Also, a bill (H. R. 12007) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. F. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 12008) for the relief of Ester I. Fismer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12009) granting a pension to Caroline Thie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12010) granting an increase of pension to Mary Igert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12011) granting an increase of pension to Livona E. Miner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 12012) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Scofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12013) granting an increase of pension to John Q. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12014) granting a pension to Karl H. Lange; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12015) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ferguson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12016) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Richmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12017) granting an increase of pension to Helen Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12018) granting a relinquishing title to certain lands in the State of Washington to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12019) granting an increase of pension to Lavina Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD of New York: A bill (H. R. 12020) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Henry C. Davis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 12021) authorizing payment of reward due Frank M. Snow for the arrest of J. K. Giles, alias John C. Laird; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 12022) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12023) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Holliday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12024) granting an increase of pension to Marah A. Pinkerton; 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:

3579. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of citizens of Michigan and Williams County, N. Dak., opposing compulsory Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3580. Also (by request), petition of Park Manor Congregational Church, Chicago, Ill., indorsing the Capper-Hull measures (S. 2532 and H. R. 7038); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3581. Also (by request), petition of Emilio Farisa, general organizer, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, asking for an investigation of the economic, social, and industrial conditions in Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

3582. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the Boston First Austrian-Hungarian Association, urging a revision of the Johnson immigration bill to take care of stranded immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3583. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of New York Chapter, Military Order of the World War, indorsing the bill for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3584. By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Petition of New York Chapter, Military Order of the World War, urging the passage of legislation respecting the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3585. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Cleveland Bar Association, indorsing House bills 7785 and 7786, for increase in salaries to all Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3586. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the New York Chapter, Military Order of the World War, favoring House bill 6484 and Senate bill 33, for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3587. Also, petition of New York Chapter, Military Order of the World War, irrevocably against the consideration of any attempt to recognize the Soviet Russia until such time as the government may be established and shall give unmistakable proof that its activities conform in general to the ideals of the United States and its Constitution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3588. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif., urging completion of the lower Sacramento River control works project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3589. Also, petition of Blanche A. Bellak, national chairman Gold Star Department of the American War Mothers, Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of House bill 9095, to incorporate the American War Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3590. Also, petition of Thomas Donlan, San Francisco, Calif.; G. M. Wilson, San Francisco; Rose Brennan, San Francisco; Mary A. Burns, San Francisco; Mabel Murray, Oakland; Louise Heaney, San Francisco; Mrs. Daisy Reiel, San Francisco; Annie M. McEnaney, San Francisco; Blanche G. Fletcher, San Francisco; Mrs. J. Sims, San Francisco; Frances L. Bludson, San Francisco; James Moore, Oakland, Calif., all urging support and passage of the Shreve bill (H. R. 8352); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3591. Also, petition of the Holmes Investment Co., San Francisco, Calif., and the West Hollywood Realty Board, Hollywood, Calif., protesting against the establishment of a rent commission in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3592. Also, petitions of Curt Teich & Co., of Chicago, Ill., and Pacific Novelty Co., of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against increased rates on souvenir post cards; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3593. Also, petitions of E. D. Wichels, of Vallejo, urging early consideration and passage of civil service retirement bill (S. 3011), and Katherine Goodwin, Mrs. M. Gimenes, and Mamie Logan, all of San Francisco, urging support of the Shreve bill (H. R. 8352); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3594. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of Dubuque Chapter of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, approving Senate bill 2532 and House bill 7036; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3595. Also, petition of Fairbank Tourist Club, favoring entrance of the United States in the World Court of International Justice on the basis of the Harding-Hughes reservations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3596. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of the Board of Commerce and Navigation of New Jersey, approving the rivers and harbors bill and urging its speedy enactment into law; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3597. By Mr. SITES: Petition of the general executive committee of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church in annual meeting, October 29, 1924, requesting a reconsideration of the Japanese exclusion section in the immigration act of 1924, with a view to elimination of race discrimination and to reestablishment of the bonds of friendship that will make possible cooperation in works of peace throughout the world; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

THURSDAY, *January 29, 1925*

(*Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1925*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11956. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909" approved February 9, 1909; and

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution authorizing the improvement of the system of overland communications on the Seward Peninsula, Alaska.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 703. An act making an adjustment of certain accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia;

S. 1179. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening, extension, widening, or straightening, in accordance with the highway plan of other streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 25. An act providing for a per capita payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota, from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 7064. An act to encourage commercial aviation and to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for air-mail service;

H. R. 8308. An act authorizing the Coast and Geodetic Survey to make seismological investigations, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to take action relative to adjustments in the rate structure of common carriers subject to the interstate commerce act, and the fixing of rates and charges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 51. An act for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Itasca*;

S. 1199. An act authorizing the appointment of William Schuyler Woodruff as an Infantry officer, United States Army;

S. 1665. An act to provide for the payment of one-half the cost of the construction of a bridge across the San Juan River, N. Mex.; and

S. 2148. An act to empower certain officers, agents, or employees of the Department of Agriculture to administer and take oaths, affirmations, and affidavits in certain cases, and for other purposes.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks the Clerk to read the following order, which was entered many years ago by the Senate.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, unless otherwise directed, on the 22d day of February in each year, or if that day shall be on Sunday, then on the day following, immediately after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address shall be read to the Senate by a Senator to be designated for the purpose by the Presiding Officer; and that thereafter the Senate will proceed with its ordinary business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with this order, which is still in force, the Chair designates the Senator from Arizona, Mr. ASHURST, to read the Farewell Address upon the 23d of February.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., submitted pursuant to law, to be substituted for the incomplete report heretofore submitted, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND DISTRIBUTED BY THE TREASURY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the number of documents in the Treasury Department received and distributed during the calendar year ended December 31, 1924, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1925, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Borah	Bursum	Caraway
Ball	Brookhart	Butler	Couzens
Bayard	Broussard	Cameron	Cummins
Bingham	Bruce	Capper	Curtis
Dale	Harris	Neely	Smoot
Dial	Heflin	Norbeck	Spencer
Dill	Howell	Norris	Stanfield
Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Oddie	Stanley
Edwards	Johnson, Minn.	Overman	Sterling
Ernst	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Swanson
Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Trammell
Ferris	Kendrick	Phipps	Wadsworth
Fess	Keyes	Ralston	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Frazier	McKellar	Reed, Mo.	Warren
George	McKinley	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Gerry	McLean	Sheppard	Weller
Glass	McNary	Shields	Wheeler
Gooding	Mayfield	Shipstead	Willis
Greene	Means	Shortridge	
Hale	Metcalf	Simmons	
Harreld	Moses	Smith	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Mike Holm, Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy with record of the original instrument in my office of senate file No. 97, being a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation to restore equality to agriculture, and that said copy is a true and correct transcript of said instrument and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at the capitol, in St. Paul, this 26th day of January, A. D. 1925.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation to restore equality to agriculture

Whereas the American farmer is forced to sell the major portion of what he produces on a world market and purchase all of his necessities on a highly protected stabilized domestic market; and

Whereas to encourage, create, develop, and maintain a stable, prosperous, and permanent system of agriculture in the United States it becomes necessary that agriculture should enjoy the same protection; and

Whereas such protective system does not operate to protect the farmer when there is an exportable surplus of agricultural products, thereby resulting in the world price being paid on not only the exportable surplus of such agricultural products but on that consumed domestically as well; and

Whereas the existence of an exportable surplus of a vitally important food crop is a national necessity, and from the consumer's standpoint nothing could be more dangerous than to urge deliberate curtailment of the potential supply of the essential food products; and

Whereas the result of the American protective system has been to create a great disparity in prices in what the farmer receives for what he sells and that which he has to pay for what he buys, thereby causing such severe loss, despair, and ruin in our basic industry, that a real crisis has for a long time and does still exist in the Nation's agriculture; and

Whereas to remove such disparity in prices and to guarantee equality to agriculture with the other classes in this country it is wholly essential and absolutely necessary that the American farmer should receive an American price based on American standard for his product consumed domestically and a world price only for the exportable surplus consumed abroad: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That Congress of the United States, at its present sitting, be, and the same is, urgently petitioned and requested to enact such legislation to meet this agricultural crisis that will extend the protective system and the benefits thereunder to the farmer whereby he will receive an American price for what is consumed domestically, independent of the world price for the surplus, thereby restoring equality to agriculture.

That to attain this end provision should be made for the creation of an export corporation to purchase and dispose of the surplus of agricultural products as will guarantee to the producer an American price based on the cost of production and in the future assure consumers of an ample supply of American-grown farm products; be it further

Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President's Agricul-

tural Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of Minnesota in Congress.

W. I. NOLAN,
President of the Senate.
JOHN A. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 20th day of January, 1925.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 20th day of January, 1925.

OSCAR ARNESON,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Approved January 22, 1925.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed January 23, 1925.

MIKE HOLM, *Secretary of State.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, F. A. Jeter, secretary of state of the State of Idaho and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 1 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Eighteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Idaho and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Idaho January 23, 1925, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 24th day of January, A. D. 1925.

[SEAL.] F. A. JETER,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial (Senator Crooks)

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the people of the State of Idaho have long suffered under an unjust and oppressive discrimination in the matter of transcontinental freight rates in that the transcontinental railroads have been permitted to charge higher rates upon freight traffic originating in the eastern portion of the United States and consigned to Idaho than were charged upon freight traffic originating in the same territory and consigned to more distant points on the Pacific coast, and have also been permitted to charge higher freight rates upon freight traffic originating in Idaho and consigned to eastern points than were charged on similar shipments from more distant points on the Pacific coast;

Whereas the effect of such practice has been to retard the growth and development of Idaho, and can not be defended upon any principle of just or fair dealing;

Whereas the methods now provided by law for obtaining relief from such unjust rates are slow, expensive, and unsatisfactory; and

Whereas an adequate method of obtaining such relief is afforded by a bill now pending in the Congress of the United States designated as Senate bill No. 2327, introduced by Senator FRANK R. GOODING, a Senator of the United States from the State of Idaho, which has recently passed the Senate and is now pending for consideration in the House of Representatives.

Now, therefore, we, the Senate of the State of Idaho, the House of Representatives concurring, do earnestly request and recommend that speedy and favorable action be taken on said bill in the House of Representatives, to the end that the people of the State of Idaho may obtain speedy relief from tthe injustice above mentioned:

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 14th day of January, 1925.

H. C. BALDRIDGE,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 20th day of January, 1925.

W. D. GILLIS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 1 originated in the senate during the eighteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

A. L. FLETCHER,
Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a telegram embodying joint resolution No. 2 of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARSON, NEV., *January 26, 1925.*

PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.:

In accordance with demand upon this office I am telegraphing senate joint resolution No. 2, which reads as follows:

Senate joint resolution, approved January 26, 1925

Whereas there is pending in the United States House of Representatives an appropriation of $500,000 for the construction of the Spanish Springs extension of the Newlands project, which has already received the approval of the United States Senate; and

Whereas such project extension will place the Newlands project upon a sound economic basis, provide necessary winter feed for the livestock industry of the State of Nevada, and by the storage of flood waters now running to waste, prevent destructive water shortages upon a large area of said project; therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of Nevada, That this body hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to give its approval to such Spanish Springs appropriation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this resolution by telegraph to each of our Senators and to our Representative in Congress, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the President of the Senate of the United States.

A. S. HENDERSON,
Speaker of the Assembly.
MAURICE J. SULLIVAN,
President of the Senate.
H. WISE,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
R. W. BEAMAN,
Secretary of the Senate.
W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the Akron, Ohio, Chamber of Commerce relative to the supply of helium gas in this country and the necessity for its conservation. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD and that they may be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, who have charge of the proposed legislation on this subject.

There being no objections, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

AKRON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Akron, Ohio, January 28, 1925.

Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of directors of the Akron Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting on January 23, unanimously adopted the following resolution, with the request that it be given your most careful consideration:

"Whereas the United States has the only known supply of helium gas, which is noninflammable, and thus has a wider opportunity than any other country for developing a safe means of transport by airships; and

"Whereas, according to Government estimates, enough of this valuable gas is now going to waste annually to fill a fleet of airships of the size of the *Shenandoah* or the *Los Angeles;* and

"Whereas legislation is now pending in Congress to provide, first, for the conservation of this helium gas as a valuable natural resource and the stopping of its waste through dissipation in the air, and, second, for the sale or lease of such supplies of helium gas as are not needed by the Army or Navy, to commercial interests in this country for the development of lighter-than-air craft transportation; and

"Whereas the commercial use of helium gas in airship operation will open the way to the building and operating of commercial airships, and consequently provide for the training of flying and ground crews, the laying out of flying fields, the building of hangars and mooring masts and the establishing of manufacturing plants and facilities, all of which would be available for the national defense in case of emergency, and which could quickly be expanded in such an event to meet the needs of the United States Government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Akron Chamber of Commerce recommends to the Congress of the United States the passage of such legislation during the present session of Congress to provide for stopping the waste of helium gas, and also for developing this supply and thus assist in the development of lighter-than-air aeronautics, and the interesting of capital in the development of this industry, and creating of aviation fields throughout the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators FRANK B. WILLIS and SIMEON D. FESS, Congressman MARTIN L. DAVEY, and to the Ohio Members of the House of Representatives."

Respectfully submitted in behalf of the directors.

VINCENT S. STEVENS, *Secretary*.

Mr. BROOKHART presented the petition of the Literary Circle of Rock Valley, Iowa, praying for the adherence of the United States to the World Court under the terms of the so-called Harding-Hughes plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions of the American Forestry Association, favoring the passage of the so-called migratory bird refuge and public shooting ground bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BINGHAM presented resolutions of the Hartford (Conn.) section, National Council of Jewish Women, favoring the participation of the United States in the World Court under the terms of the so-called Harding-Hughes plan, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of the Connecticut Nurserymen's Association, praying for the passage of legislation providing for a national botanical garden and arboretum, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GOODING presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the passage of the so-called Gooding bill, being the bill (S. 2327) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. (See the joint memorial printed in full when presented to-day by the President pro tempore.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6755) granting six months' pay to Maude Morrow Fechteler, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 932) thereon.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) granting permission to Fred F. Rogers, commander, United States Navy, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Venezuelan Government, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 933) thereon.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8263) to authorize the accounting officers of the Treasury to pay to certain supply officers of the regular Navy and Naval Reserve Force the pay and allowances of their ranks for services performed prior to the approval of their bonds, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 934) thereon.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 122) for the relief of Charles D. Baylis, first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 935) thereon.

Mr. BROUSSARD, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3202) for the relief of Lieut. (junior grade) Thomas J. Ryan, United States Navy, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 936) thereon.

Mr. SWANSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5061) for the relief of Russell Wilmer Johnson, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 937) thereon.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9308) to authorize the appointment of Machinist Henry F. Mulloy, United States Navy, as an ensign in the regular Navy, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 938) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 4127) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kingsbury (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4128) to change the name of Sixteenth Street to President's Avenue; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 4129) for the relief of W. B. de Yampert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4130) authorizing an investigation, examination, and survey for the control of excess flood waters of the Mississippi River below Red River Landing in Louisiana and on the Atchafalaya outlet by the construction and maintenance of controlled and regulated spillway or spillways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 4131) for the relief of Harry C. Ford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 4132) to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Rocky Mountain National Park for Government lands in the park; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4133) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the congressional medal of honor to Theophile A. Dauphin; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) to amend section 2 of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes," approved April 14, 1922; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO CAPE COD CANAL BILL

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3933) for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal property, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. EDGE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 11472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were severally referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 318), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 52, agreed to December 19, 1923, authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to employ an assistant clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, is hereby continued in full force and effect during the Sixty-ninth Congress.

CLAIMS AGAINST ARMENIA

Mr. KING. I submit a resolution which, because of its importance, I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 319), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Armenians participated in the war with the allied powers and the United States against the Central Empires; and

Whereas in the treaty of Versailles settling the terms of peace, and in the negotiations leading up to said treaty, the Armenian Republic was recognized by the allied powers and the Government of the United States as an independent state; and

Whereas the United States Grain Corporation in the years 1919 and 1920 advanced to the Armenian Republic 35,000 tons of wheat and wheat flour of the value of $13,000,000, which advancement was made necessary in part because the Turkish Government had arbitrarily seized and transferred to the Turkish Treasury all bank accounts, both current and deposit, belonging to Armenians by which Armenian gold in the sum of 5,000,000 Turkish pounds, amounting to $22,450,000 was transferred to the Turkish Treasury which gold was afterwards deposited by the Turkish Government in the Reichsbank at Berlin; and

Whereas said deposit of Armenian gold in the Reichsbank at Berlin was by article 259 of the treaty of Versailles transferred and surrendered to the principal allied and associated powers, including the United States, whereby the United States has an interest in said deposit which has not been renounced or otherwise disposed of by the Government of the United States; and

Whereas said deposit in equity and right belongs to the Armenians from whom the same was seized, or to their legal representatives; and

Whereas if said fund be regarded as property of Turkey which by the treaty of Versailles was transferred by Germany to the allied and associated powers, including the United States, and if said deposit in pursuance to the treaty of Lausanne of July 24, 1923, or otherwise is to be applied to the payment of claims, the nationals of the United States can not rightfully be excluded therefrom; and

Whereas the United States Grain Corporation has a valid claim in the sum of $13,000,000 against said deposit whether the same be regarded as of Turkish or Armenian derivation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to make representations to the allied powers that the United States has an interest in said deposit and has a right to be consulted in respect to any allocation, distribution, or disposition of the same; that said deposit should be set aside in trust to be hereafter paid over to the persons from whom said gold was seized or to their lawful representatives, and that in the event that said deposit be subjected to the payment of claims, that the Government of the United States for the account of the United States Grain Corporation, has a valid claim against said deposit in the sum of $13,000,000 and is entitled to share in the distribution of the same.

COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2842) to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was, on page 4, line 23, after the word "employer," to insert "if any."

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL REFERRED

The following joint resolution and bill were each read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution authorizing the improvement of the system of overland communications on the Seward Peninsula, Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

H. R. 11956. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909," approved February 9, 1909.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to ask the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] whether the House bill should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations or to some other committee? The Chair is informed that it was reported by the Committee on Territories in the House; therefore, if there be no objection, it will be referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions in the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is an amendment to the urgent deficiency act it ought to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It relates to taxes levied in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WARREN. Then it should go to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reference will be changed and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the amendment be read.

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

The READING CLERK. On page 39 it is proposed to strike out from line 5 to line 14, both inclusive, of the committee amendment and in lieu thereof to insert:

In the case of the portion of such publications devoted to advertisements the rates per pound or fraction thereof for delivery within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows (but where the space devoted to advertisements does not exceed 5 per cent of the total space the rate of postage shall be the same as if the whole of such publication was devoted to matter other than advertisements): For the first and second zones, 1½ cents; for the third zone, 2 cents; for the fourth zone, 3 cents; for the fifth zone, 3½ cents; for the sixth zone, 4 cents; for the seventh zone, 5 cents; for the eighth zone, 5½ cents.

Mr. GEORGE. On my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McKINLEY (when Mr. McCORMICK's name was called). If my colleague [Mr. McCORMICK] were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD]. I do not see him in the Chamber, so I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] and vote "yea." The junior Senator from New York would vote "yea" if present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. Upon this subject I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised, however, that if present he would vote as I am about to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. McLEAN. Has the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. McLEAN. Having a pair with him, in his absence, I withhold my vote

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. ASHURST. On this question, I am paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], but I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], and vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am requested to announce the general pair of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—36

Ashurst	George	Neely	Simmons
Bayard	Harris	Norbeck	Smith
Broussard	Heflin	Overman	Stanfield
Bruce	Howell	Ralston	Stanley
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Ransdell	Swanson
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Mo.	Trammell
Edwards	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Ferris	McNary	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Mayfield	Shortridge	Wheeler

NAYS—43

Ball	Dill	Jones, Wash.	Phipps
Bingham	Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.
Borah	Ernst	Keyes	Shipstead
Brookhart	Fernald	King	Smoot
Bursum	Fess	McKinley	Spencer
Butler	Frazier	Means	Sterling
Cameron	Gooding	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Couzens	Greene	Moses	Warren
Cummins	Hale	Norris	Watson
Curtis	Harreld	Oddie	Willis
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—17

Capper	Harrison	McLean	Underwood
Copeland	Ladd	Owen	Weller
Elkins	La Follette	Pittman	
Gerry	Lenroot	Robinson	
Glass	McCormick	Stephens	

So Mr. GEORGE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that the Secretary may read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The READING CLERK. On page 39, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

For newspapers in first and second zones, 1½ cents; for the third zone, 2 cents; for the fourth zone, 3 cents; for the fifth zone, 3½ cents; for the sixth zone, 4 cents; for the seventh zone, 5 cents; for the eighth zone, 5½ cents; and on page 39, line 9, after the word "For," insert "second-class matter other than newspapers."

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will accept the amendment.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, in view of the vote which the Senate has just taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I can not accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee. I could not accept the amendment, anyway, Mr. President. I wish to point out to the Senate that the rates proposed by the amendment just offered by the Senator from Tennessee are exactly the rates which have just been rejected by the Senate, except that they are made to apply to newspapers only and do not affect periodicals. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee should be agreed to by the Senate, it would mean that we were again setting up another specially preferred class; that is to say, the newspapers would be getting a rate which would be more than 2 cents a pound less than is applied to periodicals under the amendment which the

committee has reported; a rate of more than 3 cents below that now paid by all publications, newspapers, and periodicals alike; and considerably less than the existing rates which all of these various amendments are attempting to amend. The loss in revenue would be difficult to estimate, because the Senator from Tennessee makes his amendment apply only to newspapers.

I have said to the Senator from Tennessee and to the Senator from Georgia that if they had been able to strike some kind of a mean between the average rates which were proposed, the rates being alike in both amendments, I would not combat it seriously, although, it being my duty to protect the integrity of the bill, I could not accept it. As it stands, Mr. President, I can not accept the amendment, and, after the vote which the Senate has just taken, I can not conceive that the Senate either can accept it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will bear with me for just a moment or two while I explain this amendment, which is of great importance, and I know Senators are or will be interested in it.

The amendment applies solely to newspapers. Some several years ago, while a matter similar to this was before the Senate, I took occasion to examine very carefully into the cost of the transportation of newspapers. I came to the conclusion that, as a rule, newspapers paid their own way under the then existing rates. Those rates were subsequently raised to a higher figure, and they have been increased a number of times since I examined the matter.

Mr. President, the same rule does not apply, in my judgment, to other periodicals. There is a great loss on second-class mail matter. The department has reported that there is a loss of $74,000,000. I do not believe that loss is attributable to newspaper transportation. It is possible that there is some loss on the large Sunday newspapers, but on the general run of newspapers, and even including the Sunday newspapers, my judgment is that they now pay their way and even more than pay their way.

I wish to give the Senate an illustration. Take a newspaper published in my own State, say in Nashville, Tenn. Most of its circulation is within the first and second zones. In the afternoon publishers of the newspapers themselves undertake to haul copies of that day's issue down to the railroad station and put them on the train, so that all the mail clerks have to do is to throw those newspapers off at the stations to which they are consigned. They also have to weigh the newspapers. For that service the Government receives a cent and a quarter a pound for the news portion of the newspaper and a cent and a half a pound for the advertising portion. Senators, that more than pays for that service. The greater number of newspapers are circulated in that way. Those that are not circulated in that way are kept out of the post office entirely and are circulated by means of trucks or by means of freight shipments. Reducing the rates to the figures I have mentioned will cause the department, in my judgment, to earn more money. I am quite confident that the rates proposed are fair and equitable and will pay for the cost of the transportation. They affect every newspaper in the country.

We all know that the newspapers are using the mails less and less every day because of these high rates. This amendment will increase the use of the postal system by the newspapers, and increase the amount of pay coming from that source. The rates, it is true, are exactly the same as those embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the only difference being that his amendment applies to all second-class matter—trade journals, magazines, and every other part of second-class matter. This amendment applies only to newspapers, and they pay their way and will pay their way under this amendment if it is adopted.

I hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will be adopted; and I ask for the yeas and nays on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. On that question the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McKINLEY (when Mr. McCORMICK's name was called). If my colleague [Mr. McCORMICK] were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the former vote with regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. The senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Chamber on account of official business. If he were present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—31

Ashurst	Fletcher	McNary	Shields
Bayard	George	Mayfield	Simmons
Broussard	Glass	Neely	Smith
Bruce	Harris	Norbeck	Stanley
Caraway	Heflin	Overman	Swanson
Dial	Howell	Ralston	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Wheeler
Edwards	McKellar	Sheppard	

NAYS—45

Ball	Ernst	Keyes	Shipstead
Bingham	Fernald	King	Shortridge
Borah	Ferris	McKinley	Smoot
Brookhart	Fess	McLean	Spencer
Bursum	Frazier	Means	Sterling
Butler	Gooding	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Cameron	Greene	Moses	Warren
Couzens	Hale	Norris	Watson
Cummins	Harreld	Oddie	Willis
Curtis	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	
Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—20

Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Stephens
Copeland	Ladd	Pittman	Trammell
Elkins	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Underwood
Gerry	Lenroot	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	McCormick	Stanfield	Weller

So Mr. McKELLAR's amendment was rejected.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF POWER COMPANIES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have been instructed by unanimous vote of the Interstate Commerce Committee to ask that the time for reporting the Norris resolution (S. Res. 286) be not later than February 5. I recognize the position that I am in and the committee is in in the view of the Senate; but we have given this matter all the attention that was possible, and by the unanimous vote of the committee this morning they asked for an extension of time to not later than February 5. I therefore ask that that be granted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, of course, the matter is in such shape that I can not object, although I want to voice my protest. I want to call the attention of the Senate to the position in which this resolution is now being placed.

One extension has already been granted. Now another one is asked for. That indicates that the committee are taking up this resolution and doing something with it that never has been done, as far as I know, with a similar resolution simply asking for an investigation, after extended debate in the Senate, covering many weeks, when the probability of the existence of the kind of trust that is outlined in that resolution was debated at length, and facts and figures given, without a single Member of the Senate contesting them or denying any of the statements that were made. It simply means that because Senators expressed the opinion, when the resolution came before the Senate, that this "t" was not crossed or that "i" was not dotted it ought to go to a committee, not, I think, for the purpose of having an investigation such as the resolution provided the Federal Trade Commission should make, but to see whether the resolution was too broad, and, if it was, to bring it back in a modified form.

I do not want to take up the time of the Senate in the closing hours that are coming; but, Mr. President, weeks of time can be consumed on the subject involved in this resolution. I do not want to be put in an attitude, during the closing hours of this session, where some one can say that I am filibustering against legislation or unduly taking up the time of the Senate. I have been acting in good faith on it. I can not myself understand even why the Senate should want to refer it to a committee. It became evident, however, when I had the resolution up, that it was going to be an impossibility to pass it at that time on account of various technicalities that arose that can be brought up in connection with any resolution or any bill; and it now seems to me as though since it has gotten into committee somebody there is dragging it out, and time is going to be taken and the report to the Senate is going to be delayed so as to get it as near the 4th of March as possible, and then, by a filibuster or something of that kind, when other matters are demanding attention, prevent action by the Senate altogether.

I can not help thinking that even though it is entirely unintentional, the result is going to be as I have stated, and I notify the Senate now that if that is undertaken with this resolution there is more than one Member of the Senate who can play at the same game.

I do not believe in asking for anything that is not fair; but I say now that when that resolution comes back, no matter whether the committee reports it favorably or unfavorably, I am going to insist on a vote. I have no right to insist that the resolution be agreed to, but I shall insist on a roll call. If the resolution is defeated, that will be the end of it, so far as I am concerned, and I will have nothing further to say; but I am not going to see that resolution smothered without doing all I can to smother something else. It may be something I do not want to smother, but I will do the best I can to see that progress on some other things is not made as rapidly as it would be made if a fair attitude were taken on this matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, just a word——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This matter is not subject to debate; and if there is no objection, the order will be entered extending the time as requested.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, permit me to make just this statement, that as soon as I may get the floor on this matter I may have something to say in justification of the action of the committee.

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRISON AT COLUMBUS, OHIO

Mr. RALSTON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] delivered last night a very able speech at Columbus, Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Is that the same speech which was published yesterday in the RECORD?

Mr. RALSTON. No; the one published yesterday was delivered in Cincinnati. This is an additional speech.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Indiana simply asks that the speech be printed as an appendix in the RECORD?

Mr. RALSTON. That is all.

Mr. MOSES. It is a speech delivered by a Senator?

Mr. RALSTON. It is a speech delivered by the senior Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRISON's speech is as follows:

SPEECH, IN PART, OF SENATOR PAT HARRISON, OF MISSISSIPPI, DELIVERED AT THE JACKSON DAY BANQUET OF OHIO DEMOCRATS IN THE CITY OF COLUMBUS, OHIO, WEDNESDAY EVENING, JANUARY 28, 1925

What political organization is comparable to the Democratic Party, either in the length of its history or its sensitiveness to speedy restoration? For more than a century and a quarter it has sailed the quadrennial storms of political strife—at times tempest tossed and weather beaten—but never yet have its sails been furled or its hull impaired. During its long existence it has witnessed the rise and fall of many political parties; the Federalist and the Whig have come and gone. The Republican Party to-day, conceived in sectionalism and sustained through governmental favoritism, is but the receiver of these two bankrupt political organizations. Special privilege is the corner stone upon which these organizations were builded. They were sustained through unjust permits issued on the selfishness of their principles and the sordidness of their policies. What poignant reasons exist for the lasting life of the Democratic Party?

To our opponents who assert that we are the party of destruction—the party the principles of which would restrain material development of the Nation and the results of which spell economic unrest and business depression—we say you are but indicting the statesmanship of some of the greatest men whose names adorn the pages of American history. We say that such an assertion is a reflection upon the millions of men and women who for 125 years have championed Democratic principles and kept the Democratic faith. Such a suggestion assumes that during that long period every man and woman who followed the banner of Democracy was either a fool or a knave. Wise and patriotic men and women do not and could not lend assistance to promote any cause the results of which retarded the country's natural development and robbed themselves of the fruits of their own labor. It is impossible to imagine that sensible men and women would pull down upon themselves the pillars upon which rest their own prosperity and happiness. If such assumptions were true, what possible influence prompted the incomparable Jefferson, the brainy Madison, the courageous Jackson, and thousands of others whose names have enriched our history to advocate successfully Democratic principles from 1801 to 1860? During that period—nine years more than half a century—the Democratic Party, with but a lapse of eight years, controlled the destinies of the Republic. If such a statement were true, what influences kept the fires of Democracy burning through the tragic days of reconstruction, and up until this good hour has possessed such militant power as to make every national election uncertain, and throughout the life of the Government sharing with our ancient political antagonists periodic changes of the national administration?

No; the Democratic Party is not dead. Those who believe that a party's defeat one year portends disaster for its future need only remember that in 1872, when our party became temporarily insane, and to meet the exigencies of the hour, nominated a Republican for President and went before the country without a platform of its own, resulting in Grant's election by an unprecedented majority, that it was just four years thereafter we nominated Tilden and carried the country by a tremendous popular vote. They need only remember that following the defeat of Cleveland by Harrison in 1888 Cleveland came back strong four years later and won. In its long and eventful history the Democratic Party has "never crooked the pregnant hinges of its knee that thrift might follow fawning." It has never bartered away the rights of the people to win temporary advantage. It has never allied itself with any class, section, or interest to gain temporary success. It has never relied upon providential occurrences and transient incidents to expound its principles. They are just the same to-day as when conceived by Jefferson, practiced by Madison, executed by Jackson, proclaimed by Cleveland, and revived by Wilson. And to-night, viewing from this vantage point the battle fields, strewn with the wreck and lighted by the flickering campfires of the last campaign, I want to join with you and the Democracy of the country in blazing the road for our next journey. If we are to reach the promised land of to-morrow, we must see to it first that all differences within our own ranks are discarded and a common understanding promoted among Democrats of every kind. It is not necessary that we offer apology for the character of our leaders or excuse for the record of our party. Neither need we make amends for having championed such attractive and progressive measures as to win support from the independent elements of the opposition party. If carrying out the principles of our party draws to our support the cooperation of the independent and progressive forces of America, then well and good. Their coming to us assuredly is no justification for our forsaking those principles or modifying our efforts in their behalf. The Democratic Party is and always has been the party of progressive thought. We welcome to our camps all who subscribe to that theory and believe in those principles.

In a great government like ours, so interwoven with the affairs of the world, new conditions make new problems. They naturally invite new issues. It has been the history of national campaigns that, while parties divide along certain fundamentals, the verdict is very often decided upon irrelevant issues. These questions as they arise must be met and will be met in that broad spirit of statesmanship that has ever characterized our party's leadership. In making plans for the future we can not close our eyes to the fact that the Republican Party to-day is well entrenched and strongly fortified. Every modern weapon of attack is employed by them and the most perfect camouflage raised to cover up their movements. Weak and defenseless as is the Republican Party in cherished principles, that is not true respecting the character of its leadership in the arts of political warfare. We must know that not only are their guns ever loaded with the most poisonous munitions of misrepresentation, but that every avenue through which information travels is laid with bombs of dangerous propaganda. Their long years of training and their subserviency to special interests have given to them decided points of advantage. In these nefarious schemes they have a complete understanding and the ready organizations upon which they can call to perform are many and efficient.

The protective tariff is to the Republican Party what flowing locks were to Samson. It is the source from which most of the iniquities of Republicanism flow, the keystone upon which rests a moneyed aristocracy that gauges the unsuspecting public. It is a disease that destroys national virtue; a cancerous sore that eats away commercial and industrial freedom. It has been the license by which a favored few have been permitted to extort from the unfavored many. The means of amassing aggregated wealth in the hands of a few and the pitiful pauperization of the many. It has dislocated the economic machinery of the people and created castes and classes through the derangement of a parity amongst industries and peoples. We must combat that oft-repeated Republican fallacy that the policies of the Democratic Party have created panics and caused economic depression. Not only must we show that the depression during the first years of Cleveland's second administration was due in no degree from Democratic ascendancy, was unrelated to tariff legislation at that time, by pointing to the fact that the panic took root in the last year of Harrison's administration and was in full blast before either Cleveland was inaugurated or the Wilson tariff was enacted into law. We must recall the Roosevelt panic of 1907, as well as the economic depression during this administration, and visualize the beneficent results flowing in unsurpassed prosperity from the Democratic tariff of 1913.

Political history tells the startling story that during more than the last half century whenever the Democratic Party has waged relentless

war in sharp and aggressive manner against the citadel of special privilege it has triumphed. It is only when the membership of our party have become enmeshed in family quarrels, drawn into the momentary whirlpools of conflicting opinions, or permitted our opponents to dictate the issues of the campaign that we have lost. Our trouble to-day is not that the majority of the American people believe in the principles of a protective tariff, in subsidies to special interests, or in tax reform that relieves wealth disproportionately of its fair burden of taxation, but the Republican Party has sold its materialistic theories to the country and the public is at this time deluded and deceived. Those theories, being founded upon injustice and inequality, exact from their advocates efficient organization and modernized propagation. Because of the enormous benefits that have accrued to a very few through such special favored treatment, these interests have been able, and certainly quite willing, to make a division with their beneficiaries that such unfair policies be maintained and such unjust practices be continued. And so it is that the Republican Party has been able, without difficulty, to finance campaigns and employ, without embarrassment, all the modern arts of propaganda to accomplish their ends. These beneficiaries possess no scruples against obtaining control of every agency, whether of news or education—every avenue that might lead them to their desired end and make certain the success of their purposes. While at times they have become brazen in the openness of their actions, they have for the most part employed every subtle means to mislead. Powerful newspapers and great periodicals, organized to inform and educate the public, have sometimes permitted their high purposes to be desecrated in a sordid endeavor to promote their own selfish interest. Organizations and agencies of every kind have been drawn by the contaminating influences of these special interests and their satellites into the maelstrom of the sordid conspiracy.

When Samuel Tilden carried the popular vote in 1876 tariff was the dominant issue. When Hancock lost in 1880 it was because of his weak and vacillating position touching the tariff question. When Cleveland swept the country in 1884 it was on the tariff question. When he was reelected in 1892 it was on the tariff question. When Wilson was elected in 1912 it was largely due to the American people's repudiation of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law and an indorsement of the Democratic House of Representatives in the writing of a Democratic tariff measure.

When the Democratic Party carried the House of Representatives by over 100 majority in 1890 and defeated William McKinley as a candidate for reelection to the National House of Representatives, it was because of his authorship and the enactment of the McKinley tariff law. Two years ago, when our party reduced the Republican majority in the House from 169 to 13 and the Republican majority in the Senate from 20 to 9, it was following the enactment of the present indefensible Fordney-McCumber tariff law. And it will not be forgotten that its author in the House of Representatives refused to stand for reelection and its author in the Senate was ingloriously defeated.

One of the baneful effects of a protective tariff is, being indefensible in principle, when practiced by a political organization or sanctioned by an individual it destroys in that individual and political organization those high ideals of government that should guarantee, at all times and under all circumstances, "equal rights, equal justice, and equal opportunity" to all men. It is like sin—it grows upon you, and when the first offense is committed, no matter what may be the provocation, it establishes a precedent which grows until it becomes malignant, destroying the high purpose and fine virtues of a just government.

"Oh, what a tangled web we weave,
When first we practice to deceive."

We can not hope to enlist in our cause those pets and puppets of Republicanism that grow fat and sleek from the large profits they are permitted to exact through such a policy of special privilege. We have a right to expect and shall employ every agency at our command from now until the next election to acquaint the people with those startling inequalities, that indefensible unfairness, the injustices and wrongs inflicted upon the many through such policies. We must dissipate those erroneous impressions upon which the first inflictions were imposed and impress by the logic of facts that whatever excuse may have once been offered for protecting infant industries, it no longer exists. That such a suggestion is repudiated to-day, not only by the monopolistic tendency of the times, but the very fact that practically every protective interest in America, and certainly those efficiently managed, have established selling agencies abroad and in thousands of instances in foreign countries have located branch manufacturing establishments. They not only control the domestic market here and exact higher prices for their manufactured products under a protective tariff, but they are able to do business and dominate trade upon profitable terms against foreign competition—aye, even into the markets of their competitors.

We must impress upon the American farmer that his prosperity is dependent upon the markets of the world and that any policy proposed by this Government that will add to the cost of his needs and at the same time restrict those markets for the sale of his products, is inimical to his interests. We must show to the American farmer and indelibly impress on his mind that a protective tariff, so far as he is concerned, is but a delusion and a snare. We must show him what he needs is international stability, a readjustment of world conditions, and the restoration of good feelings and common understanding among all peoples, that world markets with ability to buy may be found for his surplus products. We must cite him to the fact that with a 42-cent tariff rate upon every bushel of wheat imported into this country to-day, the price of wheat ranges from 7 to 10 cents more in Winnipeg than it does either in Chicago or Minneapolis. We must show to the American farmer that what he needs is not protection on the products he raises but a removal of the high rates upon the things, whether necessary to his business or not, made by other industries so that the purchasing power of his dollar may be placed upon a parity with the purchasing power of the dollar of every other industry. We must show the inequalities resulting from such a system, and the disastrous results that must inevitably flow from such a policy to the great agricultural interests of America.

We must carry the battle into the ranks of labor and drive from his mind that seductive impression left there by Republican propaganda that a protective tariff protects the wages of the American laboring man. Refresh his memory as to that fact with which he must be already familiar that it was the highly protected interests of this country that have brought and sought to bring to America more of the cheap foreign labor of the world, and to employ it in competition with, or as a means of driving down the wages of American labor. We must present to them the indubitable facts that they may see that the profits derived from the protection accorded to their employers go into the accumulation of larger profits, distributed in larger dividends, and seen in greater amalgamation of wealth and not in the justice of increased wages.

We must show to the American consumers that $216,000,000 annually are being exacted from them because of the protective duty upon sugar alone. We must show to the American consumers that they are paying $187,000,000 annually in increased cost of living upon wool and woolen products alone. We must show to the American consumers that the cost of living, by virtue of the protective features of the present tariff law, is over $2,000,000,000 annually?

We must appeal to the patriotic business men of America who believe in the high principles of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," those business men who might, through the protective tariff, exact higher prices upon their manufactured goods, sold at home, but which at the same time restricts their markets abroad and shackles honest endeavor. We must appeal to the heart of the Nation upon the high principles of justice and right. We must drive forever from cover that false impression that the Democratic Party is a free trade party, and cite to them the long and unvarying Democratic doctrine of a tariff that relieves the consuming masses of unreasonable exactions and places tariff rates in such an amount only "that will promote effective competition, protect against monopoly, and at the same time produce revenue to support the Government."

In the present abnormal condition of the world, the baneful effects of the present exorbitant tariff are lost amid the cross currents of international economic upheaval. But normal times will return and with them under the operations of the present tariff law still higher prices will be exacted from the consuming masses—more pronounced retaliation will ensue from the countries of the world—a corresponding restriction of commercial and trade freedom, together with a far reduced revenue resulting therefrom. In the strongest possible way and through every avenue of approach we must combat every suggestion of special privilege. If it be a protective tariff enriching a few at the expense of the many, we must fight for its immediate repeal. If it is a subsidy taxing the many for the benefit of the few, we must strangle it. If it be in the inequitable imposition of taxes releasing unfairly the wealth at the expense of the many, we must defeat it. The Democratic Party was, in the days of Jefferson, the party that fought for the liberties of the people. In the days of Jackson, it was the party that fought for the rights of men. It can not to-day, if it be true to the teachings of those great men, be false to the American people. It is as true to-day as in the days of our fathers that there is room in this country but for two political parties. One as expressed by Jefferson "fears the ignorance of the people; the other, the selfishness of rulers independent of them."

The Democratic Party has taken its stand; its long history is written in its service for the people, in its warfare for their rights and against the encroachments of selfish predatory interests. It has never and never will be for the destruction of or injury to legitimate business. It believes not only in the guarantee of personal liberty, but in the protection of property, whether possessed by the powerful or the weak. We can not become "mollycoddles" either in the assertion or in the aggressive advocacy of every Democratic principle. We can not in waging warfare for the rights of humanity be deterred by the opposition, it matters not what exceptional influence it may wield or what tremendous power it may exert.

Jeffersonian justice is Democracy's demand. The purchase of special favored legislation, either through protective tariff duties or class legislation in the form of subsidies, is just as repugnant to Democratic principles as governmental strictures upon the liberties and freedom of men and the unreasonable regulation of private business. The tendency of vesting the National Government with powers never contemplated by the Constitution reveals the fact that Jefferson was right when he said that "our country is too large to have all of its affairs directed by a single Government" and that after all "the encroachments of a State government tend toward liberty, while those of a general government tend toward monarchy." That "it is far better to be exposed to the inconvenience attending too much liberty than those attending too small a degree of it." "The least governed are the best governed."

We must return to governmental simplicity, economy, and straight dealing. We must put a stop to moneyed aristocracy through the instrumentality of political organizations and through agencies poisoning the minds and prejudicing the hearts of the public through the sordid and profligate use of money. We must deport ourselves through steadfastness to the Democratic faith and the espousal of wise Democratic policies, so as to regain and hold the confidence of honest business. We must consult more often the statesmanship of Jefferson and revive the courage reflected in the administrative acts of Jackson. In our dealings with all nations we should shirk no responsibility and welcome every opportunity that will draw to us in more cordial and friendly relationship all peoples of the world. If we can forget the differences of the recent past and inspired by the spirit of toleration, rededicate ourselves to the progressive principles of right, justice, and equality, we will soon wrest this Government from the sordid hands that now grip it and the selfish influences that direct it.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, on page 39, line 9, after the word "first," I move that the word "and" be added; after the word "second" I move that the words "zones, 2 cents," be added; and on the same page and line, after the word "third," I move that the word "zones" be stricken out and the word "zone" inserted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

The READING CLERK. On page 39, line 9, after the word "first," it is proposed to insert the word "and"; after the word "second" it is proposed to insert the words "zones, 2 cents"; and on the same page and line, after the word "third," it is proposed to strike out the word "zones" and insert the word "zone."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask serious consideration by the Senate of the amendment I have sent to the desk. This amendment leaves the rates on the advertising portions of second-class matter in the first and second zones where they are to-day. During the last two days much valuable information has been given the Senate by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I agree with him that in many ways the rates on second-class mail matter are too high. I believe that if the rates can be studied carefully and scientifically there may be found a method of adjusting them at some time in the future in such a manner that more money will be brought in, because more business will be given the post office because of such adjustment.

I believe this amendment of mine, leaving the rates on the advertising matter in second-class mail in the first and second zones where they are, will prevent further loss to the Post Office Department on second-class matter, and I feel that if we raise these rates from where they are many publications, including large numbers of small publications, will be caused serious loss, and numbers of them will be put completely out of business.

I believe the point of saturation has been reached in regard to second-class mail matter, and that if these rates which I have suggested are adopted by the Senate satisfactory results will be obtained, and if the other suggestions of our subcommittee are carried through, with possibly some minor amendments, we will have this bill in such shape that the necessary revenue will be raised and the post office salary increase bill, which is Title I of this bill, will be passed. I hope it will be.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, my conception of my duty in connection with this bill does not lead me to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada, but the amendment represents a middle ground of opinion which developed in the subcommittee which heard the question. It is an amendment which is limited in its effect both as to the revenue to be derived under the bill and upon the publishing industry in general, but while limited in the latter regard, it is my opinion that the amendment of the Senator from Nevada will prove extremely helpful to certain elements in the publishing industry, which I freely concede can not bear any radical increase in the burden which they now have.

If the amendment had been drawn in the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, to include newspapers only, I could have no objection to it at all. As it stands, while I can not accept it, it is an amendment of such a nature that I can not feel it my duty to offer prolonged or strenuous resistance to it, and I hope it will not lead to debate and that it may be decided by a vive voce vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, are there other amendments to be offered to this section?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I feel constrained now to ask that the Senate disagree to the amendments on page 39. We have, I think, reached a very important, not to say serious, matter in the discussion of this bill.

I think Senators have indicated by some votes cast that they are losing sight of one very important feature in connection with this bill, and that is that the bill must raise some revenue over and beyond the revenue derived from present rates on postal matter. The amendments proposed by the committee would change altogether the present zone system, making three zones out of the eight zones now existing, and the whole effect of this system of three zones provided for in the committee amendments, together with the rates provided for the three zones, will be to decrease the revenue now derived under the present law and under the present zone system. The zones and rates are as follows:

For zones 1 and 2 the present rate is 2 cents. The proposed amendment would make it 3 cents in the first and second zones, there being an increase of 1 cent.

In the third zone the rates are the same. The present rate is 3 cents, and the proposed amendment would give 3 cents to the third zone.

In the fourth zone there is an increase of 1 cent under the committee amendment.

In the fifth zone the rates remain the same as they are now.

In the sixth zone, however, there is a decrease of 1 cent, in the seventh a decrease of 1 cent, and in the eighth zone a decrease of 2 cents from present rates. On the whole, therefore, there will be a decrease in present rates.

How much is expected to be realized from the proposed increases in the original bill? The yield from present zone matter it is estimated is $1,130,997.68. If we should put scientific, religious, and educational journals in the zone system, and have them pay a rate on advertising matter, it is estimated that the revenue yielded would be $1,355,369.36. But by a vote of the Senate on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] scientific, agricultural, and religious matter was taken out of the zone system altogether and restored to the present 1¼-cent flat rate. So that by that process we will lose $1,355,369.36, according to the estimate of the Post Office Department.

What has been urged here as a reason for the reduction in rates? That more matter will be taken from express and from freight and go into the mails, and thereby become a source of revenue. The Post Office Department say in regard to that as follows:

It has been stated that the reductions in rates are suggested for the purpose of inducing publishers who now ship publications by freight for reentry at another point to return such publications to the mails for transportation the entire distance. No information was submitted at the hearings indicating to what extent the publications now shipped by freight would be returned to the mails should the rates be reduced, or how much reduction would be necessary in order to induce such a return.

The Post Office Department further say, and I hope I may have the attention of Senators in regard to it, because I think the conclusions of the department are based on careful study and estimates:

It might be assumed that this matter when reentered is carried into the first and second zones and into the third zone in equal quantity. The present rate to the first and second zones is 2 cents and to the

third zone 3 cents. Therefore the rate on all would be on the average 2½ cents, which is the basis for present revenue. Assuming that it all comes back to the mails and that the haul would be as far as the sixth zone, the new rate would be 6 cents. Therefore the additional revenue would be approximately 3½ cents a pound on the advertising matter. This would yield a revenue of $1,567,529. The rate on the reading matter would be reduced one-fourth cent, which would amount to $90,161, leaving a difference of $1,477,368. As against this possible revenue we must set off the probable additional cost for transportation.

These periodicals would be carried on the heavy lines, where there is no considerable surplus space available in the cars, and where space is purchased on the emergency basis to carry all considerable additions from day to day. It is estimated that the probable cost of the additional space necessary to carry this amount would be $1,487,661. This is on the theory that these mails are now carried the average distance of the second and third zones and would be carried under the new arrangement the average distance to the fifth zone. If this be correct, there would be no revenue derived, but a slight loss.

So that is the situation in regard to the new proposed zone system offered by the committee, with the rates imposed by the terms of the amendment.

I have already referred to what we lose—over $1,350,000—by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER]. I think there will be a loss of several million dollars under amendments that have already been adopted by the Senate in regard to second and first class mail. So I hope, in the interest of the bill and its success, that the committee amendment in regard to the zone system, making three instead of eight zones, with the rates imposed, may be disagreed to and that the original provisions of the bill may in this respect be allowed to stand.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, it seems to me that if any class of people using the mails can afford to pay for that use, it is the advertiser. The cost of the advertising is undoubtedly in practically every case charged up to the cost of selling the product which is advertised. The committee amendment reduces the rates on papers carrying advertising and increases the cost of the parcel post. The zones are the same for the parcel post and for newspapers carrying advertising. It seems to me the rates should be practically the same. I wish to compare briefly the difference in the rates.

Under the proposed committee amendment, the first, second, and third zones are 3 cents for papers containing advertising matter. The parcel-post rate in the first and second zone is 5 cents and in the third zone 6 cents. Under the committee amendment, for newspapers carrying advertising the rate in the fourth, fifth, and sixth zones is 6 cents, and for parcel post in the fourth zone 7 cents, in the fifth zone 8 cents, and in the sixth zone 9 cents. The rate on newspapers carrying advertising in the seventh and eighth zones is 8 cents, while on parcel post in the seventh zone it is 11 cents and in the eighth zone 12 cents per pound, with an increase for additional pounds.

It seems to me, even if there is any excuse for raising revenue in this bill, there is absolutely no excuse for cutting down the regular rate proposed by the department in the bill on papers carrying advertisements to the basis of the committee amendment.

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] that the provision of the original bill should be retained and the committee amendment defeated. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who has charge of the bill, made a statement day before yesterday on the floor that if we are going to legislate we should legislate for everybody alike. Let us do it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am quite sure the Senator from North Dakota will find, when the section of the bill dealing with fourth-class matter comes before us, that the rates he has been quoting as the rates proposed by the committee are erroneous. The Senator from North Dakota, however, is not so blamable for that, because the bill as now before the Senate does not represent what the subcommittee had in mind to accomplish. The reason for that is that we were using a print of only a portion of the bill which had been made for committee use.

Without wishing to anticipate any debate with reference to fourth-class matter, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that we leave the rate structure on parcel post entirely unchanged from where it now is. If the Senator wishes, when we come to that section of the bill we can take it up in detail and show that exactly. The Senator, as I have said, is quite within his rights in every way in offering the observations he has. He is justified in making them because of the print of the bill that he has in his hand.

Mr. FRAZIER. Then the proposed rates on parcel post are higher than the proposed rates for newspapers carrying advertising?

Mr. MOSES. That is quite true. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the amendment?

Mr. STERLING. I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ernst	McKellar	Sheppard
Ball	Fernald	McKinley	Shields
Bayard	Ferris	McLean	Shipstead
Bingham	Fess	McNary	Shortridge
Borah	Fletcher	Mayfield	Simmons
Brookhart	Frazier	Means	Smith
Broussard	George	Metcalf	Smoot
Bruce	Glass	Moses	Spencer
Bursum	Gooding	Neely	Stanfield
Butler	Greene	Norbeck	Stanley
Cameron	Hale	Norris	Sterling
Capper	Harreld	Oddie	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Couzens	Heflin	Owen	Wadsworth
Cummins	Howell	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Johnson, Minn.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Warren
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Watson
Dill	Kendrick	Ransdell	Weller
Edge	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Edwards	King	Reed, Pa.	Willis

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The yeas and nays have been demanded upon the amendment and the question is whether the demand is seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. May we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator want the amendment read?

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it a long amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the amendment proposed by the committee as amended by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE]. I think the Chair ought to state the exact situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Chair will do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the amendment be agreed to it would strike out lines 1 to 4, on page 39, and for the matter stricken out will be substituted the committee amendment as amended by the two amendments to which the Chair has referred. Upon that question the Clerk will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], which I previously made, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. Upon this vote, I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised, however, that if the Senator from Mississippi were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. FRAZIER. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—66

Ashurst	Fernald	Mayfield	Shortridge
Bayard	Fletcher	Means	Simmons
Bingham	George	Metcalf	Smith
Borah	Glass	Moses	Smoot
Brookhart	Hale	Neely	Spencer
Broussard	Harreld	Norris	Stanfield
Bursum	Harris	Oddie	Stanley
Butler	Heflin	Overman	Swanson
Cameron	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Trammell
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kendrick	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Keyes	Ralston	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	King	Ransdell	Watson
Dial	McKellar	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Dill	McKinley	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Edge	McLean	Sheppard	
Ernst	McNary	Shields	

NAYS—14

Ball	Ferris	Howell	Warren
Bruce	Fess	Johnson, Minn.	Willis
Caraway	Frazier	Shipstead	
Edwards	Gooding	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—16

Capper	Greene	La Follette	Owen
Copeland	Harrison	Lenroot	Robinson
Elkins	Johnson, Calif.	McCormick	Stephens
Gerry	Ladd	Norbeck	Underwood

So the amendment of the committee as amended was agreed to, which was, on page 39, to strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert:

(2) On that portion of any such publication devoted to advertisements the rates per pound or fraction thereof for delivery within the eight postal zones established for fourth-class matter shall be as follows:

For the first and second zones, 2 cents; and third zone, 3 cents.

For the fourth, fifth, and sixth zones, 6 cents.

For the seventh and eighth zones, and between the Philippine Islands and any portion of the United States, including the District of Columbia and the several Territories and possessions, 8 cents: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on newspapers or periodicals maintained by and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, shall be 1¼ cents per pound or fraction thereof, and the publisher of any such newspaper or periodical, before being entitled to such rate, shall furnish to the Postmaster General, at such times and under such conditions as the Postmaster General may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of the net income of such organization or association inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

Mr. HEFLIN obtained the floor.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama be willing to yield before taking the floor in order that we may dispose of the other amendments under this section, which are purely formal and can be disposed of very rapidly, inasmuch as they merely propose to strike out those portions of the section which it is necessary to strike out because of the rates which have been agreed to by the Senate, and also to change the lettering of the section?

Mr. HEFLIN. If that can be done immediately, I have no objection.

Mr. MOSES. It probably can be done within 60 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed committee amendments.

The next committee amendment was, on page 39, after line 14, to strike out down to and including line 14, on page 40, as follows:

(3) The rate of postage on that portion, devoted to matter other than advertisements, of newspapers or periodicals maintained by and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, shall be 1¼ cents per pound or fraction thereof, and the publisher of any such newspaper or periodical, before being entitled to such rate, shall furnish to the Postmaster General, at such times and under such conditions as the Postmaster General may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of the net income of such organization or association inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual;

(4) On that portion of any such publication (including newspapers) devoted to advertisements, the rates per pound or fraction thereof for delivery within the eight postal zones established for fourth-class matter shall be as follows:

(1) For the first and second zones, 4 cents;
(2) For the third zone, 5 cents;
(3) For the fourth zone, 6 cents;
(4) For the fifth zone, 7 cents;
(5) For the sixth zone, 8 cents;
(6) For the seventh zone, 9 cents;
(7) For the eighth zone, 10 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 20, after the word "newspapers," to strike out "described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of" and to insert "provided for in," so as to read:

(c) The rate of postage on daily newspapers and on the periodicals and newspapers provided for in this section, when deposited in a letter-carrier office for delivery by its carriers, shall be the same as now provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 11, to strike out from lines 12 to 25, both inclusive, as follows:

(e) For the purpose of this section the term "newspaper" shall include only such publications as are issued weekly or more frequently than weekly, and having the ordinary characteristics of a newspaper; that is, devoted mainly to the current events of the day or week immediately preceding the date which the publication bears and which contains matter of interest to the general public and not restricted to a particular trade, industry, occupation, religion, or profession, and before being entitled to transmission in the mails as a newspaper under the rates herein provided the Postmaster General shall require the submission by the publisher thereof at such times and under such conditions as the Postmaster General shall prescribe satisfactory evidence as to the character of such publication.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(f)" and to insert "(e)," so as to make the clause read:

(e) With the first mailing of each issue of each such publication, the publisher shall file with the postmaster a copy of such issue.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 204, page 42, line 8, before the word "cents," to strike out "1½" and to insert "2," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 204. The rate of postage on publications entered as second-class matter, when sent by others than the publisher or news agent, shall be 2 cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof, for weights not exceeding 8 ounces, and for weights of such matter exceeding 8 ounces the rates of postage prescribed for fourth-class matter shall be applicable thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, under the subhead "Third-class matter," in section 207, line 21, before the word "ounces," to strike out the word "eight" and to insert the word "four," so as to read:

THIRD-CLASS MATTER

SEC. 207. (a) Mail matter of the third class shall weigh not in excess of 4 ounces.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, if the next amendment may be stated, so that there will be a question before the Senate, I will not ask that we proceed with the consideration of the bill further until the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] shall have completed his remarks.

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

The next committee amendment was, on page 42, line 25, after the word "same," to strike out "merchandise, and all other matter not included in the first and second classes," and to insert "merchandise (including farm and factory products), and all other mailable matter not included in the first or second class, or in the fourth class as defined in section 208," so as to read:

and shall include books, circulars, and other matter wholly in print (except newspapers and other periodicals entered as second-class matter), proof sheets, corrected proof sheets, and manuscript copy accompanying same, merchandise (including farm and factory products), and all other mailable matter not included in the first or second class, or in the fourth class as defined in section 208.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I inquire what amendment is that?

Mr. MOSES. I did not intend to ask that any of the amendments in section 207 should be pressed, because I had an understanding with the Senator from Alabama that he was to make a statement at the conclusion of our consideration of the bill down to section 207.

Mr. GEORGE. So I understood; and it was for that reason I asked the question.

