of men an advantage over another set of men.

Gentlemen say that the war is over. Yes; the war is over, but I will tell you now that those of us who sat here in this House at that time saw the wives of soldiers who were fighting at the front crowded in little, old, attic rooms at outrageous prices. We who sat here then saw the men who were fighting for this country charged unreasonable rates of rent, outrageous rents, under the shadow of the Capitol, and I will say that so far as I am concerned the war has just started against such shameless conduct. [Applause.] The hostilities between the American people and the German nation are over, but the war as to profiteers in the United States is not over. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think perhaps I can say all I want to say in less than five minutes, and I would like to have the attention of the committee just for one statement. Two years ago this body in solemn deliberation increased the Rent Commission from three members to five. Do we now want to burlesque our activities and our actions by cutting it down to three? The law either should be repealed by killing this amendment or else it should be enacted and put in such condition that it can function. Those of us who were here two years ago and voted to increase the number to five, certainly would be inconsistent and unreasonable if, perchance, we were to vote for this amendment cutting it down to three.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why can not three function? I am for your proposition, but why can not three function?

Mr. BEGG. I will ask the gentleman if he did not vote two years ago to make it five?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I was not here two years ago.

Mr. BEGG. I can answer the question, and it is a legitimate question. The reason that three can not function as well as five is because the law permits an individual commissioner to hear a case as a court of itself, and the complaints that have been presented to the court for adjudication have been so numerous that three people were not physically able to handle the work, and five is reasonable, and all the money that would be saved—

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Let me finish this statement, and then I will yield.

And all the money that would be saved under this proposition would be \$10,000.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the commission is about 600 cases behind now, and that each member of the commission has been working to get current?

Mr. BEGG. Yes; the commission is already behind more than 600 cases, and you will only put them further behind by decreasing the number of commissioners.

Mr. WEFALD. The amendment is offered by an enemy to the bill, is it not?

Mr. BEGG. Yes; and I will submit to the committee that all amendments ought to be voted down and none of them passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Underhill].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The hour of 4 o'clock has arrived, and under the rule we must vote upon the Lampert substitute as it may have been amended prior to 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The hour of 4 o'clock has now arrived, but had not arrived at the time the Chair started talking.

The question is now, under the rule, on the Lampert substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 114 ayes and 25 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The amendment reducing the number of commissioners has failed?

The CHAIRMAN. It was not voted upon.

The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the committee will automatically rise.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7962) to create and establish a commission, as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and the hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, in pursuance of the language of House Resolution 270, the committee automatically rose; and he reported the bill to the House with an amendment for such action as the House might care to take upon it.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the reporters' notes will show that the committee took no vote whatever on the bill as amended by the Lampert substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has heard the report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and is governed thereby. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. JOST. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOST. Will a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to the committee be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. Not at this time. It will be in order after the bill has been ordered to be engrossed and read the third time.

Mr. JOST. I would like recognition at that time.

Mr. UNDERHILL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Does that include or exclude the Underhill amendment?

Mr. BEGG. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will answer that question when the motion comes to recommit. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were 129 ayes and 83 noes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground, and make the point, there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 64, answered "present" 1, not voting 122, as follows:

