

William E. Fuson, Hartville.
 Earle W. Phillips, Henrietta.
 George S. Brown, Hornersville.
 George P. Megaffin, Hunnewell.
 Paul P. Bradley, Leeton.
 William A. Barris, Marionville.
 Leonard Ford, Morley.
 Elvin Lee, Mountain Grove.
 William F. Crigler, Nevada.
 Arthur S. Calame, Niangua.
 John F. Hamby, Noel.
 Thomas O. Spillers, Otterville.
 Ruth E. McCormick, Reeds Spring.
 Evelyn S. Culp, Rocky Comfort.
 Nelle Whalen, Rushville.
 Milton Wilhelm, Seligman.
 Charles F. Hamrick, Stover.
 Junius M. Bryant, Strafford.
 James Z. Spearman, Tuscumbia.
 Leonard D. Fisher, Union Star.
 Isaac M. Galbraith, Walker.
 John Black, Washburn.
 Edwin McKinley, Wheaton.

NEBRASKA

Alfred G. Taylor, Chappell.

NEW YORK

Richard Bullwinkle, Central Valley.
 Frederick M. Avery, Cold Water.
 George W. Mohlfeld, Cutchogue.
 Edward T. Sheffer, Shortsville.
 William R. Crawford, Warsaw.
 William F. Raynor, West Hampton Beach.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sam L. Franks, Franklin.
 Albert Z. Jarman, Richlands.

OHIO

French Crow, Marion.
 Earl Augustine, Montpelier.
 Florence Mutchler, Rutland.
 George W. Hurless, Waterville.
 William G. Hoffer, Willshire.

OREGON

Guy E. Tex, Central Point.
 Ethel N. Everson, Creswell.
 Albert M. Porter, Gaston.
 Elizabeth E. Johnson, Gresham.
 William G. Smith, Mill City.
 Carl A. Peterson, Orenco.
 John S. Sticha, Seio.
 Rever G. Allen, Silverton.
 William E. Tate, Wasco.

PENNSYLVANIA

John L. Chapman, Blue Ridge Summit.
 Charles N. Thompson, Buck Hill Falls.
 Elmer P. Richards, Easton.
 Frank H. Shenck, Landisville.
 Harry Zanders, Mauch Chunk.
 Frederick W. Kieffhaber, McVeytown.
 Wilberforce Schweyen, Mifflintown.
 Howard Weiss, Northampton.
 Harry H. Carey, Plymouth.
 Robert E. Gammell, Tremont.
 Julius C. Gleason, Villanova.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth D. Kirksey, Pickens.
 John S. McCall, Society Hill.

TENNESSEE

James S. Braswell, Murfreesboro.

VERMONT

George F. Flint, Chelsea.
 Carrie E. Sturtevant, East Fairfield.
 Garvin R. Magoon, Gilman.
 Marion J. Hall, South Ryegate.
 Lilla S. Hager, Wallingford.

WASHINGTON

Orris E. Marine, Colton.
 Frank R. Jones, Lacrosse.
 Adam L. Livingston, Mabton.
 Theo Hali, Medical Lake.
 Lucy F. Bushnell, Napavine.

Wayne S. Kelsey, Opportunity.
 Ira G. Allen, Pullman.
 Laura P. McIntyre, Skykomish.
 Thomas J. Smith, Spokane.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, February 6, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We praise Thee, our Father in heaven, for Thou art the King of love whose goodness faileth never! The sublime truth is with us: "Greater love hath no man than this." It glorifies all there is in earth and sky and places supreme value upon the worth of man. We thank Thee that there is nothing to separate us from this divine love and providential care. May we enjoy life at its best and give this life of joy to others. Forgive our failures and help us to an increasing mastery over self. With unfaltering faith and courage endow us, and thus may we promote good and righteous government among all men. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

H. R. 6226

Mr. TOLLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings on yesterday whereby the bill H. R. 6226 was ordered engrossed, read a third time, and passed, and the amendment recommended by the Committee of the Whole House adopted; that said amendment recommended by the Committee of the Whole House be considered as having been rejected and that the following amendment adopted:

Strike out the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That no back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act."

That said bill be considered as having been ordered engrossed, read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid upon the table.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that Mr. BLACK, who made the amendment, agrees with me on this, that this change agrees with the spirit of his amendment and it is entirely in accord therewith. I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings on the bill referred to and make the correction as indicated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to vacate proceedings on the bill referred to and make the correction as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Correction of the RECORD or the Journal, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. It will be merely to vacate the proceedings taken yesterday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PERMISSION TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTION SIGNED BY MORE THAN ONE MEMBER

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congressmen KNUTSON, ANDRESEN, GOODWIN, and FULROW, and myself be allowed to introduce a resolution, as I understand under the rules unanimous consent has to be granted for more than one Member to introduce a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that several Members, including himself, have permission to introduce a resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, does this mean to introduce a resolution—

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands, except by unanimous consent, not more than one Member can introduce a bill or resolution. The gentleman from Minnesota merely asks that he be permitted to introduce a resolution in conjunction with four of his colleagues.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, we had quite a long consideration of that matter several years ago, as to whether more than one Member could attach his name to a bill or a resolution even by unanimous consent. Mr. Speaker, may I venture to suggest to the gentleman that he withhold his request for the time being, in order to look up the precedents which have been made?

Mr. CLAGUE. I introduced yesterday the resolution, but the parliamentarian stated it would have to be done by unanimous consent, as I understood; that it is against the rules to introduce it except by unanimous consent.

Mr. TILSON. I hope the gentleman will withhold this, at least until Major STEEDMAN has concluded his remarks. I re-

member on the occasion to which the gentleman referred we had quite a long parliamentary battle over this very thing, but it has been so many years ago it is rather hazy in my mind, and I would like to refresh my recollection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me, bills are never introduced from the floor under our rules, but they are introduced from the basket. It seems to me it is a matter that the majority leader might think over very carefully, whether even by unanimous consent we can change the precedents and introduce a resolution from the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair's understanding is that the unanimous consent is not to permit introduction from the floor, but merely to attach four signatures to a bill introduced regularly through the basket.

Mr. CLAGUE. That is all.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is almost the same thing, without a difference. But I do not want to kick up a quarrel about it.

Mr. TILSON. I hope my friend from Minnesota [Mr. CLAGUE] will withhold it until after the special order of the morning.

ADDRESS BY MR. STEDMAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair takes pleasure in announcing that, under an order adopted by the House, the gentleman from North Carolina, Major STEDMAN, is recognized to address the House for 30 minutes. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. STEDMAN. Mr. Speaker, the traveler from distant lands who has the good fortune to visit that section of Virginia located in Carroll and Patrick Counties and that section of North Carolina lying in Surry County will be greeted by a vision of rare beauty, which ever charms and delights. Here nature is arrayed in her most gorgeous apparel, inviting rest and repose. Dense forests cover the landscape. Here the mocking bird and thrush, undisturbed, make their home and fill the air with their morning song of happiness and contentment.

In Patrick County, Va., at a place called Laurel Hill, not remote from the North Carolina line, on February 6, 1833, was born Maj. Gen. J. E. B. Stuart, commander of the cavalry of the Army of Northern Virginia, and here he passed the days of his boyhood.

His ancestry on both his father's and his mother's side was distinguished. His father, the Hon. Archibald Stuart, of Patrick County, Va., was an officer in the United States Army during the War of 1812. He was a man of splendid ability. He had the confidence, respect, and affection of all the people amongst whom he lived. His mother, Elizabeth Letcher Pannill, was a woman of rare accomplishments. She was the center of attraction in the high social circles in which she moved.

It is not my purpose to give in detail the great events which will ever be connected with his name and which cast a halo of renown and glory upon his life. It would be idle for me to attempt to do so in the brief space of time to which I must restrict myself. Chancellorsville, Brandy Station, and Gettysburg will ever recall the fields of his renown.

Nor can I call to your attention all those great qualities which formed the basis of his character and which will forever perpetuate his fame. But my heart prompts me on this, his birthday, to express my admiration for a man whose memory I shall ever cherish, whose life was one of unsurpassed courage, of unexcelled heroism, of rare self-denial—a life without stain and without reproach.

The era of 1861 was the most glorious epoch in the history of the South. During that period was given to the world many great names whose achievements have illumined the pages of history. To that list of immortals, whose glory shall never fade, belongs Maj. Gen. J. E. B. Stuart, of the Confederate Army. He inherited from his ancestors high ideals. Moral power to an eminent degree was an element of character made manifest during his entire life. The force of moral power during all ages has controlled the destiny of nations. From its influence comes a supreme sense of duty. Without it the legions of Lee would have struggled in vain for so long a time to roll back the tide of invasion across the banks of the Potomac, and the marvelous campaigns of Stonewall Jackson would have found no place upon the pages of history to gild forever with a romantic luster the beautiful valley of Virginia. Without it the great charge at Chancellorsville, led by Major General Stuart, would not have brought victory but only disaster and ruin. His mental activity was very marked as evinced by his great achievements. A supreme sense of duty was the cardinal trait of his character, and he was ever governed by its dictates. He loved the truth and kept it inviolate. No obligation resting upon him was ever neglected. A promise made to his mother that he would never taste intoxicating drinks was kept faithfully to his death, and no soldier who followed his banner ever heard

him utter an oath upon any battle field of his renown. He had an abhorrence for hypocrisy and deceit. He was cast in the heroic mold and from the lofty heights where such spirits are at home looked down with scorn upon all that was base and mean.

He had a passionate love for the beautiful region where he first saw the light, and during his most active campaigns often expressed the wish that he might return there and spend his days in quiet when the strife of war was over. He was ever a friend to the weak and helpless. None ever appealed to him in vain if within his power to afford relief. Courage is of two types, physical and moral. He was the embodiment of both. His personal or physical courage made him indifferent to danger. Upon every battle field he sought the place where the strife was most severe and was as calm amidst the storm of battle as in the seclusion of his home.

Upon the field of Borodino, when Marshal Ney, almost alone and surrounded by thousands of Russians, saved the army of France from annihilation, Napoleon, in a burst of enthusiasm, said:

He is the bravest man I ever saw.

The Army of Northern Virginia, the witness of his heroism, with one accord said:

No braver man than Major General Stuart ever walked upon any battle field of this Republic or any other land.

At no time when the Army of Northern Virginia was in peril was he absent from the territory where the danger was supposed to be. The only criticism, so far as I can learn, of his entire career when commanding the cavalry of the Army of Northern Virginia was his absence on the first day's fight at Gettysburg. That criticism was unjust and without merit. He was absent under well-considered orders.

Carl Schurz in his autobiography says:

Neither General Lee nor General Meade desired to fight at Gettysburg; that General Lee wished the battle to be fought at Cashtown, and General Meade wished it at Pipe Creek.

Of course, I do not know what were General Lee's wishes as to the place where the battle should be fought, but I do know that General Stuart was guilty of no negligence and violated no order by his absence on the first day's fight.

As a military commander he had all the qualities requisite for success. As a commander of Cavalry he had no superior, and few equals, if any, in either army. General Sedgwick, an officer of high repute in the Army of the United States, said:

Stuart is the best Cavalry officer ever born in North America.

During the war between the States in the two campaigns most disastrous to the Federal Army—that of General McClellan in his unsuccessful attempt to capture Richmond, and that of General Pope—he contributed largely to the final result. He made the entire circuit of both armies and furnished information of the highest importance to Confederate headquarters.

Many critics have pronounced the Battle of Chancellorsville the most brilliant of the many victories won by Gen. Robert E. Lee. When his inferiority in numbers and the fact that the Federal troops were driven from their entrenchments are considered, the statement is probably correct. It has been called the tactical masterpiece of the nineteenth century.

This battlefield will ever be blended with the name and fame of Maj. Gen. J. E. B. Stuart. When Gen. A. P. Hill was wounded, Gen. Stonewall Jackson, upon that field of his renown, gave the last military order ever issued by him:

Send for General Stuart. Tell General Stuart to act upon his own judgment. I have implicit confidence in him.

General Lee also sent a message to General Stuart to assume command. He had gone toward Ely's Ford. When the message reached him, he rode rapidly to the scene of conflict.

The Battle of Chancellorsville was brought on by the superior strategy of General Lee, but the result on that battle field was due largely to the daring and skill of Major General Stuart. He rode in front of the Confederate forces, shouting and singing, "Old Joe Hooker, will you come out of the wilderness?"

There came back the response, "We will drive Old Joe Hooker out of the wilderness."

His heroic conduct created the wildest enthusiasm, and the cheers which greeted him could be heard above the rattle of musketry and the thunder of artillery.

The face of General Lee lighted up with a certainty of success as he listened to the cheers, and he said: "General Stuart is there. No force can stop him. The battle is won."

He has been likened by many to Marshal Ney. Both had the same splendid courage, but Marshal Ney had not the moral force which was an element in the character of General Stuart.

Marshal Ney hesitated to assume responsibility in an emergency. General Stuart always was prompt to act when duty required. Unlike Marshal Ney, who had risked his life upon a hundred battle fields for the glory and honor of France, and who was tried by the Chamber of Peers under a royal ordinance, found guilty of treason, and judicially murdered, General Stuart had the respect and confidence of his comrades during all the vicissitudes of the era which witnessed his great achievements. He had their unchanging love—a love as unselfish as that given to him by his comrades in the days of his boyhood.

They have erected to his memory in the city of Richmond a beautiful equestrian statue, upon which is engraved this well-deserved epitaph:

STUART

I've called his name, a statue stern and vast,
It rests enthroned upon the mighty past,
Fit plinth for him whose image in the mind
Looms up as that of one by God designed.
Fit plinth, in sooth! The mighty past for him
Whose simple name is Glory's synonym.
E'en Fancy's self in her enchanted sleep
Can dream no future which may cease to keep
His name in guard, like sentinel, and cry
From Time's great bastions, "It shall never die!"

His most enduring and noblest monument will be found in the hearts of the people of this great Republic, regardless of sections, from the Great Plains of the Northwest to the Gulf of Mexico. He was mortally wounded at Yellow Tavern, about 8 miles from the city of Richmond, State of Virginia, on the 11th day of May, 1864, and on the next day his mighty spirit went to a final rest, rejoicing in the triumph and faith of the Christian religion.

His death brought sincere and profound sorrow to the brave in every land. He is buried in the city of Richmond amidst the people he loved so well, in whose behalf he had displayed boundless activity and heroism unsurpassed. When his death was announced to Gen. Robert E. Lee that great commander said: "I can scarcely think of him without weeping."

Ararat River, upon whose banks he had played in his early days, to the melody of whose rippling, laughing waters he had so often listened with joy and delight, will ever sing his requiem. His name will be respected and honored in every land where patriotism and moral heroism has a home.

Fortunate is the Nation and exalted will be its destiny which can furnish to the world such a model for emulation as that portrayed in the character of Maj. Gen. J. E. B. Stuart. [Applause, the Members rising.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on February 4, approved bill of the following title:

H. R. 7484. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Fulton, Ark.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2586. An act granting the consent of Congress to the J. R. Buckwalter Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across Pearl River in the State of Mississippi.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2586. An act granting the consent of Congress to the J. R. Buckwalter Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across Pearl River in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

S. 1423. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to the land in the donation claim of the heirs of J. B. Baudreau, situated in the county of Jackson, State of Mississippi.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on what subject?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am about to submit a unanimous-consent request, and I wish to explain it to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am almost committing an act of desecration in taking the floor after the remarkable oration to which we have just listened, and were it not for the fact that I wish to call the attention of the House to an emergency which requires immediate action, I would not have the temerity to follow so eloquent a speaker and so beloved a Member as our good friend Major STEDMAN.

My friends, on the first day of this session I introduced the bill H. R. 183 to provide a \$100 per capita payment to the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota. This action was taken at the request of the Chippewas themselves, and is the result of a very serious condition that exists among them.

The Chippewas of Minnesota are in destitute circumstances and they must have relief. The Committee on Indian Affairs very kindly reported this measure out of the committee several days ago, and this is the first opportunity that I have had to call it up; and in view of the great emergency which exists, I trust that no Member will offer any objection.

Let me say for the benefit of the House that the money that it is proposed to pay to the Chippewas belongs to them. They have with the Federal Treasury a tribal fund of something like \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, and it is for the purpose of tiding them over a very critical period that I am asking at this time, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 183.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 183) providing for a per capita payment of \$100 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States so much as may be necessary of the principal fund on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L. 642), entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," and to make therefrom a per capita payment or distribution of \$100 to each enrolled member of the tribe, under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That before any payment is made hereunder the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify the provisions of this act and accept same: *Provided further*, That the money paid to the Indians as authorized herein shall not be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other parties.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill providing for a per capita payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to state that it is not usual for unanimous-consent matters to be called up on any other day except on unanimous-consent day. It is a good rule to abide by, and the only deviation from it should be in cases of real emergency. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has presented a case of a real emergency where there seems to be suffering and where we are asked to allow these Indians to use some of their own money. We must authorize it by appropriation, however, before they can use it, as I understand the situation.

Mr. BYRNS. Has the bill been favorably reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. TILSON. I so understand.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was reported on Thursday.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] this question? This bill does not say from what fund this money is to be paid, whether from the principal of the permanent fund or the interest thereof. From what funds is the payment to be made?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is to be paid from moneys to their credit in the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Both interest and principal are deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the Chippewas. But there is some considerable difference between the use that should be made of them under the law.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has been a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs for a number of years, and this bill follows the language of previous bills.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. We have a treaty with the Chippewas by which certain uses can be made of the interest on the permanent fund, but which directs that the principal be held in the Treasury of the United States for 50 years after the adoption of that treaty in 1889, and that it be divided among the members of the Chippewa Tribe then living and enrolled.

Now, there is this contingency when you appropriate from the principal of the permanent fund: The personnel of the Chippewa Tribe may change considerably between now and the expiration of those 50 years, so that many of those now living will probably have died at the end of that 50-year period, and there will be some born that are not now living. As this money is divided among the Chippewas at this time, just to that extent is there a violation of the treaty, and just to that extent will the Federal Government be called upon to rectify that some time in the future by an appropriation—not from Chippewa funds but from Treasury funds.

I do not expect to object to the bill, because the gentleman says it is a necessity and that the Chippewas are in dire need at this time. But I do not think the matter should be passed without calling this to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is no man on the floor of the House who knows more about Indian affairs than the gentleman from Oklahoma; and I wish to say to the House that the committee has reduced the amount called for in my bill from \$100 to \$50.

I have here in my hand clippings from newspapers in Minnesota calling attention to the urgency of the situation, and I sincerely trust that no Member on either side of the aisle will object to the present consideration of this bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand that a great many of these Indians are starving and that is the occasion for the consideration of this bill at this time, and I will say to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] that the Bureau of Indian Affairs suggested to the Committee on Indian Affairs that after this payment was made they were going to initiate another policy that will take care of the situation.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand that is correct.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. This is what should be done: The whole matter ought to be sent to the courts for appropriate adjudication, pending which no further depletion of the fund should be permitted.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that our committee has already reported a jurisdictional bill.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If that is not done in the end, we are going to have big claims made on the Treasury by those who are born hereafter on account of these payments to those who are now living but who will be dead at the time payments are to be made under the treaty.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I say, the committee has reported a jurisdictional bill, and we hope for early consideration of it by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader if he regards this as emergency legislation?

Mr. TILSON. I do. The gentleman from Minnesota has convinced me, together with the action of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which has carefully considered the matter—and I am prepared to accept their judgment in the matter—that this is an emergency proposition.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I would like to ask the distinguished Member whether he would be willing to also include some coal legislation as being proper emergency legislation at this time. I consider that an emergency of greater importance than the matter now before the House. Why does not the gentleman introduce legislation of that character?

Mr. KNUTSON. I hope the gentleman from New York will not gum up the cards by any suggestions of that kind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, with the following committee amendment: On page 2, line 2, strike out "\$100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50," and amend the title.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill providing for a per capita payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the coal question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD on the coal question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, winter has come. Winter with its wind and its sleet and its cold. Hitherto nature has been kind to the East, forcing us to endure only a comparatively few days of severe weather. But yesterday morning New York awoke to find itself wrapped in a blanket of snow and of ice. Ordinarily our city would pay little heed to this sort of storm, for we have learned to expect it at this time of the year. We have also learned to expect much more such weather in the next two months. Hence, it was that there arose from the lips of the people a cry of despair. For New York has no coal. It is being denied coal by a small group of militant labor leaders and avaricious mine operators, whose differences are not only permitted but are encouraged by the willfulness of an indifferent administration. Our city has its aged, its ill, and its infants, and it must have heat to keep the crape from their doors.

When the strike first threatened, the President, through his Secretary of Labor, repeatedly assured us in straightforward language the Federal Government would take drastic steps, if necessary, to prevent suffering on the part of those who were dependent on anthracite coal. Now, the strike has gone on for more than five months. Men, women, and children have borne with remarkable patience the inevitable suffering, eagerly awaiting the fulfillment of the President's promise. Are we to wait in vain? In the meantime being robbed by unscrupulous profiteering.

We have been told the State of Pennsylvania must settle this problem, but Pennsylvania politicians have betrayed the people, fearing to offend the money interest on one hand and the labor interest on the other. On the former depends their nomination; on the latter their election. No mercy can be expected there. Substitutes for coal are in such demand that the price has gone far out of the reach of the poor. They can only shiver and suffer and die.

After witnessing the obstinacy of both sides in the recent conferences, we have given up all hope for a settlement in this direction. We can only look now to the mercy of the President of our country. We have continually beseeched him to hear our pleadings. So far there has been no response.

The President could send the Army into the mines tomorrow. He could send coal into our homes in seven days. After the crisis is over, he could argue his constitutional rights in as long a period as he pleased. What we want now is coal. Not constitutional camouflage.

