

ago as regards our colleague the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER]. I believe that the Legislature of Massachusetts went far afield when it provided its enabling act to permit the filling of a vacancy, as took place in the appointment of Mr. BUTLER. It was clearly the intention of the people of the United States in adopting the seventeenth amendment that Senators are to be elected, and under the spirit and letter of the seventeenth amendment only a temporary appointment can be made. If it is legal for Mr. BUTLER to hold his office in this body, and if Senators take the view that it is legal, I can not for the life of me see why any man should consider that the seating of Mr. NYE would be considered a matter of expediency and not of law.

When section 696 of the Compiled Laws of North Dakota, 1913, was amended and reenacted in 1917, I can not understand why it was, if the legislature had in mind simply the changing of the first section—was it the first section?

Mr. GOFF. The first section of the law passed in 1913 became the fourth section of that passed in 1917.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Legislature of North Dakota had intended merely to amend what has now become subdivision 1 of chapter 696, if the Legislature of North Dakota had intended to do nothing except to amend that one small section, the natural course would have been for them to say in the preamble of the measure that it was the intent to amend that particular subdivision. But that is not what happened. I am confident in my own mind that it was done as it was because the legislature had before it the knowledge of the adoption of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and had the intent to include in this act the power on the part of the governor to fill a vacancy in the office of United States Senator.

I do not wish to leave this, however, until I say again that I do not believe the committee has performed its full function, in that it has failed to find out from living men, as it could have done, what actually was the intent of the legislature in amending and reenacting chapter 696.

The State of North Dakota has a constitutional right to be represented in this body by two Senators. By the rules of strict construction, by what some of my colleagues have called technicalities, an effort is made to deprive the State of equal representation. When we reflect how lightly many persons in this country regard the Congress of the United States, we should never seek to take any action which would bring grief and criticism and ill feeling to the hearts of our people if there is any reasonable way by which we may avoid the unkind action. I can see no reason in the world why the Senate of the United States might not accept the enabling act in the language found in this act of 1917 as ample legal authority for the seating of Mr. NYE.

I believe this discussion has made it apparent that there should be a review of its enabling act on the part of every legislature in the United States. I think it would be well for every State to reexamine its law, to see if proper provision has been made for the filling of a vacancy in the office of United States Senator.

It was intended, by the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, that the people should have the right to choose their Senators. The Governor of the State of North Dakota has made provision that when the roads break up in the spring there shall be an election.

I heard it suggested by my colleague from South Carolina that if anybody is to blame in this matter, it is the governor, that he should have called a special session of the legislature. I do not want the people of North Dakota to suffer because the governor made a mistake, and it is not necessary that they should. We have, in this act of 1917, passed four years after the adoption of the seventeenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, ample, sensible, and, in my judgment, legal reason for the seating of Mr. NYE, and I hope that the Senate will not deny to North Dakota, in the time of her stress and trial, at a time when she wants assistance from the Federal Government in the way of legislation, at least some participation in the framing of that legislation.

In the name of the people of North Dakota, in the name of the people in my State who are interested in this question, and watching to see what we do, I beg Senators to vote to seat Mr. NYE, when they come to vote to-morrow, so that the State of North Dakota may have equal representation in this body.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 6 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1926, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, January 11, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, for the birth of this new day we bless Thee; for every hope and prospect that makes us happy we give Thee thanks. In Thee we have our rest and security. Thy loving Providence is a daily miracle. May it never be overlooked or undervalued. Fill our lives with mighty meaning. Give them the vision of the unattained and a pulsing passion to realize it. May the law of truth be native to the very depths of our beings. Keep in our minds this day the counsels of the Lord. May the sweetness of Thy love, the sense of Thy mercy, and the joy of Thy presence fill all our homes. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 9, 1926, was read and approved.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 6707.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman this: To-day is District day. I know the gentleman has a right to ask for recognition if he claims it, and I know the Chair has a right to recognize him in preference to the gentleman from Maryland, because the two bills have equal privilege here in the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not prepared to admit that—

Mr. BLANTON. That is the fact, because this is District day, and it is simply a question of recognition.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the gentleman's statement, not mine.

Mr. BLANTON. On a forced vote the House could decide which bill it would take up. To-day is District day. There are two bills reported by the District Committee on the calendar, and it will not take an hour to dispose of both of them. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has given out, both to members of the District Committee and to Washington people, that he was going to give this day to the District and let the District finish its business.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will only possess his soul in patience, we are only trying to get this bill out of the way, so that the District Committee may have its day.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, if the gentleman is going to filibuster against—

Mr. BLANTON. I have no intention of filibustering. I want to say this to the gentleman from Michigan. If he will only let the District have its day, we will consume but very little time. I think it would just take not over 30 minutes to the side, as there is only one bill that is controversial.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Texas will permit. This bill, the gentleman knows, is a very important measure. It has been before the House for a long time—

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman—

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, we expect that we can complete this bill in an hour or less, and there is no reason why we should take more time, and then there will be abundance of time after that for District business. Therefore it seems the orderly way is to complete the bill that is before the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; but I hope the gentleman will not make any long argument.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman this: Does not the gentleman know that there are some items in this Interior appropriation bill yet to come that are quite controversial; items upon which there is going to be points of order and upon which there is going to be argument that may be extended?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is a situation of which I was not aware before.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman may just as well notice now that there are certain items in his bill such as I have mentioned. Why not let us come in here and have 30 minutes to the side in which to dispose of the District business? Otherwise we will lose District day. I know that we are not going to finish the consideration of this Interior Department

appropriation bill in a short time because there are items in it which need discussion.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the motion.

Mr. BLANTON. I appeal to the gentleman from Connecticut to keep faith with the House and make good the assurance he gave us.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Connecticut will try to see to it that the District Committee shall have plenty of time in which to consider its business to-day. That will save that much time for the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. That assurance is satisfactory.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement by Governor Ritchie, of Maryland, on Friday evening last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement by Governor Ritchie, of Maryland. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I hate to be the goat, but it seems to me the House has started along the line of printing speeches of gentlemen outside of the membership of the House in the RECORD. No matter how valuable they may be to a local constituency, perhaps, they do not have national significance, and I feel that if we are going to stop this thing we should stop it right now. Consequently I feel that I shall have to object.

AGRICULTURAL FUNDAMENTALISM

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the present bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his own remarks on the present bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, when we come to the Interior Department bill I always have grave doubts about the two largest items in it, Indian affairs and reclamation. I know that the Indians are wards of the Nation. We owe them some obligations and are bound to them by treaties as well as by ties of humanity. I want to show them both justice and kindness. Yet, I am right sure we are adopting some policies which cost the Government heavily and which tend to make these people paupers and dependents instead of self-reliant and useful citizens.

Again, I doubt if any activity of our Government affords more opportunity for waste and graft and gives more jobs to needless employees. As once said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] it is a waste of both money and manhood.

In our reclamation policy I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If we are to continue the policy it ought to be nationalized and not applied to the West only. There are many thousands of acres in the South which can be reclaimed by drainage and flood control for less money than irrigation costs, and when reclaimed they are more fertile, closer to the markets, and less costly to cultivate than many of the western lands.

Yet just now I question whether Congress should appropriate money to reclaim farm lands anywhere, except in so far as necessary to avert actual loss on projects already begun.

We already have thousands of farms that are being turned back and deserted because of lack of labor to cultivate them, or because farming has become so unremunerative and unattractive that families are deserting our once happy rural homes and flocking to the factories, the mines, and the commercial centers. Our problem now is to maintain and improve the farms we have, rather than to expend large sums and pile up taxes to develop new ones in the deserts and swamps. In 1921 more than 15,000 farmers went bankrupt in the United States. In 1922 twenty-two and a half thousand went bankrupt; in 1923 more than 34,000; in 1924 more than forty-one and a half thousand. This is a steady and alarming increase. From every section of the country comes the report that farms have not paid enough to cover taxes and upkeep and that products cost more for production than they bring in the markets.

Yet railroads were never more prosperous, factories are paying well, commerce is phenomenally active, and banks in many places are reporting large profits and declaring large dividends. All prospering but agriculture. Everybody knows this to be a fact. Only here and there do we find an exception. But what is to be done about it?

Mr. Speaker, since I came to Congress I have heard more talk about doing something for the farmer than about any

other subject that ever comes before this House, and I have seen less done. That is not because the Congress has not been earnestly desirous of doing something for him. Nine out of ten of the Members of this House know that the farmer needs to have something done for him, that he deserves to have something done for him, and that sooner or later he is going to have something done for him, because he is not going to put up always with conditions as they now are. Our country can not permanently exist with agriculture languishing and everything else fatten.

Everybody knows that farming is the one great American industry that is not on a paying basis. It is the fundamental industry. For a hundred years and more it has supported our other industries. The farmer has paid a tariff tax on everything he has bought—on his shoes and his implements and the materials that have gone into his children's schoolbooks—and the men who manufactured these things behind their protective-tariff wall have waxed rich. For a long time the farmer was able to stand up under the burden. He had boundless lands of great fertility and the world for his market, and such labor as he had to employ was plentiful and cheap.

But now that is all changed. The lands are no longer new and their fertility has come to where it must be maintained by artificial means. Frontier lands are being developed in other countries—in Canada, South America, India, Australia, and Africa. Products from these lands are competing with American products on the world market, and because they can be grown more cheaply are gradually crowding American products out. Labor is becoming scarce and in its effort to better its own condition is demanding higher and higher wages.

As a plain matter of fact, staple farming in this country can not be made to pay year in and year out. Our farming people who are heroic enough to stay with the farms instead of flocking to the cities are going into debt two or three years to where they come out one. There are individual exceptions here and there of men who are more fortunately located or luckier in getting their stuff on the market at the right time or keener in their deals. But these men are the exception and not the rule, and conditions which make it possible for only the exceptional man to succeed are not fair conditions. The American ideal is to have conditions where the average man can succeed.

The endless game here in Washington is to tinker. We tinker with rates, we tinker with cooperative marketing, we tinker with diversification, we tinker with additional and easier credits, we tinker with crop reports.

Mr. Chairman, tinkering never permanently cured anything. All it ever does is to patch up and help the farmer over another season, so he can go further in debt and help us politicians over campaigns so we can come back to Congress. If we want to cure the evil, we have got to do more than tinker. Better marketing will help greatly. Yoakum is right, and I am for a bill to promote his plan.

But the only way to help the farmer permanently and effectively is to give him an equal chance with the other fellow. The other fellow is behind a tariff wall, by reason of which he gets a bonus from the Government every time he manufactures an article and sells it. Now, it is impossible to put the farmer behind a tariff wall that will give him the same sort of protection, because the farmer sells about half of his cotton and a very considerable portion of his grain and meat in other countries.

He has to. We can not use anything like all he produces in this country. The result is that the price men pay on the cotton market in Liverpool, England, this morning has a direct effect on the price my friend, John Fuller, gets for his cotton down in my home town in Mississippi this afternoon. And the same is true of Ole Nielsen and his wheat somewhere in Iowa or Nebraska.

There are only two ways in which the American farmer can be given the same protection we have been giving the manufacturer for all these years. One is for the Government to buy all his surplus produce and sell it abroad for what it will bring and stand the loss. That is what some of our Republican friends from the Northwest are proposing. It sounds like socialism or sovietism, or whatever else you want to call it. It is putting the Government in business. It is contrary to all our so-called American principles. But it is not a bit more contrary to them than is the protective tariff. If we are going to take money out of the pocket of the farmer and give it to the manufacturer to make him rich, by means of a tariff, why not take money out of the pocket of the manufacturer and give it to the farmer to save him from the ruin that the other system has brought on him? Nothing could be fairer. The only trouble is that, easy as it

seems, it will not work permanently, and it is an utterly false policy of government to tax one class of citizens for the enrichment of another class.

If our Republican friends from the Northwest who are so disturbed about the plight of the farmer, are so hard of heart and of head that they can not see this danger in their subsidy scheme, then perhaps enough Democrats may join with them and try their scheme out.

But the logical thing, and the honest thing, for our friends from the Northwest to do is to join with us, the Democrats, and reduce this protective tariff that is at the bottom of all the trouble. If we will do that then things will gradually come back to a sound equilibrium. The farmer will then be able to buy on the same plane he sells on, and it will not be an artificial plane maintained by an un-American subsidy. Then the average farmer will be able to make a decent living for himself and his family and put away something for a rainy day. And I repeat, Mr. Chairman, until the time comes when the average farmer can do this we are not dealing fairly with him, and we are putting the whole Nation in jeopardy.

Some of you Republicans over there are fine fellows. Many of you admit freely in private conversation where the trouble is. Some of you go so far as to admit it in debate on the floor of this House, and then you turn around and vote the other way, which is simply another way of admitting that your party has a strangle hold on you, just as it has on the American farmer. Why do you not show the courage of your conviction and come over into Macedonia and help us? I do not ask you to turn Democrat, because there are some of you who, if you will just stay Republicans, are going to get beat by honest-to-goodness, lifelong Democrats next fall. But pull in harness with us just this once and see how much clearer your conscience will be. It will be good for you as well as for your farmer constituents.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6707) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6707, the Interior Department appropriation bill, with Mr. BURTON 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 House bill 6707, making appropriations for the Interior Department. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6707) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will resume the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$1,200 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$39,550; for construction of physical improvements, \$32,750, including not exceeding \$12,000 for the construction of buildings, of which \$2,500 shall be available for a community house, and \$7,500 for the Aileen Nusbaum Hospital and equipment thereof, and including not exceeding \$20,000 for increased water supply; in all, \$72,300.

MR. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the paragraph.

MR. BLANTON. I want to call the attention of the House to a new policy that is embraced within this paragraph. The time was when the Congress did not furnish all these bureaus and institutions of the Government with automobiles, but during the war and since we have embarked on that bad policy. Now, in this particular paragraph of the bill we have a new policy. We are not only giving them automobiles, but we are giving them horses and horse-drawn vehicles. What kind of horse-drawn vehicles are they going to use out there? Are they going to do some four-in-hand driving or some tandem driving? Just what are they to be furnished with?

MR. CRAMTON. The total amount available is \$1,200 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven, passenger-carrying vehicles for use in general park work. The gentleman will realize that in a park as large in area as this one which is, as I remember, 30 miles from the nearest town, and that a good deal of that is upgrade.

MR. BLANTON. The gentleman is not answering my question.

MR. CRAMTON. The gentleman will realize that there can not be much extravagance when the amount allowed for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles is only \$1,200. If there are any horses used in that park under this appropriation, they will be work horses used on the road.

MR. BLANTON. The gentleman says:

If there are any used.

That is the kind of information we get. The gentleman does not know whether they will be used or not. He says:

If they are used, they will be used so-and-so.

MR. CRAMTON. There are some used in road work, and I suppose if an old wagon needs some repairs it will be done out of this item.

MR. BLANTON. This is the sole paragraph in this bill that carries horse-drawn vehicles. They could buy for themselves a span of Kentucky thoroughbreds out there, or they could go down to Texas and get a span of Texas standard breds.

MR. CRAMTON. If the gentleman had ever visited Mesa Verde and so knew of the actual conditions out there he would know that there would not be a penny wasted and not a penny spent on anything except an absolute necessity.

MR. TAYLOR of Colorado. The park is in my district. If the gentleman will yield—

MR. BLANTON. I do not yield. I do not want to have all my time wasted.

MR. TAYLOR of Colorado. If you want information let me give it to you.

THE CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

MR. BLANTON. No; I do not yield. The gentleman can take his own time. I do not want to be interrupted by the distinguished Members of this oligarchy.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

MR. BLANTON. We have a right to expect from the chairmen of these subcommittees that they shall be able to give us information. I know that there are members of the Committee on Appropriations in whose districts these hand-outs are given, and I know that they could give us some general information about them; but what we want is specific information from the chairmen of the subcommittees. Why do not the chairmen of these subcommittees ask specific questions of these bureau chiefs and get us specific information?

MR. CRAMTON. The trouble is that when the gentleman gets the information he does not recognize it.

MR. BLANTON. I never recognize a generality when I ask for something specific.

MR. CRAMTON. I said the only use of horses is in general road work.

MR. BLANTON. The gentleman did not ask specific questions about that when the bureau chief was before his committee. He only knows it because he has been out there visiting.

MR. CRAMTON. But I do know it.

MR. VAILE. Because he was out there.

THE CHAIRMAN. The committee will proceed in an orderly way. Members will not interrupt. The gentleman will proceed in order.

MR. BLANTON. I was proceeding in a very orderly manner, but the disorderly colloquy was forced upon me by this oligarchy that prepares these bills. I think they should furnish this specific information. I do not think we should have to rely on the visiting chairman who visits all over this country, where the houses are 30 miles from each other. I asked for specific information that ought to be shown in the hearings. We can not tell what the chairman has learned from his visits. His experience is not shown in the hearings.

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

MR. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the amendment. My understanding is that a large part of these thoroughbreds, tandems, and four-in-hands, about which my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]

complains, consist of Navajo ponies, worked by Navajo Indians on the roads in this park.

The gentleman from Texas serves a very valuable purpose in this House, and that is recognized by every Member of the House, but sometimes, it seems to me, the gentleman, to use a sporting term, slightly "overtrains" himself. Day before yesterday he took occasion to criticize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] very caustically for having visited some of these irrigation districts, parks, Indian reservations, and so forth, throughout the country. He spoke of his having been dined—he first said wined, but he withdrew that—because he knew the House would accept no such accusation as that against the gentleman from Michigan.

It has been my privilege to be with the gentleman from Michigan on several of these trips. These trips were not official investigation tours authorized by Congress, and most of the expenses fell on the Members making the trip, without cost to the Government. Now and then the gentleman from Michigan would get some obliging superintendent of an Indian reservation, a park ranger, or perhaps some irrigation official to accommodate him with a ride from one project to another, but aside from that the expenses of these trips were borne by the gentleman from Michigan, myself, and other members of the party.

The gentleman from Michigan has a very inquiring mind, and he dislikes to act upon any proposition without all the knowledge he can get about it. After having accompanied the gentleman on several of these investigations, I can say with verity if there is a man in this House who goes to the bottom of a proposition, when once he gets a scent of the trail, it is the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.] None of this time has been wasted in these investigations. But, as a matter of fact, he has gained very valuable and necessary information. As we all know, the gentleman comes from a country where there are practically no Indians. He comes from a State where there is very little public land, and he comes from a State where there is no irrigation. Naturally the gentleman from Michigan knew very little about irrigation, very little about Indian affairs, and very little about public lands when he came to this House, but he has applied himself so diligently to the task assigned him by this House that he has become an authority on irrigation, on Indian affairs, and on all other things which come under his supervision as chairman of this subcommittee. He has been able to reach that state by making these trips. It is true that occasionally some one invited him to a dinner. It is impossible to refuse all of these invitations. As a matter of fact, the bane of an investigating trip is the almost compulsory entertainment that does with it. A little entertainment, of course, would be very gladly relished, but the fact is, as those of us who have been on investigating trips know, the entertainment is so constant, persistent, and continuous that to yield to all invitations would very seriously handicap and hinder the work in hand.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I have noticed that the gentleman from Michigan has a way of stopping these entertainments when they interfere with his work, and he has a way of stopping them without offending anybody. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has convinced me with specific information, and I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. When the gentleman from Texas spoke Saturday and to-day, he spoke in a somewhat facetious vein, but that does not show in the RECORD. The gentleman from Texas knows that when that goes out to the country the smile he had on his face, when he was accusing the gentleman from Michigan of having been influenced by having been dined, does not show in the RECORD. For that reason I thought I should make these few remarks in vindication of the splendid work done by the gentleman from Michigan during these investigating trips, as well as throughout his service here.

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

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I have nothing in common with the gentleman from Michigan from a political standpoint, but I feel I can say truthfully that I have served with no man in any capacity in my entire life who was more zealous,

more diligent, more energetic, and who undertakes to do his work more intelligently and fairly than the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska: For administration, protection, and improvement, \$18,700.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 93, lines 11 and 12, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, it happens I, too, was on the trail of the gentleman from Michigan very unofficially part of the time last summer, and I want to corroborate, although it needs no corroboration in this House, the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] who has just taken his seat as to the diligent manner in which the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, his colleague [Mr. MURPHY], and one or two other gentlemen pursued their work this summer in investigating the items in this bill. I want to say still further that from my personal visit, which I admit, in spite of the jocular way in which the chairman of the committee referred to it on Saturday, was more or less brief in these various places, I think this Government in no one detail gets more worth for its money than in the appropriations we make for the national parks. [Applause.] The service of the park system is wonderful, and I wish to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with what I personally saw in the parks, not taking the time for that purpose in connection with this item.

The one park which I visited which it is not worth while for the Government to support is the Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska. It is true, as the chairman said in a reference to another item I criticized on Saturday, it is a very meek appropriation. I do not know just how we get to be meek in the way of spending Uncle Sam's money, but the gentleman from Michigan, I think, did use that phrase in describing an item on last Saturday. It is meek; you are only asking the Government to spend \$18,700, but the gentleman who appeared before the subcommittee advocating the Mount McKinley appropriation said that no tourists visit Mount McKinley; it is too inaccessible, and they are glad of it. They are glad they do not have visitors go to Mount McKinley. I went as near as it is possible to get—drove about 15 or 20 miles over a very poor road—and tried to see Mount McKinley. By great good fortune the clouds broke during the morning I was there and I caught a glimpse of this wonderful 20,000-foot-high peak. But why, Mr. Chairman, should the Federal Government spend one dollar in the support of any administration having to do with Mount McKinley? Nothing we can do can remove that wonderful peak. We can not take down Mount McKinley, the largest peak in the Western Hemisphere. What are you going to do with any money? There has been a road built there with Government funds about 8 miles in length. It is laid out for 20 miles farther, and even if you go 30 miles inland from Mount McKinley Park station you will still be over 100 miles from the base of Mount McKinley. Two men are said to have once scaled Mount McKinley, but that is disputed. It is not certain anybody has ever been to the top of Mount McKinley, and still we are asked to appropriate the small sum of \$18,000 to leave Mount McKinley standing there.

We can not remove it; we can not improve it; we can not do a blessed thing worth while with an appropriation. They admit in this item of \$18,000 that an additional sum is asked at this time—I am reading from the gentleman's testimony before the committee—"an increase in travel expense is requested to permit of inspection of the park activities in 1927 by an officer from Washington." In other words, we are asked to appropriate here a sum sufficient to allow some gentlemen to have a pleasant vacation next summer. I would be glad if Mr. Mather or Mr. Albright would designate me for that trip. I would be glad to go. Last year when I went I paid my own expenses. I felt I was well repaid for the trip; but somebody evidently wants a trip to Mount McKinley at the expense of the Government next summer, and we are therefore asked at this time to increase the appropriation for Mount McKinley.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. This is a sample, Mr. Chairman, of how generous we have been throughout in Alaskan appropriations.

That is all I care to say, and I withdraw the amendment, because I am sure it will not be adopted.

Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. BLANTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I object. I want to answer the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to ask leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks on the subject of the park system.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in the manner in which the national parks in this country are managed and the control exercised over the concessions in them we have the very best illustration of one institution of the Government wherein business methods prevail.

With the increased population of the United States vacation spots and breathing spaces for the people are becoming more and more curtailed. Through wise foresight the national parks have been set aside as the playgrounds of the people. Money appropriated by Congress for their improvement and oversight is as worth while an expenditure as any payment made from the Public Treasury.

The records of the parks show that their use is increasing year by year. Health and pleasure go hand in hand and are bringing the best returns on the principal invested by the Government.

We are particularly fortunate in the men who are at the head of the National Park Service. Mr. Stephen T. Mather and his able assistants have established such a high type of service that their influence permeates to every employee. Only the love of the great outdoors could retain in Government service the type of men who are filling the positions of superintendents of the parks or rangers under them.

As one illustration, let me only mention Mr. H. M. Allbright, the superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park, a cultured, educated gentleman, a disciplinarian, and above all an enthusiast in Government service. It is fortunate, too, that such men as Mr. E. T. Scovay, chief ranger at the Grand Canyon, and Ranger Clarence Fry at the Sequoia National Park, and many others of the same type can be retained in the service to carry out the details of their chiefs.

One hears a great deal of complaint about monopolies. It is a favorite topic of many speakers. There are also frequently complaints about the manner in which monopoly is regulated by the Federal Government. I want to refer to one monopoly, Government regulated, in the highest terms of approbation. It is the concessions granted in the parks for both hotels and transportation. Accommodations are available at prices fixed under Government authority within the reach of the most modest tourist or one able to pay for the most luxurious rooms. There is a satisfaction in knowing before one leaves home exactly the cost of accommodations for a certain period. There is a further satisfaction when those accommodations are used, in realizing that you are receiving full value for your money.

Such was my experience wherever I traveled in our national parks. In addition to the excellent accommodations, the transportation system is also a wonderfully controlled and regulated monopoly. Hundreds of passengers are moved daily, at prices regulated by the officials, from one portion of the parks to another, particularly in the Yosemite and the Yellowstone, without the least friction, confusion, or difficulty.

To my mind it is the perfection of tourist accommodation. In addition to the hotel and transportation facilities, there is every opportunity for the person, man or woman, driving his or her car, to enjoy the park and live at well-kept camps.

It is unnecessary for me to refer to the national attractions of the parks. They are too well known to need further description. Any citizen having a vacation to spend, particularly if limited in purse, can have no more delightful experience than a tour of as many of our parks as the vacation period may permit.

No country ever possessed greater natural attractions than does ours, and I hope that the high type of service to the people now rendered by Government officials can be indefinitely continued. My life occupation has been connected with the vacationist so I may be pardoned if I feel in some slight degree qualified to speak as to the needs of and methods employed for this ever-increasing class of our people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object to the withdrawal of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. CRAMTON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, Mr. Chairman, let the amendment stand, inasmuch as there is opposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the Assistant Director of the National Park Service when he appeared before us, stated:

The park was established primarily to protect its wonderful wild life, and that we feel is our chief function. There are not many visitors, as you know, who go to the Mount McKinley National Park, and we are glad of it, because we have not anything to show them in the way of accommodations; but we have a duty which I consider is quite serious in protecting the wild life against poaching, and an additional ranger is needed. We ought to have more than the one.

The policy of this committee has been, with the tremendous increase there has been in attendance at the national parks and in this time of economy, to use first such money as was available for parks to provide the needed facilities for visitors. There has to be sanitation, there has to be a water supply, there have to be roads, and so forth, and as a matter of fact, we have not really been able to keep up with those needs, and therefore new park areas that are not now being thronged with visitors, we have held back from providing facilities in them, accommodations for tourists, and so forth. So there are no accommodations now in Mount McKinley Park, and we have discouraged providing anything of that kind. We have kept it on the basis primarily of mere administration to protect the game, as has been stated. Some time there will be a development of the park—camps, trails, hotel accommodations will be provided and then there will be a way of taking care of tourists. But until the conditions are different than they are now, we ought not to abandon the park and leave the game subject to the attack of violators of the game laws.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman think that it is practical to protect such an enormous area as McKinley Park by the employment of one or two rangers. Would it do any good?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; it would do some good; the gentleman has already pointed out the limited population of Alaska, and that limits the danger to the game. The rangers will be used where they are most needed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman state what is the area of McKinley Park?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is something over a million acres, something over 26 square miles. It is next in area to the Yellowstone Park, and the time will come when it will be a wonderful recreation area when developed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It seems that we have annually the grand assault on Alaska. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts will let his heavy voice boom forth repeatedly until he can attract the attention of the whole United States to the wretched way Alaska has been treated all these years, in a legislative way, except for a few paltry appropriations. Remember, gentlemen, that all of Alaska is still 98 per cent in the possession of the Federal Government. If it is ever to be opened, the opening must be by Congress. There is opportunity there for fortunes for many thousands, opportunity for the habitation and the comfort of still many other thousands, but we will have to do the pioneering. For, gentlemen, we have so arranged things by law that no capital can go in there with much chance of success. If capital wins there, we take the winnings. We extended the leasing laws, intended for Western States, to Alaska, and when we did that we laid a dead hand on all Alaska by barring nearly all chance of development there by private capital. That is the proposition in a nutshell. Alaska is suffering from the laws that Congress has passed. Do not abuse Alaska. Instead examine the laws that retard Alaska.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] says that the roads to McKinley Park are poor. Of course they are poor. Who lives there that can build roads and trails for that country? What do the small appropriations of the Government amount to in putting roads and trails into the great area of Alaska? Perhaps we can blanket Alaska and let it lie aside and idle for 100 years. We may have to do that because, unfortunately, this Government is not organized to do justice by that country, or to properly care for any insular or outlying possession.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes, certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. Do I understand the gentleman from Washington to say that the enormous appropriations made for

roads and trails construction does not amount to anything in Alaska?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It amounts to very little in proportion to the great size of that Territory.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then let us do away with it altogether.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I said that the roads and trails built by the Government can cover only a small part, and the people up there can not build any because it is all, or nearly all, Federal domain. We stand up here and talk about what we have done, but somebody always assaults the little that we have done. I say it is a crime and an outrage to stop capital from going there to develop the country, and thus forcing the capital of our country to go to South America and elsewhere.