YEAS—245

Abernethy	Fisher	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Allen	Fitzgerald	Leavitt	Rouse
Aligood	Fleetwood	Lee, Ga.	Rubey
Almon	Foster	Lehlbach	Sabath
Arnold	Fear	Lilly	Sanders, N. Y.
Ayres	Freeman	Lathicum	Sanders, Tex.
Bacon	French	Little	Sandlin
Bankhead	Frothingham	Longworth	Schafer
Barbour	Fulbright	Lowrey	Schneider
Barkley	Fuller	Lozier	Scott
Beck	Fulmer	McFadden	Schallenberger
Beedy	Funk	McKeown	Sherwood
Beers	Garber	McLaughlin, Mich.	Simmons
Begg	Gardner, Ind.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinclair
Black, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	McReynolds	Sinnott
Boles	Garrett, Tex.	McSwain	Sites
Boz	Gasque	McSweeney	Smith
Brand, Ga.	Gibson	MacLafferty	Smithwick
Brand, Ohio	Goldsborough	Magee, N. Y.	Speaks
Briggs	Graham, Ill.	Major, Ill.	Stalker
Browne, Wis.	Greenwood	Major, Mo.	Stearns
Browning	Griest	Mapes	Stedman
Buchanan	Hammer	Martin	Stenge
Burness	Hardy	Mead	Stephens
Busby	Harrison	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Butler	Hastings	Miller, Wash.	Summers, Wash.
Byrnes, S. C.	Haugen	Minahan	Summers, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hawes	Montague	Swank
Cable	Hawley	Moore, Ohio	Swing
Campbell	Hayden	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Tenn.
Canfield	Hickey	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Cannon	Hill, Ala.	Morehead	Thatcher
Casey	Hill, Wash.	Morgan	Thomas, Okla.
Christopherson	Holaday	Morris	Thompson
Clague	Hooker	Murphy	Tilman
Clancy	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Timberlake
Cole, Iowa	Hudson	Newton, Minn.	Treadway
Collier	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Mo.	Underwood
Colton	Humphreys	Nolan	Valle
Connally, Tex.	Jacobstein	O'Connell, R. I.	Vincent, Mich.
Connery	James	O'Connor, La.	Vinson, Ga.
Cook	Jeffers	Oldfield	Voigt
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver, Ala.	Watkins
Cooper, Wis.	Johnson, Tex.	Park, Ga.	Weaver
Cramton	Johnson, W. Va.	Patterson	Wefald
Crisp	Jones	Phillips	White, Kans.
Croll	Keams	Purnell	White, Me.
Crosser	Kelly	Quin	Williams, Ill.
Cummings	Kendall	Razon	Williamson
Dallinger	Kent	Rainey	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Minn.	Kerr	Raker	Wilson, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	Ketcham	Ramsayer	Wingo
Dempsey	Kincheloe	Rankin	Wolf
Dickinson, Iowa	King	Rathbone	Woodruff
Dickinson, Mo.	Kopp	Rayburn	Woodrum
Dowell	Kvale	Reece	Wright
Drewry	LaGuardia	Reed, Ark.	Yates
Eagan	Lampert	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Evans, Mont.	Lanham	Richards	
Fairfield	Larson, Minn.	Roach	
Faust	Lazaro	Robison, Ky.	

NAYS—64

Ackerman	Garner, Tex.	McKenzie	Sanders, Ind.
Andrew	Gifford	Madden	Seger
Anthony	Gilbert	Mansfield	Sprout, Ill.
Aswell	Graham, Pa.	Merritt	Sprout, Kans.
Bixler	Hadley	Miller, Ill.	Strong, Pa.
Bland	Hersey	Milligan	Taylor, W. Va.
Blanton	Howard, Nebr.	Moore, Ga.	Tilson
Boyce	Hull, William E.	Moore, Ill.	Tucker
Browne, N. J.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morrow	Underhill
Brumm	Jost	Nelson, Me.	Vinson, Ky.
Chindblom	Kunz	O'Sullivan	Watres
Denison	Kurtz	Parker	Wertz
Driver	Lankford	Perkins	Williams, Mich.
Elliot	Larsen, Ga.	Pou	Williams, Tex.
Evans, Iowa	Luce	Rogers, N. H.	Winslow
Fenn	McDuffie	Salmon	Wyant

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tidings

NOT VOTING—122

Aldrich	Carter	Dickstein	Greene, Mass.
Anderson	Celler	Dominick	Griffin
Bacharach	Clark, Fla.	Doughton	Hill, Md.
Bell	Clarke, N. Y.	Doyle	Hoch
Berger	Drane	Dyer	Howard, Okla.
Black, N. Y.	Cole, Ohio.	Edmonds	Hudspeth
Bloom	Collins	Fairchild	Hull, Morton D.
Bowling	Connolly, Pa.	Favrot	Hull, Tenn.
Boylan	Crowther	Fredericks	Johnson, Wash.
Britten	Cullen	Free	Kahn
Buckley	Curry	Gallivan	Kless
Bulwinkle	Darrow	Geran	Kindred
Burdick	Davey	Glatfelter	Knutson
Burton	Deal	Green, Iowa	Langley
Carew			Leatherwood