FIRST URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8722, the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8722) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8722, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on Thursday the bill was being read for amendment under the five-minute rule, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$97,265,821.84, which shall be credited, respectively, to the appropriation accounts above enumerated.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, having been born and raised on a farm until 20 years of age, I have a recollection of what the farm was 35 years ago.

In that period there was always a surplus of grain on the farm. This surplus was carried by the farmer.

In those days after the harvest the haymow was filled with hay, the granaries were filled with corn and other cereals, and the straw stack remained on the outside.

The farmer went to town on Saturday, made his purchases for the necessities of life.

Then he gradually sold from the granary and haymow enough to pay his bills.

But invariably at the end of the year there was left a surplus. This surplus was in the clear and he carried it over until the next year or to such time as the prices would show a reasonable profit.

In this way the farmer carried the surplus. This was the time of the reaper, the mower, and the self-binder. But since then the farming business has changed. To-day the farmer carries on his farming with improved utensils at a high automobile speed, raises better crops, increases production, plants more land, and the result is a larger supply of products.

But when the harvest time comes his indebtedness is so large that he finds it necessary to sell the entire crop in order to raise the money to pay the bills. What is the result? Market declines, he sells at low prices, and plants at high prices, and the result his profits are nil, and the farming occupation to-day is not a profitable proposition.

Regulation of production and rotation of crops in accordance with instructions that might be sent out by the Agricultural Department would aid the farmer more than any other process. Can it be done? That is the question that always brings a negative answer.

It would seem to me that if every State through the farm organization would work out this principle the farmer would soon see the advantage of reducing production in accordance with the surplus of the previous year and in that way would regulate prices. However, this does not meet the approval of those managing the legislation for farm relief.

For the demand at this time seems to be to pass legislation to give the farmer immediate relief. What that will be is problematical. I believe that an export company would be advantageous.

Take corn as an example. Where will they export corn? There is no country in Europe that uses corn to any extent, and so corn will have to be fed for pork and the pork exported in order to dispose of this surplus in an export way.

Getting back to the surplus proposition. I believe over a period of five years there would be no surplus of any grain raised in the United States, if you could take the average. For illustration, we will start with the year 1926, and we will say that there is a surplus of corn. The surplus of that year would be placed in elevators. The Government might loan money on that crop, on the elevator receipts. The farmer could get along for another year with the use of this money, and we will say that at the end of the next year, 1927, there was another surplus of corn for that year, and the same process could be carried on. But in 1928 there might be a failure of the corn crop, and the result would be that during that year the surplus held over from the years 1926 and 1927 would be sold.

The farmer would take the income and profits and pay off the original loan, and what would be left would be his, which would necessarily be a profit, because by housing the surplus the price would be regulated to the advantage of the farmer.

Reduced prices in transportation, in my judgment, is the most feasible thing for the farmer at the present time. If we should build a waterway from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico, it will reduce the price of transportation on grains averaging from 5 to 7 cents. The result would be that if a farmer raised 60 bushels of grain on an acre, and he saves 7 cents a bushel, he would save \$4.20 an acre. Add that to his profit on a hundred acres, and it would make \$420 that he could put in his profit.

There are other things, such as corn sugar, that might use large quantities of the corn that the cane of southern countries have the advantage of at the present time.

The manufacture of alcohol in this country to-day is about 80,000,000 gallons per year. This alcohol is mostly all made of blackstrap coming from Cuba. If that blackstrap could be

stopped from coming into this country or a regulation passed where all alcohol should be made of corn and cereals in this country, it would use up 20,000,000 bushels of grain per year. This would reduce the surplus to that extent.

My judgment is that the farmer will be obliged to work out his own salvation to a large extent, but I think that every Congressman, regardless of his location, wants to help the farmer, providing something can be brought before them that would be sound legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fees to special delivery messengers, fiscal year 1924, \$213.06.

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

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in this morning's paper appears this cablegram from London:

STOCKINGS FOR DONKEYS—THEY WILL BE WORN IN WOMAN'S ANTIFLYBITE CRUSADE

LONDON, February 5.—The silk-stocking fad is to be taken up by the donkeys in Algeria. Mrs. F. K. Sahi, who has been carrying on humanitarian work among the donkeys, mules, and camels in North Africa, is in London to collect stockings for them.

She says the animals in Algeria, especially the donkeys, suffer from flybites on their legs, and she desires to obtain worn-out stockings which will be used to keep secure bandages on their legs.

She has authority from the governors of Algeria, Tunis, and Morocco to seize any unfit animal for treatment.

Mr. Chairman, the President in his message to the Congress recently said that we should not be unmindful of the common obligations of humanity. To-day, in the city of New York and throughout the Eastern and Northern States, a snow fall encompasses the entire territory. It will take the city of New York at least 10 days to dig itself out of the snow that has fallen there, and yet that city, together with other cities of the East and North, suffers from a lack of anthracite coal. Substitutes have been used without proper effect.

Illuminating gas has been used for heating purposes, causing the death of many of the residents of our city. Soft coal is being used as a substitute, blowing out the fronts of stoves in the homes and suffocating the residents of our city, and yet the Congress remains supine. Although the President tells us we owe an obligation to humanity, we do not make a solitary move to relieve this situation. We will vote millions, even to the extent of \$25,000,000, for the enforcement of a single law, but not a dollar will we spend or not a move will we make to help the suffering citizens of the North and East in our country. We are evidently proceeding under the plan that we will give millions and millions to keep a nation sober in order that they may die sober, but let them die of cold or hunger or any other thing as long as they die sober. It is the verdict of the American Congress that we will disregard the dictates of common humanity; far better that the soul in passing on to its Maker pass on, although starved, yet by all means let it pass on sober. [Applause.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST GUARD

Additional vessels: For additional motor boats and their equipment and for five seaplanes and their equipment for the use of the Coast Guard in enforcing the laws of the United States, and in performing the duties with which the Coast Guard is charged, to be constructed or purchased in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for repairs or alterations to or for equipping and placing in commission vessels or boats transferred from the Navy Department to the Treasury Department for the use of the Coast Guard, \$3,900,000, to remain available until December 31, 1926.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from New York that no point of order was reserved against this bill at the time of its introduction in the House and its commitment to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIFFIN. May I say a word on that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not stated his conclusion, but the Chair will listen to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am aware of the fact that no point of order was reserved upon this bill, and it is perhaps the first

and the only bill from the Committee on Appropriations upon which all points of order have not been reserved. It seems to be necessary, under the precedents of the House, that somebody should be alert enough upon the floor when an appropriation bill is reported to rise in his place and say, "I reserve all points of order against this bill," in order to preserve the right of the 435 Members of this House to object to an obviously illegal, unlawful, and improper provision in an appropriation bill.

This bill contains an appropriation of \$3,900,000 for the building or purchase of new ships. It is clearly new legislation. If a naval appropriation bill were submitted to the House containing an appropriation of \$3,000,000 or more for the building of a destroyer, the peace advocates in this House would rise howling in their places and protest against it and reserve all points of order. Why is it when this bill comes in for the Treasury Department, appropriating \$3,900,000 to build vessels for the Coast Guard to be used in the enforcement of prohibition, there is no man here sufficiently dispassionate to get up in his place and forget his attitude upon the prohibition question and say, "Here is a situation where the rule is being violated and an improper appropriation is being put upon a bill, and I reserve all points of order," no matter how he may think upon the merits of the question.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman brings an indictment against every Member of the House, because any Member is privileged to reserve points of order on such a bill. The gentleman brings an indictment against every Member for failure to reserve all points of order. The gentleman himself is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a Member of this House, and the gentleman had the same privilege and the same opportunity to make the point of order that any other Member had to make a point of order against this bill. So the indictment which the gentleman draws against the membership of the House is an indictment against himself.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is only partially stating the facts. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but I was engaged in my subcommittee work. This bill was reported at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and there were not 20 Members here in the House when the bill was reported. I doubt whether there was a member of the Committee on Appropriations present when the bill was presented, and I certainly acquit the gentleman from Tennessee of any indifference about it, because I know if he had been here he would probably have reserved his rights, as he did on the War Department bill, which was reported day before yesterday.

Mr. DOWELL. May I ask the gentleman how the bill could have been reported without a member of the Committee on Appropriations being present?

Mr. WEFALD. I would like the gentleman to also get excited over the item here that carries \$149,250,000 for refund of taxes. That is much larger than this item.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will allow the gentleman to exercise his privilege to get excited over that, but I want to call the attention of the Chair and the Members of the House to the fact that we are governed by a precedent in this House that is unjust to the 435 Members of this body who are interested in all bills that come before them.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order. The gentleman is simply trying to lecture somebody for something which he himself failed to do.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman should not interrupt me unless the gentleman is recognized by the Chair or unless I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would not have to yield to the gentleman from Iowa in order that the gentleman from Iowa might make a point of order. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that the gentleman from New York is not discussing his point of order.

The Chair thinks that the gentleman has consumed more than a reasonable time in criticizing the rule rather than discussing the rule itself.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I know that the Chair is disposed to rule against me on my point of order. The point I want to make is this. I have a right to appeal—

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order. If the gentleman from New York desires to discuss the point of order he has that privilege, but we have listened long enough to him charging everything to other Members of the House in failing to perform a duty which he failed to perform himself.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Permit me to say that my object in discussing this point of order to the extent it has gone is simply to call the attention of the House to the precedents under which

we are governed and which we can override. I have a right, as the Chairman knows, to appeal from his decision and take up the time of the House in discussing the point of order and disposing of it. I do not want to do that, I am willing to abide by the decision of the Chair on this matter, but I want to put on record my protest against the method under which we are working by saying that the rights of Members are sacrificed by an apparent want of vigilance when appropriation bills come in.

It is distinctly understood that the Appropriation Committee has no right to tack new legislation upon an appropriation bill or to provide appropriations for undertakings not passed upon by legislation committees and duly enacted into law. When the Appropriation Committee was granted its extensive powers it was with the distinct proviso that it should not trespass upon the rights of the legislation committees. This salutary and eminently fair demarcation of duties may, it seems, if we are going to cling to hoary precedents, be utterly wiped out if through inadvertence there is no one on the floor interested enough in the subject to reserve all points of order when the bill is reported to the House.

If the division of duties between the Appropriation Committee and the legislation committees is desirable—and no one will deny that fact—then, whenever the Appropriation Committee exceeds its powers, as I think has been done in this case, the right of the Members to object should not be destroyed by the mere accidental omission of some member of the committee to make a technical objection when the bill is introduced. Such an omission can not make a thing right which is wrong from the beginning. It gives the committee the advantage, whereas the advantage, if any, should be reserved to the Members of the House.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for three minutes out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to make this statement. As the gentleman from New York says, points of order are always reserved on appropriation bills when introduced. I do not think there is any Member of the House on either side that can be charged with dereliction of duty in failing to reserve a point of order on this bill, nor can any charge be made against the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who introduced it at the time he did. That is a privilege which belongs to every Member of the House, whether he is a member of the committee or not. It is the usual custom for members of the subcommittee to make that reservation.

The full Committee on Appropriations met in the morning and considered this bill very carefully, at which, I think, the gentleman from New York was present. Of course, every member of the committee understood when it was reported unanimously from the committee, without any point of order being made against it, that the bill would be introduced during the afternoon.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does not the gentleman remember that I raised the point of order against this item in committee?

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman did, I withdraw my statement as to him. I had forgotten it; and, of course, I gladly accept the gentleman's statement. It was understood by every member of the committee that the bill would be introduced that afternoon by the chairman of the committee. The House was busy that afternoon considering the Agricultural appropriation bill, and the committee did not rise until about 5 o'clock in the afternoon, as the gentleman from New York states. The bill was introduced just before adjournment. I was absent from the House at that particular time, although I had been here all the afternoon. Other members of the committee were in a similar situation and were not on the floor.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And the gentleman remembers that two of the subcommittees were meeting in their rooms.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. The fact is I was not on the floor at the time, and other members of the subcommittee were not on the floor at the time it was introduced. Therefore, not being advised of the hour it was to be reported, I was not here to make a point of order. Personally I am in favor of this particular provision and would dislike to see it go out on a point of order, but if I had been here I would have made the reservation, if others had not, so as to preserve the rights of all the members. I want to say, in addition, that I do not think the gentleman from New York has lost any rights, because the Coast Guard has already spent quite a sum of money

in building a fleet, and I am clearly of the opinion that this particular paragraph would not be subject to a point of order if the gentleman had the right to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order pending, the Chair will say that when he was asked to preside as chairman on this bill, he was aware that no points of order had been reserved against the bill. While being generally familiar with the rule now involved, he proceeded to study the precedents and to further advise himself as to the philosophy and reasoning underlying the rule. It is some time since the rule has been invoked because, ordinarily, points of order are reserved on all appropriation bills.

It should be clearly stated first, that the right to make a point of order in Committee of the Whole is not inherent; the Committee of the Whole is a creature of the House; the Committee of the Whole has no power, no authority, except as granted by the House. As a matter of fact, each time a resolution is passed to go into Committee of the Whole or into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, there is a new organization of such committee. The House, before the Committee of the Whole begins consideration of any bill, has an opportunity to pass upon points of order relating to such a bill. Points of order may be made or, without objection, may be reserved to a bill before it is committed to the Committee of the Whole, or to Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for consideration. If the House desires that the Committee of the Whole shall consider points of order, that result is usually accomplished by the House permitting the reservation of points of order to be made, and then the Committee of the Whole gets jurisdiction to consider points of order. Otherwise, the theory and philosophy is that the House, having committed a bill to the Committee of the Whole House for its consideration, desires the committee to consider the whole bill and does not desire that the committee shall strike out any portion of the bill on points of order.

When portions of a bill are struck out in the Committee of the Whole on points of order, the Committee of the Whole does not report those portions of the bill back to the House; it does not even report its action upon those portions of the bill, but its report relates only to matters which have been considered in the committee and to the amendments that have been adopted. Then the House has the opportunity to act upon the amendments which have been adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair believes that the rule is a wholesome one. The Chair does not feel that it is subject to the criticism offered by one of the gentlemen in debate. No rights are lost. Anyone who objects to a paragraph in a bill which can not be made subject to a point of order may make a motion to strike out such paragraph in the bill, and a vote can be had in Committee of the Whole and subsequently in the House upon a motion to strike out the paragraph of the bill to which objection is made. In fact, the House, upon failing to order the previous question, may itself proceed to consider the report of the Committee of the Whole. The Chair is perfectly clear as to the rule and will add that, in the consideration of legislative bills, no question of order arises except as to the jurisdiction of the committee reporting the bill, and under specific rules and the precedents questions of jurisdiction in respect to a legislative bill must be raised before consideration of the bill has begun, except in the case of an appropriation on a legislative bill, to which, under a special rule, objection may be made at any time. The precedents are to the effect that the rule relating to the reservation of the points of order relates only to appropriation bills, and in the opinion of the Chair the reason for those rulings is that questions of order can not ordinarily be raised in the consideration of bills, except in the case of appropriation bills.

In view of the statements made in debate, the Chair has thought it proper to make this general statement with reference to the philosophy and effect of the rule. No point of order having been raised to the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Chair feels that under the decisions he must decline to entertain the point of order made by the gentleman from New York, because it relates to a paragraph in an appropriation bill, as to which bill no reservation of points of order was made.

The Chair will add that the precedents sustaining this ruling will be found in paragraph 816, under section 2 of Rule XXI in the House Manual, and in Hinds' Precedents, Volume V, pages 955-959, sections 6921-6925.

In section 6921, Volume V, of Hinds' Precedents, occurs the following:

Points of order are usually reserved when appropriation bills are referred to the Committee of the Whole in order that portions in violation of rule may be eliminated by raising points of order in committee.

The Committee of the Whole must report in its entirety a bill committed to it unless the House by a reservation of points of order sanctions the striking out of portions against order.

On July 11, 1884, the House was considering the river and harbor appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when Mr. Jones, of Wisconsin, made a point of order against a particular paragraph on the ground that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had no jurisdiction of the subject, and so forth.

The point was then raised that this point might not be made, since points of order had not been reserved on the bill when it was committed to the Committee of the Whole. Mr. Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, referred to this paragraph of the Manual and Digest:

In case of an appropriation reported by the Committee on Appropriations in conflict with rule 21, clause 3, and committed with the bill, it is not competent for the Committee of the Whole or its Chairman to rule it out of order, because the House having committed the bill (of course, it is otherwise where the point was reserved before commitment) are presumed to have received as in order the report in its entirety.

In deciding the question of order Mr. Wellborn, of Texas, Chairman, said:

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union is asked to withhold from the consideration of the committee a particular clause in an original bill on the ground that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, reporting the bill to the House, did not have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the particular clause. In the view which the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole takes of the question it is not necessary to decide whether the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this particular clause or not. Whether it originally possessed that jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the Chair to decide in the view which he takes of this question, hence the Chair will not take the time to express any opinion in reference to it.

The view of the Chair is this: The action of the House in submitting this bill to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for consideration does not leave it within the province of the Chair to pass upon the question of original jurisdiction in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The bill has been committed to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of consideration, and the Chairman of this committee believes that he is but executing the order of the House when he decides that the bill shall be considered. The committal of the bill to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the Chair thinks, was not a submission to the committee of the question whether or not the bill should be considered, but an express direction to the committee to consider the bill. To hold that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on a point of order could go back and inquire into assorted irregularities and errors in the stages of the bill which preceded its reference to the Committee of the Whole would be either to clothe the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole with power to review and reverse the order of the House in the matter of the reference, or place the House in the anomalous position of having expressly directed the Committee of the Whole to do a particular thing and at the same time left the committee to determine whether the thing directed should be done or not.

The point of order raised by the gentleman from Indiana is overruled.

On appeal the decision of the Chair was sustained by a vote of 103 to 63.

Other decisions in Hinds' Precedents are to the same effect. Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL of Maryland: Page 37, line 14, strike out the figures "\$3,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$14,994,000."

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I am able to approach this committee with the calm assurance that I possess at the present time, that my suggestion on pending legislation will be unanimously adopted; but I know to-day that such gentlemen as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] will eagerly support this amendment which I propose, and I feel doubly confident in this assurance because I have here upon this table before me a splendid statement from that veteran temperance reformer, Rev. Sam Small, with whom I know the gentleman from Georgia is in entire agreement, and which I shall later call to the attention of the House.

This item is for additional vessels for the Coast Guard. It appropriates \$3,900,000. In view of the statements made in the hearings, in view of the far-flung coast line of the United States, and in view of the existing situation on the question, that sum of money is grossly inadequate.

In studying these hearings I have been convinced of the fact that this matter of coast defense from rum smuggling has not been approached from the theory of policy and armament. We must have sufficient armament to carry out the declared policy of this House. [Applause.] And I hope the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] will continue to applaud during the rest of my discourse.

Mr. UPSHAW. I shall, as long as the gentleman keeps dry and reasonable.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I shall; and I am going to cite Rev. Sam Small to the gentleman from Georgia.

Therefore, having made a careful analysis of the coast line of the United States, I propose to this House not a haphazard appropriation for 35 vessels, 125 feet long, with a cruising radius of a certain few miles for the defense of the coast, but I am proposing to you that we adequately protect the coast. Do not take a haphazard request for 35 vessels.

Figure out what the policy of the Nation is, figure out what the necessary armament is, and then reconcile policy and armament. I wish to read first from the hearings on page 542, and I think it is valuable that the House hear this. Admiral Billard, who has charge of the policy and armament of the Coast Guard, is being questioned by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

The CHAIRMAN. I think you told the committee when you were here before that the vessels you then had you thought were adequate to meet the existing needs of the service. What has happened since that time to change your mind about it?

Admiral BILLARD. I do not recall telling the committee that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, when we gave you the additional boats I think that statement was very comprehensively made.

Admiral BILLARD. When you gave us the additional boats, some year and a half ago, I told you that I hoped that they would be adequate, but when I was last before you I recall making no such statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, I made a mistake in saying that it was when you were here last. What I meant to say was that you made the statement when we were giving you the boats. It was then that the statement was made.

Admiral BILLARD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, I ask you what has changed the situation to require these additional vessels?

Admiral BILLARD. Simply a better knowledge of the problem as it has developed.

My colleagues, a better knowledge of the problem as it has developed is evident in the splendid statement of the Rev. Sam Small, which I shall offer you in a few minutes:

The CHAIRMAN. What has your better knowledge of the problem disclosed?

Admiral BILLARD. It has disclosed the fact that the equipment we now have, while it can guard very satisfactorily certain sections of the coast, is not adequate to guard the entire coast.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean the whole coast?

Admiral BILLARD. Yes, sir; the coast where smuggling takes place.

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

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this pending bill—H. R. 8722—makes appropriations, first, to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926; second, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926; and, third, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927.

The whole of the proposed added Coast Guard appropriation is as follows:

COAST GUARD

Additional vessels: For additional motor boats and their equipment and for five seaplanes and their equipment for the use of the Coast Guard in enforcing the laws of the United States, and in performing the duties with which the Coast Guard is charged, to be constructed or purchased in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for repairs or alterations to or for equipping and placing in commission vessels or boats transferred from the Navy Department to the Treasury Department for the use of the Coast Guard, \$3,900,000, to remain available until December 31, 1926.