Mr. MOSES. But if action has been taken by the Senate other than under that understanding I had with the Senator from Alabama, I ask that that action may be reconsidered and that the question before the Senate now shall be the amendment proposed by the committee on page 42, in line 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MOSES. I will not ask for action or discussion on the amendments in section 207, Mr. President, until after the Senator from Alabama shall have made the statement which he wishes to make to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the Chair rule, so that the action agreeing to the amendments in section 207 may be formally reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, and the pending amendment is that on page 42, in line 21, to strike out "8" and insert "4" before "ounces."

REPLYING TO ATTACK OF WASHINGTON POST REGARDING ATTORNEY GENERAL STONE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Washington Post of to-day contains an attack upon me for discussing a matter of record regarding the Attorney General of the United States. I have in my hands the arguments made in the Supreme Court in the case of the J. Pierpont Morgan heirs *v.* Colonel Ownbey. The whole proceedings are of record. The newspapers have had a great deal to say about this case. The whole story has been printed in the press.

When I learned what had transpired in the case originating in Delaware, in view of the fact that the Attorney General of the United States appeared in that case and urged the Supreme Court to sustain what was done in the lower court, I felt that I owed it as a United States Senator to the Constitution of my country and to the people whom I in part represent, and to the citizen who was deprived of his property without due process of law, to make the statement which I did make.

Before I read the article printed in the Washington Post this morning I wish to read a very fair statement from the New York World, which tells the truth about the case. It is as follows:

HEFLIN started the trouble with a speech, which he had been prevented from delivering by President pro tempore CUMMINS's ruling that it belonged to the camera proceedings. CUMMINS later announced that his ruling was an error, so HEFLIN lit into the Attorney General on the record of his appearance on behalf of J. Pierpont Morgan and others in a case against Colonel Ownbey.

"My criticism"—

The paper quotes me as saying—

"is because he insisted that the Supreme Court sustain a decision in a Delaware court where I feel a citizen was denied his rights and robbed of his property without due process of law."

Mr. President, I contend that if a Senator feels that way about a question he has a right to discuss it. The fact that a man happens to be Attorney General or Secretary of State or holds any other office in the Cabinet does not preclude a Senator from discussing his record as a lawyer before he came into the Cabinet nor his record as a Cabinet officer before he goes on the Supreme Court, nor even after he goes upon the Supreme Court.

A Supreme Court justice is made by the President and the Senate. The Senate can reject the appointment made by the President. A grave responsibility rests upon the Senate, and Senators have the right to inquire into the conduct of a man aspiring to that high place; and if a Senator who is to pass on him finally in this Chamber wants to call attention to some act of his that he believes runs counter to a proper construction of the Constitution and does not show sufficient regard for the rights of the American citizen, that Senator who must finally pass upon the judge before he goes on the bench ought to have a right to say how he feels about him, and the country, whose Government this is, ought to know all about the person who goes upon that bench to exercise the great power vested in a judge for the remainder of his lifetime.

This attack made upon me by the Post is a compliment to me. I regard it so. Whenever one of these hirelings of the corrupt interests of the country assails me, I know that I am right and that I am doing my duty. I know the purpose of this editorial attack. It is to intimidate Senators. It is to create an atmosphere about this Capitol that will chill and frighten and drive away from their solemn duty Senators who feel that they owe something to the country they represent and who have due regard for the oaths they took when they came into this Chamber. I want to notify those who indulge in this sort of thing that they can not intimidate me—they ought to have learned that long before this—and there are other Senators here whom they can not intimidate.

Of course I know that there are men in public life who fear the lash of a powerful newspaper. I know there are those who move along the lines of least resistance. I know there are those who will shape their creed by their cravings and swallow their convictions in order to have themselves played up and praised in the press for the people back home to read. But, Senators, what of the final record in the years to come, when, little by little and bit by bit, corrupt interests encroach upon the constitutional rights of the people and put things over while Senators remain silent until so many things have been put over that the whole thing tumbles down? It is too late then, Mr. President. I owe a duty to myself and I owe it to the people who sent me here; I owe it to the people of this Nation, because, by reason of the position I hold in this body as a Senator, I am responsible in part for those who go upon the Supreme Bench while I am a Member of this body.

This inspired article, coming from the same paper that defended Daugherty and Fall and all the scandals and crimes committed against the Government last year and the year before, says:

We hold no brief for Mr. Stone, nor do we prejudge him.

That is unfortunate for Mr. Stone. As I said before, Mr. Stone is personally a very clever gentleman, so far as I know; but it is unfortunate for him that this paper comes out in this fashion for him, because the presumption is that there is something wrong whenever that paper espouses the cause of a man. [Laughter.]

Continuing, the Post said:

If Mr. Stone is unfit to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court it is for the Senate to ascertain the facts and act accordingly; but it is a disgrace verging on indecency, and brings the Senate into disrepute, for a Senator to use Mr. Stone's nomination as a political football and to hit over Mr. Stone's shoulder at the President.

Mr. President, I do not know of any Senator who is doing that. I have not mentioned the President's name. I never thought that the President knew anything about this Delaware case. I did not until it was brought to my attention, and I do not know yet that the President knows about it in detail. I have said nothing about the President. It is not a matter of politics with me. Mr. Taft was appointed and confirmed by this Chamber, and there was no opposition to him, and I congratulated him myself. He is a Republican. Mr. Sanford, an excellent, able, and clean judge from Tennessee, was confirmed by this body. No fight was made upon him. He is a Republican. I made no objection to him; so it is not a matter of politics with me. I know that the President has the right to name a Republican, and I am not complaining about that. In my judgment, there are many Republicans who never would have urged the Supreme Court to sustain the action of the lower court in Delaware, as Mr. Stone did.

This article goes on to say:

Mr. HEFLIN was condemning Mr. Stone unheard, a sorry performance.

Mr. President, this paper was unfortunate in using that expression. I was condemning him for failing to permit an American citizen to be heard when all that he had accumulated in a lifetime was at stake. I was condemning him for standing and pleading in the highest court in the land, from which there was no appeal, asking it to sustain the judgment of the lower court where an American citizen was denied the right to answer, to plead, to have counsel, or to testify in any way whatever.

Mr. President, the sad part of it all is that this case has been closed in the Supreme Court. This American citizen, Colonel Owenby, has never yet been heard. He walks the streets of Washington to-day practically bankrupt. His property, which he accumulated in the West when in partnership with the Morgans, has been taken away from him by courts without, in my judgment, due process of law. His property is gone. Now, you may say, "Could that happen in a free country like ours?" It did happen. This man was called over there to court to answer, as I have stated, and he went there with the facts to refute the allegations against him, and because he could not put up $200,000 he was turned away and not allowed to testify. He has not testified yet, but his property has been taken, sold upon the block by an order of that court, and the heirs of the Morgan estate bought it in. The old fellow said he would not have taken a million dollars for his holdings prior to that suit, so you can tell what happened to him by using a court to accomplish something that highwaymen would accomplish on the roadside with clubs and guns. So this man has been dragged into court, he has been deprived of his property, he has never yet been permitted to be heard, and I am criticized by this unworthy and discreditable sheet for daring to come into this presence and talk to the country about conduct of that kind because they happen to favor the appointment of a certain man who has represented certain big interests.

I have not criticized Mr. Stone for representing Pierpont Morgan in the past. I do not criticize any lawyer for representing a big client if he chooses to do so; but I watch his conduct in the case, and it makes no difference whether it is for a big client or a little client when he comes to construe the Constitution, and he argues it so that he shows a disregard for the Constitution itself and the rights of the citizen under it, then I have a right to come in and make my objection known to him, and I shall continue to do it. I have a re-

sponsibility; I am trying to live up to it; and I want Senators not to be intimidated by this onslaught made by this paper in the Capital which is trying to drive to cover Senators who dare to advocate open executive sessions so that the country may know who men are, how they are selected, and what their records are, before they go upon the Supreme Bench to hold that great office for a lifetime.

That is the solemn duty that we have, Senators; and those who do not want the light turned on, and who do not want the truth discussed, are like those spoken of in the Bible; they love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.

To show that the heirs of Morgan thought they had done Ownbey an injury, and that he might come back in some way, here is a telegram sent yesterday by Chief Justice Teller of the Supreme Court of Colorado to a Senator in this Chamber. He says, in part:

I saw Satterlee and Stone in obtaining option for Ownbey on the Morgan interests in Wootton Coal Co. I refused their request to include in option contract release of all claims for damages growing out of the Delaware suit.

Does not that seem to support me in what I am doing here? I have already stated that the State of Delaware tried to amend that statute in order to give this man Ownbey an opportunity to open the judgment, to come back and plead, to make his answer. I have already stated that the Senate of Colorado passed a resolution condemning the heirs of the Morgans for what they were doing and trying to do to Colonel Ownbey. Now, here is a telegram from the chief justice of the court out there who says that he saw Satterlee and Stone and refused their request to tie into this option a provision waiving this man's right to sue them for damages growing out of the suit in Delaware.

That shows that they knew Ownbey had been unjustly treated. Senators, it will be a sad day for this Nation when Senators in this body, for want of backbone and courage or for love of publicity by these hired sheets, will fail and refuse to get up here and contend for the rights of the citizen, for the proper construction of the Constitution, for the preservation of the Supreme Court as it should be preserved for the people in all its integrity.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I shall not take very much time, or insist upon a record vote upon this proposition, but it will be noted that this is a radical change not only in regard to rates, but in regard to the weights of packages which will be included in third-class matter.

It was proposed in the original bill that mail matter of the third class should weigh not to exceed 8 ounces. The subcommittee proposed that "8" be changed to "4," so that mail matter of the third class should weigh not in excess of 4 ounces, and should include "books, circulars, and other matter wholly in print (except newspapers and other periodicals entered as second-class matter), proof sheets, corrected proof sheets and manuscript copy accompanying same, merchandise (including farm and factory products), and all other mailable matter not included in the first or second class, or in the fourth class as defined in section 208."

Without arguing the matter further, I send to the desk and ask to have read a portion of a letter of the National Cloak & Suit Co., beginning with next to the last paragraph on the first page, and reading to the star in the margin on the next page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The Secretary will read:

The principal legislative clerk read as follows:

None of the reasons, however, which influenced us in refraining from appearing before the subcommittee to seek to obtain any modification of the bill in the form upon which hearings were held are present in the bill which has been introduced into the Senate. We desire, therefore, to protest strongly against certain of the provisions of the bill.

First, the details in which the provisions of the original bill relating to third-class matter have been changed create a condition which is absolutely destructive so far as a very considerable volume of business hitherto handled by the Post Office Department is concerned, and which is even more destructive in its effect upon a large number of concerns doing business through the medium of small-sized catalogues.

A catalogue of, say, 6 ounces could be mailed under the present provisions covering third-class matter at a cost of 3 cents regardless of zone, and this rate was not affected in the bill as originally considered by the subcommittee. Under the bill as now introduced, however, the cost of mailing such a catalogue would be 6 cents up to the second zone, 7 cents in the third zone, 8 cents in the fourth zone, 9 cents in the fifth zone, 10 cents in the sixth zone, 12 cents in the seventh zone, and 13 cents in the eighth zone. It would cost as much to mail such a catalogue to the seventh zone by parcel post as it would to mail it as first-class matter, and it would cost more by parcel post than first-class mail to the eighth zone; it would cost as much to mail a 5-ounce catalogue in the sixth zone by parcel post as it would to mail it as first-class matter, and it would cost more by parcel post than first-class mail to the seventh and eighth zones.

These inconsistencies in themselves would appear to be sufficient to condemn the proposed changes. Their effect upon business, however, is so serious that the necessity for their amendment is obvious. As we have pointed out in the preceding paragraph, the additional cost of mailing, for example, a 6-ounce booklet varies from 3 cents, or 100 per cent, in the first and second zones up to 10 cents, or 333 per cent, in the eighth zone—an average, let us say, of 6 cents. The volume of business which can be counted upon from a catalogue of this size is ordinarily insufficient to permit of its absorbing any such additional cost. On the other hand, the volume of business from a catalogue reduced in weight from, say, 6 ounces to 4 ounces, in order to bring it within the limits now proposed for third-class matter, would be so seriously diminished as to compel an entire readjustment of the business of a house depending upon a catalogue of this size as its chief selling agency. This condition is, of course, even accentuated in the case of a house accustomed to do business with a 7 or 8 ounce catalogue.

We respectfully urge that the rates at present in force for third-class matter and the provision of the present law for treating as third-class matter catalogues, books, seeds, bulbs, etc., up to 8 ounces are fair and equitable and productive of the maximum amount of revenue to the Post Office Department, and are a vital factor in the affairs of many business undertakings in this country. We desire, therefore, to protest against the changes made in this class of postal matter in the bill as reported out of committee.

Mr. STERLING. I also send to the desk a telegram received from Mr. D. B. Gurney, of Yankton, S. Dak., of the Gurney Seed Co., an old and very reputable institution in my State. I ask that the telegram be read as bearing upon this very question.

Mr. GEORGE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. May I ask what amendment is now being considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now under consideration is that found on page 42, line 21. The Secretary will read the telegram sent to the desk by the Senator from South Dakota.

The principal legislative clerk read as follows:

YANKTON, S. DAK., *January 21, 1925.*

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.:

My opinion mighty bad policy to limit third-class matter to 4 ounces. Present limit should not be changed. In our own case it would cost us additional ten thousand per year, and this penalty would be unbearable and should be borne by other classifications that are not self-supporting. D. B. GURNEY.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, this is one of the two places in the bill, as I indicated in the colloquy had with the Senator from North Dakota a short time ago, where, by reason of an imperfect print with which the subcommittee was working, the subcommittee fell into error in the manuscript of the bill as it went to the printer and as it now comes before the Senate. The Senator from Georgia, who is a member of the subcommittee, has, however, and is about to offer, an amendment covering paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 207, which amendment contains the opinion of the subcommittee in dealing with this subject, and which meets the objection which has just been raised by the Senator from South Dakota through the telegram from his constituent. I now yield to the Senator from Georgia to offer his amendment, and on behalf of the committee I accept the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I offer the amendment which I sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read.

The READING CLERK. On page 42, line 20, and on page 43, section 207, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] moves to strike out paragraphs (a) and (b), and to insert:

SEC. 207. (a) Mail matter of the third class shall include books, circulars, and other matter wholly in print (except newspapers and other periodicals entered as second-class matter), proof sheets, corrected proof sheets and manuscript copy accompanying same, merchan-

dise (including farm and factory products), and all other mailable matter not included in the first or second class, or in the fourth class as defined in section 208.

(b) The rate of postage thereon shall be 1 cent for each ounce or fraction thereof up to and including 4 ounces in weight, except that the rate of postage on books, catalogues, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants, not exceeding 8 ounces in weight, shall be 1 cent for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether that is now the committee amendment?

Mr. MOSES. It is.

Mr. STERLING. Do I understand that it in effect provides that mail matter in the first class shall weigh not in excess of 8 ounces?

Mr. MOSES. Four ounces, except as provided in paragraph (b)—catalogues, seeds, bulbs, roots, scions, and so forth.

Mr. STERLING. That would not meet the objections suggested in the letter from the National Cloak & Suit Co. which I had read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. Section 208 is another section in which, as I have already pointed out, an error occurs, and I send to the desk, in behalf of the committee, the following, to be substituted for all of section 208 as it appears in the print. May I say before it is read that it was the purpose of the subcommittee to make no change whatever in the rate structure affecting fourth-class matter. The rates on fourth-class matter remain, under the amendment which I have just sent to the desk, exactly where they are now. The only change in the cost to users of fourth-class matter is the application of a 2-cent service charge upon each package.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much revenue will that produce?

Mr. MOSES. Inasmuch as the Post Office Department itself varies in its estimates and in the number of packages carried in fourth-class mail matter, and inasmuch as Postmaster Generals in their reports, and even the present Postmaster General, in a striking address on the Postal Service which he made in Philadelphia the other evening, seem to be at variance, nobody can at the moment say with accuracy.

Assuming, however, that the change we have just made with reference to third-class matter by taking the small packages of merchandise out of the fourth class and putting them into the third class, where there will be no service charge, will be approved, and assuming that the diminution in the number of packages will be as much as 30 per cent, I would unhesitatingly say that this charge ought to produce from $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 at least.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will be very much more than the loss on the fourth-class matter.

Mr. MOSES. Of course, if the Senator agrees with the cost-ascertainment report that more than 60 per cent of the weight of the mail and more than 50 per cent of the bulk of the mail paying less than 25 per cent of the postal revenue is carried at such a loss, that is correct; but I am in marked divergence from the cost-ascertainment report on that particular point.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I remember the report, it stated that the loss on the parcel post was between six and seven million dollars.

Mr. MOSES. That is correct—that is, the report said so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the parcel post ought to be made to bear more than the cost thereof. I do not think it is the purpose of the Government to make profit on the parcel post, and for that reason I think the amendment ought to be changed so as to reduce the amount, surely so that it would not bring in a greater revenue than the amount of the loss as reported by the department.

Mr. MOSES. To that I can make but one rejoinder, and that is in two parts. First, if the Senator is as eager to procure the postal salaries increases as his correspondence would indicate, he should agree to the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I indicated my attitude on the salary increase question not only by voting for the bill in the first instance, but by voting to pass the bill over the President's veto, and I am going further to indicate it by voting for the Senator's bill, much as I dislike some provisions in it; which would indicate that I am fairly well interested in this matter.

Mr. MOSES. I am glad to have the Senator's cooperation, and I hope he will cooperate with me now in making this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair suggest that the Secretary read the corrected amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Chair permit us just a moment, so that the Senator can conclude his reply?

Mr. MOSES. The second part of my rejoinder is that since the inception of the parcel post, in 1913, it has had an actual reduction in rates applied to it, of money paid for its transportation; and, second, has had the weight and the cubic contents of the packages handled by parcel post greatly increased. The Senator, who I think was a Member of the other House when the parcel post legislation was enacted, will remember that the limit was then 11 pounds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. MOSES. And the cubic contents of a package were very much less than now permitted. The package now may measure 72 inches in circumference, and they may carry a package weighing 69 pounds. So that the parcel post having gone through all the periods of this novelty in postal legislation whereby the Finance Committee, in a tax bill, undertook to apply postal rates, having gone free through that, and having prior to that enjoyed an absolute reduction first of all in its money rate and second through the weight and size of the package carried, we feel justified in asking for a service charge on every parcel-post package, and we feel further justified in it because the subcommittee could not share the views of the cost ascertainment committee with reference to the loss sustained in the handling of parcel-post business.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I am concerned, I believe the report of the commission is fairly accurate. I think the loss on parcel post is about what the department has reported. I think it would injure the system of parcel post to add this great cost to it. I think it would be an imposition upon the country people of the United States, which people have so generously used the system and made it a success, a very much greater success than we thought it could be when we established it. The loss is very much less than it was expected to be by almost anyone, so much less than the Senator from New Hampshire thought it would be that he now doubts the accuracy of the report of the committee. It seems to me that we certainly ought not to put a greater burden on fourth-class matter than would make it pay for its own carriage.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment which I think the Senator from New Hampshire will accept, providing that no service charge shall be imposed upon any package originating on rural free delivery routes.

Mr. MOSES. I was about to advert to that proposal, which was discussed in the subcommittee and I believe by a very narrow vote in the committee was not agreed to there.

In the first place, replying to or informing the Senator from Tennessee, the use of the parcel post by the farmer has been most disappointing to the friends of the parcel-post system and friends of the Post Office Department. Out of the entire number of packages carried in the parcel post, and aggregating something like 4,000,000,000 pounds out of 7,000,000,000 pounds of total mail matter, and out of something like 1,200,000,000 individual packages comprising the parcel post, only about 1.5 per cent originated on rural free delivery routes or on star routes, and only about 9 per cent of the total number of packages are delivered on those two routes.

However, inasmuch as there is in the amendment now pending a paragraph contained in the bill as printed and before the Senate, providing for an expedition charge on certain parcel-post packages, which charge we expect to be highly productive of revenue and inducive to increasing the number of packages carried on parcel-post routes especially from rural sections by bringing perishable articles into the parcel-post mail, I am entirely willing to accept the proviso which the Senator from Georgia has just stated and which I understand he formally will offer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MOSES. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator what the loss of revenue would be as a result of adopting the amendment?

Mr. MOSES. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Utah, being a much better mathematician than all the rest of us put together, can estimate what 1½ per cent of 1,200,000,000 packages would be at 2 cents apiece.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire indicate how far beyond page 44 the amendment goes?

Mr. MOSES. The amendment which I am proposing, and which I have sent to the desk and which will presently be read,

is a substitute for entire section 208. The committee amendment now is to begin on line 16, page 43, and strike out down to and including line 9, on page 47, and insert the amendment now at the desk. There is another amendment which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is about to offer. and I will ask that he withhold it until we have dealt with the amendment as it now stands, because I intend to accept his amendment also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will now read the amendment.

The READING CLERK. In lieu of section 208 as printed, insert the following:

SEC. 208. (a) Mail matter of the fourth class shall weigh in excess of 4 ounces, and shall include books, circulars, and other matter wholly in print (except newspapers and other periodicals entered as second-class matter), proof sheets, corrected proof sheets and manuscript copy accompanying same, merchandise (including farm and factory products), and all other mailable matter not included in the first or second class, or in the third class as defined in section 207.

(b) That on fourth-class matter the rate of postage shall be by the pound as established by, and in conformity with, the act of August 24, 1912, and in addition thereto there shall be a service charge of 2 cents for each parcel, except upon parcels or packages collected on rural delivery routes, to be prepaid by postage stamps affixed thereto, or as otherwise prescribed by the regulations of the Postmaster General.

Whenever, in addition to the postage as hereinbefore provided, there shall be affixed to any parcel of mail matter of the fourth-class postage of the value of 25 cents with the words "Special handling" written or printed upon the wrapper, such parcel shall receive the same expeditious handling, transportation, and delivery accorded to mail matter of the first class.

The classification of articles mailable as well as the weight limit, the rates of postage, zone or zones, and other conditions of mailability under this section if the Postmaster General shall find on experience that they or any of them are such as to prevent the shipment of articles desirable, or to permanently render the cost of the service greater than the receipts of the revenue therefrom, he is hereby directed, subject to the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission after investigation, to reform from time to time such classifications, weight limit, rates, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public or to insure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

(c) That during the 12 months next succeeding the approval of this act the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of not more than 50 rural routes, in localities to be selected by him; said experiments shall be designed primarily to develop and to encourage the transportation of food products directly from producers to consumers or vendors, and, if the Postmaster General shall deem it necessary or advisable during the progress of said experiments, he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, on such number or all of said routes as he may desire, to reduce to such an extent as he may deem advisable the rate of postage on food products mailed directly on such routes for delivery at the post offices from which such routes start, and to allow the rural carriers thereon a commission on the postage so received at such rate as the Postmaster General may prescribe, which commission shall be in addition to the carriers' regular salaries. The amounts due the carriers for commissions shall be determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Postmaster General directly from the postal revenues: *Provided*, That the amount so paid shall in no case exceed the actual amount of revenue derived from this experimental service.

A report on the progress of this experiment shall be made to Congress at the next regular session.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire that the service charge will bring about $16,000,000 or $17,000,000, and in view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] will only reduce the amount, according to the mathematics of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], about $24,000, I am wondering if he would not accept——

Mr. MOSES. It is $240,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Utah, who is a great mathematician, said it is $24,000.

Mr. MOSES. I bow to his mathematical ability.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would not the Senator from New Hampshire be willing to accept an amendment providing for a 1-cent service charge, which would then bring the amount of revenue from parcel post to more than it cost, according to the report of the commission?

Mr. MOSES. Great as is my regard and affection for the Senator from Tennessee, I can not accept the amendment. The proposal as it first came before the committee was to make the service charge 5 cents, and we discussed all sums from 1 cent up to 10 cents, and finally decided upon 2 cents as being productive, as being equitable, and as being easy to administer, because one can buy a 2-cent stamp anywhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. Inasmuch as the Senate has shown this morning on two votes that a majority is going to carry out the wishes of the Senator from New Hampshire in the matter, I will not formally offer the amendment. I think it is unnecessary to do it. I know what the view of the Senate is on the situation. I am led to take this course for another reason, that the rates will only exist until February 15, 1926, and they can be tried out. I hope, however, it will not be the policy of the Government to make money out of the parcel post. We ought not to go any further than to have that great system made to pay its own way. We ought not to go any further than that, in my judgment.

Mr. MOSES. I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota who, I believe, desires to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire the parliamentary status. Is the amendment which he just suggested to be considered the committee amendment?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. I hardly know where the amendment will come in after the reading of the new proposal offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, but it refers to that part of the amendment relating to the 25-cent charge for special handling. If the Clerk will follow my reading, as I think I have the language here, we can determine that point. I read:

Whenever in addition to the postage as hereinbefore provided there shall be affixed to any parcel of mail matter of the fourth-class postage of the value of 25 cents with the words "special handling" written or printed upon the wrapper, such parcel shall receive the same expedition of routing, dispatching, working, and delivery as is accorded mail matter of the first class.

I wish to offer this amendment to that language: Strike out all after the words "the same," as far as I read, and insert in lieu thereof the words "expeditious handling, transportation, and delivery accorded to mail matter of the first class."

Mr. MOSES. To my mind there is very slight difference in the language contained in the committee amendment and in that proposed by the Senator from South Dakota. My understanding is that under the language employed by the committee in its amendment it would be imperative upon the Postal Service to handle these special packages in closed pouches, which, of course, is one of the purposes of the amendment. However, inasmuch as the whole matter of the 25-cent expedition charge is experimental I am not inclined to be captious about the language in which the department is instructed to institute this new service, and I accept the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment is agreed to. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has offered an amendment to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. GEORGE. I have sent my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 44, beginning in line 5, the language now reads:

(b) That on fourth-class matter the rate of postage shall be by the pound, as established by and in conformity with the act of August 24, 1912, and in addition thereto there shall be a service charge of 2 cents for each parcel—

At which point the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] offers the following amendment:

Except upon parcels or packages collected on rural-delivery routes.

Mr. MOSES. I accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with reference to the 25 cents special charge for the expeditious handling, and so forth, of parcel-post packages, I merely wish to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire this thought: I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if this amendment, in his judgment, will not create a large class of preferred parcel-post matter and thereby further defer the handling and delivery of that class of parcel post that the system was really established to handle? I think the Senator will get my idea.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator's idea, if I caught it correctly, is that the application of the expedition fee to a large number of parcel-post packages will delay the accumulation of a

sufficient number of ordinary parcel-post packages to fill a storage car, and to that extent a considerable portion of the parcel-post matter will be still further thrown back into the grade of high-class freight; in other words, the bulk of parcels-post matter of which we are speaking would then be dealt with here exactly as parcel post is dealt with in Europe, for example. I wish to be entirely frank with my colleague from Georgia, who rendered the subcommittee such distinct service in the course of the trying days when we were attempting to get this bill together, and I will say that there is a chance that such will be the result. I can not tell how great a chance that will be; I can not tell how far it will detrimentally affect a large bulk of parcel post; but may I point out to the Senator and to the Senate that this is an entirely new Postal Service, and nobody can forecast with accuracy what its effect will be? I believe it will be widely made use of; I believe it will be highly productive of revenue; but I think that, in some degree, it will produce the result of which the Senator from Georgia is apprehensive.

However, let me say to the Senator that we can determine that result during the test period in which these rates are applicable. I think we can readily find out in the course of the investigation which is to take place during the recess exactly what the effect of the expedition fee will be.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is upon that theory that I am not going to offer any objection to this special charge, although I apprehend that precisely what I fear will take place; that the Parcel Post System, in so far as it benefits those people for whom it was specially designed—farmers—will be practically destroyed by virtue of the creation of this special class of preferential matter.

Mr. MOSES. I do not think it will go so far as that, Mr. President, though in some degree it might result in the manner suggested by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Inasmuch as it is a test I am not going to make a formal objection to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator from New Hampshire will now describe to the Senate the exact situation in connection with this amendment and what condition it is in? As I understand, there have been some amendments accepted to the amendment.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, we are now dealing with the entire subject matter of the bill so far as it relates to fourth-class mail. There is no change whatever in the bill as the committee intended to report it, except that the proviso of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] exempting certain packages from the service charge has been agreed to. Other than that and certain changes in language offered by the Senator from South Dakota, which, in my opinion, do not at all change the intent or the effect of the measure, the amendment now pending is exactly what the subcommittee intended to report except, as I have stated, for the verbal change offered by the Senator from South Dakota and the proviso which has been presented by the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the service charge apply to packages down to a certain weight?

Mr. MOSES. It applies to all packages in the parcel post except those covered by the proviso offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then, with that one exception, there is a blanket service charge of 2 cents?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I imagine that exception will be adopted, although the entire amendment as amended has not as yet been adopted, but I can not help making the observation that the proviso suggested by the Senator from Georgia singles out one class of citizens for preferential treatment.

Mr. GEORGE. It does, Mr. President.

Mr. MOSES. It does.

Mr. GEORGE. And the parcel-post system was created largely to serve that particular class, and we justify it upon that basis alone.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should like to make this further observation: As I understand it, under the amendment a patron of the Rural Free Delivery Service may ship through the mails a package in the parcel-post system without paying the service charge, but if another person living in a village in which there is a house-to-house delivery but no rural free delivery ships exactly the same kind of package through the parcel post he must pay a 2-cent service charge.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Why not also include the latter in the exemption?

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MOSES. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. On that point I wish to state that it is my understanding that the parcel post law was passed originally for the benefit of the people living in the rural communities. Since it passed it has grown in magnitude, so that only about 11 per cent of the parcel-post packages originate on or go to rural routes, and practically the bulk of the loss, or at least a proportionate percentage of the loss, chargeable to the Parcel Post System is due to the parcel-post service in the cities and villages. For that reason I am in favor of this amendment and believe it should be adopted, and that there should be further provisions made for the benefit of the farmers and those living on rural routes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MOSES. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I recollect the circumstances surrounding the inception of the Parcel Post System, and I think the Senator from North Dakota is correct, or substantially correct, when he says that it was inaugurated for the benefit of those who live in the open country, as it were; but, after all, it has brought that benefit to those people already, and in the rates thus far imposed on parcel-post packages there has been no distinction or discrimination made as between the users, whether they live on a country road or a village street or a city street. I can not see how we can say that the citizen who lives on Main Street, where the inhabitants are not dependent upon a rural route, shall be called upon to pay more to send his packages through the mails than the man must pay who lives a mile out of town.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I quite agree with what the Senator from New York says. I am perfectly willing that the exemption shall be made in favor of those suggested by the Senator from North Dakota; but why does not the Senator from New York present an amendment which will exempt all the other patrons of the Parcel Post System?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If such an amendment were adopted, there would be no 2-cent service charge at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What of it? What difference does it make if accommodation is given, and, if our people are to be put upon a parity, why should it not be so? The Senator from New Hampshire is correct in saying that yesterday we established the precedent of creating class exemptions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We did.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And one of the reasons why I voted against the amendment then presented was because I thought that would be the ultimate result of the amendment, and I wished to prevent discrimination and partiality in the execution and administration of the proposed law. Let us try to make it just as equal in administration as we can. If the Senator from New York will present an amendment providing that the exemption shall be applied equally to all, I shall be delighted then to vote in favor of it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from California is endeavoring to entice the Senator from New York to wipe out what little revenue there is left in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, no. I do not want to entice the Senator from New York into wiping out any revenue in the bill; I want the Senator from New York to pursue a course that the Senator from California always likes to pursue, that of making all people equal before the law in any measures that we pass. I know the Senator from New York is sympathetic with that view from the expression that he has just used, and, inasmuch as he broached the subject, I wanted to assure him of my hearty support in the views that he expressed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad to know that I have the support of the Senator from California. I hope he will support me in whichever alternative I will finally make up my mind to adopt. So far as my own conduct is concerned, if I had my way about it—and I suspect I am not going to have my way——

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the Senator have such a suspicion?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. I would impose 2 cents on all customers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended by the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not mean to impede the orderly and expeditious progress of this bill, but would the Senator from Georgia permit, without a record vote, a reconsideration of the vote by which his amendment to the committee amendment was adopted?

Mr. MOSES. There was no vote, may I say, Mr. President, but I accepted the amendment of the Senator from Georgia as perfecting the committee amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad to hear the Senator use the word "perfecting."

Mr. MOSES. That is the term ordinarily employed, but I am not using it in its dictionary sense.

Mr. President, if the Senator from New York wishes a separate vote upon the proviso presented by the Senator from Georgia, I am quite sure he can get it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It may not be important, but possibly it might be interesting for me to state that I myself am a patron of the rural free delivery, and were the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to be embedded finally in the act I would save 2 cents on every package which I mailed, compared to my neighbors living in the neighboring villages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Georgia was adopted. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is now before the Senate.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, what is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I certainly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to a reconsideration of the vote?

Mr. FRAZIER. I object to a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota objects to the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was adopted. The question, therefore, is on the committee amendment as amended by the two amendments indicated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Do I understand that there was a vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MOSES. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated, "Without objection, the amendment is agreed to," after the Senator from New Hampshire had accepted it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then, I suppose in the parliamentary sense a motion to reconsider is the only recourse I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not desire a roll call on this question, Mr. President; I will be content, may I say, with a rising vote. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would rule that the Senator from New York may make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have made such a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, can there not be discussion of that question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is open for debate.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think there will be nothing to prevent the Senator from New York, on his rural-route packages, from putting on the extra 2 cents if he wishes to do so, regardless of whether the law provides for it or not, so I can see no reason why he should object on personal grounds.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I call for a rising vote, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was adopted.

On a division, the motion to reconsider was rejected.

Mr. MOSES. Now may we have a vote upon the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the committee amendment as amended by the two amendments that were agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and which, I understand, will be accepted by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires whether the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is a committee amendment?

Mr. MOSES. No; this amendment is offered by the Senator from Georgia to provide a new paragraph in section 208; but on behalf of the committee I intend to accept it, because, I may say at this stage, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me, that the language is the language of a bill which has already received the approval of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and has already passed the Senate and is awaiting action in the House of Representatives. It is perfectly germane to this legislation, and if put on here will enable its more prompt consideration at the other end of the Capitol. I accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia, which is to add a new paragraph, paragraph (c), to section 208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to add, as a new paragraph, the following:

(c) That during the 12 months next succeeding the approval of this act the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of not more than 50 rural routes, in localities to be selected by him said experiments shall be designed primarily to develop and to encourage the transportation of food products directly from producers to consumers or vendors; and if the Postmaster General shall deem it necessary or advisable during the progress of said experiments, he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, on such number or all of said routes as he may desire, to reduce to such an extent as he may deem advisable the rate of postage on food products mailed directly on such routes for delivery at the post offices from which such routes start, and to allow the rural carriers thereon a commission on the postage so received at such rate as the Postmaster General may prescribe, which commission shall be in addition to the carriers' regular salaries. The amounts due the carriers for commissions shall be determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Postmaster General directly from the postal revenues: *Provided*, That the amount so paid shall in no case exceed the actual amount of revenue derived from this experimental service.

A report on the progress of this experiment shall be made to Congress at the next regular session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. May we go on now with the other amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 49, line 20, after the word "provisions," to insert "of the act entitled 'An act to extend the insurance and collect-on-delivery service to third-class mail, and for other purposes,' approved June 7, 1924, and," so as to make the paragraph read:

(c) The provisions of the act entitled "An act to extend the insurance and collect-on-delivery service to third-class mail, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1924, and of section 8 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912, with respect to the insurance and collect-on-delivery services, are hereby continued in force.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 24, after the word "title," to insert "except section 217," and in line 25, after the word "on," to strike out "July 1, 1925," and insert "April 15, 1925; and the rates and fees herein provided shall not apply beyond February 15, 1926, at which date the rates and fees in force next prior to the passage of this act shall become again operative unless Congress in the meantime shall otherwise determine," so as to make the paragraph read:

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 216. This title, except section 217, shall become effective on April 15, 1925; and the rates and fees herein provided shall not apply beyond February 15, 1926, at which date the rates and fees in force next prior to the passage of this act shall become again operative unless Congress in the meantime shall otherwise determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 217. A special joint subcommittee is hereby created to consist of three members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate and three members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House, to be appointed by the respective chairmen of said committees. The said special joint subcommittee is authorized and directed to hold hearings prior to the beginning of the first regular session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, to sit in Washington or at any other convenient place, and to report during the first week of the first regular session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, by bill, its recommendations for a permanent schedule of postal rates. Said special joint subcommittee is hereby authorized to administer oaths, to send for persons or papers, to employ necessary clerks, accountants, experts, and stenographers, the latter to be paid at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words; and the expense attendant upon the work of said special joint subcommittee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon voucher of its chairman. This section shall become effective upon the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments are completed.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to a consideration of section 207, relating to third-class matter, in order that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] may present an amendment which he has in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the return? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] offers an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to add, at the end of the so-called George amendment, the following proviso:

Provided, That in the case of any third-class matter issued by individuals or committees respecting candidates and questions to be voted upon at any primary, general election, or special election the rate of postage shall remain as heretofore in effect.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Nebraska what I probably should have said at the time he was discussing this amendment of his with me—that in my opinion the amendments to this section presented by the Senator from Georgia effectively takes care of that situation. I will ask the Senator from Georgia if that is his understanding?

Mr. GEORGE. That is my understanding, Mr. President.

Mr. HOWELL. Is it the Senator's understanding that the rate on third-class matter used for political purposes will be the same as heretofore?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so; yes. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOWELL. Very well. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MOSES. And I beg pardon of the Senator from Nebraska for not having been intelligent enough to inform him of that at our earlier conversation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the purposes of the RECORD that I proposed an amendment giving a discriminatory postage rate in favor of daily and weekly newspapers with a circulation of less than 5,000, which it is unnecessary for me to offer now in view of the adoption of the Oddie amendment; but I do offer the amendment which I send to the desk, adding a new title to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not think it will be necessary to read the amendment in full. It is the amendment that was attached to the postal salaries increase bill when it was before Congress at the last session. It is the same corrupt practices act that was reported by the Committee on Elections of the House on May 13, 1924, and adopted later by the House and the Senate and presented to the President when the postal salaries bill was considered in the last session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to consider the amendment without reading. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. I shall not interpose any objection to that request. We are all thoroughly familiar with the amendment, but I deemed it bad legislation at the time to put a corrupt practices act upon a measure of this kind. I still deem it a bad practice in legislation, and I certainly hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the amendment?

Mr. MOSES. I make no objection to that request. I am simply asking that the Senate do not agree to the amendment. I think it is bad legislative practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, which is now before the Senate.

The amendment was, on page 52, after line 25, to insert a new title, as follows:

TITLE III—FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT, 1925

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925."

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(a) The term "election" includes a general or special election, and, in the case of a resident commissioner from the Philippine Islands, an election by the Philippine Legislature, but does not include a primary election or convention of a political party;

(b) The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented at an election for election as Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected;

(c) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential and vice presidential electors (1) in two or more States, or (2) whether or not in more than one State if such committee, association, or organization (other than a duly organized State or local committee of a political party) is a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, association, or organization;

(d) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution;

(e) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure;

(f) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

(g) The term "Clerk" means the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States;

(h) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Senate of the United States;

(i) The term "State" includes Territory and possession of the United States.

SEC. 303. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution shall be accepted and no expenditure made by or on behalf of a political committee for the purpose of influencing an election until such chairman and treasurer have been chosen.

(b) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) All contributions made to or for such committee;

(2) The name and address of every person making any such contribution and the date thereof;

(3) All expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

(4) The name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made and the date thereof.

(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $10 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

SEC. 304. Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received.

SEC. 305. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file with the Clerk between the 1st and 10th days of March, June, and September, in each year, and also between the tenth and fifteenth days and on the fifth day next preceding the date on which a general election is to be held, at which candidates are to be elected in two or more States, and also on the 1st day of January, a statement containing, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) The name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution;

(2) The total sum of the contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

(3) The total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

(4) The name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such committee, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(5) The total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4);

(6) The total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) The statement filed on the 1st day of January shall cover the preceding calendar year.

SEC. 306. Every person (other than a political committee) who makes an expenditure in one or more items, other than by contribution to a political committee, aggregating $50 or more within a calendar year for the purpose of influencing in two or more States the election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk an itemized detailed statement of such expenditure in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 305.

SEC. 307. (a) Every candidate for Senator shall file with the Secretary, and every candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall file with the Clerk, not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before, and also within 30 days after, the date on which an election is to be held, a statement containing, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) A correct and itemized account of each contribution received by him or by any person for him with his knowledge or consent, from any source, in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, together with the name of the person who has made such contribution;

(2) A correct and itemized account of each expenditure made by him or by any person for him with his knowledge or consent, in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, together with the name of the person to whom such expenditure was made, except that only the total sum of expenditures for items specified in subdivision (c) of section 109 need be stated;

(3) A statement of every promise or pledge made by him or by any person for him with his consent, prior to the closing of the polls on the day of the election, relative to the appointment or recommendation for appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy, and the name, address, and occupation of every person to whom any such promise or pledge has been made, together with the description of any such position. If no such promise or pledge has been made, that fact shall be specifically stated.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) Every candidate shall inclose with his first statement a report, based upon the records of the proper State official, stating the total number of votes cast for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, at the general election the next preceding the election at which he is a candidate.

SEC. 308. A statement required by this title to be filed by a candidate or treasurer of a political committee or other person with the Clerk or Secretary, as the case may be—

(a) Shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths;

(b) Shall be deemed properly filed when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and directed to the Clerk or Secretary at Washington, D. C., but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such statement shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk or Secretary of its nonreceipt;

(c) Shall be preserved by the Clerk or Secretary for a period of two years from the date of filing, shall constitute a part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

SEC. 309. (a) A candidate, in his campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the laws of the State in which he is a candidate, nor in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the provisions of this title.

(b) Unless the laws of his State prescribe a less amount as the maximum limit of campaign expenditures, a candidate may make expenditures up to—

(1) The sum of $10,000 if a candidate for Senator or the sum of $2,500 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner; or

(2) An amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, but in no event exceeding $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $5,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

(c) Money expended by a candidate to meet and discharge any assessment, fee, or charge made or levied upon candidates by the laws of the State in which he resides, or expended for his necessary personal, traveling, or subsistence expenses, or for stationery, postage, writing, or printing (other than for use on billboards or in newspapers), for distributing letters, circulars, or posters, or for telegraph or telephone service, shall not be included in determining whether his expenditures have exceeded the sum fixed by paragraph (1) or (2) of subdivision (b) as the limit of campaign expenses of a candidate.

SEC. 310. It is unlawful for any candidate to directly or indirectly promise or pledge the appointment, or the use of his influence or support for the appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy.

SEC. 311. It is unlawful for any person to make or offer to make an expenditure, or to cause an expenditure to be made or offered, to any person, either to vote or withhold his vote, or to vote for or against any candidate, and it is unlawful for any person to solicit, accept, or receive any such expenditure in consideration of his vote or the withholding of his vote.

SEC. 312. Section 118 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 118. It is unlawful for any Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress, or any candidate for, or individual elected as, Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or any officer or employee of the United States, or any person receiving any salary or compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States, to directly or indirectly solicit, receive, or be in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever, from any other such officer, employee, or person."

SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever to make a contribution in connection with any election at which presidential and vice presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation who consents to any contribution by the corporation in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 314. (a) Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions of this title, except those for which a specific penalty is imposed by sections 312 and 313, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any of the foregoing provisions of this title, except those for which a specific penalty is imposed by sections 312 and 313, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than two years.

SEC. 315. This title shall not limit or affect the right of any person to make expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

SEC. 316. This title shall not be construed to annul the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates, unless directly inconsistent with the provisions of this title, or to exempt any candidate from complying with such State laws.

SEC. 317. If any provision of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 318. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed: The act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," approved June 25, 1910 (ch. 392, 36 Stat. 822), and the acts amendatory thereof, approved August 19, 1911 (ch. 33, 37 Stat. 25), and August 23, 1912 (ch. 349, 37 Stat. 360); the act entitled "An act to prevent corrupt practices in the election of Senators, Representatives, or Delegates in Congress," ap-

proved October 16, 1918 (ch. 187, 40 Stat. 1013); and section 83 of the Criminal Code of the United States, approved March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, 35 Stat. 1088).

SEC. 319. This title shall take effect 30 days after its enactment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the amendment now proposed by me was attached to the postal salaries bill which passed the Congress at the last session and went to the President; and when the bill was vetoed the President stated that had this portion of the bill—the title which established a corrupt practices act—been presented to him alone, he would have approved it. It is a measure that has been given a great deal of study and thought by an important committee of the House. It was fully discussed by myself and other Senators in the last session of the Congress, and therefore a detailed analysis now of the proposed provisions of the amendment is unnecessary.

I may say that the origin of the idea of such legislation as a rider to other legislation was due to the fact that when the postal salaries increase bill was before the Senate a year ago the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] proposed an amendment wherein he sought to provide for more publicity of campaign contributions. That amendment was voted upon the bill by the Senate. When the bill went with that amendment to the House the conferees struck out the Borah amendment and added a new title, which is the amendment which I now present—a measure which seeks to provide for a strong and up-to-date corrupt practices act. When the bill came back from the conferees this title was accepted by the Senate, and the bill went to the President containing this identical corrupt practices act.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. May I say that the conferees on the part of the Senate, of whom I was one, believed, as I believed then and believe now, that this is bad legislative practice; but we were confronted by a vote of instructions on the part of the House, instructing their conferees to agree to no postal salaries bill that did not carry the Cable corrupt practices act. The conferees on the part of the Senate were powerless, and yet we came in an presented a report saying that "after a full and free conference" we had agreed to so-and-so, when, as a matter of fact, the conferees on the part of the Senate were shackled and muzzled from the beginning by the action of the House.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In any event, the Senator can not deny that attached to that bill was a corrupt practices act, and that the President in his veto message said that had that portion of the bill stood alone he would have signed it.

Mr. MOSES. No.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And everybody who is familiar with legislation here knows that there is no chance whatever to get a corrupt practices act through at this session except by attaching it to some such bill, and we have a good precedent—the very identical bill which went to the President, and which the President said he would have signed if it had stood alone.

What is the situation with regard to corrupt practices acts? There are six piecemeal statutes—the acts of 1907, 1909, 1911, 1912, and 1918—seeking to prevent corrupt practices in elections. They are all obsolete. Some of them have been held to be unconstitutional. The Newberry case held one of these acts to be unconstitutional. It is a serious question if they are not all unconstitutional, in view of the fact that the amendment providing for the election of Senators by popular vote was adopted after the present corrupt practices acts were adopted. It is a doubtful question, to put it mildly, if there is any statute whatever controlling the collection of funds and the expenditure of funds in elections of Members of the Senate and Members of the House; and I want to say here, from my own experience in public life, that if something is not done to regulate the raising of money and the expenditure of money in elections, a seat in this body or a seat in the House will be denied candidates of limited financial resources.

The costs of being elected to public office have multiplied tremendously, and it takes the wealth of a wealthy man to make an effective campaign. A poor man must put himself in the hands of wealthy men or moneyed influences in order to make a thorough campaign. Yet we have allowed year after year to pass without protest, and if I do not say anything else in the Senate before I leave my seat on the 4th day of March, I want to give warning that this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol will be delivered over to those who can raise the money to make effective and successful campaigns for public offices.

I ask that a poor man be given a chance to be elected United States Senator, or to be elected a Member of the House, and he can not be given a chance unless some steps are taken to regulate the contributions and the collection of money for election to public office. There is now no Federal statutes whatever affecting it that may be considered constitutional.

Do Senators realize what it takes merely to send a circular to every voter in a State like the State of Massachusetts? It takes about $30,000. That is the least presentation of a candidate's case which ought to be permitted, the sending of a circular to every voter to show where the candidate stands upon public questions. In 10 years I have seen the costs of being elected to public office multiply and multiply and multiply, so that a poor man can not get the money necessary unless he is willing to accept contributions from men of wealth, and from other sources of wealth.

I am going to put up to the Senate a very clear question: Do you want a corrupt practices act? I am going to have a roll call on that. There is no such act on the statute books now, there is no prospect of any being adopted during this session of the Congress except as a rider on legislation of this kind. What justification is there for any Senator voting against it now, except that it is bad practice to attach such an amendment to a bill of this kind and character? We have a precedent. It was actually attached to the last bill of this character and kind passed by the Congress, and it was attached here in this body, on a roll call, on a motion made by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and the principle of that amendment was agreed to upon the part of the House by attaching this very amendment I now propose.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. According to the Senator from New Hampshire, it was attached at the demand of the House, so that it is presumable now that if it is put on in the Senate, the House will agree to it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly. The House on its own demand insisted in conference that this identical amendment should be attached to the bill, word for word and letter for letter, and the Senate accepted that upon the demand of the House. So it is not a new measure; it is not an unstudied measure. Let me say that the amendment has been prepared with very great care, and after a very great deal of study by the Committee on Elections, and reported by a very capable Republican Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. CABLE, who has given the subject a great deal of thought and a great deal of study.

It was the insistence upon the part of both the Senate and House, on the eve of the last national election, that we go before the country with some pretense of belief in a corrupt practices act, which resulted in it being adopted. We have no such act now on the statute books, nor are we likely to have one unless we can secure it in some such way as this. Here is an immediate opportunity; here is a chance at this time for this important legislation.

This amendment is not perfect. If I had my way I would limit the amount that could be expended by committees. The measure limits the total amount that may be expended by any individual candidate, but it does not limit the amount that any committee may expend. It is the curse of our election system, that a committee can expend a million dollars to elect a Senator, but the candidate for Senator himself is limited in the amount he may expend.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, is this the same measure, in identical language, that was attached to the other bill?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly; and deliberately and purposely it was not changed, because the House accepted it, the Senate accepted it, and the President accepted it, so far as he could. So it is fair to assume that if the rest of the bill is acceptable to the President, he will accept this provision. But there is no assurance, no promise of any action along this line at this session except through the adoption of this amendment.

On April 24, 1924, I offered a sweeping resolution, which was adopted, asking the Committee on Privileges and Elections to report a corrupt practices act, calling attention to conditions in this country, to the fact that there was no law whatever controlling the use of money in elections of Senators and Representatives and no legal method of requiring proper publicity of the use of money in elections.

Mr. President, due, I ought to say, to the efforts of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who proposed the first amendment which led to the attachment of a corrupt practices provision to the postal salaries increase bill a year ago, we have the precedent for attaching this amendment to this very bill. Therefore I shall ask for a record vote; I shall ask that the Members of this body declare where they stand, whether they wish to continue to have no statute regulating corrupt practices in elections of Members of the House and of Members of the Senate.

I again want to emphasize the thing that has come home to me in my short public career more than anything else, that the day is coming and coming soon when no man of limited financial means can be elected to office in a state-wide campaign in any of the great States of this Union; that he can not afford the necessary money; that he can not compete with the wealth that can be accumulated by committees and spent; that the office of governor, the office of Senator, and other offices for which state-wide campaigns are conducted are to go to the rich, to those who are well to do, or to the poor man who is willing to make a campaign upon funds that are subscribed by the well to do. I ask is that not a serious outlook for a great country like ours?

When I ran for governor of my State in 1913 a modest sum of money was sufficient to make a campaign. That day is gone. One hundred thousand dollars is insignificant in making a thorough state-wide campaign in competition with a wealthy candidate in this country to-day. What is the alternative? When committees can spend all the money they can raise, what is the alternative except that poor men who do not want to put themselves under the domination and influence and control and direction of those who have wealth must surrender their right to hold important public office.

I protest against that, and if I were to remain in this body I would urge, and so far as I have influence I am going to continue to urge, fixing an exact limit on the total sum of money that may be raised and the total sum of money that may be spent, so that all candidates shall be on an equal basis in presenting their cases to the electorates of their respective constituencies.

So sincerely and deeply do I feel upon this subject that I think a vote ought to be taken upon this question and a record be made of whether or not this body wants to have incorporated an amendment of this kind, which seeks, for the first time, to put a corrupt practices act upon the statute books that will have some meaning, that will be up to date, that will be constitutional, and that will remove the present obsolete laws and the unconstitutional statutes that are now not respected or obeyed.

I would prefer to have this subject matter dealt with in a separate bill, but the inaction of committees of the Senate that have had bills and resolutions before them on this subject prompts the presentation of this amendment to prevent in part at least corrupt practices in our national elections.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. We have no corrupt practices act on the statute books now, as the Senator has said. We did have a law upon the subject, but it was declared to be null and void, in effect, by the Supreme Court. There ought to be some effective statute on this subject. The Senate should at this session do something to safeguard the ballot. It should not be left as a matter of barter, sale, and traffic to the highest bidder.

It ought to be so that a poor man could run for any office in this country and not be embarrassed at all financially. We have reached a time in some sections, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, when a poor man can not become a candidate for the Senate. That is a sad situation in our country. It should not exist in any State in the Union. Yet we know that in some of the States a man can not become governor, he can not become a United States Senator, he can not become a Member of the House, unless he is a man of wealth, or, as the Senator has said, unless he is a man who is ready to pay the price; that is, go to the corrupt interests and tell them that he will be their agent and tool in this body or in the other body, and if he will do that, they will see in some instances that a poor man is elected, they will buy the office for him, and if he will then do what they want him to do, they would as soon have him as to have a man of wealth here.

I think we ought to do everything we can in a legislative way to keep the corrupt influences away from the ballot box and to remove restraints from honest, meritorious men and women who desire to run for office. They should not be handicapped because of a situation which exists in which large sums of money are required to enable them to run.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will pardon a personal allusion. When I became a candidate for the Senate in 1920 in a state-wide primary, I had a number of friends who were also friends of some of the gentlemen who were running against me, and they came and talked to me seriously, privately, and told me that I could not make the race because I did not have the money necessary, asking me if I had any idea how much money it would cost. I said "No." They said, "You can not go up against it. It costs a tremendous sum." I said, "It is not going to cost me any tremendous sum, because I have not got it, but I am going to become a candidate, and the matter you state with regard to money has no terrors whatever for me. I believe that if the people can be reached with a cause that is just, they will vote right." I said, "So far as my candidacy is concerned, I will rest it upon the record I made in the House for 16 years, and I am going to try to lay it before the people before the primary election."

I did that, and I am happy to say that I was nominated. At the last election I had no opposition at all, and my election did not cost me one cent. But there are places where thousands and hundreds of thousands were expended, and I think wrongfully and corruptly expended.

I do not know how much was spent in the last national campaign. I have an idea that it was somewhere between twenty and thirty million dollars. I have been told that a gentleman last summer, speaking about Mr. McAdoo, said—

> If McAdoo is nominated, we will spend as much money to defeat him as we did to defeat Bryan in 1896.

The gentleman said, "How much did you expend then?" He said, "$60,000,000." Those of us who can remember that far back remember that it looked like everybody on the face of the earth was for Mr. Bryan, but somehow or other he did not get elected.

I think that instead of yielding to the encroachment of wealth and corruption in politics we ought to stand with drawn sword and combat it at every step of its approach. Here is an opportunity in this bill and it ought to be amended as is suggested by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. We ought to have this much of law to take the place of the corrupt practices act that we once had upon the statute books. I do not see why there should be any objection to an enactment of this kind and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I presume it is somewhat unusual to add to a piece of legislation like that which we really have here under consideration a bill of another character taking up a widely different subject, but my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, has offered the amendment for our consideration. It presents an interesting subject and one to which allusion has been made many times.

I have not had the time nor the opportunity carefully to examine the amendment proposed by my colleague, but I agree with its purpose and its object. Such examination as I have been able to give it indicates to me that the amendment is a fair and reasonable proposition. I believe that the people of the country are interested in the subject. I have had some experience more recently in the matter of managing a nation-wide campaign and it is no particular pleasure to expend a large amount of money upon a political campaign.

Perhaps it ought not to be required, although we have to consider, in taking into account a national campaign that it covers 48 States, and in taking into account the different conditions and the exigencies of the campaign extending over many months, it does require a large amount of money to cover the matter of publishing to the people of the country the facts and conditions relating to the campaign and informing and educating the people of the country in relation to the issues involved in the campaign.

It seems to me, without going into detail, that the proposition is a reasonable one. Standing by itself it is one which I should support by my vote. It may be somewhat out of order to consider it in connection with the main proposition which we now have under consideration. I should not vote against it on that account, however. Notwithstanding that the proposal is offered as an amendment and though it does not relate to the subject of the bill now before the Senate, yet taking everything into consideration I think it is an amendment which should be supported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. OWEN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is unavoidably absent. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], but I am at liberty to vote on this question, and therefore allow my vote to stand.

I desire to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERRIS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] are engaged in a hearing before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FRAZIER. My colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], is unavoidably absent. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] if present would vote "yea." His pair has already been announced.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], who is necessarily absent, has a pair on this question with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. If present my colleague would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—71

Ashurst	Edge	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell
Ball	Ernst	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Fernald	Keyes	Sheppard
Bingham	Fess	King	Shipstead
Borah	Fletcher	McKellar	Shortridge
Brookhart	Frazier	McKinley	Simmons
Broussard	George	McLean	Smith
Bruce	Gerry	McNary	Smoot
Butler	Glass	Mayfield	Sterling
Cameron	Gooding	Means	Swanson
Capper	Hale	Neely	Trammell
Caraway	Harreld	Norris	Underwood
Couzens	Harris	Oddie	Wadsworth
Cummins	Harrison	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Heflin	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Johnson, Calif.	Phipps	Wheeler
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Willis
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	

NAYS—3

Moses	Spencer	Warren

NOT VOTING—22

Bursum	Howell	Norbeck	Stanley
Copeland	Ladd	Pepper	Stephens
Edwards	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Elkins	Lenroot	Robinson	Weller
Ferris	McCormick	Shields	
Greene	Metcalf	Stanfield	

So the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on page 1, line 5, of the bill I move to strike out the words "July 1, 1924," and to insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1925."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. DILL and Mr. CURTIS asked for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators in favor of the amendment will rise and stand until they are counted.

Mr. HARRISON. I call for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask that the amendment may be restated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will restate the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

The READING CLERK. On page 1, section 1, under the heading "Reclassification of salaries of postal employees," the bill reads:

SECTION 1. That on and after July 1, 1924, postmasters and employees of the Postal Service shall be reclassified and their salaries and compensation readjusted—

In line 5 the Senator from Kansas proposes to strike out "July 1, 1924," and to insert "January 1, 1925."

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas would not such an amendment, if adopted, be in violation of the pledge which was made here in the debate when the veto message was under consideration, that the new bill would carry exactly the same terms as to the payment of postal employees as were contained in the old bill which was vetoed by the President?

