

Herbert E. McElheny, Gobles.
Harvey Tewksbury, Kingston.
Florence J. Truax, Ortonville.
Fred J. Smith, Pickford.
Charles P. Neumann, Rochester.

MISSISSIPPI

Samuel W. Pendarvis, Magnolia.
John W. Woodward, Oxford.
James C. Reddoch, Quitman.

MISSOURI

Vaughan V. Hammitt, Curryville.
Wilbur N. Osborne, Williamsville.

NEBRASKA

Alvin O. Jones, Adams.
Joseph S. Jackson, Inman.
Minnie Johansin, Loup City.
Mary E. Krisl, Milligan.
Clarence Rosecrans, Odell.
Rolland C. Shetler, Riverton.

NEVADA

J. E. Drendel, Minden.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Benjamin H. Dodge, New Boston.

NEW YORK

Edwin P. Gardner, Canandaigua.
Stella Hackett, Central Park.
William V. Fitzpatrick, Cleveland.
Warren C. King, Dobbs Ferry.
Reuben H. Gulvin, Geneva.
George S. Peterson, La Salle.
George M. Grant, Parksville.
James R. Rodman, Port Ewen.

NORTH CAROLINA

Festus E. Sigman, Thomasville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Martin A. Wahlberg, Oberon.
Viola Tomlinson, Oriska.

OHIO

James K. Fulks, Ada.
John W. Swing, Bethel.
John R. Miller, Franklin.
George W. Burner, Johnstown.
Peter Weishaupt, Lynchburg.
Jasper A. Barrell, Malta.
Marold J. Taylor, Marengo.
Reed Wilson, Pleasant City.
Jesse A. Hayes, Stockport.
Paul E. Muckley, Waynesburg.
George W. Smith, Wheelersburg.

PENNSYLVANIA

Vera Ritchey, Dunlo.
Herbert M. Black, West Sunbury.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Francis B. Gaffney, Gaffney.

TEXAS

Roy K. Duphorne, Aransas Pass.
Walter W. Layman, Bangs.
Wilce V. Garton, Booker.
Jacob Bennett, Bremond.
William H. Tallant, Chico.
McKinley H. Frank, Grapevine.
William L. Allen, Hawkins.
James W. Johnson, Italy.
Ada H. Worley, Malone.
Thomas J. Bailey, Royse City.
John F. Warrington, Valley Mills.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mary B. Wolfe, Mount Clare.
Helen Cox, Purseglove.
Daniel A. Jackson, Rowlesburg.
Walter Thomas, Triadelphia.

WISCONSIN

Orrin W. Groot, Elmwood.
John H. Zahrt, Sparta.
Ernest L. Messer, Unity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, April 5, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

We praise Thee, O God, of whom and through whom and unto whom are all things. Blessed be the Father of all mercies for Him who is now on the right hand of all power. He has brought incorruption out of corruption, glory out of weakness, and set the halo of immortality upon the brow of man. Help us to sow conscientiousness to the light we have, obedience to the truth we know, integrity to the purpose we possess, and our conduct shall grow the fruit of character born in the soil of Thy eternal truth. May there be in us a resurrection to a new life. Roll away from the doors of hearts the stone of malice; roll away from the doors of our minds the stone of intolerance; roll away from the doors of our characters all stones that obstruct the onward march and development of our immortal souls. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 1, 1926, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 7. An act to reimburse the Truckee-Carson irrigation district, State of Nevada, for certain expenditures for the operation and maintenance of drains for lands within the Paiute Indian Reservation, Nev.;

S. 47. An act making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid, at the request of the President, in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War, in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims and Senate Report No. 764, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session;

S. 87. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain lands to school district No. 58, of Clallam County, State of Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 108. An act for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), the Automobile Insurance Co. of Hartford, Conn., American & Foreign Insurance Co., Queen Insurance Co. of America, Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Co., and the United States Merchants & Shippers Insurance Co.;

S. 161. An act for the relief of Charles H. Willey;

S. 587. An act for the relief of John O'Brien;

S. 674. An act granting certain lands to the city of Kaysville, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city;