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Coast Guard, as follows:

For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers, cadets and cadet engineers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired, temporary cooks, and surfmen, substitute surfmen, and one civilian instructor, fiscal year 1926, \$1,235,000;

For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers, cadets and cadet engineers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired, temporary cooks, and surfmen, substitute surfmen, and one civilian instructor, rations or commutation thereof for cadets, cadet engineers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, fiscal year 1927, \$1,218,141;

For rations or commutation thereof for petty officers and other enlisted men, fiscal year 1926, \$100,000;

For fuel and water for vessels, stations, and houses of refuge for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, \$20,000;

For 1927, \$336,206;

For outfits, ship chandlery, and engineers' stores, fiscal year 1927, \$102,700;

For carrying out the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, \$10,000;

For 1927, \$3,000;

For mileage and expenses allowed by law for officers, and actual traveling expenses, per diem in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4, for other persons traveling on duty under orders from the Treasury Department, including transportation of enlisted men and applicants for enlistment, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; expenses of recruiting; rent of rendezvous and expense of maintaining the same; advertising for and obtaining men and apprentice seamen, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, \$20,000;

For 1927, \$12,000;

For coastal communication lines and facilities and their maintenance, fiscal year 1926, \$30,000;

For draft animals and their maintenance, fiscal year 1926, \$4,000;

For contingent expenses, including communication service, subsistence of shipwrecked persons succored by the Coast Guard; care, transportation, and burial of deceased officers and enlisted men, including those who die in Government hospitals; wharfage; towage, freight; storage; repairs to station apparatus; advertising; surveys; medals; labor; newspapers and periodicals for statistical purposes; and all other necessary expenses which are not included under any other heading, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, \$10,000;

For 1927, \$20,000;

For repairs to Coast Guard vessels and boats for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, \$500,000;

For 1927, \$143,410;

Total, exclusive of additional vessels, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, \$1,929,000;

For 1927, \$1,835,457.

Office of the commandant: For additional personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with "the classification act of 1923," for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1926, \$1,650;

For 1927, \$8,750.

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Treasury Department, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Document No. 153, Sixty-ninth Congress, \$1,634.96.

The Appropriations Committee advises me that the cost of attempting to enforce the Volstead Act is as follows for the years 1926 and 1927:

	1926
Coast Guard:	
Regular act.....	\$10,500,000
This bill.....	1,932,000
Total.....	12,432,000
Prohibition Unit.....	11,000,000
Department of Justice (estimated at one-third of total appropriation for the department).....	8,000,000
Total.....	31,432,000

To this should be added amounts for Customs Service devoted to prohibition activities and other miscellaneous expenses not definitely determinable. These would bring the total to around \$32,000,000.

1927

Coast Guard:	
Regular bill	\$12,700,000
This bill—	
New equipment	8,900,000
Operating expenses	1,842,000
Total	18,442,000
Prohibition Unit	10,635,000
Department of Justice (one-third total)	8,000,000
Total	37,077,000

Adding Customs Service expenses and other miscellaneous would bring total to about \$37,500,000.

This makes for 1926, \$32,000,000; for 1927, \$37,500,000. Approximate total for two years, \$69,500,000. And there will be more later.

I thank the acting chairman of the committee for these figures of the Coast Guard this year, the appropriation last year, the appropriation for prohibition enforcement this year, and the appropriation for prohibition enforcement last year.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. With pleasure.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, the gentleman is aware that if such a large increase, as proposed, is made that there ought to be a great many millions of dollars to provide the personnel to man the vessels and the supplies and fuel necessary during the year. Does the gentleman propose to follow this with a subsequent amendment?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. If this is adopted, it has been estimated by the Coast Guard it will cost to run each one of the 1,666 added boats at least \$100,000 a year for each boat. So that will make necessary the difference between—

Mr. BYRNS. Let me ask the gentleman who offers the amendment and says he proposed to follow that with an amendment, is the gentleman sincerely in favor of appropriating \$114,000,000 in this deficiency bill in addition—

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am against all futile waste of money, because it is futile. But, if you appropriate anything, I should be glad to see a proper appropriation made.

Mr. BYRNS. Is the gentleman really for his amendment?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am for attempting to enforce all laws. If some laws are unenforceable, they should be repealed or modified; if, however, you propose to appropriate \$7,000,000 more for Coast Guard, do it with some degree of common sense. I am against throwing good money after bad. If you gentlemen are sincerely for what you call "law enforcement," you will vote for my proposed amendment.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I will.

Mr. SPEAKS. I want to inquire why the gentleman thinks it necessary to make such a very large increase of appropriation for Coast Guard purposes in view of Admiral Billard's statement that "there has been a very great diminution of smuggling, notably on the North Atlantic seaboard." He further says:

I am satisfied that smuggling along the shores of Long Island has been greatly curtailed, and that there is comparatively little at this time. Undoubtedly there is some. Occasionally a launch will get by the Coast Guard line, but I am satisfied that the amount of smuggling there has been greatly reduced.

In view of that statement, why does the gentleman think it is necessary to enlarge the appropriation to such extent?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I will say to the gentleman I would not have offered it except for the fact that Admiral Billard is asking for this increase of thirty-five 125-foot boats and asking a total of \$7,674,491.96, and states:

The equipment we now have, while it can guard very satisfactorily certain sections of the coast, is not adequate to guard the entire coast.

If we guard part of the coast, why not all?

Now, I desire to ask permission to put in a section of the report of the committee under the heading of "Coast Guard."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The extract is as follows:

COAST GUARD

The Coast Guard is given the sum of \$7,674,491.96, practically all of which is due to the increased and onerous duties which have been placed upon the service in connection with the prevention of the smuggling of liquor and combating the activities of the "rum runner." In 1924 additional vessels and personnel were granted the service to engage in the work on a larger scale than had theretofore been possible with the fleet which the Coast Guard had operated for many years in the discharge of its normal functions. The extent to which the service would have to go in carrying out the new duties devolving upon it

could not be foreseen, and vessel and personnel requirements had to be estimated without any previous experience as a guide in coming to a determination of the needs. This experience has now been had, and as a result of it two factors bring this appropriation before the Congress. First, in estimating personnel and other operating expenses for the vessels which were appropriated for in 1924 it has been found that the total personnel was inadequate for the complements which should be provided for the various classes of boats and to maintain a proper reserve of men in training. Second, the activities of the Coast Guard have driven the smuggling vessels farther out from our coast lines and scattered them over a wider area. The vessels heretofore granted, while suitable for the purposes for which they were asked, have proved inadequate in number properly to protect the vast coast line of the United States and have not a cruising radius or seaworthiness sufficient to take them the distances out to sea which are now required. The amounts carried in the bill are divided into three parts—\$3,900,000 for the acquisition of additional vessels; \$1,842,207 for the maintenance, repair, and operation of these vessels during the portion of the fiscal year 1927 that they will be in commission; and \$1,932,284.96 for the fiscal year 1926 to provide for the additional personnel and maintenance expenses of the present fleet.

The \$3,900,000 for additional vessels provides \$600,000 for the reconditioning and equipment of five 1,000-ton destroyers to be transferred from the Navy Department, \$3,150,000 for the acquisition of thirty-five 125-foot offshore patrol boats, and \$150,000 for five seaplanes.

The amount of \$1,842,207 for operation for the fiscal year 1927 provides for 80 warrant officers and 803 enlisted men and the necessary maintenance and repair funds for operating the vessels above provided for during that portion of the year it will be possible to have them in commission.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. I understand the gentleman's position from his statement as made a moment ago is that in his opinion the \$3,900,000 being appropriated here is a waste of money. In other words that it is a useless appropriation.

Now, I understand the gentleman's position to be this, that in support of the Coolidge program for economy he is willing to appropriate \$110,000,000 more than is appropriated here for the same purpose for which \$3,900,000 is appropriated?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because every appropriation that is made that is inefficient, useless, and not successful is a waste of money. Now, the position I take is that if you are going to appropriate \$7,000,000 more for the Coast Guard, let us not do it in a slipshod fashion and—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. May I have five additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I take great pleasure in developing the theory on which I have proposed this meritorious amendment. We have in the United States 5,720 miles of seacoast on the Atlantic side. We have 10,740 miles on the Pacific side. That gives us a total coast mileage, exclusive of 8,000 miles in Alaska, of 16,660 miles. I understand the Volstead Act is not violated in Alaska! Now this bill provides for thirty-five 125-foot offshore destroyer boats costing \$3,150,000. One of those boats costs \$90,000. We have 16,660 miles of coast on the Atlantic and Pacific. Now, one of these boats can only patrol and protect 10 miles on these waters with certainty and therefore 1,666 boats are needed and would cost \$149,940,000. My amendment provides 10 per cent of this. Now, gentlemen, I plead with you if we are going to make an honest and sincere attempt to carry out the policy which has been declared by this Congress, do it systematically. Do it in a way that will redound to our glory as business men. I have only two more things to say, and I will conclude. General Wood told the Committee on Military Affairs of this House in 1916 that it would take a million and a half men to hold the line running from Boston south. We really need one boat to each 10 miles. This would cost \$149,740,000, but I am only now proposing 10 per cent of this to test your sincerity for "law enforcement." If you vote to increase the appropriation to \$14,974,000, we can then go the rest of the way. Of course, there will also be the cost of operating these new boats.

I am dealing to-day with the interior problem only of enforcing the Volstead Act, because Admiral Billard, on page 543 of the hearings, demands an air service and estimates the cost of aircraft to start the progress of aviation at five planes, at \$30,000 apiece.

I wish to incorporate in my remarks a very pertinent statement on the subject of prohibition enforcement by the Rev. Sam Small.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by the inclusion of the statement or article referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have always assumed, of course, that the gentleman's nationality is American.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I have always assumed it, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the gentleman to-day is masquerading in the garb of a Greek, because he is bringing gifts here. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The gentleman must remember that old classic story from the *Gesta Romanorum*, to the effect that they found honey in the skull of a dead lion. If I offer you honey, take it, no matter where its comes from. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let us have the article read.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I will ask to have it read in my time.

Mr. MURPHY. How long is it?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. It is brief, considering its value and authority.

Mr. MURPHY. I object to that.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I hope the gentleman will not object. Here is a statement by an intimate friend and disciple of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

Mr. MURPHY. I suggest that the gentleman put it in the RECORD. Do not read it here.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland withdraw his request for the reading of the article?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

[From the Sun, Baltimore, Sunday, November 29, 1925]

SAM SMALL SAYS PROHIBITION IS GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT—EVANGELIST ADMITS DRY LEADERS REALIZE AMENDMENT WAS ENACTED BEFORE PEOPLE WERE FULLY PREPARED TO ENFORCE IT

(By the Rev. Sam Small, veteran temperance lecturer and evangelist)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 28.—I am not satisfied with national prohibition "as is."

It is not the prohibition that I have publicly contended for during 85 years, from 1885 to 1920.

It is not the prohibition that I have shed my body's blood for on eight occasions during those years.

The present status of prohibition under the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, after over five years of so-called national enforcement, is a bitter disappointment of the faith that led to their enactment.

Fresh from attendance upon the biennial national convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America and from hearing the expressed views of antisaloon leaders, governors and ex-governors of States, Senators and Representatives in the Congress, active officials of the Federal Prohibition Unit, bishops of churches, judges, and prosecuting attorneys, editors of great newspapers, and women of reform organizations, I am deeply impressed by the continuity of the question: "Will prohibition prohibit?"

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

The problem as presented now by the prohibition leaders is how to obliterate the traffic in and use of alcoholic intoxicating liquors, "root and branch," as they put it, from the daily business and habits of the American people. All of the advocates of that policy frankly admit that it is one of the largest contracts ever undertaken by a self-determining nation through the agencies of civil government. They hold that the presence of the prohibition amendment in the Constitution of the Republic, affirmed as properly there by the Supreme Court of the Nation, is conclusive evidence that a majority of the people wish that prohibition policy exploited to its fullest limits.

But the holding of this latest "crisis convention" in Chicago this month in advance of the convening of Congress in December was to advertise how far the enforcement of the prohibition law has failed up to date to secure desired effect, to locate responsibility for the failure, and then to propose agreed-upon remedies for the unsatisfactory condition.

TOO EARLY AND TOO EXPANSIVE

Conferences between those concerned in the convention's objectives revealed that some of them are coming to realize that probably national

prohibition was brought into law and action before the people were fully prepared to enforce it. One of the outstanding leaders of the cause on the floor of the Congress said so much to this writer at the convention and explained the reasons that have brought him to that conclusion.

The prohibition policy was winning its way by State adoptions in all sections of the Union. Thirty-two States by constitutional amendments or legislative action had provided for state-wide prohibition before the eighteenth amendment was submitted to the States. One other State, Kentucky, adopted the state-wide policy while the amendment was yet pending and unratified.

But there were 15 States, among them those of the largest population, that had not adopted the policy, and some of them had but recently rejected it by large popular majorities. Hence the belief still prevails with many prohibitionists that the blanket national policy was applied too soon. The answer of the more ardent prohibitionists is to point to the ratification of the amendment by the legislatures of 45 of the 48 States within the short period of 13 months. Also that among the ratifying States were the largest in population, such as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. Only New Jersey, Connecticut, and Rhode Island failed to ratify, and New Jersey has since done so. It is upon that record that radical prohibitionists stand and, with the difficulty of amending the Federal Constitution back of them, declare with every sense of certainty that the amendment will not be repealed within any calculable time.

TOO INTENSIVE POLICY

I have found some most sincere believers in the prohibition policy who yet think the steps taken by the antisaloon people in framing the amendment and in legislating to enforce it were beyond the original objectives for which the league was formed and supported.

The name "Anti-Saloon League" was clearly indicative of the work it was organized to accomplish. That was to suppress the legalized, licensed dramshop. It was generally denounced as the source of drink evils and the generator of crime, poverty, and a host of social evils. It was constantly in the public eye and its products constantly in the courts, the prisons, and the poorhouses.

For over a hundred years of our national history legislative skill and social wisdom had been taxed to find safe and tolerable restrictions that could be imposed on those institutions, and without satisfaction. Promoting, multiplying, and magnetizing saloons became the joint enterprise of liquor profiteers and liquor politicians. They jeered at every sentiment of national sobriety and bludgeoned every demand for social safety and decency. To save their existence and business they fought the antisaloon proposition with every weapon and bitterness, and eventually forced the religious and temperance people to fight for drastic national prohibition.

INSTANCES OF LIQUOR FOLLY

The earliest proposals to amend the Federal Constitution and establish a national prohibition policy—such as those by Blair, Plumb, Ballou, and others in the seventies and eighties—dealt almost exclusively with ardent spirits, with distilled liquors, native and foreign, and would not have affected fermented beverages of ordinary type. The movements of that day aimed at "hard liquors." Indeed, they were then disposed to agree with the earlier view of Thomas Jefferson that mild brews would be a panacea against fiery liquors. But the friends of the liquor trade fought those propositions with as much vehement bitterness as they now do the Volstead Act itself.

It should be remembered that when Congressman Richmond Pearson Hobson presented his famous prohibition amendment in 1914 he was hilariously ridiculed in and outside of Congress by publicists and press for restricting prohibition to the "sale" phases of the liquor traffic. The wording of his proposed amendment was:

"The sale, manufacture for sale, transportation for sale, importation for sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and exportation thereof, are forever prohibited."

Such eminent opponents as Congressmen Mann, Underwood, Henry, Gallivan, Carlin, and a score of others derided the repetitions "for sale" in the resolution and declared there could be no genuine prohibition upon those terms; that it really would set up a "free liquor" régime, because it would leave everyone free to distill and brew his own liquors, and that under this Hobson plan there would be universal drunkenness without regulations or restraints.

WHAT HOBSON PLEDGED

In reply to the savage attacks made upon his proposition Congressman Hobson replied that he and those whom he represented did not believe the Federal Government should be empowered to go further than to control and prohibit "the commercial features of the liquor traffic." "The people have the right," he said, "to determine what manner of manufacturers and commerce they will permit within the Nation, but there are ancient and unalienable nature rights which they may not deny and prohibit."

When he was challenged to name those indefensible rights Hobson said:

"The object of forbidding the sale is to avoid even a suspicion of any desire to impose sumptuary legislation upon the American people or to invade the rights of the individual and the home."

On the floor of the House of Representatives he again declared:

"I want my colleagues to understand from the start, and so far as we can have them the American people, that there is no desire, no intent on the part of this resolution, to invade either the individual rights of inherent liberties of the citizen or to climb over the wall that civilization—particularly the Anglo-Saxon civilization—has built around the home."

Because it was pronounced "a free whisky measure" the Hobson resolution failed to carry in Congress. It was the tenor of the criticisms launched against it that forced the prohibitionists to frame the Sheppard-Webb amendment in the comprehensive terms it now carries in the Constitution.

Those are the facts of history which explain why the Anti-Saloon League changed its plan of campaign from a crusade against the saloon to a drive against every phase of legalized beverage liquor commerce.

This writer, as one of the headline speakers of the amendment campaign, made thousands of speeches in churches and to other assemblies, repeating everywhere the assurances contained in the quotations from Hobson. All of us strenuously combated the charge that we sought to deny the individual citizen his right to have and drink what he pleased; we only denied that any man had an inalienable right to run a barroom and conduct a commercial manufactory of drunkards. Such was our main argument, and with it we won millions of voters to support the proposition of decommercializing the drink traffic.

THE PREDICTED RESULTS

On the other hand, the opponents of national prohibition predicted that our success would remove all regulatory restrictions upon the traffic, that moonshining, bootlegging, and smuggling would be enormously increased, and that the transfer of police power from the States to the Federal Government would tremendously increase the mechanism and expense of enforcing all antiliquor laws.

All those predictions, at which we hooted, have come true. The convention at Chicago was a great wholesale complaint against just those evil results.

No one present there ventured to deny that moonshine stills and bootleggers cover the country as the locusts did the land of Egypt. While most of the States have adopted enforcement acts in concurrence with the Volstead Act, nevertheless the authorities in charge of them have almost wholly looked to the Federal officers to detect, chase, capture, and convict the violators of the law.

When that condition was forecast in the debates over the amendment in Congress the reply of its friends was that the States, to prevent being overrun by Federal foreign spies, snoopers, and enforcement officers sent out from Washington, would be foremost in the use of their own officers and in securing to themselves the fines, forfeitures, and convictions from prohibition enforcement.

But all those local benefits have not been experienced. On the contrary, the Federal forces have been planted all over the country and have sought, for either honest or dishonest purposes, to take entire charge of prohibition enforcement. The consequence has not only been a flood of official scandals, evidences of corruption, instances of unwarranted outrages upon private rights, but the demonstration that the Volstead Act is practically unenforceable in its present terms with all the machinery possible for the Federal Government to employ. Hence, the silly demands we hear for more drastic legislation and the use of the armed forces of the Nation.

100 PER CENT PROHIBITIONIST

I am a 100 per cent prohibitionist. I was wholeheartedly in the fight years before the present leaders got actively into it—even before some of them were born and eight years before the Anti-Saloon League was founded by Dr. Howard Hyde Russell in Ohio. No man can discount or deny my devotion to the cause and I want now what I have wanted for those 40 years. That is the abolition of the liquor saloon, and in nearly all the States that is now accomplished. Secondly, the suppression of the manufacture and transportation and importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

Those two objectives constitute the heart and lungs of the eighteenth amendment. Unfortunately, in my judgment, the Anti-Saloon Leaguers have gone far beyond those original objectives and have used their influence to enact laws that are designed to control every act relating to liquor, however private, personal, and even permissible under the terms of the law.

DIFFERENCE OF TWO WORDS

When the eighteenth amendment was being framed it was strenuously urged to use in it the words "alcoholic liquors" rather than "intoxicating liquors," but on the committees of Congress who handled the amendment there were able lawyers and ex-judges who saw both the injustice and the futility of attempting to outlaw every kind of liquor that contained any percentage of alcohol. They said in plain speech that the chief purpose in setting up national prohibition was and is to delegatize the making of and commerce in liquors that are generally and necessarily "intoxicating."

In other words, at that time the whole avowed purpose of those who were promoting the amendment was to put a rational stamp of illegality upon liquors of any kind that are actually "intoxicating." It was acknowledged that whether any particular liquor is classifiable as "intoxicating liquor" is a question of fact, dependable upon convincing proof, and is not a matter of opinion—not whether Wayne Wheeler or Sam Small or any other person thinks it is "intoxicating." It is an issue to be determined by expert definition, by cumulative human experience, and by the testimonies coming from courts and corrective institutions.

LIGHT BEER ISSUE

For instance, the issue has been presented in the House of Representatives by the introduction of 58 separate bills to legalize the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer in such States as may elect to have it, on the ground that such beer is not an "intoxicating liquor."

The proponents of those bills say such beer is not "intoxicating" in fact and therefore should not be included in the prohibition of the eighteenth amendment. The opponents of those bills contend that such beer is "intoxicating." But who knows positively, irrefutably, whether it is so or not?

I have, for five years, sought every available authority and evidence on that question—and yet I do not know whether or not 2.75 per cent beer is necessarily and invariably "intoxicating." But I want to know the truth about it and am ready to welcome any investigation that will get that truth and establish it incontestably.

THE VOLSTEAD DICTUM

I find all over the country men who are as pronounced prohibitionists as myself who are anxious to have that question finally settled. They, like myself, do not believe that the Volstead standard that any liquor with more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol content must be accounted "intoxicating" is either true or reasonable. It is the insertion of that drastic and irreducible minimum of alcohol content that has caused millions of men in America to pronounce the standard a "palpable lie on its face" and to resist, or condone those who do resist, such a definition of an "intoxicating liquor."

The answer of the Anti-Saloon Leaguers and dry legislators is that "the law does not say that any liquor with more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol is in fact intoxicating," but they hold that there must be a base line of alcoholic content from which to project enforcement, and that one-half per cent alcohol content has been found in State experience to be the most ascertainable and feasible standard for enforcement purposes.

The reply made to that is the double one that while one-half per cent may be feasible for taxation it is not indubitable for intoxication, and, second, what a State establishes as a standard for itself is not to be generally accepted as an incontestable standard.