I am with the gentleman in his effort to shut off the continual annual trips by Government officials from Washington to Alaska. They gain little by it. But even worse is the new practice of assaulting Alaska because conditions are not quite right there. Please remember that in the case of Alaska, we have got the cart before the horse. Under our Constitution we can not give sufficient power to the Governor of Alaska. We can not make our laws which are passed for continental United States fit Alaska or Hawaii or Porto Rico or the Philippines or the Virgin Islands or the Canal Zone. Unfortunately, Congress is so busy that it has no time for intelligent effort in behalf of these outlying possessions—and that is what is the matter with Alaska. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, it was in the Budget.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield. With the few minutes that I am taking this morning, I am merely illustrating one thing to the new membership of the House. If you ever get up here and interfere with the Committee on Appropriations on a single item that they bring in, you will see happen just what has happened this morning. If you jump on a Republican, then one of the Democratic members of the committee will get up and defend him; and if you jump on a Democrat, one of the Republican members will come to his rescue and overwhelm you with his defense.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] needs no defense at the hands of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] from any attack that I might make. I would defend the gentleman myself as quickly as anyone in the House. I believe in him. He is one of the stalwart Republicans of the House and speaks in Democratic language sometimes on some measures that are not too partisan. I would even go to his State and make speeches for him, if it were necessary. But all that does not keep me from attacking some of the foolish items that he puts in his bill. However, there is no chance to change the bill, except by points of order. When the Committee on Appropriations brings in a bill, it must be passed as it is written. You can not change it.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand it, the only item that we have brought in here which the gentleman criticizes the committee for bringing in on the ground it is not in the Budget is one that he says he favors himself.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but I do not favor the policy of just putting in everything that these bureau chiefs ask you to do. I do not favor the policy which puts in such an item as, say, the \$400,000 Baker project in Oregon, simply because our good friend from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT], whom we all love, goes to the committee and asks it after the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] visits out there, when the Budget has not recommended it. And I do not approve of the policy of putting in, say, this splendid project out in Colorado, simply because our beloved colleague from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], who is on the Committee on Appropriations, wants that item, and it was put in because he wanted it, and, of course, he is ready to defend it. I do not blame him for that. I admire him for defending it. That is what the people of Colorado sent him here for. He can very ably and efficiently defend anything that concerns Colorado, but why have not we a right to attack items in this bill if we want to? That is all I want to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to let the assertion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that I am opposed to this item go uncontradicted in the RECORD. I am, of course, in favor of the item. So far as it relates to the payment of the expenses of junketeers on trips through the Territory, I should be against it. I wish that the Committee on Appropriations might be able to learn from the various departments in Washington just how many Washington employees have been on junketing trips to Alaska during the past season. That would be very interesting information. I think

it might open the eyes of Members of the House to the fact that Alaska is to-day looked upon as a playground, as a vacation ground for employees in Washington, and they invariably go there at Government expense.

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I may be wrong, but it is my recollection that neither Mr. Mather, the head of the National Park Service, nor Mr. Cammerer, the assistant director, nor Mr. Demaray, the administrative assistant, has ever visited the Mount McKinley National Park, which they are administering. I think that no supervisory official has ever visited that park. The time is going to come when the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and others are going to insist that we permit some development in that park, that we provide some accommodations for tourists. We have not done that as yet, but that is going to be the duty of the National Park Service at some time, and is it not going to be vitally essential that some supervisory official, having that responsibility, should take up that matter and proceed with the making of plans?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I assume that the supervisory officials of the national parks and public roads have a fund out of which they may pay their expenses, no matter where they may go. I do not assume that a special fund is necessary to be appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. CRAMTON. It costs the Government just the same, whichever fund it comes out of. I thought the gentleman was criticizing the fact that some such official might go there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, I am not criticizing any proposed visit of a supervising official to Mount McKinley National Park, but I am criticizing the sending of secretaries to Cabinet officials and subassistants up there to inspect, say, our fisheries, something that they know absolutely nothing about. They would not know which end of a fish moved ahead in the water if they saw one. They pass through the Territory and go back to Washington, and we never hear anything of what they see or what they have done; but we do know that they were traveling all of the time at Government expense, and in many cases dabbling in our Territorial politics. Those are the visits that I criticize. Members of Congress go there and come back and announce every time that they have paid their own expenses. They should. Why should they travel at Government expense? I do not think there is any particular credit due them in the fact that they travel at their own expense.

With respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] about the effect that this annual attack against Alaska has upon the investing public, let me say that last Saturday a representative of one of the very largest mining concerns in the United States called at my office to inquire what the result of this was going to be with regard to the operation of the Alaskan Railroad. I could not tell him, of course, but his company to-day is making an investment of \$8,000,000 in a mining project which is just beyond the interior terminal of the Alaskan Railroad. They depend entirely for the transportation of their freight and all supplies upon that railroad, and right to-day the matter is hanging in the balance with them as to whether they shall go ahead or wait until they find out what the action of Congress is going to be with respect to the railroad. The effect of these attacks on the committee and on the appropriations for Alaska is disastrous upon the investing public in the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Is not the greatest blight on Alaska at the present time the fact that it is administered by practically all the bureaus of all the departments and that there is no head or tail to the system of administering the various resources of that country, and until we can have all of these activities consolidated in some bureau or some one department, so there will be some responsible coordinated head, we never will have any satisfactory developments in Alaska?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would say so.

Mr. Chairman, under the permission granted me to revise and extend my remarks, I herewith submit the following statement regarding Federal expenditures in Alaska.

NOTES ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN ALASKA FOR FISCAL YEAR 1924

Statement is made that Alaska costs the Government \$10,000,000. This is the amount of the expenditures, but account should also be taken of the receipts of over \$2,000,000, bringing the net amount of the expenditures to \$7,955,024, or \$8,000,000, instead of \$10,000,000.

Statements are made to the effect that it costs \$10,000,000, which should be \$8,000,000, for the operation of the Territory.

The amount expended includes items for permanent investment, in improvements, such as the building of roads and trails, the building of the post-office building at Cordova, completion of the Alaska Railroad. From the data at hand we can not separate all of these charges, but the total of such expenditures would exceed \$2,075,340, leaving the amount of maintenance and operation of the various departments in Alaska \$5,919,644.

It is popular to divide the amount expended in Alaska by the estimated number of white residents. The natives participate to some extent in all expenditures made for Alaska, but certain of the appropriations are made directly for the Indians and certainly should not be included in the total that is divided by the number of white inhabitants. The largest of these expenditures is \$496,737.21 for education and medical relief of the natives. Therefore, disregarding other expenditures for the natives, the expenditure is reduced to \$5,422,907.

Of the above figure, \$5,422,907, not all is expended at the request of the white population or is of any benefit to them, such as the following:

Weather Bureau	\$12,106.51
Investigation and protection of wild animal life (for the benefit of "outside" hunters)	28,005.55
Steamboat inspection	17,526.00
Lighthouse Service (for commerce and shipping of the world)	369,718.00
Coast and Geodetic Survey (as above)	533,458.00
Fur Seal Service (for seal-fur users in States)	176,705.00
Protection of fisheries (for food supply for people in the States)	128,041.00
Fish culture (as above)	42,173.00
General fishery investment (as above)	6,936.00
Expense of Coast Guard Service	299,781.66
Expenses of boundary between United States and Canada	1,378.91
Expended for military purposes	646,831.36
Navy petroleum reserve, No. 4	75,000.00
National Park Service	8,272.82
Protection of game	18,347.62
Total	2,364,281.43

After deducting the above items, the amount to be divided is \$3,058,626.

However, in this amount is included expenditures that are for the future development of Alaska, and of no immediate advantage to those now living there, such as—

Maintenance and operation of experimental farms	\$70,438.25
Administration and protection of national forests	111,136.07
Investigation of reindeer industry	20,876.95
Geological Survey	75,423.57

Total	277,874.84
-------	------------

leaving the amount to be divided \$2,780,751. Of this amount \$151,237.78 is for the care of the insane, which is chiefly for insane persons who come to Alaska for seasonal work, and very few of whom are from the permanent residents, and should therefore not be included.

In the Post Office Department only the receipts from post offices in Alaska are credited, while seven-eighths of the mail is inbound. The post-office receipts should, therefore, have an additional credit of \$926,000, thereby reducing the total to be divided between the permanent residents of Alaska to \$1,703,513 instead of \$10,000,000. But should the permanent white residents be charged with this total amount? There is a large summer population—men with business interest, tourists, and employees at canneries and in other seasonal occupations. The Indians do quite a portion of the laborers' work, and many of them are profitably engaged and helping in the development of the Territory.

Fifty dollars instead of \$500 would be more nearly an accurate charge against the permanent white residents of the Territory.

Federal expenditures in Alaska, fiscal year 1924

	Gross expenditures	Receipts	Net expenditures
Department of Agriculture:			
Maintenance and operation of experiment stations	\$70,438.25		
Enforcement of food and drug act	355.00		
Weather Bureau	12,106.51		
Administration and protection of national forests	111,136.07		
Investigation of reindeer industry	20,876.95		
Investigation and protection of wild-animal life	28,005.56		
Construction of forest roads and trails	639,181.40		
	882,099.74	\$144,099.71	\$738,000.03

Federal expenditures in Alaska, fiscal year 1924—Continued

	Gross expenditures	Receipts	Net expenditures
Department of Commerce:			
Steamboat inspection	\$17,526.00		
Lighthouse Service	369,718.00		
Coast and Geodetic Survey	533,458.00		
Fur-seal service	176,705.00		
Protection of fisheries	128,041.00		
Fish culture	42,173.00		
General fishery investment	6,936.00		
	1,274,557.00	\$111,271.00	\$1,163,286.00
Department of Labor:			
Immigration Service	8,492.32	1,418.00	7,074.32
Treasury Department:			
Expenses of collection, Customs Service	43,701.68		
Expenses of collection, Internal Revenue	1,589.92		
Additional income tax on railroad in Alaska	18,358.28		
Expenses of Coast Guard Service	299,781.56		
Expenses of Public Health Service	21,361.50		
Operating expenses, public buildings	2,728.77		
Post office and courthouse, Cordova	76,851.00		
	464,372.71	206,680.30	197,692.41
State Department:			
Expenses, boundary between United States and Canada	1,378.91		1,378.91
War Department:			
Expended for military purposes	646,831.36		
Other expenditures (nonmilitary)	1,058,791.98		
	1,705,623.34	107,365.35	1,598,257.99
Navy Department:			
Radio stations	101,792.78		
Navy Petroleum Reserve No. 4	75,000.00		
	176,792.78		176,792.78
Department of Justice:			
Fees of witnesses and jurors, support of prisoners, salaries, fees, and expenses of district attorneys and other expenses	658,186.78	372,326.97	285,859.81
Post Office Department:			
Star-route (overland) service	150,531.76		
Steamboat service	371,390.05		
Mail-messenger service	11,101.00		
Railroad service	43,348.52		
Salaries and expenses, post-office inspectors	4,214.00		
Salaries and expenses, chief clerk, Railway Mail Service	6,704.50		
Postal clerks on steamers	17,159.23		
Compensation to postmasters	66,821.00		
Post-office clerk hire	69,859.00		
Post-office rent, light, fuel, etc	16,092.00		
	757,221.06	132,305.01	624,916.05
Department of the Interior:			
Office of the Secretary—			
Salaries	7,000.00		
Contingent expenses	9,976.23		
Legislative expenses			
Public schools, Alaska fund	19,569.15		
Care, custody, etc., of insane	151,237.78		
Protection of game in Alaska	18,347.62		
Suppressing traffic in intoxicating liquors	12,791.95		
	218,902.73		
Bureau of Education—			
Education and medical relief, natives of Alaska, and reindeer for Alaska	496,737.21		
General Land Office	75,689.23		
National Park Service	8,272.82		
Geological Survey	75,423.57		
Bureau of Mines	33,877.76		
The Alaska Railroad—			
Maintenance and operation	2,297,573.78		
Improvements	859,347.36		
	3,156,921.14		
	4,005,844.46		
Total	9,004,348.04	2,039,324.22	7,955,023.82

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected. The Clerk read as follows:

Platt National Park, Okla.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$12,400.

MR. SWANK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 2, after the word "improvement," strike out the figures "\$12,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

PLATT NATIONAL PARK

MR. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have appeared before you many times on the floor of this House and before the Committee on Appropriations asking for additional appropriations for Platt National Park, near Sulphur, Okla. Among my many other duties as a Member of this body, I have presented the claims of this park before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior, the National Park Service, the Budget Committee, and the membership of the House. I have done everything possible to convince those in authority of our need for greater appropriations for this park. I am here again asking for a larger appropriation, and will be here again next year, and until the necessary amount is granted, consistent with the growth of the park and the good it is accomplishing for the thousands of people who visit there each year.

For the fiscal year 1924 the subcommittee recommended an appropriation of \$10,000, which is \$2,500 more than the amount received the preceding year, and for 1925, \$11,920 was recommended by the subcommittee. In addition to this amount for 1925, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], agreed to my amendment increasing the recommendation of the committee by \$6,000, and bringing the total appropriation in the bill to the sum of \$17,920. A further appropriation of \$42,000 was made for road work in the park. In comparison with the amount the park was receiving for maintenance and upkeep when I came to Congress, this is a good increase, but insufficient, considering the growth of the park. When the people sent me here the park was receiving but \$7,500 per year for all purposes. The appropriation last year, including the amount for road work, was \$59,920. It is, of course, gratifying to receive this large increase over preceding years, but if every member of the Committee on Appropriations and the membership of this House could indulge in the pleasure of visiting this park you would at once be impressed with the necessity of larger appropriations and wonder at the modest appeals for more money to increase the usefulness of the park.

I am at this time offering my amendment to increase the amount of \$12,400, recommended in the bill by the Committee on Appropriations, to \$25,000. I tell you in all seriousness that more than this amount should be given. Larger appropriations are needed to keep the park improved and prepared for the increased number of visitors, and the number is increasing rapidly each year, as the tables will show from the report of the Director of the National Park Service. The report of the superintendent for 1924 shows that the city of Sulphur, by reason of the great need for additional improvements for the comfort of the visitors, spent between \$16,000 and \$17,000 in the park for community buildings, comfort stations, and extension of the sewer and water lines. This large contribution by the enterprising and good people of Sulphur shows their activity and progress. This is a national park and these people should not be required to spend their money for the proper upkeep of this park, but Congress should make sufficient appropriations as it does for other parks that have many thousand fewer visitors. The citizens where any national park is located should not be compelled to pay out their money to maintain such parks. They belong to the people of the United States and not to the communities nor the States where they are located.

The chief purpose and consideration in making appropriations for our national parks, in my judgment, should be their usefulness, the purpose they serve, and the number of people who visit them each year. Platt National Park contains 848.31 acres and was created by acts of Congress of July 1, 1902, and April 21, 1904. It is located in Murray County and is adjacent to the city of Sulphur, with its progressive, intelligent, law-abiding citizenship, unsurpassed and unexcelled by any other community in the country. There visitors will always find a sincere, cordial welcome that makes you feel

at home. The hotel accommodations are good, with moderate and reasonable charges. There are many first-class restaurants and rooming houses at moderate cost. There are also excellent and convenient locations reserved for campers and no charges made.

Mr. Cammerer, of the National Park Service, in his statement before the subcommittee, on page 873 of the hearings, said:

This park is located in southern Oklahoma and adjoins the city of Sulphur. It contains medicinal springs, which are said to have high curative value. Physical improvements: Eleven miles of road, one stone office building, six cottages and outbuildings, two community buildings, nine cement comfort stations, pavilions over five springs, two bridges and six causeways, and public camp grounds having sewer and water systems and electricity for lights.

The report of the Director of the National Park Service for 1922, on page 66, states:

During the year the city of Sulphur, which adjoins Platt National Park, donated between \$13,000 and \$16,000 for park improvements. * * * This excellent cooperation on the part of the city of Sulphur was appreciated both by the visitors and this service. It is estimated that 246,998 visitors in all entered the park gates. As many of them undoubtedly repeated their visits from day to day, 70,000 individuals is considered a fair estimate of the travel. The park is a focal point for motor travel from all the Southern States west of the Mississippi. During the season the campers held several big meetings and community camp fires and organized a Platt Park Club with over 100 vice presidents in different States. The aim of the club is to tell others of the benefits to be derived from the health-giving waters of the park and to see that it has financial help to properly maintain it and for needed improvements. The wild animals maintained under fence in the park were added to—a fine bull elk from Yellowstone was received, four fawns were added to the deer herd, and a baby buffalo was born in the park. The park roads are especially in need of improvement, and adequate appropriations should be made to bring them up to a standard worthy of a national park.

On page 78 of the report of the National Park Service for 1923 is this statement:

During the year the city of Sulphur, which adjoins Platt National Park, continued its cooperation in every way possible in helping the park serve the thousands of visitors. Records show that 470,841 people entered the park gates, but as many of them undoubtedly repeated their visits from day to day, 117,710 individuals is considered a fair estimate of the travel. The park is a focal point for motor travel from all the Southern States west of the Mississippi, and its popularity as a health and pleasure resort is increasing yearly. Little in the way of extensive improvements has been made, and to properly care for the increasing patronage there is needed larger annual appropriations for the extension of camp grounds, sewer, water, and light systems, and for general sanitation. The park roads were not constructed for automobile traffic; they are narrow and need to be widened and resurfaced.

The annual report of the Director of the National Park Service for 1925 shows a total of 2,108,084 visitors to our parks and monuments, as compared with 1,670,908 in 1924. This report further says:

These figures are of significance to every thinking American, for it is evident that the nation-wide revival of interest in outdoor recreation is carrying our health and pleasure seeking people into the national parks in a far larger degree than was expected 10 years ago, when the service was created. The travel induced by the attractions of the national parks, irrespective of other local attractions, means the distribution of hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the country, of which a great portion is left in the States in which the national parks are located. It is the national park cross-country tourist who distributes money into sections that are away from money-making industrial centers. Tourist money goes straight into circulation and immediately benefits the locality visited.

This great flow of tourist gold is adding new life to communities unprogressive for years. It is a particularly dependable annual source of income for many of the Western States. It has been told me in many sections of the West that when short crops and droughts produced failures, or epidemics among livestock depleted the capital investments of substantial citizens of a community, the tourist money was the stable source of income that assisted in keeping the community alive. Every visitor is a potential settler and investor.

Continuing, the director says:

It is with gratification that I report the satisfactory condition of the wild life in the national parks. The animals themselves seem to know that the parks provide a safe refuge for them. Where thousands of motorists visit the parks and must be accommodated in the public camp grounds, it is inevitable that serious problems of sanitation are encountered and must be solved. It is imperative that from year to

year more funds must be secured to carry this work forward, and this is considered one of the most important of the duties devolving upon the service in providing for its guests.

This report of the National Park Service shows that the visitors in our national parks have increased from 488,268 in 1917 to 1,670,908 in 1924, and the appropriations have increased from \$537,366.67 in 1917 to \$1,822,730 in 1924. The appropriation for the fiscal year 1926 is \$3,243,409. In addition to this, the Interior Department appropriation act of March 3, 1925, carried an additional \$1,500,000 for road construction in the parks. These figures show the increasing importance of our national park system in its service to the citizens of our country. Not only are the local communities where the parks are located benefited by the visitors, but the visitors are benefited by outings to these places endowed so richly by nature; and especially is this true where the parks have a plentiful supply of medicinal water, as is found at Platt National Park.

The report of the Director of the National Park Service for 1925 and the hearings on this bill show the number of visitors in our leading parks, appropriations, and private automobiles entering the parks.

Visitors, 1920 to 1925

Name of park	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925
Platt	38,000	60,000	70,000	117,710	134,874	145,380
Yellowstone	79,777	81,651	98,223	138,352	144,158	154,282
Yosemite	66,906	91,513	100,506	130,046	105,894	209,166
Mount Rainier	56,491	55,771	70,371	123,708	161,473	173,004
Rocky Mountain	240,966	273,737	219,164	218,000	224,211	233,912
Grand Canyon	67,315	67,485	84,700	102,166	108,256	134,053
Lafayette	66,500	69,836	73,779	64,200	71,758	73,673

Appropriations, 1921 to 1926

Name of park	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
Platt	\$9,000	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$17,920
Yellowstone	286,000	350,000	361,000	368,000	372,800	396,000
Yosemite	303,000	300,000	280,000	295,000	300,000	252,714
Mount Rainier	40,000	150,000	106,800	133,000	100,000	106,500
Rocky Mountain	40,000	65,000	73,900	74,280	93,000	84,660
Grand Canyon	60,000	100,000	75,000	125,400	216,000	192,380
Lafayette	20,000	25,000	25,000	30,000	34,700	34,190

Private automobiles entering the parks

Name of park	1922	1923	1924	1925
Platt	30,000	50,000	57,400	60,000
Yellowstone	18,253	27,359	30,689	33,068
Yosemite	19,583	27,233	32,814	49,299
Mount Rainier	17,149	27,655	38,351	39,860
Rocky Mountain	52,112	51,800	53,696	58,057
Grand Canyon	7,890	11,731	13,052	19,910
Lafayette	8,650	8,600	12,561	9,381

Visitors in other parks

Name of park	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925
Sequoia	31,508	28,263	27,514	30,158	34,468	46,677
Crater Lake	20,135	28,617	33,016	52,017	64,312	65,018
Mesa Verde	2,890	3,003	4,251	5,236	7,109	9,043
Glacier	22,449	19,736	23,935	33,988	33,382	40,063
General Grant	19,661	30,312	50,456	46,230	35,020	40,517
Zion	8,692	2,937	4,109	6,408	8,400	16,817

Appropriations for other parks

Name of park	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
Sequoia	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$78,000	\$120,000	\$136,000	\$71,710
Crater Lake	25,300	25,300	32,000	35,000	30,700	35,980
Mesa Verde	14,000	16,400	43,000	35,000	42,500	42,835
Glacier	107,564	195,000	178,700	225,000	281,000	184,960
General Grant	5,300	6,000	6,500	50,000	14,175	12,180
Zion	8,885	10,000	10,000	13,750	15,190	20,000

In determining the value of a national park we must take into consideration the number of its visitors. Our parks should, of course, conserve the natural scenery and animal life, but appropriations should bear relation to the benefit to our people and the country in general. Figures taken from the report of the superintendent of Platt National Park show the visitors as follows:

Visitors for the past seven years:

1919	107,918
1920	173,310
1921	216,022
1922	246,998
1923	470,841
1924	539,495
1925	573,522

The visitors have increased from 107,918 in 1919 to 573,522 in 1925. The reports of the Director of the National Park Service show that in 1924, 57,400 private automobiles entered the park and the number was increased to 60,000 in 1925, and for these two years excelled the number of private automobiles entering any other of our national parks. The superintendent of the park in his report to the director shows that 539,495 people visited Platt National Park in 1924, and that this number was increased to 573,522 in 1925. The National Park Service estimates the number of visitors for these two years at 134,874 and 143,380, and, as a basis for this reduction, gives the reason that many visitors entering the park gates were counted more than once. While it is true that visitors were sometimes counted more than one time, it is also a fact that thousands of people who visit the park each year are never counted at all, for the reason that they do not visit Bromide Springs, where visitors are checked. If those who visited the park and were never checked at Bromide Springs were counted, the reports would show thousands more visitors. After this great reduction by the director in making his estimate of visitors there were but six other parks that had more visitors than Platt in 1925. These figures show the wonderful growth of the park and its need for larger appropriations in properly caring for these visitors and adequate development work.

The director's report for 1923 says:

To properly care for the increased patronage there is needed larger annual appropriations for the extension of camp grounds, sewer, water, and light systems, and for general sanitation.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior for 1924 states:

Platt Park, which is open all year, was visited by 134,874 visitors last year, compared with 117,710 in 1923. On July 4 alone over 20,000 people visited the Bromide Springs and drank of the medicinal waters. The park is gaining in favor as a health and pleasure resort.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Platt National Park is property of the Government, and as such should be properly maintained in accordance with the benefits it renders the people of the country. While it is not so large as some of our other parks, I believe it does more real good to a greater number of people than any of the other parks. The Legislature of Oklahoma has appropriated more than \$270,000 for the erection of a sanitarium and hospital for soldiers of the World War, and, after a thorough and careful survey made by a committee of prominent physicians, located this hospital at Sulphur, near the park. The hospital is in charge of a staff of competent physicians, surgeons, and nurses, and gives first-class treatment to its patients. I have visited the hospital many times and have always found it clean and sanitary, the officials courteous, kind, and considerate, and everything possible done for the patients. The superintendent of the hospital states that the value of this property, buildings, improvements, and equipment is \$400,000. The legislature appropriated \$120,000 for maintenance for the fiscal year. The citizens of Oklahoma are always doing everything possible for the proper care and treatment of our soldiers, and located this hospital in the most healthful surroundings, where the scenery is beautiful, and surrounded by Christian influences, and the selection was wisely made. Sulphur has an excellent school system, and here is located the State School for the Deaf, with a large enrollment, a fine campus, many buildings, and able teachers.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SWANK. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that the water was particularly good for bathing purposes. Does it apply to the girls or the men?

Mr. SWANK. To all of them. I would be glad if the gentleman from Massachusetts would go down there and take a bath and a few drinks of the bromide water.

Mr. Chairman, Platt National Park has more than 30 mineral springs, and is one of the most noted health resorts in the whole country. These springs afford an ample supply of water, unsurpassed in quality and character. The visitor there will find pure water, bromide, medicine, and all kinds of sulphur water. Any kind of water can be found in this park that is beneficial to the health of the human body. No finer place can be found at such small expense for people who want a good outing, and the miraculous wonders effected by the waters in curing disease can not be told. I wish every Member of this

House could pay a visit to this park and take a few drinks of this water and bathe in the many swimming pools watered by great artesian wells. You would be wonderfully rejuvenated in both mind and body, and the effects of the water can not be exaggerated. No park furnishes wells and springs of water with such wonderful properties. One of these wells flows 2,500 gallons of pure, clear, sulphur water per minute, and Buffalo Springs flows 5,000,000 gallons per day. It is indeed a great sight to see thousands of people—old, young, healthy, decrepit men, women, and children—swim in these waters each day during the spring, summer, and fall.

The bromide water is almost a sure cure for all forms of nervousness, stomach and digestive disorders, and sleeplessness will be cured by a few drinks and the patient can enjoy that needed rest that is so essential to good health. The sulphur water affords one of the best treatments for rheumatism, and I have personally seen stubborn cases yield to the treatment in a few days, and for skin diseases of all kinds this place is unequalled.

While this is essentially a park for people of modest means, all classes of people from every section of the country visit this park each year. It is a place where people can find everything they want in the way of amusements and can have their health restored if it is impaired. Excellent camping grounds are provided for those who do not want to stay at the hotels. People who can not spend large sums of money for treatment in most cases can be cured here at little expense. There is no charge to camp in the park nor to drink the water, and all other expenses are most reasonable.

The city of Sulphur, adjacent to this park, is a most beautiful little city, with an elegant, well-equipped auditorium, a fine new county courthouse, churches of almost all denominations, private hospitals, bathhouses, and first-class physicians and surgeons. In addition to all this, visitors will find a most hospitable, generous, friendly people. The Ozark Trail and the Bankhead Highway pass through Sulphur. It is traversed by the principal motor route through the State and is on the Santa Fe and Frisco railroads. Other roads in that county are good and it is near the Washita River and the Arbuckle Mountains. This is a park of great natural beauty, but its chief value is in restoring people to health, reviving low spirits, renewing the vigor of youth, and in giving visitors a new lease on life with more promising prospects for the future.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of our greatest parks, when we consider value by services rendered, and should be adequately provided for, along with our other great parks, in conformity to the program of our National Park Service. Many Government improvements are needed in Platt National Park; among them should be increased appropriations for continued improvement of the roads, extension of sewer and water lines, additional comfort stations, tree planting, further improvements at Bromide Springs, the drilling of additional wells, dams across the creek flowing through the park, improved camping grounds, and the construction of proper residences and office buildings for the superintendent and other employees. In addition to this, further appropriations should be made for the establishment of a Government bathhouse where people can bathe in these wonderful life-giving, health-restoring waters at the many springs at actual cost. These are some of the necessary improvements that are greatly needed and for which sufficient appropriations should be made. Money can not be expended to a better advantage than to restore the health of our citizens. The amount recommended by the Budget Committee is greatly inadequate and I hope this Committee of the Whole will adopt my amendment for the small increase requested.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the best description of this park that I have seen is—

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds I wish to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Platt National Park is a municipal park of some State importance, maintained by Federal funds. I think that is a fair characterization. It never should have been made a national park. It is not of the national importance from any standpoint to justify setting it aside as a national park. But nevertheless it is a national park, and we are providing for its administration. It is patronized by a large number of people from Sulphur City and the vicinity who appreciate the importance of a bath in the particular kind of water that those springs possess. We made an increase in the appropriation last year on account of the gracious manner of the gentleman from Oklahoma and his personal charm; we accepted his amendment last year making an increase of \$6,000.

It should not become a habit to increase the appropriation each year by \$6,000.

Mr. DENISON. Is there any wild life in this park that needs protection?

Mr. CRAMTON. None that they brag about.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

National monuments: For administration, protection, maintenance, preservation, and improvement of the national monuments, including not exceeding \$400 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the custodians and employees in connection with general monument work, and including \$500 for the construction of buildings, \$21,270.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to call your attention to the fact that you have just passed expenditures for 19 national parks, which aggregate, according to my estimate, about \$1,150,000 a year. I am not opposing the expenditure of this amount of money for this great American educational feature, because I think it one of the most worthy objects we have in the United States to-day. But I want to call your attention to this fact, that we have 32 national monuments under the administration of the National Park Service, and that the expenditure for these 32 national monuments, which in character are similar to the national parks, but of a much inferior character, is \$21,270. Your chairman announces the figures, and they are absolutely correct, that 2,108,064 people visited the national parks in the year 1925. I want to call your attention to this fact, that while we did spend scarcely any money on national monuments, yet 247,572 people visited the 32 national monuments in the United States that were under the supervision of the National Park Service.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Budget Commission and the Members of this House to the fact that the national monuments do not receive the attention in the appropriation bill that they should receive. Many of these monuments are of almost national park character. In my State there are eight of these national monuments. In the State of Arizona there are nine. We have a great many national monuments that are not supervised by the National Park Service. There are 14 under the Department of Agriculture and 10 under the War Department.