Lindsay	O'Connell, N. Y.	Schall	Upshaw
Lineberger	O'Connor, N. Y.	Sears, Fla.	Vare
Logan	Oliver, N. Y.	Sears, Nebr.	Vestal
Lyon	Paige	Shreve	Wainwright
McClintic	Parks, Ark.	Snell	Ward, N. C.
McLeod	Peery	Snyder	Ward, N. Y.
McNulty	Perlman	Stevenson	Watson
MacGregor	Porter	Sullivan	Watson
Magee, Pa.	Prall	Sweet	Weller
Manlove	Quayle	Swoope	Welsh
Michaelson	Ransley	Taber	Winter
Mills	Reed, W. Va.	Tague	Wood
Mooney	Reid, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.	Wurzbach
Morin	Robinson, Iowa	Thomas, Ky.	Zihman
Mudd	Rogers, Mass.	Tincher	
O'Brien	Rosenbloom	Tinkham	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. O'Brien (for) with Mr. Watson (against).
 Mr. Gallivan (for) with Mr. Shreve (against).
 Mr. Kiess (for) with Mr. Johnson of Washington (against).
 Mr. Mudd (for) with Mr. Geran (against).
 Mr. Bloom (for) with Mr. Rogers of Massachusetts (against).
 Mr. Reid of Illinois (for) with Mr. Burton (against).
 Mr. Carew (for) with Mr. Taber (against).
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Bulwinkle (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Weller.
 Mr. McLeod with Mr. Tague.
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Doughton.
 Mr. Crowther with Mr. Cullen.
 Mr. Vane with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
 Mr. Watson with Mr. Sears of Florida.
 Mr. Darrow with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
 Mr. Free with Mr. Prall.
 Mr. Greene of Massachusetts with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. Hull, Morton D., with Mr. Cleary.
 Mr. Welsh with Mr. Black of New York.
 Mr. Vestal with Mr. Berger.
 Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
 Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
 Mr. Clarke of New York with Mr. Bowling.
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Kindred.
 Mr. Curry with Mr. McDuffie.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Perry.
 Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Davey.
 Mr. Fairchild with Mr. Boylan.
 Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Drane.
 Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Manlove with Mr. Corning.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Hudspeth.
 Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Ransley with Mr. McNulty.
 Mr. Winter with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Deal.
 Mr. Robinson of Iowa with Mr. Logan.
 Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Favrot.
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. Snell with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Hill of Maryland with Mr. Thomas of Kentucky.
 Mr. Snyder with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Hoch with Mr. Quayle.
 Mr. Sears of Nebraska with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Sweet with Mr. Lyon.
 Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Mooney.
 Mr. Burdick with Mr. Glatfelter.
 Mr. Swoope with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Kahn with Mr. Parks of Arkansas.
 Mr. Schall with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Oliver of New York.
 Mr. Anderson with Mr. McClintic.
 Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Upshaw.
 Mr. Dyer with Mr. Dominick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOST. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Jost) there were—ayes 53, noes 165.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Ten Members rising, not a sufficient number and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 194, noes 54.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BEGG, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. GALLIVAN, is unable to be present on account of sickness, and he has authorized me to say that if he were here, he would vote "yea" on the rent bill.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. BERGER, has been suddenly called back to Wisconsin and was unable to pair on the rent bill. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on the amendment as well as on the bill.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted to—Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania, for several days, on account of sickness.

Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa, for 10 days, on account of death in family.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, for one week, on account of Republican State convention in Tennessee.

Mr. FAVROT, for one week, on account of important business.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT, for two days, on account of important business.

Mr. BURDICK, for three days, on account of the meeting of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Md.

DEFERRING PAYMENT ON RECLAMATION CHARGES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report for printing under the rules on the bill S. 1631, to authorize the deferring of payment of reclamation charges.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the conference report.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1831. An act to loan to the College of William and Mary, in Virginia, two of the cannon surrendered by the British at Yorktown on October 19, 1781.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

An act (S. 3023) designating the State of New Mexico as a judicial district, fixing the time and place for holding terms of court therein, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record for three legislative days on the rent bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, made this afternoon on the rent bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RENT BILL

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in December last I decided that in matters of constitutional law my actions would be largely governed by the arguments made by the legal lights of the House, as I am not a member of the bar. I confess, however, that no Member of this body was ever more mystified than I have frequently been as I have listened to the various "schools of thought" here represented.