WHAT IS THE WAY OUT?

There were men who have been long in Anti-Saloon League service and are yet, but who will not consent to be personally quoted and so "get in bad" with their league leaders, who are puzzling over "the way out" of the present conditions of law defiance, official derelictions and corruptions, and the broken hopes of those who brought prohibition into the national policy. Incidental benefits to individuals, families, industries, and morals they publish and emphasize, but the criminal increases, the perjuries, murderers, moral poisoning of officials, judicial truculencies, and social demoralizations they do not attempt to deny and deplore.

Unless I have utterly lost all my half-century experiences as a newspaper man and evangelist in gauging public sentiment, I can say with surety that the discontented public, whether for or against prohibition per se, is anxious to have a thorough and honest investigation of the present status of prohibition and how to make it enforceable and satisfying.

Congress and the friends of the eighteenth amendment should cease to camouflage actual conditions and face them frankly and fearlessly, seeking and applying whatever solution may be found rational and constitutional.

LINE OF APPROACH

This question of why prohibition is not being effectively enforced is the most universal and acute issue being discussed by our American people and press. It is up to Congress to find out the answer and legislate upon the facts to the satisfaction of the people.

Congress and the people know that both personal and partisan politics have honeycombed and rotted the national enforcement service from the hour that the Prohibition Unit was formed in the Treasury Department after the enactment of the Volstead law. I have inquired into the operations of the unit in more than 20 States and found in all of them the agreement that lax enforcement and immunities for law-breakers are almost wholly out of the power of politicians to nominate and control the enforcement officials. This is capable of irrefutable proof—but will Congress dare to bring it to the surface and cure the corrupting evil by divorcing prohibition enforcement from all political control? I doubt it.

Another thing that persons who want practical prohibition, and whose jobs, personal or political, are not dependent upon the Anti-Saloon League, would ask of Congress is a full and comprehensive investigation of the 2.75 beer proposition. What they want Congress to find out definitely and finally is whether that sort of beer is or is not "intoxicating" and deal with the subject accordingly.

SCOFFS LEAGUE'S CHARGE

In plain words:

If such beer is intoxicating, keep it under the amendment ban.

If it is not intoxicating, let those States have it that want it, but rigidly prohibit them from exporting it into other States that do not want it.

The charge by the Anti-Saloon Leaguers that such action would be "a surrender to the outlaws" is pluperfect poppycock. The demand for a decision of this widely mooted question is not influenced by what brewers, beersuckers, bootleggers, or booze politicians want. Their outcries are negligible and, taken en bloc, would get no attention or response from any type of prohibitionists. Certainly they do not affect me.

The demand comes, in fact, from those who want that truthful and reasonable legislation that will make prohibition appeal to the honesty, loyalty, and law-abiding spirit of the commonality of our American citizens. Until we can get that popular reaction, prohibition will be a delusion and a failure.

URGED THAT MARYLAND BE DRIVEN FROM UNION

Twice in recent years has the Rev. Dr. Samuel White Small attacked the "sinfulness" of Maryland for failing to follow the lead of other Commonwealths in the passage of legislation to back up the Volstead Act.

At the International Conference on Christian Citizenship, held at Winona Lake, Ind., in 1923, Doctor Small introduced resolutions, which were passed, urging that Maryland and New York be denied the right of representation in Congress until they had passed State prohibition enforcement laws.

In an address at the convention of the American Anti-Saloon League at Chicago early this month he was even more vehement in his utterances on this topic, according to newspaper reports of the proceedings. He accused Maryland and New York of "aiding and abetting anarchy," and charged that both States were "working under the shadow of treason," and that "Congress should read them out of the Union."

EVANGELIST NOW 75 YEARS OLD

Doctor Small was born in Knoxville, Tenn., July 3, 1851. He received his A. B. and A. M. degrees at Emory and Henry College, the latter in 1887. He was given the Ph. D. degree at Taylor University, Upland, Ind., in 1894, and the same year was accorded the degree of doctor of divinity at the Ohio Northern University.

Sam Small's first occupation was as a stenographer and newspaper reporter. He later became secretary to Ex-President Andrew Johnson during his post-Presidential campaigns. He was also official reporter of the Georgia Constitutional Convention in 1877 and secretary to the American commission to the Paris Exposition in 1878.

From then until the time he entered actively into evangelistic work at Atlanta, Ga., September 15, 1885, Doctor Small had been variously a committee reporter in the United States Senate, founder of the Norfolk Daily Pilot and the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City. He went to Cuba as chaplain of the Third United States Volunteer Engineers in the Spanish-American War.

ONCE SERVED WITH SAM JONES

He is a member of the National Reform Association, the Anti-Saloon League of America, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Masonic fraternity, Odd Fellows, Knights of Pythias, and Red Men. He has also written several books, one of which was *A Plea for Prohibition*.

Doctor Small first gained national prominence as an evangelist in his association with the late Rev. Sam Jones, by whom he was converted. The pair toured the country about 40 or 45 years ago and had large meetings wherever they went. Later Doctor Small started out as an evangelist on his own account, and there seems to have been a period when he "fell from grace." He was reconverted in a great revival meeting held in Atlanta on May 23, 1906, and since then has devoted much of his activities in the furtherance of prohibition.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the committee for its courtesy and helpful suggestions on this great question. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes; I yield with pleasure to my friend from Maine.

Mr. HERSEY. I did not exactly understand the gentleman's position. His position, as I understand, is that he is in favor of a large enforcement fund, larger than the committee recommends, for the enforcement of the Volstead law. Now if we should get 2.75 per cent beer, would not that solve the whole question?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I have a great affection for the gentleman, and I have a great affection also for the gentleman's State. When the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hersey] was still a young man my uncle, John Boynton Hill, was Speaker pro tempore of the Maine Legislature, and he participated in that regrettable Neal Dow prohibition legislation in Maine. He later regretted it exceedingly, and abjured prohibition before he died. I hope that answers the gentleman's question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HERSEY. It is no answer at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL of Maryland. My proposed amendment has nothing at all to do with the merits or demerits of the Volstead Act. My amendment solely deals with what is known as "law enforcement," meaning thereby enforcement of the Volstead Act.

The Coast Guard asks for 35 more 125-foot patrol boats costing about \$90,000 each.

PATROL BOATS

The CHAIRMAN. How do you estimate the cost of these patrol boats?

Admiral BILLARD. As I have told the committee, we have built and are building 13 of this same general type of boat, 100 feet long, upon the Lakes. The total cost of building and equipping those boats is slightly over \$80,000 apiece. These boats we want to make a little longer. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that we can build a boat 125 feet long for \$90,000, but we can probably build one 110 or 115 feet long.

Captain NEWMAN. The speed of these boats is 11.2 knots. That is something over 12 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not very speedy, then?

Admiral BILLARD. No; but they have a large steaming radius and ability to go way offshore.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men would they carry?

Admiral BILLARD. A crew of two warrant officers and nine enlisted men.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the motive power?

Admiral BILLARD. Diesel engines.

The CHAIRMAN. They will run economically?

Admiral BILLARD. Yes, sir.

Thirty-five added boats admittedly will not accomplish the desires of Admiral Billard. The Coast Guard will soon be back for more boats, and then for more airplanes.

We have, on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, 16,660 miles of seacoast open to the rum runners. One boat for each 10 miles would mean stopping smuggling, though, of course, smuggled liquor is only about 1 per cent of the illegal supply. One boat to every 10 miles would mean 1,666 boats. One thousand six hundred and six-six boats at \$90,000 each would cost \$149,940,000, exclusive of cost of operation. I am only asking now by my proposed amendment for 10 per cent of that sum. If you vote for that and show your sincerity for "law enforcement," we can then add the other 90 per cent of the cost of the boats and get, at least, a real attempt to enforce the Volstead Act. No matter what your views may be on prohibition; no matter whether you are a "wet" or a "dry," here is a chance to vote for real enforcement of the Volstead Act, if anything can enforce it, which I very much doubt. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if I believed that the additional appropriation asked for in the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Hill] would bring about the enforcement and compliance of the prohibition act I would gladly support it. But I am satisfied that it can not and will not effectively do so, and for that reason I am opposed to it. I am willing to give to the department all the money they ask for, but I am not ready and willing to give them five times as much as I believe they can uselessly spend, as they have been doing for several years.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Would my colleague be in favor of guarding each 10 miles of coast?

Mr. SABATH. Even with this sum you would not stop the smuggling that is going on, and for that reason I think it would be an unwise expenditure of money and placing an additional burden upon the taxpayers of this country.

Years ago I made the statement on this floor, when the gentlemen from Georgia and Michigan, Kentucky, and others assured the House that \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 would enable them to bring about the enforcement of the Volstead Act. I then stated that it was impossible. I pride myself on knowing the American people, and I know that neither the Volstead Act nor any other similar obnoxious law can be enforced, it matters not how much money you spend, and it is for that reason that I am not in favor of continuing to waste annually millions of dollars of the people's money.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have not said a word on the question of prohibition for some time. I have voted, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] knows, for all of the appropriations. I was willing that we should try it in an endeavor to bring about enforcement, if it was possible, at the same time being satisfied that if strong, honest efforts were made and it could not be enforced, that the people would demand its repeal. Not only I share this viewpoint but thousands upon thousands of honest men and honest women who are not blinded by prejudice, men and women in this country, hundreds of prominent organizations, doctors, lawyers, men from all walks of life recognize the condition that now exists and are coming to the conclusion that the law can not be enforced, as the law instead of being beneficial is detrimental to the welfare of this Nation. Therefore I feel that it is high time that sensible men from every section of the country should realize that fact. I feel that most of you gentlemen are sensible men, men of standing, and a majority of you are men of courage; and I can not see for the life of me why you can not commence to realize the intolerable conditions that to-day exist. Perhaps you have not the time to investigate and examine the conditions; but we have evidence from men of standing, men of reputation, men who believe in temperance and are sincere advocates of temperance, who from day to day report to their organizations and make statements, that prohibition has failed, that it can not be enforced, and that modification is absolutely necessary.

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

Mr. SABATH. May I have five minutes more? I may not use it all.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. They, after a careful investigation, tell you that the Volstead Act can not be enforced, and they make recommendations of what they believe would be wholesome and beneficial, that would save thousands upon thousands of young girls and young men of America.

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

Mr. SABATH. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MURPHY. I challenge the gentleman's statement that he makes, that our young girls are any worse to-day than they ever were. That statement has been made by men of your type so many times that I am tired of hearing it. The girl of to-day is as good as she ever was. If she happens to go wrong she is unfortunate, and it is not because of conditions as they are.

Mr. SABATH. As to that, I will say that my reputation is just as good as that of the gentleman to whom I yielded, and I am often as provoked and nearly as much excited as he is when I read these reports about the flask parties in our colleges, schools, and universities. Nor have I stated that they are bad. I have stated that I believe the modification of the Volstead Act would save thousands of our young people who now consider it smart to secure and carry a flask to parties, and openly are showing off by drinking high per cent alcohol containing partly distilled, yes, in many instances poisonous stuff, not only they but I believe the majority of men and women who never have taken any hard liquor do so, as resentment against a law which deprives them of their personal liberty, a right and privilege which every true American citizen cherishes and believes in. Why, Mr. Chairman, I know of hundreds, yes, thousands, of American homes that before the advent of the prohibition act would not allow any alcoholic beverages in their home, but who are now serving cocktails, gin, and other strong alcoholic drinks, and what I have observed a majority of you have, and you know it is true, but you dislike to admit it, hoping against hope that the increased use of this kind of dope may be some day arrested. But I say, no; it can not be done; it matters not whether the entire Army and Navy be utilized to enforce this obnoxious law.

Reliable men and women after a thorough investigation reported that there are hundreds of thousands of homes from the highest to the lowest where alcoholic beverages are being concocted which are not only harmful but poisonous. Now, I know whereof I speak, and I am not speaking only from the investigations and things I have seen myself; I am stating and giving to the House the information that has been broadcasted within the last six months. Doctor Empringham, at one time superintendent of the Antisaloon League of New York, recently stated before a meeting of the Episcopal clergy of New York that prohibition had increased drinking among young people, discouraged the consumption of wine and beer, and increased the demand for distilled liquors, which to-day are

mostly poisonous. But a week ago Mrs. Angela Kaufman, founder and president of the International Narcotic Crusade, made this statement:

I hate to admit it, prohibition has increased the use of narcotics more than any other one thing in the country.

Now comes the statement from one of the leaders of the Big Brothers and Big Sisters' Federation, Mrs. Sidney C. Borg, of New York:

When the law was first enacted I was strongly in favor of it, but since I have seen how it has broken down the morale of the young my opinion has changed. I have found the moral standards of the youth with whom I have come into contact have declined because of it. There is open defiance of it among the young people on every hand.

I believe that by a modification of the Volstead Act permitting the sale or the manufacture of a beer of about 3 per cent and light wines that we will eliminate the evils that now exist.

Mr. HUDSON and Mr. BARKLEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUDSON. I would like to have the gentleman explain to me what the alcoholic content of light wines would be.

Mr. SABATH. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I am not an expert on wine. But I know that an alcoholic content of about 3½ or 4 per cent in beer makes a good, palatable, and wholesome drink, and is not intoxicating.

Mr. HUDSON. The gentleman was speaking about light wines.

Mr. SABATH. And I believe that if we were to permit the manufacture and sale of that kind of a beverage the people will not demand the harder drinks, which contain 75 or 80 per cent alcohol. I will now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering whether when the gentleman refers to light wines he means light in content or light in color.

Mr. SABATH. Light in content; but, of course, the color in itself would not make much difference to anyone; the gentleman might know this. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for an additional five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER. Did not the sovereign voters of the great State of Illinois several years ago, in a referendum vote, indicate by an exceedingly large majority that those voters were in favor of the modification of the Volstead Act by permitting the manufacture and sale of light beer and wine?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; they did that by a vote of about 4 to 1, and I think if a vote were to be taken to-day it would be 10 to 1; not only in my State, but I believe that in a majority of the States the result would be the same as in Illinois.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HUDSON. What was the percentage of that vote to the total vote in the State of Illinois?

Mr. SABATH. I think the vote that was cast was about 60 per cent.

Mr. HUDSON. No; it was less than 25 per cent, was it not?

Mr. SABATH. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield for a question, but not for a tirade and play to the gallery.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman has just answered the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] and given figures as to the vote in Illinois. If conditions are as the gentleman says they are, and considering the orderly manner in which this law was put into the Constitution, could not the same orderly method be used, if conditions are as the gentleman states them to be, in taking it out of the Constitution? If conditions are as the gentleman says they are, why does he not start a movement in each and every one of the States to take it out of the Constitution?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, Congress must act first; the States can not act first; Congress would have to pass a resolution first, if I am not mistaken, and I do not think the House is ready to act now. But what I believe is this, and I am bringing this to the attention of the House, hoping it will receive that con-

sideration to which it is entitled. I firmly believe that if the House, in an orderly way, would amend the Volstead Act which it has the power to do, that we would eliminate a great deal of the evil which now exists.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UPSHAW. The gentleman said that a movement like that must begin in Congress, a repeal of the eighteenth amendment. Does the gentleman believe Congress would ever have acted on the eighteenth amendment if there had not been a ground swell from great and dry America which brought it on?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, the gentleman knows as well as I know how that amendment or the resolution was brought in; how it was forced through the House, and how little the people of America knew what was transpiring, or how far-reaching the act would be under the amendment.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UPSHAW. I want to ask the gentleman if there was not as much agitation, as much referendum, and as much general national attention given to the eighteenth amendment when we were bringing it to the Congress, as there was with regard to the sixteenth, seventeenth, or nineteenth amendments.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows that the eighteenth amendment was passed during the war hysteria.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland will state it.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. In great deference I suggest that we are not discussing prohibition but a question as to how many boats we need to each square mile of territory along the coasts. There is nothing in this about prohibition. This is ordinary law enforcement.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Georgia knows that the American people did not know anything about the resolution to amend the Constitution; that there was very little publicity; and that they had no expectation the Congress would act at that time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have one more minute. I want to ask the gentleman a question. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object to the request for this additional time, but I hope the gentlemen will finish the debate on this general subject and let us get on with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if this is not the fact: When the Congress submitted this amendment to the States, 45 out of 48 States of this Union promptly ratified it?

Mr. SABATH. The legislatures of 45 of the States.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; the legislatures, who are the direct representatives of the people.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but the American people did not do so. They did not secure an opportunity to vote on the proposition and the gentleman knows this. If the gentleman believes in referendum and if he believes that the American people should have a voice in such an important matter, why not give them the opportunity and the right to vote on it? I am ready and I am willing to abide by the vote of a majority of the American people on this or any other proposition that is of such great importance to the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. CRISP, and Mr. SUMMERS of Washington rose.

Mr. SABATH. Give me a little more time and I will yield to all of you gentlemen.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Does the gentleman want to submit the other 18 amendments to a vote of the people? They have never come before the people any more than this one. Would the gentleman want to submit all of them in that way?

Mr. SABATH. Well, they are not in question to-day, but the eighteenth amendment is. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to ask the gentleman if his State feels on this question as he represents it to feel, why not let his State petition the Congress to amend the Constitution by eliminating the eighteenth amendment. The gentleman is inaccurate when he says that Congress alone has the power to initiate proposed amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. SABATH. But nothing can be done without an act of Congress; is not that right?

Mr. CRISP. No.

Mr. SABATH. They can petition.

Mr. CRISP. The Constitution can be amended by Congress by a two-thirds vote or upon petition by the legislatures of two-thirds of the States of the Union.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman's own statement bears me out in what I have stated and therefore he himself was inaccurate and not I. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have no desire to take up your time in an endeavor to make what you might term a dry speech. I have great admiration for the gentleman who has just left the floor, Mr. SABATH, of Chicago. I could not sit here and let his statement go unchallenged. I could not help it.

Those who are advocating the nullification of the eighteenth amendment have been flaunting the charge publicly everywhere that the children of America are being debauched by reason of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and I have taken the floor just for the purpose of challenging that statement and of saying that the motherhood of this country is being maligned as it was never maligned before by that contemptible kind of vilification—that our young girlhood and womanhood is not as clean, wholesome, and sweet as it was in the days of our mothers. [Applause.] Of all the contemptible arguments that have been put forth to try to justify the changing of this law, that of all is the lowest down. There is no place in hell quite deep enough for it. [Applause.]

Talk about law enforcement! My friend the gentleman from Maryland, who constantly advocates nullification of the Constitution and the return of legalized liquor traffic, is truly representing his district and State. He lives on that politically. His habits are the habits of a gentleman—I am speaking personally now—but he comes to this floor and advocates that which has debauched from the very beginning to the present day the manhood of this great land. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; I yield, gladly.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am advocating only an increase in this appropriation from \$3,000,000 to \$14,000,000 for law enforcement.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman is not sincere and never was sincere in his argument for his side of this question. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I do not think gentlemen who vote against it are sincere. Admiral Billard says he needs one boat for every 10 miles along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and you are only giving him 35 boats when he says he needs 1,665. If you are sincere, you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. The time has come when men like you in this country should not say the time has come for law enforcement, but the time is here when decent men should observe the law. [Applause.]

That time will come to you gentlemen who are in favor of nullifying the Constitution of the United States. The eighteenth amendment was not put there in a day, and some of you folks who are anxious to debauch the manhood of our country seem to forget that it took 60 years to get the eighteenth amendment placed in the Constitution. It was not put there overnight, it was not slipped in as you so often say "while the boys were over there." [Applause.] Why men, we live in the most prosperous country that God's sun shines upon.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. What has made us prosperous? Why, any thinking man knows the thing that has made us prosperous is because the man who toils with his hands is not spending his surplus for alcohol, but is buying homes and autos for the enjoyment of his entire family—thus giving work to builders of every craft. [Applause.]

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Did the war have anything to do with that prosperity?

Mr. MURPHY. A little bit; yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER. Did not the American Federation of Labor come out in favor of a modification of the Volstead Act?

Mr. MURPHY. No; I deny that statement. One great labor organization to-day, I think in the current issue published in their paper, says that they are against the modification of the Volstead law. I refer you to the engineers who operate the locomotives that pull you through the country in safety while you sleep.

Mr. SCHAFER. I have the honor of belonging to a labor organization, the Railroad Brotherhood. I asked if the American Federation of Labor has not gone on record in favor of a modification of the Volstead Act.

Mr. MURPHY. But, thank God, the Federation of Labor does not represent all the people of America. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. William Green is dry.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, and he is from my State.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not true that Secretary Hoover has said that one cause of the prosperity of the Nation has been prohibition?

Mr. MURPHY. Absolutely. I tell you I know what I am talking about from personal experience. I came up from the street to my seat in this House where I can look you gentlemen in the eye and talk to you about the chances that can come to an American if he leaves this damnable stuff alone. [Applause.] Gentlemen talk about labor unions; I belong to a labor union and have a union card.

Mr. SOSNOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. SOSNOWSKI. Is it not true that the Rev. Dr. James Empringham of the Episcopal Church convention indorses a modification of the Volstead Act?

Mr. MURPHY. I have no quarrel with any denomination, but I want to say to you that the record does not show anywhere who that gentleman is. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And it does not represent the sentiment of our colleagues in this House.

Mr. MURPHY. It does not.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I will.

Mr. SPEAKS. I hold in my hand a copy of the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch, across the entire top of the front page of which are these glaring headlines, which, with the statement following, will answer the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Sosnowski]:

Bishop Reese repudiates temperance report; charges not recognized as from church. Doctor Sweet, Episcopalian minister also upholds the law. Columbus Episcopal Church leader points to prohibition's successes.