I am presenting you these figures to show you that one-sixth as many people visited the national monuments during the past year, with practically no expenditure on the part of the National Park Service or provision made by the Budget for any expenditure except for the merest possible supervision, notwithstanding this almost one-sixth as many people visited the 32 national monuments as visited the national parks. Besides the \$1,150,000 appropriated for the national parks there is a road appropriation to be expended in three years of \$7,500,000, and every dollar of that will go to the development of roads to the national parks and not one dollar will go to the development of the roads to national monuments. In my State we have three national monuments which are practically to-day attracting just as much attention as any national park in the United States, and the National Geographic Society is spending in New Mexico thousands of dollars in excavating ancient pueblos. Two of these are the Bandelier National Monument and the Chaco Canyon National Monument. The Bandelier National Monument offers the visitor a rare combination of scenic beauty and antiquarian interest. West of the Rio Grande at Buckman, N. Mex., but 1,000 feet above it, lies the Pajarito Plateau, a rolling yellow-pine country cut by deep canyons that lead down to the river. One of these canyons contains a pretty little mountain stream, the Rio de los Frijoles. Between picturesque cliffs and canyon walls this stream literally tumbles into the Rio Grande over many falls, two of them 80 feet high. On a little flat bordering this stream, where fields were available close by, some prehistoric man established his communal house, his dwellings in the cliffs, and his kivas—the village of Tyuonyi. Others of his people lived in villages on the Pajarito Plateau and in near-by canyons, where natural defenses made their habitations more secure. Long ago these people disappeared, but the ruins of their cities have remained.

Adolph F. Bandelier, the distinguished archaeologist whose name has been given to the national monument, was a native of Berne, Switzerland. In visiting the Bandelier National

Monument one should not fall to see the communal house, the cliff ruins, the ceremonial cave, the upper and lower falls, the gorge of the Rio Grande del Norte at the mouth of the Rito, the stone lions of Cochiti and the ancient ruins of Yaphashi near by, the painted cave, the ruins of Otowi and Tsankawi, and the stone tents. It should be noted that along the Rito de los Frijoles there are many excavations and restorations of talus pueblos, cliff ruins, and kivas. Some of the tools, implements, and simple household equipments of the former inhabitants have been restored as they were centuries ago.

As examples of prehistoric architectural skill the ruins of the Chaco Canyon National Monument are without equal in the whole United States. The cultural material recovered from their abandoned rooms excels in variety, technique, and beauty of design that from any other archaeological site in the entire Southwest. No written word of history exists concerning the Chaco Canyon builders.

This is from a departmental memorandum for the press.

I am not going to offer an amendment to this item of the bill, but I am calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the national monuments are neglected. I am not saying that the National Park Service is neglecting them, but I know that these different States in the western country that have their national parks and get these appropriations pay no attention to the national monuments, and that the National Park Service, in order to secure the necessary appropriations for the parks, neglect the national monuments. I want to say that if one-sixth of the people of the United States visit the national monuments in proportion to the number that go to the national parks and you spend practically nothing for them, there certainly must be some neglect somewhere in providing for the development of the national monuments.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For administration, protection, maintenance, preservation, and improvement of Carlsbad Cave National Monument in New Mexico, \$15,000.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORROW: Page 96, line 25, after the words "New Mexico," in line 25, strike out "\$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I offer this amendment in conformity with the request of my people in the State of New Mexico. This Carlsbad monument is to-day perhaps one of the most wonderful attractions in the United States. Many of the Members of the House heard the lecture delivered by Dr. Willis T. Lee—and saw the pictures—last winter in the caucus room. The National Geographic Society is giving this monument wonderful advertisement throughout the United States.

On October 24, 1923, the President of the United States proclaimed the caverns a national monument. At that time it was the property of the State of New Mexico. The President perhaps was not aware of that fact, but it had been deeded and passed to the State of New Mexico many, many years before. However, the people of the State of New Mexico voluntarily surrendered their rights to this monument so that the Government of the United States might improve the same.

Two years ago we had to offer an amendment in the House to the appropriation bill for \$5,000 to make an inspection and survey of this monument. Last year we had to offer an amendment in the House of \$25,000 to get the necessary improvements to this monument carried forward.

The people of Carlsbad have erected a stairway leading into these caverns at their own expense. The State of New Mexico has built a road 24 miles long, an up-to-date, drained road leading to these caverns. It is to-day, as I said, advertised throughout the entire United States. The transcontinental lines of railroads are selling tickets and requesting their passengers to visit these caverns on their western trips.

The National Park Service is starting the improvement of these caverns, and the statement of the people of Carlsbad is to this effect: That \$15,000, as carried in this bill, will not make the necessary improvements to put these caverns in shape for the tourists who desire to visit them and make it convenient and accessible. They claim the improvement of this monument is not being advanced as rapidly as the public demands it

should be. The State of New Mexico has spent \$2 to \$1 appropriated by the Government up to this time.

I want to say to you in all sincerity that I am not asking anything from the Government in this appropriation that will not be returned to the Government. They have already outlined a plan whereby the money will be returned. They are charging the tourist who enters these caverns \$3 for the services of a guide and for the inspection. The superintendent of the national parks informs me that it is the intention to charge the tourists who enter these caverns at least \$2.

Gentlemen, if you will make the necessary appropriation and let these caverns be developed as they should be developed at this time, and as soon as it is possible to develop them, the people from the Lone Star State of Texas, which is only about 75 miles from these caverns on their western border, will send sufficient people to visit them to pay back this appropriation and all the appropriations which the Government will have expended in that direction.

These are wonderful phenomena that the American people are desirous of visiting. There should not be any delay in developing them and not carry this development along for a period of years. What should be done is to develop them as speedily as is possible so that the American tourist and the American lover of nature can go there and have proper conveniences in going through these caverns.

The Carlsbad Caverns have now reached that importance that the Government should not delay in placing these caverns in proper condition to be viewed by the American public.

They are no longer a local attraction to New Mexico or to the Carlsbad community, but they have been so well advertised by those who have been fortunate enough to see these marvelous stalactites and stalagmites in these mammoth underground caverns, where nature has fashioned its handiwork, that the Government ought not to lag in placing these caves in shape, to take care of them in the proper way, and to provide for those who desire to enter and enjoy this marvelous display.

The State generously donated the land where the caves are located to the Government, and since the Government has acquired title the State has continued to spend its money to develop the same. Ten thousand dollars additional will help very materially in handling these caves. It is very important that this development hasten along and not be delayed. The Budget Committee should at least spend as much as the State in bringing this great wonder before the American public. The people of the Nation are greatly indebted to Dr. Willis T. Lee for bringing so vividly to them the story of his exploration and discovery of the hidden beauty of these immeasurable caves. Many rooms have been discovered and there are many yet unexplored. Already 7½ miles have been explored and mapped.

The caves became the property of the United States September 19, 1925. These caves are situated in the Guadalupe Mountains of New Mexico, 24 miles southwest of the town of Carlsbad, N. Mex. They consist of many chambers of great dimensions, filled with a wonderful display by the great artist, nature. I quote here a press description of the caverns:

A wonder world, hundreds of feet underground, with neither animal or vegetable life, yet overflowing with the beauties of nature. An underworld cathedral of nature filled with the most beautiful display of stalactites and stalagmitic formations it is man's privilege to behold. A startling wonder that has been silent and concealed for countless centuries, first discovered by James White and brought to the attention of the National Geographical Society by Dr. Willis T. Lee, who headed an expedition under the auspices of the National Geographic Society of Washington, D. C. Doctor Lee spent much time in exploring and mapping the caverns, and no doubt has more knowledge concerning this wonder than any other citizen or scientific individual.

E. Dana Johnson, editor of the Santa Fe New Mexican, says:

There are acres of frozen gardens, fantastic flowers in translucent marble, towering giant figures, brooding and sinister, slender minarets and spires, mushrooms 20 feet across. And always is the black mystery of other gigantic vaulted crypts and chambers.

C. L. Seagraves, general colonization agent of the Santa Fe Railway, says:

Word and pen pictures are insignificant when compared to the real thing. I am convinced that the beauties and grandeur of the Grand Canyon are no more wonderful than are the scenic beauties of the Carlsbad Caverns; a trip across the continent is not complete without a visit to this wonderland.

Dr. C. R. Crook, director Illinois State Museum, says:

So wonderful and instructive do I consider the Carlsbad Caverns that I have shipped large quantities of similar formations from caves in the vicinity to Springfield and intend to construct a miniature "Carlsbad Cavern" in the Illinois Museum.

Judge Adrian Poole, Texas, says:

The wonders of the Carlsbad Cavern can not be described by man.

Walter Murck, an artist who has painted scenes of the interior decorations, says:

How on earth can one find adjectives fit to describe it?

Ex-Gov. James F. Hinkle, of New Mexico, says:

It ranks with the wonders of the world; all the decorators in the world could not improve on the Carlsbad Caves.

Ex-Gov. Pat Neff, of Texas, says:

I thank you for showing me the greatest wonder of the world. I can not understand how a natural wonder could be so gigantic and beautiful without Texas having a hand in its making.

In closing let me ask, Why be so penurious in appropriating the money to make the caverns conveniently accessible and providing for the comfort of the many thousands of citizens who are desirous of visiting this wonder of nature? They await a call from the Government to the effect that the caves are open and properly equipped for a pleasant educational trip through the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this national monument is this year given a consideration that has never been shown to any other national monument, in that an appropriation is being made exclusively for this one monument. For the current year \$25,000 was given for the preliminary work of development and \$15,000 is included in the current bill.

It is a feature, I understand, of great merit, but it seems to me the work is proceeding as rapidly as is to be expected, in view of the very great need there is in connection with the whole park service for more money than they are receiving.

It seems to me this monument has received consideration entirely equal to what it deserves, as compared with other monuments and parks, so I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MORROW) there were—yeas 5, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction, etc., of roads and trails: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, \$2,000,000, of which amount not to exceed \$6,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may also approve projects, incur obligations, and enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of \$1,500,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act approved April 9, 1924, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be available for road construction in the Rocky Mountain National Park until the State of Colorado cedes to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over said park.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Page 98, line 23, after the word "created," strike out the remainder of the paragraph, including the first three lines on page 99.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, in support of my amendment I want to refer briefly back to the creation of this park by Congress in 1915. I have here a 75-page pamphlet copy of the hearings held by the House Committee on the Public Lands on the bill establishing this Rocky Mountain National Park. Those hearings were held on December 23, 1914. I introduced the bill in the House and as a member of that committee was in charge of those hearings, and in support of the

bill I introduced four Governors of Colorado—the then Governor Ammons and Governor-elect Carlson and former Governors Thomas and Shafrroth, both of whom were then United States Senators. I also introduced a very forcible and lengthy letter to me from former United States Senator Thomas M. Patterson; and I also presented hundreds of resolutions, letters, and other endorsements, including a memorial from the Colorado General Assembly; also Enos Mills and several other witnesses appeared. They made a most elaborate and strong showing in behalf of the park. The committee authorized me to report the bill to the House, which I did with a 48-page printed report, a copy of which I have here. I called up the bill on unanimous consent Monday, January 18, 1915—11 years ago next Monday—and there were 18 pages of debate and insertions on the bill, extending from page 1788 to page 1806 of volume 52, Sixty-third Congress, third session, part 2. The bill was passed by the House by unanimous consent and President Wilson approved and signed it on January 26, 1915, and presented me the pen he used in creating the park.

I make this detailed reference to the matter to assure the House of my personal knowledge of the history of this park, and also because I do not recall that there is a soul on the floor to-day who was present at that time. Senator Charles S. Thomas introduced the bill in the Senate and passed it through that body. He was also present on the floor of the House during the debate here, and he remembers all the facts perfectly. The Members all, I think, fully appreciated the great importance of this park, but there was very general and serious opposition to the creation of any more parks at that time on account of the additional expense, and as a condition precedent to allowing the bill to pass I had to, and did, agree to three things, namely: First, to allow the bill to be amended limiting the appropriations for the park to \$10,000 a year until otherwise provided by Congress; second, that the State and local authorities would complete the Fall River Road; and, third, that the State would cede to the Federal Government whatever authority and jurisdiction was properly necessary for the orderly management of the park.

At that time the Interior Department officials recommended that we should receive the entrance fees and receipts from licenses and concessions and all other emoluments derived from the park. But soon after that the department decided that that was not a good fiscal policy, and because the park was deprived of those receipts we passed a bill several years after removing that limitation of \$10,000 a year upon the appropriations for that park, and this bill carries \$87,000 for the maintenance of this park during the next fiscal year. As to the second requirement, the State has complied with that and built and completed the Fall River Road. They have spent a vast amount of money on it, and they have built a much better road than they ever expected they would be required to build under my agreement. However, there is no contention about that matter now. That requirement has been complied with. As to the third requirement, to formally cede jurisdiction to the Federal Government, Colorado has not yet carried out my agreement.

Our idea was to turn that marvelous region over to the United States Government as a real, great national park. I was asked a great many questions on the floor of the House at the time of the passage of this bill. One of them was by Mr. Moore, of Pennsylvania, which, together with my answer, appears on page 1791 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, as follows:

Mr. MOORE. Now, one further question. I am still seeking information. Why is it that the State of Colorado does not take care of this park itself?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Well, there is very little use of our discussing that question, because, in the first place, Congress would not under any circumstances cede that territory to the State. It would be wrong for the Government to ever surrender title to that territory. Secondly, Colorado has a large number of beautiful parks. Half of the State is composed of mountain parks. We have three times as much mountain scenery in our State alone as there is in the entire Swiss Nation. Our State does not want this as a local State park. We want the Nation to have this marvelous region, so the entire population of the United States will feel a proprietary interest in it. We prefer to surrender jurisdiction over the territory to the Federal Government and let the entire world feel at liberty to come there as the guest of Uncle Sam.

So that was really the understanding, and, frankly, I do not know why that cession has never been made. I think it is purely an oversight. Certainly no one in my State has ever thought of not keeping faith with the Federal Government. I believe the reason is very few people in the State know about that requirement of the national parks. Possibly I may be

somewhat to blame myself for not having called the attention of the Colorado Legislature to the matter. I think I should have done so. I just assumed that the public knew it, and overlooked it myself. However, it is not at all the fault of the people of the State of Colorado. No one has ever asked the legislature to make this cession that I know of. Possibly the Bureau of National Parks should have done so. It just has not been attended to in Colorado. The park is a wonderfully popular park in our State, and nobody would want to do anything to jeopardize its development.

If this clause remains in the bill it has the effect of preventing any road work in the park during the next fiscal year. It would deprive our State of the benefits of the allotment of \$140,000 to the park for this coming year. Therefore I feel it would be an unwarranted and wholly unnecessary hardship upon the State and the park development for this provision to remain in the bill. I have written the situation fully to Senator PHIPPS and the attorney general, who are in Denver now, and they have promptly taken the matter up with the governor, and the governor of the State and the attorney general have just sent a telegram here to my colleague [Mr. VAILE], who represents the Denver district, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., January 8, 1926.

Hon. WILLIAM N. VAILE,

Congressman, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

Conference held on this day with Governor Morley at his office with Senator Phipps; Secretary of State Milliken; Mr. Paul Lee, of Fort Collins; Charles Roach, deputy attorney general; and W. L. Boatright present. Governor Morley issued an executive order directing the attorney general to dismiss at once, without prejudice, the action of the State of Colorado against Roger W. Toll, superintendent of the Rocky Mountain National Park, which will be done at once. Governor Morley agrees to submit to the incoming legislature for their action the question of ceding to the Federal Government the highways in the Rocky Mountain National Park. The above action was taken as the best judgment of all present in said conference, except Mr. Lee, who is special counsel in said case. Advise TAYLOR, TIMBERLAKE, and HARDY.

CLARENCE J. MORLEY, *Governor.*

WILLIAM L. BOATRIGHT, *Attorney General.*

I feel that this very positive assurance is abundantly sufficient to satisfy the House that the State has not repudiated anything and has no thought of doing so, and will promptly comply with the regulations in this matter, and that we ought not to inflict this hardship upon the park but should allow this appropriation to go on for the current year and rely upon the State of Colorado at the next session of its legislature, in January, 1927, to cede to the Federal Government the proper authority the same as the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Wyoming have done, I understand, to the national parks within their borders, as to the roads and the game and fish.

Therefore, I hope the chairman of the committee will not seriously object to the elimination of this clause for the next fiscal year, and will rely upon Colorado and her officials to see that this condition is rectified before the next annual appropriation bill is drawn.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MORROW. Is all the land in this park still the property of Colorado?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no; not at all. That territory was nearly all in a forest reserve before it was made a national park. It was not owned by the State. The land itself never belonged to the State. There is some land in private ownership now, and that condition has not been changed much, if any, since the park was created. There has been some effort to exchange some of that private land and get them out of the park, but they have not yet got through with that.

Mr. MORROW. How much of the present area that is included in the park is still the property of the State of Colorado?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. None of it. The State, never having surrendered jurisdiction over that region or over the roads or the game or fish, or formally released any of its authority over the lands or anything else in the park, still retains a certain amount of authority. I will not attempt to say how much.

Mr. MORROW. Who owns it—the Government?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; the Federal Government owns the land, except some private holdings that were there before the park was created and are there yet, nearly all of them.

Mr. MORROW. If the Federal Government owns it, why would the Legislature of the State of Colorado have to act in conveying it?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. A controversy arose over the granting of an exclusive franchise or permit by the park service to carry passengers through the park, and suit was brought in the United States district court to test that authority of the park service. The case was carried to the United States Supreme Court, which rendered a decision on the 11th of last May, reversing a decision of the district court in favor of the park service and remanding the case for trial largely upon the question as to whether or not the State had formally and officially surrendered its jurisdiction over the roads in that park; that is, the roads that had been built over the public lands by the State and the counties. I will not insert that decision in the RECORD, because it is too long, and I think it is unnecessary, because the case is now dismissed. I am in hopes and believe that some of the regulations that lead to that litigation may be amicably adjusted, but in any event we feel that the State should give the Federal Government whatever jurisdiction is necessary to properly maintain and exercise its lawful authority within the park. It will not do to have a conflicting or divided authority over park matters.

I want to say further that my colleagues, the gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE and Mr. VAILE], have both of them always been very diligent in the support of this park. We have all of us worked together on it for many years, and it is one of the idols of the Centennial State, and we hope no action will ever be taken by Congress to throw any impediment in its rapid development. There are more people who visit this park every year than any other park in the United States. About a quarter of a million people visited the park this last season, and the number is rapidly increasing every year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the statement the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has just made, of course, is entirely correct. There is a large attendance of people at this park. Its proximity to centers of population, like Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, and so forth, brings about a large attendance, and it would be greatly to be regretted if the proper development of the park could not go forward.

The development of it, however, has not gone forward heretofore as it ought to, because there has been surrounding the park the most unfriendly, unappreciative, unhelpful public sentiment that has surrounded any national park. The great mass of the people of the State no doubt feel as the gentleman has just suggested, entirely friendly toward the park and proud of it, but they have permitted a few trouble makers from the very beginning to monopolize the spotlight, with the result we find a very undesirable situation.

In the first place, inside the park we own approximately, and roughly speaking, the scenery, but wherever there is any land on which development could go forward for the convenience of tourists some private interests own it. If you drive your automobile into the Yellowstone Park, you are permitted to camp anywhere in that park, unless it is some place that will obstruct some wonderful view; but if you drove into the Rocky Mountain National Park in your flivver and you wanted to set up your camp, there is a sign at almost any place you would want to go, "Private property; keep off." When we constructed recently an automobile camp for public convenience we had to buy some of this privately owned land. In other words, we own the scenery, but if we want to develop the park in any way we have to buy somebody's private holdings, and every time we go forward with a development we increase the price of the remaining holdings, so we will have to pay more later for the land that we will need hereafter. This is the first trouble with the park, and it is highly important that the privately owned lands should be either eliminated from the park or purchased.

I am not talking about property that has been highly developed like certain hotel property; I am talking about the undeveloped private holdings in the park. There ought to be some way to secure them. I ventured to suggest when in the park this year—and I spoke as frankly to the people at the chamber of commerce dinner as I am speaking here—that we should have cooperation so that Congress might work with them.

The reason for putting this proviso into the bill is this: The State did build the Fall River Road, which is vital to the administration of the park. The State built it and it was one of the conditions of the establishment of the park; but recently a suit has been brought in the name of the State of Colorado claiming that the Federal Government does not have

control of that road. It was built on Federal-owned land. It was built for the purpose solely of securing a national park, but the State has permitted its name to be used in the institution of the suit, claiming the control of the road is in the State and claiming that the park authorities can not exercise supervision over it.

If the suit should prevail, administration of the park along proper lines would be impossible, and would make possible conditions that the Federal Government can not contemplate. And we have felt that that condition ought to be disposed of; it ought to be made clear that the Federal Government is supreme in the national park, so that it can proceed with its administration along proper lines.

It seemed to the committee that before we proceed with the expenditure of \$400,000 which is needed for improvement of that road, it seemed to the committee that before we spent \$400,000 to put that road in proper condition, we should know whose road it is.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the road belongs to the State of Colorado the State ought to expend the \$400,000. If they want us to spend \$400,000 it ought to be made clear that it is our road. Hence this limitation as to the provision that no further money should be expended on the road until control is ceded by the State.

The recent developments are as the gentleman from Colorado has indicated. I am advised by the National Park Service that the suit in question has been discontinued by the State of Colorado and the statement that the governor made has been carried out to that extent. I have not the slightest question but that the Governor of Colorado will proceed to do the other things that he has suggested—that when the legislature meets he will seek legislation that will make clear Federal control over the road. That will take care of the road situation. I hope he will go further and do the other things such as has been done in Wyoming and other States, cede the exclusive jurisdiction to the Federal Government. There are certain things in the parks that ought to have different regulations than in the balance of the State. Take the matter of fish, for instance. I hope the State will dispose of the whole situation. In the meantime I have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado and I am sure the committee will have no objection, because the development of a desire on the part of the authorities to meet us and work the thing out. I may say that while we were there we found that many influential people desired to cooperate with the Government, and I think the conditions are the best there now that they have been at any time. I think I should say further that, in my judgment, there can not be any actual expenditure of funds on that road during this calendar year—not the fiscal year but the calendar year—and soon thereafter we hope control will be actually given to the Government. I do not think there can be for the reason that this fund is one in great demand and it has been so far allocated that I do not think there is any money available for the calendar year 1926 for Rocky Mountain although there may be in the fiscal year 1927.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very glad that my colleague [Mr. TAYLOR], who is a veteran on this subject, has given the committee the history of the Rocky Mountain National Park. He is familiar with every detail of it. He was a tower of strength for us when it was created. I want to confirm particularly one thing he said by referring to a recent conversation which I had with ex-United States Senator Thomas, whose recollection is similar to that of Mr. TAYLOR. At the time the bill for this park was put through he had charge of it in the Senate, and he tells me that the agreement there also was that jurisdiction should be ceded to the United States.

We have not any quarrel with this provision except that we do not think it should be applied in this case on account of the recent action by the Governor and attorney general of Colorado, to which reference has been made, and we wish to thank the chairman for meeting us halfway by agreeing that this limitation may go out.

However, I do want to refer to the use of this kind of a provision generally in appropriation bills. As I say, it may be all right in this particular instance, and I think perhaps it has served a useful purpose in bringing this particular matter to the attention of the House and promoting an equitable adjustment, but is a form of compulsion—I do not like to use the

word "duress," because it seems a little harsh—upon the States or upon individuals to make them do something which we think they perhaps ought to do and which they may think, with good reason, that they ought not to do. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] made a very resolute fight the other day to have a similar limitation taken off of the appropriation for the North Platte Nebraska-Wyoming reclamation project. It was provided in the bill that that appropriation should not be available unless some State or district official or somebody else did such and such things.

But the making of such limitations seems to be an established policy; and if it is, then I respectfully submit that there is a place in the bill where it should have been applied, and that is on page 27, where we provide for the construction of the Coolidge Dam across the canyon of the Gila River near San Carlos, Ariz., as authorized by the act of June 7, 1924.

There it would have been useful if we had put in a proviso that no part of the sum therein appropriated should be available for the construction of such dam until the State of Arizona ratifies the Colorado River pact. That reclamation project was created by the act of July 7, 1924, and went through by unanimous consent, because the rest of the Western States had an understanding, and my recollection is that it was induced—at least it was not discouraged—by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], that when Arizona got that very large allowance of water, Arizona would come in and be a party to the working out of a big system in respect to the use of the waters of the Colorado River, which would cover all of the States. They got the matter through by unanimous consent in this House and got their dam built; and then, although the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] acted as he always does, in the utmost good faith, a lot of his folks down there could not see it in that way. They could not see why Arizona should join in the ratification of the compact, and they are laughing quite a good deal at Colorado and Utah and Wyoming and the upper States. What they say now is that they have got what they wanted, and that they have got it without giving any consideration, and that the upper States can go to the devil. Now, we did not ask to amend the bill by applying such a limitation to the San Carlos reclamation project, because we did not want to work a hardship on the Indians who have lands under it. And the upper States wanted to be generous, even if some of their neighbors were not; but the time is coming when, if such compulsion as Congress applies in other portions of this bill is to be applied at all, we shall ask that it be applied to make our great neighboring State of Arizona see things in a light a little more consistent with the conduct of a good neighbor. My remarks are not directed to my colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], because I know his attitude in regard to the pact. I know that he has been diligent in his efforts to promote a just and equitable settlement of that problem, and I believe that his constituents will yet be brought to see that problem in the sane and reasonable way in which he sees it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the gentleman would fully agree with us that, before we expend \$400,000 on a road, we ought to know that it is our road—referring to the matter under consideration.

Mr. VAILE. Oh, entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Education in Alaska: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, to provide for the education and support of the Eskimos, Aleuts, Indians, and other natives of Alaska, including necessary traveling expenses of pupils to and from industrial boarding schools in Alaska; erection, repair, and rental of school buildings; textbooks and industrial apparatus; pay and necessary traveling expenses of superintendents, teachers, physicians, and other employees; repair, equipment, maintenance, and operation of United States ship *Boxer*; and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under the above special heads, including \$245,500 for salaries in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$14,000 for traveling expenses, \$118,100 for equipment, supplies, fuel, and light, \$13,000 for repairs of buildings, \$47,000 for erection of buildings, including necessary expenses incident to the acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior of donations of sites for school buildings at Juneau and Ketchikan, Alaska, \$35,000 for freight, including operation of United States ship *Boxer*, \$4,000 for equipment and repairs to United States ship *Boxer*, \$2,400 for rentals, and \$1,000 for telephone and telegraph; total, \$480,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 per cent of the amounts appropriated for the various items in this paragraph shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included in this paragraph, but no more than 10 per

cent shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency and then only upon the written order of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That of said sum not exceeding \$7,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That all expenditures of money appropriated herein for school purposes in Alaska for schools other than those for the education of white children under the jurisdiction of the governor thereof shall be under the supervision and direction of the Commissioner of Education and in conformity with such conditions, rules, and regulations as to conduct and methods of instruction and expenditures of money as may from time to time be recommended by him and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I am somewhat confused as to the meaning of two phrases here. One is on page 100, and reads—

including \$245,500 for salaries in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Then on page 101, line 15, we find the language:

Provided further, That of such sum not exceeding \$7,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

It would seem to me that the first clause would indicate that any part of the \$245,500 can be expended within the District, and the latter clause that only \$7,000 can be expended here. I think the \$480,000 item alone is a very large one, and if half of it can be expended for salaries in the District of Columbia, we ought to have that information. If it is only \$7,000, then there is a different situation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed that on one matter pertaining to Alaska the gentleman from Massachusetts and the rest of us can agree entirely. There is no doubt but that \$245,500 is the limit that can be expended for salaries in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and that of that \$245,500, \$7,000 is the limit that may be expended within the District. That is the intention of the committee, and I think we have made it clear.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad to have the explanation of the gentleman and withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Alaska Railroad: For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, including maintenance, operation, and improvements of railroads in Alaska; maintenance and operation of river steamers and other boats on the Yukon River and its tributaries in Alaska; stores for resale; payment of claims for losses and damages arising from operations; payment of amounts due connecting lines under traffic agreements; payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the injury compensation act, approved September 7, 1916, to be reimbursed as therein provided, \$1,700,000, in addition to all amounts received by the Alaska Railroad during the fiscal year 1927, to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$6,200 of this fund shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1927: *Provided further*, That \$500,000 of such funds shall be available only for such capital expenditures as are chargeable to capital account under accounting regulations prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which amount shall be available immediately.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 105, line 11, after the word "provided" strike out "\$1,700,000" and insert "\$1,200,000"; also, strike out after "1927" in line 16, page 105, the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this is not one of those meek appropriations that the chairman referred to the other day. This is a very large appropriation, \$1,700,000, and I ask the careful consideration of the House in connection with this item. I realize that the Government wasted \$60,000,000 in constructing the Alaskan Railroad. We have talked that here before, and it is generally accepted, I think, that it was a very serious blunder upon the part of the Government to have appropriated that money or to have constructed that road. Having spent \$60,000,000, I realize that there must be an appropriation annually for a deficiency sure to arise. The time will never come when the Alaskan Railroad can be self-supporting. There is here an item of \$1,200,000 for that deficiency. I am not asking to remove that item from the bill, but I do say that we ought not to continue putting good money after bad, and increasing the capital expenditure. You are asked in this item now for \$500,000 more for capital construction. I maintain that we ought to get to the bottom of this Alaskan ques-

tion before capital construction is continued along the line of the Alaskan Railroad. I say frankly to the House that I have not expected that any of the amendments that I have offered cutting down Alaskan appropriations, as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, would be adopted.