Mr. CURTIS. I did not understand that the bill was to carry the retroactive feature at all. I think it would be a dangerous and unwise precedent to make the salary provisions of the bill retroactive. I believe it would be in the interest of the employees themselves if the amendment which I have offered should be adopted.

Mr. DILL. The Senator will recall that when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] introduced and discussed the bill which he said he would attempt to have passed, he particularly pointed out that the language as to the salaries was identical with the language of the bill on which we were about to vote and which had been vetoed. Now, near the end of the discussion of the pending bill, it is proposed to reverse the position on that question by striking out six months of the years' pay which would have been given under the other bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I never pledged myself to the retroactive feature of the measure, and I would not do so. I think it would be a mistake to make it retroactive.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I should like to say that to make the bill retroactive from July 1 last would involve the expenditure of $38,000,000. Now, it is perfectly manifest to those of us who have the interest of the postal employees at heart that if we increase the burden of the bill by $38,000,000 without the corresponding revenue we jeopardize the prospect of the bill ever becoming a law. That is why I had much rather have the date fixed as January 1, 1925, than July 1 of last year. If we agree on July 1 of last year, as it is now in the bill, the measure will be jeopardized, for, as I have stated, it will require $38,000,000 more revenue to meet its terms. It is much better to take a half loaf than none.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, as a rule I deem all laws which have a retroactive effect to be on a wrong basis, and I think that such laws should not be enacted. One reason why I voted to sustain the President's veto was that this act would have had a retroactive effect to last July. The Government would never know where it stood financially if such action were taken.

I am willing to vote for an increase of compensation, but I object to the bill having retroactive effect to July 1, 1924. If such a provision should remain in the bill, it jeopardizes its passage and would establish a bad precedent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ERNST. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK], and vote "yea."

Mr. FRAZIER. My colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], is absent unavoidably. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is necessarily detained from the Chamber. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], and vote "nay."

Mr. CARAWAY. My colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—30

Ball	Fernald	McLean	Spencer
Bingham	Fess	Means	Sterling
Borah	Gooding	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Bursum	Hale	Norbeck	Warren
Butler	Harreld	Oddie	Watson
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Willis
Dial	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	
Ernst	King	Smoot	

NAYS—51

Ashurst	Caraway	Fletcher	Heflin
Bayard	Couzens	Frazier	Howell
Brookhart	Cummins	George	Johnson, Calif.
Broussard	Dale	Gerry	Johnson, Minn.
Bruce	Dill	Glass	Jones, N. Mex.
Cameron	Edge	Harris	McKellar
Capper	Ferris	Harrison	McKinley

McNary	Owen	Shipstead	Underwood
Mayfield	Pepper	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
Moses	Pittman	Smith	Walsh, Mont.
Neely	Ralston	Stanfield	Weller
Norris	Ransdell	Swanson	Wheeler
Overman	Sheppard	Trammell	

NOT VOTING—15

Copeland	Kendrick	McCormick	Shortridge
Edwards	Ladd	Reed, Mo.	Stanley
Elkins	La Follette	Robinson	Stephens
Greene	Lenroot	Shields	

So the amendment of Mr. CURTIS was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I gave notice that after the bill had been perfected I should move to strike out all of its provisions providing for an increase of postal rates.

I move to strike out, on page 37, commencing on line 11 with the word "Title," down to the end of line 4, on page 52.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from Virginia proposes to strike out, on page 37, lines 11 to 25, both inclusive, being Title II, "Postal rates, first-class matter, drop letters, postal cards," and so forth, and the remainder of the bill down to and including line 4, page 52.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long.

I do not think this is the right way to go about granting a just increase of salaries to postal employees. I do not think we should require these increases in rates to be made before their salaries shall be increased. I do not favor the increases contained in the bill. They have not been sufficiently examined, and, in addition, I do not think they ought to remain in a bill originating in the Senate. Consequently I gave notice that I should move to strike out all that portion of the bill when it had been completed.

I shall not detain the Senate by arguing the matter. We have heard what these increases are. Most efforts to modify and change the increases made were defeated. I believe they impose upon certain people a burden that ought not to be imposed upon them in order to do justice to the postal employees.

I voted to increase the salaries of the postal employees. I think the increases are just; I think they are proper; I think they are reasonable; and I do not think relief to this deserving class of citizens should be conditioned upon the certainty or uncertainty of raising additional revenue.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I have supported salary increases for postal employees on all occasions and in every instance since this matter has been before the Senate. I believe that they are entitled to a reasonable increase; but I am not in sympathy with the double-barreled legislation that we have before us at the present time. I know of no instance where we have provided for an increase in salaries to any other class of Government employees when there has been an effort to provide for the additional revenue in the same legislation, as is true in the measure we are now considering.

I am in sympathy with the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. I believe that the question of the increase of the salaries should stand upon its own merits, and that we should not have forced upon us the necessity for providing increases in this particular legislation. I am going to vote for the amendment proposed by him, and in doing so I wish it distinctly understood upon the other hand that my sympathies are with the idea of increasing the salaries of postal employees. I think, unquestionably, we should pass legislation providing for an increase, but I do not think we should be forced to accept some increases in postal rates to which we very strenuously object.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Virginia will be adopted.

Mr. MOSES obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds will he answer some questions which I should like to put to him?

Mr. MOSES. I will try to do so.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator can, I am sure.

There has been a great deal of confusion about the consideration of this bill, some amendments having been rejected and some having been adopted. With the amendments that have been adopted, how much revenue will the bill raise, in the opinion of the Senator?

Mr. MOSES. My impression is that the bill will raise well upward of $50,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. And the amount it would take to give the increased salaries to the employees would be some sixty-odd millions?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. How much does the Senator estimate the charge on parcel post will amount to?

Mr. MOSES. Both charges, something rising twenty millions.

Mr. HARRISON. It is an increase, then, to the extent of twenty millions on parcel post?

Mr. MOSES. I think so.

Mr. President, the effect of the motion made by the Senator from Virginia will be exactly such as he attempted to bring about by a point of order, which the Senate, by a decisive vote, refused to sustain. I am glad to hear him once more make a statement of his beliefs. His faith is constant and shining and always interesting in its declaration. But, Mr. President, we have already tried once to increase postal salaries in a naked measure, and we know it has failed. If there are Senators here who wish to increase postal salaries, they will reject the motion of the Senator from Virginia and they will vote to enact this bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me it is evident that all that part of this bill included in the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is an attempt to legislate without proper and fair consideration of the subject upon which we are legislating. There is a great difference of opinion as to just what the effect of nearly every item is going to be, a difference of opinion as to the amount of money that will be raised, a difference of opinion as to what effect it will have upon the Postal Service.

I am not averse to a revision of the part of the postal laws that is attempted to be revised in this bill. I agree, so far as my limited knowledge goes, with many of the things that the Senator from New Hampshire has said; but I think it must be conceded that we are legislating on a subject of vast importance—in which all the people of the United States have more or less a direct interest—without sufficient information.

That is borne out by the fact that this very legislation shows on its face that we are not able to legislate intelligently by one of the provisions of the bill proposed to be stricken out by the pending motion.

Mr. President, I call attention to page 51, commencing with line 24, section 216:

> This title—

That applies only to that part of the bill which the Senator is trying to strike out, Title II—

> This title, except section 217, shall become effective on April 15, 1925; and the rates and fees herein provided shall not apply beyond February 15, 1926, at which date the rates and fees in force next prior to the passage of this act shall become again operative unless Congress in the meantime shall otherwise determine.

So that if we pass this bill as we have now amended it, all of Title II will not go into effect until the 15th day of April next, and on the 15th day of February, 1926, it will all pass out of existence.

Section 217 of Title II, which is exempted from the motion of the Senator from Virginia, provides for a joint committee to investigate and report to Congress next December a proposed law that we could pass at that time and put into effect, the theory is, before the 15th of February following.

Mr. President, is not that a demonstration that those who have proposed this legislation are themselves admitting by their action that it is only "half-baked" legislation, and that they are not even proposing to put permanent legislation on the statute books? They are proposing only to put a temporary statute on the books; and while it is provided—and against that I have no objection whatever—by section 217 that a joint commission shall be appointed to investigate and get the facts and figures so that we can legislate intelligently, while that is true and while we undoubtedly ought to do that, and then act intelligently and efficiently, everybody knows that the way things are done in the House and the Senate on a mighty important proposition of this kind, if that joint commission reports by the 1st of December Congress will not have enacted the law by the 15th of February.

I know, Mr. President, and you know, and every Member of the Senate knows, and God knows, that that is a practical impossibility, and never will take place. Why, then, are we going through this sham? It seems to me it is a sham. Why are we going through this operation of enacting a law that is going to be in to-day and out to-morrow? Why are we going

to put upon the statute books, with all the solemnity of grown men, a statute that we know is going to be in force but a few days, and then pass out?

The Post Office Department is perhaps the greatest of any department of the Government as far as coming in contact with the people is concerned. It reaches into every business institution; it reaches into every religious organization, every fraternal lodge; yes, Mr. President, it goes into every home and every fireside. Yet we are going to revolutionize the fees of this great department and change them all about without knowing what the result is going to be, and that change is going to be in force for 10 months, and then it will pass out and the department will go back to the old rates. Is that economy? How much is it going to cost the Post Office Department to make all the necessary changes when they know they are going to be only temporary?

In the first place, it is a demonstration, it is an admission on our part that we have not the information to legislate intelligently. In the next place, those who know how business is done here know that between the 1st of December, when a new Congress convenes, and the 15th of February we can not enact a new postal system. It is perfectly absurd. In the first place, as I said, that will be a new Congress, unorganized, with no committees in the House or the Senate. They will not be organized before the holidays. Even if we were organized we would not get down to business in a new Congress before the holiday recess. It will be after the 1st of January before business is really commenced either by the House or by the Senate. Perhaps that is wrong, Mr. President. Perhaps we ought to do differently. Perhaps we ought to meet in October. Perhaps we ought to meet on the first Monday in December and have this bill on the skids on the next day; but you know we will not. That is not the question involved. We know practically now that we are enacting legislation here that is expecting, if it is to be successful, an absolute impossibility. Is it not foolish, then, for us to do it?

Are we to go through the foolish procedure of enacting a new system of rates for the greatest department in the Government, which will affect everybody, every business, and make it only temporary, enacted upon information that is not sufficient to enable us to act intelligently?

Why should we do that? Let Senators ask themselves the question. We want to be frank with each other and with the country; it is done for the purpose of avoiding a veto by the President. Does the President expect us to do such a foolish, silly thing? Does the President expect us to act like a lot of schoolboys in legislating here, to pass legislation back of which we have not sufficient information, and as to which he can not give us information sufficient to give us a reasonable belief and expectancy that these new rates, these temporary rates, will be fair and just and reasonable? I do not believe he expects us to be so foolish.

Has he a right to expect it? Has he a right to say, "I vetoed a bill which I believe was right, except that it did not contain a provision for raising revenue"? Should we provide a means for raising revenue that is unscientific, which may be unjust, so far as we know; which may be unfair, so far as we can tell? Are we to do that? If this motion prevails there will still be left in the bill—and that ought to be sufficient for the President to ask, it seems to me—provision for the appointment of a joint committee, whose duty it shall be to report to Congress as soon as possible information upon which we can act intelligently. The President should not ask more than that. He has no right to ask more than that.

On the other hand, the Senator from South Dakota has said in the debate on this bill that if this committee amendment were adopted, he feared the bill would be vetoed by the President. We have adopted the committee amendment. So, if you are afraid of a presidential veto, you are scared now. I suppose nobody will contend that the Senator from South Dakota, the chairman of the committee, who was opposed to this amendment, and who has been working in conjunction with the Post Office Department, and who is in dead earnest about it, is not able to tell us, as nearly as anybody can, the attitude of the Post Office Department and of the administration.

Outside of that, however, why should we, when we legislate, legislate through fear? Why should we, acting on a good bill, or an indefinite bill, or no bill, have our official actions controlled by fear of what some other official may do? That is said without criticism of any other legislative body, or any other official. I assume that all officers of the Government will do their duty as they see it, and far be it from me to criticize any of them when they do their duty. But why is not that rule good here in the Senate? Why should we not do our duty as we see it?

I think it can be fairly stated here, without any successful contradiction, that if we pass this bill with the language in it which is found in it now we will be passing a bill upon information which is confessedly incomplete. What would that mean to business? Some men publishing newspapers, let us say, are afraid of the rates in this bill. They say they will destroy them, will put them out of business.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, does not the Senator think that perhaps the best way and the only way to find out what these rates will do would be to try them on for 9 or 10 months?

Mr. NORRIS. No. If we had a dog to try them on I would not object, but we do not have. We are going to try them on the people.

Mr. McLEAN. There are estimates now; the rates have been carefully considered. How are we ever to know what these rates will bring until we try them?

Mr. NORRIS. It is true that we will never know to a penny what they will bring until we enact a law embodying them, and try them.

Mr. McLEAN. We will have more reliable information as a result of the experience. We will not be in the dark to the same degree we are now.

Mr. NORRIS. Perhaps. That is one way of getting experience, to put a law on the books which we say we pass on insufficient evidence, and see how it will work. If the Senator is right, then we ought to strike out of this bill the provision that makes it temporary. If we think it is correct legislation, let us make it permanent. If we have now sufficiently reliable information upon which to legislate intelligently and properly, let us not make a 10 months' plan out of it, but let us make it permanent.

Mr. McLEAN. Make it for a year. That will give us sufficient time.

Mr. NORRIS. Let it stand like any other law, until it is repealed by a subsequent law. Make it for all eternity.

Mr. McLEAN. That is going further than I think I can accompany the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is on that road. He is going, and I expect to go, too, and I would enjoy his company.

Mr. McLEAN. We will not vote on postal revenue bills when we do go.

Mr. NORRIS. I am afraid our paths may diverge.

Mr. McLEAN. I hope so. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. I do, too. I agree with the Senator, I would not like to travel on his road, not that I would not enjoy his company—I like him—but I do not like the place where he is going. [Laughter.]

If we mean what we say——

Mr. BORAH. We do not.

Mr. NORRIS. As the Senator says, and as everybody knows, we do not mean what we say. Everybody in this body knows we do not mean it. If we were in earnest about it we would strike out that limitation.

Mr. BORAH. When the Senator from Idaho said that the Senator did not mean what he said, I meant that when he was talking to the Senator from Connecticut as to where he was going he did not mean what he said. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to discuss where the Senator from Connecticut is going. That might be embarrassing, and I do not want to hold up any bad picture here before anyone of any other location. [Laughter.] Not only that, but no matter where he is going or how fast he is going it is never too late to repent. [Laughter.]

To begin with, Mr. President, we ought to fix no limitation, if we are in earnest, if we have the information. If we do fix a limitation we ought to fix one that will carry us to a time when we could reasonably expect that this joint commission will be ready to report, and, in addition to that, when Congress will have sufficient time to enact legislation carrying out the commission's recommendations.

I repeat, I think we ought to legislate on this subject. I think there are a lot of inaccuracies in this bill, but Senators have not taken the interest in this matter they would have taken if they had thought we meant it in dead earnest, and that it was not a temporary matter. I know from conversations with Senators how they feel about it. A good many of us have felt that we were wasting time considering this matter. We did not dispute anybody else's earnestness in the matter, but we felt we were enacting a law that was going to last only a few days after it was put on the statute books.

If no evil consequences were likely to follow in the wake of it, I would not care much about it, but it will practically revolutionize the post-office business of this country for 10 months, and then we will go back to the old law.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there is no reason why these changes in postal rates should remain in this bill. The reason for that, it seems to me, is apparent. When we do change the rates of postage we ought to have the very best and the most scientific information we can get before we make the changes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment. When this proposition was raised by a point of order on the ground of the unconstitutionality of this portion of the bill it seemed to me, on the first presentation of it, that it was vulnerable to the objection made. I confess that after listening to the arguments of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] I permitted myself to believe that it was constitutional, and I voted against the point of order.

I think the principles announced by those able Senators the correct ones, but upon a reexamination of the authorities I do not believe that they apply to this bill; that is to say, I believe that this amendment is in violation of the principles announced by the decisions upon which they relied and the rules which they announced.

Of course, where a tax or a burden is purely incidental the rule which they announced may be, and undoubtedly is, the correct one, but this is not incidental, in my opinion, and I am very much of the opinion that this bill will in all probability come back here to us upon this proposition. After an examination of the matter on my own account I have concluded that I must vote against the bill upon that ground.

There is another reason why I shall vote against it. The Senate, by an overwhelming vote, have kept in the bill a retroactive clause which is not only pernicious as a form of legislation but controverts the principle upon which I was willing to support the bill.

I desired to say this much for the reason that I should have supported the measure had it originated in the House and had it conformed to the ordinary rules of legislation and been free from the retroactive clause which is now in it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I had intended to vote for the increases, provided the measure would carry into law means by which the deficit could be cared for. However, when it was introduced in this body instead of the other I took the position that the tax feature originating here would make the bill nugatory, for it certainly will be sent back to this body if it carries with it the tax feature; and while I had intended voting for the increases in a bill which would carry the means to pay for them, I could not do it when the means are introduced in this body. Consequently I shall be compelled to vote to strike out this provision, in the hope that when the bill is considered in the other body and the tax feature is there put in and it comes here I shall vote for it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia because I believe the increases in rates unwarranted and unfair, because I doubt whether these increases will add to the postal revenues, and because I fear the unconstitutional assumption of jurisdiction by the Senate to originate the legislation will imperil the measure if passed. I agree with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that the decisions relied upon in support of the right of the Senate to originate the legislation did not apply to the facts of this case. His statement to this effect is in line with my contention in the remarks I submitted in support of the point of order against this section of the bill.

I agree also with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that we are about to do a vain and useless thing. I have no question, as I did not have when the point of order was under consideration, about the action of the House with reference to this matter. I am quite sure it will send the bill back to us without action upon it. This phase of the matter embarrasses me in the vote I desire to cast. I am anxious to support that part of the bill which provides for an increase in the salaries of the postal employees. Theirs is such a just demand and there seems to be such a crystallization of sentiment in Congress and throughout the country in favor of granting the appeal of these underpaid employees of the Government that I dislike to cast any vote or to do anything that will tend to either defeat or delay them in getting what they want and are entitled to receive.

I am opposed to the section the motion of the Senator from Virginia proposes to eliminate from the bill for several reasons. In the first place, it is illogical in theory and unjust and unfair in application. It is not right to vote taxes upon one class of the people regardless of whether the tax is fair and just, per se, to meet the obligations of the Government to another class. That is just what the bill does.

In order to give the postal employees what we all concede they are entitled to, it is proposed in a spirit bordering on recklessness to lay heavy burdens upon the users of the mails without proper investigation and determination of fairness and justice of the new impositions. We have not been in the habit heretofore and I hope we will never fall into the habit of imposing taxes upon the illogical basis upon which this section of the bill is predicated.

Again, Mr. President, to increase the postal rates when it is plausibly contended and claimed that those rates are so high that in effect they are diverting business from the mails should at least admonish us to be careful and not to act without full and satisfactory investigation. It is admitted by the committee which made the investigation that they did not have sufficient time to make it either thorough or satisfactory, and for that reason they provide that the rates shall be of temporary application. We are, therefore, under such circumstances about to impose heavy taxes—for these rates are taxes—upon certain publications and upon the patrons of those publications. They are just as real taxes as those imposed in our revenue law. We are proposing to impose those taxes without proper investigation and to impose them without due regard to the justice of the rates for the purpose of raising money to pay increased salaries of certain Government employees when we have a huge surplus in the Treasury.

If there was a deficit; if we did not have the money in the Treasury, some such makeshift as that proposed might be justified or at least furnish a plausible excuse. But I call the attention of Senators that we now have in the Treasury, according to the latest reports I have been able to ascertain, a surplus raised by taxation upon all the people of the country, quite, I believe, as large as the surplus we had when we felt that we were justified in reducing the taxes to the extent of the accumulated surplus in the Treasury—and there seems to be no reason why so much of this money as may be needed could not be applied to the payment of these increases in salaries.

The President wants economy in Government—we all want economy—but it is not economy to impose an additional tax on the people to accomplish a purpose, however meritorious or urgent, when we have already ample moneys raised by general taxation in the Treasury to accomplish that very purpose.

There is another reason why I am going to support the motion of the Senator from Virginia. It has not been made clear to my mind that the proposed increases in rates will accomplish the purpose which the committee proposing the bill have in mind. It is not every increase in taxes that results in an increase in revenue. It is an axiomatic principle in the imposition of taxes that there is a point beyond which, if you go, instead of increasing revenue by increasing rates you will diminish them. I think the facts that have been developed in this controversy, especially the facts that were put in evidence by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], tend powerfully to support the contention that, under the higher rates of the present law, the revenues of the Postal Service have been less than under the lower rates they superseded; in other words, that the increases which we made the last time we raised the rates, instead of resulting in an increase in revenue, resulted in a decrease because on account of these higher rates other methods were devised or resorted to to secure cheaper distribution of newspapers and magazines, and so forth. The fact that only a small per cent of the great metropolitan papers and magazines, according to the testimony presented to the Senate by the Senator from Georgia, are now distributed through the mails ought to cause us to halt. Especially ought that to be so when the publishers or representatives of papers and periodicals tell us that they are not using the mails because the rates we have imposed upon their publications are so high that they can distribute them more economically by the use of trucks and by freight cars and express.

If the last increases resulted in driving these publications out of the mail, thereby decreasing the revenues which the Government might have derived from that source, is it not logical to conclude that a further increase in those rates will result in a further diversion of the publications from the mails, and instead of accomplishing the purpose which the movers of the legislation have, it will defeat that purpose they have in mind?

Again, I am going to vote to strike out this section of the bill because I fear if it is permitted to remain in the bill, on account of its unconstitutionality, for the reason heretofore assigned, it will jeopardize that part of the bill which all of us, or most of us at least, earnestly favor. It does not make any difference whether the House sends it back to us or not. The House may, for the purpose of helping out a situation, not send it back, although I think they will send it back; but if the House approves of our action and does not send it back, clearly if the case should ever get into the courts, and it will get into the courts, if that happens and the courts should find that the measure was essentially a measure to raise revenue, the courts would hold that the act was unconstitutional because it originated in the Senate in violation of the constitutional provision with respect to where legislation raising revenue should originate.

That has been decided in many of the cases. There is no dispute about it as a legal proposition; there can be no dispute about it as a legal proposition. So, Mr. President, I say that if no question should be made in the other House. and the bill should become a law, the very fact that these provisions are left in the bill and that the bill originated in the Senate will imperil the whole legislation in the courts; and that it will get into the courts there can be no question whatsoever.

I do not wish to jeopardize this legislation so far as it relates to the salaries of postal employees. I do not wish it to go upon the statute books in such form that will make it easy, in my judgment, for any objector to overthrow the whole legislation and deprive these employees of the benefits it proposes to confer upon them. For that reason, Mr. President, I think the Title II should be stricken out. Let it go to the other House with these eliminated, and if the House desires to put in these provisions it can put them in. That body will have the right to do that if it so wishes, and the question of constitutionality by reason of origination in the wrong branch of Congress will be eliminated.

In the interest of the legislation, and to make certain that these meritorious employees of the Government will get the benefit that we intend to confer upon them, why should we not pursue that course instead of having the bill enacted in a way that would leave it open to this constitutional objection?

For that reason, Mr. President, I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and I trust it will prevail. Should it be adopted, it would not finally defeat Title II. It only provides a course by which Title II may hereafter be incorporated in the measure, without delaying the legislation, in a way that it will be safe, so far as the accomplishment of the primary purpose that we have in its enactment is concerned, against any constitutional objection.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I voted in the last session for the bill providing increased salaries for the postal employees, and later to override the President's veto, because I believed that those employees were grossly underpaid; because I believed that an injustice was long operating against them, and that the way to remove that injustice was to increase their salaries. The President of the United States does not agree that those employees are grossly underpaid, but he is willing, as I understand it, to accept the judgment of Congress, providing Congress increases postage rates in order that the revenue may be provided to pay the increased salaries proposed to be given to the postal employees.

I am so thoroughly convinced that the postal employees of this country are suffering as the result of their present inadequate salaries that I am willing reluctantly to vote for a bill which does provide increased postal rates.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question in that connection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will yield in a moment.

When I know that in the city of Washington a negro family can not hire a tenement for less than $60 a month, aggregating $720 a year, and the minimum salary for a postal employee is $1,400, I am going as far as I possibly can to see that a postal employee is given more than $700 with which to feed and clothe, pay doctor bills, send to school and raise an American family. Now I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, Mr. President, the Senate knows and the country knows that the Senator from Massachusetts has been one of the greatest advocates of increased salaries for postal employees; hardly anyone has worked harder than has he to bring that increase about. The Senator, however, has stated that he is going to vote for this bill even if increased rates are imposed on parcel post and other classes of mail matter. The Senator recalls that the President vetoed the previous bill in relation to this matter on the theory that we must raise a sufficient amount of revenue to pay for the increase of the postal employees' salaries. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who has this bill in charge, has stated that it will cost $68,000,000, as I understand, to pay the increased salaries to postal employees. He admits that under the terms of the bill we shall only derive $50,000,000 of revenue, thus leaving a deficit of $18,000,000. I understand that the Senator from South Dakota, who has given great study to this question and who is close to the administration, and ought to be close to the administration, and I hope he will be still closer to the administration——

Mr. STERLING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. Estimates that we will get about $30,000,000, or something like that, from the increased rates. I will be very glad if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield in order that the Senator from South Dakota may state for the RECORD just how much revenue, in his opinion, will be raised by this bill.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

Mr. STERLING. I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that from $29,000,000 to $30,000,000 was the estimate before some changes were made in the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. What estimate does the Senator now place on it, with all the changes having been made?

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has been asked for his estimate in regard to the result of these changes, and has stated that, with those changes, according to his estimate, there will be $50,000,000 raised, instead of from $29,000,000 to $30,000,000; and I am willing to concede that I think, perhaps, he is right in that estimate.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me further, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will give us the benefit—because it is very important in voting upon this question as to what the President might do in signing or rejecting the bill—of what is his estimate, in view of all the changes which have now been embodied in the bill through the various amendments that have been adopted, as to the amount of revenue which will be derived, and what is the estimate made by the Post Office Department.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I do not think we have the estimate of the Post Office Department in regard to the latest changes which have been made. Changes have been made this day, and there has been no opportunity to submit them to the Post Office Department. I think the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire can be relied upon as to the amount that will be raised and the increased revenue that will come from the changes that have been made, and I accept his statement that the bill as now framed will increase the revenue by $50,000,000.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to get that much in the RECORD, but the question which I was going to ask the Senator, in view of the statement contained in the veto message of the President, was how could the President sign this bill, if the Congress should pass it, with an $18,000,000 deficit between the increased salaries provided for and the revenue which may be derived from the changes in postal rates?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, with the courtesy of the Senator from Massachusetts——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will extend the courtesy to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. The language of the President's message, Mr. President, was "approximately." This bill provides, as I believe, not only "approximately" but actually for the increased expenditure made necessary by salary increases, when we consider the normal annual increase in the postal revenues, regardless of any changes which the bill makes. We can not disregard that normal increase, because it has been going on in a constant curve year by year. So it is my opinion that the direct increase in revenue to be derived from this bill plus the anticipated normal increase in postal revenues will bring the postal revenues up substantially to the point where the salary increase necessitates their coming.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and myself are agreed that this is a political bill, and discreditable to the legislative branch

of the Government. I have much sympathy with what the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has said and with what the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has said. The bill has elements of sham and pretense in it; it is simply put forward here to save the faces of men who voted to sustain the President's veto. That is the whole truth. It would not be here otherwise.

But what is the other alternative? Four years of poverty and of suffering and of want on the part of as faithful Government employees as may be found in any department of the Government; notice from the President that for four more years these employees must live on inadequate salaries, must live in cities where the rent item alone consumes from one-half to two-thirds of their income—four years of want, four years of injustice, four years of denial of relief to men who are denied the right to strike and protest against their Government's action.

If the postal service were a private organization who would doubt, in view of what has been asserted in this Chamber for the last year, that there would be now a strike of these employees? I saw a strike of city employees—the policemen of the city of Boston. I saw men strike and commit a very serious offense by striking, but who were obliged to strike in order to awaken public officials to the knowledge of their demand and necessity for an increased wage, for the very untrained and inexperienced men who took their places were given higher wages than the men who had been in the police service for years.

I am not going to wait until the postal employees strike; I am going to vote to place the responsibility of increased rates where it belongs, upon the executive department of this Government; I am going to vote against the amendment to strike out the rate section of the bill as the only present practical way to remove the injustice and the denial of a living wage to men and women who are in the Postal Service, men of whom we exact intelligence, of whom we exact honesty, of whom we exact character; whom we trust with the secrets of our homes and of our business; as faithful employees, I repeat, as ever served any government in a civil capacity.

I am going to vote to put the responsibility for the second injustice, if there is one in this bill, upon the Chief Executive. If it is unfair to increase these postage rates, it is not as cruel as to deny a living wage to faithful employees.

I would say more, but it is all summed up in this:

I will vote for this political bill, for this sham and pretense, linking together these two propositions, but I will justify my vote on the ground that I am removing discontent and unhappiness and suffering and the pinch of poverty from honest, decent Government officials who can not speak for themselves, who must rely upon our sense of justice to give them what they are entitled to. If those who have to pay the increased postage complain, I shall point to the responsibility. The responsibility is on the Chief Executive, who has notified us that what we consider to be a grave injustice can not be removed except by increasing the postal rates.

Mr. HEFLIN. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement heretofore made of the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I desire again to announce that if the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] were able to be present he would vote "yea" on this question.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. My colleague [Mr. STEPHENS] has a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. If my colleague were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—34

Ashurst	George	Neely	Simmons
Borah	Glass	Norbeck	Smith
Brookhart	Harris	Norris	Stanley
Broussard	Harrison	Overman	Swanson
Bruce	Heflin	Pittman	Trammell
Caraway	Howell	Ralston	Underwood
Ferris	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Fess	McKellar	Sheppard	
Frazier	Mayfield	Shields	

NAYS—49

Ball	Ernst	McKinley	Smoot
Bayard	Fernald	McLean	Spencer
Bingham	Fletcher	McNary	Stanfield
Bursum	Gerry	Means	Sterling
Butler	Gooding	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Harreld	Oddie	Warren
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Watson
Curtis	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Weller
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Willis
Dial	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	
Dill	Keyes	Shipstead	
Edge	King	Shortridge	

NOT VOTING—13

Capper	Greene	McCormick	Wheeler
Copeland	Ladd	Reed, Mo.	
Edwards	La Follette	Robinson	
Elkins	Lenroot	Stephens	

So Mr. SWANSON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRINCIPAL LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of the bill following line 11, page 37, and to substitute therefor the following:

SEC. 13. The forms and character of service now in effect and performed by the Post Office Department shall be hereafter continued with such modifications and extensions as the usefulness and efficiency of the service shall dictate in the judgment of the Postmaster General.

SEC. 14. The rates for each form or classification of Postal Service shall be based on the actual cost thereof, but no existing rate shall be reduced; and, subject to the foregoing limitations, said rates shall be fixed and determined from time to time by the Interstate Commerce Commission, subject to the same legal provisions, rules, and regulations now in effect respecting the determination of railroad and express rates: *Provided, however,* That where Congress shall from time to time make special appropriations to the end of reducing the charge for any particular service, then and in such case said Interstate Commerce Commission shall take into consideration such special appropriation or appropriations in determining such rate or rates, as though the same were derived from payments for such service.

SEC. 15. The Postmaster General shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to provide an additional form and series of postage stamps to be known as franking stamps which shall hereafter be affixed to all official and other mail now entitled to the franking privilege, and in the same amount or amounts as in the case of mail matter not entitled to free delivery. Such stamps shall be delivered, upon proper receipt therefor, to officials and others entitled to the franking privilege; and the Interstate Commerce Commission shall take into consideration the amount of such stamps used in lieu of regular stamps as postal income from the various classes of postal services.

SEC. 16. The following acts, parts of acts, and all other acts inconsistent or in conflict with Title II of this act are hereby amended or repealed:

"(a) Sections 1101 to 1106, inclusive, of the revenue act of 1917;

"(b) The act entitled 'An act fixing the rate of postage to be paid upon mail matter of the second class when sent by persons other than the publisher or news agent,' approved June 9, 1884; and

"(c) The act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1914,' approved April 24, 1914."

SEC. 17. This title shall become effective April 15, 1925.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, not wishing at all to deprive the Senator from Nebraska of the privilege of explaining his amendment—and he will correct me if my interpretation of the amendment is wrong—this amendment is a third effort made to strike out Title II of the bill, once by a point of order which was not sustained, once by the motion we have just voted upon and by a sufficient majority have defeated, and now by the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska proposes, whereby he would provide no rates whatever in this bill, but would send the whole question to the Interstate Commerce Commission for determination, with the exception that a new franking stamp is provided. If I am wrong in my summary of the effect of the amendment, the Senator from Nebraska will correct me.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, so far as the Senator from New Hampshire has gone, he has made a correct statement of the purpose of this amendment.

The Post Office Department and service is a public utility, and as a public utility it ought to be treated exactly as other public utilities engaged in interstate commerce are treated by Congress. For instance, the rates of the express companies are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the express

companies are in competition with the Post Office Department. The rates for telephone service are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, so far as interstate business is concerned, and the same is true with reference to telegraphs. In other words, all forms of communication carried on in this country are regarded as public utilities, and the rates are referred to a commission which can judicially and properly determine what those rates should be.

Why, then, should we give different treatment to this public utility? Why should we deviate from the general policy of Congress? It may be urged that it is because this public utility is owned by the Government of the United States. But we own the Alaskan Railway, we own the railway crossing the Isthmus of Panama, and we refer the determination of the rates of these two public utilities to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We should not attempt, and we are not in a position, to determine in a judicial and careful manner what the rates of the Postal Service should be. We are not in a position to do that for the same reason that we are not in a position to determine what the rates on the Alaskan Railway should be, or what the rates on the railroad across the Isthmus should be. We recognize the necessities in relation to these latter utilities, and we refer the matter of rates to a body created to perform just this kind of work. Why, then, should we make an exception of the Post Office Department?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. Would the Senator be willing to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to decrease the rates on letters from 2 cents to 1 cent, and to increase the rates on the parcel-post packages 50 per cent?

Mr. HOWELL. I wish to state that the description of the amendment given by the Senator from New Hampshire was not complete, and I propose to go into that matter, and to show the Senator that that is not my intention.

I will state my purpose. The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads came before this body, quoted certain statistics afforded by the Post Office Department, and stated that they did not believe that those statistics were correct; they could not believe they were correct. Therefore they assumed certain premises and proceeded to fix rates. It must be recognized that that is not a scientific way of arriving at so important a conclusion as postal rates. We have created a body, the Interstate Commerce Commission, to do that sort of thing. Why should we not refer these rates to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Now, with the consent of the Senate, I will take up the various features of this bill to show that the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi is not correct. The first section of this amendment provides:

> The forms and character of service now in effect and performed by the Post Office Department shall be hereafter continued with such modifications and extensions as the usefulness and efficiency of the service shall dictate, in the judgment of the Postmaster General.

This section merely recognizes the Postmaster General as the general manager of the Post Office Department and places him in a position to exercise initiative.

The next section provides:

> The rates for each form or classification of postal service shall be based on the actual cost thereof.

I would say to the Senator from Mississippi that here is where we provide against what he fears. My amendment provides—

> But no existing rate shall be reduced.

The Senator will recall that there is just one rate that is affording a surplus, and that is the first-class mail rate. That affords a surplus of about $80,000,000 a year. It is proposed that that shall be maintained where it is. Every other form of service results in a deficit. Therefore the Interstate Commerce Commission would start out with the advantage of this surplus, but would be in a position to raise these other rates to meet the situation.

It is further provided that Congress shall from time to time make appropriations, if it sees fit, to reduce the burdens of these other classes of rates by direct action. That is the correct method from a business point of view. We will know just what this service costs. We will know just how much we want to bonus second-class postal rates, because in order to bonus them we will have to pass an appropriation through Congress. We can bonus each class of rates just as we see fit, just as we do now, only we do not know how we do it. That is no way to carry on a business. I am simply proposing that the Post Office Department shall be conducted as a business enterprise, Congress knowing exactly what it is doing.

Furthermore, section 15 of the bill provides that a special series of stamps shall be afforded for franking purposes. Congress should know exactly what the mail that is sent out under franks would cost if charged for at the usual rates, and when it knows, Congress ought to be willing to contribute that amount to the postal revenues of this country. We should not go about it in a blind way, but we should provide that the cost of the franking privilege for each department should be known to Congress.

Prior to 1907 the officials of the District of Columbia enjoyed the franking privilege. It was then taken away, and what was the result? There was marked economy in the use of postage facilities by the District officials. If the War Department, the Navy Department, the Agriculture Department, and other departments knew that there were to be charged up to them certain amounts for postage, that is, that Congress would know exactly how much the franking privilege cost in each case, there would be a reduction in the cost of the carrying of the mails from those departments.

We ought to treat this matter in a businesslike manner, and if we do, and adopt such an amendment as the one proposed, it will give Congress every opportunity to bonus the various classes of service, as it does now, only Congress will know just when they are bonused and just how much. This is purely a business proposition and it ought to be treated as a business proposition, and that is the purpose of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senators in charge of this bill think they can get a vote this afternoon, and I want only a few minutes, in order to explain what my vote will be upon the bill.

The chairman of the subcommittee having this bill in charge has stated that all of those who favor these raises voted against the Swanson amendment. I voted for the Swanson amendment, and yet every act of mine in this body has shown I have favored the raises in the salaries of the postal employees. I voted for the Swanson amendment because I could not vote for this bill unless the Swanson amendment was carried. I took the position on the floor, and I still maintain it, that the provision which the Swanson amendment proposes to strike out is unconstitutional. I have argued that fully, and I do not care to argue it any more.

I am not in a position to vote for any bill which I believe is unconstitutional. I think it has been urged upon the friends of postal raises sufficiently for them to understand that. There are quite a number of Senators who voted for the point of order, and gave it as their opinion that this bill was unconstitutional. I do not see how any of those Senators, unless they have changed their minds on the subject, can vote for the bill.

There has been some inference that those who were opposed to the raise of the postal rates were opposed to the raises of salaries of postal employees. It could just as readily be charged that some of those who voted against the postal raises in an independent bill, and have since voted for this bill, are doing it for the purpose of killing the raises for postal employees. I am not charging that.

It is said here that unless this bill, in the form in which it is, goes through, the President will veto it. It is well known in this body that the President's veto before was sustained by only one vote. It is also generally known that there were four or five Senators who had to seek an excuse for not keeping their pledges with the postal employees, and what was that excuse? That excuse was that, "We will vote to sustain the veto of the President because we are going to have another bill later on."

Those Senators who were sincerely in favor of the raises for the postal employees hope that this revenue bill will carry the whole matter through. It is possible that there are other Senators who will not be sorry to see the whole bill defeated. As a matter of fact, I am firmly convinced, and I now unhesitatingly prophesy, that if this bill passes with that revenue provision attached to it, it will not become a law at this session of Congress.

There is no question at all that the injustice of this method of legislation is understood and recognized in this body and

throughout the country. There is no doubt that if we should pass the bill it would be an outrage upon a far greater number of people in the country who are dependent upon the Postal Service than even the outrage that is being committed against the postal employees.

This provision was added to the bill knowing that it was unpopular. It was added to the bill knowing that there had been no consideration of the matter whatever. It is going to kill the bill. I know that the postal employees of the country have been urging us to support the bill with the revenue provision contained in it as the only hope of getting it passed. Of course, with their personal interests at stake, they would urge us to vote for it even though they knew it was unconstitutional. They would urge us to support the bill if the cost of mailing a letter or parcel-post package was trebled. There is no doubt about that. It is human nature.

I do not believe for one moment that some of the Senators who have supported the amendment care whether the bill passes or does not pass. I do not think they are interested in the matter whatever. My record has demonstrated that I am interested in the matter. When I fought the unconstitutionality of the provision I did it because if it were retained in the bill I could not conscientiously vote for it. I voted to strike out the proposition for the same reason, and for the further reason that I know that the Congress of the United States is not going finally to pass any such bill. They are not going to impose upon the farmers of the country and the other great users of the Postal Service this unnecessary burden in this form. I venture to say that no matter what action this body finally takes on the bill it will never become a law. I think that is the judgment of a great many in this body who have had parliamentary experience.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are similar to the sentiments entertained by me upon this measure. I am very desirous of seeing the salaries of the postal employees increased. I think they are deserving of some reasonable increase in their compensation. I have been consistently advocating and standing for such justice being given to them ever since the question has been before the Congress.

We have to consider not only the interests of the postal employees, but we have to consider the interests of the general public of the country and of the patrons of the Postal Service. There has been a tendency on the part of some ever since the inauguration of the parcel-post system to endeavor to increase parcel-post rates. Of course, many believe—whether true or not it is a common idea throughout the country—that the express companies, and those who are in sympathy with these corporations, are desirous of seeing the parcel-post rates increased in order that there may be less competition on the part of the parcel-post system with express transportation. Express rates are excessively high throughout the entire country. I am favorable to any plan to reduce them. I regard the increase of the rates in the pending measure as but an entering wedge toward a further increase of parcel-post rates. If we once permit an entering wedge toward such an increase we can not forecast where the end will be.

I am opposed to writing into the bill an increase of $20,000,000 for parcel-post rates, and that is what it means according to statements made here. There are other increases affecting second and fourth class mail matter which will run into millions of dollars. Those increases, in my opinion, are not justified. We have no information and no data upon which we can justify ourselves in voting for such increases.

For these reasons, while I very reluctantly vote against any measure that would give the postal employees an increase of salary, which I believe they deserve, I do not propose to stultify myself by supporting an increase of $20,000,000 in parcel-post rates and an increase on periodicals and newspapers running into millions of dollars. In my opinion the patrons of the Postal Service should not be subjected to this additional burden. For these reasons I will have to vote against the bill in its present form. Had the increased rates in the bill been eliminated, then I would have cheerfully voted for the measure.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one his secretaries, announced that on January 29, 1925, the President had approved and signed acts of the following titles:

S. 369. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913;

S. 2526. An act providing for an allotment of land from the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation, Okla., to James F. Rowell, an intermarried and enrolled member of the Kiowa Tribe; and

S. 3073. An act for the relief of George A. Berry.

COLLECTION OF TAXES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. WARREN. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 11956) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909," approved February 9, 1909, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. KING. What is the measure, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. WARREN. It is a measure to correct an old act relating to licenses in the Philippines. While nothing has happened under the old legislation yet, it might happen if we did not correct it.

Mr. KING. Has the bill been approved by the committee?

Mr. WARREN. It has. It is a House bill and has the approval of the committee.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909," approved February 9, 1909, is amended by adding after the end of the first paragraph under the title "War Department" a new paragraph to read as follows:

That the taxes imposed by the Philippine Legislature in Act No. 3065, approved March 16, 1923, and Act No. 3183, approved November 27, 1924, are hereby legalized and ratified, and the collection of all such taxes made under or by authority of said acts of the Philippine Legislature is hereby legalized, ratified, and confirmed as fully to all intents and purposes as if the same had by prior act of Congress been specifically authorized and directed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 6 of the trading with the enemy act, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Alien Property Custodian, submitting his annual report of the proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act for the year ended December 31, 1924.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1925.*

BRIDGE ACROSS BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), (S. Con. Res. 27) passed January 27, 1925, I return herewith the bill S. 3622 entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at each of the following-named points in Morehouse Parish, La.: Vester Ferry, Ward Ferry, and Zachery Ferry."

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1925.*

Mr. BROUSSARD. I ask that the message may lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will lie on the table for the present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MOSES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 30, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 26), 1925

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

INFANTRY

To be Chief of Infantry with the rank of major general for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from March 28, 1925

Col. Robert Henry Allen, Infantry, vice Maj. Gen. Charles S. Farnsworth, Chief of Infantry, whose four-year term of office expires March 27, 1925, and who will retire on that date after 40 years' service.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Amos Alfred Fries, Chief of Chemical Warfare Service, to be Chief of Chemical Warfare Service with the rank of brigadier general, for the period of four years beginning March 28, 1925, with rank from July 1, 1920. His present term of office expires March 27, 1925.

CHAPLAINS

Col. John Thomas Axton, Chief of Chaplains, to be Chief of Chaplains with the rank of colonel for a period of four years beginning March 18, 1925, with rank from July 15, 1920. His present term of office expires March 17, 1925.

FIELD ARTILLERY

Maj. Gen. William Josiah Snow, Chief of Field Artillery, to be Chief of Field Artillery with the rank of major general for a period of four years beginning March 28, 1925, with rank from July 1, 1920. His present term of office expires March 27, 1925.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

To be assistant to the Quartermaster General for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank of brigadier general from April 19, 1925

Col. Moses Gray Zalinski, Quartermaster Corps, vice Brig. Gen. John T. Knight, assistant to the Quartermaster General, who retires by operation of law April 18, 1925.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 26), 1925

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Theodore Douglas Robinson to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be admirals

Henry H. Hough.
Harley H. Christy.
Arthur L. Willard.

To be captains

Edward J. Marquart.
Frank R. McCrary.
George F. Neal.
Robert T. Menner.
Merlyn G. Cook.
John P. Jackson.
Wallace Bertholf.
William H. Allen.
John Downes.
Jesse B. Gay.
William W. Galbraith.
Joseph L. Hileman.
Charles T. Hutchins, jr.
John V. Babcock.
James O. Richardson.
Harry A. Baldridge.
George J. Meyers.
Donald C. Bingham.

To be commanders

Ralph B. Horner.
Elmer W. Tod.
Herbert B. Riebe.
Stuart W. Cake.
Richard S. Galloway.
Ralph C. Parker.
Thaddeus A. Thomson, jr.
William F. Amsden.
Reuben R. Smith.
Samuel L. Henderson.
Homer H. Norton.
Alfred H. Miles.
Charles S. Keller.
Harold H. Ritter.
Joseph Baer.
Carl C. Krakow.
John F. Cox.
George N. Barker.
Harry A. McClure.
Louis J. Gulliver.
Newton L. Nichols.
Francis A. L. Vossler.
Cortlandt C. Baughman.
Richard B. Coffman.
Jonas H. Ingram.
Emory F. Clement.
Schuyler F. Heim.
Herndon B. Kelly.
James Parker, jr.
Patrick N. L. Bellinger.
William T. Mallison.
Jere H. Brooks.
Samuel A. Clement.

To be lieutenant commanders

William H. Burtis.
Walter O. Henry.
Carl T. Hull.
Thomas G. Berrien.
Hamilton V. Bryan.
Wilbur J. Ruble.
John R. Palmer.
John L. Hill.
Hartwell C. Davis.
Robert H. Grayson.
Terry B. Thompson.
John L. Hall, jr.
Laurance T. DuBose.
James H. Strong.
Arthur G. Robinson.
Walter E. Doyle.
Hardy B. Page.
Karl E. Hintze.
William W. Meek.
Justin M. Miller.
Ellsworth Davis.
Charles J. Parrish.
Oliver L. Downes
Paulus P. Powell.
Roy Pfaff.
Benjamin H. Lingo.
Earle H. Quinlan.
Lloyd H. Lewis.
Clark Withers.
Samuel N. Moore.
Tunis A. M. Craven.
Stuart E. Bray.
William G. B. Hatch.
Arthur W. Dunn, jr.
Valentine Wood.
Philip C. Ransom.
Leo H. Thebaud.
Jerome A. Lee.
Leman L. Babbitt.
Henry A. Seiller.
Alfred H. Donahue.
Horace W. Pillsbury.
John D. Jones.
Walker Cochran.
William Masek.
Julian B. Timberlake, jr.
Gordon Hutchins.
Franklin B. Conger, jr.
Henry F. Floyd.
Robert D. Kirkpatrick.
David R. Lee.
Rawson J. Valentine.
August Schultz.
Ralph Martin.
Maxwell Case.
Carl H. Jones.
Charles B. C. Carey.
Henry P. Samson.
Carleton F. Bryant.
William J. Larson.
Alfred P. H. Tawresey.
John H. Buchanan.
Herman A. Spanagel.
Frank L. Lowe.
Theodore D. Westfall.
Zeno W. Wicks.
Andrew H. Addoms.
Frank G. Kutz.
Theodore D. Ruddock, jr.
Joseph R. Redman.
Laurence Wild.
Herbert K. Fenn.
George D. Hull.
Harry P. Curley.
Paul Hendren.
Henry M. Briggs.
Paul Cassard.
Joseph Y. Dreisonstok.
Eric F. Zemke.
Samuel S. Thurston.
Albert G. Berry, jr.
John M. Creighton.

To be lieutenants

George F. Mentz.
Rony Snyder.
John B. Cooke.
Andrew L. Hass.
Guy B. Hoover.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Guy B. Hoover.
Harold F. Hale.
Walter F. Hinckley.
Joseph B. Tomelty.
Herman B. R. Jorgensen.
Emil Pohli.
Leonard LeB. Lyons, jr.
Willis N. Rogers.
John M. Eggleston.
Joe E. Rucker.
William L. Drybread.
Dashiell L. Madeira.
David W. Roberts.
Elmer A. Tarbutton.
Silas B. Moore.
Harry L. Bixby.
Nicholas B. Van Bergen.
Irving D. Wiltsie.
Elwood D. Poole.
George D. Martin.
Frank R. Talbot.
Boynton L. Braun.
Joseph C. Cronin.
Everett E. Pettee.
Wyatt Craig.
Walter S. Dufton.
Keith R. Belch.
Franklin O. Johnson.
George M. Brooke.
William G. Forbes.
Paul E. Howell.
Walfrid Nyquist.
David E. Carlson.
Fort H. Callahan.
Hezekiah W. Carroll, jr.
Rogers S. Ransehousen.
Herbert W. Taylor, jr.
George D. Lyon.
Carl S. Drischler.
Herbert A. Tellman.
Charles F. M. S. Quinby.
Charles O. Glisson.
Walter R. Jones.
Everard M. Heim.
Edmund Kirby-Smith, jr.
James S. Freeman.
George C. Miller.
Harlow M. Pino.
Stephen B. Cooke.
William V. Hamilton.
George H. Lyttle.
Dewey G. Porter.
Wakeman B. Thorp.
Charles W. Gray, jr.
Charles W. Roland.
George C. Crawford.
Robert W. Berry.
Lorenzo S. Sabin, jr.
William S. Price.
Thomas P. Kucera.
Joseph A. Connolly.
August J. Detzer, jr.
William R. Cooke, jr.
Marion C. Thompson.
Francis H. Stubbs, jr.
Elmer P. Abernethy.
Edward C. Ewen.
Eugene B. Oliver.
Robert L. Pickens.
John E. Rezner.
Edward I. McQuiston.
James B. Voit.

Frederick S. Steinbauer.
Robert E. Canty.
Thomas M. Dell, jr.
Casper H. Eicks.
Julius A. McNamar.
Joel Newsom.
Apollo Soucek.
Ralph E. Hanson.
Thomas Lee McCann.
Willard R. Gaines.
Edmund C. Mahoney.
Angus M. Cohan.
Geoffrey E. Sage.
Harold A. Carlisle.
Delwyn Hyatt.
Herman Barter.
Clarence E. Aldrich.
Charles F. Greber.
Michael H. Kernodle.
Donald T. Giles.
Charles H. Judson.
Donald F. Smith.
Charles F. Macklin, jr.
Campbell D. Emory.
Robert P. Lewis.
Ralston B. Vanzant.
Jasper T. Acuff.
Francis J. Firth.
Hugh Peters.
Arthur H. McCollum.
Lawrence E. Divoll.
Lawrence C. Grannis.
John F. Madden.
Bernard J. Skahill.
Louis G. McGlone.
Melville E. Eaton.
John W. Rice.
Walter G. Schindler.
William A. Griswold.
Howard N. Coulter.
George G. Herring, jr.
Edward P. Moore.
Morris J. Westfall.
Donald L. Erwin.
Gale C. Morgan.
George L. Russell.
John S. Crenshaw
Lawrence F. Connolly.
Walton B. Pendleton.
Kent H. Power.
Leo B. Farrell.
Charles J. Marshall.
George C. Stevens.
Walter S. Keller.
William B. Cranston.
John R. Kivlen.
William C. Gray.
Peter M. Moncewicz.
Frederick L. Entwistle.
Walter F. Weidner.
Clement R. Baume.
Burtnett K. Culver.
Lamar M. Wise.
Clinton A. Misson.
Thomas L. Lewis.
Thomas A. Parfitt.
William D. Johnson, jr.
Joseph R. Barbaro.
Leslie K. Pollard.
Charles R. Lamdin.
Robert T. Kain.
Charles S. Alexander.
Henry T. Wray.
Horace L. de Rivera.
Philip G. Nichols.
Alex M. Loker.
Edward A. Maher.
Robert E. Jasperson.
Walter J. Lee.
Daniel A. Frost.
Joseph M. Began.
William D. Hoover.
Blair M. Fuller.
Edwin M. Crouch.
Hal C. Jones.
Richard R. Dennett.
Stuart S. Purves.
Robert C. Brown.
John K. Lynch.
John M. Campbell, jr.
Oral R. Swigart.
Dallas Grover, jr.
Buell F. Brandt.
Lester R. Reiter.
Robert G. Willis.
Harold A. Houser.
Leo J. McGowan.
Julius L. Thompson.
John P. Heath.
Francis J. Bridget.
Robert F. Hickey.
Albert B. Cook.
Theodore R. Wirth.
James A. Roberts, jr.
Charles Bell.
James H. McWilliams.
Charles R. Brown.
John M. Hoskins.
Frederick H. W. Jackson.
Lowden Jessup, jr.
Joseph P. Rockwell.
Myron E. Thomas.
James R. Hughes.
Lionel I. Rowe.
Jennings Courts.
Floyd F. Ferris.
Frank S. McCrory.
George W. Snyder, 3d.
Raymond D. Edwards.
Francis D. A. Ford.
George I. Richmire.
Carl H. Sanders.
John J. Lenhart.
Justin H. Dickins.
James V. Carney.
Sterling T. Dibrell.
Ruthledge B. Tompkins.

To be ensigns

Willford M. Hyman.
Leon W. Johnson.
Ted C. Marshall.
Neville L. McDowell.
Ralph V. Baldwin.

To be medical directors

Henry E. Odell.
Joseph A. Murphy.

To be medical inspectors

William J. Zalesky.
William D. Owens.
Curtis B. Munger.
John B. Mears.
William N. McDonell.
George S. Hathaway.

To be surgeons

Franklin F. Murdoch.
Harold L. Jensen.
James A. Halpin.
Russell J. Trout.
Aubrey M. Larsen.
Louis H. Williams.
Ogden D. King.
Irving W. Jacobs.
Lockhart D. Arbuckle.
Robert L. Nattkemper.
George P. Shields.
John P. Owen.
George B. Tyler.
Arthur Freeman.
Jack H. Harris.
Thomas C. Anderson.
Leon W. McGrath.
William H. Whitmore.
Kenneth E. Lowman.
Earl C. Carr.
Melville J. Aston.
Leo C. Thyson.
Alma C. Smith.
John T. Bennett.
Paul W. Wilson.
Erik G. Hakansson.
Rolland R. Gasser.
Ellis A. Stephens.
William J. C. Agnew.
Rudolph D. Joldersma.
Jesse W. Allen.
Alanson L. Bryan.
Ross T. McIntire.
John R. White.
Mortimer T. Clement.
Edward Allan Brown.

To be assistant surgeons

Alfred L. Aldrich.
Harry L. Reinhart.
George R. Murray.
James C. Gladney.
Thomas H. Hayes.
Richard H. Gallagher.
Everett H. Dickinson.
Battey B. Coker.
Walter G. Kilbury.
John M. Woodard.

To be dental surgeons

George M. Frazier.
Frank S. Tichy.
Rufus A. Ferguson.
Alfred W. Chandler.
Albert Knox.
Everett K. Patton.
Cedric T. Lynes.
Richard C. Green.

To be assistant dental surgeons

Virgil H. Traxler.
Francis W. Lepeska.
Wadsworth C. C. Trojakowski.
Alfred R. Harris.
Otto W. Rogstad.
George H. Rice.
Gunnar N. Wennerberg.

To be pay directors

Frank T. Arms.
Charles W. Eliason.

To be paymasters

Charles G. Holland.
George C. Simmons.

To be assistant paymaster

Charles E. Beatty.

To be chaplains

Thomas B. Thompson.
John J. Brady.
Thornton C. Miller.
George G. Murdock.
Joseph H. Brooks.
Stanton W. Salisbury.

To be naval constructors

Earl F. Enright.
Frederick G. Crisp.
Everett LeR. Gayhart.

To be assistant naval constructors

Clement F. Cotton.
William H. Magruder.
William J. Murphy.
Joseph Huske.

To be chief boatswains

Earl Swisher.
Roy J. Jennings.
Garrison Payne.
Robin Southern.
Joseph K. Konieczny.
Frank Jurgensen.
Walter W. Hedges.
John W. Collier.
Carl Axelson
John C. Baldwin.
Gustave B. Martinson.
James F. Tracy.
Ernest R. Belbourne.
Henry Meyers.
Albert Speaker.
Archie O. Mundale.
George B. Kessack.
John H. Kevers.
Earl E. Reber.
John L. McDonald.
Richard Monks.
Frans O. Anderson.
Harry H. Fennerty.
James C. Legg.
Roy C. Hampton.
Ashley D. Holland.
Edward J. Heil.
William P. Arrowsmith.
Harry B. Romberg.
William W. Dyer.
Oscar Leo.
Frederick P. Uhlig.
Raymond A. Calkins.
Harry J. Kupbens.
George Gregan.
George O. Augustine.
Harry W. Weinberg.
James Wallace.
Owen J. Maloney.
Peter S. Nystrom.
William H. Justice.
Harry E. Montgomery.
Lucius H. Truman.
Oscar Eng.
James F. Dillard.
John H. Anderson.
John B. Manghan.
Clarence E. McBride.
John B. Carroll.
Grover C. Gittens.
Victor H. Kyllberg.
George F. Kahle.
Harry J. De Voto.
Herman Ruhle.
Edward Burnett.
Frederick J. Davis.
Fred H. Stewart.
George E. Henning.

To be chief gunners

John A. Lemanski.
Benjamin F. Blume.
Roy Childs.
Walter F. H. Nolte.
John Bjorling.
Elmer E. Callen.
Stanley B. McLaughlin.
Richard L. Reuling.
Leo E. Orvis.
Thomas H. Murphy.
Caesar Cooper.
Leslie W. Beattie.