Heinz became famous because of his 57 varieties of pickles. If we keep up the record of the last few days, I anticipate that this House will have heard almost as many varieties of legal opinion as we have subjects for discussion and decision. Here we have to-day the very latest legal opinions of my friend BLANTON, of Abilene, Tex., and that other most likable fellow, TINCER, of Medicine Lodge, Kans., and each of these opinions is directly opposite to those of the distinguished BEGG, of

Ohio. How can an ordinary citizen reach a correct decision if he be compelled to accept all of these arguments at face value?

On the necessity for the continuance of the District of Columbia Rent Commission, I have decided to leave the constitutionality of the measure to the distinguished barristers of this body and seek the solution of the problem through the route of discovered facts, which facts, in my humble opinion, are sufficiently strong to prove the existence of an emergency. That being true, I can discover no reason why we should forthwith abolish the Rent Commission and open wide again the gates of profiteering in the domiciles of this great city.

The half million people residing in Washington, because of their lack of suffrage, are at the mercy of the exploiters unless we protect their interests. They may voice their protests against bad treatment at the hands of greedy landlords but that is as far as they can go. If their firesides are to be sustained, Congress alone can make it possible. They have a perfect right to call upon us for help in their time of need, for every Member of the House, in addition to representing some particular section of the country, is in honor bound to likewise and in as faithful manner represent the people of the District of Columbia. The House committee having the affairs of this District in charge, after a most thorough and painstaking investigation, has declared that renting conditions are still bad in this city, that they have improved somewhat since the Rent Commission was first established, but that to remove the "grip" which Congress has on the situation at this time would mean the immediate increasing of rents out of all proportions to necessity and place the thousands of tenants at the mercy of those who would prey upon the helpless. I shall support the committee and vote to continue the life of the Rent Commission for two more years, in the hope that in the meantime some way may be found by which landlords and tenants can adjust their differences without further resort to law.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to call the attention of the House to the further fact that 65,000 of the persons permanently residing in the city of Washington are employees of the Government and entitled to our special care and attention. Thousands of them accepted appointment years ago, before war conditions gave birth to wholesale profiteering, when the salaries offered them were sufficient to provide for their necessities. But times have greatly changed and the cost of living has soared to the very sky. To permit the additional burden of exorbitant rent we will simply be making it almost impossible for them to live in this city even though they desire to continue to serve the Government. You and I know what the result will be. Already we have been asked to raise the salaries of the thousands of employees of Uncle Sam who work in the District. Even now, with the Rent Commission functioning day and night, rents are so high that when one adds that to the tremendous food and clothing costs it is simply impossible to save enough to pay a doctor's bill or give your families a little bit of the pleasures of life. I have voted for increased salaries because I did not want the employees of my Government to starve while performing faithful public service, but, gentlemen, if we permit the rapacious landlords of this city to get another strangle hold on the rent payers it will be necessary to look for more money in order to grant further increases to our employees. That fact in itself ought to be sufficient cause for favorable action on the resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, when the rents of any city are so high and prohibitive that it becomes necessary for human beings to be herded like cattle under a single roof, those legislators who can prevent such a condition would, in my humble opinion, be guilty of a criminal offense did they not immediately act. There is something more than mere dollars and cents involved in this issue. If we are to keep the morals and health of this community up to anywhere near standard, we must make it impossible for a few greedy landlords to drive our people into congested places. Oh, I know somebody will cry socialism when we talk about this somewhat paternalistic plan, but I certainly shall not allow such argument to sway me from my purpose to help the thousands of American citizens residing in this city who would be absolutely at the mercy of real-estate "vultures" were we not to protect them.

Let those who are declaring that all emergency has passed away listen to this: Yesterday, while seated in a near-by barber shop, the barber asked me to help save his home. He told me that when he last went down to pay his rent the agent said, "You will have to pay more rent soon, as the rent law is going to be abolished by a man named BLANTON." From this conversation one is led to believe that already the bloodthirsty landlords are preparing for an expected "celebration." Gentlemen, there will be no show if my vote will prevent it; there will be

no celebration if I can stop it. If the landlords want my friendship, let them act like men and be fair with their tenants. Until that time I shall continue to urge and vote for the continuance of a rent commission for the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Speaker, on December 5 last I introduced House bill No. 23, to make the rents act of the District of Columbia permanent legislation. Subsequently I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee of the House District Committee to investigate the necessity for the continuance of rent legislation in the District. The committee held numerous hearings covering a period of over two weeks. I became convinced from the testimony taken that permanent legislation for the District is a necessity, and am still of that opinion. After careful consideration of the evidence the majority of the subcommittee finally agreed upon bill H. R. 7962, which was introduced by me on March 15 last. This bill extended the life of the rents act to August 1, 1925. Some slight amendments were made by the House District Committee, and the bill was reported to the House, accompanied by my majority report.