I realize we have got to go to the bottom of Alaska legislation before anything can be accomplished to improve conditions there, but I do say that we have no right to take from the pockets of Uncle Sam \$500,000 for additional capital construction on that line of road. I know what it means. Every man up there who has got an acre of coal land or any other kind of land wants you to build a line of road to that field. Now, that is not good business; that is not good judgment; that is not a good way to expend our taxpayers' money. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, we ought to sift this Alaska problem to the bottom before we continue capital construction on the line of the Alaskan Railroad, and therefore I think that the amendment I am offering should be adopted by the committee at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would the gentleman be quite willing to work for legislation that would let capitalists build their own railroads?

Mr. TREADWAY. I certainly would.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But how can it be done if—

Mr. TREADWAY. I know that no capitalists are going to build a road, because there are no demands for it. I maintain, and Mr. TAYLOR, of the committee, agrees fully with the position which I take, that it was a waste of money ever to have built there and that the Pennsylvania or the officials of any other well-managed railroad never would have built the Alaska Railroad. But it has been done. The gentleman knows this line of 500 miles runs through the wilderness between two towns—one of 2,000 inhabitants and the other about the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is exactly what was said when the Union Pacific Railroad was built with Federal aid.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is no more comparison between the Alaskan situation than the comparison which some gentleman the other day undertook to bring up of the Panama Canal—no comparison whatsoever.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I take it this is a real amendment?

Mr. TREADWAY. It is a real amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. On which we will be called upon to vote?

Mr. TREADWAY. And I would like to see the gentleman vote and vote right.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman is not going to withdraw it?

Mr. TREADWAY. I was following the example of the gentleman from Texas in withdrawing one or two. He is a leader of the House, acknowledges it himself, and when he offers an amendment and withdraws it some of the rest of us only follow suit. This is an amendment to which I think the committee can give real consideration, whether it is worth while to continue this extravagant expenditure on the line of the Alaska Railroad, of which \$500,000 is for capital construction. I am opposed to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] that this is a matter that deserves the serious consideration of the committee. I disagree with him in his statement that it is an extravagant expenditure that is proposed. The general manager of the Alaska Railroad, Mr. Noel W. Smith, is an experienced railroad man. He has not only won the confidence of our committee as to his business judgment and his judgment in matters pertaining to railroad operations, but I understand he has won the confidence of the gentleman from Massachusetts in an equal degree.

Mr. TREADWAY. Absolutely; he is one of the most practical railroad men I have ever heard of.

Mr. CRAMTON. So far we are in agreement. I think we can go further in agreement than that.

Mr. TREADWAY. I hope so.

Mr. CRAMTON. The question as to whether the Alaskan Railroad ought to have been built is not before our committee. It is there as a running concern, and the gentleman approves of the appropriation of \$1,200,000 to meet the deficit in operation and maintenance, but objects to the \$500,000, so there is a place we for the moment disagree, but I am in hopes after I have finished we may be in agreement and that the gentleman will, notwithstanding the appeal of the gentleman from Texas, withdraw his amendment.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am only in accord with the gentleman so far as the \$1,200,000 is concerned in considering it is temporary only.

Mr. CRAMTON. And as a necessity which has to be met.

Mr. TREADWAY. For the time being, but I am not in favor of the \$500,000 for capital construction of the Alaskan Railway.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the necessity of the case means that until Congress takes some different action the Appropriations Committee must report the items deemed necessary to keep it in running order.

Now, the gentleman is in this error: He has not understood what that \$500,000 is for. He visions the building of extensions here and there all over that territory. That is not the purpose of it at all. This item is just what, it has seemed to me, business men such as the gentleman from Massachusetts would approve. Mr. Smith, the general manager, explained the item in this way: This is a part of an item of several million dollars of expenditure entered upon a year ago, not for extensions of the system but for certain betterments. This \$500,000 is to be used for bridges, trestles, culverts, the widening of fills, riprap and bank protection, fuel and water stations, replacements, roadway tools, telegraph and telephone lines, additional tracks, buildings, and miscellaneous—a total of \$500,000. Each of these items is explained here. Lack of time prevents the reading of all of it; but Mr. Smith, whose judgment was approved by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and myself, says:

There are many instances where bridge renewals are absolutely essential to the safe operation of the railroad and if made will reflect a saving in future maintenance and operation cost. The principal reasons for these bridge renewals are to prevent danger of loss of life and property due to fire and also high waters in the spring or fall. Under existing circumstances the driftwood brought down by swollen streams accumulates against the piling and, as has frequently happened in the past, the water is dammed to such an extent that the bridges have been materially damaged and in some instances washed away. If steel spans or plate girders are substituted, sufficient clearance will be given to allow proper passage of the driftwood. Attention is further called to the fact that in many instances the wooden piers and abutments are constructed of native spruce timber. This timber is subject to rapid deterioration, presenting not only a heavy expense for annual maintenance but a risk to safe operation. In the removal of the driftwood to prevent destruction of bridges during periods of high water a dangerous and costly operation is necessary and necessitates the dispatching of men and cranes to the bridges. There have been times when it has been necessary to call a crew from some other work at a distant point to take care of the emergency. An estimated saving of 8.36 per cent can be made on this investment in future maintenance and operation costs.

He points out that in many instances the wooden piers and abutments are of native spruce timber and subject to deterioration. You will observe that his estimate of the saving that can be made, 8.36 per cent, is as exact as any Massachusetts business man would want it to be. Then he concludes as follows—

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is recommended by the able business man at the head of the operation of the railroad:

As has been pointed out before, this railroad can not be economically operated unless appropriations are made to be applied to capital account, which will result in reducing maintenance and operating cost in future years. To continue operating the road, making replacements in kind, and not installing betterments necessary will result in a very high maintenance cost and in the final analysis result in much larger expenditures for upkeep. It is the desire of the management to maintain and operate this property on an economical basis, and the only logical method appears to be through installation of betterments and improvements, which will reflect a reduction in maintenance and operating costs.

The proviso that is put in is for the purpose of segregating this \$500,000 so as to make it apply to that particular class of replacements.

I hope the amendment will not prevail. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will withdraw it, understanding that it is not for the extension of the line, but for these necessary improvements and replacements.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. WINTER. For the first time in several days, Mr. Chairman, I find myself in accord with the committee. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] called the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to the character of the country through which the Pacific railroads were constructed. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that the comparison is not valid and that the two areas, Alaska and western United States, are not comparable. I want to remark that a very able man from Massachusetts—a real statesman, by the way [laughter]—on the 23d day of March, 1848, told the people of the United States from the floor of the United States Senate that the entire country contemplated to be received from Mexico as indemnity or purchased as territory for new States, after the Mexican War, including California, golden California, and all of New Mexico, out of which were afterwards carved wonderful Arizona, Utah, and Nevada, and parts of marvelous Wyoming and Colorado—that that entire area was not worth one dollar; that it was a barren waste, a desert inhabited only by Indians and wild beasts; that there was nothing there but shifting sands, alkali, and blizzards, that it would not sustain any more people than were there at that time under any system of cultivation the American race would ever submit to; that it was an affront to reason that this was indemnity. It was not worth a dollar. That was the language of Daniel Webster on the floor of the Senate on March 23, 1848.

I submit that the views of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts at that time regarding the West were no more mistaken than are the views regarding Alaska of the gentleman from Massachusetts to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Webster's ignorance of conditions in the remote West at that time was excusable. He had never been there. In those days there were no geological reports on the conditions in that country. He had merely to guess. But there are Members of Congress who visited Alaska last summer who tell the President of the United States that there is no opportunity for agricultural and mineral development along the line of this railroad in Alaska for the reason that it is all of volcanic origin and formation.

The gentleman who gave the President this misinformation was not from Massachusetts. We have to-day the geological survey from which he could find out the authentic facts in a matter of that kind. The fact is that there is not an acre of volcanic formation within a hundred and thirty miles of the course of that railroad. The gentleman from Massachusetts is perfectly willing to aid private enterprise in the construction of Alaska railroads, and presumably in handling this railroad. I am naturally curious to know how he would do it. Would it be by direct subsidy from the Government? I do not think so. I do not think Congress would consider a proposition of that kind for a moment. Would it be by a land grant? If you undertake to submit a measure to this Congress providing a grant of land to a railroad in this day and generation you will immediately see how far you will get with it. When you propose to give the lands there, including coal lands, to private interests, you will have a controversy arising all over the United States, and nothing will be done along that line. There are Government utilities which by reason of the operation of economic laws have to be operated by Government.

They can not be operated by private individuals. You may take the case of the Canadian Northern Railroad. It is very evident that that road could not be successfully operated by individuals, so the Canadian Government takes it over and operates it, and the operating deficit is borne by the entire Government of the Dominion of Canada.

I want to direct attention to another great public utility in private hands that has not been successful, and for many years Members of Congress have been praying that the National Government would take it over and maintain it. I refer to the Cape Cod Canal.

Mr. TREADWAY. Before the gentleman leaves the Alaska Railroad and gets back to Massachusetts will he yield for a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman think he can visualize the line of the Alaska Railroad as ever being of any great use in the way of serving the public or in reaching various developments there?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that was Mr. Webster's opinion in 1850 when he was discussing the Pacific coast.

Mr. TREADWAY. Let us not talk about that but the Alaska Railroad.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The same conditions obtain to-day that obtained in Mr. Webster's day.

Mr. TREADWAY. Not in the slightest degree.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. With regard to population. It is to be presumed there will be a large population on the line of that railroad and there is every reason to believe there will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it not quite possible that the Alaska Railroad is worth while being maintained liberally by the United States Government as a warning against Government ownership of railroads?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The same thing might apply with reference to the Cape Cod Canal. That might apply as a warning against the Government operating a public utility. Now, I have not the slightest question in the world that if the stockholders of the Cape Cod Canal could be guaranteed sufficient in tolls to maintain the canal and pay interest on their stockholdings there would be no desire on the part of those people or the Members from Massachusetts to have that project taken over by the Government. But the proposition is that it is a great utility and one that can be made an even greater public utility if its operating expenses are carried by the Federal Government, and the amount required to do that would be infinitesimal because it would be borne by each individual taxpayer of the United States, which is the theory of Government ownership of public utilities, such as those I am speaking of, that it is for the benefit of the whole people. So, as I say, there are conditions which arise whereby it is the better part of wisdom and better business for the Government to operate the utilities than for a private individual to do so. I presume that is the reason why the gentleman would say that the Federal Government should take over, maintain, and operate the Cape Cod Canal.

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

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in spite of the very persuasive argument of the gentleman from Michigan, asking for the withdrawal of the amendment I have proposed, I can not yield to that solicitation on his part. I think it would be very advisable to have a vote on this amendment, not with the view of its adoption but with the idea in mind that we have accomplished something. We have directed attention to the need of a reorganization in Alaska. This is the last item; it is the largest Alaskan item and it is the one wherein the House can well express its views as to the needs of a general reorganization of the whole government of Alaska, and that has been my purpose throughout this debate.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman think that even if this House thought there ought to be a general reorganization of the Government in Alaska that that should be a basis for crippling the operation of this railroad?

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, as I say, it is the largest item, and it is one wherein we can better call attention to the mismanagement up there, perhaps, than any other item. The items relating to Alaska are scattered throughout various appropriation bills, and unless attention is called to them as they come along there is no opportunity to accomplish anything in the way of reorganization. It seems to be universally agreed in the House that the organization having to do with the management of Alaska should be changed in some way. It is to center attention upon the situation that I have brought up these various amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. And, if the gentleman will yield further, it is one item wherein the gentleman frankly admits the management is 100 per cent perfect.

Mr. TREADWAY. The management of the Alaskan Railroad, as I have said several times on the floor, is in most excellent hands, but that does not take away the fact that the Alaskan Railroad is a burden on the taxpayers of the country and one that we ought not to continue.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I take back what I said about the gentleman not standing hitched. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Then next time I suggest that the gentleman stick by his own amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Governor, \$10,000; secretary, \$5,400; in all, \$15,400.

For contingent expenses, to be expended by the governor, for stationery, postage, and incidentals, \$1,000; private secretary to the governor, \$3,000; for travelling expenses of the governor while absent from the capital on official business, \$500; in all, \$4,500.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I trust my remarks will not be misconstrued as a criticism of the Department of Agriculture, because they have always cooperated with me. I realize that a public official should go rather slowly before criticizing any department, and during my 11 years of service I have never criticized the departments, because, as I stated, I have received their hearty cooperation.

A few months ago the Department of Agriculture estimated the citrus crop of the State of Florida at 19,000,000 boxes. I wired the Department of Agriculture stating that, in my opinion, the crop would not exceed 15,000,000 boxes, and that it was a poor guess at the outside and no living man could guess what the citrus crop of Florida would be. The Department of Agriculture had a reinvestigation made and issued another statement to the effect that there would be 17,000,000 boxes of oranges, or a drop of 2,000,000 boxes. In the meantime the price of oranges had dropped 75 cents a box, because of the supposed large crop. About a month afterwards we had the October storm, and it is estimated, according to information I have just received from the Florida Citrus Exchange, that over 300,000 boxes of oranges dropped, and that the crop will not exceed 14,500,000 boxes.

Unless this is corrected it will mean a loss of over \$2,000,000 to the citrus growers of the State of Florida. The Department of Agriculture is supposed to-day to send to Florida a representative to make another investigation and make another report, but long before that report can be published the producer, as is usually the case, will have lost his \$2,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

The apple growers, the corn growers, and the wheat growers of the country can realize and appreciate what this means to the producer. Those who understand the citrus industry know it is impossible for any living man to guess what a crop will be. Going through groves of thousands of acres and hundreds of thousands of trees, with oranges of different sizes, different numbers of oranges on the trees, each orange that is pierced by a thorn dropping off, you can not come within 4,000,000 boxes of a proper estimate. If the Department of Agriculture had estimated the crop at 15,000,000 boxes as per my first request, they would have saved the citrus growers of the State of Florida more than \$2,500,000.

I sincerely trust in the future the money of the people will not be uselessly spent in making these idle estimates and guesses at what nature will do and what the crop will produce. I sincerely trust the Department of Agriculture will wire the agent they sent to Florida and request and demand of him that within the next three days he wire to the country the exact condition of the crops and assure them that there will not be 19,000,000 boxes as per their first guess, not 17,000,000 boxes as per their second guess, but 14,500,000 boxes or less.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I understood the gentleman to say it was humanly impossible to estimate the crop anyway.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. No living man can guess.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Then why does the gentleman want them to guess?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I do not want them to guess. If I had my way, I would not send a single man out.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I simply want to use a minute or so to say that when a bureau or department needs defending I believe in defending it.

When the Department of Agriculture made an estimate on the cotton crop some time ago it was "cussed" from one side of the cotton region of the United States to the other for overestimating the crop, and the Department of Agriculture was accused of robbing our cotton farmers out of millions of dollars. Time has passed and a more accurate check up of cotton production has been made, and it has turned out that the estimate made by the Department of Agriculture, instead of being an overestimate, was an underestimate, and much of the early

cotton that was gathered and sold by the farmers, as they must nearly always do—they must sell it almost always as soon as they gather it—was sold at an increased price and they got the benefit of the underestimate made by the Department of Agriculture, and I have been wondering why these critics all over the country, who cussed out the department because they thought it had caused a loss to the farmers, have not come in and apologized to the department for their hasty criticism.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield, although I am through with my statement.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. As far as Florida is concerned, we do not ask them to underestimate the crops. We do not want to gain by it, but we do not want to lose by an overestimate, and I am not criticizing the department.

Mr. BLANTON. I was not criticizing our distinguished friend from Florida in the remarks I made, but I want to say to the people over the country that an estimate is, after all, an estimate. It can not be correctly given. The farmers ask for these estimates. The Department of Agriculture attempts to benefit the farmer by giving them out, and when they think the estimate is wrong they ought to wait to determine whether or not the Department of Agriculture has been in error before they begin to cuss out a great department which is really the one department of Government that seeks to benefit the producers of the country.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield, although I am through.

Mr. ARENTZ. I am wondering if we are going to request current reports or post-mortem reports. We have got to have some report. A delegation from Iowa is going to come here within a short time, and I think rightfully so, and ask for current reports on corn and other farm products, and we have either got to accept that or we have got to accept post-mortem reports, and I would like the gentleman to state which is best.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the current reports are best, and I think it is best to give them as the Department of Agriculture finds the facts to exist. If their agents make mistakes, the people over the country must take into consideration that the estimates, after all, are estimates and not facts stated as to actual production.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Legislative expenses: For furniture, light, telephone, stationery, record casings and files, printing and binding, including printing, publications, and binding of the session laws and the house and senate journals, indexing records, postage, ice, water, clerk hire, mileage of members, and incidentals, pay of chaplain, clerk, sergeant at arms, stenographers, typewriters, janitors, and messengers, \$30,000: *Provided*, That the members of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall not draw their compensation of \$200 or any mileage for an extra session, held in compliance with section 54 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 30, 1900.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeth's Hospital for the Insane from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, civilians in the quartermaster's service of the Army, persons transferred from the Canal Zone who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, and beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau, including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, \$804,000, including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding \$1,500 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers, for which payments may be made in advance, as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding \$1,500 for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates who are not or who cease to be properly chargeable to Federal maintenance in the institution and in returning them to such places of residence: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1927 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeth's Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent, upon his written request, either in advance or at the

end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the superintendent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the superintendent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the superintendent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeth's Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition by the disbursing agent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

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:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 107, line 17, after the word "patient," add a colon and the following proviso, to wit: "Provided, That no part of the money appropriated by this paragraph shall be used to pay the salary of any Government official who shall enter into an agreement with criminals to testify in their behalf in consideration of which such criminals agree to pay substantial remuneration."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. It is evidently legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard a moment on that. I think the Chairman is reaching an unwise conclusion hurriedly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is open to conviction, but would be glad if the gentleman from Texas would be brief.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Chair will notice the manner in which the amendment is drawn, it is clearly a limitation. The amendment will stand the test as a limitation under the rulings of practically every Chairman who has occupied that seat during the nine years I have been here. I have drawn it strictly in accord with such rulings on limitations. It merely provides that no part of this money shall be used for a certain purpose and it mentions the purpose for which it shall not be used. It is clearly a limitation.

I called the Chair's attention to a ruling made by former Speaker Clark—and there never has been a better parliamentarian—wherein he said that if Congress wants in a bill of this character to make a limitation to pay the salary only to a red-headed person it has the right to do it.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would be a limitation on the spending of the money. What the gentleman proposes is not a limitation on spending the money—the gentleman expects the money to be spent, expects them to have a superintendent—the limitation is not on spending the money, but it is on the discretion of the official.

Mr. BLANTON. O Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the ruling on the Hull amendment. That amendment provided that money appropriated in the naval bill and in the Army bill should be expended only in a certain way, to the men who performed certain kind of services, and could not be paid to any official who used a stop watch or who supervised men. It took all discretion away from certain officials. Yet many Chairmen occupying the position which the gentleman from Ohio now occupies held that that was in order as a limitation. And when the gentleman from Connecticut held that it was not in order appeal to the House was made against his decision, and the House on appeal held that it was in order as a limitation. We have the right to restrict the money that is spent in a bill to a certain character of employees. I am providing in this amendment that no Government official shall testify in court for a criminal under contract whereby they shall pay him money for so doing. I say that is a proper limitation. The precedents are complete; they are full, and the gentleman from Michigan is mistaken in making the point of order. If he is in favor of Government officials selling their testimony to criminals who ought to be hung, selling their testimony for \$250 a day, let him vote this amendment down, but, for God's sake, let Congress stop that pernicious practice. I do not believe in it, and I do not believe there is a Member in the House who believes in it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment is not to lessen the expenditure of the money. The gentleman knows that the institution can not be run without the superintendent, who must be paid, but he proposes that the money shall not be paid if the superintendent does certain things.

I do not know what the law is; but if the superintendent has not the authority to do these things now, the amendment is a futility. If he has the authority now to do these things, then the effect of the amendment is to legislate and put new restrictions upon that official. In other words, in so far as the amendment can have any effect it would not be to bring about a less expenditure of money but a limitation on the discretion of the official.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, may I make an observation? Mr. Chairman, it has been held—and the precedents are full of cases—that words like "until," "unless," "however," and like qualifying words, import legislation rather than limitation. The purpose of this amendment is to prescribe a course of conduct on the part of an official. If you can prescribe one course of conduct, you can prescribe another. If you can say that the salary shall not be paid an official who does so and so, then you can say that it shall not be paid if he does something else and something else, and so on ad infinitum.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the same argument that the gentleman from Illinois made when they offered the amendment to the Army bill to prevent any enlistment under 18 years of age, and yet the Chair held it in order. The gentleman's argument was made then against that amendment, and the Chair overruled it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will distinguish that case from this one clearly. That was not a course of conduct prescribed for the official; that did create a class to which the limitation applied. I will say to the gentleman that I was opposed to the legislation and sought to reach it by a parliamentary point of order. This is altogether a different situation. It is very easy to prescribe and very easy to control the action of officials in regard to enlistment of men under 21 or 18 years of age, but when you say that officials must follow a certain course of conduct in the discharge of their duties you are no longer making a limitation, but legislation under the guise of a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. There are several decisions on this subject—one the so-called stop-watch case, which I understand was decided by vote in Committee of the Whole to be in order. The Chair thinks, however, in this case that it is a limitation upon what the official may do, and, as argued by the gentleman from Michigan, if he has the right under existing law to accept such employment, to forbid such employment is a modification law, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call attention to the principle that was involved in my amendment which a point of order prevented the House from registering a vote upon. I sought to stop Dr. William A. White, Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, a Government institution, from selling his testimony to criminals for huge sums of money. I received the following from the Secretary of the Interior:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 2, 1925.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: Your letter of October 30, 1925, has been received requesting certain information in relation to Dr. William A. White, Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

In response thereto your questions will be answered in the order in which presented, to wit:

1. How long has Doctor White been connected with St. Elizabeths? Since October 1, 1903; 22 years.
2. How long has he been superintendent of same? The same length of time.
3. What salary does he now receive as superintendent? Seven thousand five hundred dollars.
4. Besides his salary what emoluments does he receive? Under the readjustment of compensation of officers and employees, St. Elizabeths Hospital, under the sundry civil act of July 19, 1919, Doctor White is allowed board, lodging, laundry, medical attention for self and family. Section 4839 of Revised Statutes requires the superintendent to live on the premises.
5. Is he furnished (a) his residence; (b) furnishings; (c) any servants; (d) his lights, heat, gas, and water? Yes to all.

6. Is he allowed a specific traveling allowance; if so, what? He is entitled to the same allowances for travel as any other employee of the Interior Department, being governed by the travel regulations issued September 30, 1914, and amendments thereto; allowance is actual expenses not to exceed \$5 per day, or \$4 per day in lieu of subsistence.

7. How many assistant superintendents has he and their salaries? He has two assistants; one medical assistant, at \$5,400, and one administrative assistant, at \$5,200.

8. Does his employment contemplate that he shall give his entire time to the Government, or is he allowed to practice at will when he pleases? Under section 4839, Revised Statutes of the United States he is required to devote his whole time to the welfare of the institution.

9. What leave is he allowed each year? The same as any other public officer holding a similar position in the Government. Under departmental practice the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital must secure the approval of the department for periods of absence from Washington. He is actually on duty during the regular office hours of the institution and is on call every hour of the 24.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT WORK.

You will note, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that Secretary Work says that the law requires Dr. William A. White to devote his whole time to the welfare of the institution.

And you will note that Secretary Work says that besides the salary of \$7,500 that the Government pays to Dr. William A. White, that the Government also furnishes him, for himself and family, his residence, his furniture, his food, his servants, his lights, his heat, his gas, his water, his laundry, and medical attention, free of cost to him, for himself and family. He receives much more from the Government than does any Congressman in this House, or any Senator in the other end of the Capitol. But he does not comply with the law, for he does not devote all of his time to the welfare of the institution, as Secretary Work says the law requires him to do.

And note from Secretary Work's statement that Doctor White is allowed traveling expenses not to exceed \$5 per day, or \$4 per day in lieu of subsistence. But that means traveling in the interest and for the welfare of St. Elizabeths Hospital. It does not contemplate that he shall take trips to Chicago for the welfare of criminals.

When the noted lawyer for bad criminals, Clarence Darrow, was hired by millionaire fathers to keep the two high-browed murderers, Leopold and Loeb, from a just hanging at the gallows, he hired our Government official, Doctor White, at \$250 per day to come to Chicago and testify his clients into a life sentence. I quote from the official records of said case the following answers Doctor White made to questions propounded to him by Prosecuting Attorney Crowe, to wit:

Question. Doctor, when is the first time you came to Chicago in this case?

Answer. The 1st of July is my recollection of the date.

Question. And how long a time did you remain in Chicago on that particular business?

Answer. I think it was about 10 days.

Question. You returned to Washington about the 10th of July?

Answer. I went to New York.

Question. Well, you left Chicago?

Answer. I left Chicago; yes.

Question. How much, if anything, have you been paid for that particular visit?

Answer. I have been paid at a per diem rate of \$250 a day.

Question. Do you expect any more?

Answer. At the same rate.

Question. So for every day you have put in this case you expect \$250 a day?

Answer. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if Dr. William A. White had been testifying, even for the Government, to uphold law and order and to protect society from educated murderers, he would not have had the right to leave his work in Washington and go to Chicago and spend a week or 10 days on that occasion and another week or 10 days on that occasion, and then go to New York for another trip, because his employment required his attention here, devoted to the interest of St. Elizabeths Hospital. God knows that there is enough important work for him to do out there. He had no right to thus sell his services to criminal interests for \$250 per day.

Now, note that Dr. William A. White testified on the stand that for his first trip to Chicago he was paid \$250 per day for 10 days, which, by the way, netted him the snug little sum of \$2,500, and then he went on to New York. And then when he went back to Chicago to attend this famous trial of Leopold and Loeb he said that he was to get \$250 more for each day he put in, and that, of course, meant each day away from Washington. But he does not say how much it all netted him.

On October 20, 1925, I wrote to Doctor White and asked him to—

please advise me exactly the sum you received for the first trip to Chicago and New York, and the sum you received for the trip to Chicago while attending the trial, and if you made other trips the exact sum you received for same.

And I asked him to give me a statement of the various trials in which he had testified for money and the amounts he received for each case.

On October 21, 1925, he sent me a very evasive reply, in which he said:

In the first place, I can not answer your questions in detail. My outside activities are so few that I am not justified in maintaining a set of books, and I therefore keep only a memorandum of them, which, after it has served its usefulness, I destroy.

He admitted, however, that in Chicago he was paid for as much as two weeks, and he says:

Of course, I feel, where some one wants my opinion and they have plenty of money to pay for it, that there is no reason why I should not charge for it.

I did not receive his letter of October 21, 1925, until October 23, 1925, and I immediately wrote to him again and requested that he give me a statement of the number of different cases in which he had testified for money, both in Washington and elsewhere, and the amounts of money he had received in such cases, respectively, and on the next day, October 24, 1925, I received the following reply from him, to wit:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ST. ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1925.

(Address only the Superintendent, St. Elizabeths Hospital)

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have your letter of the 23d instant. I am very sorry that you feel as you do about my answer to your letter. I assure you I have been quite frank. A detailed statement such as you ask is absolutely impossible for me to make. My memory does not serve me, and, as I told you, I have no record to which I could refer. If my failure to remember the details of many years of active work is considered sufficient ground for a congressional investigation, then the investigation will have to go forward. I have nothing to conceal or evade. I have been able, in the years of my stewardship, to make out of this institution what an international authority said only a short time ago in visiting me, "the best institution of its character he had ever seen in the world."

Very sincerely yours,

WM. A. WHITE,
Superintendent.

Every lawyer in this House knows that Dr. William A. White can remember every important case in which he has ever testified wherein he received a large fee for testifying, and that he can remember the fee he received. He did not have to keep a set of books. He could have told me if he had wanted to tell me. And, as a Representative of the people in this Congress, I had the right to ask him these questions, for I am called upon to vote the appropriations that give to him his salary, and his residence, and his servants, and his food, and his furnishings, and his lights, and his heat, and his gas, and his water, and everything else he wants for himself and his family, given to him free by this Government; and when the law requires him to devote all of his time to this Government institution out here, I have the right to know whether he is doing it or not.

And, Mr. Chairman, he had no right to sell his services to the defense in the Leopold and Loeb trials at \$250 per day.

Doctor Work says that he owes his time to the people. How does this institution get along when he is spending two weeks in Chicago? How does it get along without its head when he makes these trips to New York? How does it get along with its head absent if there should be a Leopold and Loeb trial in San Francisco and they call on him to come there at \$250 a day? I say as one Member of this House that he should stop that kind of work if he expects to hold his position with this Government.