Charles R. Brown.
Fred B. Chilson.
James Clancy.
Bernhardt E. Blossi.
William Wilkinson.
Frederick P. Graziani.
Jacob S. Parker.
Del L. Young.
Joseph Pranis.
John J. Jesso.
Charles E. Keptner.
Oscar E. Dannegger.
William H. Recksiek.
Leroy H. Ripley.
Ellis H. Roach.
Thomas F. Cullen.
Chester C. Culp.
Henry L. Bixbee.
Harry T. Dodd.
Frank B. Finney.
Warren S. MacKay.
Joseph L. Marshall.
Christian W. Manegold.
Frederick C. Nantz.
John H. Hart.
William J. Volkman.
John P. Richardson.
Edward A. Wintermute.
Grover Williams.
John Gordon.
William A. Gerdts.
Frank C. Szehner.
William P. Montz.
Harold Osborne.
Joseph S. Weigand.
Thomas A. Marshall.
Mars W. Palmer.
Jesse E. Jocoy.
William E. Perschbach.
Ernest R. Frakes.
Robert F. J. Connolly.
John Brenner.
William R. Dillow.
Arthur F. Murphy.
Nat B. Frey.
Richard J. Ostrander.
Lawrence Fasano.
Edgar W. Mallory.
Charles M. Cunneen.
William M. Fitzgerald.
William H. Hughes.
Samuel A. Klish.
Robert S. Hazlett.
John C. Waldau.
Einar Bjorhus.
Frederick E. McCoy.
Charles W. Piper.
Milton Bergman.
Joseph R. Choate.
William H. Cady.
Thomas L. McCann.
Lloyd M. Harmon.
Charles E. Smitherman.
Raymond Cole.
Linwood C. Gray.
Christian Ohlschlager.
Hugh M. Norton.
Biven M. Prewett.
Wilber J. Meade.
Isaac L. Glenn.
George J. Byrne.
William F. Loughman.
John L. Hood.
Donald H. Bradley.
William Jamieson.
Clarence E. Delp.

To be chief machinists

Ellis L. Robinson.
Wilfred G. Lebegue.
James D. Goff.
Valers G. Savage.
Benjamin F. Strawbridge.
Robert E. Simon.
Leo Kampman.
Robert E. Sammons.
Walter F. Marriner.
Herman G. Mecklenburg.
John L. Kershaw.
Alexander B. Provost.
Edward A. O'Neil.
Albert A. Elliott.
Clyde W. Jordan.
John A. Peckham.
Henry F. Mulloy.
Martin J. Moore.
Thomas M. Arrowsmith.
Henry J. Behrends.
Earle S. Nason.
Wade Lash.
Louis J. Miller.
Lawrence E. Boyer.
Oscar F. Bandura.
Ray S. Jones.
Frank Carter.
Archie M. Bushnell.
Franklin P. Early.
George W. Weaver.
Denis J. Kiely.
Forest H. Howe.
Charles M. Leslie.
Henry Bullmer.
Edward L. Gench.
Roscoe C. Noland.
Stephen M. Henagan.
Thomas Downs.
Albert Adams.
Eustace G. Wilson.

To be chief carpenters

Nicholas Mazzarella.
John Conboy.
William G. Scott.
William G. McIntyre.
Edourd Desormeaux.
Frank Jackson.
James J. O'Donnell.
Joseph A. McDonough.
Eugene F. Smith.
Elias G. Williams.
John F. O'Brien.
Harry W. Shomaker.
William J. Waterworth.
William E. Redfern.
George D. Forsyth.
Basil N. Procter.
George J. Schindele.

To be chief pharmacists

William C. Van Norden.
Caleb C. Petrey.
Neil H. McLean.
Matthew Birtwistle.

To be pay inspectors

Lewis W. Jennings, jr.
Brantz Mayer.

To be chief pay clerks

Henry G. Conrad.
Rufus J. Harrell.
Peter E. Brusky.
Bennie C. Smith.
William H. Misch.
Joseph A. Cossairt.
John R. Terry.
George W. Knoll.
Seymour Delong.
John R. Wallace.
Barr K. Parker.
Edward E. Sleet.
Carl M. Eysinger.
John W. Luce.
George R. Heissel.
George G. Jordan.
Charles T. Stanworth.
Harry S. MacKan.
Albert Fender.
William J. Murphy.
John W. Nichols.
Maurice A. Herrlich.
Elmer A. Chatham.
Theodore J. Vincent.
Herbert N. Dinsmore.
Carl W. Dunlap.
Robert D. Pace.
Charles P. Doughty.
John J. Shea.
William H. Hopkins.
Oscar B. Bennett.

MARINE CORPS

John A. Lejeune to be Major General Commandant.
John L. Doxey to be major.
Alton A. Gladden to be captain.
Dudley S. Brown to be captain.
Otto B. Osmondson to be first lieutenant.
Joseph L. Moody to be first lieutenant.
Walter A. Wachtler to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS

NEW JERSEY

Joseph B. Kronenberg, Bernardsville.
William Griffin, Cresskill.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles O. Smith, Black Lick.

VIRGINIA

Samuel W. Collie, Danville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, *January 29, 1925*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Abram Simon offered the following prayer:

O Thou, whom we revere as Father, be with us as we begin our deliberations! May we direct our souls to Thee that Thou mayest fill them with Thy grace. We feel stronger in the consciousness of Thy presence. The thought of Thee hallows our words. Touch us with the wand of consecrated duty. Speak to us as that Thou didst to Thy inspired prophets that what Thou askest of us is to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before Thee. Help us to write these great virtues into our works and into our legislation, and to realize them for our Nation's well-being. Take under Thy special care the President of our country and those whom the people have set in authority, and shine with a radiant beneficence upon the Nation and its free institutions. Help us to repeat and feel in every fiber of our being the serenity and spiritual vigor of the psalm: "The Lord is my Shepherd. I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures. He leadeth me beside still waters. He restoreth my soul. He guideth me in paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil. Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me. Thou preparest a table for me in the light of my adversaries. Thou anointest my head with oil. My cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in the House of the Lord forever and ever." Amen.

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

MINORITY VIEWS, H. R. 11796

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five days in which to file minority views on the bill H. R. 11796.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he may have five days in which to file minority views. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11505.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11505, with Mr. TILSON 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. 11505, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11505) making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose time had been consumed so there is still remaining 2 hours and 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana and 2 hours to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for extending me the time to make a statement, which may be due from me individually, possibly from others, but I am acting simply in my own capacity and on my own responsibility.

The press of January 10 quotes a statement of House Majority Leader LONGWORTH to the effect that 15 or more Members of Congress are to be punished because of so-called political indiscretions. Similar public statements at other times have been attributed to the present majority leader and to other leaders. As a member of the Wisconsin delegation and one who may be so threatened, a protest is made against frequent public threats which from their nature can not well be answered excepting in this forum. My protest is voiced in no spirit of controversy.

Let me say at the outset that no one has been authorized to speak for those who would thus be threatened; they are all eminently qualified to speak for themselves.

Last session in this place I commended the majority leader's ability in securing passage of the best tax reduction law ever enacted by Congress. When the bill, substantially the present law, passed the House with only eight dissenting votes, attention was called by me to criticisms lodged against the Republican leader in the House of his friends, and he was supported and defended for his course. Legislative tax reduction was then brought about only through the efforts of all Republicans to get together on a just bill, far better than as originally introduced, resulting in a definite performance of Republican tax reduction platform pledges.

WHAT WAS DONE OR NOT DONE

The alleged offense of 15 or more Members, according to frequent speeches and press statements, is for failing to support the Republican presidential nominee at the recent election and alleged efforts to defeat Republican Members of the House. Unwillingness to support an administration program hereafter to be presented is also alleged to be involved. In other words, it is proposed without a hearing to assume to read out of the Republican Party all duly elected Republican Representatives of a great State in which the Republican Party had its birth.

At this time I will only say that lifelong Republicans who sometimes differ from my own views have frequently in my State and other States opposed the regularly nominated Republican candidates for governor, for Congress, and for other positions as late as 1924, under a plea of differences in brands of Republicanism of one or the other. Are they to be excommunicated from the party for so doing? Chastisement of Republican Members through exclusion from a Republican conference, whether for that purpose or not, it is charged, may affect the speakership contest, for they would thus be deprived of expressing any choice for Speaker or other officials. So, too, object lessons of dire punishment inflicted on alleged irregular Republicans, when placed before the House, may deter others from acting independently. The right or power to punish either by a party leader or by any number of party colleagues is challenged but will not be here discussed, although unprecedented in the House. By such precedent, however, if once established, future party organization and legislative performance may well become involved. However, I desire only to offer a brief personal statement, based on facts and political history, where silence may otherwise be mistaken for fear or for acquiescence in vague or untrue allegations.

TEN MEMBERS ELECTED BY AGGREGATE REPUBLICAN MAJORITY OF 333,518

For 30 years with one Member and for many years with others the 10 Republican Members of the present delegation from Wisconsin have invariably participated in and supported every Republican organization of the House at every session. During that period, I believe, they have all supported Republican platform pledges. I leave it for them to say if this is challenged. In every political campaign these 10 Republican Representatives of Wisconsin have stood for election in their respective districts as Republicans. Last election they received majorities over their Democratic opponents aggregating 333,518 votes, or an average of over 33,000 Republican majority in each district. That record is a certificate of membership in the party that can not well be impeached.

To the first charge affecting campaign support I speak only for myself when saying that over 20 years ago many hard-fought battles occurred in the old Badger State under the leadership of Gov. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE. During that early period some of us were closely associated when pioneer laws affecting primaries, taxation, railroad legislation, and general welfare were first enacted in Wisconsin. During the last 20 years his long service as Senator enlarged the field of labor and identified him with much valuable national legislation. Few men, if any, have an equally large personal following in my State or many other States throughout the country.

No postelection autopsy is here proposed, nor do I care to offer any excuses or explanations. Although not present at any conventions that were held, when requested personally to say what has been done by Senator LA FOLLETTE in Wisconsin and to support his candidacy for President, I did not hesitate to do so.

I never heard at any time of any so-called black list of Congressmen, nor was reference made by me to congressional or State candidates or State issues at any time. This is not offered by way of excuse, but to state a fact and to deny frequent general charges that have been made.

I have no apologies to make here or elsewhere, irrespective of what action may be urged by those whom I submit are not authorized to speak for my Republicanism.

POLITICAL IRREGULARITY OF A GREAT AMERICAN

One of the greatest Republicans known to this generation in recent times unsparingly denounced the Republican Party, by which he had been previously elected President. He bitterly denounced the party's standard bearer, whom Roosevelt claimed represented malefactors of wealth. Roosevelt fought particularly against his own party and tore it asunder. After repudiating his party and party leaders he was welcomed back with outstretched arms more like a prince than a prodigal son and would have been seated again on the highest throne but for his untimely death. At no time did he renounce his views nor apologize for the wreck of the Republican Party. His fight against party leaders ousted the Republican Party from power for eight years. He followed his own judgment and the country believed conscience guided Theodore Roosevelt in his attempt to resurrect party standards and individual responsibility that had reached low ebb.

I much doubt if at any time then or thereafter present Majority Leader LONGWORTH, or Republicans generally, would have voted to excommunicate Theodore Roosevelt from the Republican Party. Countless examples of political independence in both parties are familiar to every Member, but speakership contests and other local considerations have never heretofore been involved, nor an important factor when testing party regularity.

A GRIST OF EMINENT IRREGULAR REPUBLICANS

The last election brought an apparently safe majority of Republicans to serve in the next House, although a loss of over 100 Republican Members compared with four years ago is not to be ignored. Whatever the situation may be two years or four years hence, when other elections shall have rolled around, the majority leader now, if supported by party colleagues, may be placed in a position to impose political penalties under any new flexible code needed to fit the exigencies of the case. No constitutional right belonging to any Member, however, will be infringed nor the right to participate freely in legislation, so with that knowledge I am undisturbed over any action taken toward unnamed Members whom Mr. Harvey, the new Republican censor, calls "renegades." He ought to know what that term implies, for in 1912 Mr. Harvey denounced Republicans like Roosevelt and Taft until finally silenced by Wilson, whom he was then actively supporting against Wilson's own published protest. Roosevelt, Hiram Johnson, Garfield, Beveridge, Pinchot, Cummins, McCormick, and other eminent Republicans like General Wood in the Philippines, Senator Poindexter in Peru, and I may add Kellogg, Senator, ambassador, now Secretary of State and high in party councils, all I believe were once engaged jointly in politically wrecking or reconstructing the Republican Party.

I measure Republicanism largely as I have interpreted the principles voiced by Frémont and Lincoln, first and foremost standard bearers of a great party, organized at Ripon, in my own State of Wisconsin, about 70 years ago.

A CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION SUBMITTED

Over a quarter of a century continuously elected by the Republican Party has been my length of official service. Last fall a home constituency gave me the Republican primary nomination without opposition by over 32,000 votes; at the November election a majority of more than 36,000 was received on the Republican ticket over an active Democratic opponent and of 44,000 majority over another candidate who ran as a

"Progressive Republican." I mention this specifically to show faith of a highly intelligent constituency in their representative and I believe I have maintained complete faith with Republican principles.

My father, now living, voted for Frémont, served three and one-half years in a blue uniform under Lincoln from 1861 to 1865, and he voted at the last election. A lifelong Republican, so voting for 68 years, his party record few men have equaled. No conclusions or comparisons with critics are drawn—the record speaks for itself.

It has been publicly stated that committee assignments may be taken away from 15 Members whose Republicanism is under consideration. If so, it would advance many worthy Members on different committees, but if 15 Members are ousted now, why would not that precedent justify 50 or more committee vacancies, if desired in the future?

COMMITTEE POSITIONS PROVIDE LEGISLATIVE WORK

If committee places or so-called key positions depend upon the legislative views of Republican Members, then proposed legislation will govern any threatened punishment rather than abstract principles in politics. Based on precedence, Members have generally held former committee positions when reelected; but personally I offer no claims and make no request here beyond saying that on every committee of which I have been a member I voted with my party colleagues in reporting bills supported by them, reserving, however, on two or three occasions the right thereafter to offer amendments in the House. Would any Member of either party do less?

Without prophesying as to future legislation it is probable no fair-minded Representative of either the Republican or Democratic Party will obstruct needful legislation, but Members of neither party, I apprehend, will concede that results of the recent election demand a surrender of our constitutional rights or individual opinions in all matters of legislation.

Party platform pledges, if definite, of course should govern those serving under any party banner, but a new doctrine is announced if this principle extends to everything advocated under color of party regularity. Whenever Article I of the Constitution is abrogated so that Congress voices alone the views of administrative public officials or other outside influences then representative government will become a farce.

CONGRESS LEGISLATES AS A CONSTITUTIONAL BODY

During the last four years personal letters or utterances were procured from Executives and presented to the House supporting measures not mentioned in party platforms, including a general consumption tax for financing a bonus bill; a ship subsidy; a dye embargo; a retroactive repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1921 involving $450,000,000; a Treasury bill carrying 50 per cent tax reduction to some 6,000 wealthy taxpayers, with only 25 per cent cut for 3,500,000 small income taxpayers. In like manner Executives opposed the soldiers' compensation and affirmative tax-cut legislation subsequently passed by Congress that is now law. In every case the action of Congress based on its own judgment, I believe, was a political asset instead of party liability and of benefit to the country, yet if any mistake or series of mistakes occurred Congress is the representative constitutional body empowered to enact or repeal laws.

This much has been said in a general way. I would be remiss in duty, however, if I failed to state a further situation in no way personal nor suggested to me by any Member, but which has moved me to voice this protest against misstatements and frequent public threats.

During the Sixty-ninth Congress the dean and oldest Republican Member of the House of Representatives will be HENRY ALLEN COOPER, of Wisconsin. For 32 years in 16 elections he has been returned to this body, an evidence of the love and loyalty felt for him by the people of our State. I offer no eulogy for his long, valuable service here. Because of his ability, experience, and sterling Republicanism, Wisconsin sent him back to Congress for the sixteenth time last election with 37,000 majority over his Democratic opponent.

INJUSTICE TO AN HONORED MEMBER

At the last Republican National Convention Congressman COOPER was asked to offer a substitute platform. This he did with parliamentary fairness, eminent ability, and rare good nature, so as to command the respect of political friends and opponents alike. Thereafter he was prevented from outside speaking during the campaign because of illness and active contests in his own district. I do not know that he took any part in the national campaign. Whether he might have done so under different circumstances I can not say. This much is certain, if COOPER for 32 years a Republican Member and dean of the House is to be humiliated for no overt political act, then support of a substitute platform in a Republican Convention is for the first time in America's history to be held a political crime. If independence at a political convention is held improper or legislative independence merits punishment, then let him without political sin cast the first stone.

Nothing could be more unjust unless found in the action of those who refused to permit Lodge, Republican Senate leader and keynoter of the 1920 Republican National Convention from actively participating at Cleveland, because it was reported, pursuant to a pledge, he voted to pass a soldiers' compensation bill over the presidential veto. To transport the steam roller, however, of a political convention down to the Halls of Congress where legislation depends on fairness and justice to colleagues, irrespective of party, is without precedent. Consistency is a desired virtue when Republicans in another legislative body "disciplined" Republican legislators for alleged party irregularity, yet themselves were first to vote to override the President's veto on the post office bill during this session.

A moment's reflection will disclose that few men are always "regular" or never independent, and in that fact rests the safety and security of our constitutional government and of the Republic.

Other members of the delegation, I believe, were not actively engaged in the last national campaign, which was their right, I assume, if so, but I am not authorized to speak for them nor to ask any favors. They are all able to speak for themselves when occasion requires.

From the days when Lincoln in this House opposed President Polk and the Mexican War during the war's progress down to the days when, as President, he led the fight against human slavery, independent thinking and uncontrolled legislation have been the best safeguards of human rights.

From recent days, when Roosevelt and scores of men now in public life denounced the corrupt influence of big business when found in politics and legislation, down to the day of Roosevelt's death the country honored him for his course. No new standards, I submit, should be raised wherein Senators or Representatives would be elected only to serve as rubber stamps rather than as representatives of their constituents.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will; certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to preface my question by stating that no man in this House has a higher regard or a warmer friendship for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] than I have. I want to ask the gentleman this question, founded on his statement that Mr. COOPER did not leave the district during the campaign. I want to ask the gentleman if, to his knowledge, any members of the Wisconsin delegation went into other States and advocated the election of Democratic candidates for Congress?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know; I speak only for myself; I know I did not. It was never suggested to me at any time, nor I am quite sure in the case of Mr. COOPER, and the reason I speak from positive knowledge in his case is that I spent one week at his request in his district at the time of the primary, and I know that he was ill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman himself did not leave the State?

Mr. FREAR. Yes, I did; but not to discuss congressional or State issues in any way. The subject of my discussion was along the lines I have heretofore stated—the Presidency.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman, however, spoke against the interest of the Republican ticket?

Mr. FREAR. I spoke for the candidacy of Senator LA FOLLETTE; but I believe I can fairly say I never reflected on the highest officer of the administration.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Did the gentleman advocate the election of Senator WHEELER?

Mr. FREAR. I assume he was on the ticket; I do not know that his name was ever mentioned.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman can not state, of his own knowledge, whether any member of the Wisconsin delegation advocated the election of Members of Congress other than Republicans?

Mr. FREAR. No; I do not know as to that. They can speak for themselves.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I hold in my hand a newspaper clipping from the Providence Bulletin of October 29 referring to a speech delivered at Pawtucket, R. I. Referring to a speech delivered in Pawtucket, R. I.——

Mr. FREAR. May I have a little more time, if questioned?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman additional time.

Mr. FREAR. I have no objection to the interruption, but I will be glad to have two or three minutes additional.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I hold in my hand a newspaper clipping referring to a speech delivered in Pawtucket, R. I., in which a gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman's colleague, Mr. BROWNE, was alleged to have said this, after having delivered a very strong indictment of the Republican Party generally from its leader down, speaking of candidates, Democratic candidates for office in the State of Rhode Island, and particularly for the Democratic Member of Congress, who was seated with him on the platform. I read this sentence:

Speaking briefly on the men running on the Democratic ticket in this State, Mr. BROWNE said O'CONNELL is a hard worker and has "voted just the way I did." "Your lieutenant governor is an independent and should be elected governor, for he has a big amount of backbone," the speaker added. "If I were a Republican in this State, I would vote for Mr. Flynn for Senator."

Mr. FREAR. I will say, if the gentleman wishes me to, that I never heard anything about it, but it shows the danger or the unfairness of putting all Members from Wisconsin together with anyone who has that view, if correctly quoted—with the dean of the Republicans of the House of Representatives, who was ill and unable to leave his district. I know nothing about the Rhode Island meeting.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to ask the gentleman if he will state if in his opinion the gentleman who made those remarks can be called a Republican?

Mr. FREAR. I will, with this reservation: If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] will insist that a man who was very close to him and one of the most prominent in all America and who came out and demanded as he did the destruction of the Republican Party—Theodore Roosevelt—if Roosevelt was a Republican, the rule should apply to both. The people did not say Colonel Roosevelt was not a Republican, because he came back to the Republican fold. I assume both men named were Republicans after their election as such.

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had 20 minutes. He now has 2 minutes.

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

LET ACCUSERS BE MET FACE TO FACE

Mr. FREAR. I will in a moment.

Briefly in no spirit of controversy I have sought to submit facts entitled to be considered on their merits. As a Republican who has continuously represented the same constituency in this body for many years, I expect to work as heretofore with my party, and in so doing recognize the necessity of party leadership, yet of highest importance I believe is intelligent, independent, and wise legislation by Congress, a coordinate branch of government equally responsible with the Executive for the welfare of the State.

If Republicanism is to be tested by an unbroken record of elections on the Republican ticket or by support of party platform pledges theretofore given to the people, then the test should be welcomed. My contention is that every Member of this great body now and hereafter is entitled to meet accusers face to face before any tribunal of his party colleagues that assumes to be empowered to act. If challenged, that right is asked at the hands of my Republican colleagues, on behalf of any Member elected as a Republican, not as a matter of favor, but as the inherent right of every Member, that he be heard in his own defense.

ARE THESE MEN REPUBLICANS?

I have already quoted the names of eminent Republicans who joined Roosevelt in 1912 in an effort to reelect him President. Others of equal note may be added.

The Progressive Roosevelt platform adopted at Chicago, June 22, 1912, contained among other things these planks:

Political parties exist to secure responsible government and to execute the will of the people. From these great tasks both of the old parties have turned aside.

Instead of instruments to promote the general welfare they have become the tools of corrupt interests, which use them impartially to serve their selfish purposes. Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government, owing no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people.

The deliberate betrayal of trust by the Republican Party, the fatal incapacity of the Democratic Party to deal with the new issues of the time, have compelled the people to forge a new instrument of government through which to give effect to their will in laws and institutions.

Thereafter followed many planks in the Roosevelt platform of sizzling character on inheritance taxes, the courts, corrupt practices, and so forth. Equally blistering denunciation of President Taft and the Republican Party appear in speeches of many well-known men.

To this effort in overturning the Republican Party was given the active aggressive support of men like Frank A. Munsey, a great publisher, who contributed $70,000, according to published reports, and whose countenance is photographed among many irreconcilable anti-Republicans as "one of the strongest supporters of the new party." From an editorial, September 4, 1912, in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of Minnesota, conservative of the conservatives, I quote as follows:

Senator CUMMINS announces he will vote for Colonel Roosevelt, although he does not approve all the planks in the Progressive platform.

The highest position in the Senate to-day is held by this distinguished supporter of Roosevelt in 1912.

Some of the strongest utterances against the Republican Party and vigorous condemnation of President Taft and others came from men who are active in public life to-day. Among those names appear Hon. Medill McCormick; Gov. Hiram Johnson; Senator Miles Poindexter, then Senator, now American Ambassador to Peru; Senator Beveridge; Senator Moses Clapp; and others notably active in another great legislative body. Alexander P. Moore, Ambassador to Spain; Frank B. Kellogg, Senator, then Ambassador to the Court of St. James, and recently promoted to the position of Secretary of State, appointed by President Coolidge, are also among those whose names and photographs appear in the reports as supporters of the Roosevelt campaign.

This record is submitted, lest we forget, with a score of other names still conspicuous in American affairs. They are all highly honorable men whose independence in 1912 was no disgrace. If punishment, if banishment, if ouster or other chastisement was ever proposed or given to one of these men I have been unable to find the record.

Men highest in the present Republican Cabinet, men highest in the present United States Senate and others of note who represent our Government to-day in foreign countries. All these are still honored notwithstanding they supported a movement that bitterly opposed and condemned President Taft, then a candidate for reelection and further declared the Republican party had "become the tool of corrupt interests" and had betrayed a great trust.

This record is submitted without further comment than to say that the most exalted places in administrative and legislative positions in America to-day are held by men who in the past, based on the record, joined a movement to wreck the Republican Party and defeat its Chief Executive. It is well again to add "let him without sin cast the first stone," when standards of party regularity are to be fixed.

SENATOR LADD'S SPEECH

Members of both Houses of Congress of both political parties are indebted to Senator LADD, of North Dakota, for his exposition on the subject of political independence and party regularity which appeared in his speech in the Senate of January 6, 1925.

I am quoting from several prominent men whose opinions have been collated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and who expressed definite views that very largely will be subscribed to by the average man in public life. The record of Roosevelt and those who rallied under his standard in 1912 has been alluded to. He was never punished for party irregularity, but would probably have been the unanimous Republican choice for President in 1920 had he lived. The following eulogy was expressed by one of the most conspicuous men in public life since 1912, a Republican Senator and President, and a man whose judgment dictated the policy of his party in recent years. I quote from Senator Harding, who said of Roosevelt:

He was one of the foremost citizens of the world in a most extraordinary era, as he was the most vigorous and courageous American of his time. In spite of conflicts in which he was critic or the subject of criticism, he was respected as no other American. There is no direct legatee of his vast political estate.

That sounds far removed from political punishment for irregularity.

I quote again, this time from Senator NORRIS on political independence, and with this sentiment most men find an echo in their hearts. He said:

I have been opposed to political machines, to boss control, and to caucus rule, and it seemed to me it was my duty to proclaim what I

believed to be right and to expose what I believed to be wrong just as quickly when I find it in my party as though I found it in some other party. * * * I must stand with anybody who stands right—stand with him when he is right and part from him when he goes wrong.

Again quoting from Senator LADD's speech, I find therein a quotation from another distinguished Senator which is equally forceful and full of meaning. Senator BORAH is quoted as having said during the last campaign:

I claim the right as your Senator to oppose any measure, by whomsoever proposed, which I believe to be injurious to the public interest or unwise in government. I claim the right to support any measure, by whomsoever proposed, which I believe to be in the public good and in the interest of sound government. This states the whole thing. I would rather have the people of my State believe that I have the courage to vote as I think I ought to vote, regardless of passion or party, than to have any office they can give me. * * * Republicanism, as I understand it, is clean government. It is economic government. It is progressive government. No greater progressive ever lived than Lincoln. Republicanism is government free from monopolistic control at home and equally free from domination and political entanglements abroad.

And still another gentleman of distinction in the same great body of independent Republicans comes to us in Senator COUZENS, of Michigan, who said:

If complete adherence to the proposals and policies of President Coolidge is the test of Republicanism, there are no Republicans in the National Congress. I do not believe it to be the desire of my constituents that I abjectly promise to follow some one and do his bidding. * * * I believe in party government, but so long as I am a member of the party I propose to have a voice in it and not to be controlled by party "bosses" or leaders.

Another sentiment to which we may all subscribe is that also found in Senator LADD's speech, originally expressed by Secretary of State Hughes, wherein he said:

Party loyalty and patriotism should coincide. But if they are antagonistic, patriotism must ever be supreme. The party is not the Nation or State. When the attitude of party threatens the interest of the community, when ill-chosen policy invites general disaster, when party success means the debasement of standards of honor and decency, the party man should recognize the superior obligation of his citizenship.

I conclude with one more brief statement from a man whose fairness, ability, and political and personal cleanliness of mind are beyond criticism. I refer to the distinguished Senator who comes under the ban of his party associates, but whom I have known intimately through several months' close association on a European trip and found him to be in all things a square and just man. Senator LADD made the following statement of his position in the same speech:

If the judgment of the majority members of the caucus is to prevail in the councils of the party, I am sure that in 1926 the party will be figuring on how to get somebody into it harder than the arrogant would-be leaders are now scheming to get certain Senators out of it. * * * Let no one think I am making any personal appeal. I do not acknowledge any default for myself, nor do I recognize any jurisdiction that can hold me to account except that of my constituents.

AN EDITORIAL SERMON WITH A MORAL

An editorial last Monday in the Washington Star on the subject of party regularity is timely. Intolerance leads to ridiculous conclusions. The Iowa Republican State committee asks the Senate to oust a Senator because he is not loyal to the State committee's standard of party loyalty. Ousting any duly elected official from office in a slightly less degree applies to ousting from legislative committees. Duly elected Congressmen have been patient while critics have noisily and based on incorrect reports discussed "party loyalty" as applied to everything from President down to justice of the peace. By the Star's test 90 per cent of the members of both parties would find themselves disqualified. It is well to act not only with justice but may I say without being misunderstood also with good judgment.

Legislation depends on many things that are not determined behind closed doors of caucuses or committees. Legislative work, however, if confined to the Committee of the Whole, would even then offer many compensations. Good judgment should prevail with both critics and those criticized, and I submit herewith the editorial for prayerful consideration by ousting advocates.

An episode entitled, When is a Republican not a Republican?

[Editorial from the Washington Star, January 26]

The old saying that there is nothing new under the sun is considerably discredited by the demand of the Iowa Republican central committee that SMITH W. BROOKHART be denied the seat in the United States Senate to which he was elected last November. Certainly the demand raises a new issue in American politics, and one that is full to the brim of interesting possibilities.

Demand that Senator BROOKHART be debarred is not based on allegation that he did not receive a requisite number of legal votes, but it is charged that he was guilty of "fraud and deceit" in that he obtained the senatorial nomination as a Republican and continued to pose as a Republican "until the time for filing independent candidacies had expired, and until it was no longer possible for him to be removed from the Republican ticket," whereupon he repudiated the national candidates and platform of the Republican Party and supported the candidacies of LA FOLLETTE and WHEELER and the platform upon which they stood. "Members of the Republican Party were thereby deprived of having a candidate for United States Senator," the Iowa committee asserts.

Senator BROOKHART already has been "punished" for his disaffection by the Senate Republican caucus, which read him out of the party. But to undertake to read him out of the Senate for the same offense is something very different. The Constitution takes no account of political parties or of party nominations. Party loyalty is nowhere made a test of fitness for office. It is true the Constitution makes the Senate the sole judge of the election and qualification of its Members, but never in the past has it been proposed to unseat a Senator on the ground that he was disqualified by disloyalty to his party, or that such disloyalty constituted fraud of a character to invalidate his election. If the Senate once started making party loyalty a test of fitness for membership in that body, one can not help but wonder where the experiment would end.

Would, for instance, refusal of a candidate for the Senate to support a nominee for his party for justice of the peace constitute a disqualifying breach of party loyalty? Absurd, you say. Well, then, would refusal to support his party's nominee for governor constitute such a breach? Or refusal to support the candidate in his district for the House of Representatives? Unless the loyalty test was to be confined to presidential candidates it would be difficult to find a stopping place down the scale of consequential office.

And how about a Senator who, after attaining office, refused to support the President upon some vital question of national policy which had been made an issue in the campaign and had influenced the casting of votes by which they both had been elected? Unless he had declared himself in advance upon that issue would not he, too, be chargeable with "fraud and deceit"? How many Senators are there of either party who would be willing to have the Iowa theory of party discipline carried to its logical conclusion? Contents of the box Pandora opened would seem tame and commonplace compared with the things which would be likely to escape once the Senate undertook to comply with the Iowa demand that Senator BROOKHART be denied the seat to which Iowa voters elected him.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this brief reply to repeated threats and some misstatements given wide publicity. As stated at the outset, I have no favors to ask, but my Republican colleagues from Wisconsin reelected by unprecedented majorities are not required by any precedent to submit their Republicanism to any man or group of men for judgment, but to their constituents alone. No legislative rights of any Member nor of any constituency will be taken away, for the Constitution protects all alike without reference to party, partisanship, or official pronouncement, however high.

Now, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLS. I will ask the gentleman whether during the last campaign the gentleman attended a meeting in the forty-third congressional district of New York advocating the election of the candidate opposed to the Republican, Mr. REED?

Mr. FREAR. I spoke on the presidential candidacy. I never spoke on the subject of any congressional candidacy. I have talked with Mr. REED about it. He understands it. There was not one there who spoke in opposition to Congressman REED. I certainly did not.

Mr. MILLS. Was not his opponent there, and the gentleman was on the platform?

Mr. FREAR. I was on the platform. But Mr. REED knows that no statement of that kind was made. I did not oppose the election of anyone on the congressional or State ticket.

Mr. MILLS. Did not the gentleman favor the candidacy of the gentleman opposed to Mr. REED?

Mr. FREAR. In no way at any time. I assumed it was a meeting on the subject of the Presidency. I was there to speak for Senator LA FOLLETTE's candidacy, and I did so.

Mr. MILLS. And at the same meeting the candidacy of the gentleman opposing Mr. REED was advocated? He was on the platform?

Mr. FREAR. He advocated his own candidacy, and he never said anything against Mr. REED, but I knew nothing about arrangements and have stated the facts.

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

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will my colleague be kind enough to give me some information with regard to the nature of the speech he himself made at Boston?

Mr. FREAR. Undoubtedly; yes. The Secretary of War had made an attack, which, as I believe, was without foundation, on the State of Wisconsin. He went on to describe the conditions existing there on taxation and other subjects. I was asked if I would go there and answer that, which I did briefly as one of the speakers present. At the same time I mentioned the candidacy of Senator LA FOLLETTE.

Mr. TREADWAY. Did my colleague make any reference in that speech to the congressional election in that district?

Mr. FREAR. Not, to my recollection, at any time.

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

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BERGER. Is it not a fact that our leader in the last campaign, Senator LA FOLLETTE, said that both the Democratic and Republican Parties were corrupt beyond help and beyond redemption? Did he not say repeatedly that we needed a new political alignment, and this new movement was inaugurated at that time?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know that Senator LA FOLLETTE said that, but I have frequently heard the gentleman who is now talking say that. While every member of the Republican Party in the congressional delegation from Wisconsin had about an average of 33,000 majority, the gentleman who is now interrupting me, the gentleman from Wisconsin, had less than 1,000 if I remember correctly.

Mr. BERGER. I ran on the straight Socialist ticket, not camouflaged as a Republican. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. FREAR. I do not care to yield further. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me more time.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as I understand it, this is a meeting of the Committee of the Whole House and not a Republican caucus. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNELL. The Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This bill appropriates $452,000,000, not for the regular establishments of the Government but for independent offices. The expenditure of half a billion dollars for independent offices shows the trend of government toward bureaus and commissions. Ten years ago there were listed in the Congressional Directory 20 commissions, boards, and bureaus under the Government of the United States. To-day we have 39 independent establishments, whether called commissions, bureaus, or boards, operating under the Government of the United States. And that does not tell the whole story, because unfortunately the various States of the Union have followed the example of the Government of the United States and have proceeded to establish commissions and bureaus, covering all kinds of activities, greatly increasing the cost of government by the States.

The creation by Congress of these commissions and bureaus necessarily increases the expense of government. As late as 1916 there were 27,243 employees in the Government service outside of the 10 established departments presided over by members of the Cabinet. Eight years later, in 1924, the number of employees of commissions and bureaus had increased from 27,000 to 51,643.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I would suggest that 30,000 of those employees were in the Veterans' Bureau to take care of the disabled soldiers of the late war.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. On June 30, 1924, there were 27,035 employees in the Veterans' Bureau, a service growing out of the war. But on the other hand, in 1916 there were 19,291 persons employed on the Panama Canal who were included in the total of 27,035. That number has been reduced to 8,890.

I know that some of these commissions must remain independent of the 10 established departments of the Government, but I know, too, that some of them ought to be merged with existing departments and that others ought to be abolished. We have boards exercising powers which ought to be exercised by individuals, whose work should be supervised by members of the Cabinet. There are some activities which would be discharged with greater efficiency if placed in charge of an individual who would be held responsible. I contend that commission government encourages extravagance. For instance, this bill carries appropriations for the Shipping Board, whose chairman tells us that he has an assistant at a salary of $10,000 a year.

The salary of a Member of Congress is $7,500; the salary of a United States Senator is $7,500; but an assistant to a member of the Shipping Board draws $10,000 a year, almost as much as the salary of a member of the Cabinet. Until two years ago the Assistant Secretaries in the various departments received a salary of $5,000; under the reclassification act they receive a salary of $7,500. The Assistant Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy receive $7,500 a year, but the chairman of the Shipping Board appoints an assistant who draws $10,000 a year. I have no doubt that an investigation will prove similar extravagance under other commissions.

I call attention to another evil growing out of government by commission, namely, the demands made upon citizens for reports. The commissions and bureaus empowered to call upon citizens for information vie with each other in their efforts to annoy the citizens of this country with requests for information until the average business man's life is just one blamed report after another. The printing bill of the departments of the Government during 1924 amounted to more than $850,000. Even with this enormous expenditure for printing bulletins and reports, the statistics printed by the departments are often so long out of date as to have no value other than historical value. As an instance of it, ask the Bureau of Labor Statistics to-day for information as to the wages paid in the industries of this country. I remember making that experiment about two years ago in order to ascertain the wages paid in the textile industry of the South and compare them with the wages paid in New England. I was advised that the latest statistics compiled were two or three years old, which were of absolutely no value except as a matter of history, because in two or three years conditions greatly change. They collect so much information that they can not print it and much of it is of no value. Let me illustrate. One of the activities provided for in this bill is the Federal Board for Vocational Education. Some one has sent me one of the bulletins issued by that board. It is entitled "Diary of Homemaking Activities," in which the women of America are told that they should carefully note all of their activities during the day, and in order that they might be fully advised a sample is furnished of what information should be jotted down, from which I read:

> Saturday, November 5: 6.30–7, dressed self; waked husband; opened doors and windows downstairs; prepared breakfast. 7–7.30, ate breakfast; planned evening party with husband; called children.

Telling a woman in Idaho, Maine, or South Carolina that at 7 o'clock in the morning she should begin planning an evening party for her husband while she dressed her children. That she should record such activities and report to that board.

> 7.30 to 8: Dressed baby, combed Alice's hair, helped Billy put on his overalls, gave children breakfast. 8.30 to 9: Put kitchen and dining room in order. 9 to 9.30: Gave baby his bath—

He did not get his bath until 9 o'clock—

> planned luncheon and dinner. 9.30 to 10: Put house in order. 10 to 10.30: Gathered peas out of the garden. 10.30 to 12: Minded baby, mended husband's shirt, hunted his tie, washed and ironed waist. 12 to 1: Gave children luncheon. 1 to 1.30: Inquired about sick neighbor, planned the afternoon for the children, punished Billy for hurting Alice.

[Laughter.]

And so on through the day until finally at the evening hour, when all of these pages are filled, the women of America are told that they should furnish this information:

> Name all the different kinds of planning jobs which you must do and which were not listed in the day's work. For example, planned to spend month's income so as to save for a new rug; planned a new coat for Jane out of my old skirt; planned to store winter clothes; store vegetables for the winter.

As if any woman on earth would ever have time to do anything if she stopped to jot down all the information that these people in the department want them to jot down and report. And I ask you, if they sent back that information, what in the world would the board do with it?

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I notice that one of the entries in that model diary is that the woman punished Billy. Does the diary disclose the proper method to use, whether it is the old method or the modern method?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; that is one of the oversights, but I am sorry my friend has suggested it, because I fear the department will note the suggestion and issue a new bulletin next week.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If not restrained by Congress, there is absolutely no limit to the investigations which enthusiastic department officials would conduct. In the departments are many able men, interested in their work but unmindful of the burden of taxation.

I remember that a most enthusiastic official in one of the departments came before a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on which I was serving and wanted an additional appropriation in order that he might conduct an investigation as to how many hours a day a woman might work without being fatigued, and although I suggested it might be of little value, that it might depend entirely on the kind of a woman she might be—whether she was a big woman or a little woman, a strong woman or a weak woman—his enthusiasm for his cause never waned, and his earnestness increased as he pleaded his cause.

I know that no man can be a success in a department unless he is enthusiastic about his work. He must be zealous, but at the same time the Congress must have common sense enough to restrain the desires of these gentlemen who would investigate everything on earth and who apparently believe that the people are so helpless they can do nothing for themselves.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BOYCE. What division of the Government is responsible for the creation of these boards and commissions and the like?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question, because I intended to come to it later. The Congress, and the Congress alone, is responsible for it.

Mr. BOYCE. Is it not time that the Congress of the United States stopped it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. My only hope in making these remarks at this time is that some Members of the House would take the view that I infer the gentleman from Delaware entertains, that it is time Congress stopped it.

The presumption that States can do nothing for themselves, and the constant interference with the rights of the individual citizen have, in my opinion, resulted in the growing sentiment against the extension of governmental activities which is fairly reflected in the action of the legislatures of the States to-day in rejecting the child labor amendment. It was submitted to them just at a time when the people had come to realize the extent to which the Government of the United States is encroaching upon the rights of the States. In my own State of South Carolina, within the last few days, this amendment has been unanimously rejected, not a vote being cast in favor of its ratification, either in the Senate or in the House, and in every other section of the country States are rejecting it. So that whereas when it was submitted to the States I predicted it would not be ratified by a majority of the States, I now confidently believe it will not be ratified by one-third, instead of the necessary three-fourths of the States.

Mr. BLANTON. It is 15 to 2, now.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Well, I am in favor of the score.

Those who defend the extension of governmental activities have been urging, especially in the last six months, that State taxation has increased more than taxation of the United States Government. Figures do not justify this statement.

In the year 1922 the total cost of national, State, and local governments was $7,425,045,000, or an average cost of $68.29 for each person in this country. Of this total, $3,204,133,000 represents the cost of the National Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, according to the statistics published by the Bureau of the Census, the last available statistics, while $4,220,912,000 was the cost of government by States, counties, municipalities, and other subdivisions of the States. The figures show, however, that between 1912 and 1922 the cost of government in the States and subdivisions of States increased 115 per cent, while the cost of the National Government in 1922 showed an increase of 380 per cent as compared with the cost of the National Government in 1912. Some statisticians have figured five persons to the family. If this is fair, and the average tax per person of the National Government is what the Bureau of the Census has figured it to be, $68.29, then the tax bill of the average family of five is $341.25 per year, and it seems that when the head of a family of five earns only $1,200 a year, he spends more than one-fourth of his time working to pay his taxes.

Mr. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not true that this 300 per cent increase in the expenditures of the Federal Government was due entirely to the war?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH. And the comparison should be made with last year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, no. If we compared taxes in 1912 with taxes for the years 1917 and 1918, the percentage instead of being 380 per cent would be much greater. In 1922 we were four years removed from the war, and the expenses of the National Government were 380 per cent more than in 1912. Of course, the gentleman may say that in 1922 there were some activities that were brought about by the war, and of course that is true. As I said just a moment ago in discussing the question of employees, there are many employees in the Veterans' Bureau, which is a new bureau established since the war, but on the other hand there were employees who were at the Panama Canal in 1912 who are not now employed. The increased expense of government can not be charged entirely to the war and activities growing out of the war.

Mr. SMITH. Why not make the comparison between 1924 and 1912?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have been making the comparison of 1922 with 1912 in expenditures because 1922 is the latest year for which the Census Bureau has prepared statistics.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I think the gentleman's statistics should go a little further and should show a higher percentage because the gentleman does not include the postal receipts as taxes of the Government, and yet they are taxes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know that; but I purposely excluded them because the Bureau of the Census did so, and I wanted to use their figures and not cause confusion. But what the gentleman from Texas says is true. The postal revenues are taxes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And they go into the Treasury?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They go into the Treasury and ought to be counted.

I want to call attention to another item. This bill carries appropriations for a new organization of government, the Board of Tax Appeals. I had hoped that with its establishment we would hasten the day when the Government would settle finally its claims against citizens for back taxes. Already 900 appeals have been filed with the board. I am advised, however, that as a result of the investigation conducted by a Senate committee the Bureau of Internal Revenue has concluded that some settlements were based upon erroneous interpretations of the law, and as a result citizens who thought they had finally secured a release from taxes due in 1917 and 1918 are now receiving little notes advising them that their cases had been reopened and that they must appear and pay. This means the employment of lawyers and additional accountants.

The interests of the Government should be protected, but at the same time the citizen is entitled to some protection, and I believe that there ought to come a time in the life of the taxpayer when, having paid the amount determined by the Government to be due, he can finally secure a release for the payment of taxes due to his Government six or seven years ago.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. May I ask the gentleman a question there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Does the gentleman mean to say that as a result of the investigation of the Couzens investigation the policy of the department is being changed with reference to the collection of revenue?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I mean to say that they have changed their view as to certain provisions of the law, which affects many cases heretofore settled.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That is very illuminating and is a very interesting statement.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. My own inference from what has occurred is that criticisms have been voiced as to the settlement of certain cases, and gentlemen have gone back to the department and, having changed their views, have reopened cases, and I understand that already a number of taxpayers in this country have received notices that their cases have been reopened. The Government has a right at any time to reopen a case, and the only recourse a taxpayer has is to appear, and if he can not induce them to again change their views he can appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. As I understand the gentleman, he says the investigation of the department has changed the decision of the board as to what the law authorizes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Not the Board of Tax Appeals, but officials of the bureau.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue told the Ways and Means Committee that they would be current within 12 months if we would give them the relief which they got.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Since that time they have changed as to the time within which they will complete the settlements for the year 1917. Officials have told the Appropriations Committee that the investigation has cost the department $100,000, because 200 employees have been engaged in furnishing information to the Senate investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Under what authority of law were the bulletins referred to by the gentleman furnished or printed?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Vocational Education Board. I have called it to the attention of the committee, because somewhere there ought to be a censorship of bulletins sent out by departments so that it would not be possible for subordinate officials to send out such silly and absurd documents, asking mothers to make a note of when Johnny had his breakfast in the morning, that Alice had her hair combed at 10 o'clock, and Billy was whipped at 10.30 a. m.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. When was that law passed?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. When Congress established the bureau they secured the power to print.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is it not likely that the Revenue Bureau reopened the cases of prominent people in an attempt to set up a backfire and stop the criticisms of the bureau?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Well the taxpayer who has to pay the taxes thinks it is a pretty expensive backfire to him. I believe that a taxpayer is entitled to have finally determined how much he owes and by payment be able to secure a final release from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. [Applause.]

I am convinced that Congress should discontinue the practice of creating independent offices; that it might with profit abolish some of the commissions now existing and merge others with the regular departments of the Government; that restrictions should be placed upon the power of departments, commissions, and bureaus to demand all kinds of reports from citizens, thus causing them expense as well as annoyance; that the cost of the National Government should be reduced, and that the taxpayer should at some time during his life be definitely advised of the amount he owes the Government, and when he pays that amount be finally released from liability to the Government. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The committee informally rose; and Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, was read.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes also to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in my opinion the Veterans' Committee of the House has done an earnest, faithful, honest, and sympathetice work in providing for the disabled veterans of America, as much so as any committee could have done. We have taken but very little time of the House for this entire Congress. As one member of that committee I believe that we have approached closely to the point where we will not have to come to the House any more and ask for legislation which will involve the outlay of expenditure over and above what we have already done.

There are a few matters, however, in connection with the law which experience has taught me could be improved. I am speaking as one member of the committee, and I want to discuss one phase of that legislation now pending in the committee which interests me very much. That is the proposition of the permanent minimum rate of pay for arrested tubercular patients.

Practically every Member of the House knows that many men from among his constituents have been sent to Veterans' Bureau hospitals with tuberculosis; that after being there for a while some of them have reached the point where apparently there is an arrested condition. In most of these cases they are discharged with 10 per cent or less rating. I take the position that the man who has had any amount of involvement of the lungs by tuberculosis has just as definite a physical handicap as a man who has had his leg amputated. It may not be to the same degree but the nature of the disease is such that it consumes any area of the lungs it attacks. The position I take is based upon the medical authority which we have in the RECORD by some of the most prominent tuberculosis practitioners and specialists in the country. Among them are Dr. W. L. Dunn, of Asheville, N. C.; Col. Walter C. Klotz, medical officer in charge of the National Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.; Dr. Kennon Dunham, of the University of Cincinnati; Dr. V. F. Cullen, superintendent of State Sanatorium of Maryland, and others. They practically agree that any man who has had involvement by tuberculosis has a definite permanent physical handicap.

What I want to do is to give these men a rating of 50 per cent permanent pay on arrested development on discharge from the hospital, because the great problem with arrested tubercular patients is the fact that the disease does recur, or tends to recur, periodically and come back, brought about because he undertakes to carry the load of an ordinary man in the way of effort forced upon him in his weakened condition by the urge of economic needs for himself and family. No red-blooded man can, for his own preservation, sit by and see those he loves and feels both legal and moral responsibility for suffer without making an effort to relieve their want. So he is simply forced into attempting a man's load under present conditions, after six months elapse under the present law, and it amounts to forced suicide, nothing short of it. The urge of duty to one's family is even stronger than life.

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

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. A person having been once afflicted with tuberculosis, is it not the fact that one of the things that helps him live is to have ample time to rest, in order to prevent its recurrence?

Mr. BROWNING. That is a vital element if life is to continue. Another element is this: Some of the physicians tell us that at least 80 per cent of the patient's chances of recovery depend upon his mental contentment. To prevent a recurrence of the disease is a thing which the Government owes to a man in whom it has invested so much money in undertaking to bring him to a state of arrest, even if there was no human element in it. The first consideration should be for the man himself, to give him a chance to recover and live. While on that point I might say that the word "cured" has no place in the parlance affecting a tuberculosis patient. There is no such thing as his being cured. That is why the medical profession uses the terms "arrested" or "apparently arrested." Doctor Dunn uses the illustration of a rebuilt motor to describe the condition of these tuberculosis-arrested patients and says that a machine rebuilt might for a short time carry the ordinary weight of the machine, its ordinary capacity when new, but sooner or later it is going to break under the strain, and any man who takes a position in our economic system is sure to be called on at times to perform an overload of work, if he retains his position, because those times come in every human activity. If this tuberculosis-arrested patient is forced to shoulder an ordinary load, sooner or later the strain is going to overcome him, and he is going to become reactivated. There is no such thing as regeneration of the areas of the lungs. When part of the lung is gone it is gone, and the man who has part of that vital

organ on which the whole system depends taken away from him naturally does not have the capacity to stand up under the load as he did before the disease attacked him.

The first consideration is for the man himself. In my personal experience I can think of nothing better to describe this man than the illustration of a Ford car undertaking to pull a hill with only two or three cylinders working, and most of us who have had that experience know what it means to the machine. That is the condition confronting this man. The Government takes him at a tremendous expense and brings him to a state of arrest. To maintain that condition, he must have improvement in food, in its cleanliness, its nutrition. He must have an improvement in the quality of his food, in the comforts of his residence, in the warmth of the clothing he wears, and in the lack of exposure to which he is subjected, and then he must have the privilege of laying down the burden which he has resting upon him to maintain himself and family when he sees that burden is going to crush him and bring him back to a reactivated condition. He not only has the actual, permanent, definite, physical disability by having part of his lung areas taken away, never to be restored, but he has ever present that potential disability which comes with the nature of tuberculosis to recur periodically, and that dread eternally hangs over his head. Not only the definite, but the potential. He does not dare follow the ordinary pursuits of life with any degree of satisfaction or regularity. He does not dare go out and cope with other men in the ordinary activities, because this sword of Damocles hangs over him. If he walks across the line of exertion, which his condition will permit only temporarily, then this grim specter with blazing eyes is crouching ready to spring at the vital organs of his existence. Add to this the wolf howling at his door. No wonder these men have nightmares, no wonder their mental attitude is different from that of the ordinary sick man, because they are forever conscious of the fact that at any time when they overreach the limits of strength and capacity of their impaired existence after this disease attacks them, this reactivated condition must come about.

To show you that these physicians are not alone in their attitude toward the permanent disability these men suffer, I call attention to the fact that the insurance companies of America treat an arrested tuberculosis patient as a substandard risk, and definitely so, and as Colonel Klotz points out in one place, Mr. Picken, one of the insurance actuaries of England, in discussing the insurability of arrested tuberculosis patients, says that while the expectancy of life for an ordinary man of that age is 30 years, for the arrested tuberculosis patient it is 14 years. Therefore, he is less than a 50 per cent risk. It is very interesting to run down some of the scattering statistics which we have available to show how the insurance companies of America consider these men. I find that Hunter and Rogers, the actuaries for the Equitable Life, in examining 4,000 cases of arrested tuberculosis patients, insured by their company, found that of those patients whose last attack had been within five years, and whose ages ranged from 15 to 39 years, the death rate was 233 per cent ratio to that expected by the company's experience on standard risks, and by the medico actuarial tables, it was 260 per cent. That table can be found in the Mortality Study of Impaired Lives, 1922.

In 1920, in the eleventh district under the Veterans' Bureau, of those arrested tuberculosis patients placed on training, after they had been arrested more than 30 per cent became reactivated that year. This is comparatively light work always. In 1921 of all the cases that were discharged from the Veterans' Bureau hospitals in America as arrested, 31 per cent became reactivated that year and reentered the hospitals. Under those conditions, if the best medical authority of America points out the only way in which we can aid these men in maintaining their condition of arrest, then why not follow that course? The first consideration is the condition of the man himself and what is best for him. In discussing this question of discharging men as arrested and stopping their pay, on page 325 of part 2, hearings before our committee last session, I asked Doctor Dunham his opinion, and he answered as follows:

> Mr. BROWNING. Doctor, do you think from a medical standpoint it is a sensible thing, then, to reduce a man's compensation to practically a nominal amount, just because his case is arrested?
>
> Doctor DUNHAM. I think it is a crime, sir. I think it is a perfect crime.

I am speaking, of course, of men who have been connected with the service with their disability. The consensus of opinion is that 50 per cent of permanent disability will be reasonable. In some cases a man may not have been disabled to 50 per cent physically, but he certainly would be handicapped with that disability $40 a month industrially if he had any noticeable amount of involvement. Some would be more than that, those far advanced before it became arrested. We can not treat these men all alike, of course, without doing more for one man than we do for another in proportion to his handicap. We must strike an average. But the difficulty of the matter we have confronting us is the proposition of determining just what the disability is. I want to read a paragraph of what Doctor Dunn says about that:

> It would require the very finest sort of judgment based upon a tremendous experience and a very accurate knowledge of the whole course of the individual case to rate these properly. This is manifestly impossible of accomplishment with so many cases and with so many necessarily inexperienced men to do the rating.

In this connection Colonel Klotz says:

> It is obviously difficult to arrive at any quantitative estimate of this permanent potential disability. It will naturally differ widely. This makes it difficult also to arrive at any exact amount of compensation that ought to be granted to offset this potential disability. In the case of disabled veterans there must necessarily be one standard for all. Previous social or financial condition can not be considered. It follows necessarily that no matter what amount is determined on that it will be more than adequate for some, who may be accustomed to a lower scale of living and who may be permanently arrested, while it must necessarily be too low for others whose demands are higher and who at the same time may not reach the same proportion of working capacity or productivity. However, there are a number of statistical data that might offer a basis for a permanent rating that would be adaptable to the average. It has been estimated by different authorities that the average value of the arrested sanatorium patient is about 50 per cent in the labor market. In other words, his productive capacity is about half of what it was before he developed his disability.

We naturally have to strike an average, and I am convinced that 50 per cent is just and equitable.

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

Mr. BROWNING. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. I have listened to the gentleman with great interest, and I can say as one who has practiced medicine for 19 years that I fully agree with everything he has said in connection with tuberculosis patients. Now, in connection with what the gentleman has just stated here, I will say there would not be so much difference between those men because, as a rule, it is the patient who is beginning tuberculosis from whom they get such good results. The advanced cases, as a rule, are not arrested. There would not be much difference between those men. I would like to ask the gentleman to bring out this fact, that aside from the interest that people should have in the ex-service man whose case has been arrested, the public is also interested in this man not becoming affected a second time, because then he would become a menace to his family and the community.

Mr. BROWNING. That is true, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Now, from the commercial standpoint to the Government. I believe it is estimated that it takes, in round numbers, three years to bring a man to the quiescent or arrested state, on the average. To hospitalize him during that length of time, as the last report of the Veterans' Bureau shows, the per capita cost for the tuberculosis man for the fiscal year 1924 was $5.20. That is not counting the capital investment in the hospital and the major improvements. For the three years it would cost $5,694 to hospitalize that man who has become reactivated, because the Government did not give him the pittance to save him from this exposure. During that length of time the average of $100 a month, hospital pay, would be $3,600, making a total cost of $9,294. At $50 a month that would pay him for fifteen and a half years, and if you save one man out of five from becoming reactivated by giving him this allowance, you have saved the Government money. The director, a few days ago, in testifying about what the cost would be to the Government by giving this man a permanent rating of 50 per cent, said it would cost $217,485 per year more than the present expenses of these tuberculosis patients. I asked him if he took into consideration the fact that the Government would be saved the expense of hospitalizing these men that became reactivated, and he said he did not. And if the figures I have just quoted are correct, and I think they are, to hospitalize 70 men for a year would cost as much money as this cost would be, it is certain we would save more than that number. Do you not think, if the doctors tell us this is the best remedy we can get, give them permanent pay, lighten the economic pressure, satisfy their minds, keep them alive by not forcing them to be exposed and exert themselves—in other words, give them a slight chance—

do you not think we are only doing belated justice by providing proper means for them to fight this predacious enemy of mankind?

There is no outlay to the Government on this proposition. In fact, it is going to save the Government money if we place this provision in the law; and if it is best for the man, if it is best for the Government itself, if we protect the public, if it gives the man a longer life and the privilege while living it to have the comfort necessary for himself and his family, why should we hesitate to place any such proposition in the laws of this Government?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Take, for instance, the present situation: A man who served in the trenches in France, was gassed, and has tuberculosis and has not been to a doctor until this present day. The presumption is that it was not of service origin under the present law. Why do we not wipe away that negative presumption and make it an affirmative presumption in their favor, and not just let it run until the 1st of January, 1925, but let it run on for several years yet? As to the man who served abroad and now has tuberculosis, the presumption ought to be that it was of service origin. Why does not the gentleman think of that?

Mr. BROWNING. That is a debatable question. The medical authorities have not all agreed that we were justified in the last extension, but they could not give any reason why it should not be done, and we just did it. There is no presumption against him now, but the conclusive presumption does not run after January 1, 1925.

Mr. BLANTON. Why not extend it to the men who need the attention?

Mr. BROWNING. I will say to the gentleman that there are many considerations justifying the gentleman's position. But he is reaching the field of invalid pensions for World War men, and the Congress has not yet embarked on that policy.