The article says:

Episcopal Church leaders in Columbus, Thursday, refused to consider seriously the charges of inequality in the administration of the Volstead Act and flagrant violation as brought by Rev. Dr. James Empringham, national secretary of the Church Temperance Society, in his purported survey of conditions throughout the country.

That it was the expression of a voluntary organization and can not in any sense be considered an official voice of the church was emphasized by Bishop T. I. Reese of the Episcopal Church; Rev. S. E. Sweet, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church; and Rev. B. H. Reinheimer, executive secretary of the Episcopal diocese of Southern Ohio.

The Church Temperance Society, Bishop Reese explained, was a purely voluntary organization, formed long before the enactment of the eighteenth amendment, and is classified in church directories under the heading of "Organizations for social amelioration and advance." Its membership list is very small, it is said, the organization having experienced a dwindling of power since prohibition, as its main objective in the promulgation of its work was the teaching of temperance in opposition to the stand of the Anti-Saloon League for complete prohibition.

REPUDIATES SOCIETY

Reverend Reinheimer estimated the society's membership at approximately 5,000. It is not believed that there is any branch of the organization or members in this city or in Ohio.

Bishop Reese refuses to become embroiled in the generalities of Reverend Empringham's findings, declaring that it did not have the im-

primatur of the church and did not reflect the church's stand or the majority of its members.

"I believe in the enforcement of the Volstead law," Bishop Reese declared, "and I practice it, largely as a means toward training future citizens."

Following this statement by Bishop Reese is set forth the views of Right Rev. Charles P. Anderson, of the Chicago diocese:

CHICAGO, February 4.—The attitude of the Church Temperance Society in seeking modification of the national prohibition law is not reflected in the Episcopal Church in Chicago and surroundings, in the belief of the Right Rev. Charles P. Anderson, bishop of the Chicago diocese.

"The Church Temperance Society of the Episcopal Church is one of only small membership, and has no official connection with the church," Bishop Anderson said.

"I am not acquainted with the Rev. Dr. James Empringham, its superintendent, and to my knowledge there are no members of that society in Chicago."

Mr. MURPHY. Thank God for Ohio. [Applause.] Now, my friend from Illinois told you how they voted in Illinois. Let me tell you how Ohio voted when they had a chance to express how they felt. They voted 190,000 majority for a sober Ohio and America. That is the kind of people we have in Ohio, who believe in the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

Mr. KNUTSON. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MURPHY. You wet gentlemen have had days and days to talk about this, now we want a minute or two.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was going to suggest that the gentleman have 10 minutes more. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURPHY. Good, thank you.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to ask my friend if the referendum to which he refers was not taken after the soldiers were discharged, got back home, and participated in the vote?

Mr. MURPHY. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question. That is true. The soldiers voted for upholding the law and voted right; they knew the curse and you know it; if you want to deal with it fairly and look it squarely in the face. They talk about there being more booze now than before prohibition. That is such a ridiculous statement that I wonder, with the intelligence of this House, that they have listened to it as long as they have without rebuking the statement.

Mr. HUDSON. And does the gentleman recall that Michigan had a referendum vote upon this and went 270,000 dry?

Mr. MURPHY. That is the kind of folks we have in the Central West, and we are proud of them. Yes, and that vote was had after the soldiers were home. We believe in this Government, we believe in its Constitution, and we believe, not in law enforcement—I have a contempt for a citizen who has to be forced to observe the law—we believe in law observance.

Mr. LEAVITT. And is it not true that the vote referred to as a referendum in Illinois followed a statement sent out by the Anti-Saloon League requesting their followers not to vote in that election because it was a question put in a misleading way.

Mr. MURPHY. That is quite true.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what my colleague has said, but I have been unable so far to find out whether the gentleman favors my amendment, which proposes raising this amount from \$3,900,000 to \$14,994,000, with which to adequately enforce the law. Is the gentleman for this amendment to properly enforce the law?

Mr. MURPHY. Let me answer the gentleman's question. If I had the direction of the spending of the amount of money that the gentleman suggests as a total necessary to enforce the law, I would use it in trying to educate fellows like him. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman from Ohio know that an amendment that comes from the gentleman from Maryland is wet, ipso facto?

Mr. MURPHY. Absolutely. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the day of miracles has not passed. Whenever the gentleman from Maryland, the Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL, and the gentleman from Georgia, who, I hope, has won the reputation of being dry not only in precept but in practice, are found voting on the same side of a question the prohibition millennium must be near at hand. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the gentleman forgotten what happened to the Trojans when they let that wooden horse in? [Laughter.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the old-fashioned Bible that teaches that sometimes the Lord maketh the wrath of man to praise him. I am not responsible for the "wet" Mr. HILL getting on the side of the "dry" Mr. UPSHAW. I have contended from the beginning that we have played at the matter of guarding our coast against the pirate liquor ships of foreign lands. [Applause.] I indorse the bill of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] invoking an old constitutional law concerning slavery which would make a pirate of every ship from a foreign land that got clearance papers to a friendly nation and then came here roosting out yonder on ram row like the very cormorants of hell to violate our Constitution, defying the flag of a friendly nation, while debauching the citizenship of this country. I said on this floor three years ago that I was in favor of calling out the Navy, every vessel if necessary, to say to these devilish foreign ships, "If you defy our Constitution and our flag, you go to the bottom of the sea." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to admit that I am afraid of Greeks bearing gifts, especially when they come from Baltimore. [Laughter.] I am willing to admit that the past of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] lays him under suspicion. I am willing to admit that he, deep down in his soul, wants to use this before the wet galleries of Baltimore in order to increase his majority; but I am in favor of feeding him out of his own spoon. I am in favor of following Admiral Billard's suggestion that we bottle up the whole American coast, saying to these pirates' liquor ships, "You shall not enter one foot of American territory." [Applause.]

Enemy ships did not enter when we were at war with a foreign nation. Who ever heard of German vessels landing on American soil after the war began? The Government was a unit in its purpose with a militant conscience and kept all enemy ships from touching American shores. And I want not a mere gesture to foreign lands; I want the strong fist of American manhood and the majesty of American law to say to other lands: "We have outlawed intoxicating liquors, and you shall not flaunt our constitutional law." Let nobody talk about the cost. The few little millions that this would cost are not to be considered beside the countless millions that have been saved. We saw crocodile tears shed on this floor a few weeks ago about the cost of enforcing this law. I remind the wets, whose motives may not be commendable in this matter, that the cost of \$2,500,000,000 as the bar bill alone was laid every year at the door of the saloon. That was the annual income of the saloons in this country, and what is a paltry little \$7,000,000 or \$14,000,000 beside that? [Applause.]

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

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. What are these paltry sums, I say, compared with the majesty of our Constitution? When an alien country offered insult to the American flag we threw nearly \$30,000,000,000 at the feet of the Goddess of Liberty. We dedicated it in prodigal loyalty to the triumph of American ideals and the safety of American homes. [Applause.] And I want the word to go out far and wide that the American Nation is no longer playing with this law, that we shut the doors of America to every liquor pirate that tries to challenge the supremacy of the American Constitution and the American flag.

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

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am in accord with much that the gentleman says. Does the gentleman think that hanging is too good for those who operate on rum row?

Mr. UPSHAW. I have already advocated sending them to the bottom of the sea.

However, I would like to give them time to pray, because, God knows, they are not fit to die. Take this last word, and I speak seriously. I indorse what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] has so eloquently said about the influence of American

motherhood on the youth of to-day. And that is one reason for my voting to put an American patrol boat on every 10 miles of our prohibition shores. Let the word go out the world around that American shores are protected and pirate liquor ships will stop their impudent and devilish business.

Again I declare that the fact that the "wet" gentleman from Maryland who proposed this wholesome amendment shall not make me refuse to vote for the ample Coast Guard protection which I have advocated for years.

I do not propose to allow any "blooming wet" to beat me trying to enforce our prohibition law.

Listen, gentlemen of this Congress, that beautiful flag above the Speaker's chair has never dipped its colors to any defiant foreign foe, and, God help us, that flag that has been made stainless before the eyes of the watching world shall not now lower its majesty and glory one inch to rum runners from abroad or bootleggers, liars, and cowards at home. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, and gentlemen of the House, I am one of those who believe that the Volstead law should be modified. I shall not vote for this amendment. In my judgment there are some classed "wets" and there are some classed "drys" who do more harm to the cause which they are supposed to be championing than any possible good they may do. I wish to call attention to the fact that the American Federation of Labor indicated its position in favor of modification of the Volstead Act during the hearings before the Judiciary Committee during the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress. A Member who has spoken a few minutes ago tells of his holding a labor-union card. In the same breath he casts reflections on the American Federation of Labor's indorsement of modification.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell the House where the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers stand? [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER. I will tell you at a later date; but I will say the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of which I am also a member, has not anywhere near as large a membership as the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHAFER. As soon as I finish the statement I would be glad to yield. I am a labor man who believes the American Federation of Labor has rendered valuable service to the laboring people of the United States as well as to the Nation. There are some men who when campaigning for public office exhibit their union labor card and say to the workers: "Here is my card; I belong to this labor organization." But their votes in different legislative bodies do not square with the legislative program of organized labor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Not now.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be too late.

Mr. SCHAFER. With reference to the Illinois referendum brought to the attention of the House during the address a few minutes ago by our distinguished colleague, Mr. SABATH, an antimodification Member interjected and stated that the antimodificationists sent out word to their friends not to vote on the referendum, and in substance that the referendum vote was no criterion as to the wishes of the voters of the State of Illinois. The question as submitted on the ballot was, "Shall the existing State and Federal laws be modified so as to permit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of beer (containing less than 4 per cent by volume of alcohol) and light wines for home consumption?" The question was voted on by the people on November 7, 1922, with the following results: Yes 1,065,242 and no 512,111, a majority for beer and light wines of 553,131.

Now, let us see whether the vote is a criterion of the will of the Illinois voters. In this vote the interest was so intense that 92 per cent of the highest legislative vote was cast on this modification ballot, and the vote of Cook County alone reached 95 per cent of the highest legislative vote cast and 91 per cent of the vote for the head of the ticket. I have in my office a petition signed by over 4,000 dirt farmers of Wisconsin asking for a modification of the Volstead Act—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I shall not if the gentleman will answer the question put by our distinguished colleague from Ohio whether or not his locomotive engineers and firemen are for prohibition; if not, I will object.

Mr. SCHAFER. I will answer that question.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman is against his organization? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Just a minute until I handle this man [Mr. BLANTON]. [Laughter.] In reference to his reservation to object, my distinguished colleague from Texas said he would object if I did not answer the question. In view of the fact I take very little time on the floor of this House and the gentleman takes here hours and hours, and the gentleman extends in the Record page after page, I think it is somewhat extraordinary for him to threaten to object if I did not answer a question.

Now, in answer to the question, I will state that I am a member in good standing of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, as well as of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and up to this time I have not received a communication, a regularly authenticated communication, from either of those great labor organizations to indicate that they are working at cross purposes with the stand of the American Federation of Labor. According to my observation, the brotherhoods are working in harmony with the American Federation of Labor on legislation, and if the gentleman will furnish me with an authentic document showing that they have appeared against modification—

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, I can give him that information in a moment.

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is it not a fact that in 1914 at the triennial convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, held at Cleveland, Ohio, and again in 1918, they took this position, and the resolution passed that convention unanimously pledging the organization in its best efforts to support State and Federal prohibition of the liquor traffic?

Mr. SCHAFER. I admit your statement; but I will say this, that that resolution did not consider the attitude of this organization on a question that was not then on the statute books. There is a good deal of question as to whether one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol is the highest amount of alcoholic content not to be intoxicating.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If you were a member of that organization at that time—the delegates representing you voted for State prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Mr. SCHAFER. Well, State prohibition is not the Volstead Act. [Applause.] People have differences of opinion as to whether one-half of 1 per cent is the maximum per cent not to be intoxicating. I wish you would bring the question before the next convention of the brotherhood for a vote, the same resolution as passed by the American Federation of Labor in favor of modification subsequent to the enactment of the Volstead law.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It was the American Federation of Labor that took the attitude you speak of, was it not?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. You will stand by the declaration of an organized convention like the Brotherhood of Engineers, will you not?

Mr. SCHAFER. The Volstead Act was not a law at that time, and they could not, of course, indorse a question or act upon a question that was not written then on the statute books. It is ridiculous for the gentleman to bring that indorsement of prohibition up here as an argument to indicate the brotherhood's stand against modification.

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

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. The gentleman says that the Volstead law was not then before the people. Does not the gentleman know that the Volstead law was made mandatory by the passage of the eighteenth amendment, and that the Volstead law is simply the eighteenth amendment in action, and that the eighteenth amendment had been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. SCHAFER. In reply to that I suggest that my distinguished colleague go and get a copy of the eighteenth amendment and read the language over very carefully, and show me where the eighteenth amendment says that more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol is intoxicating. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I suggest that the gentleman also ask the gentleman from Georgia to read the minority opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, which was a 5 by 4 opinion, on the Volstead Act.

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes. I kindly request the gentleman from Georgia to read that opinion.

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

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. I submit to the gentleman, in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN], that the question of minority does not enter into the decisions of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is the last word to every loyal American.

Mr. SCHAFER. But I submit to the gentleman this: Does he think that if a great man who sits on the bench in the Supreme Court reaches an opinion that we could have more than one-half of 1 per cent without violating the eighteenth amendment, he should be charged with undermining the Constitution and not being loyal to the eighteenth amendment?

Mr. UPSHAW. The Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that the American Congress was competent to interpret the eighteenth amendment, which outlawed the liquor traffic.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman from Georgia use every effort to provide that a modification bill may be brought before this House, so that the Members may have an opportunity to cast their vote so that the sovereign voters of their districts may have an opportunity to observe the gentleman's vote?

Mr. UPSHAW. "The gentleman from Georgia" is a constitutional American, and he will not stand for any law passed by this House which—

Mr. SCHAFER. Then the gentleman holds to the belief and would have us infer that the Justices of the Supreme Court who held that more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol was not in violation of the eighteenth amendment are un-American?

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

Mr. UPSHAW. I did not finish.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SABATH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will suspend until the Chair restores order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, you can not take a gentleman off the floor by a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] rises to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the rules, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman wait a minute? Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SCHAFER. I certainly do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SCHAFER. Certainly I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to ask whether it would be in order to offer a resolution inviting Jack Dempsey to participate in this contest upon the floor? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman now yield to me?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Wisconsin has convinced every Congressman in this House that his statement is correct; that there are some wet speakers who make wet speeches and hurt their cause. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Well, I would like to state to the gentleman from Texas that I do not make it a test for any Member of the House on the question of whether he is a wet or a dry. If a man is with his constituents nine hundred and ninety-nine times on economic and political questions and is against them on one question, be it modification or antimodification of the Volstead Act, I do not believe in making that a test of the Member. In a representative Government I do not believe in testing a man on one vote, as our ardent dry organizations do.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman one question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that a request for the right to revise and extend remarks does not extend the gentleman's time for debate. The gentleman's time for debate has been exhausted and the question is: Is there objection?

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say that the committee desires to finish this bill this afternoon. I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Ohio, but will object to any more requests for extensions of time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPEAKS. In view of the fact that there has been more or less humor in the whole situation here I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question in all seriousness. As a member of the locomotive engineer organization, and as a man who runs a locomotive engine, would the gentleman advocate modification of the Volstead law as a means of better assuring the safety of the millions of people who utilize the railroads of the country for traveling purposes?

Mr. SCHAFER. In answering that I wish to state that the consumption of a glass of 2½ per cent beer following a hard trip on a railroad or before going out would not jeopardize the life or the limbs of the engine employees or the general public. There are many ways where you could protect the lives of the workers and the general public by enacting legislation beneficial to these people, which the great brotherhoods have repeatedly asked Congress to enact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired. All time has expired.

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

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, may the amendment be again reported?

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HILL of Maryland) there were—ayes 8, noes 110.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Coast Guard, as follows:

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

When the Treasury bill was under consideration I called attention to the fact that the Coast Guard had an appropriation of \$12,717,804 to be devoted exclusively in the enforcement of prohibition, in addition to the regular appropriation of \$10,635,685, making a total of \$23,353,489 for next year. Last year the Prohibition Bureau received \$11,000,000 as its specific allowance, which was increased by a further appropriation of \$9,649,257 for the prohibition activities of the Coast Guard. Now comes this deficiency appropriation of \$7,738,291.96—making the total appropriation \$28,407,548.96 for the enforcement of prohibition for 1926.

You know a deficiency bill is a compassionate bill. It is one that takes compassion upon the various bureaus and provides them with additional funds which they were not able to get in the ordinary course of business negotiation with the Budget Bureau or a hard-boiled committee. For instance, take this provision in the deficiency bill of \$3,900,000 for the building of new ships to be used by the Coast Guard.

I believe in being fair about these things. If anybody were to bring on the floor of this House under any other appropriation bill a proposal for the construction of a new warship for the Navy, it would have a mighty slim chance. Why show this favoritism to this particular activity of the Federal Government?

I do not disguise my sentiments in any way upon this prohibition-enforcement proposition. I am against the eighteenth amendment upon the ground that its avowed object is to curtail human rights. As students of American history and of the origin of this Government, I ask you to give the subject just for a few moments your dispassionate consideration.

The eighteenth amendment, or so-called prohibition amendment, in my opinion, is a blemish upon the magnificent instrument of government created by the founders of this Nation. It is a flareback to medievalism in the evolution of public opinion.

When our Constitution was framed, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and many of the greatest Americans in the thirteen Colonies objected, and the instrument was finally only adopted in their respective States upon the understanding that at the very first meeting of the Congress the 10 amendments protecting the fundamental rights of liberty embodied in our Bill of Rights should be inserted.

These 10 amendments were intended to enlarge human liberty, to protect the citizen in his right to practice his religion, to secure a free press, to guarantee the rights of property, the right to bear arms, and to conserve the sovereignty of the respective States. They all enlarged human liberty, extended human rights, but the eighteenth amendment is the only amendment in the history of the United States that is intended to, and does, curtail and diminish human liberty.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Take the fifth amendment to the Constitution and read what it says:

That no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Is not liberty of importance to the individual even though it may extend to so trifling a matter as his apparel or his diet? The eighteenth amendment is simply a sumptuary law engrafted out of place in the Constitution of the United States. Gentlemen assail those of us opposing this particular constitutional amendment and classify us with the so-called "Wets." That is only resorting to the childish practice of "calling names."

I do not feel that I should be put in a category of those encouraging nullification. I am a firm believer in temperance, but I do not believe in total abstinence, nor in forcing it upon any human being.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. BOX. Does the gentleman understand that he has a right to attack the Constitution of the United States as to the validity of an amendment which has been put there by the solemn action of the people and the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The first amendment to the Constitution accords to every citizen freedom of speech and the right to protest against any law under which he feels he is aggrieved. When I arise here in this House or anywhere else and attack this amendment I do so under the authority and protection of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The fifth amendment, which the gentleman read, says "except by due process of law." Does not the gentleman consider the eighteenth amendment and the statute passed by Congress to be due process of law?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No; I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. What could be more "a due process of law"?

Mr. GRIFFIN. "Due process of law" means the law of the land. The highest law of the land is that embodied in the Bill of Rights protecting the citizen against invasions of his liberty, and neither the Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States, nor even a majority of the people of the United States have the right, although they may arrogate the power, to deprive a minority of the sacred guarantees of the Constitution. Those guarantees were put into the Constitution by virtue of a sacred compact entered into by the thirteen Colonies upon their adoption of the Federal organic law. It was under such a compact that the smallest States in the Union were forever guaranteed the right to have a representation of two Senators in the United States Senate.

If an amendment were adopted, changing that system of representation, assuming that it could be adopted by a majority of the people of the United States, would that not be a breach of faith? Is it any less, then, a breach of good faith to nullify the original compact of the citizen with the Federal Government and with the other States of the Union by repealing the protective clauses of the Bill of Rights, which assure the citizen the guarantees of perpetual freedom?

Tyranny by the majority is no easier to bear than tyranny imposed by kings, aristocracies, or privy councils. It is true, it bears the semblance of conforming to the principles of democracy. But those principles have their limitations, as the

founders of our Republic fully understood. Why did they put in our Constitution the Bill of Rights? For no other reason than to protect minorities.

White flour made into cake or bread is unwholesome and positively injurious. Perhaps it has done more harm to the race than alcoholic beverages. With the poorer classes bread is truly the staff of life. They are the ones who suffer most. Many children grow to manhood suffering from malnutrition, impoverished blood, and depleted nerve power through an unbalanced diet, chiefly composed of white bread. Its damage to youth is almost incalculable, unquestionably greater than that inflicted upon the constitution of older folks through indulgence in alcohol.

Suppose, now, the knowledge of this truth became sufficiently general to incite the formation of an "antiwhite-flour league," and it were backed by the wealth of the country and fortified by the support of religious organizations. And suppose they sought to engraft upon our Constitution another prohibition amendment couched in the following language:

The manufacture and sale of white flour for the making of bread and cake is prohibited.

What would happen to such a proposal? I believe that white flour is a greater menace to health than alcoholic beverages ever were, or ever can be, and I never eat it. Yet I would not support such an amendment to our organic law.

Those who believe that it is the duty of the Government to protect the people from harmful beverages would logically be bound to protect the people from harmful foods; but would they ever accept such an amendment? They would laugh at the idea.

What is the difference? Or, in the slang of the day, "Where is the catch?" There is no difference whatever in principle. The "catch," or the solution of the puzzle, is in the difference in point of view. The antiliquor mind has infected itself with a moral fervor based on a revulsion against drunkenness and a hatred of "saloons," which they consider the source of untold evil. In that I believe they were right. The saloon should be doomed, and so long as the reformers confined their efforts to the abolition of that evil, there is hardly a respectable man or woman who would not indorse and support their efforts.