The statistics show that in Chicago, just one city in the United States, there were 180 people murdered during 1924. Connected with same there were 258 persons arrested. Only one was hanged. They could not entirely defeat justice in Chicago, however, for 20 murderers committed suicide. Only 30 were sentenced to prison.

In New York, during 1924, 297 persons were arrested charged with murder. During 1923, with 112 persons tried for murder in New York, only 1 was convicted for first-degree murder, and only 11 were convicted for second-degree murder.

The latest statistics I have for England and Wales is for 1922. Throughout the entire boundaries of England and Wales during the year 1922 there were only 100 deaths thought to be from foul causes. Twenty-seven persons suspected committed

suicide. Sixty-five others were arrested. Of these 5 were discharged, as the evidence was not sufficient to hold them. Sixty were tried, and 34 were sentenced to be hanged. On account of extenuating circumstances 4 females and 6 males had their death sentences commuted to life imprisonment at hard labor.

It is sure certain adequate punishment in England that deters crime. Life is of value there. Life would be of value here if we would have the manhood to inflict death when death is deserved. We must put aside this foolish sentimentalism. When Leopolds and Loeks commit these studied, vicious, cruel murders we ought to stop their breed by hanging them by the neck until they are dead. Life will not be of value in the United States until we do wake up.

If Dr. William A. White had not been connected with this Government institution, Clarence Darrow would not have given 30 cents for his testimony. He must stop selling the Government of the United States for money in murder cases to let criminals escape just punishment. And he must not secrete his facts.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that the gentleman from Michigan saw fit to make a point of order against my amendment, for I believe that if it could have come to a vote in this House the membership would have stopped this Government official from leaving his position, to which by law he is required to devote all of his time, and selling himself to millionaire criminals, and spending two weeks in Chicago to help them escape the hangman's noose, at \$250 per day reward for his testimony. This is one time when the House should have been permitted to vote on this proposition. And I serve notice now that I am going to our two Senators at the other end of this Capitol and request them to put this amendment in this bill there, where technicalities can not keep it out, and I believe that they will put it in and that the Senate will pass it.

If Congress does not stop this pernicious practice, the American people are going to hold Congress responsible for it. They have a right to pass this amendment over in the Senate. We are under limitations here, but they have no limitations over there and they ought to do it. We ought to stop these avaricious alienists from testifying for big pay in court to keep from the gallows men who ought to be hanged. I say that it is my belief that these two educated criminals ought to have been hanged by the neck until they were dead. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the Senators from Texas did not understand when they read the news of the lamentable death at the hands of those two young men in Chicago that it also meant their political death. I had not supposed that our committee was to try that case anew. I do not care to argue with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as to the propriety of many practices that obtain in the use of expert testimony in courts. There is certainly a field for reform in that connection.

The item before us has to do with St. Elizabeths Hospital. The gentleman's remarks are directed against its superintendent, Doctor White. I have had contact with Doctor White for several years, first, with the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice when we made some investigation of that institution and then for five years in connection with this bill, and I am frank to say, and I think it is only justice to Doctor White that I say it, that my opinion is that Doctor White has all of the time that he has been in public service rendered a conscientious and able and effective service, which has been worth more than the Government has ever paid him, and as such he is entitled to a fair deal here in the House. I do not care at this time to have the trial of some of the law-suits in Chicago landed on this bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But as I understand the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] it is directed against the policy of a Government official who is receiving presumably an adequate salary for the performance of his official duties accepting private employment which might take him away from his post of duty.

Mr. CRAMTON. The correction of that policy, if it be needed, is a legislative matter for which we are not responsible.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was curious to know the gentleman's attitude upon it.

Mr. BLANTON. He has none.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the

university, ice, and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction, \$125,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the paragraph, lines 8 to 13, page 109, is not authorized by law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a few minutes to permit me to make a statement with reference to the paragraph?

Mr. HARE. I shall be glad to withhold the point of order for a moment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say this: The point of order is valid. The paragraph has no legislative authority. If the gentleman insists upon his point of order, of course, the Chair will be obliged to sustain it. I ask the gentleman not to insist upon his point of order for this reason: Howard University has been supported in small part by Federal funds for some 40 or 50 years. It has in that time developed until they now have a regular attendance of something over 2,000 colored students, students who would not have an opportunity elsewhere to get the training they get at this university, especially in certain professional courses. The Government does not bear the whole expense of the institution, as will be realized when it is noted that this bill carries only \$218,000 as a contribution on the part of the Federal Government for the institution for this year, that institution having over 2,000 students.

This item and those to follow are all on the same footing, and, although this has not authority of law, because of its long-established usage back of it your committee felt obliged to report the item that came to us from the Budget. If the gentleman does insist on his amendment, then that will only serve to emphasize the necessity of finally having legislation instead of only custom, if the House itself desires such appropriations continued.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this: A similar point of order has been made every year on this item. For 40 or 50 years the Government has been very properly making contributions to Howard University; I would like to ask the gentleman what committee has charge of reporting a bill which properly authorizes it?

Mr. CRAMTON. A point of order has not been made every year. Several times points of order have been made against new construction items proposed, but this bill does not propose any new construction, and on some occasions points of order have been made against items similar to this for maintenance and have, of course, always been sustained. The Committee on Education has jurisdiction of the question. I introduced a bill in the last Congress which went to that committee authorizing such appropriations in order to clean up this situation and make clear the authority. That bill was favorably reported at the last session by the Committee on Education only a little time before adjournment. I have introduced such a bill in this Congress, which is before that committee.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. My recollection is last year that the chairman of the committee, when a point of order was made, said he would introduce such legislation, and I wondered whether it had been passed or not.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If legislation is passed, then an appropriation will always be in order.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would relieve the committee greatly, because in view of the long-established custom—

Mr. CHINDBLOM. On the other hand, it is possible in some other way provision may be made to care for the expenses of this institution, and then it would not longer be necessary to carry it, while if we pass legislation, then certainly appropriations will be made forever.

Mr. CRAMTON. I personally feel there is a real Federal obligation in connection with that institution.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think so myself, but if we pass legislation then we perpetuate it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think such legislation ought to be passed.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I think so, too.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for Howard University stands on a different basis from other appropriations connected with the Federal encouragement of education. Federal assistance has been rendered to Howard University for 40 or 50 years. The appropriation might well be contained in the District of Columbia appropriation bill. While I am against the Federal Government taking over control of education in the States from State authorities, I do favor in every possible way the eu-

couragement of education by the Federal Government in its own proper sphere.

The full proposed appropriation for Howard University is as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, ice, and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction, \$125,000;

For tools, material, salaries of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, of which amount not to exceed \$21,800 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$28,000;

Medical department: For part cost needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, \$9,000;

For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, biological, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the science hall, including cases and shelving, \$5,000;

For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, \$3,000;

For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, including replacement of steam line from central heating plant, \$30,000;

Fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, \$18,000;

Total, Howard University, \$218,000.

I have here a copy of the bill which was reintroduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, in reference to conferring legislative authority for appropriations for Howard University. This bill (H. R. 393) is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 393) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Annual appropriations are hereby authorized to aid in the construction, development, improvement, and maintenance of the university, no part of which shall be used for religious instruction. The university shall at all times be open to inspection by the Bureau of Education and shall be inspected by the said bureau at least once each year. An annual report making a full exhibit of the affairs of the university shall be presented to Congress each year in the report of the Bureau of Education."

I hope the above bill will promptly pass, since this Congress should do everything possible to encourage so valuable an institution as Howard University.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not discuss the merits or demerits of the proposition at this time, but insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For tools, material, salaries of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, of which amount not to exceed \$21,800 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$28,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Medical department: For part cost needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, \$9,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, biological, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the science hall, including cases and shelving, \$5,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, \$3,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, including replacement of steam line from central heating plant, \$30,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, \$18,000.

Mr. HARE. I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Howard University, \$218,000.

Mr. HARE. I make the point of order to the entire appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from South Carolina can agree on having line 7, page 109, stricken out, I do not think that is included in the first point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. He made the point of order as to line 7.

The Clerk read as follows:

For subsistence, fuel and light, clothing, bedding, forage, medicine, medical and surgical supplies, surgical instruments, electric lights, repairs, replacement of X-ray apparatus, furniture, motor-propelled ambulance, and other absolutely necessary expenses, \$52,894.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 110, line 13, after the word "clothing," insert "to include white-duck suits, white-canvas shoes for the use of internes, and rubber surgical gloves."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is because of a recent ruling of the General Accounting Office which interferes with a former custom. The Surgeon in Chief says:

As a reason for the above request, I beg to state that the General Accounting Office has recently disallowed payment for white-duck suits and canvas shoes. As to surgical rubber gloves, no operation can be performed with safety to the patient unless rubber gloves are worn by the operator. They are as necessary as the scalpel in an operation, and both are essential for hospital work.

This has been the common custom heretofore.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that this amendment is in rather a peculiar form: "To include white-duck shoes and white-canvas shoes for the use of internes and rubber surgical gloves." Should it not be, "To include white-duck shoes and white-canvas shoes and rubber surgical gloves for the use of internes"?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say it is the language that was sent to me. Yes; that change should be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 110, line 3, after the word "clothing," insert: "To include white-duck shoes and white-canvas shoes and rubber surgical gloves for the use of internes."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment had better stand as it was. The purpose of the amendment was not to restrict the surgical gloves to internes. The surgeons performing operations would use them.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that we send for the legislating drafting service. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The term "rubber surgical gloves" is broad.

Mr. CRAMTON. The amendment is right, Mr. Chairman, as presented.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the language should be changed to "also" in the last line. However, it is not the responsibility of the Chair.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is not necessary, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be concurred in and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the committee rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be concurred in and that the bill as amended do pass. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 6707) making appropriations for the Interior Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, had recommended certain amendments, and it now recommends that such amendments be adopted and that when so adopted the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill H. R. 6707, reports that the committee has instructed him to report it with certain amendments, and recommends the adoption of the amendments and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

On motion of Mr. CRAMTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a resignation, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, D. C.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a Representative elect to the Sixty-ninth Congress from the tenth Kentucky district, to take effect immediately. I would appear on the floor and do this myself but for the state of my health and other conditions. I am taking this action for two reasons:

First. The action of the Supreme Court in denying my application for a writ of certiorari.

Second. I do not wish to cause my colleagues in the House any embarrassment. Most of them have been my associates and warm, personal friends, having served with many of them for nearly 20 years, and I am glad to believe that, notwithstanding the unfortunate circumstances which have recently surrounded me, they will have faith in the reiteration which I now make of my absolute innocence of the charges upon which my prosecution has been based, and that the day will yet come when my complete vindication will follow.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. LANGLEY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he will transmit a copy of this letter to the Governor of Kentucky.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, a committee was appointed at the beginning of the session to consider the qualifications and election of Mr. LANGLEY. This resignation seems to make it unnecessary that the committee should file any further report or take any action. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may be discharged from further consideration of the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the committee appointed to consider the qualifications and election of Mr. LANGLEY be discharged from further consideration of the matter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PARKWAY CONNECTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4785) pertaining to the Rock Creek and Potomac Park Commission; and, pending that, I submit a unanimous-consent request that the debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], the ranking member of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the city, and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas

[MR. BLANTON] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the agreement had with the gentleman from Maryland, that will be agreeable.

THE SPEAKER. There is no objection. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4785. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [MR. MERRITT] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4785, with MR. MERRITT in the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4785, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4785) to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to complete the acquisition of the land authorized to be acquired by the Public Buildings appropriation act, approved March 4, 1913, for the connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, and Potomac Park.

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to complete the acquisition of the land authorized to be acquired by section 22 of the public buildings appropriation act approved March 4, 1913 (Stat. L., vol. 37, p. 885), for the connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, and Potomac Park, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in addition to the sum authorized by said act of March 4, 1913, the sum of \$600,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, in line 1, after the word "appropriated," strike out "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and insert "out of the surplus revenues of the District of Columbia made available by Public Laws 358, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved February 2, 1925."

MR. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Texas [MR. BLANTON] to use the time allotted to him, as there is only one speech on this side. I have no requests for time.

MR. BLANTON. The gentleman is not going to present the bill?

MR. ZIHLMAN. I will be very glad to present the bill, but I think as chairman of the committee I have the right to close, and unless the gentleman insists I would be glad to have him use his time.

MR. BLANTON. I would rather have the gentleman make a presentation of his bill, so we shall know what we are up against.

MR. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Texas has filed a minority report on the bill of some 15 pages, printing letters which have been repeatedly printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and reports of committees for the past four or five years, so I do not think he needs any light on this subject.

The bill is an act to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to complete a project that was started some 13 years ago, when Congress authorized the appropriation of \$1,300,000 to be expended on a parkway connecting Rock Creek Park and the Potomac Parkway. The commission, which is composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Agriculture, has been proceeding for a number of years to purchase various tracts and parcels of land, and has exhausted the original authorization made of \$1,300,000. This bill, which is transmitted by the chairman of the commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, is to enable the commission to complete their work.

MR. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. ZIHLMAN. I will yield in just a moment. The total area in this project is 159 acres of land. The percentage acquired to date and owned by the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, prior to the passage of the legislation I have referred to, the act of 1913, is 92.63 per cent of the area of the entire project, so that there only remains to be acquired 11.73 acres. The commission has a balance on hand of some \$47,000. It is estimated that the land to be acquired—condemnation proceedings having been instituted through the Department of Justice—will require \$647,000. This money, if made available, will enable the commission to complete the project and finish the work of this commission.

In the original act it was provided that one-half of the expense, 50 per cent of the expense, of acquiring this land was to be paid for out of the Federal Treasury, and one-half was to be paid for by the District of Columbia in eight annual installments, with interest at 3 per cent. The bill as transmitted by the chairman of the commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, provided that all of the money should be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States. The Committee on the District of Columbia has amended the bill so as to provide that this \$600,000 shall be paid out of the surplus revenues of the District of Columbia, which were made available by the act of February 2, 1925. I might say in connection with this amendment that during the last session of Congress, when the House was considering the bill crediting to the District of Columbia the surplus revenues of the District, amounting to approximately \$5,000,000, an amendment was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [MR. CRAMPTON], who had been acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on District Appropriations, providing that this surplus revenue should be expended for park, playground, and school purposes. The last Congress appropriated the sum of approximately \$2,000,000 for school buildings and school sites. Estimates submitted to the Director of the Budget and transmitted by him to Congress are now before the Committee on Appropriations amounting to some \$2,000,000, and this \$600,000, which is the first of the surplus revenue that has been appropriated for park purposes, has been set aside and held in reserve both by the District officials and by the Director of the Budget for the purposes set forth in this bill. So we are following not only the precedent established by the Committee on Appropriations in dealing with the surplus fund but we are following the policy of the Bureau of the Budget.

MR. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

MR. TILSON. Will this \$600,000 additional complete the project? Will it buy all the land that is necessary to connect those two parks?

MR. ZIHLMAN. It is estimated by the Director of Public Buildings and Grounds, who has been acting as the executive officer of this commission, that this will complete this project and vest in the Government of the United States the ownership of this entire 159 acres.

MR. TILSON. Just one further question. Will immediate steps be taken, then, to complete the roadway so as to connect the two parks? It seems to me that is an important matter in connection with those two parks—a road which will take traffic out of the streets.

MR. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut that plans have already been prepared for connecting the roadways between Rock Creek Park and Potomac Park. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [MR. BLACK].

MR. BLACK of Texas. The question I wanted to ask the gentleman was this: I notice that the figures mentioned by the gentleman indicate something more than \$50,000 an acre. Has the land any improvements on it or is it vacant land?

MR. ZIHLMAN. The majority of it—and I might say there is not very much remaining—is vacant land, but the most costly of the land is the land at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and M Street, which is improved, which is rapidly increasing in value.

I insert herewith as a part of my remarks a statement of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission as of October 1, 1925, giving in detail the various appropriations made, the land acquired, and the cost of the property to be acquired:

OCTOBER 1, 1925.

Statement of Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission

APPROPRIATIONS	
July 1, 1916	\$50,000.00
July 12, 1917	100,000.00
July 1, 1918	150,000.00
July 19, 1919	250,000.00
July 5, 1920	200,000.00
March 4, 1921	200,000.00
July 1, 1922	100,000.00
July 1, 1923	75,000.00
July 1, 1924	75,000.00
March 4, 1925 (for fiscal year 1925 only)	100,000.00
(1) Total appropriation	1,300,000.00
(2) Organization expenses	\$86,618.07
(3) Paid for land	1,106,004.06
(4) Total disbursements	1,252,622.13
(5) Balance available for condemnation	42,106.99
Appropriated March 4, 1925 (for fiscal year 1925)	42,106.99
Balance available from previous continuous appropriation	5,270.88
Total	47,377.87

GENERAL DATA

(a) Area of proposed parkway (1916) _____	square feet	6,800,197
(b) Area added to parkway, June 5, 1920 _____	do	47,708
(c) Area added to parkway, Feb. 28, 1923 _____	do	18,442

Total acres _____		
Of this total area—		
(7) The United States owned by virtue of cessions, dedication, etc., condemnations—		
Square feet _____		2,881,094
Acres _____		68.14
(8) Leaving to be acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise—		
Square feet _____		4,082,853
Acres _____		93.78
(9) The assessed value of this land is _____		\$1,512,980.00
* * * * *		
(10) Number of squares affected _____		41
(11) Total number of lots and parcels included in project _____		470

PROGRESS OF PURCHASING

July 1, 1924, to October 1, 1925

Number of lots acquired _____		8
Area of lots _____	square feet	37,200.21
Purchase price _____		\$118,914.25
Organization expenses _____		\$13,883.80
Assessor's valuation _____		\$90,703.36
Above assessor's valuation _____		\$58,210.89

1916 to October 1, 1925

Number of lots acquired (including 9 parcels) _____		286
Area of lots, etc., parcels _____	square feet	3,572,600.21
Assessor's valuation _____		\$1,196,607.10
Paid for land _____		\$1,166,004.06
Organization expenses _____		86,618.07

Total disbursements _____		\$1,252,622.13
Above assessor's valuation _____		\$53,805.04

Status as of October 1, 1925

Total area of project—		
Square feet _____		6,965,347.00
Acres _____		153.90
Total area of land owned by the United States October 1, 1925—		
Square feet _____		6,454,094.21
Acres _____		118.168
Per cent acquired to date _____		92.63
Area outstanding to be acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise—		
Square feet _____		511,252.79
Acres _____		11.73
Estimated cost (based on assessor's 3/3 valuation) _____		\$647,377.87

The following properties have been offered to the commission at favorable prices:

	Area square feet	Offered price
Peck Memorial Chapel, Twenty-eighth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., lot 14, square 1194	4,438	\$106,650.50 (\$27,994.26)
Lawton Bros. Carriage Factory, 2702-2704 M Street N.W., lot 13, square 1194	8,338	91,960.00 (\$25,372.80)
Total offers pending _____	12,976	198,610.00

The Attorney General has to date been requested to condemn 44 parcels of land, the majority of which are now filed or in process of being filed in the Supreme Court of the District.

Total estimated amount of these 44 awards, \$293,606.50.

Total cost of property freely offered as listed herein _____		\$198,610.50
Total estimated cost of condemnation of properties requested of Attorney General (as above) _____		293,606.50
Total estimated cost of remaining outstanding properties (no offers pending, nor has the Attorney General been requested to condemn), 84 in number _____		155,160.87

Total estimated cost to complete land acquirement _____		647,377.87
---	--	------------

Total authorized in section 22 of the public buildings act approved Mar. 4, 1918 _____		1,300,000.00
Total appropriated to date _____		1,300,000.00

Balance due under original authorization _____		None.
Balance available Oct. 1, 1925:		
Available for condemnation appropriated Mar. 4, 1925, for fiscal year 1925		42,106.99

Balance available from previous continuous appropriation _____		5,270.88
Total _____		47,377.87

Total additional funds necessary to complete land acquisition under new authorization _____		600,000.00
---	--	------------

Mr. ZIHLMAN. If there are no further questions, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, having obtained permission of the House to revise and extend my remarks, it will permit me to print my prepared speech in

logical form and use most of my time on the floor on a subject other than the bill now under discussion.

I did file minority views, because it was very necessary that an amendment which in the committee I forced to be placed in this bill should be passed and not be defeated by the House, as it means \$600,000 to the taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. TILSON. My friend speaks of minority views which the gentleman filed; are they available?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; they are available there on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Has the action the gentleman just referred for been taken in this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; that has been done. That is a committee amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] very wisely offered and we had the committee adopt.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will my colleague yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] agree to this amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but I will tell the gentleman why it was necessary to file minority views.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Why the minority views then, I want to ask my colleague?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has seen amendments come in here from committee in bills that must be voted upon on the floor of the House, and he has seen them stricken out by the action of the House.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] support this amendment on the floor?

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman will personally, because the gentleman is always fair.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. May I say to the gentleman I am for the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman can not control all of the other members of the committee. And unless the membership knows what is in a proposition, they can not vote intelligently upon even committee amendments. And the Senate must pass on this bill. And it must know all of the facts connected with it. So I did some hard work.

The antagonistic position of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as well as that publicly expressed by one member of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER], concerning one feature of this measure, which, if they could frame it as they would, would materially affect to their detriment the taxpayers of every State in the Union, necessitate this review of the facts relating to the subject.

There are several new Members who for the first time are now serving on the District of Columbia Committee, and there are quite a number of new Members of Congress who are wholly unacquainted with the fiscal relation existing between the District and the Government of the United States. As H. R. 4785 is the first bill favorably reported by the District Committee, it is well that in its consideration before the House they should have the following facts brought to their attention:

This bill is to authorize an appropriation of \$600,000 to acquire small plats of land to round out a connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, and Potomac Park. All three of these beautiful parks are daily used and enjoyed by the citizens of Washington. They are for the use and benefit of the citizens of Washington.

But when the commissioners had this bill prepared and sent to the chairman of our committee for introduction and passage, they had it provide that this \$600,000 should be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States, so that it would be paid by the taxpayers of the United States, and not by the people of the District of Columbia.

I insisted that it should be amended, so that it should conform to the laws passed by Congress.

When I first came to Washington the Government of the United States paid one-half of all of the fiscal expenses of the Washington people under what was known as the ridiculous 50-50 plan, and this continued until the fiscal year of 1921. Under such plan the people of Washington paid a total tax of only about \$1 on the \$100. Then Congress changed it to what is known as the 60-40 plan, whereby the people of the District of Columbia paid 60 per cent of their fiscal expenses, and the Government of the United States paid the other 40 per cent of same. Under this system the people of Washington had to pay a total tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, both on personal and real property. Then beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, Congress has paid \$9,000,000 annually out of

the United States Treasury toward the fiscal expenses of the people of Washington. And their tax rate for the present year is only \$1.70 on the \$100. And their tax rate for the last year was only \$1.40 on the \$100. And to have their automobiles registered and receive number plates costs them only \$1 each, whether they are Fords or Pierce-Arrows. And each person is allowed \$1,000 of personal property exempt from all taxes. And the tax rate here on intangible property is only five-tenths of 1 per cent, and until recently it was only three-tenths of 1 per cent. Annual sewer service is furnished free to each family. To show you how little water costs here, my water for last year cost me only \$6.25. There are seven in my family, and there were no restrictions as to use, and we used all we needed both in the house and in the yards. This small charge is due to the fact that the Government of the United States owns the original conduit that brings city water into Washington, and that its original cost was wholly paid for out of the Treasury of the United States.

On account of the fact that in many of the Government supply bills money for many purely local civic institutions was provided wholly out of Government funds from the Treasury of the United States, it was unnecessary to spend all of the funds which the District raised from the \$1.20 tax it collected from Washington people to pay its one-half under the 50-50 arrangement, and in the Sixty-seventh Congress the District of Columbia claimed that it should be credited with \$4,438,154.92 of balances unexpended, and also of an additional claim of \$819,373.83. As a rider tacked onto an appropriation bill Congress caused a commission to be appointed to investigate and report on such claims, giving such commission specific directions.

A majority of the commission reported that such claims should be allowed, but former Congressman Evans, of Nebraska, who was a member of such commission, filed an exhaustive minority report against such claims, showing that the commission did not obey the instructions of Congress and did not properly audit said claims, and insisted that such claims were unjust, and that if such fiscal relations were completely and properly audited it would disclose that from the District of Columbia was due the Government of the United States many millions of dollars. Congressman Evans said that our colleague, Hon. BEN JOHNSON of Kentucky, who was formerly chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, is the best posted man in the United States on the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the United States. The following correspondence is self-explanatory:

WHAT CONGRESSMAN BEN JOHNSON OF KENTUCKY SAID

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 5, 1924.

Hon. BEN JOHNSON, M. C.,

House Office Building.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: With reference to the so-called surplus alleged to be due the District of Columbia by the Government, Mr. Daniel J. Donovan, the auditor for the District, testified that the reason the joint congressional committee, created June 29, 1922, confined its investigations to the period between June 30, 1911, and June 30, 1922, and did not go back to July 1, 1874, as directed by Congress, was because you had fully covered the period between July 1, 1874, and July 1, 1922, in an investigation you had conducted while chairman of the District Committee. And he claimed that you had balanced accounts up to July 1, 1911.

From my conversations with you and in examining many speeches made by you on the many ways the District has overreached the Government on finances, I am constrained to believe that Auditor Donovan is mistaken.

Will you kindly advise me whether you did, in fact, cover all matters involved between July 1, 1874, and July 1, 1911, and whether you agree that the District balanced accounts up to July 1, 1911?

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

[BEN JOHNSON, M. C., fourth Kentucky district, member Appropriations Committee]

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am just in receipt of your note asking whether or not, in my opinion, all matters relative to the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the United States Government were covered by the investigations made by the Committee on the District of Columbia while I was chairman of that committee.

In reply thereto I wish to say that not only is the statement made by Mr. Donovan incorrect, but that it was never contemplated under the authority given by the House to the District Committee to go into the

entire fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia. The authority given and the work undertaken included nothing more than to recover specific items due the United States from the District of Columbia.

In those items were embraced considerably more than a million dollars owing to the United States by the District of Columbia on account of the lunatic asylum, approximately half a million dollars on account of the Center Market, and various other items on account of advancements made for schoolhouse purposes, the jail, the 3.65 bonds, and a number of other items which I can not now enumerate.

When I retired from the chairmanship of the District Committee I invited the attention of my successor to several other items which, beyond any sort of doubt, were due to the United States by the District of Columbia and volunteered by assistance in helping him to develop them so that they might be paid. The resolution which would have authorized additional payments to the United States by the District was never asked for, and my offer to designate the specific sums due the United States was not availed of.

In my opinion, large sums of money are still owing to the United States by the District between the 1st of July, 1874, and the 1st of July, 1911.

I notice in the local papers that those who are designated as "friends of the District" are asking for another investigation into the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the United States. In my opinion, the "special committee" now being asked for to once more inquire into these relations is but an excuse to avoid the real issue. It is easily ascertainable that every time the District of Columbia has been called upon to pay a decent rate of taxes without infringing upon the rights of the people of other States to help them pay their taxes they have resorted to a "special committee" to inquire into the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the United States. It is not the investigation that they want. Instead it is delay and a lack of adjustment that they desire by seeking an investigation.

The last investigation, with all due respect to those who conducted it, was farcical. That "special committee" was particularly directed to make specific findings. If they had complied with the law made two years ago, they could not possibly have failed to find the District of Columbia indebted to the United States in excess of \$50,000,000 spent in beautifying and upbuilding the District of Columbia.

Instead of going into the matter in detail they treated the proposition in a blanket way and found that the United States owes the District of Columbia what is now known as the "four and one-half million dollar surplus"; while, as I have said, if they had followed the directions of the law, the balance would have been on the other side of the ledger in an amount certainly not less than \$50,000,000.

Very truly yours,

BEN JOHNSON.

BUT AS USUAL THE DISTRICT GOT WHAT IT WANTED

In the Sixty-eighth Congress the District of Columbia got its bill passed by the Senate with practically no consideration, and got it favorably reported by the House committee over my protest. I filed a minority report of 29 pages against it, but was unable to stop its passage in the House, and it became Public, No. 358, approved February 2, 1925. Congress thus gave this \$4,438,154.92 and the \$819,373.83, aggregating a total of \$5,257,528.75, to the people of the District of Columbia. But before passing the bill the House of Representatives did place an amendment on it providing that this money should be credited to the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States and made available "For appropriation by the Congress for the purchase of land and construction of buildings for public school, playground, and park purposes."

So I insisted that this \$600,000 authorized to be appropriated in this bill, H. R. 4785, should be appropriated out of this so-called surplus of \$5,257,528.75 to the credit of the District of Columbia, which Congress specially provided should be used for park and other purposes.

As soon as the committee voted to do this the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER] insisted that we should appropriate this \$600,000 out of Government funds in the United States Treasury and stated that he was in favor of reestablishing the old 50-50 system, and I quote the following excerpts from the Washington Star of January 6, 1925, as to what occurred:

Mr. UNDERHILL offered an amendment that it should be taken from the surplus fund, and on that basis Mr. BLANTON agreed not to oppose the legislation. Representative WILLIAM C. HAMMER, Democrat, of North Carolina, vigorously protested, however, that this meant the District paying entirely for the land to be acquired.

Mr. HAMMER protested that the fiscal relation between the National and District governments should go back to the 50-50 policy. He said he had no patience with a bulldozing policy which said, "Take this and be satisfied."