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

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. In the original law the period was two years, was it not?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. I afterwards suggested that that be extended three years, and then the bill made it six years finally. I remember the evidence given at the time was that it was considered by the best medical authorities that five years would be the proper limit. They made it six years. Have those six years expired now?

Mr. BROWNING. They expired January 1, 1925.

Mr. BLANTON. They will not even let him go to a hospital.

Mr. BROWNING. Oh, yes. He will have hospitalization. All soldiers get that, regardless of disability, under the law as it now is, with preference to those unable to pay.

Mr. SNELL. Every member of the foreign expeditionary force will have hospitalization.

Mr. BLANTON. But they do not pay him anything.

Mr. SNELL. They do not pay him anything, but he has the right of hospitalization.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, this is not an attempt to raid the Public Treasury. It is a matter which appeals to me as being based on common sense and justice. It is no effort to favor one class as against another of disabled ex-service men, because this disease, known as the white plague, is not self-determinative as most diseases are. It is an inflammatory scourge that thrives on the poverty of the victim, and has its best chance to work havoc when he is forced to struggle in a cruel world without assistance. We are only asking that we be allowed to strike an average of 50 per cent for these men. If it is done, this will be a great line of defense behind which they can protect themselves from ravages far more dreaded than the carnage of battle.

My visits to the tuberculosis hospitals the past year opened my eyes to the fact that no more desperate battle was ever fought by these men than the one they are now making. "Eternal vigilance" and patience indescribable constitute the essential elements of their fight. They are enduring this and more. They are hopeful beyond belief that they can win as they did in 1918. God sustain them in this effort. I for one am not willing that the hospital should be held out as their only hope of financial help for them and their families. I want them to be offered as a privilege and benefit to the men and not as a place of confinement before the Government will assist them. I am not willing that they should be forced to lie with their eyes on the clock or calendar to know when they must fight alone. The American people do not want it either. A failure to grant this relief will be a decree by us that they must know the foreboding of sorrow's return henceforth, and that they must watch the candle of life prematurely burn low, wane, and flicker.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly thank the House for this privilege. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, about 15 minutes before my time finally expires will the Chair call my attention to it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman under the rules is entitled to one hour. The Chair will call the gentleman's attention to the fact when he has consumed 15 minutes less than one hour.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the time is equally divided in the House, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDLIN] are each to control one hour. I did not know that the rules provided that each one personally should have an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House it is provided that no man can speak more than an hour unless by unanimus consent. If it is desired to speak longer, the unanimous consent of the House must be obtained.

ANSWER TO REPRESENTATIVE FREAR ON WISCONSIN REPUBLICANS

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before discussing the merits of this bill I desire, very briefly, to answer some of the propositions advanced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and in answering what he has submitted I do not wish to be understood as casting any reflection upon the personal character or the honest intention of a single man involved either in his discussion or in mine. But I believe I am in a position to know something of the trouble that these gentlemen not only afforded the Republican Party during the last campaign, but the perturbation of mind in which they placed the voters of the United States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin adverted to the fact that for more than a quarter of a century Wisconsin has stood by the principles of the Republican Party. In a measure he is correct; in a measure he is very greatly incorrect. I can remember a time when all the United States was wavering in the balance politically and when uncertainty was felt with reference to the result of the election everywhere else, there was no uncertainty in Wisconsin. It was as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar in the Republican ranks. That was in the days of Matt Carpenter and John C. Spooner.

The time came, however, when a new prophet entered Wisconsin, who was not content with the existing order of things; and if you will mark the progress of that State from its admission into the Union down to the time of its advent into this new land of prophecy you will find it was one of the most progressive States in the Union. They had everything given them by the endowment of the Creator to make one of the greatest States of the Union. But a new theory of political environment and enforcement was injected into its political being that seemed to find a majority for its support and in consequence that State which had for those long years been one of the great Republican States of the Union began to diverge from Republican principles until finally it was no longer a Republican State. Nor was it a Democratic State. It was a one-man State.

In the discussion that I am making here to-day and in the remarks I may make with reference to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, I mean to reflect nothing upon those who have followed Mr. LA FOLLETTE in his school of thought except to express my regret. That State is still one of the great potential States of the Union, and whenever they get away from the vagaries to which they have submitted themselves, and from under the spell of this false leader, it will again be one of the great States of the Union.

Now, in passing I want to say this: I believe that political parties are just as essential to the perpetuity of our Government as any other fundamental. I believe that there is no place in this country for more than two dominant political parties. I believe that they should be so strongly constituted that whenever one goes very far wrong the other will checkmate it. [Applause.]

From the beginning of this Government of ours down to this time, like cankerous growths on the human body or on the vegetable body, so-called independent political parties have appeared, and then disappeared just as suddenly as they came. It may be that in revolutionary times where there is necessity for the overthrow of political parties, there should be a reorganization. Such was true at the advent of the Republican Party. Such was true with the advent of the Democratic Party. It may be again. But under existing circumstances there is no use for a La Follette party; there is no use for a socialistic party; because the Democratic and Republican

Parties are now so constituted and so equally divided that neither of them can go very far astray without the one checkmating the other; and I believe that the salvation of this country and its future success depends upon the progressive conservatism of the Democratic Party and the conservative progressivism of the Republican Party. [Applause.]

Now, there is no room for a political party representing the thought of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who spoke this morning. He was mistaken when in the last campaign he thought that the time was ripe to disrupt not only the Republican Party but the Democratic Party, and over their remains build a new political party. The verdict of the people, which is, after all, the balance of power and the best prediction of what is best for the future, prevailed against the efforts of these gentlemen, and they met the defeat they so righteously deserved.

A year ago to-day you gentlemen upon the Democratic side would not have given 15 cents to have insured the election of a Democratic President and a Democratic majority in Congress, and I confess that I had some doubts in my own mind as to what the result of the election would be, but after the catastrophe that occurred in New York at the Democratic convention there was not much doubt as to what would transpire at the November election, so far as the choice of a President was concerned. But there was much doubt for a long time after that, and until the election period had almost half transpired, as to what the result would be in so far as the selection of a Congress was concerned. I remember coming down here about five weeks before the election and with a little bit of trepidation, yet with an assurance founded on hope, I submitted to the President of the United States and to those who were interested in the election of a Republican Congress what I thought was a conservative figure concerning the next House of Representatives. I am frank and honest enough to confess that I was not quite sure about the figures I gave at that time. The gentleman then representing the Democratic Congressional Committee, for whom I have the highest regard, believing I did not know what I was talking about, gave out an interview in which he said I was using my hat for a megaphone. I then submitted the proposition that we would have a majority of 10 over all, not counting the so-called La Follette Republicans and those who had been affiliating with them. I remember that the gentleman who writes the editorials in the first column of the Post said, after submitting the figures given by the gentleman in charge of the Democratic Congressional Committee, that if I were using my hat for a megaphone he was using his for an amplifier. The final result disclosed that we have a majority of 25 over and above all, and it was due to this fact: That the American people, the voters, who determine the future welfare of this country, realizing how futile it would be to elect a President of the United States and then handicap him with an opposition congressional majority that would thwart every attempt he made to carry out any policy, by their ballots made this Republican majority possible.

Now, then, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has emphasized the fact that consistently, and for lo these many years, they have supported the Republican Party and its principles. I remember that when we convened at the beginning of this Congress the so-called Republicans from Wisconsin were not content to abide by what was thought by a majority of the Republican elect to be for the best interests of the Republican Party, in so far as the organization of this House was concerned, and for two or three days—three, I think—they kept us unorganized. It took some six or seven ballots to decide who should be the officers of this Congress, and it was more than a month, if my memory serves me right, before we adopted the rules, and that long delay was caused by reason of contention on the part of these so-called La Follette Republicans. Had I had my way then, they would have been contesting the organization of this House until now, and they would have had no voice, in so far as changing the rules to meet their whims are concerned, for, after all, the only rule they changed of concern has proven an abortion. Had this course been pursued the public would have soon said to these gentlemen that they were occupying an untenable position and that they were just simply throwing a monkey wrench into the machinery of government, without any good purpose, and demand that they desist their obstruction. So these gentlemen who are now professing their Republicanism have no sufficient ground in the past upon which to stand, and certainly nothing in this last campaign that justifies their professions of fealty.

At the Republican convention in Cleveland the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], whose high and commanding qualities have been so admirably extolled by his colleague [Mr. FREAR], appeared as a Republican delegate from the State of Wisconsin. That entire convention was in accord, in so far as the adoption of a platform was concerned, with the exception of Mr. COOPER and one or two other delegates. He presented a minority report from the committee on resolutions; was tendered every courtesy that a well-ordered convention could render. He had his day in court, and at the end of his presentation was overwhelmingly overruled. Had he been a Republican, following the traditions of the Republican Party and the law of majority rule, he would have submitted to the will of that convention; but he did not do it. He joined with his rebellious leader, who has never been content with the existing order of things, and followed him as one of his abject supporters in his so-called "progressive candidacy" for President. So, while we may admire all the sterling qualities of mind and heart that have been accredited to him, these are not sufficient to wipe out his breach of faith to the Republican Party.

I wish to submit to the gentlemen upon both sides of the aisle that if the fundamentals of this country are to be preserved we must mind well and be critical of all those who would destroy it. Read the returns of this last election and they afford an argument stronger than I can make, stronger than anyone can make, as to why the American people returned Calvin Coolidge as President of the United States. Good man, as he is, ever conservative, as he is, there was something beyond all that which appealed to the people. It was the attempt of these gentlemen who are professing to be Republicans at the destruction of the very foundation of this Government of ours.

I have a very high regard for John W. Davis. I know him personally and have great respect not only for his integrity but for his ability. I have a very high regard for the party he represents, and if I were not a Republican I would be a Democrat. But I want to say to you gentlemen that his campaign was the most pitiable thing that was ever presented by the Democratic Party. Why? Because you were depending too much on a false prophet who you thought would be a helpful agency in elevating to power the Democratic Party through a rending in twain of the Republican Party, but you found you had been nursing a snake that in the end stung you to death. The time may come, if this sort of political expediency is pursued, when you gentlemen upon the Democratic side, conservative as you always are and have been so far as the Constitution of the United States is concerned, will unite with the conservatives upon this side in order to perpetuate the fundamental principles of this Government, against which the gentleman who appeared here to-day, and those of like associations, were fighting and trying to destroy. It was this assault upon the Constitution that aroused the American people to action, and you can depend upon it whenever the clarion call goes forth that there is an attempt upon that Constitution—which has been said to be the greatest guaranty for the liberty of men ever inaugurated by mortals—that those who are making the attack will be defeated.

So I say to you that the gentlemen who are now professing that they are Republicans have but little foundation upon which to stand. It may be that by reason of the chastisement that has been administered, and it may be that heeding the voice of the people, which is the law of the land, these gentlemen, erring in their ways, will come back to the path laid out by Carpenter, by Spooner, and that galaxy of Republican patriots in the formative days of Wisconsin. If that time comes, the doors of the Republican Party are open to them; if it does not come, they are shut; and if you gentlemen on the Democratic side want them, until then they are yours. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Has the time arrived now?

Mr. WOOD. On our side it has passed. Has it arrived with you?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Not yet. Do you expect to take them in at your next conference?

Mr. WOOD. I want to say it is always meet to repent. If these gentlemen will come back and ask for admittance into our door, after due time for repentence, they will be admitted. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question in that connection?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Before they come back into the fold, though, they will have to occupy a reasonable period of time on the mourners' bench, as I understand the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD. That is a matter for future determination; but I wish to say to the gentleman that when we were in the throes

back at the beginning of this Congress, and when you gentlemen on the Democratic side were flirting with them, trying your best to get their support, you little knew of the agony they were so soon to cause you.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman stated they could come back after due repentance or after due time for repentance. Does the gentleman think there will be time enough between now and your Republican caucus to let them in?

Mr. WOOD. So far as I am concerned, no; and I will tell you why. [Applause.] Under the present peculiar organization, it appears that I am the only one who has authority to call a meeting for the organization of the next Congress on the Republican side. I have issued that call as chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee. Gentlemen will receive their notices I expect before night, and I have called it a caucus, not a conference, but in this list the so-called La Follette Republicans will not appear. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I congratulate you.

Mr. WOOD. And to the gentlemen from Wisconsin and one or two others, who are not included in this invitation, I wish to say now that I hope the verdict of the people of the United States will convince them of the error of their ways and that if contrite in heart they will come back to the fold where they should belong, then I will say, admit them. Oh, I tell you, that story of the Magdalene is a beautiful story. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield for just one short question?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. I understand from the gentleman's discourse that these progressive fellows, so called, are read out until after the caucus. Does that also apply to the voters who supported those fellows in the recent campaign?

Mr. WOOD. Every man's conscience is his own judge. Those gentlemen must determine for themselves. We have no jurisdiction over them. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. ROMJUE. My inquiry is really serious. I want to know whether the leadership of the party on the other side puts the voters following the progressive group in the same category that those progressives are in. I want to know what their situation is.

Mr. WOOD. I am not speaking for anybody but myself, but I do believe—and you Democrats ought to believe, for there is greater warning in the last election to you than to anybody else in this world—the average voter of this country is no longer throttled by party ties. He respects party principles, and when you gentlemen give to the country a better set of principles, appealing to their conscience so far as the good conduct of this country is concerned, than we on the Republican side give them, you will succeed, and never until then, and the voter is going to determine that for himself.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana by what authority or where he gets his authority or by what deduction he comes to the conclusion that he has the right to refuse an invitation to any Republican Member of this House to the caucus?

Mr. WOOD. I have no right whatever to refuse an invitation to any Republican Member of this Congress, but I have the right to conclude who are Republicans by their acts and not by their professions.

Mr. KING. Upon what basis does the gentleman make a distinction?

Mr. WOOD. I will tell you upon what I base my decision. There are 12 gentlemen who are now Members of this House who went out over this country advocating the election of Mr. LA FOLLETTE for President of the United States, and doing everything they could to defeat a Republican majority in this House. Do you say they are Republicans? Or that they should be treated as Republicans in the organization of the next House?

Mr. KING. There are many Members sitting in this House to-day who went out and supported a third-party movement in 1912; why are they invited to the caucus?

Mr. WOOD. I will tell the gentleman exactly. The gentleman this morning adverted to Colonel Roosevelt—and I was not with him in that movement either—I think if he could have made a confession upon his death bed, he would have said that the great mistake of his life was in doing what he did at that time in view of what happened to this country in consequence; and I will tell you what he did. Instead of trying to butt in to the Republican organization he waited until the hour struck, and it was apparent that he should again reassert himself for the principles for which the Republican Party stands and has ever stood. [Applause.]

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOOD. In a moment. And so I say now that for these gentlemen I have a high regard; there is no bitterness in my heart against any of them individually, but when I look back upon this past campaign, through which I spent many an anxious hour trying to circumvent the operations of these gentlemen who were trying to defeat Republicans in various districts, among them some of the most reputable and valuable Members of this House, in order to supplant them with Democrats; to tell me that those gentlemen should come in here and sit down at the feast board and enjoy the results of the victory is ridiculous and beyond any justification.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. KING. I simply asked the gentleman a question, which he has failed yet to answer. Where does the gentleman get his authority to read anybody out of the Republican caucus—by virtue of his office or elsewhere—where does it come from, in the House or outside?

Mr. WOOD. I have no authority except that which is given me by a reasonable amount of common sense and judgment. [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. I think in this case the gentleman has overrated the amount.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I will.

Mr. SPEAKS. I want to inquire to what extent that sublime principle enunciated in the story of the Magdalene is to apply here, or whether it is the intention to let him without sin cast the first stone? [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. I expect that with the generally acknowledged disposition of the Republican Party to give those a chance to come within the fold that they would be at least as generous as they of old were with the Magdalene.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let me say that the injunction as to casting the first stone has no connection in the Scripture with the incident of the Magdalene.

Mr. WOOD. No; it has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana if it were not for the fact that you have 25 majority over and above all defections, would not the gentleman be flirting with these gentlemen instead of casting the first stone?

Mr. WOOD. No; I would not. I want to say to you that if I had had my way about it at the beginning of this Congress, instead of bending the knee to these gentlemen I would have let you gentlemen take them over.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the Republicans did bend the knee?

Mr. WOOD. Oh, you tried the best you could to get them; but we seemed to have had the last bid and got them, to our lasting regret. [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, with this little digression I want to present as briefly as I can something that is of more interest to the country than what has been transpiring here in the last half hour.

By the way, before I go into this I want to say to the gentlemen of this House that I think one of the best dissertations that has been made, within a recent period at least, upon the duties of party loyalty and upon the essentials of party loyalty and patriotic citizenship was delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. BUTLER, in Boston the other night. I commend it not only to Republicans, but to the Democrats, because of the meat there is in it. It is going to be worth while for your consideration, and in order that you may see it I am going to make it a part of my remarks, as follows:

NATIONAL PARTY ORGANIZATION, BY SENATOR WILLIAM M. BUTLER, BOSTON, MASS., JANUARY 27, 1925

We have passed through the experiences of a national election. Our thoughts have been alive to the great principles of Government, and we have been impressed as never before in recent years by the inestimable value of party Government. The last campaign was an example of the dangers of a prominent third party. We were forced to consider, with no little concern, the different and disappointing conditions which would have arisen by reason of a result on election day which would have given to no party a majority of the electoral votes. Such an outcome would have been a calamity. The people would have lost their opportunity to elect a President. And all this experience leads us to a consideration anew of the fundamentals of our political methods and practices and of the Government itself.

The greatest nationalizing influence which has made our Federal Government virile and enduring is the two party system. The two great political parties are the sole agencies for formulating national policies and carrying them into effect. Moreover, they are the two great agencies which bring into one organization, and under a common leadership the diverse elements of the country.

An eminent writer on this subject says:

"The party unquestionably functions as a nationalizing agency of great importance. In the early period of our history, the national party system aided materially in the formation of bonds of contact, sympathy and eventually tradition. The Federalists, the Jeffersonians, and later the Whigs and the Democrats, were national parties when the nature of the Union was a subject of serious controversy. Even those who defended the rights of the States most insistently, were obliged to make a national appeal for the election of a party President and a party Congress to carry out their ideas. The parties used the language of nationalism, and their problems and leaders made their appeals to the entire nation rather than to any section exclusively. * * * The party convention, the party caucus and conference, the great party demonstrations brought together men of all sections on occasions that were essentially nationalistic in their character. It is a notable fact that the last bond to snap in the days before the Civil War was the party tie.

"Since the Civil War and the beginning of the more recent tide of immigration the parties have aided in the nationalization of the newly acquired citizens of the Republic. They have assisted nationalization of the immigrant, and encouraged them to affiliate with the political parties. Teuton and Celt, Latin and Slav, have been welcomed into the party, have attended the meetings, served upon party committees, marched in the party parades, acted as party candidates, functioned as party leaders. Party allegiance has been one of the easiest to acquire in the new country. There was no barrier, economic or social or religious, to prevent their membership. In no other organization or association, save that of labor, was the mingling of people so common and so easy as in the political party."

The two-party system of government has played an important part in holding the Union together. Under our Federal Constitution there was purposely left a wide chasm between the State and Federal Governments. Particular pains were taken by the framers of the Constitution to see to it that the Federal Government did not encroach upon the functions of the States, or the States usurp the functions of the Federal Government. Under our form of government each State is a political entity. Due to the diverse character of those who pioneered and settled the various sections of our country, the inhabitants of some States had but little in common with those of other States. As the Nation grew in territory this dissimilarity was accentuated.

The party system which has been with us since the establishment of our Government was the one bond of unity which held the various sections, the various States, and the various interests of our country together. The great political parties played an incalculable part in harmonizing these differences, in furnishing opportunity for interchange of ideas, and for emphasizing and cementing common purposes.

The work of unity performed by our two-party system of government is exemplified in another direction. It unifies the machinery of our Federal Government itself. The framers of the Constitution, fearing autocracy on the one hand and the unregulated rule of the people on the other, provided a system of checks and balances in the Federal Government which made the legislative, executive, and judicial branches completely independent of each other. It has been largely due to our system of party government that the legislative and executive branches have been not only able but willing to work together harmoniously. This is because the electorate has sought to secure executive and legislative branches of the same complexion politically. They were able to bring about this harmony through the party system. One can readily imagine the antagonism and chaos which might easily ensue in the conduct of our Federal Government if it were not for this harmonizing fact and the recognition of its value by an intelligent citizenship.

This brings us again to the realization of the need and value of party solidarity and party responsibility in the conduct of public affairs. Where the executive and the legislative control is in the hands of adherents of the same political party, we have complete party responsibility. But where the legislative branch is dominated by one party and the executive by another, we have no one party responsible for the conduct of the Government. Under these conditions, despite the fact they fully comply with the provisions of the Federal Constitution, there is always a lack of progress in public affairs and most frequently retrogression. In other words, our system of party government is essentially a supplement to the Federal Constitution if we are to have responsible and effective government.

Again, it is said by the author I have before quoted:

"Our system illustrates the principle found in every form of biparty government. Machinery is reduced to a minimum. The party is seen to govern, because its members are both party officers and officers of state. An essential characteristic of any sort of biparty government is the fusion of political and party office. The President of the United States is an officer in his party by virtue of the executive office to which he has been elected. In accepting the nomination he consents to become the leader and, to a considerable extent, the chief spokesman of his party. Having secured the election, he not only does not lay down his party office but he bears increased party responsibility.

"But the Chief Magistrate of our country is a servant of the whole people! Yes. The President can serve the entire country only by faithfulness in the fulfillment of all reasonable party pledges, by a diligence in the discovery of the policies which his party ought to adopt, and, most of all, by his skill and effectiveness in persuading his party to assume and advance the enlightened views which his position as leader has enabled him to form. Probably no public man was ever more opposed to party government than was George Washington, yet Washington's sense of duty to the whole country led him to consent to hold the position of leadership in the Federal Party.

"As with the President, so with the Members of the Congress. They are all party leaders. In accepting a party nomination they assume leadership in district or State; and, what is more important still, every Congressman who accepts a party nomination becomes responsible to the entire country for the fulfillment of certain party pledges."

This author enumerates a multiplicity of social, racial, and economic interests which divide the people, naturally. He sets forth the lack of acquaintance between various classes with consequent lack of understanding and sympathy and proceeds in his analysis, stating:

"The peculiar motion of the biparty system has been to harmonize all these discordant political elements in the body politic. In England the rival forces in government, the Crown, the Lords, the Commons, and the democracy, have been brought into harmonious working relations by means of the party system of government, and in America a vast and varied area of local institutions and prejudices which threatened to divide the people and preclude the formation of a united nation have been coordinated. The party system has undoubtedly been most effective and most obvious of the influences which have worked to overcome the effect of these divisive forces. The use of party system for the election of a President has clearly served to draw together the people of the whole country and to promote harmony of feeling and action, and like results have attended the application of party machinery to the governmental business of the States and to the political local divisions."

Unless I have misread the signs of the times we have now open to us an opportunity not only to increase the strength and influence of our party throughout the Nation but also to secure from citizens in general a greater participation than ever in political activities, an opportunity not only to increase the total of our votes but to keep the confidence and support of those who have aided in the great result of November 4.

The way has been opened by reason of the character of the issues raised and the methods pursued in the recently closed national campaign and election. The totals of votes cast for the different candidates indicate the possibilities.

There are millions of voters to-day, and I am speaking advisedly, who have no fixed political home and recognize no party control.

Aroused by their experiences in the campaign to a realization that right political thinking is as important as right living, they are standing at the political crossroads.

Overnight they have been awakened to the great underlying significance of political manifestations, which in the past they had regarded as being of minor or no importance.

Inclined to the belief, common even within our own party, that campaigns and elections are primarily the creations of politicians, who conduct them chiefly for their own advancement, and that political platforms are interesting merely as graceful arrangements of meaningless phrases, they have been suddenly brought to a realization that these happenings are of vital importance, not only to the life of our Nation but even their own personal fortunes.

Fixed in the belief that the foundation stones of our liberties were so deep that they could not be disturbed, much less destroyed, their reaction when they saw plans being laid, not only for the uprooting of the foundations but the destruction of the entire structure, we can now appreciate.

With affiliations nominal rather than actual with parties which stood indifferently by, they turned to our standards and severed old party ties by voting direct for Calvin Coolidge. These are the people who I believe can be brought into formal affiliation with us. But we can not ignore the fact their votes in the main were cast for Coolidge the man rather than for Coolidge the Republican. We must prove to them that our party is worthy of the President and that the President is typically a product of our party.

The campaign gave us not only converts, but it quickened and strengthened the respect and confidence in Republican principles among a great number of our own people who were Republicans in thought rather than deed.

We are all familiar with voters of this type—persons who rather scoff at campaigns as an unfortunate by-product of our Governmental existence and who secretly nourish, if they do not openly proclaim, a sentiment that there is something unholy, unclean, in political canvasses. Their obligations of citizenship, they believe, are paid in full by their quadrennial appearance at the polls, and many fail to pay even this poor tribute.

They have also been aroused, and to such an extent, that we can hope to count on them as militant members in the future.

The campaign of 1924 worked a veritable revolution in the political thinking processes of the people. It was the greatest "thinking election" which we have had since the Civil War, the campaign of '96 alone standing comparison.

The man who thinks before he votes—votes right.

It was as if a mammoth "Stop, look, and listen" sign had been erected on the national highway. The issues were so great that they purified even the methods of campaigning. They banished the pettiness, the selfishness, the intriguing which has so often marred political contests.

Some of our Democratic journalistic friends have argued that success came because we herded a frightened, worried people to the polls. The voters were more than worried; they were aghast at what the other parties proposed; but their worries and their dismay was not over their own fate but the fate of the Nation.

An electorate which rises in its wrath against such issues and with such a spirit is worthy of respect, and breeds confidence in the future safety of our Republic.

This is the situation in brief throughout the country as I see it. I believe we have an opportunity to attach permanently to our standard the great body of men and women who, while they have voted for Calvin Coolidge, are yet in doubt as to their future political affiliations, and to fortify the confidence and enthusiasm of the past time indifferent members of our own party, so they will become aggressive coworkers and militant party associates.

It can be done. But we must develop a program so broad and effective that they will naturally turn to us.

I have no delusions that this is an undertaking which can be accomplished overnight or which will be free of sacrifices, important personally, perhaps, but trivial in reality; but it will be worth while.

To be successful nationally we must be ready for house cleaning at home, each in his own section, and show courage and wisdom abroad. We must acquire the power to view all issues and problems from a nation-wide standpoint. We must develop a sympathetic understanding of the problems of our citizens in all sections and a willingness to cooperate.

There must be a shelving of petty and personal ambitions and the adoption of an attitude of unswerving loyalty to the principles of the party and an ambition to serve and a generous submission to discipline.

One of the important readjustments must be a more general understanding that after all we are only members, not the owners, of the Republican Party.

We must emphasize that we offer membership in a going and growing concern; that we invite comparison with other parties and await the verdict with confidence; that we know neither class nor creed nor nationality.

That we stand for equal opportunities for all and will fight those who seek to destroy that right.

That membership in the party and the party councils is free to all who pledge their willingness to uphold the ideals for which we stand.

That the open door is an actuality and not a mere figure of speech.

Holding steadfastly to the principles which Abraham Lincoln and the founders of our party first laid down, we must make it known to the people that we have no fixed and restricted formula, but one which always will be responsive to the needs of our Nation and its peoples as occasions arise.

The problems of the world are man made and can only be solved by man-made organizations. Such problems shall always have our ears, our lips, and our hearts. No party deserves to live or should live which seeks to hold itself aloof from these responsibilities.

The country to-day calls for a leadership practical in its manifestations but idealistic in its ambitions. We can not ignore this even if we would.

We must recognize that while our party is not relieved of any of its obligations to persist in its demand for the reduction of national expenditures and the development of efficiency in government, it must be ready to forward and sustain with equal enthusiasm sound humanitarian movements for the betterment of all the people in the country.

On the tariff, for example, we stand pledged to the people. But important as that issue is to the American workman, we must develop a strength of political resources so that without abating one jot of our loyalty to that plank of our platform we will be able to give generous recognition and aid to those measures which touch our people spiritually. Our party is too big to be dominated by any one plank, and that thought must be driven home and by definite action on our part if we are to win to our side those whom we are seeking.

The people look to us and expect us at all times to make certain as to the economic soundness of such projects as we propose, such movements as we indorse, but for our part we must remember there are certain moral issues which can never be determined through a cash register.

We have already before us certain movements of such magnitude, importance, and justice that we should be ready to throw all our strength behind them.

The demand for the outlawry of war is not only country-wide but world-wide. It is just, and to the accomplishment of that ideal we should bring all our ability and resolution.

The cry of the womanhood of America for the inauguration of a policy which, while not affecting our integrity as a sovereign State or involving us in foreign alliances, or affecting our purpose at all times to be first of all American, devoted to the maintenance of our own national strength and independence, will yet make for harmony among the nations of the earth, is not only impressive but right, and should have our sympathetic consideration and support.

I know that the adoption of a course of action such as I am trying to outline will make for a greater, more powerful, and more effective party. Yet I am not asking you to undertake this merely to increase our partisan strength, but because the greater our party, the greater will be the quality and quantity of the service which we can give to our country. Ours is a government of parties, and it is only through such organizations we can really aid.

The time is ripe for a great consolidation within one party, provided we are able to build a framework, national in its scope, economically sound, and also humanitarian, of the men and women who think in reasonable harmony with one another.

The people want it. After years of political experimentation with blocs and factions, which, for all of the good intentions of the promoters or participants, have only worked to increase the general confusion and delay the application of real remedies, the people are inclined to a sober and saner line of thinking. I know from interviews and conferences with men of all parts of the country there is a general disposition to support a unified Republican organization. They appreciate that the house divided against itself must fall, and this applies to political organizations.

All our efforts—and I am speaking plainly—will come to naught unless we succeed in developing, not only among the rank and file but among the leaders and our duly elected officials, an appreciation of the necessity of party loyalty. No progress can be made without a program, and no progress can be made effective without loyalty.

In Washington a man is either with a party or against it. There is no middle course. There is an absolute necessity for loyalty; for the control of Congress is regulated by party lines and conditions. It was in recognition of this situation, and not because of any feeling of personal bias, that certain gentlemen were lately stricken from the Republican rolls.

Discipline and the power to discipline are as necessary for a political organization as for a labor union or a legislative body. We all know there has been a weakening in recent years in this direction. I believe it must be restored, based on the simple thought that the majority must rule.

I have no thought of a system of discipline which seeks to encroach on the rights of any man or woman to aspire or stand for office or to limit their rights to propose or advance legislative or party programs.

But a man who is elected to office on a Republican platform must stand on that platform. If he does not like the platform, he is justified and entitled to seek to make any correction or amendments which he desires, but once the majority of the party formally rejects his suggestion, his obligation is to accept that decision.

It would, indeed, be wonderful if we had an organization so elastic in its principles, that each new thought as presented, could be incorporated in the canon of beliefs without prejudice or loss of effectiveness, but until this millenium arrives, we must continue on the old lines.

It is not that we do not want new thoughts, ideas, and inspirations, for they properly furnish the new currents of life which every party needs; all we ask is to be given the time in the party to prove the truth, the soundness of the offerings. A political party whose platform is subject like a weather chart to daily corrections will soon vanish from the face of the earth.

Political leadership—political participation at the best is a wearing task, one in which the rebuffs too often outweigh the rewards. The very term politician has been made a reproach, and a willingness to serve has too often been interpreted as concealing merely a selfish motive on the part of the volunteer. Our Government is founded on political theories, and political functions are essential to its continuance. It is time to seek, each on his own account, to remove the slur which many cast on those who become interested in this all-important feature of our life.

There is no service more important and essential to our well-being in government than a sane, wholesome understanding participation in politics.

We have in recent years changed the form of our party machinery for the selection of candidates for public office. We have very generally substituted the primary for the representative convention. We have substituted the primary for the legislative election of United States Senators. This change has brought about its problems. The old convention system of nominations fixed the responsibility upon the party and exerted a definite party influence upon the candidate. He realized his accountability to his party, and he knew definitely where his loyalty and allegiance belonged.

The primary system has given an opportunity for cunning men to use the party label in the primary, and thereby attract to their support the loyal members of the party. And it has enabled such men to gain a party nomination and, with the support of the party, an election to important office, and in some instances only to repudiate the platform of the party and the nominees of the national convention. Such conduct is reprehensible. It is obtaining office by false pretense. And such practices should be condemned not only by the party organization but by the people whose confidence has been betrayed.

But whatever the machinery—in order to preserve party government, which is so indispensable to efficient administration—men and women in their party affiliations must be honest to the party and must be loyal.

March 4 will be a red-letter day for all of us in a striking sense.

When on March 4 Calvin Coolidge will take the oath he will be following the leadership set just 100 years ago, for it was on March 4, 1825, that John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, took the oath of office as President.

There is always, as now, great interest in the inauguration ceremonies. Although we have at times given away to elaborate plans and programs, we have more often followed the example of simplicity set by the fathers. It is interesting to note the events of the inauguration of 100 years ago.

John Quincy Adams records in his diary that after two sleepless nights he was ready for his inauguration March 4, 1825, and was waited on by the marshal of the District of Columbia, with other members of local committees, to arrange for the ceremony at the Capitol. Escorted by a small detachment of local militia, he drove in his own carriage to the Capitol, followed by President Monroe and other officials. The inaugural ceremony was in the Hall of the House of Representatives (now Statuary Hall), where Vice President John C. Calhoun, who had already taken the oath of office, was presiding.

The oath of office was administered by the Chief Justice; the new President delivered his inaugural address, and was then escorted back to his own home, 1333 F Street NW., because Mrs. Monroe was ill at the White House, and President Adams insisted that she should not be removed until fully recovered. He had his dinner at his own home, and then called to bid farewell to President Monroe in company with other citizens.

At the inauguration, local papers said the President was dressed in a black all-wool suit of clothes of domestic manufacture; the cloth made in Massachusetts.

I have no hesitancy in predicting that the satisfaction over Calvin Coolidge, of Northampton, when on March 4 he takes the office as President of these United States, will know no partisan bounds or barriers. It will be nation-wide, and without distinction as to race or creed or political affiliations.

And if here in New England the tide of rejoicing will run a little higher, a little broader, a little deeper, than in other portions of our Nation, there will be none to say us nay, for all will understand that we are celebrating, not merely a political victory, but something finer and greater, a victory of the ideals which are inbred in all of us.

New England from the very beginning has been a great reservoir of vitality, of life, of thought, and of spiritual impulse. From our shores and from our hills, for 300 years, a great migration has been constantly making its way into the virgin country of the West.

While perhaps some of our New England children and great grandchildren who have been thus transplanted have outgrown our sober town meeting methods and the respect for selectmen which is a part of the inheritance of all of us, they still feel the bonds of kinship. Their inclination is to think as we do. They have notwithstanding all our temporary disagreements a considerable understanding and, it may be said, admiration of our temperament. Therefore, I know they will be tolerant of our joy.

New England can not be described or defined by geographic phrases. Statistical tables, no matter how carefully arranged, setting forth with exactness the area of land and water and the location of hills, plains, rivers, and lakes, do not meet the requirements.

New England typifies first of all to the world an ideal and the persistence of an ideal, one which is personified in the person of the President whom we honor.

New England means probity of character, honesty in mental as well as physical demonstrations.

It signifies thrift without penury, generosity without wastefulness, firmness without obstinacy, dignity without ostentation, and service without servility.

But though our hills are high, and our valleys run deeply, we have never lost our vision of the great world outside or an appreciation of our responsibilities in and to that great world.

No crop garnered has ever been so scant that we have felt justified in ignoring the call for those in distress, no matter in what part of the world they were located.

It has been our privilege in New England, one for which we have fought and suffered at times, to cherish the great ideals which have given an impetus to the Nation.

The sea at our door, the hard-soiled hills have bred in us a sense of initiative without which no people nor country can progress. The very character of our life, the district school, the town meeting have educated us, not only to an appreciation of the necessity of fair play, but also that each and every one of us is entitled to a fair start in the race of life, and that equality of opportunity is a precious possession.

To us has been given the privilege of seeing at first hand these gifts blossom to fruition in the person of the President, not by virtue of sacrifices which we have made, but through a long line of sacrifices made from the first settlement of the State.

And it is because in our President, we see a recognition of those fundamentals of character, our applause will be a little louder and deeper on inauguration day.

It will rise, not merely in recognition of the fact that your neighbor and my neighbor, and our neighbor whom we have known familiarly has been elevated to a high estate, but rather because of our general realization that in so elevating Calvin Coolidge, the people of the Nation have given recognition to that something which is a heritage of all of us, which is a part of all of us—the New England spirit.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES BILL, 1926

In presenting the independent offices' appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1926, I shall endeavor to explain some of the more important features of the bill, taking up first the appropriations and Budget estimates.

The total appropriations for the independent offices provided for in this bill for the fiscal year 1925 amounted to $533,424,147.46. This sum includes the total of the appropriations carried in the act to adjust the compensation of the field forces, amounting to $1,370,180; the sum of $126,900 transferred from the Treasury Department to the Superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Buildings for care of buildings; and $133,150,327.30 carried in the deficiency act approved December 5, 1924, the greater portion of which was necessary because of the World War adjusted compensation act of May 19, 1924. The total of the estimates for regular annual appropriations submitted for consideration in connection with this bill is $450,314,295. In several instances the committee was of the opinion that the estimates for the efficient conduct of the business of the Government establishments was too low and recommends appropriations in excess of the Budget estimates, which I shall explain more in detail in connection with the bureau or office to which they relate. The amount recommended to be appropriated in this bill is $452,349,617. This sum, compared with the regular annual appropriations for 1925 and the estimates for 1926, is as follows:

It is $81,074,530.46 less than the total of the 1925 appropriations, and it is $2,035,322 more than the amount requested in the Budget estimates for 1926.

SALARIES UNDER THE CLASSIFICATION ACT

The restrictive provision carried in the appropriation bills already considered by the House relating to expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923 is recommended in this bill as section 2. It is essentially the same as the limitation carried in the appropriation acts for the current year restricting the average of all salaries paid under any grade under the classification act of 1923 to the average of the compensation rates for the grade, modified so that the limitation shall apply specifically to those grades in which only one position is allocated, and permits an employee to pass from one grade to a higher grade without suffering a reduction in compensation because of such advance.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Only one change of importance is recommended in this bill relating to the Executive Office. Heretofore several small appropriations have been made for the care and repair of the Executive Mansion and grounds, which for the current fiscal year amounted to $112,760. In lieu of the several separate appropriations we recommend in this bill the following paragraph:

For the care, maintenance, repair, refurnishing, improvement, heating, and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion, the Executive Mansion greenhouses, including reconstruction, and the Executive Mansion

grounds, to be expended by contract or otherwise as the President may determine, $110,000.

By this consolidation a reduction of $2,760 in the appropriation has been made possible.

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

I wish to call particular attention to the office of the Alien Property Custodian. Under the Winslow Act, which provided for the return of property not exceeding $10,000 in value, there had been returned as of November 1, 1924, property aggregating $26,000,000, of which $10,000,000 was paid out during the past year. There is, however, now held in trust by the Alien Property Custodian property valued at approximately $300,000,000, and in my opinion the time is not far distant when final disposition of this property should be made.

Since adopting the Dawes plan, whereby there is a scheme to settle all controversial questions between Germany and the United States, there is no reason for the continuance of the office of Alien Property Custodian. The committee having jurisdiction of the proper legislation ought to see to it that at the beginning of the next Congress, or as soon thereafter as may be, there should be something done for the winding up of this activity. It will result in the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the United States. We are getting nothing out of it and incurring responsibility all the time we are engaged in it.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

This bill provides for the reappropriation of unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the American Battle Monuments Commission, approximating $575,000. A year ago it was proposed to erect monuments and markers to perpetuate the battle operations of the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe, at an estimated cost of approximately $550,000. However, during the past summer the commission visited the battle fields and cemeteries of France, and are now of the opinion that the original plan should be abandoned, and propose in lieu thereof to erect commemorative memorials to the Expeditionary Forces, erect naval memorials, and beautify the cemeteries. The total estimated cost for construction work under the new project is $3,000,000, divided as follows: For the erection of chapels and the construction of walls about the eight cemeteries abroad, $1,200,000. For the erection of naval memorials it is proposed to expend $300,000, and the cost of commemorative monuments is estimated at $1,500,000. However, as the act creating the American Battle Monuments Commission places no limitation upon the ultimate cost of any complete plan, it is recommended in this bill that no part of the appropriations available shall be expended on a program of construction work under the act of March 4, 1923, the complete cost of which shall exceed $3,000,000.

I confess that your committee was somewhat disappointed when we learned that the original plan, which only contemplated an expenditure of $550,000, had been done away with and another plan adopted that would cost $3,000,000. But there is a pretty good answer to that. At the time the original plan was adopted it was proposed to erect tablets hither and yon where the battles were fought and where our expeditionary forces had participated. But when the commission went over there and found these fields had been converted into farming lands and that it would necessitate the purchase of the ground and that that would be inexpedient, we felt they were right in their judgment, but we have submitted a recommendation that no plan for the erection of these memorials shall be adopted that shall in any event exceed an expenditure of $3,000,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand the original idea was $550,000?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And it is now increased to $3,000,000?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The extra money is not represented by the replacing of these tablets with monuments?

Mr. WOOD. No; they have abandoned the placing of markers entirely, but they do expect to build a certain number of chapels in the eight cemeteries abroad. Other countries have built these chapels, where people who are visiting these battle grounds and cemeteries may rest and where they may hold whatever ceremony they think appropriate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the present plan provides for $3,000,000 and that that completes it?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. That is their proposal.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And the committee limits it in this bill to that amount?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. We did that for this reason: That proposal was arrived at after some consideration by the commission, of which General Pershing is chairman. After they went abroad and came back and consulted some one who is supposed to know something about this business; but the gentleman knows how these things keep growing unless a limitation is placed upon them, and we thought it wise to place a limitation upon this project.

I next direct attention to the Board of Tax Appeals.

BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

The revenue act of 1924 created the Board of Tax Appeals as an independent establishment of the Government. For the current fiscal year this board is operating on an allotment of $500,000 made from appropriations for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The board was organized on July 16, 1924, and because it is such a new organization it is difficult to determine what its actual needs will be. However, the appropriation of $354,320 recommended in this bill is believed to be ample for the efficient operation of this organization. The board has no jurisdiction over refund cases, but considers deficiency cases only. The jurisdiction of the board was fixed in the revenue act, and the fundamental fact determining the jurisdiction of the board is the determination of a deficiency by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. If the commissioner finds a deficiency in the tax, the act provides that the taxpayer may within 60 days from the date of the mailing of the letter fixing the deficiency take an appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals. The act also provides that the board shall make findings of fact in all cases, and if an opinion is necessary the opinion is written. An opinion is required in all cases involving over $10,000 and in such other cases as the board may determine. Since its creation and by the 1st of December the board had docketed 868 appeals, of which there had been decided, dismissed, or under consideration on December 1 approximately 200 cases, and it is estimated that by January 1 of this year this number will have increased to 400 cases.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for an interrogatory with reference to the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. WOOD. I have not yet reached the Fine Arts Commission.

Mr. KING. I have long regarded that as one of the greatest incubus institutions we have in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WOOD. I shall call attention to it when we come to it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Before the gentleman leaves the subject of the Board of Tax Appeals, the gentleman calls attention to the fact that the board has no jurisdiction of refund cases? Did the gentleman's subcommittee form any opinion as to the advisability of giving this board additional jurisdiction in refund cases?

Mr. WOOD. We could not do that.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I know the gentleman's committee could not; but did the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] himself form any opinion as to the advisability of giving this board additional duties in determining the question of refund cases?

Mr. WOOD. I was much surprised when I found out they did not have that jurisdiction.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And I am surprised to have the gentleman say that they have not. I do not recall the discussion of the provision with reference to that feature, but it was my impression, as a member of the committee that helped to frame that law, that they had entire jurisdiction of questions of dispute between the taxpayer and the Treasury Department.

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

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. SANDLIN. We mentioned that to the gentlemen who appeared before the committee, coming from the Board of Tax Appeals. It was said they thought very likely that the officials in the bureau of the Treasury would follow to a great extent the rulings of the Board of Tax Appeals. In other words, they would accept their interpretation of the law.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I am glad to hear that; but this proposition comes up at this time, and there are being refunded, I believe, about a hundred million dollars a year. That represents quite a controversy as between the Treasury and the taxpayers, and it occurs to me it would be better to have this board pass on all those cases where there is a difference of

opinion as between the Treasury and the taxpayer. I am glad the gentleman has called attention to it, because if the Committee on Ways and Means undertakes to rewrite the law at the next session of Congress, as I understand it is contemplated they will do, this information will be of some value to us.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I ask this question: Do I understand that the taxpayer who files his claim for refund and has it adjudicated by the commissioner has no right of appeal to the board?

Mr. WOOD. He has not.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That is the statement of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may be individually in error, but my recollection is that the acting commissioner stated sometime ago that that was one thing that was holding up the whole proposition.

Mr. WOOD. I call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to what occurred in the hearings. Mr. SANDLIN asked the gentleman who appeared before the committee, from the Board of Tax Appeals—

You have no jurisdiction of refund cases, I believe?

And that gentleman replied:

No, sir. We decided very early that we had none.

Then he went on to expatiate. To my mind it is one or should be one of the most important functions of this appeal board, for the reason that there are millions and millions of dollars down here in the Treasury Department that ought to be refunded to the taxpayers of the country, and they are delayed in getting it by this reason and that reason, without any final board to whom they can appeal.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman will recall that the representatives of the board who appeared before us stated that on the floor of the House there was added a provision that would have given them jurisdiction, but that it was rejected by the Senate.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And that in rejecting it the Senate feared it would put too much work upon the board and that that is the only reason he knew why it was rejected.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let me suggest, in this connection, that my information is from a member of the board, and they can only take jurisdiction of cases when the commission has acted; that at the present time the commissioner and his office are very much behind in the question of determining whether any taxes are due, and we were informed at the last session of Congress that the office of the commissioner would be current in the next 12 or 14 months, but it seems from the information I have that the office is very much behind in reference to the determination of how much the taxpayers, according to the commissioner's office, may owe the Government.

Mr. WOOD. That is correct, and I think the Ways and Means Committee should take cognizance of this condition of affairs. And as the chairman of the board has said, they have already determined they have not the jurisdiction over these refund cases, and there should be some constructive legislation to remedy this situation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, is it not true the commissioner's bureau says they are from 12 to 18 months behind on account of the provisions of the 1924 act which extended the time?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That was at the request of the department itself, but at the time they made the request they expressed the hope that within 12 or 14 months the work of the office would be current. But now the information is they will still be far behind, which I can not understand. I think the commissioner's office ought to help and if this matter is considered at the next session of Congress they should give some reason why they are continuously behind with this work.

Mr. WOOD. Now, if I may proceed.

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The act of March 10, 1924, extended the provisions of the vocational education and vocational rehabilitation acts to the Territory of Hawaii, and appropriations aggregating $35,000 for these purposes are recommended in this bill.

Appropriations for continuing vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry and for administration of the act are carried in this bill. In this connection, I wish to invite the attention of the Members to the splendid results being obtained in rehabilitation work and cite the State of Illinois for an example. The average age of 319 persons rehabilitated and placed in remunerative employment was 33 years. The average cost per capita for rehabilitation was $380. The average yearly earning of these persons was $726 before sustaining injury and $418 while in a disabled condition. After rehabilitation, however, the average yearly income had increased to $1,292, or an increase of $874 per year over the earning capacity while in the handicapped condition. At the present time there are only 36 States cooperating in this work.

And in passing I wish to say that the comparison between the rehabilitation work made by this Vocational Board, as contrasted with that made by the Vocational Rehabilitation, Veterans' Bureau, shows a net saving to the Government of $9 out of every $10.

Mr. STENGLE. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I will.

Mr. STENGLE. The gentleman did not intentionally skip over two of these bureaus or departments in referring immediately to the Federal board. I noticed in the bill the gentleman skipped over the Bureau of Efficiency and the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. WOOD. No; all the bureaus and commissions will be considered in their proper order under the five-minute rule. Next I want to call attention to the Federal Trade Commission.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The appropriation of $940,000 recommended in this bill for general expenses of the Federal Trade Commission is the first important increase your committee recommends over the estimate submitted in the Budget. After careful examination it was developed during the hearings that on December 1, 1924, there were pending 568 applications for the issuance of complaints; that is, 568 cases under investigation in which there was shown some prima facie violation of law. In addition there were 271 formal complaints pending. Cases are disposed of at the rate of approximately 30 or 35 per month, but new cases accumulate at about the same rate, so that a reduction in the appropriation would considerably reduce the possibility of disposing of these cases. Therefore, in order that the work of the commission might proceed with the same organization as for the current year, the committee restored the appropriation to the amount available for the present fiscal year.

A new limitation is recommended by the committee on this appropriation, which provides that no part of the appropriation shall be expended for investigations requested by either House of Congress except those requested by concurrent resolution of Congress, but this limitation shall not apply to investigations and reports in connection with alleged violations of the antitrust acts by any corporation. The act of September 26, 1914, provides that upon the direction of the President or either House of Congress, the Federal Trade Commission shall have power to investigate and report the facts relating to any alleged violations of the antitrust acts by any corporation. The restrictive provisions recommended by the committee specifically excludes this class of investigation, and does not deprive either House of Congress of any right heretofore enjoyed under that act. However, a year ago attention was called to the fact that the Federal Trade Commission has been requested by simple resolution of either House to investigate matters which did not relate to violations of the antitrust acts and which under the law the commission was not directed to undertake. Investigations of this character frequently require the expenditure of considerable sums granted for the regularly prescribed work of the commission.

In proposing this restrictive provision the committee does not recommend that Congress be precluded from requesting investigations of a character which the commission is not specifically authorized by law to undertake upon resolution of either House. The purpose of the new language is to require concurrent action of the two Houses to request the commission to make any investigation other than one involving alleged violations of the antitrust acts. Certainly if the proposed investigation is of sufficient importance, both Houses, which approved of the funds for the regular work of the commission, should be called upon to determine whether the necessary funds should be diverted to the proposed investigation.

I desire to say in passing that it strikes me this ought to appeal to every Member of this House. There is nothing in this restriction that will prevent the Trade Commission from complying with all the original provisions of the act, but there has been an abuse of it, I am happy to say not frequently resorted to by this House, but frequently resorted to in the other House when there are not more than three men present.

One man, for the purpose of getting up some facts for himself, introduces a resolution and has it passed without any debate, requiring an investigation by this commission concerning this, that, or the other, involving thousands and thousands of dollars. Now, if it is of sufficient importance, if it is not provided by law, for the Senate to know about these things, it ought to be of sufficient importance for the House to know about it, and it ought to be of sufficient importance that the country know about it, and the commission should be given authority to make that investigation by joint action of the two Houses.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield? In the hearings the gentleman suggested that to Mr. Van Fleet. Has there been any concurrent resolution offered to that effect?

Mr. WOOD. No.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Why not, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. WOOD. It is one of those things that simply occurs. When we asked these gentlemen how we might economize and try to keep within the Budget provisions, and if they could not curtail their operations, they said that one of the greatest items of expense was due to the fact that they had to take their men away from regular business in which they were engaged in connection with their work to comply with the resolutions coming from the House or Senate.

Now, I wish to call attention to the Housing Corporation.

HOUSING CORPORATION

In discussing appropriations for the Housing Corporation I wish to invite the attention of the Members to the efficient administration of that organization. Aside from the revenues derived from the operation of the Government hotels, there was covered into the Treasury for the fiscal year 1924 the sum of $4,056,115.06, obtained from the sale of property and the operation of industrial projects. The total expense incident to handling this volume of business was $108,942.68, or 2.68 per cent of the amounts collected. The operation of the Norfolk Ferries, Norfolk County, Va., is perhaps the outstanding achievement of the Housing Corporation. This transportation system was operated at a loss prior to control by the present administration of the Housing Corporation, and by reducing operating costs and effecting other economies a profit in operation was shown which for the past several years is as follows:

1921	$81,626.93
1922	115,918.67
1923	152,697.94
1924	183,969.38

Under the efficient management of Mrs. Summers receipts from the Government hotels during the fiscal year 1924 aggregated $697,743.17 and operating expenses totaled $676,762.22, showing an excess in operating receipts over expenditures of $20,980.95. In addition to her duties in operating the hotels Mrs. Summers manages a laundry which was originally intended to perform the necessary laundry work in connection with the hotels. A year ago the committee went into this matter and discovered that the laundry had capacity sufficient to do extra work, and to-day practically all of the Government establishments are having their work done in this establishment. Towels are laundered at a cost of 45 cents a hundred, as compared with prices ranging from 75 cents to $2 per hundred, according to size, when this work was performed by public laundries.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that several of the dormitories are located on property belonging to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, for which an annual rental of $74,315 is paid. These dormitories are not used for the accommodation of guests, and one of them is occupied by the offices of the Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture. This bureau does not pay rent to the Housing Corporation, for the use of the building and the rent is absorbed in the charges made the guests of the hotels, amounting to about $5 per capita annually. The Agricultural appropriation bill has already passed the Senate, and I realize it is too late to take any action now, but we propose to correct this inequity next year.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I will.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does not the gentleman think that inasmuch as these hotels are now showing a profit that the rate charged these girls should be reduced? The Government ought not to be in the business of making money from the stenographers and clerks employed by the Government.

Mr. WOOD. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. This thing has transpired, too. One of these buildings has been abandoned, so far as accommodating guests is concerned. There are about 1,300 girls down there at this time, and they have consolidated the dining rooms and it permitted the closing of one group of these buildings in so far as the activities of the Government hotel are concerned. It is now occupied by the Agricultural Department from one end to the other and another part occupied for storage purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed one hour and has control of 35 minutes.

Mr. WOOD. I ask consent for the 35 minutes.

Mr. SANDLIN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed within his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman yields himself such time as he uses within the time which he controls.

Mr. WOOD. In consequence the Housing Corporation is now paying approximately $7,500 ground rent for space in buildings that are not occupied by guests of the hotels.

Now, how that can best be worked out I do not know. If that rent is added to the present cost of maintenance down there a surplus probably would not be indicated.

HOUSING IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON

Here is a thing that I want to call to the attention of the committee at this time. There is a constant and incessant demand upon this committee—perhaps many of you gentlemen have received correspondence to the same effect—a demand that these buildings should be abandoned. I do not know who primarily is responsible for this propaganda, but I do know that if these 1,300 girls were turned loose in this town to-day to find places in which to live the profiteers would be doing a bigger business than they are doing now. I am opposed generally to Government ownership of property. I am in favor of private initiative whenever it is possible. But I am also in favor of having the Government protect itself. I have been reading a whole lot of propaganda that is going on throughout the country concerning so-called rent legislation, to provide for a maximum of rent to be charged in the city of Washington. A great many people contend that it is unconstitutional. If the Government has not the right to protect itself, then it is the weakest government that was ever organized. One of the primary principles of life is self-defense, and whenever a government can not protect itself, then that government ought to fall.

These gentlemen who are sending out their propaganda and carrying on the agitation throughout the United States are sending letters here, and I am getting such letters every day, one of which I submit herewith as an illustration:

GARY BOARD OF REALTORS,
Gary, Ind., January 26, 1925.

Hon. WILL R. WOOD,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our attention has been called to Senate bill 3764 and House bill 11078 by the Washington Real Estate Board, whereby it is proposed to enact legislation to control rents in the District of Columbia.

We, the Gary Board of Realtors, an association consisting of 71 realtors in the city of Gary, do believe that any legislation of this character is very detrimental, will eventually interfere with property rights and private contracts, a right that has been held sacred by the American people; and we further believe that by the enactment of such legislation by our Congress that it will create a very dangerous precedent in legislation by our State legislatures.

We therefore ask of you, as our Representative in Congress, to cast your vote in the negative, and by doing so you will do justice to all property owners, large and small, throughout our entire Nation.

Thanking you in advance, I remain, in behalf of the Gary Board of Realtors,

Sincerely yours,

A. EARL UNGER, *Secretary.*

No doubt you gentlemen are getting the same kind from real-estate men throughout the country, advising us that we should be very careful about adopting a principle that will be a detriment to private initiative and ownership throughout the United States.

I have advised these gentlemen that the best service they can render their country and the best service they can render to those engaged in the real-estate business in Washington is to bring to the knowledge of the gentlemen here with whom they are in communication this fact, that they had better take and reform themselves. [Applause.]

There seems to be a misconception about the city of Washington. This city is not to be compared with any other city in the United States. This city is the seat of the Federal Government, and if the primary plan had been carried out there would have been no occasion for profiteering in the city of Washington. The original design was to make this city, as

distinguished from all other capitals of government in the world, purely a seat of government, where the business of the Government would be transacted; where, untrammeled, those who are necessary for the transaction of the business of the Government would live at the lowest possible expense. It was provided that instead of having a lot of ramshackle buildings between the Capitol and the White House, there should be nothing but official buildings. What a picture that would be if it were a fact to-day! It never was intended that there should be manufacturing here. It never was intended that there should be commercial houses here, except those that were permitted by the Government to supply the demands of those who are engaged in performing the functions of this Government. In an evil hour somebody proposed, for the purpose of raising revenues, that they sell town lots in the city of Washington. That is where our troubles began.

But these gentlemen, instead of understanding that they are here at the sufferance of the Government, labor under the misconception that those who are employed by the Government to transact the business of the Government are here at the sufferance of these business interests. These gentlemen should be reminded of the fact that all those who are here outside of the Government itself, outside of those connected with the administration of the Government, are here merely at the sufferance of the Government. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I have been informed, or I have read somewhere, that the first lots disposed of in the District of Columbia were disposed of under a lottery system. Has the gentleman heard about that?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I have heard of it. And I have also been told that our old friend Andrew Jackson in his time, when informed that the Government needed revenue, inaugurated auctions to secure it. It has also been said that he is responsible for placing the Treasury Building where it now stands, right across the Avenue, obstructing the Avenue.

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

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. I said a few moments ago that something ought to be done to reduce the amount of money that these girls have to pay, instead of the Government making a profit.

Mr. WOOD. That is a matter that is now under inquiry, but you must bear in mind that in arriving at this so-called profit depreciation and a fair return upon an investment of approximately $3,000,000 are not taken into consideration. I want to say in passing that there are constitutional lawyers and constitutional lawyers, and we have many of them in this body. Some of them contend that it is an infringement on the rights of property owners under the Constitution for Congress to regulate rents in this town. If that thing were carried to its logical conclusion, no matter how high they might pyramid rents in this city, this Congress, which is primarily responsible for all legislation here, would be powerless to act. Fortunately, that is not true. One of the greatest powers that has been granted, and which has resulted many times in the preservation of this country, is the police power, and under the police power of this Government, which must be considered with reference to the rights of property, we have this right.