S. 868. An act for the relief of Kate Canniff;

S. 1039. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

S. 1208. An act providing reimbursement to J. M. LaCalle for services as instructor at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., from October 1, 1914, to October 19, 1914;

S. 1415. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to immediately reconvey to Charles Murray, sr., and Sarah A. Murray, his wife, of De Funak Springs, Fla., the title to lots 820, 821, and 822, in the town of De Funak Springs, Fla., according to the map of Lake De Funak drawn by W. J. Vankirk;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of the city of Philadelphia;

S. 1648. An act for the relief of Rinald Bros., of Philadelphia, Pa.;

S. 1651. An act for the relief of the widow and minor children of Ed Estes, deceased;

S. 1662. An act for the relief of Francis Nicholson;

S. 1786. An act to equalize the pay of retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

S. 1895. An act to correct the military record of George Patterson, deceased;

S. 1903. An act for the relief of Capt. Murray A. Cobb;

S. 1914. An act directing the resurvey of certain lands;

S. 1903. An act for the relief of the Van Dorn Iron Works Co.;

S. 2042. An act relating to the office of Public Buildings and

Public Parks of the National Capital;

S. 2122. An act for the relief of the Monumental Stevedore Co.;

S. 2141. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Orin Thornton;

S. 2193. An act for the relief of Grover Ashley;

S. 2202. An act to provide that jurisdiction shall be conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statutes of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims arising under or growing out of any treaty or agreement between the United States and certain bands of Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 2320. An act to safeguard the distribution and sale of certain dangerous caustic or corrosive acids, alkalies, and other substances in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2483. An act for the relief of legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmarest, deceased, and others;

S. 2484. An act for the relief of Louise St. Gez, executrix of Auguste Ferré, deceased, surviving partner of Lapene & Ferré;

S. 2552. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose by sale of certain public land in the State of Kansas;

S. 2597. An act authorizing the President to appoint and retire certain persons first lieutenants in the Medical Corps, United States Army;

S. 2619. An act for the relief of Oliver J. Larkin and Lona Larkin;

S. 2646. An act to provide cooperation to safeguard endangered agricultural and municipal interests and to protect the forest cover on the Santa Barbara, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland National Forests from destruction by fire, and for other purposes;

S. 2702. An act to provide for the setting apart of certain lands in the State of California as an addition to the Morongo Indian Reservation;

S. 2703. An act to restore to the public domain certain lands within the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to provide for the reservation of certain land in California for the Indians of the Mesa Grande Reservation, known also as Santa Ysabel Reservation No. 1;

S. 2722. An act for the relief of Muscle Shoals, Birmingham & Pensacola Railroad Co., the successor in interest of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co.;

S. 2730. An act to amend section 1155 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia";

S. 2763. An act to amend section 103 of the Judicial Code as amended;

S. 2817. An act for the relief of Edgar K. Miller;

S. 2818. An act for the relief of Ivy L. Merrill;

S. 2820. An act for the relief of José Louzau;

S. 2868. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgments in claims that the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2907. An act to authorize the general accounting officers of the United States to allow credit to Galen L. Tait, collector and disbursing agent, district of Maryland, for payments of travel and subsistence expenses made on properly certified and approved vouchers;

S. 2982. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land owned by the District of Columbia near the corner of Thirteenth and Upshur Streets NW., and the acquisition of certain land by the District of Columbia in exchange for said part to be conveyed, and for other purposes;

S. 2996. An act to validate payments for commutation of quarters, heat, and light, and of rental allowances on account of dependents;

S. 3037. An act to provide retirement for the Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy;

S. 3055. An act for the relief of Lawford & McKim, general agents for the Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation (Ltd.) of London, England;

S. 3072. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Nevada;

S. 3102. An act to modify and amend the act creating the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia;

S. 3110. An act to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Haiti the medal of honor and merit;

S. 3122. An act for completion of the road from Tucson to Ajo via Indian Oasis, Ariz.;

S. 3174. An act for the relief of the Alaska Steamship Co.;

S. 3186. An act to promote the production of sulphur upon the public domain;

S. 3287. An act relating to the purchase of quarantine stations from the State of Texas;

S. 3328. An act for the relief of L. W. Burford;

S. 3402. An act relating to giving false information regarding the commission of crime in the District of Columbia;

S. 3538. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay legal expenses incurred by the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma;