Mr. HAMMER said that if it is the only way in which to get the appropriations for the parkway connection he would not oppose it, but that he did resent a parsimonious and niggardly policy in regard to park development in the National Capital.

And in the Washington Post appeared the following:

BLANTON AND HAMMER TILT

Mr. HAMMER said he believed Congress should split the expense of the Rock Creek-Potomac parkway project with the District. Mr. BLANTON asked if it were not Washingtonians who enjoyed the parks.

"People from all over the country," insisted Mr. HAMMER.

"I'll bet few from North Carolina enjoy them," retorted Mr. BLANTON.

Congressman HAMMER is very liberal with somebody else's money. I am too liberal with my own, but I am careful about giving away the people's money out of the United States Treasury.

50-50 SYSTEM MR. HAMMER ENDORSES

Just what is this old 50-50 system to which Congressman HAMMER wants to return? It is a system whereby the North Carolina constituents of Congressman HAMMER and the other constituents of Congressmen in the 48 States of this Union, after paying for their own schools, and water, and lights, and sewers, and street paving, and alley paving, and fire protection, and policing, and municipal courts, and municipal hospitals, and parks, and playgrounds, and bridges, and trees, and ash, garbage, and trash disposals, and street cleaning and sprinkling, must then be taxed additionally to pay one-half of all such local civic expenses for Washington people, in order that they, as special favorites of the Government, may escape paying like other people do for what they receive.

Congressman HAMMER may imagine that returning to such a system will suit his constituents in North Carolina, but I imagine that they will not be suited long after they find it out.

Under Congressman HAMMER's proposed 50-50 system to which he wants to return, the Washington people accomplished the following:

They built their magnificent Municipal Building, where all of the city District business is transacted, and they built the many other numerous buildings used by the city, and the obliging Government of the United States paid half of the cost. Asheboro citizens had to build their own without help.

Washington people built their splendid, well-equipped high-school plants in different parts of the city, their numerous graded schools scattered in every portion of it, and equipped their many playgrounds, and the Government of the United States paid half of all the expense, acquiring the lands, architects' fees, construction of buildings, and equipment. And then for years up to the fiscal year of 1921 the Government of the United States paid half of the expense of conducting such schools, salaries for the 2,500 teachers and officers, free school books for the 65,000 school children, and every incidental expense. Asheboro citizens had to do all of these things for themselves without help.

Over 90 per cent of the streets and alleys of main Washington were paved, and the United States Government paid half of the expense. Asheboro people had to pay for their own paving.

The sewer system of this great city was installed, and the Government of the United States paid half of the cost.

The water system was installed, and the Government paid half of all the expense, notwithstanding that it owned outright the original conduit bringing the water into the city. And the Government has helped very materially in completion the new extended system that will furnish abundant water for the future.

The complete fire-fighting system was installed, and the Government of the United States paid half of all the expense, including the salaries and equipment of the 700 firemen, fire stations in every part of the city, with latest improved fire engines, trucks, apparatus, and alarm systems. Asheboro people had to do this for themselves.

Washington people organized their Metropolitan police force with over 1,000 policemen, and the Government of the United States paid half of the expense, including the establishment of the many police stations scattered over the city, the salaries and equipment of the policemen, the patrol wagons. And in addition to this the Government at its own expense pays, equips, and furnishes its own guards and policemen for the Capitol, the Congressional Library, the Senate Office Building, the House Office Building, the Treasury, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Government Printing Office, the White House and Grounds, the State, War, and Navy Building, the Smithsonian Institution, the Agriculture Department Buildings, and all of

the other many Government buildings in Washington, without one dollar of expense to the city.

At its own expense the Government of the United States dredged the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, and created the beautiful Potomac Park running all the way down to Haines Point, which is daily enjoyed by thousands of Washington people. And the Government gave Washington people deep water where boats can dock within three minutes' ride of the White House.

Former Congressman Davis, of Minnesota, was a member of the Appropriations Committee, and for years framed the District of Columbia appropriation bill. During debate in May, 1924, he stated that large and small there are about 600 parks in Washington, most of which he said had been paid for or furnished free by the Government, so that they cost Washington people nothing.

Rock Creek Park, meandering several miles along Rock Creek, is daily enjoyed by thousands of Washington people. During the summer months it is literally alive with picnickers each afternoon. For the portions of it that the Government did not furnish free, it has paid one-half of the purchase price, and the Government has policed it at its own expense.

Washington children with many grown-ups crowd to the Zoological Park daily, not only to see the animals, but for an outing. This is maintained and policed by special police force wholly at the expense of the Government without any cost to Washington people.

The wonderful Botanic Gardens are furnished and maintained by the Government of the United States without costing the Washington people one dollar. Thousands of Washington people daily enjoy same.

The Government furnishes free to the people of Washington the lovely rose gardens, the beautiful flower-bordered driveway down the Potomac, and the magnificent flower beds covering the grounds of the Agricultural Department, which are enjoyed by all of Washington. And Japanese cherry blossoms time around the Basin is a thing of beauty and a joy forever.

Under the old 50-50 system which Congressman Hammer endorses and wants to return to the Government paid half of the expense of army of ash gatherers, the army of garbage gatherers, the army of trash gatherers who serve the residences of the Washington people, and all of which in North Carolina the Asheboro people must pay for themselves.

No Washington citizen pays any part of the expense of setting out and maintaining trees in front of his property. The Government of the United States paid half of the expense, and the city the other, furnishing the trees, setting them out, pruning them, spraying them, and maintaining them.

Under Congressman HAMMER's 50-50 system the Government of the United States paid half of the expense of lighting every street and alley in the District of Columbia.

The bridges across the Anacostia River, the splendid Highway Bridge across the Potomac, the Connecticut Avenue million-dollar bridge, the \$2,350,000 Key Bridge, and the many other bridges in the District of Columbia were paid for one-half by the Government of the United States.

The Government of the United States paid one-half of the expense of furnishing and maintaining the courthouses, the jail, the hospitals, the asylums, the house of detention, municipal libraries, community-center facilities, including the salaries and annual expenses of the great army of city officials and city employees.

I doubt whether Asheboro has any school that will match in equipment the wonderful plant of the Central High School in Washington, which, with its grounds, building, stadium, swimming pool, commodious auditorium, and equipment, is easily worth at this time over \$3,000,000. The Eastern High School has cost over \$2,000,000. I doubt whether Asheboro has any school that will match in equipment the Western High School, or the Business High School, or the McKinley Manual Training School, or even the colored Dunbar High School, or the colored Armstrong School, or some of the newest junior high schools here in Washington. Yet Asheboro has to furnish her own schools without help, and then has to be taxed to help Washington people furnish schools to Washington children. I am willing to wager that Congressman HAMMER is about the only Asheboro citizen who is thoroughly satisfied with the arrangement.

SAMPLE OF WHAT 60-40 SYSTEM COST

Let me give you the cost on streets and sewer alone under the 60-40 system, and you can then imagine what the total costs of all other items of expense totaled. The following is quoted from a letter which Daniel J. Donovan, auditor of the District of Columbia, wrote me:

The following appropriations were made by Congress for repair and maintenance of streets during the fiscal years 1921, 1922, 1923, and 1924, each of such appropriations being charged 60 per cent against the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent against the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year—	
1921	\$575,000
1922	575,000
1923	460,000
1924	550,000
Total	2,160,000

The following appropriations covering the same period have been made for repairs to suburban streets and roads, payable 60 per cent from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year—	
1921	\$250,000
1922	250,000
1923	225,000
1924	275,000
Total	1,000,000

The following appropriations have been made for the same period for street improvements, including the paving and grading of streets, payable 60 per cent from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year—	
1921	\$614,200
1922	144,840
1923	233,500
1924	578,300
Total	1,565,000

The following appropriations have been made for construction and maintenance of sewers for the fiscal years 1921, 1922, 1923, and 1924, payable 60 per cent from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the revenues of the United States:

Fiscal year—	
1921	\$515,000
1922	523,000
1923	502,000
1924	690,000
Total	2,231,000

I regret very much that it has not been practicable for me to furnish you with this information at an earlier date. In the event that you desire any more details regarding the several matters herein, I shall be very glad to respond to such a request from you.

Very truly yours,

D. J. DONOVAN,
Auditor District of Columbia.

HOW BIG OWNERS REAP BENEFITS FROM LOW TAXES

The tax assessor of the District of Columbia advised me that for the year 1923 the Meridian Mansions Hotel was assessed at \$1,481,960, and at the \$1.20 rate of taxation on the \$100 paid a tax of only \$17,783, when the sworn statement of its manager filed here in the District showed that its annual receipts from rentals alone aggregated \$281,532.20. And the following from its owner shows that he considered it worth \$3,000,000:

MERIDIAN MANSIONS HOTEL,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative from Texas,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: In the Washington Daily News of January 28, under the head of "Properties underassessed," I note that you list Meridian Mansions Hotel, at 2400 Sixteenth Street, which is a property purchased by me on January 1 of last year. * * *

The writer is at this time the president of the Louisiana Society of Washington, and for six years I was a director in the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas. * * *

The usual assessment on property is 50 per cent of the valuation. This property could not be replaced for less than \$3,000,000, in addition to the land * * * it was sold to me on very long-time payments for \$2,250,000. * * *

I have spent quite a fortune refurbishing and building over the place to make it attractive.

Very truly yours,

E. KIRBY SMITH.

UNITED STATES HAS DONE MUCH FOR WASHINGTON PEOPLE

Before the Government spent millions building all of its fine institutions here Washington was a mere village. Property here was of little value. Now there are lots here that can not be bought for \$100,000 that once could have been bought for \$100.

The Government of the United States has nearly 70,000 people on its pay roll in Washington, who are paid off twice each month with new money that has never been spent before. These people spend their money freely. This is a bonanza for Washington.

Any city in the United States would be glad to have the Government's pay roll thus distributed in its midst. If the United States would move its Washington plant to Abilene, Tex., my home city would be glad to donate it several thousand acres to house it, and grant it free of all city taxes for all years to come.

In addition to its bimonthly pay roll, the Government is constantly spending many millions here in enlarging and improving its own institutions, and the people of Washington reap the benefit of this expenditure.

Congress has already passed a bill—over my protest, however—to spend \$14,750,000 for another bridge across the Potomac River, just opposite Lincoln Memorial.

Without having the people of Washington contribute one penny, the Government of the United States has for years maintained the Howard University here for colored students. President Durkee told me to-day that matriculations in all departments of Howard University would reach 2,500 this year, and by careful check and estimate these 2,500 students would spend \$2,250,000 in Washington during the school year. For the present fiscal year the Government of the United States gave this university \$591,000, and H. R. 6707, which we have been debating, and which will be passed to-night, gives this Howard University the additional sum of \$218,000 out of the Public Treasury. All of this money is spent here in Washington.

And this same bill, H. R. 6707, gives to the Freedmen's Hospital here in Washington, which each year is maintained by the Government, the sum of \$52,894 for maintenance.

And this same bill, H. R. 6707, gives to the Columbian Institution for the Deaf here in Washington the sum of \$113,400, all of which is spent in Washington.

And this same bill, H. R. 6707, gives to the St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington for annual maintenance the sum of \$924,000, all of which is spent here in Washington. And the \$250 per day for two weeks which Leopold and Loeb paid to the Government superintendent, Doctor White, for leaving his duties at St. Elizabeths and testifying for them in Chicago to prevent a just hanging, is undoubtedly spent here in Washington by Doctor White.

And all of the millions that the Government spends in its navy yard here in Washington and on its naval school and hospital is a bonanza to Washington people.

And all of the millions that the Government spends here on its Army posts, permanent quarters for officers, and barracks for men, including its War College, Army school, and Army hospital, constitutes another rich bonanza for Washington people.

The Government's Bureau of Standards tests for the Washington people free without charge certain structural and other material purchased by the District of Columbia.

The Government of the United States furnishes to the people of Washington its commodious Center Market properties, for the maintenance of which Congress appropriated for the present fiscal year \$176,000. These properties are worth \$5,000,000.

The Government of the United States out of its own Treasury pays their salaries and furnishes to the District government free the following Army officers who are used by the District of Columbia as administrative officials, to wit: Lieut. Col. James Franklin Bell, Maj. Raymond A. Wheeler, Maj. William Henry Holcombe, Maj. William E. R. Covell, Maj. U. S. Grant, 3d, Maj. Carey H. Brown, Maj. J. C. Mehaffey, Maj. James A. O'Conner, and Capt. M. H. Parsons, together with a host of their assistants. If the Government did not furnish these officers free to the Washington people they would be compelled to employ high-salaried officials to take their places.

For the constant pleasure of Washington people, without costing them a single dollar, the Government of the United States, at tremendous expense, maintains here in Washington the United States Marine Band, one of the finest in the whole world; also the United States Army Band, and the United States Navy Band, than which there are no larger or finer bands anywhere, and these bands not only give regular concerts free for the people of Washington, but regularly give radio concerts which are listened to by practically all Washington people.

The very large, wooded, well-kept park areas embraced within the public lands set apart to the National Soldiers Home here in Washington are constantly used and enjoyed by Wash-

ington people who regularly go there with their families to pick wild flowers, to picnic, and for outings, and not one penny does it cost them, for the Government pays all the expenses.

The Government of the United States at its own expense maintains the Commission of Fine Arts, most of whose time is expended on local civic matters for the beautification of Washington, and not one dollar does it cost the people here.

The United States for the present fiscal year appropriated \$117,379 for the maintenance of the United States Botanical Gardens, situated in the heart of Washington, and daily enjoyed by thousands here, and it does not cost them one penny.

The plant of the Congressional Library is easily worth \$15,000,000 and is maintained wholly by funds from the United States Treasury, yet it is daily enjoyed by thousands of Washington people without one penny cost to them.

The Supreme Court of the United States sits here. That brings thousands of visitors to Washington. All spend money here.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue with all of its appeal branches function here. This brings thousands of people here. Some are forced to remain several days. All spend much money. Washington people get the benefit of it.

The United States Patent Office is here. That brings many thousands of people here. They all spend much money, to the benefit of Washington people.

The Comptroller General and General Accounting Office function here. This brings thousands of claimants and their attorneys here. They all spend much money. Washington people benefit by it.

The United States Veterans' Bureau is situated here. This causes thousands of people to come to Washington. And they all spend money. Washington people get it.

The United States Pension Office is here. This causes thousands of people to come to Washington. They all spend their money freely. It goes into the pockets of Washington people.

The Executive Offices of the White House operate here. Thousands of people come here constantly to see their President. They spend much money. Washington people deposit it in their Washington banks to their credit.

The Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of Western European Affairs, the Bureau of Latin-American Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of Mexican Affairs, the Bureau of Passport Control, the Bureau of Foreign Service Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Farm-Loan Bureau, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Bureau of Public Health Service, the Bureau of Insular Affairs and all of the numerous other bureaus in the War Department, the Bureau of Navigation, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the Bureau of Ordnance, the Bureau of Construction and Repair, the Bureau of Engineering, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, the Bureau of Aeronautics, the headquarters of the United States Marine Corps, and the many boards in the Navy Department, the General Land Office, the Office of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Education, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Bureau of Dairying, the Bureau of Plant Industry, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Chemistry, the Bureau of Soils, the Bureau of Entomology, the Bureau of Biological Survey, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Bureau of Home Economics, the Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory, the Packers and Stockyards Administration, the Grain Futures Administration, the Insecticide and Fungicide Board, the Federal Horticultural Board, the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of Fisheries, the Bureau of Lighthouses, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Steamboat Inspection Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Conciliation, the Bureau of Immigration, the Children's Bureau, the Bureau of Naturalization, the Women's Bureau, the United States Employment Service, the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, the National Museum, the Astrophysical Observatory, the National Academy of Sciences, the Pan American Union, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the United States Railroad Labor Board, the Civil Service Commission, the United States Bureau of Efficiency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the United States Shipping Board, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation (the last two of which handle public money by the hundred million), the United States Railroad Administration, the War Finance Corporation, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, the Panama Canal Bureau, the Board of Road Commissioners for Alaska, the American National Red Cross, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the International Joint Commission, the International Boundary Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the United States Geographic

Board, the Inland Waterways Corporation, the World War Foreign Debt Commission, the Federal Narcotics Control Board, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Personnel Classification Board, the Post Office Department, the Department of Justice, Prohibition Enforcement, and the many, many other institutions of the Government all attract thousands upon thousands of people to Washington each month during the year, and they all spend their money freely while here, and it is the people of Washington who benefit financially by it, for the money spent goes into their pockets, and into their bank accounts in Washington.

Every American who visits the shrine of George Washington at Mount Vernon must come to Washington and leave quite a little sum here when departing.

Thousands of Americans who have no business whatever here come to Washington simply because it is the seat of government, and the people here profit daily by it.

During the debate in May, 1924, former Congressman Charles R. Davis, of Minnesota, who was the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which regularly framed the District of Columbia appropriation bill, stated that during the 22 years he had been in Congress the Government of the United States had donated to the people of the District of Columbia to help pay their local civic expenses in Washington the enormous sum of \$190,000,000. This was for local civic expenses that the people of other cities must pay for themselves. This did not include any portion of the enormous sums the Government spends in Washington annually for its own institutions, and this did not include the sums that are annually carried in the Interior Department appropriation bill for St. Elizabeths Hospital, the Freedmen's Hospital, and Howard University, all local institutions here, which sums are taken wholly out of the Treasury of the United States.

Each city in the United States maintains a chamber of commerce. Its purpose is to secure institutions with large pay rolls to locate with them, so that such money may be distributed in their city. Big pay rolls make growth automatic. Big pay rolls increase local bank deposits. Big pay rolls cause local property values to increase. But Washington needs no chamber of commerce; Washington needs no reaching out after pay rolls. The Government institutions here have done for Washington what expensive chambers of commerce have been unable to do for many cities.

What city has in it an attraction half so great as the Washington Monument, with its beautiful grounds, daily enjoyed by the citizens here? What city has in it so great an attraction as the superb Lincoln Memorial, with its beautiful reflecting pools, upon which all Washington does its ice skating during winter?

In many cities the chamber of commerce lives in the constant fear that some of its large pay-roll plants will not be successful, and that their failure will throw many persons out of jobs, which would cause stagnation in business. No such fear exists in Washington. It is the Government of the United States that pays off twice each month. The money is always forthcoming. There is never any fear of failure.

No wonder \$100 lots here have gone up to \$100,000. No wonder merchants here who started years ago with little peanut joints now own their many-storied department stores. No wonder men formerly of no financial means who invested a few hundred dollars in real estate have become influential financiers. The Government has been their transforming fairy.

Yet, after our generous Government has done so very much for Washington people—and they still paid a tax rate last year of \$1.40 on the \$100, and this year \$1.70 on the \$100—their city commissioners and their city newspapers and Congressman HAMMER condemn Congress and the Government as parsimonious because I insisted on the District Committee amending the bill sent us by the Commissioners of the District so that this \$600,000 for new park ends should be paid out of the \$5,257,528.75 which Congress recently gave to the people of Washington, and that same be not paid out of the United States Treasury, as said District Commissioners selfishly hoped it would be.

The following are headlines of a front-page article in the Washington Star of January 7, 1926:

Object of placing on District entire cost of park sites—Commissioners say provisions of House bill are manifestly unfair—Want United States to pay half.

One would expect the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Col. James Franklin Bell, whose salary and emoluments are paid by the people of the United States, to view the matter from the standpoint of the whole people of the United States, and not from the selfish standpoint of a Washingtonian. But the Star quotes him as saying:

The bill originally was worded so that the entire cost of the project would be paid by the Federal Government, Commissioner Bell explained.

And that is exactly the way this bill was introduced and came before our committee, framed and worded so that the entire \$600,000 would come out of the United States Treasury.

Commissioner James Franklin Bell lives in Washington. His home is in Washington. He is taxed in Washington. When it is necessary for him to pay only \$1 to register his limousine and receive number plates for it, he can use the balance of the money that citizens of all other cities have to pay for registering their automobiles elsewhere, in buying something extra with it. If he can get the Government of the United States to pay half of the expense of furnishing him paved streets and alleys; removing his ashes, garbage, and trash from behind his residence; furnishing, planting, spraying, pruning, and maintaining his trees in front of his residence; lighting his street and alley; furnishing his police and fire protection; furnishing and maintaining schools, free text books, teachers, and playgrounds for his children; furnishing and maintaining free amusement parks for recreation; furnishing and maintaining his hospitals, asylums, courts, jail, water, sewer, and all other civic privileges that citizens of other cities must furnish themselves, so that his tax rate is only \$1 on the \$100, as against \$2.75 and up on the \$100 that others have to pay—if he can get the Government to do this for him, of course he wants it done, for he saves money each year, and it increases the value of his property holdings each year.

Congress just recently passed Public, No. 202, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved June 6, 1924, providing for the appropriation of \$1,100,000 each year for 20 years to be spent for parks and playgrounds in the District of Columbia. That ought to be sufficient authorization for parks without the passage of this new bill.

I am afraid that Congressman WILLIAM C. HAMMER, in wanting to return to the ridiculous old 50-50 plan, shows very much more consideration for the people of Washington than his own State of North Carolina shows to his home folks in Asheboro.

I have a telegram from Hon. D. B. McCrary, mayor of Asheboro, N. C., and he tells me that Asheboro people have an exemption of only \$300 personal property free from taxation. Congressman HAMMER allows Washington people an exemption of \$1,000 personal property free from taxation. Hon. Howard M. Jackson, mayor of Baltimore, wires me that Maryland people in Baltimore are allowed an exemption of only \$500 personal property free from taxation.

Mayor McCrary wires me that the owner of a Ford in Asheboro, N. C., must pay \$13.50 to register it. Owners of finer cars pay more in proportion. Mayor Jackson wires me that Maryland people in Baltimore must pay 32 cents per horsepower to register their automobiles in Baltimore. Yet, Chairman ZIHLMAN, of Maryland, and Congressman WILLIAM C. HAMMER, of Asheboro, outvoted me and permit the owners of Pierce Arrows, Lincolns, and Rolls-Royces here in Washington to register same and get their number plates for only \$1 each per year. Washington people get quite an inside there. And when passing that provision Chairman ZIHLMAN very frankly told the House that the reason he did not want them charged more was that Washington did not need the money. The reason it did not need the money is that Washington people have been getting their big hand-outs from the People's Treasury of the United States.

The highest tax rate that the people of Washington paid under the 50-50 system to which Congressman HAMMER wants to return was \$1.10 on the \$100. Under the 60-40 system they paid \$1.20. Under the Cramton amendment we passed to apply to the last fiscal year they paid \$1.40 on the \$100, and under the \$9,000,000 allowed this fiscal year by the Government they pay \$1.70 on the \$100.

But what do the people of Baltimore pay? And what do the people of Asheboro, N. C., pay? Mayor McCrary, of Asheboro, wires me that citizens of Asheboro pay a tax rate of \$2.95 on the \$100, covering city, county, and State taxes, which is \$1.20 per \$100 more than Washington people have ever paid. Mayor Jackson, of Baltimore, wires me that citizens of Baltimore, just 40 miles from Washington, pay a city tax rate of \$2.48 on the \$100, and also pay an additional tax of 27½ cents on the \$100 to the State, making over \$2.75 on the \$100 that they pay as against only \$1.70 on the \$100 that Washington people pay. Mayor Jackson wires me that household property in Baltimore with a frontage of over 12 feet pays a flat water rate of \$32.50 per year, while my family here in Washington, living in a house with 22 feet frontage, pays for all the water we need only \$6.25 per year.

Mayor Edward N. Woodruff, of Peoria, Ill., advised me in 1923 that water there for a family of seven costs \$25 per year. He advised me that the entire cost of street and alley pave-

ments in Peoria had to be paid by abutting property, and that the entire cost of sewer installation had to be paid by the property in the entire sewer district, and that the cost of sewer connection per household was about \$50.

Now, in comparison, note what Daniel J. Donovan, auditor of the District of Columbia, wrote me:

For service sewers the law at present provides for a flat rate assessment of \$1.50 per front foot, with certain deductions made for corner property. The rate represents approximately 87 per cent of the cost of the work.

The special assessments received for the several forms of improvements indicated are paid into the Treasury of the United States, 60 per cent to the credit of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent to the credit of the United States, this being the proportion that each bears of the appropriations for the improvements.

For water mains the law provides a special assessment of \$2 per front foot, and this amount represents approximately 66 per cent of the cost of the work. Water-main assessments when received are paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the water-department fund.

MAKING WASHINGTON BEAUTIFUL DOES NOT MEAN EXEMPTING PEOPLE HERE FROM TAXES

I am for making Washington the most beautiful city in the world. I am for taking every million dollars out of the Treasury of the United States for the Government to spend to do it that is justly needed, but I am not willing to continue taxing the already tax-burdened people of this country, who have to pay their own large taxes at home, to pay the civic expenses here, and then let these specially favored, petted, pampered, spoiled people in Washington pay only \$1.20 on the hundred and enjoy all the benefits of this great city at the expense of our constituents back home, under the old 50-50 arrangement.

Take this magnificent Congressional Library that would cost at least \$15,000,000 now—is not it enjoyed by every citizen of the District? Take the magnificent Smithsonian Institution, the magnificent museums here, the art gallery, the magnificent parks, the magnificent playgrounds. Are not the people of the District of Columbia getting the benefit? And yet they want to tax the Government of the United States more than \$9,000,000 a year, which the Cramton amendment offers them, for the very property that they enjoy hourly here in this District.

THE OLD SLOGAN HAS WORN THREADBARE

Whenever a Member of Congress seeks to change the unjust system of taxation here the newspapers and citizens' associations immediately resort to their old battle cry—

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

Washington is the Nation's Capital and should be made the most beautiful city in the world, and I will go just as far as any other man through all legitimate and proper means to make it the most beautiful city in the world.

The business men of Washington are a bunch of splendid fellows personally. I like them all. Many of them are my personal friends in spite of my fights against their selfish demands. They know that I am right. They know deep down in their hearts that I am doing my duty. But they have enjoyed these hand-outs from the Federal Treasury for so long that they hate to give them up.

The following will show what taxes the people of Peoria, Ill., have to pay:

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

NOVEMBER 1, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative, Washington, D. C.

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

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

City, corporate tax, including library, tuberculosis, garbage, and police and fire pension fund	\$1.94
Street and bridge	.24
School district	2.70
Park district	.41
	\$5.29
State	.45
County	.59
County highway	.25
	1.20
Total, all purposes	6.58

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

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

Wishing you success, I am,
Very truly yours,

E. N. WOODRUFF, *Mayor.*

Mr. Cornelius M. Sheehan, president, and Mr. Leo Kenneth Mayer, director, respectively, of the American City Government League, advise me that the tax rate in the city of New York is as follows:

Taxes in city of New York

City purposes	\$1.287
School purposes	.555
Debt charges	.619
County charges	.096
State charges	.171
 Total city tax rate	 2.728

REASONABLE TAX RATE FOR WASHINGTON

All I want is that there should be a reasonable rate of taxation for Washington people. If they will find out what is the lowest rate of taxation in any city of the United States and establish that lowest rate as the tax rate for Washington, then, for one, I shall be satisfied, and they will see me cease fighting, for the money they will raise, together with fair appropriation from the Government each year, will give them all the money they will need for sound, substantial, constructive, proper improvement each year.

LOYAL FRIEND TO DISTRICT

Because for nine years here I have led the fight against the ridiculous tax rate in Washington, and my fight has been determined and uncompromising, the distinguished assistant editor of the Washington Times designates me as "The Texas Wild Cat." That is my reward for doing my duty. If, like Congressman HAMMER, I would declare for a return to the 50-50 system, all the papers here with front-page columns would herald me as a wise statesman.

But after all, I am a better friend to Washington than some Washingtonians imagine. Why are so many people, papers, and magazines now knocking Florida? It is because other places are jealous of Florida's boom. When people of other States and other cities find out that Washington property is soaring sky-high, and Washington people are becoming rich until their income taxes exceed many other cities, and that such conditions have been brought about through much of the civic expenses here being paid by the whole people of the United States, they are going to have a reaction unfavorable to Washington and are going to be jealous of such situation, and it is going to hurt Washington people and Washington property.

Congressman HAMMER will remember that when in the Sixty-eighth Congress he was insisting on continuing the Rent Commission, which had kept property from lawful owners ever since the war, I led the fight against such proposal, and the Rent Commission died and property went back to owners and they have now begun to improve same, and they have reduced rentals, and rental conditions here now are better than they have been for many years. Newspapers condemned me then, and Washington people condemned me then, for fighting to kill their Rent Commission, but time has proven that I was their friend after all.

Congressman HAMMER must not be permitted to carry out any move to return to the old 50-50 system, for it is vicious and against the interests of the people of the United States and not for the best interests, after all, of Washington people.

But I desire to use the rest of my time to discuss another proposition of great moment to Washington people. When the street-car companies of this District got a charter from Congress—the Capital Traction Co. and the Washington Railway & Electric Co.—to run their street-car tracks down the main streets of this city, to the exclusion of every other street-car company in the world, they obtained a most valuable right. It was a right that belonged to the Government and the people of this city, and Congress wisely provided in that charter, which was a contract between these companies and the Government, that they should never charge the people of this District more than 5 cents street-car fare. It provided they should never charge the little school children of the District more than three-fourths of the adult fare, provided the children bought as many as 20 fares at one time and paid cash for them.