They soon changed, however, from opposition to the saloon to opposition to the things sold in the saloon. That was fundamentally wrong. The patronage of the saloon was limited and growing less every day. In many sections of New York City, for instance, saloon after saloon went out of existence because of waning patronage. Beer, wine, and whisky were sold in groceries for family needs. Beer or wine was served at the family table. Handed in this way overindulgence or drunkenness was exceedingly rare. The bottle of whisky was in the medicine chest for emergencies. That was the regimen that was completely upset by the sudden transition to absolute prohibition.

The result has been the establishment of home brewing and the introduction of the liquor still in the home. These are greater evils than that sought to be corrected. Families in which drunkenness was an utter stranger, accustomed to beer and wines, were suddenly deprived of what they considered an essential part of their household table supplies.

They did the only thing that remained for them to do. They made their own. The ancient household recipes were revived, and elderberry wine, raisin wine, and other ancient concoctions having the necessary flavor or "kick" were restored to the family larder. In such homes, and they are legion, the old status has been to some extent restored, but with this unfortunate consequence—that the shadow of hypocrisy and the gnawing consciousness of law violation disturb the peace of mind. This is the great wrong of such a tyranny of suppression. Decent, law-abiding people should not be subjected to such a hardship.

Then there is another consequence affecting the younger generation. What is their reaction to the disclosures thus made to them in the bosom of their own family? A perusal of the public press, with its daily recitals of immorality among the young, is the answer.

Then there is the saloon that was sought to be wiped out. Has that been accomplished? Yes; but in name only. The old-time corner saloon of the cities has changed the sign over its door: "Ales, wines, and whiskies," and the bottles of rye and bourbon in its windows have been replaced by others bearing the labels of ginger ale, sarsaparilla, and other liquids of stomach-destroying or of "belly wash" variety. Inside the swinging door the initiated can still get the stronger drink, but of such a vicious, unwholesome character, and at such exorbitant prices, that the health and pockets of the unfortu-

nate patrons are dangerously impaired. Three drinks of this stuff a day at 75 cents a "throw" waste enough of the workers' earnings to keep the whole family well supplied with wholesome meat, bread, and vegetables.

I am awed and perplexed by the persistence of the prohibition fanaticism. Its disciples are mad blind to all the signs and evidences of the utter failure of their propaganda.

There is not a city, town, or village in our land where this clandestine drinking and these blind tigers do not exist. And they always will exist, until the American people return to sanity and abolish the eighteenth amendment.

The decadence of youth—the ruin of morality—the wild orgy of murder, rapine, robbery that has followed the wake of prohibition seems to have no other effect than to stir them up to a wild rage for the wasting of millions of dollars for a futile, though more drastic enforcement. They have completely lost heads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Gentlemen talk here about the vote in Ohio of 180,000 majority, but there were 300,000 who voted against it, and so it is throughout every State in the Union. If a vote were taken in our State to-day a tremendous majority would be rolled up against the Volstead law.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair in his statement, and he understands that the statement he made about the vote in Ohio was inaccurate.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am talking about the vote—I understand it was 180,000 majority, but there were 300,000 that did not want it.

Mr. MURPHY. The vote was 500,000 and some odd for it—

Mr. GRIFFIN. And 300,000 against it.

Mr. MURPHY. We believe in that sort of government, do we not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. We, in New York, do not. The Constitution of the United States was intended to protect the minority States in their fundamental rights and liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

BATTLE FIELDS COMMISSION, PETERSBURG, VA.

For payment to Col. James Anderson, Springfield, Mass., \$965.22, and to Capt. Carter R. Bishop, Richmond, Va., \$520, as compensation and reimbursement for expenses incurred as members of the commission authorized by the act entitled "An act to provide for the inspection of the battle fields of the siege of Petersburg, Va.," approved February 11, 1925, fiscal year 1926; in all, \$1,485.22.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 7, strike out the word "Richmond" and insert the word "Petersburg."

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I would like to address myself a few moments to the House in explanation of the item in this bill to which the amendment is offered. This morning we heard the beautiful tribute paid by our colleague, Major STEDMAN, to General Stuart of the Confederate Army, and it seems appropriate that this opportunity should arise which permits me to pay a tribute to a soldier of the Army of the Potomac. The story is an echo of days gone by—with possibly an appeal to sentiment, if you please to call it so. It will not, however, hurt the Members of this House to refrain a few moments from the necessary, but unromantic, task of spending the people's money to listen to a little sentiment.

Thirty years ago, on the 19th of January, the old soldiers of Lee and Jackson in Petersburg were celebrating, as was their annual custom, General Lee's birthday with a banquet. On that day all business is suspended in Petersburg, and the people of the city vie in honoring the old Confederate soldiers. It is their day—the city is theirs. As it happened—and I have always thought it was providential—an old soldier from Massachusetts, who fought with Grant in attacking Petersburg, was in town for the purpose of revisiting the scenes of his fighting life. He met the old soldiers in their gray uniforms, told them who he was, and they fraternized like brothers, as brave men always will. Bravery is not a matter of the color of the uniform. He was invited to the banquet for that night and accepted. When he was called on for a speech he gave it to

them straight from the shoulder, or as one of the old soldiers said, "He gave us Johnnies hell." He made no apologies for his course in doing his duty in trying to capture the city, nor did he criticize his opponents for holding a different opinion. When he finished his speech he was cheered to the echo. One enthusiast in gray moved that the "Yank" be made an honorary and associate member of the camp. He was elected unanimously and, so far as I know, is the only Federal soldier who holds the honor of being a member of a camp of Confederate veterans. And at this point I may also say that he has never missed a meeting of this camp of Confederate soldiers in Petersburg at the annual celebration of Lee's birthday since he has been elected.

He went back to Springfield, Mass., and persuaded his city to extend an invitation to the Confederate soldiers to visit it. The invitation was accepted, and the old Confederate soldiers from Petersburg were received with such generosity and courtesy and hospitality that a counterinvitation was extended to the Grand Army of the Republic in Springfield to visit Petersburg. Various courtesies have been extended between the two cities since. Petersburg looks on Springfield as a kindly neighbor, and for a stranger to say that he is from Springfield is the open sesame in Petersburg. Springfield is a name that is synonymous with courtesy and hospitality. Nothing could have been more appropriate than that Massachusetts and Virginia should have renewed old friendships. From the beginning of the history of the States they have clasped hands in a common cause. Only once have they disagreed, and then they fought it out like brothers and brave men. Patrick Henry's prophecy that the next gale from the North would bring a clash of resounding arms was answered by the men of Massachusetts almost as soon as he uttered it. George Washington, if I remember correctly, was made commander in chief of the forces of the United States under the old elm in Cambridge. It is true Adams and Jefferson at times disagreed, but their disagreement was always a matter of mental conclusion and not one of patriotism. John Marshall interpreted the Constitution and Webster upheld it. So it was then not unseemly that a citizen of Massachusetts should come to Virginia and be received with open arms.

James Anderson, of Springfield, Mass., is as well beloved in Petersburg as he is in his own home town—maybe more so, for prophets are sometimes ignored in their own country. We call him "Colonel" in Petersburg. It never occurred to me to ascertain whether he was brevetted on the field of action, but I know that he has been brevetted in the hearts and affections of our people. In the South we like to give titles to those we love, and "colonel" is a term of affection and respect for those we wish to dignify. Many a man has the soubriquet who never wore an officer's epaulets. Every man, woman, and child in Petersburg knows "Colonel Jim," as we call him. He possesses the kindly dignity and open heart to his fellow man, and manly courage with his friends and foes that entitle him to the designation. In my humble opinion he has done more to heal the wounds arising out of that fratricidal conflict of the sixties than any man now alive. The final word might be said of him, "He loves his fellow man."

When this commission was appointed to survey the battle fields around Petersburg he was put on the commission. Notwithstanding that the appropriation was not carried at that session of Congress with the authorization, yet he came down in his own car from Massachusetts, at his own expense, and spent a good part of the summer in carrying on the work of the commission. This item of the bill is to repay him for the expenses advanced by him in this behalf.

He lies now on a bed of sickness in a hospital in his native city, and I felt that I wanted, as a spokesman of the people of Petersburg, to lay on the pages of this journal a tribute to this soldier of the Federal Army, who has done all that lay within his power to bring about a united country. After all, gentlemen, I know of no higher praise that can be awarded a man than to say that for 30 years he labored to promote the harmonious union of his country.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS

Northwestern Branch, Milwaukee, Wis.: For repairing main roadway through the reservation, approximately one and one-fourth miles in length, \$17,500, to continue available until June 30, 1927.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFER: Page 44, line 10, after the comma after the word "length," strike out "\$17,500," and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the committee on recommending an appropriation to repair the main road at the National Military Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, northwestern branch, in the city of Milwaukee. I call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the fact that the Budget has authorized \$25,000 to be appropriated for the repair of this road. The hearings on the War Department appropriation bill, page 902, reveal the fact that estimates have been obtained by the Board of Managers and that the Board of Managers feel that the amount of \$25,000 is necessary properly to repair the road. I think that my amendment is fair. It merely provides the amount estimated by the Board of Managers and what the Budget has recommended as necessary. There are thousands of disabled veterans of all wars who are residents at this national home. I feel that sufficient funds should be appropriated to keep the main roads within the confines of the home in proper shape to add to the comfort of our disabled veterans and especially to the comfort of those who must travel this road in ambulances.

At the last session I offered an amendment to the appropriation covering the home to provide for the repair of these roads which failed of enactment. I am glad the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee made a personal visit to the northwestern branch and has made recommendation properly to repair the roads.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the committee felt that \$17,500 was sufficient to make the repairs indicated to this road. The first estimate presented about a year ago to the committee was that \$10,000 would do the work. It is true that the Budget asks for \$25,000 this year. I personally looked at this road last November. The road is in bad shape and needs repair, but there is ample material, macadam, in the road now. All it needs is a tarvia resurfacing, and the committee believes \$17,500 is sufficient for the purpose.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER) there were—ayes 4, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, it is unfortunate that our distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] is prevented from being present here to-day to defend this appropriation. I have been asked to make a brief statement on it, and I refer to the amendment which was offered in the bill and successfully offered, making an appropriation of \$374,462.02 as an interest payment to the Omaha Indians. Now, I think in the discussion the other day there was one vital point that was not clearly brought out. The Court of Claims has very rightly stated as a judgment \$122,000, in round numbers, is the principal sum due the Omaha Indians. Then they started to find a judgment for interest charge at 5 per cent, which would be a total of \$374,000—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate on this amendment has been exhausted. The amendment passed under the five-minute rule, and the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. The only thing I think it is necessary to say on this point of order is I moved to strike out the last word in the bill and under that motion to strike out the last word in the bill I think I am permitted to discuss any phase of that bill which I desire to.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order that the last word in the bill is "1926." The gentleman is not permitted under his motion to go back and discuss the entire bill, which has been repeatedly held by both the Speaker and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SNELL. After the generous discussion on this bill this afternoon it seems to me rather far-fetched to raise that technicality at this stage of the game. I appreciate the gentleman has the right to make the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is one of the last men on earth who should attempt to

lecture me on the ethics of the House. I have a right to make this point of order at any time, and I submit this is the time to make it. The amendment to which the gentleman refers has been debated and passed by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union several days ago, and it is not in order to go back now and discuss it under a motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to allow me to ask the gentleman from New York a question? Without discussing the merits or the demerits of this particular amendment, I desire to ask the gentleman if in all his experience here he has heard of a case where an amendment has been passed that has been discussed at length and finally adopted and placed in the bill that when the reading of the bill has been concluded and the committee is ready to rise, I repeat, has the gentleman ever heard of such a thing as making a five-minute speech on a motion to strike out the last word?

Mr. SNELL. There has been a general discussion on the whole bill this afternoon. I appreciate the gentleman has a right to make the point of order—I am not discussing that—but I think he ought to be a little more liberal as long as we had general discussion of the bill this afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. And this discussion is on something we have already passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Ohio was to strike out the word "1926" and debate will have to be confined to the subject of striking out that word.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion to strike out the enacting clause of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the first amendment, then. The gentleman can not swap horses in the middle of the stream.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I submit I have a right to make that motion.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has been recognized for five minutes on the other proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's recognition to this point has been on the first amendment.

Mr. BEGG. I am making a new motion. I am asking a new recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment made by the gentleman from Ohio will be withdrawn. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEGG. Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, as I started to say a moment ago, I think there is one point that ought to be—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the gentleman is not in order. I renew my point of order.

Mr. BEGG. I refuse to be interrupted unless the gentleman is going to do it in accordance with parliamentary law.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman must confine his remarks to the proposed amendment.

Mr. BEGG. I have not had a chance yet. I did not get more than four words out of my mouth.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. The gentleman started out to make the same speech.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman presumes to know what I am going to say.

Mr. RANKIN. He said he was going on to discuss the proposition he started out with. I make the point of order that he must confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. BEGG. Well, members of the committee, I think the procedure so far is perhaps more effective in getting before the membership of this House what I wanted to get before it than if I had been permitted to talk three or four minutes.

What I wanted to point out was this: The Court of Claims found a decision on the principal sum for \$122,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under a motion to strike out the enacting clause the gentleman can only discuss what appears in the bill under the enacting clause, not what it will be when it is adopted by the House.

Mr. BEGG. A motion to strike out is in order at any time, and we are now in the committee, and all amendments adopted by the committee are part of the discussion that the person offering to strike out the enacting clause is entitled to discuss.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not a part of the bill until it comes before the House.

Mr. BEGG. It is a part of the bill up to the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that in his view the motion to strike out the enacting clause brings before the committee the entire bill. The motion can be made at any time before the committee concludes consideration of the bill, and when it is made it relates, as the Chair thinks, to everything contained in the bill. There is a ruling in Hinds, Volume V, section 5336, page 177, where the question was raised whether certain remarks were in order on a motion to strike out the enacting clause. The Chair will read:

5336. On a motion to strike out the enacting clause a Member may debate the merits of the bill but must confine himself to its provisions.

On July 1, 1841, the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering a bill "to appropriate the proceeds of the sale of the public lands and to grant preemption rights," the pending motion being to strike out the enacting clause of the bill, on which extended debate had taken place.

While Mr. Aaron V. Brown, of Tennessee, had the floor, Mr. Christopher Morgan, of New York, asked if they were to be detained "by discussing everything under the heavens." The gentleman's remarks had no reference to the subject under consideration.

The Chairman (Mr. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania) stated that the question then pending was on striking out the enacting clause of the bill, and the gentleman had a right to go into the whole merits of it, but the gentleman must confine himself to the provisions of the bill.

That is the only precedent that the Chair has been able to find at the present moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. My point of order is not based on the contention that the gentleman can not make his motion to strike out the enacting clause, but that the amendment is not a part of the bill within the meaning of that decision, and does not become a part of it until that amendment is approved by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. In reply the Chair will say that the only action of the committee will be to report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass. That will include a recommendation by the Committee of the Whole that the so-called Howard amendment be agreed to. The motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] will prevent that action being taken if his motion prevails.

Mr. BARKLEY. And also any other provisions of it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is for the committee to determine. Of course the striking out of the enacting clause will defeat the whole bill. But the Chair does not feel that he can consider the merits as to the effect of the motion or upon the point of order. The gentleman from Ohio is discussing the reasons for and the effects of his motion. The Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. BEGG. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman on the minority side will permit me to proceed for about two minutes, because that is about the length of time I wanted to consume.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has already made that statement in his speech heretofore.

Mr. BEGG. The Court of Claims found there was due the Omaha Indians, in round figures, \$122,000. Then the court started to render a decision which contained a finding that there was an interest charge due of \$374,000, when the attorney for the Government called the attention of the court to the fact that the court was without jurisdiction to make a finding for an interest charge.

Now, here is the point I want the House to keep clearly in mind: If there had not been a carrying up of that case by the claimants to the Supreme Court of the United States, there would have been an element of doubt as to whether or not they were entitled to the interest. But, as so often happens, a claimant is dissatisfied with the decision; he carries his case up and the lower court's finding is sustained.

Now, the case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States by the claimants and the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the finding of the Court of Claims, to wit, that they were not entitled to an interest charge. I want the House to have that information and I want to call the attention of the House to another fact. There seemed to be some alarm about the fact that the Appropriations Committee was usurping its authority in not appropriating, because we had passed a law specifically authorizing it. However, all that law did was to make this money available, so as not to make it subject to a point of order if the Appropriations Committee found it to be due. In their investigations they find—or they must have found—that it was not due, else they would have brought in a provision carrying the appropriation.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman said the higher court affirmed the judgment of the lower court, holding that there was no interest due. Does not the gentleman know that the lower court, in its original finding, held they were entitled to interest and it was only disallowed because the attorney for the Government called their attention to the fact that they were without jurisdiction to allow interest.

Mr. BEGG. I made that statement very clearly.

Mr. BYRNS. I did not so understand the gentleman.

Mr. BEGG. Yes; and I will make it plain so that the gentleman will understand, because there are no dollars in it for me either way. I said that the Court of Claims found \$122,000 due as principal and started to allow \$374,000 as interest, when the attorney for the Government called their attention to the fact that they had no jurisdiction to find any interest due. Then they carried the case to the Supreme Court, and according to the gentleman's own committee report it appears:

The modified decision of the Court of Claims rendering judgment in favor of the Indians in the sum of \$122,295.81 and eliminating any provision for interest was rendered on June 10, 1918.

On appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States that court affirmed the judgment of the Court of Claims as to the disallowance of interest.

Mr. BYRNS. Certainly.

Mr. BEGG. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. And there is a statute which forbids the payment of interest.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Kansas calls my attention to another fact, that there is even a statute prohibiting the payment of interest. I give the House that information on the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object. I think it is time we voted on this bill.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio be given two more minutes in order that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understood the gentleman from Ohio, when reading a moment ago, to say that the Supreme Court in its opinion affirmed the modified judgment of the lower court?

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman want the exact language?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, the gentleman himself read "modified judgment."

Mr. BEGG. No; I did not. I said affirmed the judgment of the Court of Claims as to the disallowance of interest.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the original judgment of the court below, as I understand, was that the claimants should have principal and interest.

Mr. BEGG. No; the gentleman is in error.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And then the counsel for the Government called the attention of the court to the fact that the statute forbade the granting of interest; thereupon they modified their original judgment, and then the claimants took the case to the Supreme Court. Only a few moments ago did not the gentleman himself read the words "modified judgment" in what he read? Please read what the gentleman read a few moments ago.

Mr. BEGG. I will do that, but before doing so I want to read the statute with reference to an interest charge. Now, mind you, this interest, as attempted to be allowed in the original judgment, was all prior to the rendering of the judgment, and the statute reads:

No interest shall be allowed on any claim up to the time of the rendition of judgment thereon by the Court of Claims, unless upon a contract expressly stipulating for the payment of interest.

Now, there was no contract and there was no judgment. The Court of Claims started to render a judgment when their attention was called to the fact that they had no jurisdiction to do so. The case was carried to the Supreme Court by the claimants and the Supreme Court reaffirmed the finding of the Court of Claims as to the disallowance of interest. Now,

then, on what ground can we override that kind of a decision?

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I know you are all anxious to go home. You are anxious to get through with this bill to-night, and I am going to detain you only a little bit; just long enough to say that I am surprised at the action of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, in injecting an argument here so out of place, it seems to me, and not in harmony with the well-settled procedure of the House.

I have no argument to make on the legal phase of this question. I could not make an argument in five minutes; that would not be possible. I only want to say to you, gentlemen, that we have discussed this matter for more than a year now, off and on. Practically every Member of this House is entirely familiar with the situation. Either it is right or it is wrong for this House now to pass judgment favorably upon a former action by the House, by the Senate, and with the approval of our President. One of two procedures is right, and one must be wrong. I am of opinion it will be the right and the fair thing for us now to say to these Indians that the Congress, having passed their bill authorizing this appropriation, the President having approved it, the Budget Bureau having estimated for it, the hour has arrived now when we ought to close the discussion and say to them that their money will be paid. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SIMMONS. The statement was made by the gentleman from Ohio that the bill authorizing this payment did not direct the payment, but that it contained a proviso, if the Appropriations Committee found it due. I have here the bill which is in the regular form authorizing the appropriation of a specific amount, with no proviso giving the Committee on Appropriations the authority that the gentleman from Ohio states; and may I ask the gentleman further this question?

The gentleman from Ohio read the statute, saying that interest was not authorized, was not this authority on the part of Congress directly authorizing this payment passed years after the general statute to which the gentleman referred, and does it not necessarily supersede it?

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, yes.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOWARD. I will.

Mr. BROWNING. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the statute expressly provided that the Court of Claims should not render a judgment for interest; and was not that the only thing the Supreme Court decided?

Mr. HOWARD. I so understood it.

Mr. BROWNING. And the fact is this Congress in exercising its judgment said that this interest should be allowed, and passed an authorizing act to that effect.

Mr. HOWARD. That is the situation exactly.

Mr. BROWNING. And directing the Appropriations Committee or this Congress to make this appropriation?

Mr. HOWARD. That is it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And if your claim should be disallowed we would be disregarding the action of a former Congress.