And I want to say to you that unless something of that character is done we shall have to begin and appropriate more money for the expenses of the Government. We have been increasing the salaries of these employees here ever since the World War began, and it has not done them a bit of good. Why? Because every dollar of increase given to these employees is taken away from them by these profiteers.

That is what has been happening. I happen to know, by reason of my acquaintance and association with the citizens of this town, of two or three concrete cases which disclose to me what is going on here. There have been many new buildings erected here since the war. The population of Washington has nearly doubled since the war began, and of course you and I know that the cost of materials and the cost of labor and everything else has gone higher and higher; but there are many buildings that were constructed before the war, and a lot of their owners are taking advantage of these increased prices. I know of a building where the rent was $50 for a five-room apartment before the war. The owner first raised the rent to $55 per month, then to $60, which increases were paid.

Then when, under the provisions of the rent act, the tenants refused to pay further increases the owners refused to furnish them with any of the needed repairs. The paper was hanging from the wall and there were all sorts of defects in the floors, while immediately under those very apartments a like apartment had been increased more than 100 per cent, and being paid by a new tenant.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. All the gentleman has said is very fine, but has the gentleman any assurance or can the gentleman give us any assurance that we shall get any legislation at this Congress to remedy that situation?

Mr. WOOD. No; I can not give that assurance to the gentleman although I wish I could. I wish I had the power to remedy that situation, and there would not be any question about my doing it. I am amazed at gentlemen, who have the best interests of this country at heart, who believe in economy in Government and who know of these things, who try to obstruct the character of legislation that would bring about this relief.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I think that matter will be attended to without passing any bolshevik remedy by requiring all realtors to be licensed under regulations, by requiring the true consideration to be placed in deeds and deeds of trust, and by preventing a concert of action among realtors in the matter of raising rents. But I want to ask the gentleman this question: Suppose the gentleman owned a residence here before the War began and it cost him $10,000, and for him to replace that residence now it would cost $20,000, because of the increase in labor and materials, and the gentleman can sell it for $20,000, would the gentleman say that residence was worth $20,000 or $10,000?

Mr. WOOD. I would consider it worth $20,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, and the gentleman would want a return on his money.

Mr. WOOD. But I want to say that if I were renting a room in that house for which I was getting $10 before the War, based on the original cost, I would think I was a thief if I were trying to get $40 a month for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose the gentleman asked $15 for it?

Mr. WOOD. Well, that is a matter of gradation. I want to say to you in passing—and it is a little digression—that we shall make a very great mistake if we remove these Government hotels until such time as these 1,300 girls can be absorbed in the apartment houses of this city at a reasonable rental.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman know that on the 1st of January there were over 100 vacancies in the Government hotels and that on the 1st of January last year there were 100 vacancies?

Mr. WOOD. There are 1,300 girls down there now. It is the policy of this committee, and I think it is the policy of this Government that as soon as the necessity ceases that all these buildings should be abandoned. I now wish to direct attention to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

In discussing the appropriations recommended for the Interstate Commerce Commission for 1926, I wish to say that the recommendations of the committee were arrived at only after very careful and conscientious consideration of the needs of the commission. The bill provides for appropriations in excess of the estimates submitted in the Budget in several instances, which I shall later explain more in detail, but which are submitted herewith for the information of the House:

Object	Estimated for 1926	Recommended for 1925
General expenses	$2,100,000	$2,318,660
Bureau of Accounts	600,000	1,189,250
Bureau of Safety	500,000	650,000
Locomotive inspection	450,000	450,000
Valuation of property	1,000,000	1,946,552
Printing and binding	124,000	160,000

GENERAL EXPENSES

In order to show the necessity for the increased appropriation recommended for general expenses in this bill I wish to call attention to the increase in work of the commission. The number of formal proceedings that were filed as complaints and subcomplaints is as follows:

1906	74
1920	1,040
1923	1,160
1924	1,332

In connection with investigations instituted on motion of the Interstate Commerce Commission there were in—

1906	8
1920	31
1923	28
1924	11

The decrease in the number of these proceedings in 1924, as compared with the preceding year, were made necessary because of the inability of the commission to continue their regular work, and at the same time provide funds for this class of investigations.

I should also like to call attention to the number of reports that have been issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is as follows:

1906	32
1920	510
1923	938
1924	1,663

These reports cover rate, valuation, and finance cases, and I should like to show the increase by the number of pages issued in connection with these reports, which follows:

1906	251
1920	2,870
1923	4,391
1924	7,760

In addition to the regular work of the commission and the activities of its various bureaus, the Supreme Court decision in the Wolfe case, which was to the effect that the statute of limitations of two years on claims for overcharges must be specifically adhered to, and that when the two years' limitation expired it destroyed not merely the liability but also the remedy, greatly increased the duties imposed upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. As a result of the decision of the court Congress passed an amendment to the law which granted an extension of time in which to file overcharge claims, and during November and December these claims aggregated approximately 40,000.

As I have indicated the increase in the volume of business, there are at the present time some 49,000 informal docket cases pending, over 3,000 special docket cases, and approximately 2,100 undisposed-of formal cases now before the commission. In view of the importance of the work of the commission and the number of cases pending, your committee is of the opinion that the sum recommended to be appropriated is necessary.

I wish to say in passing that it was perfectly patent to your committee that if the railroads of this country are to function all the increases asked by the commission and which have been allowed in this bill are absolutely essential. If there is an appeal by the railroads to this commission whereby they ask an increase of a rate, it must be determined within 120 days, unless the commission itself takes action and grants an extension of that time, but it must finally be determined within 150 days, whereas if there is a shipper throughout the country who has some fault to find by reason of the fact that an overcharge has been made against him it will be two years before he can get a determination of his complaint, and maybe longer. It has been thought not to be the best practice with respect to these matters to require these people to come from a distance to Washington when they are prosecuting their appeals, but that the machinery of this Government can be more cheaply taken to them.

Within the last year there have been more than 1,000 men and women here who should not have been put to the expense of coming here at all, and but for the lack of a proper appropriation their troubles would have been heard at home. Now, it is well known that the railroads have ample means and splendid ability to come here whenever called upon. On the other hand, we well know it is irksome for business men and those who are dependent upon their daily exertions to leave their vocations in life and come here, and we also know it is one of the primary principles of the law of this country that we should take justice to the men and women and not require them to go in search of it. So we have increased this appropriation in the belief that it would not only be an economy, so far as the Government itself is concerned, but it certainly would be a great economy in so far as those who are vitally interested are concerned.

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

The appropriation of $1,189,250 recommended for the Bureau of Accounts for 1926 represents a substantial increase over the sum now available and the estimates, but inasmuch as this bureau is called upon to perform all accounting work in connection with the recapture of excess earnings under section 15a of the transportation act, and is charged with the duty of policing the accounts of carriers, it is believed that the increase is justified. It is estimated that the recapturable surplus for the past several years will aggregate $94,060,000. There has been covered into the Treasury the sum of $5,021,894.97 as excess earnings of the carriers, the major portion of which was paid under protest pending final valuation of the carriers' property, and this contingent fund, therefore, has not been available for the uses contemplated by law.

There are approximately 564 cases on the docket awaiting consideration, and it is estimated that with the present force not more than 405 can be taken care of by June 30, 1925. In order, therefore, that the work may be kept current during the ensuing fiscal year, and that the work in arrears may be brought up to date, the sum recommended is believed essential, and can be divided as follows:

To bring work in arrears up to date	$471,585
To keep current work originating in 1926	717,665
Total	1,189,250

As I stated just a moment ago, the Bureau of Accounts is charged with the policing of carriers' accounts, and the sum of $317,604.46 was under consideration by the committee for this work. However, we were of the opinion that this work could be postponed safely until the more urgent work of the commission was brought current, and the total appropriation recommended in this paragraph, therefore, is to be used for the recapture of excess profits under section 15a of the transportation act.

THE BUREAU OF SAFETY

Section 26 of the transportation act greatly increased the duties of the Bureau of Safety by authorizing the commission to require carriers to install automatic train control upon any part or the whole of any railroad, and also to apply other safety devices. In response to this law, an order was issued in June, 1922, requiring 49 of the Class I roads to install some form of automatic train stop or train control device upon a locomotive passenger division between specified terminals, and a subsequent order effective in February, 1924, required 45 additional Class I carriers to install train-control devices upon one locomotive passenger division.

Due to insufficient personnel in the inspection force the latter order was suspended pending the completion of the installations required by the order of June, 1922. We believe that the safety work is of primary importance and should be proceeded with as rapidly as is consistent with good administration, and consequently recommend an appropriation of $650,000 for the Bureau of Safety for 1926. This is an increase of $275,000 over the amount available for the current year, but the increase is to provide for supervision of new installations and to keep up the current inspection of installations previously made. I also wish to call attention to that portion of the annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission which shows that of 100 collisions and derailments investigated during 1924, 50 of them were preventable, and that if they had been prevented 113 lives would have been saved and 780 persons protected from unnecessary injury. I do not claim that the increase in the appropriation we recommend here will prevent these accidents, but I do wish to do all in my power to reduce the possibility of such accidents, and I am of the opinion that the Bureau of Safety of the Interstate Commerce Commission is the proper organization to assist in this work.

LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

This bill provides for an appropriation of $450,000 for 1926 for the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection. The act of June 7, 1924, provided for the employment of 15 additional inspectors, and this accounts for the increase of $150,000 in the sum recommended as compared with the appropriation made for the current year. To better illustrate the increasing volume of work in this bureau, I wish to call attention to the following:

	1920	1924
Number of locomotives inspected	49,471	67,507
Number found defective	25,529	36,098
Number ordered out of service	3,774	5,764
Total number of defects found	95,066	146,121

It is impossible at this time to determine what the expenses will amount to incident to the employment of 15 additional inspectors but it is estimated that the sum recommended will be sufficient.

BUREAU OF VALUATION

Careful investigation by the committee developed the fact that to finish the primary valuations of the steam, telegraph, and sleeping car carriers of the country, under the present

rate of appropriations, would take from 6 to 13 years, during which time much of the information already obtained would be useless. We thereupon asked Commissioner Lewis, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who is in charge of this work, how much it would take to complete primary valuation in two years, and also an estimate of the cost if completed in three years. In order that an organization could be built up to handle this work and make use of the available data, the committee recommends that the three-year program be adopted, which calls for appropriations to be used in valuation work only, as follows:

1926	$1,555,602
1927	1,037,010
1928	915,264

Order No. 3 of the Bureau of Valuation provides for bringing up to date the primary valuations for the purpose of determining recapturable excess earnings under section 15a of the transportation act. To provide for the engineering forces engaged in this work, additional appropriations must be granted for the ensuing fiscal year, and for this purpose the committee recommends the sum of $137,350. To assist the Bureau of Accounts in determining amounts to be recaptured an additional apropriation of $253,600 is recommended in this bill, making a total amount available for the Bureau of Valuation for 1926 of $1,946,552. I wish to call attention to the hearings on this appropriation, with particular reference to a résumé of statements of estimates of cost and time for completion of valuation work, from its inception. (Page 347 of the hearing.)

I have set out in the report the figures that were given us by the gentlemen who are in charge of this work. To my mind this has been one of the great disappointments in our legislation. In 1913, when it was proposed that we fix a valuation on the railroads of this country, it was represented by Mr. LA FOLLETTE, who was the author of the bill or had much to do with its passage, that the whole thing could be accomplished for $4,000,000. Gentlemen testified it would be just as easy to fix the valuation of railroads as it would be to go into your farm yard as an assessor and fix a valuation on your personal property. We have spent more than $27,000,000 and it is going to take more than $3,000,000 more, according to these experts, to complete the work; but we are in it and it must be completed because these recaptures, about which we have heard so much and which are so essential in these reorganizations under the Esch-Cummins Act, can be intelligently arrived at. It is necessary that this primary valuation be made. We have initiated a policy whereby we will appropriate this year a certain amount for primary valuation, so much next year, and so much the third year, when those in charge promise us it will be finally completed. Let us hope this may be true.

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

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Does the gentleman have the data there which he intends to insert in the RECORD as to the amounts now in existence under the recapture clause?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. The total collections up to December 18, 1924, are as follows:

Number of carriers paying	64
Amount paid for 1920	$929,078.95
Amount paid for 1921	171,221.80
Amount paid for 1922	736,476.01
Amount paid for 1923	3,185,118.21
Total paid to December 18, 1924	5,021,894.97

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Where is that money located?

Mr. WOOD. This is what becomes of the money. Under the Esch-Cummins Act, this money is deposited in the Treasury of the United States, not for the general use of the Government of the United States, but for the purpose of lending it back to the railroads that are not making the 5 per cent that is spoken of in the Esch-Cummins Act. They must give a first mortgage or give security of some kind which will guarantee its final payment back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What is the total amount of that?

Mr. SANDLIN. Something over $5,000,000, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD. It is approximately $5,000,000.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And you will not be able to handle this fund as the Congress may direct until you have had this primary valuation?

Mr. WOOD. No, sir.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Can they not make that in two years? Does not the commission say they can make it in two years if you give them sufficient money?

Mr. WOOD. They said they could do it, but it would require a much larger appropriation this year, and by reason of past transactions we thought we had better give them three years in which to do the work.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. In other words, you do not believe the commission can do in two years what they say they can do if you give them the money?

Mr. WOOD. I do not think they can.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Has the gentleman's attention been drawn to the fact that since his bill was written the conferees on the Hoch resolution have filed a report here showing that if the conference report is adopted—at least I infer that is a fair statement—there will be very heavy additional work imposed on the Interstate Commerce Commission? I am not talking now about valuation, but in justification of the increased appropriation.

Mr. WOOD. I suspect that is true, and that is another place wherein the Congress of the United States, both the House and the Senate, unconsciously, are eternally throwing additional duties upon the Interstate Commerce Commission without additional appropriations. We are passing resolutions with reference to this, that, or the other thing; we are passing laws with reference to rates, and so forth, without taking into account what it is going to cost the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission today is the only agency between the people of the United States and the operator.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Since the recapture clause is in the interest of the people——

Mr. WOOD. Of course it is.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Why do you not give the Interstate Commerce Commission sufficient money to do this work within the two years and let them protect the people, as against the railroads having it for three years?

Mr. WOOD. I wish the gentleman would read the hearings on this matter, and perhaps he will find my reasons for the position we have taken. We had this appropriation when I was chairman of the legislative, executive, and judicial bill before the Budget law was enacted. They were coming here then and telling us when they were going to complete this work. It ought to have been completed. I am not criticizing them because of various things which developed that they were not cognizant of and which made it impossible for them to judge, but we ought to have had this work completed four years ago. I do not believe they will do the work in two years, and I want to give them the benefit of the doubt and make it three years.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. In the meantime the railroad has one year additional advantage under the recapture clause.

Mr. WOOD. No; they have not got that. They are going on with this work and they are making these gentlemen contribute on their estimate of what the valuation is, but the trouble arises in this way: These railroads pay, according to that valuation, under protest and the money is deposited in the Treasury, but if we have to pay it back we will have to pay them interest, and that is the disadvantage about it.

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

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I noticed in the hearings that Mr. Fulbright, of Houston, Tex., appeared before the committee.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And he stated there were 100 or more cases brought here to Washington by those who had claims against the railroads, costing the people thousands of dollars, and that those cases could have been handled by five examiners and the examiners could have taken these matters to the people and saved them this great expense. Did the gentleman provide in the bill for the five additional examiners asked by Mr. Fulbright?

Mr. WOOD. That is what I tried to tell the gentleman a while ago, and I want to say that Mr. Fulbright and the gentlemen who appeared with him were the most elucidating lot of men I have ever had before any committee that I have had anything to do with.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not know the gentleman, but I read his statement in the hearings.

Mr. WOOD. I now want to call your attention briefly to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

I want to say that I believe the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is rendering one of the greatest services to the

United States Government that it has ever had. It is composed of gentlemen eminent because of their scientific and practical ability who are serving the country without compensation. The committee has demonstrated that it is not only possible but that the United States is actually excelling in aeronautics everything in the world except as to the number of airplanes. It has also demonstrated, to the benefit of the Treasury of the United States, that we ought to look before we leap. They have been instrumental as far as the Army and the Navy are concerned in giving them practical advice that has saved the country millions of dollars. Had we had their services prior to and during the war, we would have saved not only millions of dollars but a great deal of unnecessary labor.

They have discovered that you can not build a flying machine and put an engine in it after you have built the machine. You first must have your engine and then build the flying machine about it.

Acting upon the recent discovery that a vessel can go as well and faster without sails than can a full rigged ship, by using a revolving cylinder to propel the vessel, this organization is applying this principle to the flying machines, so it will have the same propelling power that it has on the sailing vessel. All this is without compensation to the members of the committee. And let me say that if we are wise we will never allow the War Department or the Navy Department or any other department to assume all control of aeronautics of this country.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I agree with what the gentleman says, and I want to call attention to the fact that with reference to Langley Field I tried to point out when the Army appropriation bill was before the House that the appropriation for Dayton was an absolute duplication of what you have provided for here, although the work will not be as scientifically carried on at Dayton.

Mr. WOOD. We recommend an appropriation of $522,000 for the National Advisory Committee, and of this sum it is proposed to use $40,000 for the construction of an additional laboratory building to house the shops and drawing rooms, and to provide space for storage. The purpose of this committee is to secure technical information on aeronautics, and at the present time there is much agitation to establish a single Air Service, and it is proposed to incorporate this organization in such a service. In my opinion this would be a grave error, for the membership of the committee is at present made up of the very best scientific talent in America, serving without compensation, and devoting a great amount of time to the study of aerodynamics. To place a scientific organization such as this under the control of any department might result in a loss of the services of these distinguished gentlemen. Nor am I alone in this belief, for I wish to quote for the information of the Members, a portion of the President's letter of transmittal when sending the annual report of this organization to Congress:

> When the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was established by Congress in 1915 there was a deplorable lack of technical information on aeronautics in this country. In submitting this, the tenth annual report of the committee, I feel that it is appropriate to say a word of appreciation of the high-minded and patriotic services of the men who have faithfully served their country without compensation as members of this committee and of its subcommittees. Through this committee the talent of America has been marshaled in the scientific study of the problems of flight, with the result that to-day America occupies a position in the forefront of progressive nations in the technical development of aeronautics. The status of the committee as an independent Government establishment has largely made possible its success.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

In several instances the committee recommends appropriations in excess of the Budget estimates for the Smithsonian Institution for the fiscal year 1926. They may be enumerated briefly as follows: An increase of $11,082 to enable the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to keep museum buildings open on Sunday. This sum will provide for the additional necessary watchmen. For the Bureau of American Ethnology it is recommended that an appropriation of $4,200 in excess of the Budget estimate be made. This is to be used in continuing archaeological investigations in the Southern States, particularly in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, which area will be inundated with the completion of the Wilson Dam. There is also an increase of $4,260 over the Budget estimate recommended in the appropriation for international exchanges.

For the Astrophysical Observatory an appropriation of $31,180 is recommended for 1926. This sum is $9,600 more than the amount available for the current year and is $9,560 more than the estimate. It was developed during the hearings that for a number of years past Mr. John A. Roebling, of New Jersey, has been contributing approximately $8,000 annually for scientific research by the Astrophysical Observatory, and now that investigations of the radiation of the sun have passed through the experimental stage and it is possible to predict weather conditions for substantial periods in advance, he has withdrawn his support, and the committee is of the opinion that sufficient funds should be provided to carry on this work. To reduce the amount recommended would necessitate the abandonment of the station at Montezuma, near Calama, Chile, South America, which is particularly adapted to this kind of work, because of the absence of rain and where the days of good observation average 260 a year.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

The committee recommends appropriations for the United States Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation in accordance with the estimates submitted in the Budget. With one exception, the restrictive paragraphs relating to the board and the Fleet Corporation are continued in this bill without change. The paragraph which provided that no part of the appropriations available be expended for preparation of newspapers, magazines, and so forth, has been eliminated, because of the necessity of preparing newspapers and maintaining a library for use of the passengers on vessels under the control of the United States. All competing lines furnish this service to their passengers, and similar service must be given to people using Government ships.

Last year we reduced the appropriations for the Fleet Corporation some $14,000,000, which, according to Admiral Palmer, was the wisest thing Congress has done. This reduction made it necessary to introduce more efficient methods of operation, consolidate existing lines, and reduce overhead expenses. I can not commend too highly Mr. Palmer's administration of the Fleet Corporation, for, although all existing trade routes are being maintained, the operating losses are not so great as heretofore, and his conscientious efforts are bearing fruit. I am including in my remarks at this point a statement showing operating revenues and expenses, the number of ships operated, the amounts received from liquidation, expenditures on account of liquidation and cost of tie-up, and the status of the construction loan fund, from which loans are made for the Dieselization of ships.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION

Comparison of estimated revenue and expense, including appropriations

	Fiscal year 1924, monthly financial statement	Fiscal year 1925, Budget	Fiscal year 1926,[1] tentative Budget
OPERATIONS			
Estimated receipts:			
(A) Amount on hand at beginning of year	$69,706,467.63	$33,576,384.48	$30,000,000.00
Unpaid obligations of prior years	32,146,207.11	33,811,501.91	30,000,000.00
Amount returned or to be returned to United States Treasury	37,560,260.52		
(B) Appropriations	50,000,000.00	30,000,000.00	24,000,000.00
(C) From operation of ships and miscellaneous income	104,317,791.00	95,500,000.00	89,500,000.00
Total	154,317,791.00	125,500,000.00	113,500,000.00
Estimated expenditures:			
Voyage expenses and adjustments	112,412,146.00	99,580,000.00	92,180,000.00
Insurance	7,460,330.00	4,700,000.00	4,000,000.00
Repairs	12,239,543.00	9,540,000.00	9,000,000.00
Administration	7,223,254.00	5,765,000.00	5,300,000.00
Advertising	1,488,726.00	1,235,000.00	1,000,000.00
Capital charges and unusual obligations	5,790,685.00	120,000.00	20,000.00
Expenses of inactive vessels	4,467,570.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00
Reserve		2,560,000.00	
Total	151,082,254.00	125,500,000.00	113,500,000.00
Balance	3,235,536.00		

[1] Estimates for fiscal year 1926 made this far in advance (Jan. 14, 1925) and with the limited time allowed for their preparation must of necessity be very general, and the figures used here may be materially changed in future estimates

Comparison of estimated revenue and expense, including appropriations—Continued

	Fiscal year 1924, monthly financial statement	Fiscal year 1925, Budget	Fiscal year 1926, tentative Budget
LIQUIDATION			
Estimated receipts:			
Miscellaneous liquidation income	$674,295.00	$600,000.00	$500,000.00
Proceeds of sales (direct to construction loan fund during 1924)		8,000,000.00	6,000,000.00
Total available for liquidation expense and construction loan fund	3,909,831.00	8,600,000.00	6,500,000.00
Estimated expenditures:			
Expenses of laid up fleet	2,915,814.00	3,000,000.00	2,500,000.00
Administration	1,308,777.00	1,440,000.00	1,130,000.00
Expenses of dry-docking and overhauling laid-up ships		2,000,000.00	
Miscellaneous liquidation expense	94,848.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
	4,319,439.00	6,480,000.00	3,670,000.00
Deficit or balance to construction loan fund or miscellaneous receipts	409,608.00	2,120,000.00	2,830,000.00
Estimated number of ships in operation:			
Cargo	338	297	(1)
All others	50	50	(1)

[1] Due to lack of details on the 1926 estimate, it is not possible at this time to give an estimate of the number of vessels to be operated during the fiscal year 1926.

CONSTRUCTION LOAN FUND

Estimate of possible increases and decreases to June 30, 1926

	Fiscal year 1924	Fiscal year 1925	Fiscal year 1926
Amount of fund at beginning of fiscal year	$50,000,000	$60,880,000	$47,800,000
Estimated net proceeds available for credit to fund	[1] 11,280,000	2,120,000	
	61,280,000	63,000,000	47,800,000
Loans made or estimated to be made	400,000	7,700,000	5,000,000
	60,880,000	55,300,000	42,800,000
Estimated disbursements account Dieselization program		7,500,000	10,000,000
Estimated balance at end of fiscal year	60,880,000	47,800,000	32,800,000

[1] Actual amount credited to fund, $11,281,931.62.

Aside from the matters mentioned which pertain to the bill, I wish to call attention to the statements of Mr. O'Connor, chairman of the Shipping Board, and Mr. Palmer, president of the Fleet Corporation, relating to a complete separation of the activities of the board and the Fleet Corporation. The shipping act of 1916 did not contemplate that the board should be called upon to operate ships, yet because of the war, and subsequent legislation that is what happened, and to-day the operation of the fleet is hampered by the control of the Shipping Board. Friction between the board and the Fleet Corporation will continue until there is a complete separation of the two activities. There is no question in my mind but that if the Fleet Corporation was released from legal restrictions now imposed upon it, and given free hand in the operation of the fleet, instead of an operating loss, we would derive some revenue.

If the policy of the Shipping Board is to continue, and not enter the tramp-ship business, the Fleet Corporation will always operate at a loss. Tramp cargoes constitute 30 per cent of our commerce, consisting of grain, nitrates, coal, and so forth. If this class of cargo is eliminated, and the corporation compelled to compete with other highly organized lines in the high-class passenger and cargo freight service, a profit will never be realized. I am of the opinion that a trading service might be established which would enable the operators to pick up cargo wherever it might be, transport it to its destination, and then if return cargo can be secured, say 500 miles distant, permit the operator to contract for other cargo to be transported to the place where he expects to get cargo for the return trip. This is in the nature of a tramp service, but might be operated along some form of trade route, and certainly without injuring existing routes.

I wish at this time to say a word with reference to the claims pending before the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. During the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule I will offer an amendment making certain moneys available, and at that time will be glad to make a detailed explantion of the status of these various claims. I can state briefly at this time, however, that the Fleet Corporation has claims pending in their favor amounting to approximately $137,000,000, as against claims of contractors and others totaling about $196,000,000.

VETERANS' BUREAU

The committee recommends appropriations for the United States Veterans' Bureau in accordance with the estimates submitted in the Budget. The total recommended is $76,258,272.30 less than the total of the appropriations for the current fiscal year. Increases over the amounts available for this year are recommended in the appropriations for military and naval compensation and military and naval insurance, made necessary by the new legislation enacted during the last session of Congress, better known as the World War veterans' act, of June 7, 1924.

I wish to call particular attention to the cost of this new legislation which greatly liberalized hospital treatment and provided for two months' additional pay to rehabilitated trainees. The increased expenditures under the various services of the Veterans' Bureau may be itemized as follows:

Medical and hospital services	$8,000,000
Vocational rehabilitation	8,000,000
Military and naval insurance	2,000,000
Military and naval compensation	16,000,000
	34,000,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Reductions in personnel, economies in the business administration of the field offices, and decentralization will enable the Veterans' Bureau to operate under an appropriation which is $3,703,874.30 less than the sum available for administration for the current year. I can not commend too highly General Hines's splendid efforts and cooperation in bringing the administration of the Veterans' Bureau to a business basis. His straightforward presentation of the work and needs of the bureau is appreciated by the committee, and we are endeavoring to assist him in every way.

MILITARY AND NAVAL COMPENSATION

It is estimated that the sum of $127,000,000 recommended to be appropriated in this bill will be necessary during the fiscal year 1926. While this amount appears as an increase of $44,000,000 over the appropriations available for the current year, I want to make clear that beginning with the fiscal year 1926 we propose to make appropriations for military and naval compensation on an annual basis in order that the Congress may better know the cost of this service. Heretofore the unexpended balances of appropriations previously made were available for military and naval compensation, and under the new scheme it is estimated that approximately $30,000,000 will be covered into the Treasury at the close of this fiscal year.

I wish to direct the attention of the Members to the increase in the number of active claims before this bureau. On June 30, 1924, there were 179,037 active claims, and on September 30, 1924, this number had increased to 186,281. This was due to the liberalizing features of the World War veterans' act of 1924, and the increased cost of compensation of approximately $16,000,000 to which I referred a moment ago is due particularly in the class of beneficiaries that could receive compensation in cases of tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric diseases where the presumption clause was extended until January 1, 1925.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICES

We recommend an appropriation of $35,000,000 for medical and hospital services for 1926. Of this sum approximately $13,500,000 is allotted to other Government services that afford facilities to the Veterans' Bureau and services on the fee basis and under contract service. In June, 1924, there were 22,457 patients of the Veterans' Bureau in various hospitals. This number increased to 27,626 by December, 1924, due to the liberalization of hospital treatment as provided in the World War veterans' act.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The present plan of rehabilitating the trainee and placing him in employment as quickly as he has reached the point of employability has resulted in a decrease in the amount of funds required for vocational rehabilitation for the ensuing fiscal year. The committee recommends an appropriation of $38,000,000, in accordance with the Budget estimates. On July 1, 1923, there were 80,359 men in training, and at the close of the fiscal year there were 45,347 men in training. The rehabilitation of these men has been made possible

through the assistance of large corporations in placing men in employment when they have been rehabilitated. To provide for two months' additional pay to rehabilitated trainees as authorized in the new World War veterans' act, an additional expenditure of $8,000,000 will be necessary.

WORLD WAR ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

The committee recommends appropriations in accordance with the Budget estimates for carrying out the provisions of the World War adjusted compensation act. A total of 1,439,696 claims have been filed with the Veterans' Bureau, and certificates valued at $729,241,478 issued. In connection with this appropriation, I desire to call attention of the Members to the cost of the so-called "soldiers' bonus," and I shall enumerate the sums already made available, and those proposed, as follows:

Appropriations made to carry out the provisions of the World War adjusted compnesation act

General Accounting Office, administrative expenses	$75,240
Navy Department, administrative expenses	450,000
War Department, administrative expenses	3,600,000
United States Veterans' Bureau:	
Administrative expenses	1,188,500
Adjusted service and dependent pay	26,629,398
Adjusted service certificate fund	100,000,000
Total appropriations to date	131,943,138
Recommended in the accompanying bill:	
United States Veterans' Bureau—	
Adjusted service and dependent pay	12,000,000
Adjusted service certificate fund	50,000,000
Total of appropriations made and recommended	193,943,138

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I realize that after the detailed information that has been given you by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], that a further discussion of this bill will probably be rather uninteresting to you. I want to say at the outset that practically every item that is written into the bill was so written with the full agreement of the subcommittee. There is very little difference of opinion between the members of the committee on any item. I want to say that notwithstanding the fact that it has been stated by some Members of the House who probably believe it that since the Budget law has been written on the statute books of this Nation the power of appropriation has been taken from the Congress. I want to call your attention to the fact that in several items of this bill the Subcommittee on Appropriations has materially changed the figures submitted to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget. That is a concrete evidence that this House and Congress still have the right to appropriate as it sees fit.

After a study of the hearings held when the Budget law was under consideration, after reading the debates that occurred in this forum and in another body, and reading the testimony of the witnesses that appeared at the hearings before the committee, which was nonpartisan in its formation, which was composed of some of the ablest and most patriotic men in the Congress, I am free to say that the Members of Congress who were responsible for that law being written on the statute books should have no apologies to make for the faith they had in them at that time with reference to the merits of that measure. I think legitimate criticism of men and bodies is helpful at all times, and I have no quarrel to pick with those who criticize the action of the Budget because the committee itself is in disagreement with the Bureau of the Budget in several items of this bill, but I call your attention especially to the fact that the Congress still has the power to change the finding of the Budget when they think a mistake has been made by that bureau. In my humble opinion there is no piece of legislation which has been written on the statute books of this country within the past 15 or 20 years, or longer, that has saved as many dollars to the taxpayers of the country as that law which created the Bureau of the Budget. [Applause.] We are disposed to fall into the habit of criticizing carelessly. This Congress itself has been the subject of criticism which was unjust. When men make mistakes and when bodies make mistakes, there is apt to be criticism and they are subject to criticism and they should be criticized, but the Members of this body especially know that during the past few years criticisms which have been hurled at the members of the Budget Bureau and at the Congress itself have not always been justified. Therefore, I think that we should be careful when it comes to our using that weapon ourselves.

This bill now under consideration by the committee carries appropriation for 22 independent offices of the Government.

A comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1925, the Budget estimates for 1926, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1926 are as follows:

Independent offices appropriation bill, 1926.—A comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1925, the Budget estimates for 1926, and amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1926

Object	Appropriations for 1925 in the independent offices deficiency and other acts	Budget estimates for 1926, regular annual and supplemental	Amount recommended in the bill for 1926	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with 1925 appropriation	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with 1926 Budget estimates
Executive Office	$440,767.50	$439,960.00	$439,960.00	−$807.50	
Alien Property Custodian	225,000.00	189,220.00	189,220.00	−35,780.00	
American Battle Monuments Commission	500,000.00	(1)	(1)	−500,000.00	
Board of Tax Appeals	[2] 500,000.00	354,320.00	354,320.00	+354,320.00	
Bureau of Efficiency	156,150.00	150,350.00	150,350.00	−5,800.00	
Civil Service Commission	1,012,035.00	997,375.00	999,375.00	−12,660.00	+$2,000.00
Commission of Fine Arts	5,350.00	6,500.00	6,500.00	+1,150.00	
Employees' Compensation Commission	2,650,600.00	2,301,500.00	2,301,500.00	−349,100.00	
Federal Board for Vocational Education	944,000.00	855,270.00	860,000.00	−84,000.00	+4,730.00
Federal Power Commission	11,000.00	26,800.00	26,800.00	+15,800.00	
Federal Trade Commission	1,010,000.00	950,000.00	1,008,000.00	−2,000.00	+58,000.00
General Accounting Office	3,799,852.00	3,701,960.00	3,701,960.00	−97,892.00	
Housing Corporation	882,415.00	743,915.00	743,915.00	−138,500.00	
Interstate Commerce Commission	4,641,864.00	4,913,500.00	6,853,962.00	+2,212,098.00	+1,940,462.00
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	470,000.00	534,000.00	534,000.00	+64,000.00	
Perry's Victory Memorial Commission	99,185.00			−99,185.00	
Railroad Labor Board	322,200.00	296,805.00	296,805.00	−25,395.00	
Smithsonian Institution	809,101.66	757,890.00	788,020.00	−21,081.66	+30,130.00
State, War, and Navy Department Buildings	2,458,115.00	2,342,880.00	2,342,880.00	−115,235.00	
Tariff Commission	683,240.00	721,500.00	721,500.00	+38,260.00	
United States Geographic Board	1,000.00	550.00	550.00	−450.00	
United States Shipping Board	30,344,000.00	24,330,000.00	24,330,000.00	−6,014,000.00	
United States Veterans' Bureau	481,958,272.30	405,700,000.00	405,700,000.00	−76,258,272.30	
Grand total regular annual appropriations	533,424,147.46	450,314,295.00	452,349,617.00	−81,074,530.46	+2,035,322.00

[1] Use of unexpended balances.
[2] This sum was allotted to the Board of Tax Appeals from appropriations made for 1925 for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

While the total amount carried in this bill is $81,000,000 less than in 1925, $50,000,000 of this amount is deducted from the $100,000,000 which is estimated would be necessary each year for the purpose of taking care of the adjusted certificate fund. This $50,000,000 will, of course, have to be appropriated later, and can only be looked upon as a deferring of the matter.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I understood the figures of the actuary which were submitted to the House when the so-called adjusted compensation act was passed, it was stated that in order to provide a fund that would be sufficient to take care of the certificates at the end of the 20 years, and also to take care of the cash payments for the first three years, there would have to be appropriated $155,000,000 for the year 1926.

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand this bill carries $62,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. SANDLIN. That is true.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. So that really there is a discrepancy of $93,000,000 between the figures carried in this bill and the figures of the actuary which were presented to the House and upon which the House acted when the adjusted compensation bill was passed.

Mr. SANDLIN. As I understand it, the gentleman agrees with me that this is just a deferring of the appropriation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Absolutely; and I wanted to emphasize the fact that there are $93,000,000 that have to be taken care of at some time in the future.

Mr. STEPHENS. And why is not that provided for now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think that is a very pertinent inquiry.

Mr. SANDLIN. It is not provided for now because there has not been that number of applications received for certificates that was estimated would be received by this time, although it is felt by all that they will finally come in. They are merely deferred, and after these first certificates go out it is expected that that would stir the matter up in the various districts and that veterans will then begin to file their applications.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is there not another answer to the question, and that is that if the $93,000,000 had been appropriated in this bill it would have increased the appropriations for 1926 over those of 1925?

Mr. SANDLIN. I shall let the gentleman and those in the House who are interested draw their own conclusions in respect to that.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman would not see any good reason for making an appropriation before it was required by the bureau.

Mr. SANDLIN. I am not criticizing this. I am just giving the House the information and letting the House know that this appropriation will have to come later.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I understand the gentleman is not, but I understood the gentleman from Tennessee——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Washington voted for the adjusted compensation act, I believe?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I did not. The gentleman voted for it on the assumption that a certificate fund was going to be provided which the gentleman no doubt boasted back in his district——

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Oh, I never boast about anything.

Mr. SANDLIN. I hope the gentlemen will not take up too much of my time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And which other gentlemen over the country claimed would take care of the bonus for a little over two billion dollars. I ask the gentleman, if he wants to meet the actuary's figures and to appropriate from year to year the amount necessary to provide that fund, whether he is keeping faith with the people of this country, and will it not in the end cost the Treasury more money than was contemplated when the bill was passed?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. We are keeping faith because we have made the appropriation that has been estimated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You are not making the appropriation in accordance with the actuary's figures. The gentleman knows the excuse that only 50 per cent have applied for certificates now will not answer because they have three more years from now in which to make application.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. But we do not want to make the appropriation two years in advance.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that I be not interrupted until I get along further with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks that he be not interrupted for the present.

Mr. SANDLIN. Under the head of vocational rehabilitation there is a decrease of $51,000,000 from the amount carried in the bill for 1925. The law provides that application for vocational training had to be made prior to June 30, 1923, hence the number of trainees are fast declining.

Gentlemen of the committee, if there are any people in this country who are disposed to criticize Congress for not meeting that responsibility which they as representatives of the American people should meet in not fully meeting the expectations of the soldiers and those who are interested in them, I think that a reading of this bill and the appropriation bills which have gone before will be a full answer to any such criticism. I do not know that this Congress has ever refused yet to consider favorably any legislation looking especially to the rehabilitation and compensation of disabled soldiers, and it was, of course, their duty, and I am sure the representatives of the people here have tried to do so faithfully and cheerfully.

In reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission let me say that the appropriation for 1925 was $4,641,804. The Budget estimate for 1926, regular, annual, and supplemental, was $4,913,500. The amount recommended in the bill is $6,853,963, or an increase of $1,940,462 over the estimate of the Budget.

Gentlemen of the committee, the transportation act of 1920 placed many additional burdens upon this commission. If you will read the hearings you will see in detail there presented in a very forceful manner by the officials of the National Industrial League, who represented the shippers of this country, who had the facts and figures and the faculty of presenting them to the committee, the needs of the shippers of this country with reference to the activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission. As far as I know, there was no demand from any of the railroads of the country for an increase for this commission. Of course you readily understand that the activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission are to deal directly with individuals from all sections of the country. We have given them the power under different acts here to regulate the freight rates of the country, to value the railroads, and numerous other duties; and if there is any one thing that the people of this country demand and ask for and which they do not get in many instances it is that the transactions they have with the Government are done in a businesslike and prompt manner. I will say that notwithstanding the fact that the income tax law was, of course, not popular—no tax law is popular—but in my district I heard more complaints from the people about the manner in which their taxes were handled than about the amount of tax they had to pay. If this Congress can do anything in reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission or any department or activity of this Government that would bring about a more prompt action in the dealings of the various Government departments with the people, why I think that should be done. It matters not whether we are in favor of the transportation act and all its provisions. It is a law. Some of the Members of the House do not believe it was wise for that law to carry many of the provisions, such as the recapture and valuation clauses, but, gentlemen, it is a law, and now if you want that law carried into effect there is no way to do it except to give this commission sufficient funds to administer it properly, and after a full hearing it was decided by the committee to raise the estimate of the Budget in the amount that I have indicated.

In reference to the recapture clause, which was under discussion a few minutes ago, there has been paid into the Treasury under protest $5,021,897.97. A major portion of this has been paid under protest, and this contingent fund has not been available for the uses contemplated in the statute. It is estimated that the recapture service for the several past years is as follows: 1920, $5,568,000; 1921, $12,500,000; 1922, $15,000,000; 1923, $36,000,000; 1924, $25,000,000.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will necessarily have to have the final figures on valuation before these matters are definitely settled. It is for the Congress to determine whether they want to finish this work or let it stop right here. The commission tells us that if the appropriation is not increased they do not know when they can finish it, and guessed at 6, 8, or 9, or 10 years in which they could probably complete it. In connection with the appropriation for the Veterans' Bureau I will say that the applications for adjusted compensation can be filed up to January 1, 1928, and on the 1st of January there had been received in the Veterans' Bureau a total of 1,439,698 claims, with an aggregate value of certificates issued of $739,241,498. It is my opinion, and I agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics are doing a splendid work. This board is composed of experts serving without pay. A gentleman from John Hopkins University is at the head of it. I think he holds the chair of economics there, and the President said in submitting the tenth annual report to the committee, speaking of the national advisory committee:

> Through this committee the talent of America have been marshalled in a scientific study of the problems of flight with the result that today America occupies a position in the forefront of progressive nations in the technical development of aeronautics.

I believe that if any Member of this House will read the hearings on this bill he will become convinced that this country is well abreast and probably ahead of all other nations with respect to the progress it has made in technical development of aeronautics. Although we know that we can not compare in numbers with certain other countries, in the number of airships that they have, yet in technical development I think we are well abreast of them or probably ahead of all of them.

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. STENGLE. I have carefully read over the report of the hearings of the gentleman's committee, and I have discovered nothing in the report by way of explanation of the so-called Bureau of Efficiency. When the distinguished chairman of the committee was on the floor I asked of him why he skipped over that in his descriptions. Will the gentleman, as the ranking Member of the minority side, try to explain to us, if possible, why we should waste $150,000 on that so-called Bureau of Efficiency?

Mr. SANDLIN. Well, of course in all legislative bodies we have experts of different kinds, men who are more or less familiar with different questions; and the gentleman who has just asked the question, which is a legitimate one, is an expert on the matter about which he is talking. He has, of course, made a study of those questions. I can say that I do not believe that there is any board of governmental activity that could be of more benefit than the Bureau of Efficiency.

Mr. STENGLE. If properly operated.

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes; if properly operated. But that is a matter of administration. I want to say this to the gentleman from New York, who is well qualified to discuss this question, probably better than any other Member of this House, that it is only through the Bureau of Efficiency, or the Bureau of the Budget, that we can hope to secure the degree of efficiency that we desire. I asked the head of the Bureau of Efficiency if he was called on by the Bureau of the Budget to go into those particular departments and see their workings and see if changes could be made for the better, or in other words, to bring about a greater efficiency, and he replied that they were doing that, and that they were doing more and more to promote efficiency. That is what this body is doing.

Mr. STENGLE. Why has not the gentleman's committee made some report here in detail to give some excuse to this House for the continuation of a bureau which in actuality has only been doing theoretical work with respect to efficiency?

Mr. SANDLIN. The gentleman can ask the gentleman who prepared the report. So far as I am concerned, I hope the Bureau of Efficiency will not be abolished. If it is not performing the functions for which it was created there should be somebody put at the head of it that will perform so that Members of this House can know what is going on in the departments.

Mr. STENGLE. To all of which I say "Amen!"

Mr. SANDLIN. Gentlemen, with reference to the Shipping Board I will say that I think it is fortunate, indeed, that this matter is being given a study and that hearings are being held upon it before a committee of this House, a committee composed of gentlemen who have made a study of this matter and who will be prepared to report to this House some proposed legislation that may be beneficial.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There has been some apprehension expressed that a reduction in the appropriation carried for this service may result in a discontinuance of many of the trade routes. Is it the purpose of the Shipping Board to discontinue particular routes which Congress by legislation has directed to be kept up?

Mr. SANDLIN. Well, Admiral Palmer stated that where some ships had been going out of Boston or New York, for example, or different ports, the routes would be so rearranged that the same ships would touch at different ports, and the routes would not be seriously diminished.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The points referred to, of course, are supplied with ships, and many independent lines are running there. But there are some ports on the Gulf that would be very seriously crippled in the handling of business if trade routes starting from there were to be discontinued, notably the city of New Orleans and the city of Mobile, nearby. Does the gentleman fear that the trade routes that we now maintain out of those ports will be seriously crippled by the reorganization?

Mr. SANDLIN. I am not altogether without fear, but I will say this, that the amount appropriated for this purpose under the Shipping Board was the amount recommended by the Budget and by the Shipping Board and Admiral Palmer. I do not know whether the House should make it any larger.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. You take the Middle West, and the Mississippi Valley Association; I think they have some fear that this cutting of the appropriation will result seriously in the reduction of some very important trade routes that are now maintained.

Mr. SANDLIN. I hope it will not be so.

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. May I ask the gentleman how many ships Admiral Palmer thinks he can keep in operation under the amount you authorize?

Mr. SANDLIN. Something like 275.

Mr. McDUFFIE. What is the number of ships operating now? Is it 325?

Mr. SANDLIN. Not quite so many now, I think.

Mr. McDUFFIE. As a matter of fact, has not the ship service been more or less curtailed as the House has decreased the appropriations?

Mr. SANDLIN. That is true; yes, sir.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Now, did Admiral Palmer suggest to the committee that he might be able to reduce the expenditures in the way of making radical reductions in the personnel, or did he intimate or suggest that he would necessarily have to curtail the actual number of ships that are in the service?

Mr. SANDLIN. He said both. He expected to reduce the appropriation by curtailing the personnel and also by a rearrangement of the routes.

I want to say to the committee that there is no Member of this body who is more interested in this subject than myself. When I first came here I could not see how Congress was justified in spending forty or fifty million dollars for the merchant marine over and above what they were getting. But especially to these Representatives of the West and South is this a very important question. As I said a moment ago, I am glad a study of it is being made by such an able committee as is studying it at this time. A large steel corporation is looking after its exports with its own fleet.

The great oil companies of this country are looking after their exports with their fleets. Henry Ford is going into the shipping business. He has already built two ships and, I understand, is going to build more, but there is nobody to look after the great sections of the country in the West and South or the exporters from all over the country except the Congress of the United States. I will say to the Members from the cotton-growing States that last year 50 per cent of the cotton of this country was exported in ships belonging to the United States and over 30 per cent of the wheat was exported in those ships. Think what it would mean in case of a war here or a war across the water, where the ships of other countries would be taken away. We know what it would mean, as we had an opportunity to know what it meant during the war, when, notwithstanding the price of cotton in Europe was high, we could not sell a bale in this country, but we had to go around peddling one bale at a time because we had no ships available.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman, then, feels, as many do, that the Government is justified in making an appropriation such as is made for the operation of a merchant marine in spite of the fact that it may not bring a return in dollars and cents in the actual operation? In other words, the return comes from the putting of American goods upon foreign markets by our ships and in getting them there as quickly as a foreigner gets his goods to those markets.

Mr. SANDLIN. Surely. I think that if it is rendering a proper and valuable service to the people of this country it is not necessary that it be put on a self-sustaining basis, any more than that we should expect the Department of Agriculture to be put on a self-sustaining basis. That is the way I feel about the postal bill that is now under discussion. I do not believe the services of the postal employees ought to be based on what is received from the revenues of the Post Office Department.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is not the importance of building up and maintaining a merchant marine accentuated by the fact that last year the American people, according to the best statistics,

paid foreign steamship companies more than $73,000,000 for handling American freight?

Mr. SANDLIN. That is true. And let me say to the gentleman that if the American shippers were as patriotic as the shippers of foreign countries we could build up a merchant marine here very rapidly, because when a foreign purchaser purchases from our people he does so with the understanding that those goods must come to Europe in ships that belong to his country. We have testimony to the effect that six months ago there was no cooperation at all by the American shippers with the Shipping Board, but that within the last six months there has been a little cooperation. I think that probably the lack of cooperation, or some of it, is due to the fact that the big shippers of the country really have not known or felt what was going to be the final determination of this matter by Congress. I think that one thing Congress should do, above all others, is to establish some definite policy with respect to the merchant-marine situation. You can readily see that those who are engaged in shipping and have been shipping over certain lines for a number of years would hesitate to change when some Congress might come and cut off the appropriation entirely for this operation. I will say to the gentlemen from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE and Mr. OLIVER], with respect to the appropriation having been cut, that personally I felt this way about it: That there has been suggested by the President some legislation that should be written upon this question.

There is a committee which at this time is studying the question and that committee held hearings all of last summer. They were very interesting hearings and I have read them. That committee is composed of able men who have the interest of this country at heart and who understand the question under investigation. There ought to be some law written so that the American people will know that we will have a policy with reference to shipping in this country which will last over a period of at least 5, 10, or 15 years.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I agree fully with the statement made by the gentleman, but pending action by Congress surely Congress should not by indirection encourage the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation to discontinue some of these trade routes which Congress has directed should be established, and a diminution in the appropriation, as I understand the gentleman, is not to be construed in any way as a direction to the Emergency Fleet Corporation or to the Shipping Board to discontinue these routes.

Mr. SANDLIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. McDUFFIE. May I interrupt to suggest this: Would it not be well for the Congress to write into this bill, if possible, its intention in that regard, so that the Shipping Board may well understand the position of Congress in that respect?

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not a fact that much more of our tonnage would be carried in American bottoms if it were not for the fact that a great many of the railroads have pooling and traffic agreements with British steamship companies by which the tonnage originating on their lines is diverted to foreign steamships?

Mr. SANDLIN. The statement made by the gentleman from Missouri, I think, is entirely correct and it is borne out by the hearings held on this bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like very much to have the gentleman give an expression of his opinion as to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE], because I regard that as of very extreme importance.

Mr. SANDLIN. Well, speaking for myself, I would be willing to write into this bill some expression carrying out the views suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE]. You understand, however, that the board said this: "This is all we need; we can operate this year by a rearrangement of routes and by the disposition of certain vessels." Then the committee, I believe, would be in this position: We would say, "Gentlemen, take $2,000,000 or more, or $3,000,000 or $4,000,000" whatever the amount might be, "and do what you think best with it." That is the position the committee was in.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to say to my friend I did not wish to intimate any criticism whatever of the committee, because I think the action of the committee was thoroughly in accord with its duty. When the executive officers or the administrative officers of this Shipping Board or Emergency Fleet Corporation come and say they can get along with that amount, of course, it is not the duty of the committee to suggest an increase in it.

Mr. SANDLIN. I understand that, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama.

With reference to the appropriation for the Civil Service Commission, I wish to put in the RECORD some figures, and special attention is invited to the fact that on November 11, 1918, Armistice Day, the Civil Service Commission had 917,760 employees in the service. Since that date reduction has brought this service down to approximately 554,986 of date June 30, 1924, a reduction amounting to 39.5 per cent. The employees in the commission were reduced between the two dates above mentioned from $896,000 to $476,000, a reduction of 46.1 per cent. I would like to put in the RECORD, and I will ask leave to do so before I close, the number of employees in each branch of the civil service in Washington, D. C., on December 31, 1924, on June 30, 1924, and June 30, 1916, and also the total on other dates as indicated.

Number of employees in each branch of the Federal executive civil service in Washington, D. C., and outside on December 31, 1924 (estimated); on June 30, 1924, and June 30, 1916; and also totals on other dates as indicated.[1]

Department or office	Dec. 31, 1924 (estimated)			Total, June 30, 1924	Total, June 30, 1916
	In District of Columbia	Outside District of Columbia	Total		
State	596	3,616	4,212	4,697	2,783
Treasury	16,587	36,502	53,089	52,292	30,629
War	6,594	42,201	48,795	50,360	37,695
Justice	631	3,000	3,631	3,631	2,610
Post Office	3,704	296,874	[2] 300,578	[2] 296,481	250,885
Navy	5,524	37,343	42,867	41,971	35,722
Interior	6,014	11,627	17,641	17,840	19,347
Agriculture	4,887	15,724	20,611	20,665	18,736
Commerce (Oct. 31, 1924)	2,775	9,002	11,777	11,660	9,903
Labor	632	3,302	3,834	3,746	2,504
Government Printing Office	4,300	-------	4,300	4,094	4,028
Smithsonian Institution	485	-------	485	488	784
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,158	255	1,413	1,542	2,243
Civil Service Commission	343	132	475	498	250
Bureau of Efficiency	47	-------	47	49	27
Federal Trade Commission	282	36	318	315	238
Shipping Board	[3] 1,142	2,505	3,647	3,115	-------
Railroad Administration	371	17	388	577	-------
Alien Property Custodian	97	-------	97	114	-------
Tariff Commission	203	11	214	200	-------
Employees' Compensation Commission	72	-------	72	73	-------
Federal Board for Vocational Education	71	-------	71	74	-------
Panama Canal (June 30, 1924)	73	8,817	8,890	8,890	19,291
Superintendent State, War, and Navy Building	1,600	-------	1,600	1,520	217
Railroad Labor Board (June 30, 1924)	-------	67	67	67	-------
General Accounting Office	1,990	-------	1,990	2,042	-------
Veterans' Bureau	5,346	22,640	27,986	[4] 27,035	-------
Miscellaneous	[4] 700	250	[4] 950	[4] 950	165
Total	66,224	493,754	559,978	554,986	438,057

[1] Does not include legislative, judicial, military, or naval services, or the District of Columbia.

[2] Includes 13,200 clerks at third-class offices, 203 screen-wagon contractors, 175 carriers for offices having special supply, 5,315 clerks in charge of contract stations, 10,927 star route contractors, 285 steamboat contractors, and 138 clerks in charge of rural stations. Does not include 36,100 clerks at fourth-class offices, because not paid by the Government, and 21,100 mail messengers, because not included in previous computations.

[3] Includes administrative office of Emergency Fleet Corporation, but not workmen at shipyards or in warehouses or employees on vessels.

[4] Approximate.

With reference to the Federal Trade Commission, we increased the recommendation of the Budget $58,000. This activity of the Government, gentlemen of the committee, I believe is one in which the great majority of the people of this country should be interested, if they are not.

The effect of the order issued by the Federal Trade Commission on July 21, 1924, in what was known as the Pittsburgh Plus case, was brought out in the hearings, and it was shown that the steel industries in Chicago or in that section of the country had been adding to the price of steel $7.50 to cover the freight from Pittsburgh to that section of the country. It was testified by Judge Van Fleet, who is now at the head of this bureau, and an excellent gentleman, I believe, who seems to be very much interested in his work, that that order alone saved the purchasers of steel in this country $30,000,000. Another member of the commission stated that in the building of the Federal Reserve Bank Building at Chicago it cost the Government, by reason of this addition to the freight rates, $60,000 because the building was built before this order to desist went into effect.

There are some other matters I would like to discuss, but I do not care to take up any more time of the committee. Let me say in conclusion that I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], when he

discusses the necessity for a cessation in the creation of any more governmental activities. Some Member speaks about this nearly every day. I have heard this nearly every day that Congress has been in session for the last four years, which covers the time I have had the pleasure and honor of serving with you here. We will never get anywhere, gentlemen of the committee, by talking about it. Do you know what we are doing? We are simply pursuing the course of least resistance. We have a demand from this class of people or from this section of the country to give them a certain activity, and rather than explain to them that they should not have that activity or that it is not good for them or the country, we simply go ahead and say nothing, and when the matter comes up in nine cases out of ten we vote for it.

I think probably what is required is just a little more courage and a little more energy. But we do not like to explain to these people that they are asking for something that will put additional burdens on the taxpayers. It is a hard job to do this, and we usually just go ahead and vote for such measures. Anyone who serves on this committee which handles the appropriations for independent offices has only to look back a few years and see what large amounts have grown from such small beginnings. These establishments will start out probably with one bureau head and one or two stenographers and will probably have an appropriation of $10,000 or $15,000 or $20,000, and then in a few years, gentlemen of the committee, it will run into the millions.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I entirely agree with what the gentleman has said, and I presume the gentleman has also observed that when they get a bureau created they not only use their own efforts to magnify its importance and increase the number of employees, but they do their best to start a backfire behind Members of Congress sometimes in order to have some additional employees granted them and more work referred to them.

Mr. SANDLIN. I think the gentleman has stated the matter correctly. We have all known of such backfires and have felt the effect of them, no doubt, at different times.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Referring back to a subject which I know the gentleman is very much interested in, and I am sure the Members of the House also, in view of a recent decision by the Shipping Board, which is most important, whereby a serious handicap which heretofore has existed against the Gulf ports in the matter of overseas rates, it is of supreme importance that now those same Gulf ports be allowed to continue these trade routes, because with this handicap removed, as a recent ruling of the Shipping Board requires, that shipping can be greatly expedited and enlarged, and I think it is of supreme importance that inquiry be made anew whether with these funds the Shipping Board will be able to continue these important trade routes.

Mr. SANDLIN. I think the matter is very important and should be investigated with the idea in view which the gentleman has just stated. I want to say in that connection before I close that last year there was a condition existing in this country whereby thousands of tons of wheat were congested at the southern ports of this country, and had it not been for the fact that they could call on the Emergency Fleet Corporation and merchant marine vessels were sent to those ports, it would have meant a loss of untold thousands of dollars to the owners of that wheat. Such conditions are liable to arise at any time, and in closing I want to again say that I do not believe there is a more important question to be settled, and settled promptly, especially for the representatives of people who are engaged in large exports, than that of the proper settlement and adjustment of the merchant-marine question.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Before my colleague closes I would like to recur to a statement about the Bureau of the Budget. After the recommendation for any department of the Government has been sent to your committee by the Bureau of the Budget, is there anything that precludes the officials in that department from testifying freely before the committee and giving them any information they desire?

Mr. SANDLIN. In answer to the gentleman's question I will read section 206, which is as follows:

No estimate or request for an appropriation and no estimate for an increase in an item of any such estimate or request and no recommendation as to how the revenue needs of the Government should be met shall be submitted to the Congress or any committee thereof by any officer or employee of any department or establishment unless at the request of either House of Congress.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I understand that, but does that preclude the committee from bringing the heads of that department before the committee and getting freely all the information which the committee may want before they act?

Mr. SANDLIN. My answer to the question is that it has not done so, and the hearings will show conclusively that we have brought the heads of all the departments before us that are affected by this bill.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Then under the Budget law the Committee on Appropriations is able to get all the information it wants from the various departments and to pursue its own course as to whether or not it increases or decreases the appropriation.

Mr. SANDLIN. Of course, the heads of the department do not ask for an increase, but I will say to the gentleman that the committee can get full information in regard to the needs of the different departments.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. But under the Budget law there is nothing to keep the Committee on Appropriations from pursuing its own course?