Yet in the face of that charter, since the war came on, the Public Utilities Commission, which is constituted ipso facto by the three Commissioners of the District, have let these street-car companies rob every family in the District and charge them 8 cents car fare, and they charge the 66,000 little school children here 8 cents car fare or 16 cents a day if they have not the money to buy tokens at 6 for 40 cents.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Does not the gentleman know that every other city that has a street railway line charges even more than what they charge in Washington?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That splendid street-car system in the city of New York charges only 5 cents, and it has never charged more, even through the inflated war years.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. And how long a haul do they give you for the 5 cents?

Mr. BLANTON. They give you 25 miles, if you want it. You can go down in the subway in New York and ride all day long for 5 cents if you want to ride and do not go out the gates. [Laughter.] And I can mention several other large cities with splendid street-car service for 5 cents, but here they charge 8 cents. Why do they do it? They do it because Congress lets them do it.

In the last Congress, the Sixty-eighth Congress, I introduced a bill to require the Public Utilities Commission to bring these railways back to the contract agreements in their charters. But immediately, to my great surprise, the commissioners filed against my bill a more elaborate argument than could have been prepared by the combined general counsels of the corporations themselves. And the commissioners killed the bill.

I expected the street railways to file an argument against it, and to fight it, and I was prepared to meet them, but the commissioners did the work for the railway lawyers, and killed the bill without permitting me to present the people's side of it.

After Congress adjourned last March I remained here in Washington and worked the entire vacation. When, on April 25, 1925, the Washington Post heralded that the North American Co. from New York had opened offices in the Earle Building and was to spend \$50,000 making a survey of traction and traffic conditions here in Washington I kept my eyes open for developments. The higher ups had reached the conclusion that I was one Member here who was determined to get them back to their contract fare of 5 cents demanded by their charters, and I expect some such action to be taken in an attempt to head me off.

As soon as we met on December 7, 1925, I reintroduced my bill (H. R. 3805), which is as follows:

A bill to repeal and annul certain acts of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That any and all actions taken by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia permitting street railways to charge more than the maximum authorized in their respective charters be, and the same are hereby, annulled and repealed, and from and after the passage of this act no street railway company operating in the District of Columbia shall charge any fare greater than the maximum authorized in its charter. And the Public Utilities Commission shall not in the future authorize any street railway to charge fares greater than is authorized in its charter, and no charge greater than the charter authorization shall be permitted except by special act of Congress.

SEC. 2. From and after the passage of this act all street railway companies operating in the District of Columbia shall not charge school children in going to and from school on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in each week a fare greater than three-fourths the regular fare charged adults: *Provided*, That such school children shall purchase as many as 20 of such fares at a time.

And, following the custom, I had the chairman of the District Committee to send a copy of the bill to the commissioners for their recommendation. And again came back from the commissioners a most elaborate argument for the street railways, recommending that the bill be killed. But I did not let them off so easy this time. I wrote them the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 1, 1926.

Hon. CUNO H. RUDOLPH, *President*;

Hon. FREDERICK A. FENNING,

Hon. JAMES FRANKLIN BELL,

Commissioners District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN AND FRIENDS: During the past week, after making its first appearance through the press, there came to the Committee on

the District of Columbia your letter dated December 22, 1925, reporting unfavorably my bill, H. R. 3805, that would require the street railways of Washington to keep their agreement and perform their contract made with the people of Washington by not charging more than the 5-cent fare authorized by their charters. Inasmuch as you constitute the Public Utilities Commission, and these street railways could not have charged more than the 5 cents authorized by their charters unless you permitted it, and in the face of these charters, which provide that said railways shall never charge more than 5 cents, you have continued to permit them to rob the half million people here by charging them 8 cents, and the purpose of my bill was to have Congress annul your action, I very naturally did not expect you to approve it.

All of the high-salaried general attorneys of these street railways from Washington to New York combined together could not have framed a more adroit argument in their behalf than is contained in your letter. Even before asking you about it, I knew that none of you had any personal knowledge about it.

When I took the matter up with you individually, each one of you in turn admitted that you had no personal knowledge of the facts asserted in your letter, but that you were depending upon some one else for same.

President Rudolph very frankly admitted that he had to depend upon the office of Colonel Bell, who had charge of such matters, and that he signed such letters as president of the board without having personal knowledge of the correctness of the facts furnished by Colonel Bell's office.

Commissioner Fenning likewise frankly admitted that in the very nature of things he could not give all such matters his personal attention, but was forced to depend and rely upon the officials in Colonel Bell's office to compile such facts and to prepare such letters, and that he couldn't personally vouch for the correctness of the assertions, as he did not have personal knowledge of them.

As far as Colonel Bell would go was to say that he had general knowledge and felt morally certain that the facts stated, figures given, and conclusions drawn were all correct, although he did not dictate the letter and had no personal knowledge of the correctness of its contents, but that he had to depend upon his assistant, Maj. William E. R. Covell, for compiling the facts and upon Corporation Counsel Francis H. Stephens for the law.

I then took the matter up with Major Covell. He assured me that he did not dictate the letter and that he did not have any personal knowledge of the facts, figures, and conclusions stated therein, but that Secretary E. V. Fisher had prepared the whole matter, and was governed by the opinion of Mr. Stephens that these railways must be allowed to make a fair return on their investment.

So, after all, when traced back, your disapproval of this bill is founded upon the action of Secretary Fisher, guided by the opinion of Mr. Stephens.

I do not claim to be a legal wizard, but I have had 30 years experience around courthouses, 8 years of which I occupied the circuit bench in Texas, and I am willing to pit my ability to assemble facts against that of Secretary Fisher, and I feel that my opinion of the law should have equal weight with that of Mr. Stephens; hence, I am going to request, as a special favor to me, that you withdraw your disapproval of this bill from the District Committee and request Chairman ZIHLMAN to return it to you, and thus give me an opportunity to place my knowledge of the facts and my opinion of the law concerning this issue before you, and I feel sure that I can convince at least a majority of your board that this bill should pass.

The right to run a street railway through the streets of Washington is a most valuable right, and when the privilege is exclusive the right becomes doubly valuable. These rights and privileges belonged to the people and to the Government. When these street railways secured their charters they procured from the Government and from the people very valuable rights indeed. And in part payment for such rights these street railways agreed with the people and with the Government, and it was so specifically expressed in their charters, that they should never charge more than 5 cents fare. They should be held to their charter contracts.

I expect to show you that the stock of both companies has been going up constantly for several years, and that it is now higher than ever before in its history, and that it is higher than any comparable stock in the United States.

I expect to show you that respecting every group of men engaged in repair work for both companies, there is an average of as many as two-thirds of them idle all of the time, and that waste, indifference, and extravagance has gone to seed because the Public Utilities Commission has decreed that they shall have a fair return above all expenses. Mr. H. L. Bushong, of 1211 East Capitol Street, who is the president of his citizens association, will tell you that he saw 16 laborers and their foreman sit idle for an hour and five minutes on street-car repair work without moving a hand.

Your Secretary Fisher shows in the letter he prepared for you disapproving my bill that the Capital Traction Co. carried 2,160,153 less passengers in 1923 than it did in 1922; and that it carried

3,492,366 less passengers in 1924 than it did in 1923, and that for the first 10 months of 1925 it carried 11,518,101 less passengers than it did in 1924.

Secretary Fisher also shows in his letter which he prepared for you to sign disapproving my bill that the Washington Railway & Electric Co. system carried 5,191,263 less passengers in 1924 than it did in 1923, and that for the first 10 months of 1925 it carried 7,600,816 less passengers than it did in 1923.

To his mind this indicates that we ought to continue paying them 8 cents fare. To my mind it indicates that you are permitting these railroads to rob the people to such an extent that they have rebelled, and many have stopped riding street cars, whereas, if we restricted them to their charters, and permitted them to charge only 5 cents, which they agreed they would charge, and would never charge more, probably twice as many people would use the street cars, and at 5 cents fare, these railroads would have the chance of taking in 10 cents for every 8 cents they now receive. It is far more convenient to use street cars for shopping than it is automobiles, on account of scarce parking space, and if they were not robbed the people would use the cars generally.

When on April 25, 1925, the Washington Post carried the headlines "Big New York corporation quietly starts work of fact finding," and went on to tell us that the North American Co., of New York, had opened offices in the Earle Building, and had begun a traction survey upon which it was to spend \$50,000, and that your commission was to supervise the survey, I incidentally watched proceedings.

I was interested because in the Sixty-eighth Congress I had introduced a similar bill to restrict these companies to their charter authorization of 5 cents, and immediately there came from the office of Colonel Bell a similar strong argument against it, but at that time I did not know that it was an office secretary who was acting both as the embalmer and funeral director for my bill. But I then exhibited such a strong determination to try to pass it over Colonel Bell's veto that I rather expected some new move to head me off.

So the summer passed, and when Congress met on December 7 I introduced my new bill No. H. R. 3805. And the committee sent a copy to you commissioners. Within a few days there was delivered at my office by special messenger two very large splendidly bound in full morocco leather volumes, each 8½ by 11 inches, and nearly 2 inches thick, with the top of the pages entitled:

"Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia, 1925 transportation survey."

I learned from all three of you that you had nothing whatever to do with this work, but that the North American Co., of New York, had it done at its own expense; and I learned from Major Covell that these two volumes cost the North American Co. \$70,000.

Now, why did it spend this \$70,000? Does it cast its bread upon the waters without expecting Biblical returns? This North American Co. of New York owns 75 per cent of the common stock of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. It owns the controlling stock in the Capital Traction Co. And it owns the controlling stock in the Washington Rapid Transit Co. It is interested in having 8 cents fare on street cars in Washington, and it is interested in selling 8 fares for 50 cents on its busses, which take up two-thirds of the street, observe no traffic rules, will run right over you if you don't get out of their way, and will drive around a new Pierce-Arrow if it doesn't break the speed limit. And I find that these two \$70,000 volumes have been delivered to other Congressmen and to Senators. And I have perused them carefully. And if I were you commissioners, I would take my names off of the tops of these voluminous pages, for most of them are specially prepared "bunk" to gull commissioners and Congress with.

I expect to do my own thinking and not let these traction companies prepare my facts for me. The only pledge I have taken on this New Year Day is that I am going to match wits with Secretary Fisher and Corporation Counsel Stephens in overcoming your objections to my bill, and in securing before Congress adjourns legislation that will bring these companies back within their charters, and thus give the half million people of Washington a 5-cent fare. It is a crime to permit these companies to charge 66,000 little children 8 cents fare in going to and from school. In no other comparable city in the United States is it done. And when we force them back to their charters, if they want to go to court about it, I will tender you and the people here my services gratis in defending the 5-cents fare all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

GREAT REACTION

I must quote the following excerpts from the Washington newspapers to show that I correctly sized up the situation:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., January 3, 1926]
BLANTON UPHELD BY COMMISSIONERS—COLONEL BELL SAYS HE FAVORS WITHDRAWING OPPOSITION TO 5-CENT FARE

Engineer Commissioner J. Franklin Bell announced last night that he plans to reply favorably to the communication of Representative

THOMAS L. BLANTON asking the commissioners to withdraw their opposition to his 5-cent car-fare bill, on the ground that the commissioners had not directed the unfavorable report.

The letter representing the position of the commissioners, Mr. BLANTON pointed out, was drafted by Earl V. Fisher, executive secretary of the Public Utilities Commission, who was governed by the opinion of Corporation Counsel Francis H. Stephens. Colonel Bell indicated that he would tell Mr. BLANTON that the commissioners left the framing of the letter to the commission's experts because of the pressure of other official business.

"I am going to tell Mr. BLANTON that I am in hearty accord with his statements," said Colonel Bell.

[From the Washington Post, Sunday, January 3, 1926]

COLONEL BELL ADMITS TRUTH OF BLANTON TRACTION CHARGES—THE ENGINEER COMMISSIONER AGREES DISTRICT HEADS CAN NOT FUNCTION ON BODY—GIVES THIS AS REASON FOR REORGANIZATION

Charges by Representative BLANTON, of Texas, yesterday that the District Commissioners know little of local traction affairs, and that they had based their opposition to his 5-cent bill on the knowledge of a secretary, met with prompt admission by Commissioner J. Franklin Bell.

"I agree with you heartily," said Colonel Bell in a reply. "I long have maintained that under the present arrangement we can not keep ourselves well enough informed about utilities to function correctly as members of the utilities commission."

For that reason, Colonel Bell said, the commissioners had submitted a bill reorganizing the public utilities commission, and he asked Mr. BLANTON to support it.

This North American Co. of New York just a few days before this Congress convened sent us two documents like this I hold in my hand, bound in full Morocco leather, and these two volumes cost \$35,000 apiece to the North American Co. Do you know what it is? I am about the only man in Washington who reads them. [Laughter.] It is my business to read them. I want to tell you what it is; it is nothing in the world but bunk specially prepared for these commissioners to use in trying to argue the people of Washington out of a 5-cent street-car fare, to which they are entitled.

The North American Co., I am told by Colonel Bell and Major Covell, own 75 per cent of the common stock of the Washington Electric Railway Co., that it owns a big lot of stock of the Capital Traction Co., and that it owns nearly 100 per cent of the Washington Rapid Transit Co.—that is, the bus line which, if you drive your car up and down the street, you will have to get out of the way of to keep from getting run over. Those busses observe no traffic laws, they observe no signs, they observe no traffic stops, they go up and down the avenue and up and down the streets as they please, and if you are in a Pierce-Arrow and if you do not exceed the speed limit, they will run around you or run over you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As to the number of busses, are they not grossly inadequate for the school children? I came down Pennsylvania Avenue this morning and there was a perfect mob of school children waiting for busses.

Mr. BLANTON. The poor little children of this city can not afford to ride these busses at 10 cents a ride or six rides for 50 cents. And they can not pay 16 cents a day to go back and forth on these street cars to school each day at 8 cents car fare. Every time I come to my office in my automobile on a school day, I pick up a car full of school children and bring with me. Every time I go home in the evening and find them on the street, I take them in and give them a ride. I have children of my own, and I hope some one will give my boys a lift if they need it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's bill, but I would like to ask him if he has investigated the revenue derived by the street-car companies.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no more wasteful corporations on earth than the street railway companies of this city. I have known instance after instance where they have had an army of laborers employed, and about 75 per cent of them spend almost their entire time doing nothing. They ought to discharge every foreman of works employed by the street railway companies and get new ones. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Maryland was to give me five minutes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman only requires 75 per cent of the time, but I yield him five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, we got that much out of the chairman toward a 5-cent fare, did we not? [Laughter.] But he is all right. I will say it is. I want to say this: That if these street railroad companies would stop their waste, if they would reduce the fare to what their charter requires them to do—to 5 cents—if they would make the fare for school children three-fourths of the adult fare, buying 20 at a time and pay cash, as their charters require, there would be twice as many people ride on the street cars as do now, and at the same expense to the railroad company, and they would take in more revenue than they do now. If we could take the stock of this railroad company, put it out in the street and run over it every day with our cars, like we do the snow, squeeze the water out of it like we do out of the snow, we could let them pay on their bona fide stock twice as much as they do now.

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

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. I want to get these facts before my colleagues. The trouble of it all is that the commissioners are not with us. When you go to court, if you want to win, you have got to have a proper record to stand on. When they have been to court heretofore the commissioners have had nobody down there to make a record for the people, and that is what I propose to do hereafter. Whenever this question goes to court again I am going to see to it that a proper record goes there presenting the people's side, and if I can not do it in any other way I shall do it as *amicus curiae*.

I wrote the vice president of this North American Co. and asked him to answer certain pertinent questions about his company and the ownership of the stock. He would not do it. He wrote me back an evasive letter, but did not answer a question. I then wrote their chief engineer and asked him certain questions. He wrote me back an evasive letter, and he would not answer the questions. That is the kind of service we get, and they then put a misleading statement in the Washington papers, but they admit that they own practically all of the Washington Rapid Transit Co.

What are we going to do about the situation? Are we going to sit here and let these Washington people be robbed every day by these street railway companies? If you gentlemen of the House will help us pass that bill to restrict these railway companies to their charters, I think the bill will be passed by the Senate, and I promise you that I will see to it that a proper record is made on which to go to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The gentleman from Maryland has one minute remaining.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield that one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, in the one minute remaining I want to bring the Members of the House back to the matter under consideration. This bill has nothing to do with street railways, has little to do with the commissioners, but considerable to do with the people of the District. Although my amendment was adopted in the committee, which takes the total amount of the cost out of the reserves of the District, while the amendment was offered in good faith, yet it was with the knowledge we never in the world would get this through Congress unless such a provision was incorporated in the bill. It is not entirely a just provision, but it is perhaps the best we could do. This is a little different from the other park propositions upon which we have acted, inasmuch as the title of this property still remains with the Federal Government. It is hardly a fair proposition, but the best that we can offer and the best that we can get. I do not know that there is any particular opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to complete the acquisition of the land authorized to be acquired by section 22 of the public buildings appropriation act approved March 4, 1913 (Stat. L. vol. 37, p. 885), for the connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, and Potomac Park, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in addition to the sum authorized by said act of March 4, 1913, the sum of \$600,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and insert "out of the surplus revenues

of the District of Columbia made available by Public law 358, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved February 2, 1925.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I doubt if there is any necessity for this bill at all, because the last Congress went on record as authorizing \$1,000,000 to be expended each year for 20 years. However that may be, I want to speak for just a moment in respect to the intimation that the surplus bill passed the last Congress without careful consideration upon the part of the District Committee. That the District has been treated very generously by the Federal Government and perhaps more so than was necessary was the opinion of every member of the District Committee, but because Congress had adopted a very generous agreement with the District that fact did not authorize Congress to violate that agreement. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] does cite statements from a minority view, but gentlemen should bear in mind that that was a minority view. A committee appointed by Congress itself investigated the situation and reported that we owed that money. That it acted unwisely or without consideration could be charged against the verdict of any jury or the decision of any court, but the fact remains that our own committee made that finding. It was the opinion of every member of the District Committee, with the exception of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], that, however generous we felt it might be, there was no honorable escape from it. I make these observations merely that the record shall not go unchallenged that in a matter involving millions of dollars the District Committee acted without the most careful consideration.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MERRITT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4785, had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be adopted, and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

On motion of Mr. ZIHLMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION IN REFERENCE TO JUVENILE COURT

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4812 and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4812) to amend an act entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances," approved March 23, 1906

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances," approved March 23, 1906, be, and is hereby, amended so as to strike out the words "hard labor" wherever they shall appear in the act.

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the above-mentioned act be, and is hereby, amended as follows: Strike out the words "for each day's hard labor performed by such persons" and substitute therefor "for each day of the sentence served by such person."

The committee amendment was read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause on page 1, line 3, down to and including line 7 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the first section of the act entitled 'An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances,' approved March 23, 1906, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'at hard labor' wherever such words appear in such section.

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of March 23, 1906, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'for each day's hard labor performed' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'for each day of the sentence served.'"

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment, and may I say before the substitute is read that the substitute is the committee amendment, but it quotes all of these sections to which the amendment referred so that in the future, if one has to look up this law, they do not have to look up all of these references and hunt through the statutes to find them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a substitute for the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECTION 1. That sections 1 and 3 of an act entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances," approved March 23, 1906, are hereby amended so as to read as follows: "That any person in the District of Columbia who shall, without just cause, desert or willfully neglect or refuse to provide for the support and maintenance of his wife in destitute or necessitous circumstances, or any person who shall, without just excuse, desert or willfully neglect or refuse to provide for the support and maintenance of his or her minor children under the age of 16 years in destitute or necessitous circumstances, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the workhouse of the District of Columbia for not more than 12 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and should a fine be imposed it may be directed by the court to be paid in whole or in part to the wife or to the guardian or custodian of the minor child or children: *Provided*, That before the trial, with the consent of the defendant, or after conviction, instead of imposing the punishment hereinbefore provided, or in addition thereto, the court in its discretion, having regard to the circumstances and to the financial ability or earning capacity of the defendant, shall have the power to make an order, which shall be subject to change by it from time to time as circumstances may require, directing the defendant to pay a certain sum weekly for the space of one year to the wife, or to the guardian or custodian of the minor child or children, or to an organization or individual approved by the court as trustee, and to release the defendant from custody on probation for the space of one year upon his or her entering into a recognizance, with or without sureties, in such sum as the court may direct. The condition of the recognizance shall be such that if the defendant shall make his or her personal appearance in court whenever ordered to do so within the year, and shall further comply with the terms of the order and of any subsequent modification thereof, then the recognizance shall be void, otherwise of full force and effect.

"If the court be satisfied by information and due proof, under oath, that at any time during the year the defendant has violated the terms of such order, it may forthwith proceed with the trial of the defendant under the original charge, or sentence him under the original conviction, or enforce the original sentence, as the case may be. In case of forfeiture of a recognizance and enforcement thereof by execution, the sum recovered may, in the discretion of the court, be paid in whole or in part to the wife or to the guardian or custodian of the minor child or children."

"SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the superintendent in charge of the workhouse of the District of Columbia in which any person is confined on account of a sentence under this law to pay, out of any funds available, over to the wife, or to the guardian or custodian of his or her minor child or children, or to an organization or individual approved by the court as trustee, at the end of each week for the support of such wife, child, or children, a sum equal to 50 cents for each day of the sentence served by said person so confined."

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment, as it simply carries in the bill the existing law as it would read where amended.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think that what has been done at the instance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] establishes a good example which should be followed in amending existing statutes. Quite commonly existing statutes are amended so as to provide that a certain sentence or a certain paragraph or a certain line shall

be changed, and that may be done repeatedly in reference to the same original statute or the same section of that statute. That makes necessary a search through the Statutes at Large of perhaps several Congresses in order to ascertain what the law is. When an amendment is made in the form now proposed the statute is brought down to date, so that anyone examining the law as amended can see at a glance exactly how the amendment operates and what the law is. I am very glad that the committee has taken this course, and I regard it as a course that ought to be generally taken in enacting amendments. And this, I may say, is the course provided and required by many State constitutions.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will.

Mr. WINGO. What is the gentleman trying to do to this statute?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman under the decision by the Supreme Court the jurisdiction of the juvenile court in cases of neglect and nonsupport of child and wife is vested only in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, it being construed by the Supreme Court that the juvenile court has no jurisdiction in cases of this kind, but it is proposed, by taking out the words "hard labor" where they appear in the existing statute, to reinvest the juvenile court with jurisdiction in those cases, many of which are of a minor nature. It has the sanction and concurrence of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia has held that to require a married man in the District of Columbia to perform hard labor falls within the constitutional inhibition against cruel and unusual punishment?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Well, the juvenile court has no jurisdiction under cases of that kind.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. As I understand it, the law as it is now and as it will be after it is amended as proposed by the committee will not provide any different penalty for different kinds of abandonment. I refer particularly to the person abandoned. Take, for instance, the case of a child of very tender years, an infant. There is no difference in the punishment meted out by this law for the abandonment of an infant and the punishment for the abandonment of any other child, is there?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that we did not contemplate the change of existing law on this subject, except to give to the juvenile court jurisdiction in these cases. I will say further that the committee was advised by one of the learned Justices of the Supreme Court that the term "hard labor" is very rarely used in imposing sentence, but it is presumed by the court that the prison authorities are competent to determine what work shall be performed by prisoners. The elimination of the words "hard labor" is the only change we make in the law, and it almost entirely eliminates it in the District in sentences.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There are States in the Union where, for instance, the abandonment of a child of 1 year or less is a felony, whereas the abandonment of an older child or of a wife is a misdemeanor. In other words, the abandonment of an infant in those tender months is considered a much greater crime or offense than the other. I am not arguing whether you should amend the law, but I am wondering if the committee was asked to amend the law on that subject.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. There is a law to that effect, but I am not familiar with it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, in answering the questions put by various Members, has very well covered the situation. The reason for bringing this up was that under the old law there was a flagrant case where an old offender was brought before the court and ordered to pay \$30 a week to his wife and family. He failed to do so and was hauled into court, and the Supreme Court held that imprisonment at hard labor was an infamous punishment under the clause of the Constitution that had been referred to, and consequently the legislation went by the board.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman from Maryland a while ago rather led me to believe that the reason why you did this was that the Supreme Court had decided that requiring hard labor from a married man in the District of Columbia was a case of unusual and infamous punishment.

Mr. UNDERHILL. That may be a distinction without a difference. Of course, the welfare of minor children in the District of Columbia is a subject that we are all interested in, and that interest in the welfare of minor children is what was behind this legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. And the amendment came from a gentleman who is not a lawyer.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

On motion of Mr. ZIHLMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

THE ITALIAN GIFT

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I withhold.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Italian debt.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we will soon have under consideration H. R. 6773, which is the authorization of this Congress for the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Italy to the Government of the United States of America, as per the terms clearly set forth in the bill supra.

This bill, H. R. 6773, was introduced by Mr. BURTON, of Ohio, on January 5, 1926, and was promptly referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. However, this committee, anticipating the introduction of the bill, began its hearings on January 4, 1926, and concluded its hearings on January 6, 1926. The only witnesses which appeared before this committee were the following distinguished gentlemen in the persons of Mr. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury; Mr. Winston, Undersecretary of the Treasury; Mr. BURTON, of Ohio, a member of the Foreign Debt Commission and a Member of this House; Mr. CRISP, of Georgia, a member of the Foreign Debt Commission and a member of the committee; and the following members of the Ways and Means Committee: Mr. RAINES, of Illinois; Mr. HULL, of Tennessee; Mr. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts; and Mr. MILLS, of New York. On January 8, 1926, H. R. 6773 is reported back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

This bill comes to us for consideration as a result of the negotiations between the World War Foreign Debt Commission and the Italian Debt Commission, which consummated an agreement, reduced to writing and signed by the contracting parties, which has met with the approval of the President and has been ratified by the Kingdom of Italy. This settlement awaits the approbation of the American Congress to be of binding efficacy.

We know of no better manner of stating the exact status of the Italian debt, together with the specific method of payment prescribed in this bill, than to insert that portion of the contract executed by the high contracting parties, approved by our President, which relates to such specific points, which contract seems to be numbered Exhibit 74 in the hearings of our Committee on Ways and Means. We insert it herein:

EXHIBIT 74

AGREEMENT FOR THE FUNDING OF THE DEBT OF ITALY TO THE UNITED STATES

Agreement made the 14th day of November, 1925, at the city of Washington, D. C., between the Kingdom of Italy, hereinafter called Italy, party of the first part, and the United States of America, hereinafter called the United States, party of the second part.

Whereas Italy is indebted to the United States as of June 15, 1925, upon obligations in the aggregate principal amount of \$1,647,869,197.96, together with interest accrued and unpaid thereon; and

Whereas Italy desires to fund said indebtedness to the United States, both principal and interest, through the issue of bonds to the United States, and the United States is prepared to accept bonds from Italy upon the terms hereinafter set forth;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and of the mutual covenants herein contained, it is agreed as follows:

1. *Amount of indebtedness:* The amount of indebtedness to be funded, after allowing for certain cash payments made or to be made by Italy is \$2,042,000,000, which has been computed as follows:

Obligations taken for cash advanced by Treasury	\$1,648,034,050.90
Accrued and unpaid interest at 4 1/4 per cent per annum to Dec. 15, 1922	251,846,654.79
	\$1,899,880,705.69

Accrued interest at 3 per cent per annum from Dec. 15, 1922, to June 15, 1925	\$142,491,052.93
Deduct payments made on account of principal since Dec. 15, 1922	2,042,371,758.62
Interest on principal payments at 3 per cent per annum to June 15, 1925	\$164,852.94
	7,439.84
Total net indebtedness as of June 15, 1925	2,042,199,466.34
To be paid in cash upon execution of agreement	199,466.34
Total indebtedness to be funded into bonds	2,042,000,000.00

2. *Payment:* In order to provide for the payment of the indebtedness thus to be funded Italy will issue to the United States at par bonds of Italy in the aggregate principal amount of \$2,042,000,000, dated June 15, 1925, and maturing serially on the several dates and in the amounts fixed in the following schedule:

June 15—	
1926	\$5,000,000
1927	5,000,000
1928	5,000,000
1929	5,000,000
1930	5,000,000
1931	12,100,000
1932	12,200,000
1933	12,300,000
1934	12,600,000
1935	13,000,000
1936	13,500,000
1937	14,200,000
1938	14,600,000
1939	15,200,000
1940	15,800,000
1941	16,400,000
1942	17,000,000
1943	17,600,000
1944	18,300,000
1945	19,000,000
1946	19,600,000
1947	20,000,000
1948	20,600,000
1949	21,200,000
1950	22,000,000
1951	23,000,000
1952	23,800,000
1953	24,600,000
1954	25,400,000
1955	26,500,000
1956	27,500,000
1957	28,500,000
1958	29,600,000
1959	30,500,000
1960	31,500,000
1961	32,500,000
1962	33,500,000
1963	34,500,000
1964	35,500,000
1965	36,500,000
1966	38,000,000
1967	39,500,000
1968	41,500,000
1969	43,500,000
1970	44,500,000
1971	46,000,000
1972	47,500,000
1973	49,000,000
1974	50,500,000
1975	52,000,000
1976	54,000,000
1977	56,000,000
1978	59,000,000
1979	61,000,000
1980	62,000,000
1981	64,000,000
1982	67,000,000
1983	69,000,000
1984	72,000,000
1985	74,000,000
1986	77,000,000
1987	79,400,000
Total	2,042,000,000

It can be seen that the Italian debt as of June 15, 1925, is the sum of \$2,042,000,000. Under the settlement no interest charge for the 5-year period next following is made, which terminates June 15, 1930. During this first 5-year period, under the terms of the settlement, Italy agrees to pay \$5,000,000 per year, or a total of \$25,000,000. So, it can readily be seen that computing interest over this period at the present annual rate of 4.1 per cent per annum, which the Undersecretary of the Treasury, Mr. Winston, states to be the present rate paid upon our national indebtedness, we find that upon June 15, 1930, we will have paid an additional sum of \$418,610,000 in interest upon our bonds, which represents the obligations incurred to procure the money which we loaned to Italy in her time of national stress. Adding this interest charge to the principal and deducting the \$25,000,000 paid upon account, we find that Italy will owe us more than \$2,400,000,000 before she pays one copper in interest upon said indebtedness. In other words, we will have paid out \$800,000,000 in interest upon the

bonds evidencing our obligation for the money obtained and loaned to Italy before they start paying any interest.