Opponents of the bill have criticized its length. Let me point out to you that the law as it exists to-day, with the two amendments, contains 112 paragraphs. Some of these contain repetitions. Alphabetical subdivisions have been added as amendments to sections of the original act. The bill reported contains 62 sections, and is comprised in only 78 paragraphs as against 112 paragraphs in the law at present. It is a codification of the three enactments. If enacted, it would have greatly simplified reference to it by section numbers instead of by alphabetical subdivisions of sections amending amendments to sections of the original act. Also, it would have made it entirely independent of the food control act, as in my opinion it should be. It clarifies and makes more definite and certain the provisions in the present law. It embodies only three important changes.

(1) It restored to the commission the jurisdiction given by the original act to determine the sufficiency and good faith of the landlord's 30 days' notice to quit.

(2) It provided for the filing of a notice of a lien in the office of the clerk of the Supreme Court of the District. This would be most beneficial. It would protect the claims of tenants against unscrupulous landlords and prevent the transfer of rental properties to dummies, to escape liability. This provision would have enabled tenants to collect from landlords residing outside the jurisdiction of the District courts. Furthermore, it would have been notice to all subsequent purchasers, mortgagees, and judgment creditors of a proceeding pending before the Rent Commission. It is no different in form or effect to the age-old mechanic's or material man's lien or the lien given contractors and subcontractors. For ages the law has given the landlord a tacit lien on the tenant's personal property. Why should not the tenant have a lien for his claim for excess in rent paid?

(3) A third provision empowered the commission to impose a fine on the landlord for his failure to furnish proper heat or other service. This fine was to be \$25 per day for each day the violation existed after 10 days' written notice. It would have been collectible by suit in the municipal court. The landlords know that if this became law they could no longer vent their spleen on tenants by cutting off light, heat, water, and other service as a penalty for application to the Rent Commission.

These provisions are the only material changes from the present law. They are really needed to protect tenants from vindictive landlords. They are needed to make the law efficient.

As soon as the bill was reported to the House with these beneficial additions to the present law a filibuster was inaugurated by a few Members of the House determined to kill it. The present law expires on May 22 next. They hoped that by paltry artifices they might prevent a vote until the law expired. They hoped and still hope to thwart the will of the House.

IMMEDIATE ACTION IS IMPERATIVELY NEEDED

There is no time for delay. It must not be tolerated. Little more than three weeks remain before the present law expires. The urgency and necessity for its continuation are so great that all further filibuster must be stopped. Though to be desired, lack of time will prevent the adoption of the reported bill. I urge you to forget it and to adopt the resolution introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, extending the present law for a further period of two years. The public health, morals, and welfare demand, and demand at once, the continuation of the present rents act. Do not adopt the amendment to extend for one year. How many tenants would dare during the last six months of that year to apply to the commission?

This is a landlord's amendment. They want to hold an ax—the expiration of the law—over the tenants' heads.

THERE SHOULD BE FIVE COMMISSIONERS

Vote down the amendment to reduce the commissioners from five to three. It is a landlord's amendment. They hope to cripple the commission, to hamper and delay its work. The original commission was organized with only three commissioners on January 28, 1920. In a little more than four years nearly 9,000 cases have come before the commission for determination. This means approximately 22,000 families in the District. On the Census Bureau's estimate of four and one-half persons to the family in Washington, the interests of more than 95,000 men, women, and children in the District have been protected by the commission.