S. 3547. An act to change the title of Deputy Assistant Treasurer of the United States to Assistant Treasurer of the United States;

S. 3553. An act to provide for the storage for diversion of the waters of the North Platte River and construction of the Casper-Alcova reclamation project;

S. 3665. An act for the relief of the owner of the ferryboat *New York*; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution for the amendment of the plant quarantine act of August 20, 1912, to allow the States to quarantine against the shipment therein or through of plants, plant products, and other articles found to be diseased or infested when not covered by a quarantine established by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 185. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land and erect a monument on the site of the battle with the Sioux Indians in which the commands of Major Reno and Major Benteen were engaged;

H. R. 290. An act to amend section 99 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary and the amendment to said act approved July 17, 1916, Thirty-ninth Statutes at Large, chapter 248;

H. R. 1827. An act for the relief of Frank Rector;

H. R. 3953. An act to authorize a departure from the rectangular system of surveys of homestead claims in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3996. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain portions of the military reservation of Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to the city of San Antonio, Bexar County, Tex., for street purposes;

H. R. 4505. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the Washington aqueduct pumping station to the Arlington County sanitary district;

H. R. 4884. An act for the relief of Walter L. Watkins, alias Harry Austin;

H. R. 5010. An act to provide for the payment to the retired members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia the balance of retirement pay past due to them but unpaid from January 1, 1911, to July 30, 1915;

H. R. 5961. An act granting certain public lands to the city of Stockton, Calif., for flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6117. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes";

H. R. 6244. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the present Federal building and site in the city of Rutland, Vt., for the so-called memorial building and site in said city;

H. R. 6260. An act to convey to the city of Baltimore, Md., certain Government property;

H. R. 6261. An act to authorize the exportation from the State or Territory of timber lawfully cut on any national forest or on the public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 7086. An act providing for repairs, improvements, and new buildings at the Seneca Indian School at Wyandotte, Okla.;

H. R. 7616. An act to amend section 89 of chapter 5 of the Judicial Code of the United States;

H. R. 8129. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington in allocation of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

H. R. 9455. An act to dedicate as a public thoroughfare a narrow strip of land owned by the United States in Bardstown, Ky.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 178. An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

H. R. 4785. An act to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to complete the acquisition of the land authorized to be acquired by the public buildings appropriation act approved March 4, 1913, for the connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, and Potomac Park;

H. R. 7178. An act authorizing the sale of certain abandoned tracts of land and buildings;

H. R. 5242. An act to repeal the act approved January 27, 1922, providing for change of entry, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8830. An act amending the act entitled "An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924; and

H. R. 8908. An act granting the consent of Congress to George Washington-Wakefield Memorial Bridge, a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Potomac River.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8186) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in California to be added to the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation and authorizing an appropriation of funds therefor, had requested a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. HARRELD, Mr. CAMERON, and Mr. KENDRICK as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an indefinite leave of absence be granted to the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. STROTHIER, on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted, as an extension of remarks, to print in the Record 15 telegrams that I received last week from certain gentlemen, ministers and otherwise, in East St. Louis, Ill., touching on a certain phase of the English impeachment case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a number of telegrams received by him in relation to the English impeachment. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman believe that inasmuch as the case is out of our hands now and is ready to present to the Senate these telegrams can shed no light on the subject?

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, I will say that this is a matter that was not injected into the case. I think my request is wholly proper, and I respectfully submit that there would be no reflection upon the attitude of the House in having these telegrams printed in the Record.

Mr. BOIES. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, may I modify that request? Most of these telegrams are of the same tenor. They are, as I said, 15 in number. I ask unanimous consent that I may print one of the telegrams and append to that the signatures of the signers of the other telegrams, all of which are in the nature of endorsements of the original idea of the first telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modified request of the gentleman?