The original indebtedness incurred by Italy was more than the sum of \$1,648,000,000, of which amount \$1,031,000,000 was of prearmistice origin, while practically \$617,000,000 was indebtedness incurred after the signing of the armistice. The interest rate upon the original indebtedness was 4 1/4 per cent per annum to December 15, 1922, with the interest rate of 3 per cent per annum from this latter date to June 15, 1925. With our present rate of 4.1 per cent per annum, no one would contend that the stated amount of Italy's indebtedness to us as of June 15, 1925, was more than she owed us.

Ofttimes we wonder if the American people are, in fact, cognizant of the condition which surrounds this debt. Of course, it would be a happy day to get our foreign debts funded upon such terms as would permit these governments to liquidate their indebtedness to us upon none too harsh terms. But, in my humble judgment, the American people expect the foreign governments to pay their obligations rather than to be compelled to pay such obligations themselves. And should this bill become a law we can not believe that it will meet with the approbation of the people of America once they learn its terms.

The American people, through the Federal Government, are indebted in the sum of \$20,000,000,000. Upon June 15, 1925, more than \$2,000,000,000 of this indebtedness was for obligations executed by our Government in the shape of bonds which had been sold and the proceeds thereof secured by Italy, either directly in the form of money or credit or indirectly in the form of interest paid upon their indebtedness. The American people must pay their debt, and it was in their minds and hearts during the Liberty loan drives in the prearmistice days that the vast sums being handed over to Italy and our other allies were loans, to be repaid with interest. Certainly the indebtedness incurred after the armistice was labeled in this manner. Every cent that the foreign governments fail in paying to this Government must be paid by the American people. We regret to realize that there is grave likelihood of this country suffering a vast loss in money in the event that this bill becomes a law.

We have heretofore funded the foreign debt of several nations. Great Britain owed us some \$4,600,000,000. This obligation was settled on a basis of principal payments over a 62-year period, with interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum for the first 10 years and 3 1/2 per cent thereafter. England was the first country to settle its national obligation.

The annual interest rate for this settlement is 3 3/4 per cent per annum. Rumania has settled upon the same basis. It is recommended that Belgium should pay on the same basis as England, with the exception that the prearmistice debt of \$171,800,000, should be paid over the period of 62 years without interest, pursuant to the moral obligations incurred by our Government at Versailles. Finland, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, and Nicaragua have settled upon practically the English basis. The indebtedness of France and Italy are the large ones not yet consummated.

THE INTEREST RATE

We quote from the testimony of Secretary Mellon before the Ways and Means Committee:

From the United States standpoint, therefore, the question of whether a particular settlement represents a reduction in the debt depends on whether the interest charged over the entire period of the agreement is less than the average cost to us of money during that period. The flexibility in debt settlements is found in the interest rate to be charged.

We submit that this statement clearly sets forth the fact that whether a debt be paid depends on whether the interest charge over the entire period is less than that which we pay out in interest charge for a like sum during the same period.

So that there can be no misunderstanding of the interest rate charged Italy under this bill we, at this point, insert in full that portion of the bill which designates the rates of interest to be charged. It is found in lines 1 to 12, inclusive, on page 3 of the bill, and is set forth as follows:

The bonds to be issued shall bear no interest until June 15, 1930, and thereafter shall bear interest at the rate of one-eighth of 1 per cent per annum from June 15, 1930, to June 15, 1940; at the rate of one-fourth of 1 per cent per annum from June 15, 1940, to June 15, 1950; at the rate of one-half of 1 per cent per annum from June 15, 1950, to June 15, 1960; at the rate of three-fourths of 1 per cent per annum from June 15, 1960, to June 15, 1970; at the rate of 1 per cent per annum from June 15, 1970, to June 15, 1980; and at the rate of 2 per cent per annum after June 15, 1980, all payable semi-annually on June 15 and December 15 of each year.

We have heretofore called to your specific attention in the portion of the debt settlement inserted herein that there was no interest paid to this Government until June 15, 1930. Now when the debt begins to bear interest, we are astonished to find that the rate of interest upon the obligation is next to nothing. Kindly keep in mind the statement made by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, above quoted, that—the question of whether a particular settlement represents a reduction in the debt depends on whether the interest charge over the entire period of the agreement is less than the average cost to us of money during that period.

At this time, we repeat the average interest rate paid by us upon our indebtedness is 4.1 per cent per annum and, according to the gentleman best qualified to know, Mr. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, the average annual interest rate paid by Italy, under this bill, is forty-two one-hundredths of 1 per cent. What a vast difference the position of the decimal point makes. The present interest rate of this Government is practically 10 times the average rate under this funding agreement. We wonder if the people of this country appreciate just what the position of that decimal point means to them in dollars and cents. Even should the cost of money to us through this same period be lowered to 3 or $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, still the rate of interest, which we would be compelled to pay, would be between seven and eight times as much as we would be receiving from Italy.

We will compare the amount of interest which this Government would pay upon \$100 at the present rate at which she borrows money, 4.1 per cent, for the period of 62 years, with the amount of interest she would receive from Italy for the same amount over the same period of time, at the average annual rate prescribed by this bill. We find that during this period America would pay out in interest \$254.20 for her loan, and would only receive the sum of \$27.30 from her debtor, Italy. We pay out almost ten times as much as we would receive.

But some will say that we will be able to secure money at a lesser rate in the future. That, of course, is problematical, but assume we could get it through this period of 62 years at the average annual rate of 3 per cent per annum. A loan of \$100 for this period would cost us in interest \$186 as against the sum of \$27.30 which Italy would pay on a loan of like amount.

But let us get down to interest talk that the people back home, as well as myself, are personally acquainted with. We will take the 6 per cent rate—that is the least rate upon which we can procure money from our banks in Kentucky. Over this period of 62 years, interest on \$100 at 6 per cent amounts to \$372 as compared to the sum of \$27.30, which is paid by Italy for a like amount for a like period.

We submit a table showing the amount in interest that will be paid under this bill for a loan of \$100 during the first 35 years of the plan:

Period	Annual interest percentage	Annual interest money	Total interest for period
1925-1930	0	0	0
1930-1940	One-eighth of 1 per cent	\$0.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	\$1.25
1940-1950	One-fourth of 1 per cent	.25	2.50
1950-1960	One-half of 1 per cent	.50	5.00

Thus we find that under the proposed plan Italy during the next 35 years would pay us approximately \$8.75 for the use of \$100 for that period, whereas at 3 per cent it would cost us \$105; at 4.1 per cent it would cost us \$143.50; and at 6 per cent it would cost us \$210.

BELGIUM

Not only will we discriminate against our own people, but we have discriminated against that brave little people who unto the rolling down of the curtain of eternity will challenge the admiration of the world in their stand against the powerful trained troops and fresh ones of the Kaiser in the early war days. Historians now and hereafter will credit their work as a miracle that saved Europe and the world from the ravages of a war-mad King. How do we treat Belgium as compared with Italy?

Seemingly around the tables at Versailles we agreed that her prearmistice debt would be canceled. But we do not do it. In lieu of this agreement we permit her to pay over a period of 62 years her prearmistice obligation without interest. Then in respect of the postarmistice debt we treat with her exactly as we do with England. Considering the Belgian debt as a whole, the average annual interest rate is 1.84 per cent; in

other words, approximately four times the average annual interest rate of Italy.

In money we will receive from Belgium as interest charge the sum of \$7,687,520 per annum, the total interest for the 62 years being \$476,026,000. The total indebtedness of Belgium is \$417,800,000. Whereas from Italy we will receive as an interest charge \$5,887,000 per annum; the total interest charge being \$365,000,000. Italy's indebtedness is more than \$2,000,000,000.

GIFT TO ITALY

We wonder if the American people realize how exceedingly generous this Government desires to be to Italy—at their expense.

As heretofore stated, the amount of the Italian debt as of June 15, 1925, was \$2,042,000,000. Considering the rate of interest at 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent per annum, the present value of the payments made through the 62-year period, or, in other words, the present value of the settlement, is \$538,000,000; and with a 3 per cent interest charge the present value of the settlement is \$791,000,000. In other words, we have expended money from our Treasury as of the date of the settlement in the sum of \$2,042,000,000, and this obligation as of that date, upon the same rate of interest which we have paid since we secured this money for Italy, is worth \$538,000,000, or \$1,504,000,000 less than we have invested in it. If the 3 per cent basis be used, with the present value of the settlement being \$791,000,000, it is easily seen that we are \$1,251,000,000 in the hole. In other words, if we were to square the books as of the date of the debt settlement, either by the payment of the present value of the settlement by Italy or by the negotiation and assignment of the present value of the debt agreement, we would lose between one and one-quarter to one and one-half billion dollars. Of course, whatever interest we would pay upon this sum would be an additional loss.

Another angle at which this loss may be viewed is contained in the views of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], page 14 of report, in this language:

I am impelled to the conclusion, however, that the proposed settlement is not a reasonable settlement, but is more in the nature of a cancellation. The amount of this debt, with interest under the 62-year plan of payment, would, I am told, aggregate near \$5,500,000,000. The amount of the proposed settlement is \$2,042,000,000 plus interest of \$365,577,000 to be paid during 62 years, or a total of \$2,400,000,000 in round figures. This shows a scaling under the 62-year payment plan of near \$3,000,000,000, or, when compared with the terms of the British settlement, of near \$2,500,000,000.

The American people was felicitated by the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], near the adjournment of Congress for the holidays, as a result of the reduction of the Federal tax burden of the people in the sum of \$325,000,000. It occurs to me that this debt settlement having been made on November 14, 1925, making this gift to Italy in the sum of \$3,000,000,000, it might have been well to have included Italy in the words of felicitation, because their gift was practically ten times that which has been bestowed upon the American people. Divide \$3,000,000,000 by 62 and you will find that you will get practically \$50,000,000, which represents the annual gift of this country to Italy in the event that this settlement shall be ratified. Fifty million dollars per year, or more than a hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars per day, a gift out of the pockets of the American people.

Is it any wonder that at the consummation of the Italian-American debt settlement that the dictator of Italy, Premier Mussolini, wired Count Volpi, the Minister of Finance of Italy, and chairman of the Royal War Debt Commission, in part as follows:

I desire to express my full appreciation of the settlement reached which represents a happy conciliation of interests, as well as the acknowledgment of the justice of our case and of our real capabilities.

Please convey to the members of the American commission the expression of my gratification, voicing the sentiments of the Italian people.

The above quotation is taken from the statement given to the press at the time of the signing of the debt agreement, which is filed as Exhibit 73 in the hearings upon this bill before the Ways and Means Committee.

Little wonder is it that Premier Mussolini and the Italian people were pleased. They recognized the fact to be that during the next 32 years they will not pay—without adding any interest charge—the postarmistice debt, amounting to \$616,000,000—money which our people loaned Italy after the last gun had ceased firing; and which sum we as citizens of Amer-

ica must pay: in other words, during the first 32 years this agreement will run, they will not pay us one-fourth of their obligation.

J. P. MORGAN & CO.

The advocates of this settlement endeavor to support their position in part upon the fact that all of the original indebtedness save \$80,000,000 was spent in this country. To be perfectly frank, I do not get the force of this argument. I assume that Italy got value received for this money. I have heard no charge to the contrary. However, if such condition did not exist, I take it that it is merely another case where war profiteers and international bankers have feathered their nests. It may be that such persons are now repentant of having fleeced them, in consequence of which they vehemently urge this funding agreement.

However, I feel certain that one very prominent international banking group did not participate in any improper trading with the Italian Government during war days, or else there is a deeper-seated reason for the Italian Government continuing their business relations with it. The firm to which I refer is J. P. Morgan & Co., whom, I am told from the hearings, made a loan to the Italian Government immediately after the signing of the debt settlement by the commission. This loan was made to the Italian Government in the sum of \$100,000,000, of which amount \$50,000,000 was paid to the Morgan firm for moneys which had theretofore been loaned it to stabilize its currency; and the other sum of \$9,000,000 was paid to the Morgan firm as commission. Taking the total amount of the loan, the commissions were 9 per cent; but if you take the amount which Italy received after she paid off her obligation to Morgan & Co., the rate of commission was 18 per cent; and, according to Secretary Mellon, the Italian Government agreed to pay Morgan & Co. between 7 and 8 per cent per annum for the use of this money. Counting the first year's interest at seven and one-half million dollars, it can easily be seen that at the end of the first year, excluding any payment on principal, Italy could only have \$33,500,000.

At first blush I was of the opinion that the Italian Government made a bad trade when they paid Morgan & Co. \$9,000,000 in commission and between seven and eight million dollars per year in interest charge for this loan. It may be that they made a wonderfully fine trade if, in consequence of Morgan & Co.'s interest having been so well cared for in this international loan, it has seen fit to use its influence in putting across this debt settlement which would save Italy millions and millions of dollars.

At any rate, we see the spectacle, immediately after the debt settlement is signed, of this Italian Government floating a loan paying 18 per cent commission upon the amount that they actually receive and agreeing to pay between 7 and 8 per cent to a private concern in interest charge, and being called upon to pay a friend to it in time of its greatest national peril an interest charge of forty-two hundredths of 1 per cent per annum.

In my observation I would not be understood to minimize in any degree the arduous labors of our debt commission, in which my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] played a most important rôle. Intimate acquaintanceship with Judge CRISP leaves no doubt in my mind of his earnest sincerity in bringing to us this bill for consideration. However, I am constrained to believe from his statement before the committee, together with the language used in the splendid report upon this bill, that he, and probably our entire debt commission, was controlled by the facts presented to them by the Italian Government in respect of their plight to-day. It is but natural that a debtor country would not paint in roseate hue its economic advantages in the presentation of its plea for the lowest possible settlement it could procure. And I do not permit newspaper articles, magazine articles, or other statements to cloud my mind relative to their present capacity to pay.

For the sake of this discussion, I assume that our debt commission is correct in their attitude that the economic situation in Italy to-day is at low ebb. However, man can not determine what the morrow may bring forth. Within three to five years there may be such an industrial awakening in Italy that we could get something back in lieu of the moneys which we have expended in carrying this loan for them. At any rate, if we lost it all and Italy did not pay a cent of its debt, according to the figures of the Treasury Department, submitted by Mr. Mellon, the present cash value of the debt settlement to us is \$538,000,000. A small ray of light may be seen in the economic future of Italy in the fact that she has risen from the eighth nation in shipbuilding before the war to fourth position in that industry at this time. To show that her growth is a present

one, we are told that she has moved from sixth to fourth position within the last two years.

The question of her ability to pay depends, among other things, upon her ability to export her commodities. She is a country that produces lemons in considerable quantity. She is unable to sell lemons in our markets due to a prohibitive tariff of 99 per cent. Being unable to sell her lemons in this country, she does the next best thing she can do in handing us a lemon in this settlement.

In view of the fact that this bill proposes a virtual cancellation of their debt, so far as the first 40 years after the war is concerned, and in view of the magnitude of our national debt and our yearly interest charge therefor, and in view of the tax burden and economic problems of our own people, I can not get the consent of my mind to make this stupendous gift to the Italian Government.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY—THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL

MR. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MR. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since I have been a Member of this House and as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations I have earnestly supported and voted for appropriations for Howard University. Every year some gentleman on the other side of this Chamber makes a point of order against these items when the Interior Department appropriation bill is read and considered in the Committee of the Whole, and in consequence, under the rule that they are not authorized by some specific act of Congress, the point of order is sustained and the items are thus forced out of the bill.

In this way, notwithstanding the fact that for years and years these items were carried without question in appropriation bills, and the funds thus appropriated were paid out of the Federal Treasury for Howard University purposes, during the past few years this long usage has been disregarded and the items opposed.

In the consideration of this appropriation bill points of order were made against these items by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], and, in consequence, all of them, aggregating \$218,000, for the benefit of this great institution of learning, were stricken from the bill. These items as reported by the Appropriations Committee to the House and included in this bill are as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, ice, and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction, \$125,000;

For tools, material, salaries of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, of which amount not to exceed \$21,800 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$28,000;

Medical department: For part cost needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, \$9,000;

For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, biological, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the science hall, including cases and shelving, \$5,000;

For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, \$3,000;

For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, including replacement of steam line from central heating plant, \$30,000;

Fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, \$18,000;

Total, Howard University, \$218,000.

Howard University is doing a great work in providing higher education for the ambitious and aspiring young men and women of the colored race of this country. I believe it is entitled to the help that it has received from the Federal Government for 45 years or more, and until, in recent years, the indicated opposition in this House has arisen; and so long as I may remain as a Member of this body I shall expect to support all reasonable legislation or appropriations for its benefit.

To cure the present situation which cuts off further appropriations, my worthy colleague on the House Appropriations Committee, who is also chairman of the subcommittee reporting the Interior Department appropriation bill [Mr. CRAMTON], of Michigan, at this session, has introduced a bill for the benefit of Howard University. This bill reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 393) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Annual appropriations are hereby authorized to aid in the construction, development, improvement, and maintenance of the university, no part of which shall be used for religious instruction. The university shall at all times be open to inspection by the Bureau of Education and shall be inspected by the said bureau at least once each year. An annual report making a full exhibit of the affairs of the university shall be presented to Congress each year in the report of the Bureau of Education."

This bill was referred to the House Committee on Education, and that committee, after due consideration of the measure, through its chairman, Mr. REED of New York, has favorably reported the bill back to the House, as H. R. 8466, with the recommendation that the bill as introduced do pass and become a law. The committee report is as follows:

Mr. REED of New York, from the Committee on Education, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 8466):

"The Committee on Education, to which was referred H. R. 8466, a bill to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia,' approved March 2, 1867, by authorizing Federal appropriations to aid in the construction, development, improvement, and maintenance of said university, having considered said bill, reports favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass as introduced.

"Howard University was incorporated under the act of March 2, 1867. The first Federal appropriation for its aid was granted March 3, 1879. From that date the Federal Government has annually contributed to the construction, maintenance, and development of the institution, \$221,000 being the largest amount appropriated for maintenance in any one year. Since the establishment of the Budget system, however, and the consolidation of all jurisdiction over appropriations in one committee of the House, items recommended by the Budget and approved by the Committee on Appropriations have frequently been stricken out in the House on the point of order that such appropriations are not authorized by existing law. The purpose of this bill is to authorize such appropriations for the maintenance, development, improvement, and construction of Howard University as Congress may annually desire to make.

"The university has an attendance of about 2,000 students, who are required to pay tuition and provide for their own living expenses. It has been thoroughly investigated by the college rating board of the Maryland and Middle States district and rated in class A. Thirty-eight States and 13 countries are represented in its attendance. President Durkee gives it as his judgment that fully 97 per cent of those who have attended Howard have 'stood up in the country as centers of influence for good.'

"Apart from the precedent established by 45 years of congressional action, the committee feels that Federal aid to Howard University is fully justified by the national importance of the negro problem. For many years past it has been felt that the American people owed an obligation to the Indian, whom they dispossessed of his land, and annual appropriations of sizable amounts have been passed by Congress in fulfillment of this obligation. The obligation in favor of the Negro race would seem to be even stronger than in the case of the Indian. The negro was not robbed of his land as was the Indian, but he was seized by force and brought unwillingly to a strange country, where for generations he was the slave of the white man, and where, as a race, he has since been compelled to eke out a meager and precarious existence.

"Moreover, financial aid has been and still is extended by the Federal Government to the so-called land-grant colleges of the various States. While it is true that negroes may be admitted to these colleges, the conditions of admission are very much restricted, and generally it may be said that these colleges are not at all available to the negro, except for agricultural and industrial education. This is particularly so in the professional medical schools, so that the only class A school in America for training colored doctors, dentists, and pharmacists is Howard University, it being the only place where complete clinical work can be secured by the colored student.

"There is furthermore a strong practical reason why a school like Howard University should be maintained in the District of Columbia. The Freedmen's Hospital was authorized by Congress in 1904, and was built upon land owned by Howard University. The university generously leased the land to the Federal Government for 99 years, at \$1 a year, with a privilege of renewal for a like period. The existence of this hospital so near to the medical school of Howard University affords the students of the university an opportunity which exists nowhere else in this country to acquire the clinical instruction which is necessary to complete each student's medical course. On the other

hand, this opportunity exists for white students in every State of the Union.

"In addition to the great importance to the country of having an institution capable of developing trained leaders for the colored race in all walks of life, the urgent necessity of making possible a supply of properly trained physicians of that race for the protection of the health of all our people, white as well as black, must be plain to every fair-minded American citizen."

I fully approve the reasons urged by the Committee on Education for the passage of this measure. Its passage will give to Congress explicit and complete authority to make these appropriations. The 250 years, or more, of unrequited toil of the Negro race in this country; the loyalty of that race, and its sacrifices in every war for the American flag and for white Americans; its utter impoverishment and handicap at the close of the Civil War, and its loyal Americanism and capacity for progress so amply demonstrated since that war,—all constitute, in my judgment, all-powerful and convincing reasons why this great Republic of ours, which must depend on universal education and universal suffrage as the two great pillars of its support, should make a just and reasonable contribution toward the education of the race.

I shall, therefore, take great pleasure in supporting the pending bill, and I hope that at this session of Congress it may be enacted into law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PATTERSON, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1926, 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:

226. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, for the War Department for the erection of tablets or form of memorials in memory of John Adams and John Quincy Adams (H. Doc. No. 206); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

227. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the claim of Mr. Joseph Jameson, postmaster at Lorain, Ohio, for credit on account of loss sustained in a burglary of the post office on March 1, 1925; to the Committee on Claims.

228. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, \$100,688,175.84; also a draft of proposed legislation affecting an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 207); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

229. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a bill amending an act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National Labor Board of July 31, 1918, in favor of certain employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3580) granting a pension to Richard H. Williams, alias Humphrey Price; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4916) granting a pension to Alma Halbrook; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5902) granting an increase of pension to Ella Wright; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARSS: A bill (H. R. 7358) providing for the erection of a Federal building at Hibbing, in the county of St. Louis, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7359) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Duluth, in the county of St. Louis, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 7360) to purchase a site and erect a post-office building at Ahoskie, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7361) to purchase a site and erect a post-office building at Hertford, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7362) to purchase a site and erect a post-office building at Farmville, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7363) to purchase a site and erect a post-office building at Ayden, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7364) to purchase a site and erect a post-office building at Williamston, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7365) to purchase a site and erect a post-office building at Plymouth, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7366) to purchase a site and erect a post-office building at Belhaven, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7367) to erect a post-office building at Edenton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7368) to authorize the payment of 50 per cent of the proceeds arising from the sale of timber from the national forest reserves in the State of Arkansas to the promotion of agriculture, domestic economy, animal husbandry, and dairying within the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7369) granting the consent of Congress to the Wakefield National Memorial Association to build upon Government-owned land at Wakefield, Westmoreland County, Va., a replica of the house in which George Washington was born, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 7370) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of burned timber on the public domain," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by departmental request), a bill (H. R. 7371) to define trespass on coal land of the United States and to provide a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by departmental request), a bill (H. R. 7372) to amend section 27 of the general leasing act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 437); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7373) granting the consent of Congress to Harry E. Bovay to construct, maintain, and operate bridges across the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers at Cairo, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 7374) to amend section of the food and drugs act, approved June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 7375) to further increase aviation in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7376) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fourth judicial circuit, for the appointment of additional district judges for certain districts, providing for an annual conference of certain judges, and for other purposes," approved September 14, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 7377) for the erection of a public building in the town of Crisfield, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 7378) providing for the holding of terms of the United States district court at Lewistown, Mont.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 7379) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7380) to repeal a part of section 12, chapter 353, Thirty-first United States Statutes at Large, as heretofore amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7381) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Belleville, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 7382) for the establishment of a Pacific coast national highway system; authorizing ex-

amination, survey, and report to the War Department, as a preliminary to the improvement, construction, and maintenance of a system of motor-truck highways to meet the transport requirements of heavy commerce in time of peace and of heavy ordnance in time of war and to serve as post roads, with proper and sufficient laterals, in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7383) for the erection of a public building at the city of Placerville, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7384) for the erection of a public building in the city of Auburn, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7385) for the erection of a public building at the city of Yreka, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7386) for the erection of a public building at the city of Redding, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7387) for the erection of a public building at the city of Susanville, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7388) for the erection of a public building at the city of Alturas, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 7389) for enlargement of the Federal building at Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 7390) to amend and reenact subdivision (a) of section 209 of the transportation act, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 7391) to amend and reenact section 105, chapter 5, of the Judicial Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 7392) to stimulate commerce in agricultural products and provisions with foreign countries, to encourage agriculture in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINY: A bill (H. R. 7393) declaring an emergency in respect to certain agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the evacuation of Boston by the British troops, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 7394) granting a pension to Mary R. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTON: A bill (H. R. 7395) for the relief of Emanuel Xulereb; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 7396) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 7397) for the relief of Ralph C. Busser; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7398) granting an increase of pension to Philip Schumacher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLAHERTY: A bill (H. R. 7399) for the relief of David I. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7400) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Logan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7401) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 7402) for the relief of Moises Silva; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7403) for the relief of John E. Luby, of New Bedford, Mass.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 7404) granting a pension to Henrietta B. Youngs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 7405) removing the charge of desertion from the name of George A. McKenzie, alias William A. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWES: A bill (H. R. 7406) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7407) granting an increase of pension to Helen Underwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7408) for the relief of Joseph A. McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 7409) to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 7410) for the relief of John A. Odell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7411) granting a pension to George D. Helwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 7412) granting a pension to Martin Rourke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7413) granting an increase of pension to Lydia L. Shepler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 7414) granting an increase of pension to Estella Bolster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 7415) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 7416) for the relief W. F. Peck and M. B. Gott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7417) for the relief of J. A. Perry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 7418) granting a pension to Anna Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7419) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 7420) granting an increase of pension to Florence I. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7421) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7422) granting a pension to Lillian L. Near; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 7423) granting an increase of pension to John W. Horton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7424) for the relief of the Guamoco Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7425) granting a pension to James M. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7426) granting a pension to Angeline Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7427) granting a pension to Lillard Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7428) granting an increase of pension to James K. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 7429) for the relief of Joseph L. Rahm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 7430) granting an increase of pension to Walter A. Fleming; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7431) granting an increase of pension to Lucia Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7432) granting an increase of pension to Louisa White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7433) granting an increase of pension to Melissa J. Jaques; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7434) for the relief of John I. Barnes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7435) for the relief of Robert M. Angus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7436) granting a pension to Addie Bayles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7437) granting a pension to John Son; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7438) granting a pension to Nancy E. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7439) granting an increase of pension to Ida Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7440) granting an increase of pension to Charity Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7441) granting a pension to Mary A. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7442) granting an increase of pension to Katie J. Jerolmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOLLEY: A bill (H. R. 7443) granting an increase of pension to Emma Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 7444) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7445) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Seel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7446) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Cambrou; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7447) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 7448) granting an increase of pension to Emma Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 7449) for the erection of a public building in the city of Eminence, Ky., and authorizing money to be appropriated therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

338. By Mr. BARBOUR: Resolution adopted by Modesto-Turlock Typographical Union, No. 689, of Modesto, Calif., urging a revision of the postal laws relating to rates on direct mail advertising; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

339. By Mr. DYER: Petition of sundry citizens of St. Louis, Mo., requesting legislation that will correct the classification law concerning Federal employees except the Post Office Service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

340. By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce, Cedar City, Utah, supporting Federal aid on interstate highways; to the Committee on Roads.

341. By Mr. ROUSE: Resolution of Joe Hooker Women's Relief Corps, of Dayton, Campbell County, Ky., indorsing the increase of pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

342. By Mr. YATES: Petition of the Western Society of Engineers, by its board of directors, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, praying in the name of 2,500 Western engineers that Congress pass the selective service law prepared by the Secretary of War so that an effective draft may be devised capable of being put into instant operation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

343. Also, petition from Hon. James P. Ringley, president of the Cook County Association of the American Legion, favoring the holding of the Army-Navy game in Chicago in 1926; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, January 12, 1926

(*Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1926*)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fess	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.
Bayard	Fletcher	Lenroot	Sackett
Bingham	Frazier	McKellar	Schall
Blease	George	McKinley	Sheppard
Borah	Gerry	McLean	Shipstead
Bratton	Gillett	McMaster	Shortridge
Brookhart	Glass	McNary	Simmons
Broussard	Goff	Mayfield	Smith
Bruce	Gooding	Means	Smoot
Butler	Greene	Metcalf	Stanfield
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Stephens
Capper	Harrel	Neely	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Copeland	Harrison	Oddie	Tyson
Couzens	Heflin	Overman	Underwood
Curtis	Howell	Pepper	Wadsworth
Dale	Johnson	Pine	Walsh
Deneen	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Warren
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Williams
Ferris	King	Robinson, Ark.	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.