Mr. SANDLIN. The law provides not only that the officials of the Budget but heads of departments shall come before the committee by request and the committee can question them.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Now, relative to the rehabilitation of the World War veterans. Has the committee in all instances made provision for the amount necessary for building, construction, and maintenance of hospitals?

Mr. SANDLIN. We have allowed for all requests made. I have a letter from General Hines in response to a question I asked him, and he says that they have all the money needed for each and all hospitals.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to the activities and results obtained by the shippers' regional advisory boards, of which there are now 10, covering all sections of the country except the New England territory and the States of Washington and Oregon, where boards are to be organized in the near future. These boards are composed of approximately 6,600 representatives of the Department of Agriculture, leading farmers, and industrial organizations, as related to transportation, production, distribution, and consumption of agricultural and industrial commodities. These boards were organized by the car service division of the American Railway Association for the purpose of bringing the shippers and carriers together to function for their territory on all matters which come within the jurisdiction of the car service division, namely, car supply and car service matters. Briefly summarized are the following seven basic points on which the boards are organized as set forth in the blue book of the car service division, and also an outline of the principal duties of the commodity committees of the boards:

(1) To form a common meeting ground between shippers and railroads and the carriers as a whole as represented by the car service division of the American Railway Association for the better mutual understanding of local transportation requirements, to analyze transportation needs in its territory, and to assist in anticipating car requirements.

(2) To study production, markets, distribution, and trade channels of the commodities produced in its territory, with a view to effecting improvements in trade practices as related to transportation and to promoting a more even distribution of commodities where practicable.

(3) To promote car and operating efficiency in connection with maximum loading, and in the proper handling of cars by shippers and railroads.

(4) To secure a proper understanding by the railroads of the transportation needs of shippers, that their regulations may fit shippers' requirements, and to secure understanding by shippers and their cooperation in carrying out necessary rules governing car handling and distribution.

(5) To acquaint shippers and railroads in each section of the country with seasonal requirements in this section in order to promote intelligent cooperation in the handling of equipment between the different districts of the country.

(6) To adjust informally car difficulties which may arise in its territory between carriers and shippers.

(7) To give the shipping public a direct voice in an advisory way in the activities of the car service division of the American Railway Association in all matters of mutual concern.

PRINCIPAL DUTIES OF THE COMMODITY COMMITTEES OF THE REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARD (EXCLUSIVE OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE COMMITTEES)

1. To analyze and keep currently informed as to the relation and adequacy of transportation service to their industry.

2. To keep abreast with the economic conditions confronting their industry, with a view of determining periodically the approximate volume of production, consumption, and shipping within the board territory.

3. To represent the shippers and consumers of the particular commodity with the railroads as a whole in each board territory on all questions of transportation service and car supply.

4. To study trade channels and distribution practices in their relation to transportation service and car supply, with a view of effecting improvements in the methods of distribution and marketing and the elimination of economic and transportation waste between producer and consumer.

5. To informally adjust all questions or complaints between the carriers and their industry.

6. To deal jointly with other board committees on service questions of mutual interest.

7. To bring about a better understanding of service requirements and regulations and to give the railroads a clear conception of the shippers' or public viewpoint relative to the needs of their industry—to serve as a definite channel through which the American Railway Association will handle questions of service pertaining to each industry—and it is expected that each commodity committee will not only keep the car service division adequately informed regarding the different factors of its business and its transportation requirements, but will undertake to aid in the enforcement of all car service and operating regulations necessary to bring about the service demanded.

8. The car service division will file all of its current reports with board members, who are requested to analyze them carefully and make such criticism and suggestions from their viewpoint as they believe will more clearly demonstrate the needs of their particular industry. Orders of the car service division affecting service and car supply will be filed with the members of the board, and in cases where a condition arises necessitating the withdrawal or increase of car supply in any one district through orders of the car service division, this condition and necessity will be submitted to board members and their advice and suggestions solicited in order that the activities of the car service division will conform to public need in each district.

Each commodity committee through its chairman or vice chairman, who are members of the regional advisory board, is required to present a written report at each board meeting covering:

A. General business conditions affecting their industry in as much detail as practicable, including status of their production; stocks, if any; consumption as indicated by orders, etc. It is not expected that this information is to be given for individual concerns, but that it will be consolidated into one report covering the entire district by the commodity committee. Uniform report blanks, or questionnaires, which may be decided as appropriate by the committee will be furnished in as large a quantity as desired by the district manager.

B. Prospective transportation needs for the next 90 days by giving the approximate number of cars required to move the products, or by giving the relation in volume of the prospective movement as compared with the previous 90 days, and the similar period previous year.

C. Activities in detail of the committee, or its individual members, in their dealings with the carriers since the last board meeting, including the disposition made of questions which may have arisen.

D. Whether railroad service and car supply has been satisfactory since last board meeting.

E. What, if anything, the railroads can do, as related to service, to aid in solving any distribution problems confronting the industry.

F. Steps taken by the committee to insure efficient use of railroad equipment and facilities especially as related to—

1. Heaviest practicable loading per car.
2. Prompt loading and unloading.
3. Limiting use of order bills of lading to practical necessities.
4. Avoiding practice of placing cars "in transit" without definite destination wherever possible.
5. Limiting practices which prompt misuse of reconsigning.

DUTIES OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE COMMITTEES OF THE REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

(a) Terminal service questions—movement in terminals less than carload arrangements—adequacy of car supply.

(b) Adoption and enforcement of necessary transportation regulations as they apply to terminal movements and urban loading. The most important of these regulations is the car service rules.

(c) Analysis of the trend of general business conditions in the cities, including in their reports at board meetings the relative condition of business in each of the important centers of the board territory as contrasted with a year ago and with the previous three months.

(d) General point of contact between all industries and the car service division, both as regards service questions and, more important at the present time, to acquaint all shippers and receivers in every one of the communities with the functions, organization, and the purposes of the regional advisory boards.

(e) To aid any of the commodity committees thus to obtain the support of individual units of their industry located in the different specific centers.

Although these boards are of recent origin, the service they have rendered has undoubtedly been of great value to the shippers as a whole and more especially to that of agriculture. One of the outstanding complaints in the past has been the inadequate car supply available in times of peak movement, particularly as related to the movement of livestock and grain where considerable loss was sustained by the grower.

Aside from the efforts of the railroads to improve transportation conditions by putting into service more than 6,000 new locomotives and more than 346,000 new freight cars during the past two years; amongst the principal factors to bring about the present improved conditions are the following instances of constructive actions taken by the boards resulting from the reports and studies made by the commodity committees by anticipating their car requirements for 60 to 90 days in advance of the movement:

1. UNIFORM RULES FOR DISTRIBUTION OF GRAIN CARS

At country points in the Northwest there are three interests which maintain elevators at which farmers may dispose of their grain. First, is the "line" elevator whose ownership is in the larger terminal grain interests who own a chain or line of elevators at country points; second, the independent elevator, which is owned by an individual or company for profit; and third, the cooperative elevator, which is a nonprofit elevator cooperatively owned by producing farmers in the territory from which the elevator draws its grain. Prior to 1923 a large grain crop and a car shortage were more or less coincident. At such times there developed a diversity of opinion as to the basis for distribution of cars between the three types of elevators. The matter had been before the State regulatory bodies in the West, before the legislative branches of the Government, and had even been brought before the Federal body, the Interstate Commerce Commission at Washington, D. C., for solution. However, none of the solutions offered by any of these tribunals had been entirely satisfactory to all interests so it was only natural that upon formation of the northwest regional advisory board that the grain-car distribution rule should be placed before that body for solution. Here, however, a different procedure was followed. Instead of the entire board of disinterested industries passing judgment on the question it was referred to the grain committee composed of representatives of the line, independent, and cooperative elevators, who were instructed to write their own rules. This procedure soon developed the fact that the contention was not between the carriers and the grain interests but between the different grain interests. After two months of conference and consideration the grain committee brought forth a set of rules in which the three interests were in agreement. These rules were then put into effect with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission and have since worked without complaint against "blocked" elevators.

[NOTE.—Blocked elevators are elevators which are filled to their capacity and can not receive additional grains until relieved of the congestion by shipments.]

2. UNIFORM RATING FOR SAWMILLS

This matter was disposed of by the southeast regional advisory board. As in the grain distribution rule above cited, there was here, too, a diversity of opinion. The basis on which such ratings were prepared is as follows: That the rating of all sawmills, large or small, on all railroads, including short lines, for car supply shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, and production from November, 1922, to April, 1923, inclusive, is recommended as the basis; 20,000 feet shall uniformly be used as an arbitrary estimate for yellow-pine loading per car; hardwood, 15,000 feet per car.

Where mills are located at competitive points, the aggregate production thereof shall be subdivided, based on percentage of business ordinarily given the respective roads by such mills in times of car plenty.

The reference made here to the feetage basis is to be used where a particular mill did not operate during the entire time from November, 1922, to April, 1923, or to be used as a basis when rating mills commencing operation since that time.

3. FORCING LUMBER LOADERS TO "BULKHEAD" OPEN-TOP CARS

When carriers were unable to furnish closed cars for lumber shipments it had been customary to furnish open-top or flat cars for such shipments requiring the loader to bulkhead the car to prevent shifting of the load. This, lumber shippers contended, was unnecessary, and upon complaint to the southeast board the practice of requiring bulkheading of open cars was discontinued.

4. TERMINAL PERISHABLE COMMITTEES

Through the perishable committees on the various boards there were organized in 65 of the largest cities a subcommittee of dealers in fruits and vegetables, in an endeavor to accomplish a more speedy release of equipment from load, in order that the equipment could be returned to origin territory. This has resulted in a 100 per cent car supply in California for the first time.

5. RELOCATION OF EQUIPMENT

Through the voluntary cooperation of shippers in observance of the car-service rules there has been a more general movement of equipment to the territory where it is needed than was the case under mandatory orders. This in itself is of benefit to industry by having equipment built by the carriers for its industries located on home rails.

6. RACK CARS FOR PULP-WOOD SERVICE

In the territory of the Atlantic States board complaint was made by one of the large users of pulp wood that due to the carrier serving them substituting open-top cars for rack cars, as had been customarily furnished, they were put to extra expense in unloading and inconvenience in plant operations. This case was submitted to the paper committee of the Atlantic States board and in conference with the carrier involved arranged to have sufficient box cars converted to rack cars for this service.

7. HANDLING OF COMPRESS TICKETS

Cotton is floated on a cotton bill of lading, which lading is taken up by the cotton dealer's banker at concentration point and is held by the banker as collateral. When the carriers deliver the cotton to the compress they take up a compress receipt or ticket for each bale of cotton delivered, and deliver such tickets to the banker and take up the country bill of lading. The banker now holds the compress receipts or tickets as collateral. In the meantime the dealer, who has been kept advised, proceeds to select into even running grades the cotton for the market, and then directs the compress to press and mark and load into cars the number of bales called for in the spinner's order. When the loading is complete, on a certificate to this effect issued by the carrier's inspector in charge at the compress, the railroad issues the forwarding bill of lading to the dealer, who takes same to the banker, who in turn delivers to him an equal number of compress tickets as there are bales of cotton covered by the bills of lading, and the dealer delivers these tickets back to the compress for cancellation and the satisfying of records. The banker makes draft on the spinner or his agent, the dealer is credited with the proceeds, and all records are closed at the compress point.

Delay to cotton and equipment at compress points due to cotton arriving in advance of the cotton bill and refusal of carriers to give to compress in exchange for compress ticket until arrival of bill was causing some dissatisfaction in Oklahoma. Upon submission to the southwest board an arrangement was worked out whereby cotton was delivered to compress and tickets taken and held by carrier in lieu of cotton or billing.

8. LOADING WET SAND IN BOX CARS

At certain sand-loading points in the Southeast it was the practice of some loaders to load sand into box cars by hydraulic methods. This washing of sand into cars was very destructive to the equipment, due to deterioration. Some carriers permitted such loading, while other carriers forbid the practice. Upon recommendation of the Southeast regional board the practice of refusing box cars for such loading was made uniform.

9. USE OF HARLEM RIVER FACILITIES OF DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA & WESTERN EXTENDED TO BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILWAY

For some years the Baltimore & Ohio Railway had enjoyed the use of the Harlem River facilities of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western. Owing to the increasing use of the facilities by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, the contractual agreement with the Baltimore & Ohio having expired, it was necessary for the latter line to withdraw its service from this station. Unable to immediately secure other facilities, the Atlantic States board was successful in consummating an agreement with the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western whereby the use of the Harlem transfer was extended to the Baltimore & Ohio for a period of 90 days, and in the interim the Baltimore & Ohio provided the necessary facilities.

As an indication of the results of these organizations the following report from the first vice chairman of the Northwest Regional Advisory Board, rendered as a summary of conditions in North Dakota since the organization of that body, represents the feeling on the part of farmers and agricultural shippers who have been intimately associated with the board:

NORTHWEST REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARD,
January 19, 1925.

* * * * * * *

At our first meeting, two years ago, North Dakota shippers had just gone through one of the worst transportation tie-ups in the State's history. In fact, the very fact that such an unprecedented shortage of cars and general tie-up of transportation had taken place was a direct cause for the formation of the regional advisory board. The shippers of North Dakota have seen a steady improvement in the transportation situation since the formation of the board and have seen the railroads serving North Dakota move in the past months without a car shortage or without any serious complaint one of the largest crops the State has ever grown.

Last July, when the board had its meeting at Fargo and when Mr. Betts told those present at that meeting that cars would be provided to move the crop regardless of how large it might be, there was considerable doubt expressed as to the ability of the railroads, even though they had the full cooperation of the American Railway Association and the regional advisory board, to move the crop without serious delays at times.

* * * * * * *

I could burden you with many figures to substantiate the fact that North Dakota's crop per farm was worth more in 1924 than the crop in any other agricultural State. These figures, however, are readily available to all through our Department of Agriculture.

* * * * * * *

Respectfully submitted.

——— ———,
Vice Chairman, North Dakota.

As shown in the minutes of the proceedings of the meetings everyone interested in transportation matters affecting the car supply of the country are afforded an opportunity to have their transportation difficulties given due consideration and a remedy suggested. As an example of the eighth formal meeting of the Northwest Regional Advisory Board, held at Fargo July 22, 1924, the following members are reported present:

Mr. Frank Milhollan, acting chairman, Bismarck, N. Dak., North Dakota Railroad Commission.

Mr. W. P. Chestnut, Fargo, N. Dak., Fargo Commercial Club.

Mr. P. J. Coleman, Minneapolis, Minn., car service division, A. R. A.

Mr. H. S. Davies, Minot, N. Dak., Minot Daily News.

Mr. H. E. Daley, representing Mr. J. R. Beggs, St. Paul, Minn., J. R. Beggs Co.

Mr. F. R. Durant, Minneapolis, Minn., the Grain Bulletin.

Mr. J. L. Enright, Wilton, N. Dak., Washburn Lignite Coal Co.

Mr. H. A. Feltus, Minneapolis, Minn., the Van Dusen Harrington Co.

Mr. F. L. French, representing J. F. Reed, St. Paul, Minn., Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. Edward J. Fisher, Minneapolis, Minn., Northern Pine Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. R. F. Gunkelman, Fargo, N. Dak., North Dakota Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association.

Mr. G. O. Hage, Crookston, Minn., Red River Development Association.

Mr. Fay Harding, Bismarck, N. Dak., North Dakota Railroad Commission.

Mr. G. A. Heinze, Minneapolis, Minn., De Soto Creamery & Produce Co.

Mr. Paul H. Kirk, St. Paul, Minn., United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. L. W. Kube, South St. Paul, Minn., St. Paul Union Stock Yards Co.

Mr. S. M. Low, St. Paul, Minn., Minnesota By-Products Coke Co.

Mr. C. W. McDonnell, Bismarck, N. Dak., North Dakota Railroad Commission.

Mr. J. C. O'Connell, Minneapolis, Minn., assistant secretary.

Mr. H. C. Possehl, Baker, Minn., Minnesota Potato Growers' Exchange.

Mr. W. H. Perry, Minneapolis, Minn., Pillsbury Flour Mills Co.

Mr. A. B. Pratt, Minneapolis, Minn., Northern States Power Co.

Mr. A. A. D. Rahn, Minneapolis, Minn., Shevlin-Carpenter & Clarke Co.

Mr. J. W. Raish, Pierre, S. Dak., South Dakota Railroad Commission.

Mr. Walter R. Reed, Fargo, N. Dak., North Dakota Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. M. H. Strothman, Minneapolis, Minn., Washburn-Crosby Co.

Mr. C. T. Vandenover, Minneapolis, Minn., Southern Minnesota Mills.

Mr. Alva H. Benton, Fargo, N. Dak., Department of Marketing and Rural Finance, Agricultural College.

Mr. Louis Bender, Wheaton, Minn., Farmers' Elevator Co.

Mr. F. E. Carmack, Grandin, N. Dak., Farmers' Elevator Co.

Mr. J. G. Diamond, Grand Forks, N. Dak., United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. J. M. Etiman, Mapleton, N. Dak., Farmer-Inventor.

Mr. S. A. Eddy, Minneapolis, Minn., Cunard Steamship Co. (Ltd.).

Mr. R. E. Esthagen, Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. Charles E. Gage, Washington, D. C., Department of Agriculture.

Mr. H. W. Gearey, Fargo, N. Dak., mayor of Fargo and representing Merchants' National Bank.

Mr. T. Haggen, Wheaton, Minn., Farmers' Elevator Co.
Mr. P. Johansen, Wheaton, Minn., Wheaton Farmers' Cooperative Elevator Co.
Mr. J. J. Kelley, Grand Forks, N. Dak., The Kelly Co., East Grand Forks.
Mr. W. G. Knowles, Moorhead, Minn., Leonard Crosset & Riley.
Mr. E. J. McGrath, Grand Forks, N. Dak., The Kelly Co., East Grand Forks.
Mr. W. C. Macfadden, Fargo, N. Dak., North Dakota Bankers Association.
Mr. James S. Milloy, Minot, N. Dak., Association of Commerce.
Mr. G. E. Peterson, Fargo, N. Dak., the Commercial Club of Fargo.
Mr. Harry E. Reynolds, Fargo, N. Dak., McGrann-Reynolds Fruit Co., Fargo Commercial Club.
Mr. Fred Sudensticker, Wheaton, Minn., Farmers Elevator Co.
Mr. S. O. Winge, Wheaton, Minn., Farmers Elevator Co.

RAILROAD REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILWAY

Mr. George A. Upton, northwestern freight agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILWAY

Mr. James L. Brown, superintendent of transportation, Chicago, Ill.
Mr. Thomas J. Strapp, traveling freight agent, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. J. H. Degnan, agent, Fargo, N. Dak.

CHICAGO, ST. PAUL, MINNEAPOLIS & OMAHA RAILWAY

Mr. G. L. Ossmann, car-service agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. D. J. Shea, traveling freight agent, St. Paul, Minn.

CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY

Mr. D. J. Shea, traveling freight agent, St. Paul, Minn.

CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY

Mr. R. B. Croll, superintendent car service, Chicago, Ill.
Mr. M. E. Johnson, traveling freight agent, St. Paul, Minn.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILWAY

Mr. T. A. Matthews, jr., assistant general freight agent, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. W. W. Cameron, trainmaster, Esterville, Iowa.
Mr. D. C. Barrows, traveling freight agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

CHICAGO, INDIANAPOLIS & LOUISVILLE RAILWAY

Mr. J. O. Shortall, general agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAILWAY

Mr. E. M. Frank, traveling freight agent, St. Paul, Minn.

ERIE RAILROAD

Mr. W. R. Sibley, general agent, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. L. T. Coulston, commercial agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY

Mr. John C. Roth, general superintendent transportation, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. James Robinson, assistant general freight agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. J. A. Nelson, chief freight claim agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. W. D. O'Brien, general agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. J. L. Rohan, general agent, Fargo, N. Dak.
Mr. D. J. McCarthy, agent, Fargo, N. Dak.

LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD

Mr. A. P. Vanstrom, commercial agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

MINNEAPOLIS & ST. LOUIS RAILROAD

Mr. E. J. Sturdevant, superintendent of transportation, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. E. A. Healey, traveling freight agent, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. T. E. Smith, car distributor, Minneapolis, Minn.

NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY

Mr. P. H. McCauley, general superintendent of transportation, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. A. Tinling, assistant freight traffic manager, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. J. C. Simonton, assistant general freight agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. J. M. Mooney, assistant freight claim agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. Fred Brastrup, superintendent, Dilworth, Minn.
Mr. J. L. Dullea, car distributor, Dilworth, Minn.
Mr. Edwin M. Grime, supervisor buildings and bridges, Fargo, N. Dak.
Mr. J. W. Haw, agriculture development agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. H. H. Ellsworth, traveling freight agent, Jamestown, N. Dak.
Mr. L. P. Gellerman, traveling passenger agent, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. L. R. Challoner, freight agent, Fargo, N. Dak.
Mr. L. T. Stodder, freight agent, Moorhead, Minn.
Mr. M. L. Mikkelsen, passenger agent, Fargo, N. Dak.
Mr. H. A. Aberg, traveling car service agent, St. Paul, Minn.

NEW YORK CENTRAL LINES

Mr. A. L. Evans, general agent freight department, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. D. S. Carriel, traveling freight agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

SOO LINE

Mr. W. C. Ranous, superintendent transportation, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. G. W. Hawes, general agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

WESTERN WEIGHING AND INSPECTION BUREAU

Mr. C. M. Boyce, district manager, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. H. E. Helwig, assistant district manager, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. H. W. Nissen, agent, Fargo, N. Dak.

AMERICAN RAILWAY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Donald D. Conn, manager public relations section, car service division, Washington, D. C.
Mr. L. M. Betts, manager closed car section, car service division, Washington, D. C.
Mr. C. Treat Spear, freight station section operating commission, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. R. H. Grant, car service agent, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mr. B. T. O'Neill, car service agent, Minneapolis, Minn.

I believe all familiar with past and present transportation conditions will agree that through these organizations the producers and shippers of the country, especially the farmers, have been afforded channels through which they can assemble and adjust many of their problems of distribution when related to transportation service. Appreciating the service rendered and the object sought, I felt warranted in asking for time to bring what appears to me to be a valuable service to the attention of the public. They represent a valuable contribution to the success of agriculture and the most forward step in bringing about a harmonious understanding of the problems of agriculture on the part of the railroads and other industries of the country, and are worthy of encouragement and deserving of commendation.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE].

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, while I am in nowise an expert on the operation of the merchant marine, I belong to that class who are deeply interested in its success.

SHIPPING BOARD

Much criticism has been lodged against the operation of the merchant marine and the Shipping Board during the past few years. We must understand that the problem is a stupenduous one. Doubtless mistakes have been made. It is probably the biggest business in the world that our Government has undertaken to establish. It takes time, and often a long time, to get such a business as this—the competition on the seven seas for our share of the commerce of the world—in operation in an orderly and successful manner. It is not so much the showing in actual money returns to the Treasury from actual activities, though this phase must be considered with reference to some of the activities of the board. The greater service, after all, and the one you and I are deeply interested in is the return to our manufacturers and producers, in the reduction of freight rates, and in finding and establishing markets for our products of field and factory. Stop our merchant marine and we will not only be at the mercy of the foreign shipper in the matter of rates, but our goods will reach foreign markets too late and, indeed, after the goods of our neighbors, the other great nations, have already been placed upon those markets. Commissioner Hill on December 8, in Chicago, made an excellent address to the American Bureau Federation, in which he very aptly cited the business of the United States Steel Corporation and Standard Oil Corporation to prove that commerce follows the flag. This was referred to a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman Mr. SANDLIN. Commissioner Hill said:

> If we depend upon foreign ships to carry our exports, our products will not be the first to these markets. We should have our own merchant marine for this work. It should be galvanized into life, so that it would have the energy and enterprise of our carrying trade of the nineteenth century. Then we could depend on our products being early in the foreign ports to claim their share of good prices. Also our ships would open new markets and make good their claim to preference in these markets by precedence and efficiency of service. An American merchant marine, ably supported and equipped, is necessary to do this.

I believe, gentlemen, that the merchant marine justifies its existence and the money we appropriate from the Treasury for this purpose is a wise and necessary investment. I would direct your attention to a single instance where the Gulf ports were congested with grain and the Shipping Board allocated about 27 additional vessels to the Gulf trade with the result that the producers found a ready market for millions of bushels of grain.

It is most probable that this action of the Shipping Board played an important part in the rise in the price of grain and

added hundreds and countless thousands of dollars to the wealth of the people of the West.

We make no money on the Alaskan Railroad. The Navy brings no money returns nor does our standing Army and its auxiliary forces. The Panama Canal has never until most recent years showed a good money investment. For the present we must consider our merchant marine in the same light—as that of a necessity for the general welfare of the Nation. I am prepared to believe that after all, our investment in ships, if properly managed, will return to our Nation many times in wealth the actual dollars and cents now out of pocket to the American people in their efforts to put the Stars and Stripes upon the high seas and bring our producers in touch with all the busy markets of the world.

May I say just here that the Shipping Board has recently handed down a decision that meets or should meet with the approval of the entire country. It is probably the biggest accomplishment of the board in all its history. The decree or decision destroys a rate differential that existed between north and south Atlantic and Gulf ports on tonnage to Europe. This question has been agitated for some time by various Members of Congress, the committee investigating the Shipping Board, Senator FLETCHER and others. The Gulf section in which I am primarily interested is elated over the decision, and let me say, just here, that while I have had very sharp personal and political differences with Commissioner Thompson—these differences may exist in the future—yet in view of the importance of this decision to the Gulf territory as well as the entire country, I accord to the Gulf commissioner full credit for the part he played in the accomplishment of the desired result. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman tell us what the decision was?

Mr. McDUFFIE. The decision destroys a differential that has existed between ports on the North and South Atlantic seaboard and Gulf of Mexico to Europe, whereby certain ports handled tonnage, by virtue of advantageous rates, which under natural conditions or equal rates would have been handled through the natural outlets for that tonnage. The decision should mean much to our South Atlantic and Gulf ports.

Mr. LINTHICUM. They cut down the differential which had been created by conferences of the steamship companies.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Referring to the appropriation of $24,000,000 for the Shipping Board, I can not let this opportunity pass without calling the attention of the House to this item. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has already referred to it. One might read the hearings and note the gradual decrease in number of ships operated each year, and be led to the conclusion that the elimination of our ships from the high seas is not far in the future. You gentlemen of the West are interested in it because these ships are operated as much for the advantage of the West as they are for the seaboard.

If it takes thirty millions or more to keep ships on the established trade routes for a year, I am wondering how the service maintained to-day will be continued everywhere with a decreased appropriation of $24,000,000. It would seem that some service somewhere is bound to suffer. Where this will be is important, and, of course, I am primarily interested in the Gulf ports. I am one of those, however, who believe that it is most important to continue in its fullest vigor our merchant marine from every port possible, because every section of the country is vitally interested. Our investment in these ships is the investment of the whole country.

The question now presents itself:

Where is the curtailment in our service, as a result of this cut in the amount appropriated, going to be made? Will it be ship service, or will Admiral Palmer be able to make radical reduction in the personnel and overhead expenses of the corporation? It occurs to me since the change in the contract under which we now operate our ships, the personnel can be greatly reduced. It would seem that more than 3,000 employees at an expense of more than $7,000,000 is a great overhead and administrative expense and a great problem that must address itself to Admiral Palmer. Indeed, he must make additional reduction in personnel if the service as it stands today is to be continued or enlarged. He is to be congratulated on the reduction he has already made. I would not cripple or tie the hands of anyone charged with so much responsibility, but I would like to see this House adopt a provision to this appropriation bill to the effect that any curtailment of the service must be in personnel rather than in the number of ships to be operated. It is so essential, gentlemen, that we continue the operation of these ships, I think Admiral Palmer and the board should have the expression of the House in this regard. No people in the country could be more interested in this question than you gentlemen from the great midwestern sections. The operation of these ships will mean that your surplus wheat and corn can always find a ready market.

I have no desire to perpetuate the Government in the shipping business, nor do I wish to see it compete with private enterprise; I do not like Government operation of any business as a rule. Like many others I hope the day will soon come when private capital will take over our ships and operate them under the American flag. Until, however, we can permanently establish these trade routes and foreign connections for the movement and marketing of our tonnage, private capital will not rush into such an investment. Those who have given this subject the greatest study know that it is most important and essential to our national commerce that we continue the Government operation of our ships to that end. Let me say then, that in our wildest desire for economy we should not fail to provide ample funds for this governmental activity which so vitally affects every section of the Nation.

Many who are interested primarily in the success of the merchant marine have been somewhat alarmed over a resolution which was adopted by the Shipping Board on December 22 seeking to separate the functions and responsibilities of the Emergency Fleet Corporation from those of the Shipping Board and delegating certain powers to the president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. I here set out the resolution in full, because I think every Member of Congress should be fully advised as to its provisions:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD DECEMBER 22, 1924

Whereas it is the desire of the United States Shipping Board, as far as possible, to place the conduct of its shipping business on a basis approximating commercial precedent and practices; and

Whereas it is the declared purpose of the board that in the operation of ships and handling of Government property by the Emergency Fleet Corporation that the Emergency Fleet Corporation shall report to the Shipping Board as to a board of directors exercising the usual advisory capacity in the determination of broad policies and holding the management responsible for results, in the same manner as large business organizations function; and in order more clearly to define this relationship between the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation in line with the board's desire as above expressed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the resolution of the United States Shipping Board passed September 30, 1921, as amended January 10, 1924, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Whereas the merchant marine act, 1920, provides that the power and authority thereby vested in the United States Shipping Board may be exercised either directly by the board or by it through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, except as therein otherwise specifically provided; and

Whereas in the opinion of the Shipping Board the executive and personnel organization of the Emergency Fleet Corporation is equipped to efficiently exercise through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation various administrative powers and functions, thus making it possible for the United States Shipping Board to devote its attention to study and determination of the broad and constructive questions of policy relating to the maintenance, development, and encouragement of the American merchant marine under the powers and duties imposed upon the United States Shipping Board by law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Shipping Board that neither its chairman nor any member of the board should hold any office of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and that no member of any department of the Shipping Board should hold any office of the Emergency Fleet Corporation unless the Shipping Board and the board of trustees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation concur; be it further

Resolved, That the power and authority vested in the Shipping Board by the merchant marine act, 1920, shall be exercised by it through the Emergency Fleet Corporation in the following matters and to the extent and in the manner hereinafter provided:

1. The selection, employment, or removal of all officers and employees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and their compensation shall be under the control of the board of trustees and/or officers of that corporation in the manner provided for in the by-laws of said corporation: *Provided, however*, That the salaries and other compensation of the officers and of the trustees shall be subject to the approval of the board: *And provided further*, That the selection, employment, or removal of such attorneys as are engaged in handling construction claims or litigation arising from the same shall be subject to the approval of the board.

2. The management, operation, maintenance, and repair of vessels.

3. In accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the merchant marine act, 1920, the Shipping Board will determine the trade routes to be served. The Emergency Fleet Corporation will make such disposition and allocation of the vessels to serve these routes as will insure efficient and economical operations.

4. The completion or conclusion of any construction, or reconditioning work upon vessels which has heretofore been or may be authorized by the United States Shipping Board.

5. The sale of vessels on terms and conditions laid down by the board and at such prices as the board approves.

6. The operation and sale of housing projects, real estate, railroad, and other similar property, as approved by the board.

7. The operation and sale of dry docks as approved by the board.

8. The custody and sale of all other property and materials.

9. All accounting for the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

10. The insurance of vessels and other property in its custody; and matters pertaining to such insurance.

11. The management and physical operation of piers, and pier warehouses, and terminal facilities owned by or assigned to the Shipping Board.

12. The leasing and rental of offices, warehouses, docks, and storage facilities deemed essential by it for its business and for its terminal facilities.

13. The disbursement and expenditure of all moneys arising out of operations, or otherwise, in connection with the delegated powers; also moneys arising from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by Congress for the use and expense of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, as allotted by the Shipping Board, subject to the limitations of any or all acts of Congress pertaining thereto.

14. The settlement, including payments or collections, of all matters arising out of the above-mentioned powers before or after the date of this resolution.

15. All matters incidental to any of the foregoing powers, including the negotiation, preparation, and execution of contracts, charters, bills of sale, leases, operating agreements, and other instruments necessary or convenient to the exercise of such powers are hereby conferred upon the Emergency Fleet Corporation; be it further

Resolved, That an accurate record shall be made of the proceedings of every meeting of the trustees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and a summary thereof be transmitted to the chairman and each commissioner of the Shipping Board; be it further

Resolved, That the voting power upon the stock and the control of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall remain with the United States Shipping Board, according to law; and the president and each of the trustees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation shall deliver to the secretary of the Shipping Board their several qualifying shares of stock in the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, duly indorsed in blank for transfer; and the officers of the Emergency Fleet Corporation shall deliver to the president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation their several resignations for acceptance at his pleasure; and the president and trustees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation shall deliver to the secretary of the Shipping Board their several resignations for acceptance at the pleasure of the Shipping Board; be it further

Resolved, That in passing this resolution the United States Shipping Board declares that it is its policy to delegate to the Emergency Fleet Corporation all power, authority, and control essential to the full and efficient operation by it of all lines at present operated or which may be hereafter authorized, and the full performance of all powers and authority hereby delegated. All vessels, whether active or inactive, are hereby placed in the custody and care of the Emergency Fleet Corporation; be it further

Resolved, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as a transfer of title or ownership of vessels, docks, or other property, real or personal, belonging to the United States; the possession and control by the Emergency Fleet Corporation of any vessels or other property delivered to it under this resolution shall be solely that of an agent with limited powers. All contracts and agreements made by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall clearly show that the same are contracts and agreements of the United States Shipping Board, acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation as its authorized agent; be it further

Resolved, The right and duty of the Shipping Board to exercise any and all powers of supervision and control vested in or imposed upon it by law remain in full force and effect; be it further

Resolved, That all resolutions, general or special orders, or office memoranda of the United States Shipping Board heretofore passed, inconsistent with the resolution of January 10, 1924, as amended hereby, are repealed, in so far as they conflict with the provisions of this resolution.

There is now pending a bill which seeks to put into law substantially these same provisions. Whether it will be made a part of the program for this session I am not advised, but it occurs to me that no law should be passed by the Congress touching upon the operation of the merchant marine until we receive a report of the special investigating committee created to inquire into the subject. This committee has not completed its investigation and will doubtless not make its report at an early date.

While this resolution may contain some wise provisions, and while all agree that the actual operation of the ships should be done under the exclusive supervision of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, yet there are some provisions of policy in the resolution which I fear will ultimately endanger the success of the merchant marine. In short, some of the objections to the resolution may be set forth as follows:

1. It is legally impossible, in fact, because it attempts to delegate to an agent the duty of performing a judicial function which is clearly an impossibility.

2. In so far as the operation of the fleet is concerned, it delegates all of the power of the board to one man and in view of the record made at the time of the conferences between the board and President Palmer, of the Fleet Corporation, it is quite apparent that such delegation was meant to be unlimited.

3. The right of the board to determine the trade routes or areas is meaningless in view of the understanding between the board and President Palmer at the time wherein it appears clearly that the right to determine what American ports to and from which an operation should be maintained was delegated to the president of the Fleet Corporation. If such power is vested in the president of the Fleet Corporation, it makes little difference what language is used in the resolution with respect to areas or routes. Keeping in mind always that the merchant marine act provides that—

> the board is authorized and directed to investigate and determine * * * what steamship lines should be established and put in operation from ports in the United States * * * and to determine the type * * * and other requirements of the vessels * * * and the frequency and regularity of their sailings, with a view to furnishing adequate * * * service.

The resolution attempts to vest in the president of the Fleet Corporation the custody, direction, and control of all vessels in and out of service, which carries with it the determination of what vessels and how many vessels shall be kept in operation.

4. It is true that the board may claim to have reserved the right to settle all unsettled "construction claims"—certainly all other claims are placed in the hands of the Fleet Corporation for settlement, including claims running as high as a million and a half dollars growing out of charters executed and performed during and immediately succeeding the war period, all of which arose long prior to the advent of President Palmer, and concerning which it can not be fairly said that his judgment is better than the judgment of commissioners who have spent one or even two years working with and upon the same.

5. With only $24,000,000 to expend and the Emergency Fleet Corporation using about $1,000,000 per month for overhead, it necessarily follows there must be a radical reduction in the overhead of the Fleet Corporation or a curtailment in the number of ships continued in the service.

The original of this resolution contained in section 3 this provision—

> In accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the merchant marine act of 1920 the Shipping Board will determine the trade areas to be served. The Emergency Fleet Corporation will make such disposition and allocation of the vessels to serve these areas as will insure efficient and economical operation.

I am advised that Commissioners Plummer, Haney, and Benson were opposed to the resolution in this form while Chairman O'Connor, Hill, and Lisner favored it. On motion of Commissioner Plummer, who had been urged to support the resolution, it was amended by inserting the words "trade routes" in lieu of "trade areas." This being done, the resolution was passed.

The passage of this resolution and the cutting down of the amount appropriated for the operation of our merchant marine, which appears to have the indorsement and sanction of the White House and the leadership of this administration, I fear is a bad omen. One of the reasons why I would trespass upon your time to-day is to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the fact that the Congress never intended that certain powers of the Shipping Board as to policy should be delegated to any other authority, and certainly not to one man. I believe Admiral Palmer is a most excellent gentleman and most capable, but we may not have Admiral Palmer with us always, and, gentlemen, this resolution, passed on December 22,

places too much responsibility and too much power in the hands of one man, I do not care how good a man he may be. I do not see how Admiral Palmer could really care to have all the responsibility with which the board has clothed him. We at least hope the admiral will make the best job he can of it; and in meeting the reduced appropriation let us hope the curtailment or reduction in service will be in personnel rather than in ship service.

We recognize there should be a line of demarcation between the authority of the Shipping Board and the function of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The actual operation of ships should be the exclusive function of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. Divided responsibility and friction can bring no good results to the service. There are certain fundamentals of policy, however, that should be left entirely in the hands of the Shipping Board. The Congress directed the board to do certain things—establish trade routes, and so forth. A resolution that certainly divides the responsibility of the board in this respect is against the intention and will of Congress, in my judgment.

Again, the board is a creature of Congress, and it is for Congress to say what powers that board may delegate to other authority, the administration and even the White House notwithstanding.

Let us not forget that every time we eliminate an American vessel from the service a foreign vessel takes its place. It is not a lack of tonnage that makes it necessary to take a vessel out of service. The tonnage is here. I beg you, gentlemen, to adopt a provision to this section expressing the will or intent of the Congress, so as to make it clear that the Congress by this reduction in appropriation does not desire that our service, in number of ships operated, shall be diminished or reduced.

My information is that the Shipping Board has a personnel now of more than 3,000, at an expense of more than $7,000,000 per annum.

The operation for December resulted in a loss of $2,119,488.72. The administrative cost during that month was $412,576.02. That is rather a high administrative cost—20 per cent of total operating loss. I know Admiral Palmer is anxious to make some radical reductions, and he has already made some, but I fear he contemplates making further reduction in ship service. That is a matter in which every Member of the House is interested. This House should either give more money for the operation of our merchant marine or should in a proper way express itself specifically to the effect that we do not wish the ship service curtailed. I understand that under recent and better arrangements possibly these ships may be operated at a less cost than ever before.

According to the statements in the hearings my recollection is that during 1924 we operated 338 ships; that number has been reduced under the $30,000,000 appropriation to 297 ships; and under the $24,000,000 appropriation, if you will figure it at more than $2,000,000 a month loss on the freighters alone, to say nothing of the passenger vessels, the admiral can not hope to operate these ships. This committee is not chargeable with this amount of $24,000,000. You gave all that was asked by the board and Admiral Palmer. That is what troubles me. All those in authority seem to approve of this reduction. I can not believe that the members of the Shipping Board would curtail the number of ships to be operated. Is the responsible leadership of this administration desirous of getting our ships off the seas entirely, and so anxious that they are willing to curtail the service of the merchant marine to the detriment of the country as a whole? I warn you, gentlemen, that the signs point that way. If we continue to reduce the appropriation year after year, and put the destiny of the merchant marine in the hands of any one man, no matter how good he may be, the time may not be distant when we will have our ships taken from the seas, and that will be a sad day in the history of the American people. In our wildest desire for economy let us not cripple our merchant marine. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, in reading the history of the Democratic Party I used to wonder why it was that the patron saint of the Democratic Party, Mr. Jefferson, opposed internal improvements by the Federal Government. I never could understand just why he took that position, and never realized what he evidently had in mind until this session of Congress. When I looked at the river and harbor bill, which has changed its form so materially, making appropriations without designating the amount in the act itself, I thought I could then see danger, but that bill is a splendid bill as compared to the recent bill introduced and reported, known as the public buildings bill, for this session of Congress. The Elliott bill absolutely surrenders all of your constitutional functions, and I now know why Mr. Jefferson opposed the policy of internal improvements by the Federal Government.

It surrenders your right to legislate. And I say now that although its author, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT], for whom I have as high regard as any man in this House, disclaims any political intention, I say without fear of successful contradiction that it is the greatest political scheme that has ever been proposed in this House. And I will show you why. In the first place, if you pass the bill in the form in which it is now, it gives blanket authority to the Secretary of the Treasury and combined authority with the Postmaster General, and you will have no trouble in passing the Mellon plan or any other kind of plan that comes from the Treasury Department. In the first place, it is going to be a most potent factor. Another thing, if the Democrats were in power and they should pass a bill of that kind, I would not give you a cent to guarantee a Democratic House and Senate. Why? Because if you pass that bill in the form it is now, every Republican candidate for the Senate and for the House can promise the world and be justified in it under this act. Why, gentlemen, look at what this act does. It does not even confine the expenditure of this money to any particular place. It is a blanket bill, of course.

I say, gentlemen, I hate to come here constantly on the floor and oppose legislation, because it is not my disposition, although I have some disposition to be combative, but it is not my real disposition to try to thwart real legislation. But, gentlemen, this is a monstrosity. My good friend from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] who so successfully put through this House the greatest river and harbor legislation that has been passed in a half century, he himself would not dare to offer this House, from his committee, such a bill as is brought in here as a public buildings bill. Why, gentlemen, just look at that thing. Who is going to get anything after they pass it? You think you get something but do not fool yourselves. Only men on two committees will get anything, and that is on the Committee on Appropriations and the Ways and Means Committee. Now, you think you are going to get something, but you will find yourself disappointed when you get this bill through. Now, they tell me——

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. For a question.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee will not alone pass the Mellon plan in any event.

Mr. McKEOWN. They will be the only members who will get anything out of this bill if we pass it.

Mr. CARTER. But we could not pass the Mellon bill without the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. McKEOWN. No. Let me call your attention to something else. I believe that in the District of Columbia there ought to be some buildings. I can not understand why it is that they ever let these buildings be builded along down this grand Pennsylvania Avenue, which should have been set aside and the public offices of the United States ought to be put down there. Why some of the people out in the interior actually believe that all the Government functions are housed up here in the Capitol Building. That is what they believe about it. They think that all you have to do is to step around like in a State capitol, and you will find the offices there. They do not realize we have to go 3 or 4 miles after information for them when they request it. But there ought to be buildings along down this avenue, and if the committee will specify how much they will expend in the city of Washington I am one Member who is willing to vote for it, and I am not afraid to do it. But I will never surrender as long as I am here, my rights as a Member of the great House of Representatives, in the performance of my duty as a Congressman.

I say to you you have no constitutional right to delegate your power to some department of the Government. There is no safeguard given here. You can not say how much shall be spent in the District of Columbia. Why, after this bill is through, instead of voting for a bill that picks out the towns, they say that they know more about it; let us pick out the towns. It is a right and responsibility that you want to exercise in designating the city and say how much shall go to that particular city.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is there any limitation at all as to how much they can spend on any one building?

Mr. McKEOWN. There is no limitation at all that safeguards the amount to be spent.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman remember the history of the Federal reserve bank in New York, which shocked the country so that we had to put a limit on the amount that they could spend on the building?

Mr. McKEOWN. Well, I have enough confidence in the good judgment of men on that side of the House to believe that they will force this committee to go out and bring in a bill here designating the amount of money needed in the city of Washington and different places in the United States, and we will vote for it. I will go further and say I am willing to vote for public buildings needed wherever they may be, even if Oklahoma does not get a single building.

Mr. TEMPLE. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman stated a while ago that he had confidence in the judgment of the Members on this side of the House. He does not limit his confidence to this side of the House, does he?

Mr. McKEOWN. No; but this bill was offered on this side of the House and——

Mr. CARTER. Would the gentleman limit it on this side of the House?

Mr. McKEOWN. Not at all.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Would not the fair way be to arrange this bill so as to distribute these buildings through the folding room? [Laughter.]

Mr. McKEOWN. That would be justice as compared with the proposed bill.

I am going to tell you what is the matter. When you come to ask the committee to designate the place and amount the reply is that that is "pork barrel legislation." The difference between that, gentlemen, and the present bill which is offered to the present Members of the House is, "Who is going to hand out the pork?" You are going to let the Treasury and the Postmaster General distribute the "pork," whereas under the old form of bill you reserve to Congress itself the right to hand it out.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Why does the gentleman express such a lack of confidence in the executive officers of the Government when Congress has given to the President of the United States the power to equalize tariff duties?

Mr. McKEOWN. That is done so that there may be equality and in order that no particular injury may be done to any particular importer.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will ask the gentleman if in the river and harbor bill the execution of the different items was not intrusted to the Army engineers?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I was one of the men who opposed the river and harbor bill on the principle that the bill as passed does not conform to the form heretofore employed, in that it did not designate particularly the specific projects and fix the specific amount. I am not opposing the public building bill on the ground of public economy, but the proposition I am opposed to is to surrender the power of Congress to legislate upon the locations and amount of authorizations and to invest that power in some bureau where we do not know how the power is going to be used. That is such a departure from the usual form of legislation that I can not see how gentlemen of the House can bring themselves to vote for a measure of that kind.

Now, gentlemen, we surely are not ready to surrender this $150,000,000 of authorizations and repeal all the safeguards as to the contracts. This measure has no safeguard as to the amount of architectural fees that are to be paid to outside architects. It has no protection as to the amount of estimates of the contracts. It repeals the law that provides that an estimate must be made, and that the building must be constructed within the limit of cost that is fixed. It is against the law to build a building costing beyond the estimate fixed by Congress. Yet we put this all in one bill and say we will give that power entirely to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Gentlemen, I want to say here and now that we have surrendered from time to time our functions and our power as Congressmen to the departments. We have been tending toward centralization until the time has come when we are going to have to go and decentralize the Government and send it back to the several States, where it naturally belongs, and does belong.

Talk about a "pork barrel!" I once defined on this floor what "pork" is. It is simply nothing more than a case where one man has a public building and does not need another, and another man needs one, and that is "pork" in the estimation of the man who has one already.

The term "pork barrel" was initiated or inaugurated by some facetious newspaper or magazine writer. Are we to be swept off our feet and afraid to be criticised by some newspaper or magazine writer somewhere who cries "Pork!" "Pork!"? Why not divide the country into districts, and say how much of the appropriation shall be spent in each district? Under the proposed bill a Member from Oklahoma would not have half a chance to get a building. [Laughter.]

Send this bill back to the committee and let them bring in what is needed immediately for the District with a provision for the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General to make a survey and report to the next Congres as to the needs of the country.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill known as H. R. 5083, providing for the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Maryland, on December 11 last, through the chairman, Mr. GRAHAM, reported the bill to the House with a unanimous favorable recommendation. Mr. GRAHAM, in his report, stated that the appointment of this additional judge was greatly needed in that district and was necessary for the proper administration of justice there, and that such a provision had been recommended by the council of judges. That bill was on the Union Calendar and yesterday it was transferred to the Consent Calendar. There are in the House a number of gentlemen who have rendered a great public service by carefully scrutinizing the Consent Calendar, and——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, rising to a point of order, how did the distinguished white-charger rider from Baltimore get the floor?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I was yielded to.

The CHAIRMAN. How did the gentleman from Texas get the floor? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I am making a point of order. If the gentleman from Maryland is going to discuss his bill, time should be yielded to him.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The floor was yielded to me informally by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the committee has not any time to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is not recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDLIN].

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], chairman of the committee, has expired, and the acting chairman, Mr. WASON, has no right to yield time on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is recognizing the gentleman from Louisiana, the only gentleman who has time.

Mr. SANDLIN. What is the status as to time, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana has four and three-quarter minutes remaining. The Chair understood that the gentleman was permitting the gentleman from Maryland to proceed.

Mr. SANDLIN. I promised him time.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I asked for recognition to put in two or three brief letters.

Mr. SANDLIN. If the gentleman would ask it, it would be all right.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am almost through.

Mr. Chairman, this bill being on the Consent Calendar, I would like to ask unanimous consent——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands it. The gentleman from Texas need not inform the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. I am exercising my rights, and the Chair can exercise his.

Mr. SANDLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland 15 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by putting in a brief

letter from the Attorney General and a letter from the chairman and committee of the Bar Association of Baltimore on this question. This bill is unanimously favored by the Judiciary Committee, urged by the Attorney General, and needed in Maryland. I make this statement now and insert these letters in the RECORD in the hope that no gentleman will object to the consideration of the bill when the Consent Calendar is called next Thursday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letters referred to follow:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1925.

Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: Permit me to thank you for your letter of January 2 and to advise that you are correctly informed as to the attitude of this department regarding an additional judge for the district of Maryland.

Under date of December 24, 1924, we advised Judge Soper as follows: "The statistics now available, and which were not available in January of this year, indicate that congestion has doubled in the district of Maryland, nothwithstanding your own very commendable efforts. I think you are to be congratulated upon the number of cases disposed of in the last fiscal year, and I fully appreciate that you can not be expected to work indefinitely at the rate you have been working. In view of the number of cases disposed of, the increase in congestion, and the certainty that there is very little prospect of there being a reduction in the number of cases filed, I believe that this department can consistently advise Congress that the situation in Maryland has now become more urgent."

We also assured him that the Attorney General agreed with the judicial conference as to the need for an additional judge and would gladly so recommend.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

RUSH L. HOLLAND,
Assistant Attorney General.

BALTIMORE, *January 8, 1925.*

Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL HILL: The Bar Association of Baltimore City has appointed the undersigned a committee for the purpose of furthering the enactment of your bill, known as H. R. 5083, providing for the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Maryland, which, through your efforts, was favorably reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The urgency of the need for the appointment of an additional district judge in Maryland has been recognized by the Chief Justice; Judge Woods, senior circuit judge of the fourth circuit; Circuit Judge Rose, formerly district judge of Maryland; the present District Judge Soper; and by Maryland lawyers generally.

The volume of business has been and is increasing very rapidly. Exclusive of bankruptcy cases, which require considerable time and attention from the court, the number of cases docketed was 1,043, 1,473, and 1,997 for the years 1922, 1923, and 1924, respectively; that is to say, was increasing at the rate of 45 per cent per year. The number of cases disposed of for the same years respectively was 1,033, 1,347, and 1,652, with the result that at the end of 1924 the cases pending numbered 692.

The 127 district judges for the whole of the United States disposed in 1923 of 97,068 cases, exclusive of bankruptcy cases, or an average of 764 cases for each judge (report of Attorney General for 1923, p. 114), which was less than one-half the number of cases disposed of during 1924 by the present district judge for the district of Maryland. The disposal of the very large number of cases during 1924 was made possible only through the holding of court for unusually long hours and by almost continuous work at night by the judge, with resultant mental and physical demands which can not conceivably be permanently continued. It is obvious, therefore, that the limit for disposition of cases by the present judge has approximately been reached, and that unless an additional judge is immediately appointed the end of the current year will witness our dockets congested, with cases undisposed of exceeding 1,000.

Not alone is the volume of business growing, but the importance of the civil litigation is of increasing magnitude and requires longer periods of time for their trial. The situation is acute and is unjust alike to the court, to litigants, and to the attorneys practicing before the court, and unless relief is afforded promptly it will not be long before the "law's delay" in our local District Court may often defeat justice.

Our committee, both individually and as a group, are willing to cooperate with you in any way in which you may desire to make manifest to the responsible leaders of the House the imperativeness of immediate enactment of your H. R. 5083.

Very truly yours,

Clarence K. Bowie, chairman; Charles H. Knapp; Randolph Barton, jr.; Charles P. Coady; A. W. W. Woodcock; S. K. Dennis; George Weems Williams; J. Kemp Bartlett; Jesse N. Bowen, president Baltimore City Bar Association.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting part of an editorial from the Manufacturers' Record, entitled "The so-called child labor amendment."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I made the request for leave to extend and revise my remarks for the purpose of including in the RECORD an editorial from the Manufacturers Record, first, because this editorial contains a copy of a letter material to the subject matter as related to Georgia from Hon. S. G. McLendon, secretary of state of the State of Georgia, which refers to the last report of Hon. H. M. Stanley, the commissioner of commerce and labor of the State of Georgia, and in the second place and particularly for the reason that the State of Georgia has been misrepresented throughout the United States upon its action on the child labor amendment, and likewise misrepresented not only by persons in public addresses but by newspapers, which misrepresentation broadcasted throughout the land charges that Georgia not only has no child labor laws but tolerates the working in cotton mills children of tender years.

The Georgia law upon this subject is found in Parks Code of Georgia, sections 3149 (a), (e), and (g), the substance of which provides that no child under the age of 14 years shall be employed by or be permitted to work in or about any mill, factory, laundry, manufacturing establishment, or place of amusement, except that children over 12 years of age who have widowed mothers dependent upon them for support, or orphan children over 12 years of age dependent upon their own labor for support, may work in such places. There is also provided in the Georgia law a penalty for violation of this statute.

Notwithstanding this, it appears in a speech by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt recently delivered in New York in which she said "there is no child-labor prohibition in Georgia"; and that the Cincinnati Times-Star in a recent issue in defense of the child labor amendment made a similar statement, and that one woman in California, describing child-labor conditions, charged that she had seen many children 4 years of age working in southern cotton mills.

The editor of this editorial has done the State of Georgia a great favor by exposing such silly misstatements:

THE SO-CALLED CHILD LABOR AMENDMENT

When Massachusetts, long noted for its devotion to the welfare of children and to their amplest protection, after a full discussion of the proposed child labor amendment voted overwhelmingly against the amendment, the advocates of this amendment were so startled that ever since then they have been trying to put forth with the utmost unblushing effrontery false arguments of every kind to show why Massachusetts had changed its position. Some of them claimed, with utter absurdity, that because some Massachusetts people were interested in some southern cotton mills they used their power to persuade the people of Massachusetts to vote against the amendment. A more ridiculous proposition was never put forward. * * *

As a matter of fact, leading educators at the head of great institutions of learning in Massachusetts, and women almost without number devoted to the welfare of children, but realizing the danger of the amendment, presented the matter through the press, through pamphlets, and in public addresses, showing how dangerous would be such an amendment and how it would utterly ruin the childhood of all coming generations.

Many proponents of this scheme have said that it was "absurd" to suppose that Congress would pass a law, for the enforcement of the amendment, which would be dangerous to the country. But they overlook the fact, or ignore it, that the Congress which passed such a bill would have no compunctions of conscience against passing a law for the strict enforcement of this amendment.

Congress, some said, is elected by the American people and, therefore, we would never have a Congress which would go directly contrary

to the views of the public at large in the passing of a bill for the enforcement of the amendment. * * * Neither Congress nor the Federal bureaus established in Washington ever fail to go to the very limit of their power. Every bureau created continues to expand its activities, to demand more and more for carrying out its projects, and grows constantly by what it feeds upon in its autocratic activities.

This proposed amendment would take from the States and from parents the entire control of all children until they had passed their eighteenth year. It is a direct and terrific attack upon home life, as well as upon the rights of individual States. * * * Thousands of honest-minded men and women, misled by the propaganda in its favor, and thinking only of the humanitarian point of view which they believe it is intended to carry out, are innocently at work for this amendment. * * *

The kind of stuff which is unblushingly put forward in behalf of this amendment is illustrated in a speech by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National League of Women Voters, recently delivered in New York, in which she said:

> "Massachusetts defeated the child labor measure, because the Massachusetts mill owners control factories in Georgia where there is no child labor prohibition."

It would be mild to say that this is a falsehood so glaring that anyone who is misled thereby must, indeed, be very poorly informed or else very weak minded. Georgia has most excellent child labor laws. It protects its children in all lines of employment. And yet it has been maligned, and maligned time and again, as other Southern States have been, by just such wild, untruthful statements as those credited in a quoted paragraph in the New York Herald-Tribune from an address by Mrs. Catt.

W. M. McCormick, a leading business man of Baltimore, and president of the Baptist Children's Aid Society of Maryland, in a letter to the Manufacturers Record, called attention to a statement which he had heard in a recent address by a prominent religious leader, and said:

> "I could not believe this, and so wrote to the secretary of state asking for the facts, and am to-day in receipt of a letter from him, a copy of which I am inclosing. I can not help believing that this propaganda against the South originated with those interested in the mills in the North, and I earnestly hope you will find space in your paper to deny these statements, because they are doing our country harm.
>
> "The child-labor amendment is a vicious measure, and I am going to fight it when it comes up in our State. I am interested in children, being, as you know, president of the Baptist Children's Aid Society of Maryland."

The following letter from Judge McLendon, secretary of state of Georgia, in reply to the question raised by Mr. McCormick, shows how absolutely false is the address heard by Mr. McCormick in a Baltimore church.

Judge McLendon's letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Atlanta, Ga., December 2.

Mr. WILLOUGHBY M. MCCORMICK,
Baltimore, Md.

MY DEAR SIR: I am just in receipt of your favor of November 28, in which you say: "Last evening I heard a prominent speaker state that there are 60,000 children in the State of Georgia employed in the mills, not on farms, their ages ranging from 10 to 14 years." You express doubt as to the accuracy of this statement and ask me for the facts. The facts are these:

In Georgia there are 190 textile mills, employing a capital of something over $150,000,000. According to the last report of the commissioner of commerce and labor, Hon. H. M. Stanley, who is an officer and a man of the very highest character, there were in Georgia during the year 1923, 49,432 white persons employed in these 190 mills. In addition to these, there were 4,758 colored employees, not as operatives, but as porters, truck drivers, warehousemen, etc.

Of the white employees there were 44 males under 14½ years of age and 27 females, making in all 71 out of nearly 50,000.

The Georgia law prohibits the employment of persons under 14½, the only exception being orphans over 12 and under 14½ who may be earning their own living, or son or daughter of a widowed mother to whose support the children contribute.