Mr. HOWARD. That is right. I do not think we will. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that on a motion to strike out the enacting clause only two speeches may be made, one for and one against. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out the enacting clause of the bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration H. R. 8722, the deficiency appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Howard amendment.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other amendments on which a separate vote is demanded? If not the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, after line 2, insert: "To pay the Omaha Tribe of Indians of Nebraska, in accordance with the act of Congress approved February 9, 1925, estimated for by the Budget Bureau and forwarded to the House of Representatives by the President and printed in House Document No. 617, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session, the sum of \$374,465.02."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWARD and Mr. OLDFIELD) there were—ayes 101, noes 92.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 108, answered "present" 2, not voting 140, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—181

Abernethy	Dickinson, Mo.	Larsen	Sandlin
Allgood	Doughton	Lazaro	Schafer
Andresen	Dowell	Leavitt	Sears, Fla.
Arnold	Drewry	Little	Sears, Nebr.
Auf der Heide	Driver	Lowrey	Shallenberger
Bacon	Edwards	Lodder	Simmons
Bailey	Eslick	Lyon	Sinclair
Bankhead	Evans	McClinton	Sinnott
Barkley	Faust	McDuffie	Smith
Beck	Fisher	McKeown	Smithwick
Bell	Fletcher	McMillan	Speaks
Berger	Frear	McReynolds	Spearing
Black, Tex.	Fulmer	McSwain	Stegall
Bland	Garber	McSweeney	Stedman
Blanton	Gardner, Ind.	Major	Stevenson
Bloom	Garner, Tex.	Manlove	Swank
Boies	Gasque	Mansfield	Swing
Bowling	Gibson	Mapes	Taylor, Tenn.
Box	Gifford	Mead	Taylor, W. Va.
Boylan	Goldsborough	Montague	Temple
Brand, Ga.	Goodwin	Mooney	Thomas
Briggs	Green, Fla.	Moore, Ky.	Tillman
Browne	Greenwood	Moore, Va.	Timberlake
Browning	Griffin	Morehead	Underwood
Buchanan	Hadley	Morrow	Upshaw
Bulwinkle	Hammer	Nelson, Mo.	Vaile
Burdick	Hare	Nelson, Wis.	Vinson, Ga.
Busby	Harrison	Norton	Vinson, Ky.
Byrna	Hawes	O'Connell, R. L.	Volgt
Canfield	Hill, Ala.	O'Connor, La.	Warren
Cannon	Hill, Wash.	Oldfield	Weaver
Carter, Okla.	Houston	Oliver, N.Y.	Wefald
Chapman	Howard	Parks	White, Kans.
Christopherson	Huddleston	Peery	Whitehead
Cleary	Hudson	Quin	Whittington
Collier	Hudspeth	Ragon	Williams, Tex.
Colton	Hull, Tenn.	Rainey	Williamson
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Tex.	Rankin	Wilson, La.
Cooper, Wis.	Kemp	Rathbone	Wilson, Miss.
Crisp	Kerr	Rayburn	Winter
Crosser	Kincheloe	Rogers	Woodruff
Crowther	Knutson	Romjue	Woodrum
Davis	Kopp	Rubey	Wurzbach
Deal	Kurtz	Rutherford	
Denison	Kvale	Sanders, Tex.	
Dickinson, Iowa	Lankford		

NAYS—108

Ackerman	Curry	Irwin	Snell
Adkins	Davenport	James	Sosnowski
Aldrich	Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	Sprout, Ill.
Allen	Elliot	Johnson, Ind.	Sprout, Kans.
Andrew	Ellis	Ketcham	Stalker
Anthony	Esterly	Lehlbach	Stephens
Arentz	Fairchild	Letts	Strong, Kans.
Bachmann	Fish	MacGregor	Strother
Barbour	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Magee, N. Y.	Summers, Wash.
Beers	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Magee, Pa.	Taylor, N. J.
Begg	Foss	Magrady	Thatcher
Bowles	Frea	Martin, Mass.	Tilson
Bowman	French	Miller	Tinkham
Brigham	Frithingham	Montgomery	Tolley
Britten	Furlow	Morgan	Treadway
Bramm	Goeman	Murphy	Uddike
Burtness	Hall, Ind.	Nelson, Me.	Vare
Burton	Hall, N. Dak.	Newton, Miss.	Vincent, Mich.
Butler	Hardy	Patterson	Wainwright
Campbell	Hawley	Phillips	Wason
Chalmers	Hershey	Purnell	Watres
Chindblom	Hickey	Reece	Watson
Clague	Hill, Md.	Reed, N. Y.	Wheeler
Cole	Hoch	Rowbottom	White, Ms.
Cooper, Ohio	Hogg	Sanders, N. Y.	Wolverton
Coyle	Hooper	Seger	Wood
Crumpacker	Hull, William E.	Sireve	Wyant

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

McFadden McLaughlin, Mich.

NOT VOTING—140

Almon	Fuller	LaGuardia	Ransley
Appleby	Funk	Lampert	Reed, Ark.
Aswell	Gallivan	Lanham	Reid, Ill.
Ayres	Gambrill	Lea, Calif.	Robinson, Iowa
Bacharach	Garrett, Tenn.	Leatherwood	Robston, Ky.
Beedy	Garrett, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Bixler	Gilbert	Lindsay	Sabath
Black, N. Y.	Glynn	Lineberger	Schneider
Brand, Ohio	Golder	Linthicum	Scott
Carew	Graham	Luca	Somers, N. Y.
Carpenter	Green, Iowa	McLeod	Stobbs
Carrs	Griest	Madden	Strong, Pa.
Carter, Calif.	Hale	Martin, La.	Sullivan
Celler	Hastings	Menges	Summers, Tex.
Collins	Haugen	Merritt	Swartz
Connery	Hayden	Michaelson	Sweet
Connolly, Pa.	Holaday	Michener	Swoope
Corning	Hull, Morton D.	Milligan	Taber
Cox	Jacobstein	Mills	Taylor, Colo.
Cramton	Jeffers	Moore, Ohio	Thayer
Cullen	Jenkins	Morin	Thompson
Darrow	Johnson, Ky.	Newton, Mo.	Thurston
Davey	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Tincher
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Tucker
Dickstein	Jones	Oliver, Ala.	Tydings
Dominick	Kahn	Parker	Underhill
Douglass	Kearns	Peavey	Vestal
Doyle	Keller	Perkins	Walters
Drane	Kelly	Perlman	Weller
Dyer	Kendall	Porter	Welsh
Fenn	Kiefner	Pou	Williams, Ill.
Flaherty	Kless	Prall	Wingo
Fort	Kindred	Pratt	Wright
Fredericks	King	Quayle	Yates
Freeman	Kunz	Ramsayer	Zihlman

So the amendment was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. Wingo (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).
 Mr. Somers of New York (for) with Mr. Appleby (against).
 Mr. Peavey (for) with Mr. Kiefner (against).
 Mr. Weller (for) with Mr. Madden (against).
 Mr. Hayden (for) with Mr. Luce (against).
 Mr. O'Connell of New York (for) with Mr. Funk (against).
 Mr. Carrs (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Schneider (for) with Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania (against).
 Mr. Kindred (for) with Mr. Griest (against).
 Mr. Garrett of Texas (for) with Mr. Williams of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Prall (for) with Mr. Swoope (against).
 Mr. Hastings (for) with Mr. Golder (against).
 Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania (against).
 Mr. Aswell (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).
 Mr. Carew (for) with Mr. Pratt (against).
 Mr. Lampert (for) with Mr. Fenn (against).
 Mr. O'Connor of New York (for) with Mr. Carter of California (against).
 Mr. Doyle (for) with Mr. Graham (against).
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Newton of Missouri (against).
 Mr. Lindsay (for) with Mr. Fuller (against).
 Mr. Kunz (for) with Mr. Kendall (against).
 Mr. Quayle (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).
 Mr. Lee of Georgia (for) with Mr. Kless (against).
 Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Oliver of Alabama (against).
 Mr. Black of New York (for) with Mr. Bixler (against).
 Mr. Martin of Louisiana (for) with Mr. Mills (against).
 Mr. Reed of Arkansas (for) with Mr. Porter (against).
 Mr. Milligan (for) with Mr. Morin (against).
 Mr. Sabath (for) with Mr. Ransley (against).
 Mr. Wright (for) with Mr. Sweet (against).
 Mr. Corning (for) with Mr. Bacharach (against).
 Mr. Douglass (for) with Mr. Welsh (against).
 Mr. Drane (for) with Mr. Taber (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Linthicum.
 Mr. Freeman with Mr. Pou.
 Mr. Hale with Mr. Almon.
 Mr. Perkins with Mr. Summers of Texas.
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. Kearns with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
 Mr. Dyer with Mr. Cullen.
 Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Lea of California.
 Mr. Michener with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Walters with Mr. Dominick.
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Cox.
 Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Tucker.
 Mr. Thayer with Mr. Gallivan.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Tydings.
 Mr. Tincher with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Lanham.
 Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. Jeffers.
 Mr. Cramton with Mr. Gambrill.
 Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Jones.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Gilbert.
 Mr. McLaughlin of Michigan with Mr. Davey.
 Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Jacobstein.
 Mr. Parker with Mr. LaGuardia.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. JONES. I was not in the hall when my name was called.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved bill of the following title:

H. R. 7484. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Fulton, Ark.

ITALIAN DEBT SETTLEMENT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Italian debt settlement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the Italian debt settlement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the committee, to my mind the Italian debt settlement plan as here proposed provides an outright gift to Italy and a vicious robbery of the American people. I know that many who support this plan are honest in their convictions, but the result of their support is just as harmful, nevertheless.

Many say that Italy is bankrupt and unable to pay. All must admit that she has wonderful resources, and that while she has not some of the minerals, and so forth, of other countries, that her soil is fertile, oftentimes producing more than an equal acreage in this country.

Information from the division of statistical and historical research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, relating to the production of wheat, rye, barley, oats, and corn in the United States and Italy for the year 1925, discloses that—

The average yield of wheat in Italy was 20.6 bushels per acre, while in the United States it was 12.8 bushels; the average yield of rye in Italy was 21.5 bushels per acre, while in the United States it was 11.9 bushels; the average yield of barley in Italy was 22.3 bushels per acre, and in the United States it was 26.4 bushels; the average yield of oats in Italy was 39.2 bushels per acre, while in the United States it was 33.3 bushels per acre; and the average yield of corn in Italy was 27.7 bushels per acre, while it was 28.5 bushels in the United States.

Among the 89 wheat-producing countries of the world Italy usually stands about eighteenth. The average yield per acre of wheat and rye in Italy for the year 1925 was about twice as great as in the United States for the same year. The average yield of oats per acre is about 6 bushels greater in Italy than in the United States for the year 1925, and that of corn and barley is about the same. The soil of Italy can not be said to be "sterile" or nonproductive.

Italy is producing more now than she produced before the war and will continue to produce more and more as the years go by.

Italy is one of the world powers. All admit that she has at least twenty-two billions of national wealth and many contend that her national wealth probably is even twice that amount. But admit that her national wealth is at the lowest figure stated, then it naturally follows that it will increase. The national wealth of the United States to-day is nearly twenty times as great as it was just after the Civil War.

One great mistake that some make is in figuring Italy's ability to pay as of the present and then making none of the debt payable at the present. We ought to figure on her ability to pay as of the date the paying is to be done. She proposes to pay so little at the present until we can easily disregard the present payments. They will be negligible.

But is Italy so poverty stricken? She has approximately 119,000 square miles in Europe and numerous colonial possessions. No nation occupies a more favorable position on the Mediterranean Sea, and she is mistress of the Adriatic Sea. She has practically a natural monopoly of sulphur. Sicily is now producing 17 per cent of the world's supply.

Italy has a wonderful climate, and her tourist trade is very valuable.

Then again she is to receive an enormous indemnity from Germany.

Mr. Winston, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, says that Italy received from Germany last year the equivalent of \$16,000,000; that she will get about twenty million each year for the next few years, and then the annual amount will get

larger. Italy will get as indemnity from Germany during the next 40 years much more than enough to pay all the debt commission has agreed to accept in full settlement of our whole debt, and yet during the first 31 years of this time she will pay only about one-fourteenth of what she is to pay us. She will get enough out of Germany to pay us nearly all she owed, and she will get enough out of Germany to pay us several times the amount the Debt Commission says we ought to accept. She is to get all her money from Germany in 40 years, and we are asked to give her 64 years on what is due us, and we are asked to let her have this large amount of money practically without interest.

If we had not gotten into the war and had not let Italy have our money, to-day Italy would be paying indemnity to Germany instead of Germany paying it to her. Italy ought to pay us what she owes us, with a reasonable interest.

But if Italy was poverty stricken she could pay us several times what she is offering from the money she is to get from Germany as indemnity. The argument, though, that Italy is poverty stricken falls through on every point. She has all the railroads she needs, has one of the best shipping interests in the whole world, and exports much farm products.

We are simply asked to give Italy a present. We are asked to do more by Italy than we are asked to do by any other country. Even Belgium is to pay much more per dollar loaned than Italy. Belgium, which stood the thickest in the war, is offering to do her part nobly. Belgium suffered more in the war than any other country, and the war was not her fight, either. It happened to take place on Belgian territory. Belgium could have told the Germans to march through and attack France and Belgium would not have suffered so severely, but she did not do this; she held back the German army until the rest of the world could get ready for the war.

We are asked to discriminate not only against our country but also against that brave little people in Belgium who unto the rolling down of the curtain of eternity will challenge the admiration of the world in their stand against the powerfully trained troops and fresh ones of the Kaiser in the early war days. Historians now and hereafter will record their work as a miracle that saved Europe and the world from the ravages of a war-mad king.

It seems that around the peace table it was understood that the United States was to cancel the prearmistice debt of Belgium, but now we are asking her to pay interest about four times as great as that charged Italy. Why this great discrimination, and why against our own people and against poor, brave, heroic, glorious Belgium?

To my mind there is simply no defense to the Italian settlement plan as now advocated.

Some say we should be generous with Italy because of the part she played in the war. What about the part Belgium played? What about the part we took in the war?

Some gentlemen seem to have forgotten our sacrifices in the war. We drafted, chiefly from farms and factories, more than 4,000,000 American sons. They defended not only this Nation but the homes and armies of the allied nations. In addition to this, we gave nearly \$30,000,000,000 of our national wealth; \$20,000,000,000 of this amount went direct as a loan to our allies. In order to raise this money we issued Government bonds and sold them to almost every American family and taxed everyone to the limit of his financial capacity. Thousands of our sons were killed and millions were maimed or diseased. The war is still costing America billions of dollars annually, and neither the present nor the succeeding generation will live to see this enormous debt paid. We have not only been just, but we have been generous to the allied nations. We have not only loaned them money, but we have contributed generously of our substance to them in the hour of need. America gets nothing from the war except disease, debt, and death; our allies do get reparations from Germany.

The armistice was signed more than seven years ago. The allied indebtedness has not yet been funded, and in no case have we extended, or proposed to extend, the day for final payment to less than 62 years, nearly 70 years from conclusion of the war. The bonds which we issued and sold to raise the money loaned to our allies have not yet been paid, and we are now taxing our citizens almost beyond the point of endurance to pay the interest on our domestic indebtedness incurred by reason of the war.

Every citizen and individual in this Nation must pay his or her part by direct income or through the medium of an exorbitant tariff. No one can escape. Within the next few years the bonds we sold must be paid. Who will pay most of the indebtedness. Obviously, many of the same boys who defended

the allied armies. When will they collect the loans made to the Allies? If at all, it will be some 30 or 40 years later. What other obligation has America to discharge?

Some gentlemen contend, and the press has so stated, that under the proposed settlement the full amount of the American debt and interest will be collected; they do not say how much interest will be collected. Let us see if this statement is in point of fact accurate. Senator BURTON, a distinguished Member of this House and one of the ablest men on the Debt Funding Commission, speaking of the Italian debt settlement in comparison with the British settlement, said:

That seems a very great concession; and it is, for if we calculate the present worth at $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent we obtain only 25 per cent, or \$583,000,000, on a debt which was originally \$1,648,000,000. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1634.)

Senator BURTON admits that if the terms of the settlement offered are accepted, that we will obtain only about 25 per cent of the debt, and that is a fact. Gentlemen who contend otherwise should remember that we are funding a debt composed of both principal and interest. There is no fundamental difference between the cancellation of interest and the cancellation of principal. Why should gentlemen thus quibble, except to camouflage this enormous gift of the American citizens' money?

What is the difference between a dollar of principal and a dollar of interest? When we begin to figure on paying interest or of giving it away it at first seems a trivial matter, but for a long term of years the interest is much bigger than the principal. It is said, well, we are willing to practically give Italy the interest and a very long term of years, but we are to save the principal. What a wonderful saving we are about to make. This is economy, is it?

Reminds me of the railroad company which went into receivership and lost all their line of road; all their rolling stock, including passenger coaches and locomotives, and all other property of every description, but saved one cowcatcher.

The debt commission in this matter is about to succeed as well as the city fire department which went to a fire on a near-by farm and lost the home, all outhouses, and the farmer's barn and all his supplies, but saved the well.

Let us see about the proposition. Italy owes us much more than \$2,000,000,000, but let us figure on \$2,000,000,000 for a few minutes. Let us see how much interest we are about to give away. This money belongs to the people of the United States, and many of the farmers would be glad to borrow it at 6 per cent. Italy to begin with is to pay no interest for the first five years. Well, 6 per cent for five years compounded or paid annually amounts to at least 34 per cent of the principal. Thirty-four per cent of \$2,000,000,000 is \$680,000,000. This, divided into 435 shares, so as to let each Member get a share, would build in each congressional district in the United States 31 post-office buildings costing \$50,000 each.

Some economy and some liberality with a foreign nation. It is urged that we can not afford to even enter upon a program to build one building in each congressional district within the next five years, and yet it is proposed to give Italy enough to build 31 post-office buildings in each district during the next five years, and yet this liberality to Italy will have just begun at the end of the five years. It also seems that the miserly attitude toward the cities which are entitled to Federal buildings will have just begun also.

But let us figure a little more. In many sections of the country the farmers pay 8 per cent for money. Just to see how important is the matter of interest for a 64-year period let us see what \$2,000,000,000 will amount to in 64 years at 8 per cent compounded annually or paid annually. The farmers generally have to pay or compound it quarterly.

Money at 8 per cent compound interest doubles in every 8 years, then \$2,000,000,000 in 8 years becomes \$4,000,000,000, and so on until at the end of 64 years \$2,000,000,000 of principal is \$512,000,000,000, or an addition of \$510,000,000,000 on account of interest. The interest on a sum of money at 8 per cent per annum compounded for 64 years is 255 times as large as the principal.

The interest on this Italian debt at 8 per cent compounded for 64 years will produce an amount sufficient to build nearly 300 congressional libraries in each congressional district, as expensive as the one here, which is one of the most expensive and beautiful buildings in the world.

This interest thus calculated would at the end of 64 years be large enough to build a fine courthouse or post-office building for about every eight people in the whole United States. And yet it is urged that we are going to save the principal even though we practically lose the interest.

I get so tired of people howling about saving a few dollars which should be spent for the improvement of the country, and then so gladly make such splendid gifts of the people's money for any purpose sponsored by the big rich, or the international bankers, or some foreign country which happens to be able to exert some sinister influence here in America. Nearly every fellow who is supporting the Italian debt steal, the record will show, voted to cut off the garden seed from the farmers and little children and to deprive the little girls of America of a few flowers. Some economist! Most of these same people are anxious to not build any Federal buildings in the country cities and a great many of them are bitterly opposed to any sort of appropriations for good roads. Economy is a wonderful thing when it is worked overtime on the poor so as to be in position to give millions and billions to foreign nations and to international bankers.

Lets figure just a little more on what the United States will lose on this Italian proposition even with the United States borrowing money under the most favorable circumstances. Oh my, for a term of years, interest is of so much more importance than the principal. We could easily propose to Italy to give her all the principal at the end of eight years provided she paid us interest annually at 8 per cent. This trade would be many times better than what we are asked to accept.

Let us see what Mr. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, has to say about the matter of interest on this Italian debt. 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 semiannually 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 ten 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 long-term loan companies. 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.....	\$0.12½.....	\$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.

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 4½ 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 44 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 \$385,577,000 to be paid during 62 years, or a total of \$2,427,577,000 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 were 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 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 America must pay; in other words, during the first 32 years this agreement will run they will not pay us one-fourth of their obligation.

Two stock arguments of those who favor the proposed Italian debt settlement are that Italy is not able to pay and that we should be generous.

It seems that no one can reasonably contend that Italy is not now able to pay and also that she will never within 62 years become able to pay. In fact, she is able to begin paying reasonable annual amounts at this time. The indemnity she is to receive from Germany would enable her to do this even if she was in bad financial condition otherwise.

She is appropriating huge sums of money for military purposes and naval purposes at this very time. Her present army appropriation is for \$72,000,000 and her naval appropriation is for \$35,000,000.

She is entering upon a huge military policy. Here is a recent clipping from the Washington Post:

ROME CHAMBER VOTES TO STRENGTHEN ARMY

ROME, January 29 (by A. P.).—After Premier Mussolini had made a speech in which he declared that the armed forces of the nation must be maintained with the highest efficiency and that Italy wanted peace, but that peace would be more secure if backed by the sword, the Chamber of Deputies to-night adopted the clauses of the bill for reorganization of the army.

The premier announced that 76 regiments are to be stationed in the chief cities of the provinces, "regardless of prayers in the cathedrals and processions in the streets, all of which will be useless."

He said also that 11 extra regiments are to be stationed "at fitting places."

Certainly, Italy could begin paying us now. The great trouble is that she has found out that she can easily get a large part of her debt canceled.

How can anyone ever justify himself with the American people in canceling a very large part of the Italian debt on the theory that Italy is bankrupt. How can anyone justify restricting the consideration of Italy's ability to pay to the present when so small a part of this debt is to be paid in our lifetime or even in the lifetime of most of our children. Her prospective ability to pay should enter into the consideration, especially in view of the great length of time that is given.