Mr. BOIES. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Senate Joint Resolution 78 of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 78. For the amendment of the plant quarantine act of August 20, 1912, to allow the States to quarantine against the shipment therein or through of plants, plant products, and other articles found to be diseased or infested when not covered by a quarantine established by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BROMIDE WATER

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there will be to-day in the washroom a bottle of bromide water. [Laughter.] I wanted to tell you about it for a minute.

Mr. TUCKER. Is there a picture on it?

Mr. McKEOWN. No. It is no advertisement, but it is water that is fine for the nerves. [Laughter.] It is said to make you sleep.

Mr. MILLER. Is it from Oklahoma?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; it is from Oklahoma. It is said to make an unquiet man, a nervous man, sleep. It is said to quiet your nerves. You gentlemen have been on a nervous tension here for a long time. I am just telling you its effect. [Laughter.]

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

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of business on the Speaker's table, he may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLLUTION OF THE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, while we are on the subject of water I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Record a speech that I made before the New York Waterways Association on the subject of the pollution of the waters of the United States, and also to include a summary of the report by the Department of Health of New York.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting some remarks made by him on the subject of the pollution of the waters of the United States. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, some time since the president of the Izaak Walton League of America made the statement before one of the committees of Congress that—

The waters of the United States, inland and coastal, are polluted worse than the waters of any country in the world; far, far in excess of any country of the world. It is stated, and I believe it is true, that 85 per cent of the streams in America are polluted.

I am keenly anxious to do my part in awakening the people of America to this dangerous and uncivilized condition of affairs.

A short time ago I delivered an address before the New York State Waterways Association upon this subject, and I take the liberty of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Record a copy of that speech and including a statement of the New York State Department of Health as to the condition of streams in the State of New York.

POLLUTION OF WATERS

Hon. CLARENCE MACGREGOR. Mr. President and members of the New York State Waterways Association, it is a great pleasure and I appreciate this opportunity to come before you to talk on a subject which is of great importance in the United States, the subject of the pollution of State waters. You perhaps have observed that there have been quite extensive investigations by Congress upon the subject of the pollution of the coastal waters, and legislation has been passed regulating to some extent the discharging of oil and other substances into the waters of the ocean upon our coasts. Congress, however, is limited in its power. It can not go beyond the power of enacting legislation relating to navigable waters, and the subject of pollution of inland waters rests with the States more and more, and I think that the people who come in contact with this proposition are becoming impressed with the necessity of some official action on the part of the people to remedy this condition that exists all over our country.

Civilization has many problems. With the vast increase of population in the United States the problems will increase in number and complexity.

One of the great problems that becomes increasingly important is the reclaiming of our streams and lakes that have become the depositaries of our filth and the protection of those waters that have not yet become contaminated.

We glory in our great industrial system, in the rapid expansion of our cities and towns, the beautiful buildings, the fine homes, the splendid highways. We rejoice in the ever-increasing luxury of living. We exult in the fact that no people upon earth enjoy such a great degree of

prosperity nor enjoy such a high scale of living as the people of the United States. Ours is a great prosperity. We as a Nation revel in wealth. We have been called grossly material, and there is a large measure of truth in the statement. We should not live for business, but business should be the handmaid of life. Business and industry should be a means, not an end of life.

When I see a beautiful stream which pleased the eye and delighted the soul befouled and polluted with the waste of industry, when the trout no longer can live in the brook because of its foulness, when the lake no longer is the paradise of the fisherman and even becomes dangerous to take a morning plunge in because of the danger of typhoid, I feel that we are sacrificing a large part of life to the god of gold.

Upon the surface we are the cleanest people on earth, but when we consider to what extent we drink and bathe in our own filth we can not give much credit to our civilization.

We have made but feeble attempts to remedy this condition of affairs that is rapidly destroying all of our fish life, which has been a source of infinite pleasure and health to thousands of our people and also been an exceedingly important factor in our source of food.

The preservation of our waters for the enjoyment of mankind as a source of pleasure and recreation is far beyond money value, but even if we are so gross as to disregard that feature and regard only the dollar-value side the facts and figures indicate that we are grossly wasteful and negligent. The money costs of the pollution of our waters runs into many millions of dollars annually, and, furthermore, we are destroying one of the greatest sources of sustaining human life.