By May, 1922, the date of the last extension, the number of cases had become too great for the three commissioners. Calendars were congested. Determinations were delayed for months. The last extension provided for the appointment of five commissioners, and last June President Harding appointed them. On July 1 last, when the new commission organized, there were 700 cases pending before the commission undetermined, and 400 refund cases brought by the commission in the municipal court. Since that time, in spite of the fact that new cases have been filed at an average rate of over 100 per month, the undetermined cases have been gradually reduced until on January 1, 1924, there were only 512 pending unheard. Cases before the commission differ from the ordinary cases in court, where hundreds of judgments are rendered by default or after a trial lasting 10 or 15 minutes. All cases determined by the commission must be heard. Evidence must be taken and the premises must be inspected. These hearings and inspections, however, are the least difficult of the tasks of the commissioners. The testimony must be carefully analyzed. The fair and reasonable value of the property must be determined. Allowance must be made for depreciation, for repairs, replacements, renewals, taxes, service, and many other expenses. Some of these items must be apportioned over a period of years, particularly repairs, replacements, and renewals. The separate rentals of the whole property must then be fixed by the commission. For instance, one apartment house may contain 300 apartments. The fair and reasonable rental of each apartment must be fixed and each must bear its fair share of the whole rental of the building. These details require a vast amount of calculation and careful thought and study.

In spite of the reduction in pending cases the commission is still approximately six months behind in its work. On account of cases pending it will require almost another full year before cases can be disposed of promptly as the law intended. The landlords want the commission reduced to three. Why? To hamper it, to delay it, to cripple it.

Under the present law a single commissioner can hear the testimony. With five commissioners four separate sessions can be held each day. With only three this would not be practicable. Five commissioners are necessary to make the commission function efficiently. Do not do this thing by halves. Do not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Be not deceived by these amendments. They are proposed by the landlords solely to destroy the effect of the law. Shelter is the most necessary of the necessities of life. If you permit this law to lapse, thousands of tenants who have applied to the commission for protection or relief will be ruthlessly, remorselessly thrown in the gutter to gratify the landlords' spite. Thousands within a month will be homeless. Thousands more, with their wives and little ones, must and will starve to pay the extortioner for a wretched shelter.

There is no time to lose. Forget my bill. Adopt the resolution. Extend the present law with five commissioners for two years more, and you will have the everlasting gratitude of tens of thousands of anxious, almost frenzied, tenants.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to meet during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 8869. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Veterans' Bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act," approved August 9, 1921, and to amend and modify the war risk insurance act, and to amend the vocational rehabilitation act; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8942. A bill to amend the packers and stockyards act, 1921, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BOX: Committee on Claims. S. 593. An act for the relief of the United Dredging Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FREDERICKS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Fred W. Stickney and H. A. Reynolds; without amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Edward S. Scheibe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK of New York: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5803. A bill for the relief of John A. Bingham; without amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7420. A bill for the relief of Albert E. Laxton; with an amendment (Rept. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 81. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Levington*; without amendment (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John P. Hopkins; with an amendment (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8888) granting a pension to Mary Pfaff; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7834) granting a pension to Albert B. Mosinsky; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8938) for the relief of certain officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 8939) to amend section 227 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 8940) to prevent the sale of cotton in future markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8941) to establish standard weights for loaves of bread in interstate commerce, to prevent deception in respect thereto, to prevent contamination thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 8942) to amend the packers and stockyards act, 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Resolution (H. Res. 273) declaring that it is the sense of the House that the problem of fixing a day for the final adjournment of the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, should be held in abeyance until the prime problem of the hour, legislation to relieve distress in agricultural zones, shall have been accomplished; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 8943) for the relief of the widow of Rudolph H. von Emdorf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 8944) granting a pension to Mary Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8945) granting a pension to George Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 8946) granting a pension to Ida E. Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROLL: A bill (H. R. 8947) granting a pension to Mary A. Klapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8948) granting a pension to Lydia A. Gossett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 8949) granting a pension to James Surridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8950) granting a pension to Henry J. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8951) granting a pension to Bluford E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 8952) granting a pension to Charles D. Forney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8953) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Croft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8954) granting a pension to Nancy Reedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8955) granting a pension to Louise Vourden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2556. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of commander general of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2557. By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of sundry citizens of Cape May and Cumberland Counties, N. J., protesting against the consideration of bills to amend the Volstead Act legalizing 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2558. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Presbytery of McAlester of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Hartshorne, Okla., indorsing House Joint Resolution 159; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2559. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of F. S. Carr Co. and others, of Boston, Mass., protesting against continuance of tax on telegrams and telephone messages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2560. By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, against House bill 7358; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2561. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Cando Welfare Club, Cando, N. Dak.; also of the Towner County Farm Bureau and the North Dakota Farm Bureau, protesting against increased rates on parcel-post and fourth-class mail matter for the purpose of increasing the salary of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.