We have been more than generous with all the Allies. Italy could not complain if we gave her no discount on her debt. Here we are about to give her a sum of money several times larger than is the sum of money borrowed. Of course, we do not give this to her all at one time but we give her a large sum of money every year and we propose to perfect an arrangement whereby our children and our children's children will be giving her large sums of money every year and every day thereof years and years after we shall have passed off this stage of action.

It is not right. So much has been said about giving away none of the principal. The great trouble is, though, that the thing which it is proposed to cancel here is much greater than the principal. The interest on any sum of money for a long

term of years is much greater than the principal, even as a great forest which grew from one acorn is much greater than the seed from which it sprang.

The interest on this debt for 64 years at 8 per cent, payable annually, as I have shown, is two hundred and fifty-five times as large as the principal. I can scarcely believe the figures after I have gone over them time and again. At 6 per cent for this term of years the interest is more than thirty times as great as the principal. My, what a difference a slight difference in the rate makes.

The settlement becomes shocking when one stops to figure on it just a little. Experts tell us that the present worth of what Italy is to pay us is \$791,000,000, and this can be easily verified by a little use of a lead pencil and the application of a simple rule of percentage which we learned when we were school children. I have gone a little further and figured just a little more, and I invite those that may be interested to verify my statement by a little application of the rules of percentage.

Here is what I find. If Italy had paid us 8 per cent per year from the close of the war to date, she would have paid us by this good moment nearly twice as much as our debt commission are now offering to accept in full settlement. If she had paid us only 4 per cent per annum from the time she got the money until this time, and the debt commission was now proposing to cancel the whole blamed principal, the proposition would not be as absurd as the one here proposed, for the present proposition will not get this much out of the affair.

If the debt commission had brought in here a proposition that Italy pay 8 per cent per annum on what she owes for a little over four years and that then the whole debt would be canceled, it would have been a much better proposition than the one which we are asked to swallow.

Yet it is said that the principal is saved. Yes; it is saved for Italy. It is saved so that very little of it will ever be seen by us or our children.

What caused this great scramble of those who are now clamoring for this gift to be made to Italy. A little while ago many statements were given out that there would be no cancellation of any part of the foreign debts, and especially was it made clear that, by all means, the principal would not be canceled, either in whole or in part. The cry was, Save the principal, even if you give away 5 or 10 times the amount of the principal in interest.

The Italian proposition is many times more favorable than the British settlement, and yet here is what the Republicans declared to be the policy of their party in 1924, as expressed in their platform:

We have steadfastly refused to consider the cancellation of foreign debts. . . . Our position has been based on the conviction that a moral obligation, such as was incurred, should not be disregarded. We stand for settlement with all debtor countries similar in character with our debt agreement with Great Britain.

Senator BURTON, who was then on the debt commission, delivered the keynote speech at the Republican Convention and was very positive in his declarations that there would be no cancellation of the principal of these debts. My colleague from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] was not on the debt commission at that time, but he was very pronounced in his views in speeches here in Congress and assured the people that he opposed any settlement, except along the line of the British settlement.

I can easily see how a man can get wrong occasionally, for we all do this. I feel that the Democrats who favor this bill are, as a general rule, mistaken honestly.

The thing that puzzles me, though, is how the country can believe that many of the Republicans who vote for this thing and who always vote for the corporate interests are ever for the farmers or the laboring people, even though they make many protestations of love for the common folks during campaign year. They only yell for the common folks during campaign year, and then vote for the big interests during their service in Congress.

Nearly every man who voted to stop the free-seed item of only a few thousand dollars voted in a few days to spend many times that amount in building a bridge across the Potomac River, when there are already three bridges in and near Washington, and yet these people shout economy when they have taken a package of garden seed from the farmers of the Nation and from their wives and have made the little children understand that for the sake of economy if they want flower seed they must buy them. Oh, what economy! These economists voted the railroads large amounts of cash and yet voted the ex-service men no money but only a cheap form of death benefit. They furnished the railroads money so that they could live;

they said to the ex-service men, "Live if you can; we will guarantee your folks a little money when you die."

These same economists become very much wrought up when there is an effort to appropriate a little money to pay for the printing of a few books on diseases of horses and cattle, and in their anguish of spirit they cry out to their friends to please help them save the great economy program. They know that this little appropriation will help the farmers and must know that this is probably the only thing this Congress will do for the farmers, and yet there is more real agony in the camp of the so-called economist than there has been over any bill at this session.

These same economists in name know that the amount given to Italy each day under the proposed settlement is nearly large enough to print all the books on diseases of horses and on diseases of cattle which will be printed for three years under the item for this purpose as carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and yet they complain bitterly over giving this small amount to the farmers for just a day and a few hours, and gladly vote to give it to Italy not for one day out of three years but for every day in the year and for a period of years to last until our children and our children's children will be in the grave or tottering with old age. Some economy!

They say that Italy is poor and needy. What about the poor old fathers and mothers of this country and their children? Are not they needy?

They say Italy helped in the war. What about the poor old fathers and mothers of the farm and their boys and girls? Did not they help in the war, too, and did not they suffer all the terrors of that horrible conflict? They say let us be generous with Italy. Why not be generous with our own people, and why not be generous with that father who lost his sons or with that mother who is widowed and left without a son to help her as a result of that war?

There is another very interesting angle to this Italian debt proposition. The approval of this debt settlement means for the Members voting here to pass on the respective rights of the common folks who, through the Government, have loaned money to the Italian Government, and the rights of the international bankers of the country to whom Italy is now heavily indebted. There is involved, I repeat, in this bill the rights of the common people and the rights of the big rich. This is true in so many of the matters coming up here.

It is difficult, though, in many to trace out the respective rights of each and equally hard to ascertain just how each is to be effected. This bill is not so hard in this respect, for in this bill the same country owes the international bankers and also owes the United States, which is all of us.

First, let us see just how much is owed, and to whom it is owed, and also how cheap is the Italian Government to get off in its dealings with the money of the immensely rich.

We are told in the hearings that the Italian Government owes J. P. Morgan & Co., of New York, the sum of \$100,000,000; that \$50,000,000 of this is a renewal of an old loan and that the balance is in the nature of a new loan. We are reliably informed that Italy is to pay this firm of international bankers the sum of \$9,000,000 as commission and between 7 and 8 per cent as interest. Thus Italy will actually get as a new loan \$33,500,000 and will pay for it during the first year of the loan the commission and one year's interest, amounting to \$7,500,000 on the whole item, or \$3,750,000 on the new item. In other words, Italy will pay the international bankers over 85 per cent for the new loan for one year, and during this same year she will not pay the common people a blamed cent. Neither will Italy for the first five years pay any interest, and, furthermore, she will practically pay no interest for the 64 years the loan of the United States is to run.

Some bill, is not it, with no interest on our money and fabulous interest on the loans made by the big bankers. But, they say, we have saved the principal. Blamed if I know whether they are talking about saving the principal of the debt or about saving the principle of helping the big rich at the expense of the poor of the country.

There is only one way to figure that Italy is not paying the Morgan interest an outrageous interest or charge, and that is to figure that Italy not only got the money from J. P. Morgan & Co. but to understand that Italy also secured another very valuable asset, to wit, the help of the international bankers in putting over this outrageous steal about to be perpetrated on the American people. If the influence of the big rich put this thing over, then Italy is being well repaid for all the money she has agreed to pay the J. P. Morgan & Co. combine.

I wish that the farmers of the Nation could borrow money as easily as we are loaning it to Italy. Just think of a loan

to the farmers for five years without interest then at a rate which never averages as much as 1 per cent, and just think of a loan for 64 years. Just think of a loan to the farmers on the basis of the farmers paying a small interest for four or five years and then for the entire debt to be canceled. This is what we are about to do for Italy.

The farmers can not expect this kind of treatment, for they are the ones that are being forced to do this gift stunt to Italy. I have about decided that the farmers will not get any help from the Government of a substantial nature, for the Government is all the time making the farmers help those that do not need any help and who already are rich beyond our ability to comprehend.

That is a harsh statement, and I wish that it was possible for me to say the contrary and be honest with myself and with the people of my district and of the country.

I am very sorry that there are not more Members here who at heart are for the farmers of the Nation. Too many are for the farmers only in name. They are not for the farmers when voting time comes if they, the Members, are voting. They are only for the farmers at voting time when the farmers are to do the voting.

I hope that I will live to see the day when the friends of the farmers will get together and stay together until the farmers get a square deal. If the friends of the farmers and of the common folks were together at this time, we could defeat not only this Italian outrage but we could put through a program for the farmers of the Nation. When a measure comes up here which is in the interest of the farmers and the common people the friends of the farmers are scattered, and in the end the cause is lost. Some of the farmers' friends are Democrats. Some are not. Some of them are Republicans, and some are not. There is not sufficient organization. Some of the farmers' friends in the Republican camp will respond to the Republican whip and vote contrary to their conviction in order to be called regular in their party ranks. Some in the Democratic Party will do the same thing. We need men here who are for the farmers first, last, and all the time.

We may rest assured of one thing, and that is the friends of the corporate interest stand together all the time, it matters not whether they are Democrats or Republicans, and it matters not how many whips are cracked over their backs. They are loyal to the big rich and can not be swerved from the service of their masters.

Another reason for the present Italian debt settlement going through is that the press of the country are practically all lined up with whatever is called for by Wall Street. This is especially true with the press of the North and New England. Then again occasionally some paper, even in the South, which claims to be Democratic will be found barking along for the gang with the Wall Street interests.

There are too many people who claim to be for the common people who prove by their stand that they are with the other crowd.

Much has been said in this debate about being magnanimous and being generous. It all depends on whom one is to be magnanimous and generous with in his or her dealings.

People who cry out loudest for the Congress to be magnanimous with the corporate interests and with foreign governments are not at all concerned about our being generous with the common folks or with the farmers of the country.

I feel that we should extend generosity to our home people rather than to the peoples of other countries. We have many millions of farmers who are blanketed with millions and millions of mortgages. Many of these farmers are losing their homes simply because they can not pay the interest on these mortgages, and yet we are giving Italy enough to pay off all the mortgages in a few years. But if some one even suggested making the farmers of the Nation a gift large enough to pay off all their mortgages they would be criticized as a demagogue and worse than that would be called crazy and sent to St. Elizabeths asylum for the insane if the Wall Street influence could have its way in putting its enemies out of the way.

Yet we are letting the farmers lose their homes as a result of just such legislation as that I am criticizing; and while he can not pay his taxes and interest, the Congress is making generous gifts to the peoples of foreign countries.

But why talk longer about the matter? I do want to call the attention of Congress and the country, though, to the splendid essay written by the late-lamented Senator Tom Watson, of Georgia, in which he so beautifully pictured the greatness of the farmers of the Nation and the utter dependence of the rest of the country on the farmers. After describing in his inimitable way a beautifully sunny spring day in Georgia, Senator Watson said:

On such a day, such a cloudless, radiant, flower-sweetened day, the horseman slackens the rein as he rides through lanes and quiet fields, and he dares to dream that the children of God once loved each other.

On such a day one may dream that the time might come when they would do so again.

Rein in the stop, here on this high hill. Look North, look East, where the sun rises, look South, look West, where the sun sets—on all sides the steady mule, the steady plowman, and the children dropping corn.

Close the eye a moment and look at the picture fancy paints. Every field in Georgia is there, every field in the South is there. And in each the figures are the same—the steady mule and the steady man and the pattering feet of the children dropping corn.

In these furrows lies the food of the Republic; on these fields depend life and health and happiness.

Halt those children and see how the cheek of the world would blanch at the thought of famine.

Paralyze that plowman, and see how national bankruptcy would shatter every city in the Union.

Dropping corn! A simple thing, you say.

And yet, as those white seeds rattle down to the sod and hide away for a season, it needs no peculiar strength of fancy to see a Jacob's ladder crowded with ascending blessings.

Scornfully the railroad king would glance at these small teams in each small field; yet check those corn droppers, and his cars would rot on the road and rust would devour the engines in the roundhouse. The banker would ride through those fields thinking only of his hoarded millions, nor would he ever startle himself with the thought that his millions would melt away in mist, were those tiny hands never more to be found dropping corn. The bondholder, proud in all the security of the untaxed receiver of other people's taxes, would see in these fields merely the industry from which he gathers tribute; it would never dawn on his mind that without the opening of those furrows and the hurrying army of children dropping corn his bond would not be worth the paper it is written on.

Great is the might of this Republic!—great in its schools, churches, courts, legislatures; great in its towns and cities; great in its commerce; great in its manufactures; great in its colossal wealth.

But sweep from under it all these worn and wasted fields, strike into idleness or death the plowman, his wife and his child, and what becomes of the gorgeous structure whose foundation is his fields?

Halt the food growers, and what becomes of your gold and its "intrinsic value"?

How much of your gold can you eat?

How many of your diamonds will answer the need of a loaf?

But enough.

It is time to ride down the hill. The tinkle of the cowbell follows the sinking sun—both on the way home.

So, with many an unspoken thought, I ride homeward, thinking of those who plant the corn.

And hard, indeed, would be the heart that knowing what these people do and bear and suffer, yet would not fashion this prayer to the favored of the Republic: "O rulers, lawmakers, soldiers, judges, bankers, merchants, editors, lawyers, doctors, preachers, bondholders! Be not so unmindful of the toil and misery of those who feed you!"

CLAIMS BY MEXICO FOR OCCUPATION OF VERA CRUZ (S. DOC. NO. 49)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of the claims arising out of the occupation of Vera Cruz, Mexico, by American forces in 1914, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to the President on February 4, 1924, and my message to the Congress dated February 7, 1924, which comprise Senate Document No. 33, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, copies of which are furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

I renew my recommendation, originally made by President Harding, that in order to effect a settlement of these claims the Congress as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of \$45,518.69, and I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress, in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 6, 1926.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER. On yesterday the Chair referred a message of the President relating to the expenditures of the con-

tingent fund in the State Department to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He is advised that the precedents for reference are to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department. Without objection it will be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MICHENER (at the request of Mr. MAPES), on account of illness.

To Mr. ALMON, for to-day, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

And then, on motion of Mr. ANTHONY (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for February 8, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(10.30 a. m.)

Appropriations for independent offices (subcommittee).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

(10.30 a. m.)

A bill to provide for the construction of a bridge to replace the bridge known as Chain Bridge, located in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (H. R. 4006); Subcommittee on Streets, Highways, and Traffic.

A bill to abolish capital punishment in the District of Columbia (H. R. 349 and H. R. 4498); Subcommittee on Judiciary.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(10.15 a. m.)

For the acquisition or erection of American Government buildings and embassy, legation, and consular buildings, and for other purposes (H. R. 6771).

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the storage of the waters of the Pecos River (H. R. 3862).

MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(11 a. m.)

A bill to establish a national military park at and near Fredericksburg, Va., and to mark and preserve historical points connected with the Battles of Fredericksburg, Spottsylvania Court House, Wilderness, and Chancellorsville, including Salem Church, Va. (H. R. 6756); Subcommittee 6.

RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

Houston (Tex.) Ship Channel.

(10.30 a. m.)

For the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal property, and for other purposes (H. R. 8392).

POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

To regulate the manufacture, printing, and sale of envelopes with postage stamps embossed thereon (H. R. 4478 and other similar bills).

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

Bills for changes in various judicial districts, place and time of court sessions, and related subjects.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DRIVER: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 6573. A bill to extend the time for the completion of the Alaska Anthracite Railroad Co., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8128. A bill to punish counterfeiting of Government transportation requests; with amendments (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MORROW: Committee on Claims. H. R. 537. A bill for the relief of A. B. Ewing; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1731. A bill for the relief of John W. King; with amendments (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2011. A bill for the relief of William D. McKeefrey; without amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 658. A bill for the relief of Harry Coventry; with an amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3376. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner; without amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 712) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie H. Elliott; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5268) granting a pension to James L. Smith; 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. HAWES: A bill (H. R. 8988) to amend an act of February 11, 1924, entitled "An act to equip the United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., for the manufacture of supplies for the use of the Government, for the compensation of prisoners for their labor, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 8989) amending subchapter 5 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, as amended to June 7, 1924, relating to offenses against public policy; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 8990) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, as amended by an act of Congress approved December 30, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOODRUM: A bill (H. R. 8991) to establish a permanent status for the United States Army Band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8992) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Aurora, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8993) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Batesville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8994) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Franklin, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8995) for the erection of a public building in Greensburg, State of Indiana, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 8996) authorizing the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a national home for soldiers and sailors of all wars; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa (by request): A bill (H. R. 8997) to amend sections 2804 and 3402 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8998) to establish in the Treasury Department a bureau of customs and a bureau of prohibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 8999) to amend the act of February 28, 1916, creating a Bureau of Efficiency; the act of March 4, 1923, creating a Personnel Classification Board; and

the act of September 7, 1916, creating the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 9000) providing for a mine rescue station and equipment at Spadra, Ark.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 9001) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9002) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9003) to reduce night work in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9004) to reduce night work in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SINNOTT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 9005) to empower certain officers, agents, inspectors, or employees of the Department of the Interior to administer and take oaths, affirmations, and affidavits in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by departmental request), a bill (H. R. 9006) for the disposition of certain coastal lands in Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi, and the adjustment of claims arising from erroneous surveys; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 9007) 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. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 9008) to validate payments for commutation of quarters, heat, light, and of rental allowances on account of dependents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9009) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon of a fireproof office building or buildings for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 9010) for the development of the training plant for the Air Service of the United States Army at San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9011) for additional construction and for improvements at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution (H. Res. 122) calling upon the United States Tariff Commission to immediately report to the President of the United States its findings in the butter investigation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAGUE: Resolution (H. Res. 123) calling upon the United States Tariff Commission to immediately report to the President of the United States its findings in the butter investigation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: Resolution (H. Res. 124) calling upon the United States Tariff Commission to immediately report to the President of the United States its findings in the butter investigation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution (H. Res. 125) calling upon the United States Tariff Commission to immediately report to the President of the United States its findings in the butter investigation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FURLOW: Resolution (H. Res. 126) calling upon the United States Tariff Commission to immediately report to the President of the United States its findings in the butter investigation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATRES: Resolution (H. Res. 127) requesting the Secretary of Labor to meet with the representatives of the United Mine Workers and the anthracite operators' representatives for the purpose of tending his services as mediator; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9012) granting a pension to Anna F. Gourlay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 9013) granting a pension to Bernice McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9014) granting a pension to Ada Laxson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9015) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Koerper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 9016) granting a pension to Anton Aggermann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 9017) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9018) granting an increase of pension to Martha L. E. Bromberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 9019) for the relief of Ailing R. Maish; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9020) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 9021) granting an increase of pension to Cathrine Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9022) granting a pension to Jennie W. McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9023) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 9024) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Tobin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9025) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fenton Pulver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 9026) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9027) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Grissom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9028) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Sawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9029) granting a pension to Alice R. Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 9030) for the retirement as ensign of Hampton Mitchell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WYANT (by request): A bill (H. R. 9031) for the relief of Sheindel, Morris, Zechari, and Frieda Clateman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9032) to change the name of the trustees of St. Josephs Male Orphans Asylum and amend the act incorporating the same; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

588. By Mr. BARBOUR: Resolution of the Fish and Game Commission of California urging the reflooding of Lower Klamath Lake; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

589. By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Petition of Union Council, No. 21, Daughters of America, Union City, Ind., requesting enactment of House bills 344 and 5583, providing for the naturalization and deportation and registration of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

590. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of E. J. Reavey, legislative agent, Boston Lodge, No. 97, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Brockton, Mass., protesting against proposed amendments to the Federal employees liability act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

591. Also, petition of F. A. Symonds, Massachusetts legislative representative, the Locomotive Firemen of Massachusetts, protesting against proposed amendments to the Federal employees liability act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

592. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the American Enamelled Brick & Tile Co. (Inc.), New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Blanton bill, H. R. 3811; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

593. Also, petition of the National Preservers Association (Inc.), opposing the passage of Senate bill 481 and House bill 39, which would permit the use or sale of corn sugar (dextrose) under the modified name "sugar"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

594. Also, petition of the Associated Traffic Clubs of America, favoring the passage of a law charging the Interstate Commerce Commission with the regulation of motor vehicles when engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

595. By Mr. SWING: Petition of the Riverside Chamber of Commerce, opposing the anti-Federal aid for highways movement; to the Committee on Roads.

596. Also, petition of the Laguna Beach Chamber of Commerce, urging continuance of Federal-aid highway appropriation from Congress and increase in California allotment; to the Committee on Roads.

597. Also, petition of the California State Automobile Association, supporting continuation of Federal-aid appropriation for interstate highways; to the Committee on Roads.

598. Also, petition of Charter No. 30, Hotel Greeters of America, emphatically disapproving of the disallowance or discontinuance by the United States of America of the appropriation for good roads; to the Committee on Roads.

599. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Riverside County, Calif., requesting further appropriations for Federal highway aid; to the Committee on Roads.

600. Also, petition of the Western States County Officials Association, urging continuation of the granting of Federal aid to the States in highway building; to the Committee on Roads.

601. Also, petition of the Riverside Chamber of Commerce, urging continuation of the present policy of the Federal Government in extending aid to the States for the building of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

602. Also, petition of the Redlands Chamber of Commerce, urging continuation of the present plan and policy of Federal aid in cooperation with States in building public roads; to the Committee on Roads.

603. Also, petition of the motor Carriers' Association of the State of California, unanimously indorsing the Federal-aid road plan and asking for an increased appropriation of the Federal aid from the present Congress; to the Committee on Roads.

604. Also, petition of the Orange Community Chamber of Commerce, urging continued Federal appropriations for adequate highway transportation facilities; to the Committee on Roads.