In his report to Secretary Hoover in 1922 the Commissioner of Fisheries said:

"The public health has been menaced, public works have been damaged, agriculture has suffered, and in some parts of the country the streams have been swept bare of living things. The pecuniary losses suffered as a result are enormous, and the preventable damage to the life and beauty of our streams, lakes, and seacoast is beyond all estimate in terms of money."

The president of the Izaak Walton League of America in a recent hearing before a congressional committee said:

"The waters of the United States, inland and coastal, are polluted worse than the waters of any country in the world; far, far in excess of any country in the world. It is stated, and I believe it is true, that 85 per cent of the streams in America are polluted."

The annual production of fish in the United States is two and one-half billion pounds, and the value to the fishermen is \$85,000,000. The value to the consumer you can estimate.

The recent oil-pollution investigation brought forth many figures as to the cost of oil pollution in the coastal waters.

In 1908 oysters ranked first in value among all the fish products of the United States, being 29 per cent of all fish produced. In 1908 Long Island Sound produced 12½ per cent of the Nation's total. In 1920 the production fell off to 2 per cent. Originally every river and stream that empties into Long Island Sound was a natural spawning bed for shellfish and finny fish. To-day 75 per cent of these natural spawning beds are so grossly polluted that neither shellfish nor finny fish will live therein.

In 1884 the United States coast waters produced 600,000 barrels of salt mackerel. From 1916 the production averaged 90,000 barrels per year, and this in 1921 dwindled to 43,000 barrels.

Salmon was at one time more than abundant in the Connecticut River. The last salmon was seen in 1872.

The same condition obtains with reference to the famous shad of the Hudson River.

Going to the Great Lakes we find the same conditions. In 1908 Lake Michigan had a production of approximately 40,000,000 pounds of fish. In 1918 it had fallen to 38,000,000. Lake Erie in 1908 produced 42,000,000 pounds and in 1918, 38,000,000.

The conservation commission of the State of New York in the report on the investigation of the pollution of streams, published in 1923, said:

"Streams in the State of New York are generally polluted in the more settled regions; in fact, are free from pollution only in the most remote portions of the Adirondacks. This pollution is general and is increasing."

And thus the story goes. Figures might be multiplied, but I simply call attention to a condition that is general throughout our waters that we have permitted to be used as a dumping ground for our filth.

Our noble rivers, the Hudson, the Niagara, the Mohawk, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Mississippi, and hundreds of minor streams have been made sources of danger to life, robbed of their beauty, subordinated to the material side of our life, and loads upon the upward course of our civilization. From the spiritual, aesthetic, and material standpoints we have been grossly negligent and ruthless.

A writer in a recent issue of the *Outlook* has stated some very pertinent truths:

"The Nation has an inalienable right to clean waters.

"Disposition of the waste of industry is a proper charge against industry, and against industry alone.

"No corporations and no communities have any more right to pollute the waters with their waste than have citizens to dump refuse on their neighbors' property.

"We are a long way from attaining the establishment of such principles. When we have written them into law and established them in fact we may have some claim to be called a civilized Nation."

We must give greater attention to this problem so vital to the very life of our people.

Civilization must not be allowed to destroy itself. We must not be blind to the fact that the destruction of natural resources is suicide. Our civilization is too ruthless. We dry up our streams by failing to protect our forests. We kill the bird life by taking away their dwelling places and leave the fields open for the pests that destroy our agriculture. We kill off our fish by destroying their home. We create cesspools from which to extract our drinking water. We pollute our graveyards with the victims of our barbarity. We are more than foolish. We are absolutely stupid.

What are we going to do about it? If the people individually will not have sense enough to live up to a high state of civilization it is necessary for society to protect itself.

Congress is limited in its powers. It can only legislate as to navigation. It has gone to the extent of curbing the discharge of oil into coastal waters, but much further it can not go. The power rests with the States. Some progress has been made by the States. Most of them have laws upon their statute books but in the main poorly enforced. The State of New York through its conservation commission and health department has been encouragingly active. I do not say that there should be an immediate ruthless enforcement, but the enforcement should be more rapid. Methods of disposal should be adopted to rapidly lessen the dangers of industrial waste and the communities should be required more rapidly to discontinue the making of their sewage a source of danger and disgust.