There were in Georgia over 14½ and up to 16, 574 males and 526 females, making 1,100. Of all persons over 16 there were 28,925 white males and 19,400 females, making a total of 48,325. These are actual facts as nearly as they can be told in figures. I inclose copy of Commissioner Stanley's report for 1923, that for 1924 not yet being published, and refer you to page 16. I inclose copy of the Georgia child labor law, in which you will observe that the education of children in factories is well guarded, and this law is rigidly enforced by mill owners in Georgia.

Not only is this true, but the mill village is a new chapter in the industrial life of working people, which, I believe, is peculiar to the South. Not over a dozen of Georgia's textile mills are located in large cities. The great majority of them are located either in or near the smaller towns of the State, and the mill settlement is the property of the company owning and operating the mill. This company furnishes shelter, fuel, and light at rates below those paid by any mill operatives elsewhere, I dare say, on this continent. For instance, in these mill villages the rents charged run from 12½ cents per room per week up to $1 per room per week. The cottages occupied by operatives vary in size, so that families of different numbers may be accommodated in perfectly clean, sanitary buildings with clean, sanitary surroundings.

To go a trifle more into detail, in 1921 there were 188 operatives paying 12½ cents per room per week. There were 8,315 paying 25 cents per room per week. There were 890 paying 50 cents per room per week, and 1,496 paying $1 per room per week. There were many, of course, paying intermediate sums, but none more than $1 per room per week.

The mill owners provide nurseries, kindergartens, schools, swimming pools, libraries, hospitals, Y. M. C. A. halls, churches, playgrounds, doctors, nurses, and teachers for the children of their operatives.

I am sending you, under separate cover, "Industrial Georgia," recently published by the Georgia Railway & Power Co., beautifully illustrated. In so far as that company furnishes power for about a dozen mills, pictures in this booklet can be duplicated from all the other mill villages in Georgia.

It is amazing that Georgia seems to have been picked out as the special target for all the venom and misrepresentation which characterizes this propaganda in support of an amendment the adoption of which would overturn the civilization of this continent, because it would destroy the homes of the people.

Very truly yours, S. G. MCLENDON,
Secretary of State.

* * * The man who stands before the public as a supposed leader, whether in politics or in religious work; who utters statements which are not absolutely provable and which he has not taken the trouble to prove before uttering them, is a false leader and to the utmost extent of his influence is injuring the religious life of the country, for he is making thinking people feel that nothing that such men say is worthy of confidence.

What such men have said about the child labor amendment, however, is only indicative of the kind of falsehood that is being spread broadcast throughout the land by those who are favoring that amendment. For instance, the Cincinnati Times-Star, in a recent issue in defense of the child labor amendment, says:

> "In Ohio we have child labor laws. In Georgia they have not. The Ohio factory owner's products compete with the Georgia factory owner's products, but at the disadvantage caused by the comparatively humanitarian laws of Ohio."

Here is another deliberate falsehood. If the Times-Star did not seek to learn the facts, it was false to its responsibility to its readers, for no paper has a right to make such a deliberate assertion without knowing whereof it speaks. Instead of having no child labor law, Georgia, as shown by Judge McLendon, has a very excellent child labor law, as have all other Southern States.

Moreover, especial consideration should be given in discussions of this kind to the interesting facts set forth in regard to the mill villages of Georgia in Judge McLendon's letter, and these mill villages are typical of the industry in all parts of the South. They furnish superior accommodations and cheaper rents than can be found in any other line of industry in the United States, and instead of being criticized the cotton-mill operators of the South should receive unbounded credit throughout the land for their helpful work in building up the morale, the education, and the religious advancement of their employees.

In the wildest political campaigns in which the utmost bitterness has been developed, sometimes with no regard whatever for the truth, we have never, we think, seen anything quite equal to the untruths, to the misrepresentations, to the half truths, that have been put forward by the advocates of the twentieth amendment. Some of these advocates doubtless intended to be perfectly honest and truthful in their statements, but many of them unquestionably have no desire whatever for truth if they can, by telling an untruth, convert somebody to their way of thinking.

One woman in California, in painting a fearful picture of child-labor conditions, charged that she had seen many children four years of age working in southern cotton mills. That is so unpardonably false that it is difficult to find words in which to characterize it. And yet there are some simple-minded people who swallow it bodily, so gullible are they. The very suggestion of working four-year-old children in a cotton mill is on its face asinine. It is a lie out of the whole cloth. Such a child could no more work in a cotton mill than it could fly; and no cotton manufacturer would under any human condition, even if he had no regard for children, permit children of such an age to fool with costly machinery.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and also to include an article on "Why we prohibit."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the article is.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is an article on "Why we prohibit." It is from Good Housekeeping and I would like to have it printed in 8-point type.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman is not asking much, but I shall not object.

Mr. STEVENSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that unanimous consent does not permit the insertion of anything in 8-point type which is the extension of a gentleman's remarks, and the Committee on Printing has made up its mind to insist upon that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina states the rule accurately. The committee can not give permission for that. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated by him. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a wise observer has said:

> Prohibition may not prohibit, but it does make liquor hard to get, wrong to sell, bad to drink, dangerous to make, and expensive to buy.

After all, is prohibition a success? And why do we prohibit? Let me introduce Mabel Potter Daggett, who answers these questions in Good Housekeeping in a very convincing manner:

> They were speaking of personal liberty. Whose? Why theirs, of course. And their right to the pursuit of a drink. Hadn't it been guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence? And now by a Volstead Act it had been violated! Then in the name of freedom—and while there is any left in the cellar—lift the glasses higher!
>
> Which they are doing, these gentlemen in evening clothes. Sometimes ladies, too, you will find in the glow of the candle-lit dinner table similarly stirred to the defiant defense of principle.
>
> And, of course, ours is a land of liberty, where the very flag waves for freedom. No real American would wish to feel that we are losing ground that way. So the editor of Good Housekeeping said to me, "Suppose you go out and see."
>
> Well, I found Mrs. Collins. And Mrs. Collins tells me that since the enactment of the eighteenth amendment for her and her children it has been a different world.
>
> "How is it different, Mrs. Collins?" I asked.
>
> "Why, look," she exclaimed with an inclusive gesture that swept the room in which we were seated.
>
> There were the green-painted walls of a tenement kitchen. Bright linoleum covered the floor. The tubs were hung with a fresh white valance. The stove shone as if polished with black varnish. A blue-framed mirror over the kitchen sink reflected a picture of the rest of the room—the table, the straight-backed chairs, the little girl at the window with her doll, and the gingham-aproned woman standing with arms akimbo.
>
> Mrs. Collins interpolated: "Maybe you don't know the ways of a man when he's drunk. For 10 years of married life I never before had any furniture that wasn't broke or in pawn."
>
> She swung open a cupboard door. "See my dishes. There ain't so much as a saucer gone from that set. And it used to be I couldn't keep plates enough to set the table.
>
> "That's what I'm tellin' you," she replied. "Mike smashed 'em. Men always will when they're that way. An' there was worse than that he smashed. They will when they're that way. 'Twas the whisky in Mike always made him crazy. But, will you believe it, there's not so much as a black and blue spot on any of my children to-day, praise be to God!
>
> "Of course, there's Johnnie. There's nothing else broke in the house. But there's Johnnie."
>
> The woman before me lifted one corner of her apron to her eyes. At length she managed to tell me.
>
> Johnie is 11. He still has that stiff leg. She had him operated on again last summer at the Hospital for Crippled Children. He walks a great deal better. What was it happened to Johnnie's leg? Why, you see, Johnnie's father broke it.
>
> Then Mrs. Collins hastened to add, "But Mike's not lifted a finger against any of us, not once since the Tub o' Blood was closed."
>
> The saloon with this descriptive title was one of one hundred and seventy-seven that in the wide-open days dotted an area of about eighty city blocks in this particular section of New York lying between Eighth Avenue and the river. Over the bars of these places of public refreshment there passed annually some $3,350,000 from the wages of the workingmen. It made an enormous deficit in what the homes hereabouts had left to pass over the counters of the grocer and the butcher.
>
> Michael Collins, his wife says, never could get by the Tub of Blood on his way to and from the wharves without stopping for a drink Saturday nights, when the big ships were in and he'd have maybe thirty or forty dollars in his pocket. Sometimes he'd stay right through Sunday and come home Monday to go to bed with a whisky bottle for a week.
>
> "Times like that," Mrs. Collins said, "a man's a beast. You don't know the things a woman has to do. It's the women that has done 'em knows. A man just lies there for days, an' you have to wait on him. It's no use to say you won't. It has to be done.
>
> "Sometimes it's not so stupid drunk as that they are, but ugly, an' then they're dangerous. Either way they lose a lot o' time layin' off work. So often like that with Mike, there was nothin' at all comin' in. Any money he had, God knows I needed. I had to go through his pockets to get it.
>
> "One night I hadn't waited until he was deep enough in his sleep. He heard me. 'Twas only 50 cents I found. But he cursed me and said he'd have it back. My children needed milk. I wouldn't give it to him. But he got me down in a corner. Then he put me out in the snow in my nightgown and bare feet. When I came back, he only threw me downstairs again. Before I could get the cop on the beat he was smashin' everythin' that night. It was the stove lid he threw at Johnnie broke Johnnie's leg.
>
> "The judge gave him six months on the island that time. The children had to be sent to the Welfare Home while I was in the hospital. The baby that was born there died. The doctor said, you see, it hadn't been good for me bein' thrown downstairs like that when my time was so near.
>
> "After that, Mike swore he'd never touch another drop. But it just wasn't no use. In no time he was back in the Tub again. When he'd beat us the worst, I could have him arrested. But it was gettin' bad for Eddie, too, in other ways. Eddie was 10 then. He wouldn't stay in any more when his father was drunk. He'd sleep on a cellar gratin' or under a stair or anywhere so's not to be kicked. An' out that way so much Eddie was beginnin' to get in with the gang. When I'd be worryin' the most about Eddie, I'd have his father put away again for nonsupport.
>
> "But what could I do then? There was always the children to feed an' the rent to pay. I went washin' as much as I could. Katie was 7 an' could mind the younger ones. But all I could do was never enough. There was never shoes to go 'round. I put mine on Eddie once when his father was entirely gone. The children at school laughed an' called him 'High-Heeled Annie.' He stayed out of school for a week, hangin' round with the Gattlin' Gang. I didn't know till the truant officer came. The officer said he'd see about the shoes. He fixed it so we got them from the society. From the society, too, we had to have orders for coal when we was freezin', orders for groceries when we was starvin'.
>
> "Sure, now, you see what I mean; it's a different world since the Tub o' Blood is closed. Maybe there's other ways he could find it. But Mike says: 'Fifty cents the drink. Why, all I could get 'ud be only an annoyance. An' you never can tell when it's poison.'
>
> "No," she affirmed, "Mike's off the stuff entirely. See that full coal hod?" Mrs. Collins picked it up joyfully and mended her fire. "Feel that linoleum?" She walked across it with pride. "It's the best quality from the Star Department Emporium." Seating the little girl on her lap, she extended one small foot. "There's my Mamie's shoes. I paid $5.65 for them at the new store that's moved in right where the Tub used to be.
>
> "You see, now on Saturday nights when Mike comes in, he just throws his envelope into my lap an' says: 'That's for you, Mother. I ain't got no use for it any more.' That way now I've always enough to do with. I'm not goin' scrubbin' any more. I'm keepin' my own house clean an' my children off the street as any woman should. Eddie ain't runnin' with the gang any more. He's 14. But there's nights he'll just sit around the table with the others a listenin' to the tales of the sea his father tells 'em.
>
> "Nor we ain't the only ones to whom luck has come. Mike had us all to the movin' picture show on Christmas Eve. Next day the cop says to him: 'I seen you an' the missus an' the kids at the show last night. An' there was at least 10 more of the boys went in like that with their families. The more power to you,' he says. 'For it was the bunch of you in the old days we'd have had in the lock-up by Christmas mornin'.'"
>
> Mrs. Collins was setting her table for dinner. She had spread it with a gay red cloth. On it she had placed the sliced meat left from Sunday. I looked to see. It was a roast of lamb.
>
> And I went down the tenement stairs reflecting on new liberties established, the assurance for Mrs. Collins and her children of the right to personal safety of life and limb, and to roast lamb, and a number of things.

The butcher down the street told me: "Yes; that's right. Roast lamb's the regular Sunday order around here. The trade picked up right after prohibition. But lately," he added, "I don't like the looks of things. The roast lamb orders, I notice, are falling off a little. You see, the saloons are creeping back. That's bad for the women and kids."

There was a boy who thought that, too. And he wrote a letter to the governor of New York State. This was how it read:

"Dear Governor Smith:

"I heard my father say you might sign your name to a beer bill. And my mother is afraid that there may be beer again and may be whisky. Please, Governor Smith, do not sign it. Because then, you see, my father may be drunk again. And when he is drunk there is never enough to eat or anything. And he is always hitting us and making mother cry all the time. And he hasn't been drunk now in a long time, because the saloons are closed. Yours very truly, Charlie Davis."

At the dining-room table at his home in Brooklyn Charlie one night had sat copying something over and over. When he went to bed his mother had picked up from the floor the scrap of paper that she now took from her bureau drawer and passed to me to read. On it was scrawled in a school-boy hand the first draft of this letter that went to a governor.

"We've had three years of heaven, my husband and the children and I," Mrs. Davis said. "Now," and she beckoned me to the window, "see that saloon down the street. I don't know what they're selling there. But men go in and come out reelin'. And," she ended with a sob, "it's been three times already with my husband."

Charlie himself had come in from school and walked with me as I went away. "Do you think the governor got my letter?" he asked. "Anyhow it didn't do any good about the saloons. Isn't there any one can do something, don't you think, about father? You see, my father don't want to drink. He's so sorry when he's sober. He kisses mother and says he'll never do it again. Father'd be all right, you see, if somebody'd only help. Don't you think that somebody will be able to do something?"

"I hope so," I tried to reply encouragingly. But it wasn't enough. "It surely must be that somebody will do something," I had to add very earnestly before the beseeching young eyes let me go.

Up in Boston there is another exhibit that I want to present. Mr. Easton used to be a barn man in charge of the delivery wagons for one of the large department stores. But because he was almost always at least a glass of beer drunk, he was continually getting stepped on or kicked or otherwise injured. And so he was often laid up out of work. Besides, there were the periodical sprees that now and then landed him in jail. Somebody had to supplement the family income. Mrs. Easton used to put the children to bed at seven o'clock and go out scrubbing office buildings until one in the morning. As Mr. Easton got worse, Robert, the eldest boy, had to leave school with his "working papers" and go to a factory. Then there was sickness and high prices, and the family had to have other aid.

But now, to-day, the Eastons are among those who, like the Collins family, have dropped out of the charity records. And they had moved so far away out of their poverty and up in the scale of comfort that I had difficulty in locating them.

Mrs. Easton, wiping up the floor in her neat four-room apartment, rose from her knees and dried her hands. "It's me that knows the misery there is in drink," she said. "All he earned, my man used to leave at the saloon. Oh, the tears I wept and the prayers I said! And nothing at all did any good until the places closed so it wasn't right within his easy reach. Now I don't have to go scrubbin' any more. He brings his pay envelope home every week. And we're livin' like folks. And I put by $5 every month in a bank account. And Robert, since his father stopped drinkin', I was able to put back in school. In another year he'll be ready for the printer's trade."

Mrs. Easton stopped for a moment. Then, "My man ain't spendin' anything for drink," she said slowly, "but," she added, "still there's times it's given to him that we once in awhile have the trouble. You see, he works in a garage now. He's the kind that pleases the fine people, an' they pass him a bottle for a tip. I say to him, 'Why don't you tell them you don't want the stuff that's only made misery for you and your family?' But he says he has to be obligin'. So once in awhile there's trouble. An' it's so hard for my girl that's a Girl Scout, and the other children, to have folks think their father's a drunkard."

The shadow on Mrs. Easton's face deepened. "My heart's in my mouth now because he didn't show up for dinner to-day. An' I'm watchin' the door to see. I'm so fearful he'll have somethin' on him to-night. I'll know before he opens the door. For he'll stumble a little on the stairs. An' the first look in his eyes, I'll see."

With a sigh of resignation, she added: "But, praise be to God, it's so much better than it once was! It's only now and then. And it used to be all the while."

I left Mrs. Easton straining for the sound of the stumbling step on the stair. And in another quarter of the city I found the Burke family. They live in a little house in a back court. You might not think the house so fine. But Mrs. Burke is quite happy about it. There were more children at school. But three or four were tumbling over the doorsill. And one of these Mrs. Burke picked up for me to see.

"This," she said, "I call my prohibition baby. It's the only one of my eight that was born above ground. Always, before we came here, we had to live in some dark basement. Now I buy six quarts of milk a day for my children. And Willie always gets an extra portion."

Willie, who is five, is twenty pounds underweight. The doctor thinks he is tuberculous. The family used to lead a miserable existence. Mrs. Burke went out washing, and the father went on periodical sprees. But it's not happened since the Bunker Hill went out of business. Mr. Burke is working steadily now at a brush factory.

In Providence, R. I., in the outskirts of the city, and set a little back from the street on which it stands, is a trim gray and white cottage. There are marigolds and larkspur abloom in the front yard in summer. In the rear is a fine large garage with a sign above the door, "Patrick Kelly, Electric Trucking." You'll find the name listed, too, in the telephone directory. Patrick Kelly is a business man now. Once he was a drunken teamster usually out of a job. And if he earned $15 a week, his family was lucky to get $5. There were seven children. The family lived anyway they could in back alleys and side courts. Charitable organizations furnished some of their food. The eldest little girl gathered what wood and coal they had from the dumps. When there was no money for shoes, the cinders cut her feet cruelly. Mrs. Kelly went washing, of course. A good deal of his time Patrick Kelly spent in jail. Once, after lying out drunk in a storm, he contracted pneumonia, and from the prison hospital ward word was sent that he wouldn't live. Mrs. Kelly "washed the curtains for a funeral." But Patrick Kelly didn't die. He lived to be drunk many times more. Once, in a murderous frenzy, he attacked his wife and daughters with a carving knife. Two policemen overpowered him and carried him away to a cell.

That was his record over and over, until prohibition arrived and the lights went out in Murphy's saloon. The next day Kelly came home. He'd been away for a week drinking. Somehow now he was sober.

"Maggie," he said, going down on his knees beside his wife where she sat in the kitchen peeling potatoes, "if you take me back just once more, I'll never touch another drop. I mean it, Maggie. Murphy's is closed."

Well, that promise, by the help of God—and also by the help of the Volstead act—Patrick Kelly has been able to keep. The little parlor where I heard about it has a Brussels rug on the floor and green plush upholstered furniture and a polished new piano. A girl came tripping down the stairs in the hall.

"This is my daughter, Eileen," Mrs. Kelly said.

She was a pretty girl ready for the evening in a party dress. Hoops of green, that looked like jade, swung from her small ears, and on her feet were satin slippers. And this was the girl who had gathered coal from the dumps. Such is the fairy magic that was wrought by the pen that signed the new amendment.

But Eileen isn't all. Mrs. Kelly's eyes are the eyes of a happy woman. The short sleeves and the round-cut neck of her blue house-gown revealed plump arms and a white throat. It caught the gleam of a gold necklace.

Mrs. Kelly blushed like a girl. "It's my prohibition present," she admitted. "I got it the Christmas after Murphy's closed.

"'Will ye give me a good dinner if I give ye somethin', Maggie? Pat says to me.

"'Oh, go 'long wid ye,' I says. 'There's always a good dinner for ye when there's the makin's of one in the house.'

"'But Maggie,' he says awkward like, 'I got somethin' fer ye.' An' he pushed a little white box in my hand, an' there the necklace lay in blue velvet. Pat took it out. I couldn't. An' he clasped it on my neck. I ain't never had it off. An' I never shall.

"It seemed like," she said it very softly, "it seemed like when he put the ring on my finger."

She reached in her dress for the locket. As she opened it for me to see, she said defensively: "It was only the drink in my man made him not himself. There's not a better man anywhere than Patrick sober."

And I looked with interest at the handsome Irish face that has managed to hold a woman's love for better, for worse, through so many years of the worst of it.

That can't always be done. In a Pennsylvania factory town, I talked with Mrs. Parker, to whom also "the luck has come." But there's a note of hardness in her voice that hides a broken heart. "The only way you can be sure of a man," she says, "is when he can't get it. I scrubbed eight children through school while their father's money went for whisky. The works kept back the rent from his wages, and the Society helped. Now Frank Parker hasn't been drunk for seven years, not since our town went dry locally. He's got $1,100 in the bank." She brought the bank book for me to see.

"He gives me half the pay envelope," she continued. "I said I'd take mine where I could see it. And I have. The player piano, there,

cost $250. There's a full coal-bin in the cellar. This house I paid $4,000 for. I bought it in war time, and there was some thought the price was too high. But, you see, I've wanted a home all my life. I couldn't wait. Then the location, too, counted. But I said I'd lived all my married life in back alleys. Now I'd have my house right on Main Street."

We sat talking like this in the comfortable sitting room. Suddenly, as I looked into the eyes of the woman before me, I knew. The voice had trailed away in an echo that rang from all the homes through which I had passed.

"So the last time the judge's wife sent for me to wash, I told her I wasn't doing any washing now but my own—"

And it was not alone Mrs. Parker and Mrs. Collins and the rest who spoke. But I had found one whom all of us have missed, our Long Lost Washerwoman. The shadow of her was outlined against the tenement and all the miserable little homes across the railroad tracks in all the small towns. She flashed for an instant before me with her bent shoulders and her bedraggled skirts and her slouching step. Then she was gone. Something tells me we shall not see her again. Women don't wash for other women when they don't have to. When their husband's don't drink, they don't have to.

Oh, I know it's not so good for us—for you and me and the judge's wife. But see what it is for the washerwoman's children.

There's this to remember, too, that when boys and girls go wrong, there are taxes to pay for arresting them. Since the coming of prohibition Chicago has about 1,500, and New York 3,000 fewer arrests per year for juvenile delinquency than was the average for the wet years. In some of the districts of the large cities, there are now fewer calls in a year than formerly in a month, for the services of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. School departments everywhere report that where children were once getting working papers, they are now remaining in school to get an education. Philadelphia has some interesting records showing that where formerly between 100 and 200 children a month were withdrawn from school to supplement a family income depleted by a drunken father, the average now is about 15.

Sociologists have pronounced the Volstead Act the greatest child welfare measure ever invented. It is going far also to eliminate poverty. The partial prohibition enforcement that now prevails has already lifted above the ranks of the submerged so many Collinses and Kellys, and Davises, and thousands of others, that statistics give us a startled pause as we read them. In Detroit, poorhouse admissions dropped from 2,214 before, to 800 after prohibition. The Boston Family Welfare Society in 1917 had drink a factor in 27 per cent of its cases, and in 1920 in but 2½ per cent. In some of the smaller towns like Fitchburg, Mass., the number of families requiring assistance has been cut 50 per cent. And 21 of the large cities of the United States, including New York and Chicago, show an average drop of 74 per cent in cases in which drink is a factor in the family breakdown.

Beyond these publicly tabulated figures are other thousands who have found freedom from poverty. There are even homes that never experienced privation, which nevertheless before the coming of the new order were missing much that they might have had. In Philadelphia, in one of the little red brick houses that stand all in a row, an excited and happy woman exclaimed to me:

"For 20 years we've paid rent here, now we've just bought the house."

Like this all through the country, you find people buying and building houses. There is one other striking evidence of what has occured. It's the automobiles that are being purchased. Up in the little town of Ipswich in Massachusetts, the chairman of the board of selectmen said to me:

"Before prohibition we used to have the automobile agency in this town. Now we have five automobile salesrooms. And folks own cars who never before had the money to buy a wheelbarrow."

The factories, too, tell the same story. Packingtown, the dwelling section back of Chicago's stockyards, has a line of automobiles to rival a millionaire's row. It is an industrial district that most vividly reflects the prohibition panorama.

Let's look at Coatesville. This is a Pennsylvania town of about 15,000 population. And Coatesville got a good running start on some of the rest of us by going dry locally about 1912. Of course, they had some wets who were as resentful about it as were those in New York State who have secured the repeal of the enforcement law. In Coatesville, too, they got the bars back. Then a drunken man killed a policeman, and a drunken mob lynched the murderer. And the evidence was at hand that banished booze once and for all. In 1916 Coatesville was permanently dry.

To-day they show you the results. Poverty has practically disappeared. Some families went right off the relief lists on to the banking lists. When only four months of prohibition, the Coatesville savings deposits had jumped by $257,000. Now, on Saturday nights at the banks, you may see the long lines of workingmen slipping over the counter through the teller's window the pay envelopes that used to go over the bar. At the great steel plant 500 workingmen come to their daily labor in their own cars. With employees entirely sober, accidents from careless handling of machinery have dropped 54 per cent, and absences from work, with the elimination of Saturday night sprees, have decreased 80 per cent. Prosperity is everywhere apparent. Three new churches have been built, and homes for which women have waited. Out on the edge of the city, a whole colony of them has been erected since the owners changed the place of deposit for their savings from the saloon to the bank. Many of the colony are foreigners, who formerly had deemed it as necessary to "drink" as to eat.

Ludock came from some place in what is now Czechoslovakia, 27 years ago. He was a good workingman. But when Coatesville went dry, he went in despair to the superintendent of the mill.

"No beer, no whisky, me no kin work," he protested in all seriousness.

He was told that these were inexorable conditions. A few weeks passed. Ludock returned with a radiant face and a bright idea.

"No beer, no whisky, me buy a house," he declared.

Others of the employees became converts to Ludock's plan, and the colony grew. To-day Ludock owns his own house and two more besides that rent for $30 a month each. All have bath rooms, steam heat, and electric lights. Ludock has now retired from the steel mill to run a jitney that meets the trains at the station. There is also another car in his garage at home.

"What for?" I ask in some bewilderment.

"Why, for my family to use when they come into town," explained Ludock.

No; his property is not quite clear. There is a small mortgage on it. "It costs so much to send a boy to college," says Ludock.

"What?" I asked, thinking I had not heard aright.

But it is so. Ludock's eldest son is studying medicine and is going to be a doctor.

Homes like Ludock's now dot the hillsides hereabout. Even before they could be completed the standard of living in Coatesville had begun to rise. Where the bars went out these stores at once moved in—a 5-cent store, a 10-cent store, a lunch room, a bakery, a fish store, a general market, two clothing stores, and a shoe store. Within four months, after the town went dry, one butcher's sales had jumped by $500 per month, a baker's by $600, and a furniture store reported June and July sales $3,500 a month ahead of those for the corresponding period in the previous year.

With the coming of national prohibition what happened in Coatesville was repeated in America at large. Business began at once to expand. Merchants everywhere made ready. A national drink bill formerly amounting to over $2,000,000,000 yearly had been largely wiped out. It was easy to see how there was going to be money to shop with now. In New York the Bowery turned 44 saloons into 63 stores, and Sixth Avenue 46 saloons into 142 stores. Over on Eighth Avenue, where there used to be three saloons and a pool room to every four corners, you can now count the stores that have come instead. Not so long ago the Star Department Emporium, where Mrs. Collins bought her linoleum, was selling just notions and hosiery and aprons. But with the pay envelope tossed into their laps, the tenement women began to demand much more. And the little store spread into an "emporium," with four great plate-glass windows. There are a good many jewelry stores; men are buying trinkets. There are crockery stores, candy stores, but most of all there are shoe stores. The Tub of Blood isn't the only saloon that has given way to that purpose. It is often so. Two new stores in Denver hung out the sign, "Buy shoes where you used to buy booze." Seattle opened five retail shoe stores in place of five saloons.

Next after shoes, wages that once bought whisky now buy milk. Sales throughout the United States have increased by 26 per cent. When Denver went dry one milk route found its sales had jumped by $150, another by $160, and a third by $450 a month. And in Boston, where the Burke family are getting their six quarts a day, the city's consumption in 1920, in spite of the advance in price, was the highest in a decade.

Like this, conditions everywhere have registered prosperity. Savings bank deposits have risen an average of about 33 per cent. And throughout the country it is families like the Eastons and the Parkers and the Ludocks who are back of this financial phenomenon. It is quite evident that a great many people, perhaps even millions, have been set free for the enjoyment of comfort they never knew before. You really can't count all the new rights that have arrived. But there is one that's unmistakable. Practically the Volstead Act has amounted to an amnesty proclamation for thousands of men previously periodically in jail. In Coatesville the patrol wagon has entirely gone out of business. In New York City, where arrests for intoxication for nine years before prohibition averaged 18,373 yearly, the average for the three years following prohibition dropped to 6,917. Everywhere you find similar statistics. The Chicago workhouse in 1922 had hundreds of empty cells. Within 60 days after Lafayette, Ind., went dry the jail there was without a prisoner, a hitherto unheard of experience in

Tippecanoe County. Now you can't begin to count the places that are through with their jails. The county jail at Newburgh, N. Y., is closed. Ipswich and Newburyport, Mass., have sold theirs. Birmingham, Ala., has turned a $100,000 jail into a school. Surely one of the clearest results of the eighteenth amendment is that a good deal of personal liberty formerly behind the bars has been released.

Even there are gentlemen who never have gone to jail who are not without benefit of prohibition to-day. I know a man who is a commuter and makes his garden and mows his lawn in a charming suburb. Nowadays he no longer comes wavering up the walk from the station. And his wife can go to church on Sunday and look the neighbors in the face without feeling a cringing apology to the community.

There is a woman who spent the night on her knees before a satin quilted bed praying that the Volstead bill might pass next day. After it became a law she notified her lawyer that she had decided not to go on with her divorce.

"If anything should happen that my husband begins drinking again," she told me, "I'm going out with a hatchet, as Mrs. Nation did, and smash the saloons."

"Tell her there's a better way," another woman said to me. "We've got prohibition. What we need is men in office to enforce it. Votes by women can put them there."

And she told me of the save American crusade. Through your Sunday school class or your missionary circle or your woman's club you will hear of it in your town. Organizations representing ten million women are enlisted for next November. Any political candidate, from mayor to President, who gets these votes must pledge himself to the enforcement of the United States Constitution down to the eighteenth amendment.

"There's an Army and Navy to do it with," concluded the lady.

She bears a name that is written into our country's history. Some of her ancestors who wrote it there looked from their framed portraits on the wall of the room in which we sat before an open fire. She wore a lovely dinner gown of old Chinese blue.

"I've dedicated my life to the movement to wipe out alcohol," she said. And the necklace at her throat gleamed and flashed as she leaned forward in the firelight's glow. "You see," she mused, "I know the hell it makes for men and women."

She looked steadily into the fire. "I'm not speaking academically," she added. "I mean Dick. Nothing has ever helped at all until prohibition came. Then for the first time in the terrible years, when the hotels and the clubs went dry, Dick became sober. Only once has he slipped. 'Eleanor,' he said to me, 'the only way I'll ever be safe is when the cursed stuff is out of my reach.'"

Some day it may happen like that, as it did in Kansas. Prohibition began to prohibit out there when there arose a brave man. He was the district attorney who, with a menacing mob at his heels, padlocked every saloon in Kansas City. Then the State of Kansas, showing 40 counties without a prisoner for the penitentiary in 10 years, made its banner record.

The United States is not yet dry like that. But already Mrs. Collins hasn't been thrown downstairs in three years. A great many people have roast lamb for dinner. See all the little children drinking milk. And the shoes on people's feet. And the money in the bank and the coal in the bin. One little old liberty was canceled, the right of a man to the pursuit of a drink. Balance it, if you please, with a world set free for the pursuit of happiness instead.

The great Amercian principle is unimpaired. Let the flag still wave.

And next November, please remember Charlie Davis's father. Surely you're going to help.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, namely:

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

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: Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "the following sums are appropriated."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, which is providing funds merely for the executive and independent offices, seeks to appropriate $452,349,617. This bill does not embrace appropriations for any of the 10 departments of Government, the 10 departments of Government and their respective bureaus all being provided for in other bills. I want to call attention to the fact that this one bill alone appropriates more money than all of the departments of Government and all their bureaus received during many Congresses, embracing them all up to and including the Fiftieth Congress, the total appropriations for all expenses of the entire Government for the year 1890 being only $385,522,367.61.

I will go back to the Forty-third Congress, 1875, and begin with that year, as there is still living and a Member of this House one who was here then. Our distinguished friend from Ohio, General SHERWOOD, was here in 1875 in the Forty-third Congress.

Now, let me show you the total annual appropriations for all of the expenses of the Government in the Forty-third Congress, when our distinguished colleague from Ohio, General SHERWOOD, was then a Member sitting here. There was in the year 1875, covering all of our expenses and for all of the departments and bureaus of Government, only $325,666,791.89 appropriated. The next year in that Congress, 1876, there was $328,128,199.32 appropriated as total governmental expenses for all of the departments. In the Forty-fourth Congress, for the year 1877, there was $299,591,138.70 appropriated, covering all governmental expenses and for all of the departments and bureaus of the Government. In the next year, 1878, there was $296,006,694.21 appropriated, covering all governmental expenses. In the Forty-fifth Congress, for the year 1879, there was $332,407,776.68 appropriated, covering all governmental expenses and for all departments and bureaus. In 1880 there was appropriated for all governmental expenses and for all departments and bureaus only $372,119,629.30. In the Forty-sixth Congress, in 1881, there was for all governmental expenses only $361,572,204.39 appropriated for all the departments and bureaus.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I understood that the gentleman from Louisiana had promised me 15 minutes in general debate, but he did not so understand it and was unable to give me the time, hence I would like to ask for a little more time.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I never definitely promised the gentleman 15 minutes, but I told him I would try to take care of him the best I could. As the gentleman stands on that statement, I want to make the RECORD correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the total appropriations covering all expenses of Government for the year 1882 amounted to only $365,965,479.83. In the Forty-seventh Congress the total appropriations covering all expenses of the Government for the year 1883 amounted to only $422,138,073.31 for all departments and bureaus. The total appropriations for all expenses of Government for the year 1884 amounted to only $355,297,875.23. In the Forty-eighth Congress for the year 1885 the total appropriations covering all expenses of the Government amounted to only $318,829,489.13, while for the year 1886 the total appropriations covering all expenses of the Government amounted to only $336,439,913.20. In the Forty-ninth Congress for the year 1887 the total appropriations for all expenses of the Government amounted to only $387,330,971.99, while for the year 1888 the total appropriations for all expenses of the Government amounted to only $359,011,523.52. In the Fiftieth Congress for the year 1889 the total appropriations for all expenses of the Government amounted to only $408,624,057.37, while for the year 1890 the total appropriations covering all expenses of the Government amounted to only $385,522,367.61, against which compare the present bill now before us, which provides only for the executive and independent offices and does not provide one cent of any of the 10 departments of the Government or any of their many bureaus, yet it appropriates the enormous sum of $452,349,617, which is $66,827,250 more than all of our total governmental expenses were in the year 1890.

Now, remember that I began with the year 1875 in the Forty-third Congress, when our colleague here, General SHERWOOD, began his distinguished service, and then our distinguished colleague from Virginia, Mr. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, also began a distinguished service.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield to me.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman made a mistake historically. Judge HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER was not here in the Forty-third Congress, but his father, Judge John Randolph Tucker, a famous constitutional lawyer, was a Member in 1875. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] was not here until the Fifty-first Congress. I did not want the

gentleman from Virginia classed as an antediluvian in his absence. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I made that mistake by looking at an old RECORD. I thank my friend for correcting it.

Mr. STEVENSON. But his father, John Randolph Tucker, a famous constitutional lawyer, was a Member of this House in the Forty-third Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. But General SHERWOOD was here in the Forty-third Congress; there is no doubt about that, and there is no doubt about the fact that when our distinguished colleague from Ohio, General SHERWOOD, began his service here in 1875 the total appropriations that year for all governmental expenses amounted to only $325,666,791.89; and that in the Fiftieth Congress the total appropriations for all governmental expenses for the year 1890 amounted to only $385,522,367.61, while this bill now before us, providing only for the executive and independent offices alone appropriates $452,349,617, and all of the 10 departments of the Government and their many bureaus get their supply money from other bills.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield? Did the gentleman need for his own support as much 30 years ago as he needs now?

Mr. BLANTON. I will answer that in a moment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman has grown and so has the country.

Mr. BLANTON. Now let us consider the total appropriations in the Fifty-third Congress. In that Congress the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] was here. The Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] was here. In the next Congress, which was the Fifty-fourth Congress, our colleague from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD] was here, and our friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], was here.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That was his father.

Mr. BLANTON. Not according to the directory.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That was the father of the present Mr. CRISP from Georgia.

Mr. BLANTON. No; the gentleman is mistaken. In the Congressional Directory opposite his name it says that our present colleague from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] was here representing his father's old district for the unexpired term in the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman did not come here until the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. The distinguished gentleman from Maryland is mistaken. The RECORD shows differently.

Mr. STENGLE. I think the gentleman from Texas is accurate. I think the gentleman from Georgia succeeded his father at that time.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], our present colleague, was here as a Congressman filling out the unexpired term of his father from the State of Georgia in the Fifty-fourth Congress, according to the directory. But in the preceding Fifty-third Congress, when our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and our present Speaker of the House [Mr. GILLETT] began their service here, the total appropriations for all governmental expenses for the year 1895 were only $459,925,178.62, and for the year 1896 the total appropriations for all governmental expenses were only $457,088,344.72, which that year was just a little over four million more than the appropriations provided in this one bill now before us amount to, and which bill does not provide for any of the 10 departments of the Government or any of their many bureaus. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I simply wanted to state that the country has grown just as the gentleman has grown.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one more minute in order to answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is not complaining about the growth of the country.

Mr. BLANTON. Do not take up my one minute, because I want that to answer the gentleman. These independent offices and special commissions of the Government are growing faster than all the membership of the entire Congress put together, and I am in favor of stopping it. It ought to be stopped, and there must be a stop put to it. When during many Congresses in the life of some of the present Members appropriated annually for all of the departments of Government and for our total governmental expenses nearly $100,000,000 less than this one bill spends simply for the Executive Office and the independent establishments of this Government, and for none of the 10 departments, it is time for the American people to take note of it and to cause steps to be taken through their Congress to stop it. It is growing all the time.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Ninety per cent of this bill is for the Veterans' Bureau; would the gentleman cut that out?

Mr. BLANTON. No; of course, I would not.

Mr. SNELL. Then what are you complaining about?

Mr. BLANTON. But 90 per cent of it is not for the Veterans' Bureau, because the Shipping Board covers more than 10 per cent of the bill alone.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to put in a full table I have prepared covering the remainder of these years.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the manner indicated? Is there objection?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going back to the beginning of the history of this country?

Mr. BLANTON. No; only from the Forty-third Congress down.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, for the Executive Office alone in this bill we are appropriating $75,000 for the President's salary; $7,500 for the President's Secretary; $85,260 for personal services in the office of the President; $35,000 for his contingent expenses, to be expended in the discretion of the President; $2,800 for his printing and binding; $25,000 for traveling and official entertainment expenses of the President, to be accounted for on his certificate solely; $110,000 for the Executive Mansion and grounds; $83,400 for the White House police, which are entirely separate from the other 1,100 policemen of Washington; and $4,000 for uniforming and equipping the White House police.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing and binding, $2,800.

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

I simply do this for the purpose of making clear and correcting the figures given by the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman said over 10 per cent of this bill was for the Shipping Board alone. According to the report which I have in my hand the total of this bill is $452,000,000 and the appropriation for the Shipping Board is $24,330,000. The appropriation for the Veterans' Bureau alone is $405,000,000, which is practically 90 per cent of the full amount of the bill, and therefore the statement of the gentleman is not correct according to this report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman, just to ask the gentleman a question. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York, who is chairman of the Committee on Rules, and is well posted, if it is not a fact that in addition to this $24,000,000 this bill permits the Shipping Board to expend large sums of unexpended balances and revolving funds?

Mr. SNELL. I am talking about the figures that are carried in this bill, and that is what I supposed the gentleman was discussing. That was the information the gentleman gave to the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about what this bill authorizes the Shipping Board to spend.

Mr. SNELL. I am talking about the amount that is appropriated here.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that they have large amounts which they are authorized to expend from unexpended balances and revolving funds?

Mr. WOOD. There are no unexpended balances that they are authorized to spend.

Mr. BLANTON. They have revolving funds from which they are authorized to spend money.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest as a point of order that we have not reached that item of appropriation in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

For expenses of the Alien Property Custodian authorized by the act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended, including personal and other services and rental of quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $4, traveling expenses, law books, books of reference and periodicals, supplies and equipment, and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $188,420, of which amount not to exceed $176,040 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] what, if any, steps are being taken to discontinue and wind up the business of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. WOOD. There are certainly no steps that have been taken except the reports of the Alien Property Custodian, and there can not be any winding up of it until there is some affirmative action by this Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am interested in that for this reason: It has always been stated heretofore that we could not surrender this property of aliens which the Government has custody of until some arrangement was made with Germany for the payment of American claims. We have a treaty with Germany negotiated regularly between this country and Germany, and recently in the financial conference at Paris it was provided that a certain part of the German reparations, a certain percentage, should be turned over to the United States for the payment of these claims. These sums will not be paid to the United States until the expiration of a long period of years. I am wondering if it is the policy of the administration and those who are in control of the Government—and I am not trying to make it a burden on the administration—to wait until we get that money; or should we go on and do what we are going to do about this alien property and turn it back to the claimants if they are entitled to it? Six years have already passed since the close of the war.

Mr. WOOD. My theory is, and I so advocated and expressed myself this afternoon, assuming a basis has been made for the settlement of these claims, the United States Government, relying upon the good faith of the German Government, ought to immediately take some steps to send this property back to the people to whom it belongs and get rid of this activity, which is costing the Government a whole lot of money.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Indiana and I am glad to see that during the colloquy the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], the leader on the majority side, has come in, because I really think this is one place where the Government can economize. We could get rid of this expensive bureau and we could do justice to these aliens because if we intend to turn their property back to them we ought to do it, and if we are not going to turn it back to them but are going to appropriate it for the payment of American claims, we ought to do that.

Mr. WOOD. To my mind there is absolutely no use for the continuation of the Alien Property Custodian, but there has to be some affirmative and constructive legislation before it can be disposed of, and the committee that has that in charge ought to take immediate cognizance of it.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will state to the gentleman from Indiana that an amendment to that effect was offered to the last Alien Property Custodian bill, which was up in the House and the amendment was voted down. I offered an amendment that steps be taken immediately to return all of this property and get out of this business, and that amendment was voted down the last time the committee had that matter up.

Mr. WOOD. I will state, in all fairness, and I think the gentleman will admit, that at that time there had been no definite settlement made with reference to American claims. That has now been done, and as I have said there is no further excuse for a delay in this matter. That was the only excuse for it at that time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, that was not an excuse under the international law that had been in operation between the nations of the earth before that time.

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

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I was wondering if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], who is present, could give the House any assurance that there is anybody looking forward to taking some action to return or to dispose of this question of alien property?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I was not in the Chamber when the gentleman asked the question and I am not aware of what the subject under discussion has been.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The subject is the disposition of alien property and the dicontinuance of the Alien Property Custodian and the return of this property to the alien claimants or its appropriation to the payment of American claims.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If I recollect correctly we passed a bill some time ago providing for taking care of and returning claims less than $10,000 and, as I understand, that took care of 90 per cent of all outstanding claims.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Ninety per cent in number. Now this is an important matter and something ought to be done.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it is an important matter and I will be glad to look into it.

Mr. WOOD. I will say that it was the consensus of the committee that had this under consideration that inasmuch as there had been a scheme provided in the Dawes plan as to the settlement of claims between German citizens and the United States that there is no reason or excuse for continuing this bureau. There are $300,000,000 that ought to be sent back to the people to whom it belongs.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hope the statement of the gentleman from Indiana will not be taken as an expression of the will or wish of the people of this Government; that our return of the property to individuals in Germany was dependent upon any claims that the United States might have against the German people, for the reason that it has never been held that private property of individuals could have been taken to satisfy public obligations.

Mr. WOOD. I agree with the gentleman in principle, but he will admit that that was one of the excuses.

Mr. RAYBURN. But it was only an excuse.

Mr. WOOD. I never agreed to it then and I do not agree to it now.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

The unexpended balances of the appropriations made for the expenses of the American Battle Monuments Commission by the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, approved April 2, 1924, and by the act making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, approved June 7, 1924, are extended and made available until June 30, 1926, for the purposes set forth in said acts, including the employment of necessary technical and professional services, and in addition for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles since June 1, 1924, furnished by the Secretary of War or other departments of the Government for the official use of said commission and its personnel in foreign countries: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended on a program of construction work under the act of March 4, 1923, the complete cost of which shall exceed $3,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to this appropriation. I know he wants to be fair. Here is what the bill provides for the Shipping Board, page 28. Here is the appropriation: "(a) Amount on hand July 1, 1925, but not in excess of the fund sufficient to cover all obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1925, and then unpaid." If that should be $100,000,000, it would be whatever they have on hand.

Mr. SNELL. Was not the gentleman talking about the appropriations made in this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I was talking about what they had access to from the authorizations in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman to be talking about the appropriation made in this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about what the bill permits them to spend.

Mr. SNELL. Well, let us find out what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it goes on: "(b) $24,000,000." That was what the chairman of the Committee on Rules referred to. Then "(c) amounts received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, from the operation of ships." That may or may not be a big sum, but if it is $100,000,000 they have the right to expend it under the provisions of this bill. Such receipts for 1924 were $104,000,000 and for 1925 are estimated at $95,500,000. And for the year ending June 30, 1926, these receipts may aggregate $100,000,000. Now listen, here is another item: "(d) so much of the total proceeds of all sales pertaining to liquidation received during the fiscal year 1926, but not exceeding $4,000,000," and so on.

Now, all of these four items, (a), (b), (c), and (d), make funds available in this bill. The chairman ought to be fair. The gentleman limited the authorization under the bill to $24,000,000, which is only item (b), while the total appropriation means all the sums under (a), (b), (c), and (d), and he only mentioned the one under (a), $24,000,000. Did not I have a right to say that under this bill the Shipping Board could expend as much as 10 per cent of the authorization under the bill?

If they did not expend it from these various funds it would go in the Treasury to the credit of the general fund. But this is a reappropriation in this bill, and when it is reappropriated it takes it from the general fund and makes it accessible to their order and responsive to their order. There is no difference between us except that the gentleman said $24,000,000 when the bill authorizes the expenditure of very large sums in addition.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But after all the gentleman is guessing on how much it will be.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but can the gentleman from Illinois guess how much it will be?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman guess within $50,000,000?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is what I said, the gentleman from Texas is arguing on what he surmises.

Mr. BLANTON. I said these may be large sums. I know they have received large sums from receipts and sales of ships in the past, and if receipts are large for 1926 they could expend that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Board of Tax Appeals as authorized under Title IX, section 900, of the revenue act of 1924, approved June 2, 1924, including personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, traveling expenses, necessary expenses for subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence, car fare, stationery, furniture, office equipment, purchase and exchange of typewriters, law books and books of reference, periodicals, and all other necessary supplies, $345,320, of which amount not to exceed $267,520 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of Texas: Page 5, line 11, after the word "subsistence," add "not exceeding $4."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, that is already taken care of by law in the sundry civil act of August 1, 1914.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I notice in most of the paragraphs dealing with the per diem in lieu of subsistence that this language is used.

Mr. WOOD. I understand so, but we left it out of this because it is already permanent law.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman feels sure that that is the case, I shall not press it, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of Texas: Page 5, line 16, after the word "Columbia," insert: *"Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. WOOD. The committee has no objection to that amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all printing and binding for the Board of Tax Appeals, $9,000.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, 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. 11505, the independent offices appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 12033) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, together with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

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:

S. 1975. An act for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), Federal Insurance Co., American & Foreigin Marine Insurance Co., Queen Insurance Co. of America, Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., United States Lloyds, and the St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 6 of the trading with the enemy act, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Alien Property Custodian, submitting his annual report of the proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act for the year ended December 31, 1924.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1925.*

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentlemen from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the committee, it will be pleasing news to the million stamp collectors in the United States to learn that the Congress has made the usual annual appropriation for the upkeep of the collection in the Smithsonian Institution this year. That the interest in philately is increasing is evidenced by the fact that the revenue to the United States by reason of the sales through the agency established by the post office for the sale of stamps to collectors has increased 600 per cent since it commenced to do business in 1922, and the department informs me that this year the profit accruing to the Government will run well above the $100,000 mark!

Now that the bill has passed both Houses of Congress permitting the use of precanceled envelopes, and that the department has given orders that unused current envelopes shall be sold over its counter at the Philatelic Agency, and that the new envelopes are to bear the 1925 watermark, an additional stimulus will be imparted to stamp collecting, which has proved of such great educational benefit to the thousands of its devotees. Combining as it does the pleasure of quest as well as attainment, the knowledge of history, geography, and the fine arts, the strong probability of an increase in value of the purchases made and the delightful relaxation afforded to jaded minds because of the intense interest manifested by those who become its devotees, it can be truly considered as

the "king of hobbies" as well as the "hobby of kings" in no mere technical sense. The King of England and the King of Egypt count it one of their pleasures to own fine collections, and the President of France is loaning his influence and may exhibit some of his treasures at the exposition to be held in Paris next May.

In 1876, for our own centennial, the United States Government recognized the desirability of having two special envelope stamps commemorating the event prepared and issued, and millions of them were sold. In 1892 there was a set issued for the Columbian Exposition at Chicago, the Jamestown Exposition was also honored by a set of three values, the landing of the Pilgrams likewise, the Panama-Pacific Exposition was not forgotten, the Tercentenary of the Landing of the Huguenot-Walloons was remembered. Now the word has gone forth for a set to commemorate the landing of the Norsemen several hundreds of years ago, and likewise we are to have in April next a set of three values to commemorate the stirring scenes of the sesquicentennial of events in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Already it has been suggested that official notice be taken of the forthcoming one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, and if no time is lost in getting out a comprehensive set sufficient funds could be raised by the sale thereof to collectors throughout the world to go a long way, if not to completely compensate, for any expense that the National Treasury might be called upon to contribute for its participation therein. By those whose memories can run back for a score of years or more it will be recalled that the display of stamps of a certain Central American country during the discussion of the Isthmian Canal caused its location to be decided at the Isthmus of Panama rather than at another point.

EVENING SESSION

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday evening next, February 4, 1925, it shall be in order to consider bills unobjected to on the Private Calendar, between the hours of 8 and 11 o'clock, beginning where we left off.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it has been suggested that the calendar has now been gone through with once, except as to some bills, perhaps, that have been put on the calendar since the last evening session, and that it might be well now to start with the beginning of the calendar again.

Mr. TILSON. We have now reached the place in the calendar where all of the bills on the calendar have been reported since the holiday recess. Query, Whether the bills previously reported and that have been passed over should not at some time have an opportunity to have a second trial? Would the gentleman from Tennessee have any objection to adopting the same rule that we now use on public bills, so far as these bills are concerned; that is, on those bills that have had one trial and have been objected to; that three objections be required just as on the Consent Calendar? Of course, that could only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not think I should object to that but I would not want to agree to it now.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall defer my request until to-morrow morning, when the gentleman can look up these matters.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Very well.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading and approval of the Journal to-morrow morning I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 30, 1925, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

826. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department during the calendar year ended December 31, 1924, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1925; to the Committee on Printing.

827. A letter from the President of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting supplemental report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for the year 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

828. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Fresh Kills, Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11280. A bill authorizing the construction of a bridge across Rock River at the city of Beloit, county of Rock, State of Wisconsin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LAMPERT: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2803. An act to regulate within the District of Columbia the sale of milk, cream, and ice cream, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Washington: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10687. A bill granting to the county authorities of San Juan County, State of Washington, certain described tracts of land on the abandoned military reservations on Lopez and Shaw Islands as a right of way for county roads, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHERWOOD: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10771. A bill authorizing the acquisition of land and suitably marking the site of the Battle of Franklin, Tenn.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. S 3760. An act to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 3080. An act for the relief of the Uintah and White River Tribes of Ute Indians of Utah; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11752. A bill to provide for extension of payment on homestead entries on ceded lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, State of Montana, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11998. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1919, relative to per capita cost of Indian schools; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11980. A bill to provide for the securing of lands in the southern Appalachian Mountains for perpetual preservation as national parks; with amendments (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. J. Res. 318. A joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 11799. A bill to secure a replica of the Houdon bust of Washington for lodgment in the Pan American Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Commitete on the Library. S. J. Res. 95. A joint resolution to authorize the American National Red Cross to continue the use of temporary buildings now erected on square No. 172, Washington, D. C.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 4848. A bill to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy in 1891 and entitled "Peace"; with an amend-

ment (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 12033. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1326). 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. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 1016. An act for the relief of Augusta Reiter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Claims. S. 1323. An act for the relief of Eugene K. Stoudemire; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SWING: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4410. A bill for the relief of Arthur L. Hecykell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 11871. A bill for the relief of Stephen A. Farrell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUDSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Benjamin Gauthier; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LARSON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 12025) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the cities of Superior, Wis., and Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McSWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 12026) for the erection of a public building at New Philadelphia, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12027) for the erection of a public building at Millersburg, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 12028) to amend the tariff act of 1922 in order to provide for a tariff on hides of cattle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 12029) for the relief of sufferers from the fire at New Bern, N. C., in December, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12030) for the relief of sufferers from cyclone in northwestern Mississippi in March, 1923; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 12031) to erect a postoffice building in the village of Bath, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12032) making appropriations for the Wichita and Affiliated Bands of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 12033) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. KELLER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota with reference to agricultural relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota asking for agricultural relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho asking the House of Representatives for favorable action on S. 2327; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota urging Congress to enact legislation to restore equality to agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 12034) granting an increase of pension to Melinda Cannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 12035) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McKay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 12036) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Brunsteter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 12037) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12038) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Dill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 12039) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Nelligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 12040) for the relief of Levi Rodenberger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 12041) granting an increase of pension to Elisabeth Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 12042) granting a pension to Joseph H. Cote; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 12043) granting an increase of pension to Susan Tolbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 12044) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12045) for the relief of the estate of R. B. Cuthbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12046) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 12047) granting an increase of pension to Frances L. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12048) granting an increase of pension to Celestia F. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12049) granting an increase of pension to Martha B. Fisher; to the committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 12050) granting an increase of pension to Deborah E. Bowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12051) granting an increase of pension to Dorothea E. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12052) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Skeaton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 12053) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Bunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS: A bill (H. R. 12054) granting a pension to Friederich W. Rohrs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12055) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12056) granting an increase of pension to Georgiana Kilby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 12057) granting an increase of pension to Augusta A. Rich; 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:

3598. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., calling attention to the necessity of an increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago River by the sanitary district of Chicago; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3599. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of citizens of the thirty-fourth congressional district, State of New York, not to concur in the passage of Senate bill 3218, compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3600. By Mr. DAVEY: Petition of 70 residents of Ravenna, Ohio, protesting against the proposed compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) or any other religious legislation which may be pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3601. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of citizens of Allegan, protesting against Senate bill 3218, a bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3602. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Jewish Veterans of the Wars of the Republic, 15 Park Row, New York, N. Y., that the joint resolution be passed which has been introduced in Congress providing for admission for approximately 8,000 immigrants now stranded at European ports, these having passports duly viséed by the United States consuls prior to last July and being prevented from sailing because of exhaustion of quotas and new immigration law; this petition is presented in effort to undo grave injustice and to favor humanitarian measures; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3603. Also, petition of John H. McCandless, secretary courts committee, organized to promote the interest of the interior criminal courts, headquarters 69 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., care Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, that House bill 5195, by Congressman GRAHAM, be accorded favorable consideration by reason of the great good to be derived from the extending of the probation system to the Federal courts, which do not now have the power of placing offenders on probation. There has been ample opportunity to observe the workings of probation, especially for first offenders, and the courts committee of which Mr. McCandless is secretary are convinced that it is highly desirable that the Federal courts should have this same power. When consideration is given to the high type of Federal judges, we believe that we can count upon a wise choice of the cases to be placed on probation, and that the appointment of well-qualified probation officers to administer the system could be safely counted upon. The Brooklyn courts committee earnestly petitions support for this measure when it comes up for passage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3604. By Mr. McDUFFIE: Petition of 40 residents of Mobile, Ala., opposing the proposed Sunday observance law (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3605. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of the Rotary Club, of New York, urging that subtreasury building in New York City be converted into a national memorial and historic headquarters and to provide a permanent museum to contain specimens of all the coinage from the outset of this country; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE

FRIDAY, *January 30, 1925*

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1295)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Ferris	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.
Bayard	Fess	Keyes	Reed, Pa.
Bingham	Fletcher	King	Sheppard
Borah	Frazier	McKellar	Shields
Brookhart	George	McKinley	Shipstead
Broussard	Gerry	McLean	Shortridge
Bruce	Glass	McNary	Simmons
Butler	Gooding	Mayfield	Smoot
Cameron	Greene	Means	Spencer
Capper	Hale	Metcalf	Stanley
Caraway	Harreld	Moses	Sterling
Copeland	Harris	Neely	Swanson
Couzens	Harrison	Norbeck	Trammell
Cummins	Heflin	Norris	Wadsworth
Curtis	Howell	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Warren
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Watson
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Wheeler
Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Willis

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1975) for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), Federal Insurance Co., American and Foreign Marine Insurance Co., Queen Insurance Co. of America, Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., United States Lloyds, and the St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co., and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the general organizer, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America (Federacion Libre), of Santurce, Porto Rico, relative to industrial conditions in Porto Rico and transmitting certain exhibits in regard to the wages of carpenters, joiners, and auxiliaries in the island of Porto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

Mr. FRAZIER presented the memorial of Henry Schrenk and 32 other citizens of Logan and McIntosh Counties, in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Home Economic Club, of Ryder, N. Dak., favoring the adoption of the child labor amendment to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, favoring the permanent improvement of the Missouri River to Kansas City, Mo., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Galena, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

H. R. 7821. An act to convey to the city of Astoria, Oreg., a certain strip of land in said city;

H. R. 7911. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the appraisers' stores property in Providence, R. I.; and

H. R. 11501. An act for the exchange of land in El Dorado, Ark.

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

S. 3676. An act for the relief of Harry Newton (Rept. No. 939); and

H. R. 1717. An act authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Joseph J. Martin (Rept. No. 940).

Mr. BAYARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9535) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 941) thereon.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8329) for the relief of Albert S. Matlock, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 942) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 5752. An act for the relief of George A. Petrie (Rept. No. 943);

H. R. 8727. An act for the relief of Roger Sherman Hoar (Rept. No. 944); and

H. R. 8741. An act for the relief of Flora M. Herrick (Rept. No. 945).

Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6436) for the relief of Isidor Steger, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 946) thereon.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to provide payment for additional work on the Grant Memorial, Washington, D. C., moved that that committee be discharged from its further consideration and that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 917) for the relief of Ernest F. Church, formerly boatswain, United States Naval Reserve,