We of New York pride ourselves upon the fact that we have one of the most beautiful States in the Union. We have our beautiful mountains, our valleys, our lakes, and our streams. We have our wonderful cities, towns, and villages. We are the Empire State. We have the largest population and the greatest wealth. We should be a shining example to our sister States in making every stream, every lake, a source of joy to the lover of nature and a source of food value to our people with sane and sensible usage. We have progressed along the road, but I believe that we can go much faster and finally bring about the ideal condition when we can pride ourselves that we are not wallowing in our own filth.

I submit herewith a summary of the sanitary conditions of the watersheds of the State, made by the State department of health.

SUMMARY OF SANITARY CONDITIONS EXISTING ON WATERSHEDS IN NEW YORK STATE

The State of New York contains several large watersheds, or drainage areas. The watersheds drained by the following streams, which comprise practically the entire area of the State, have all been carefully inspected by the State department of health: The Hudson River, the Susquehanna, the Oswego, the Genesee, the Mohawk, the Black, the Delaware, the Au Sable, the Allegheny, the Oswegatchie, and the Raquette. Since 1903, when the present stream pollution law went into effect, it has been the policy of the department to require provision for the construction of sewage-treatment plants for all new sewer systems installed. In the case of approvals of sewer extensions, the department has required that adequate sewage-treatment works be installed by a certain definite date, or that such works be installed and put into operation whenever the State commissioner of health deems the construction of such works necessary. As a result of this policy sewage-treatment plants have been installed in some 20 cities, including Rochester, Syracuse, and Albany, and a number of other cities are either constructing or planning to install treatment works. Similar works have also been installed in nearly 80 villages. A brief description of the sanitary conditions existing on the watersheds of the State is given below.

HUDSON RIVER WATERSHEDS

That the Hudson River is appreciably polluted by sewage and industrial wastes is a well-known fact. Above the village of Corinth this pollution is relatively small, as the river drains vast unpopulated sections of the Adirondacks. At Corinth the pollution of the river begins, as a result of the discharge of pulp-mill wastes into the river. Between Glens Falls and Fort Edward there are a number of pulp mills which discharge sulphite wastes and add very much to the pollution of the river. The effect of this pollution has been found to cause a discoloration of the water and an increase in the turbidity, to fill the stream to a more or less degree with fine suspended and coarse masses of pulp fiber, and to produce a deposit of this matter upon the banks and bed of the river. In view of the fact that these wastes when discharged into the streams do not carry with them the germs of disease and probably very few bacteria, and many of the chemicals discharge with them have germicidal properties, there is no reliable evidence that the discharge of the waste from these industries into the upper Hudson has

any appreciable effect upon the life and health of persons residing along the river. It is possible that at times, when portions of the bed and banks of the river upon which deposits of pulp have occurred, are exposed to the sun, odors may arise from decomposition and create a nuisance locally. Most of the mills which are discharging these wastes were constructed and in operation prior to 1903 and have filed reports as required by section 79 of Article V of the public health law.

As regards the discharge of sewage into the river, it may be stated that there is only one village above Glen Falls which has a public sewer system and discharges sewage into the river. The sewage from Glen Falls is not discharged directly into the Hudson but into a ravine or rock crevice tributary to the river. This department has approved plans for a sewage-treatment plant for the city. Many of the cities and villages such as Saratoga, Ballston, Round Lake, located along tributaries of the Hudson, have constructed and are operating sewage-treatment plants. The cities and villages located along the main stream, such as Troy, Mechanicville, Cohoes, and others, have not, as a rule, provided for the treatment of their sewage, but action is being or has been taken by the department to require such treatment. Where permits have been issued by the department allowing the discharge of sewage from such municipalities, the permits have required that plans showing adequate means for sewage treatment shall be submitted for approval on or before a certain specified date and that the treatment works shall be constructed and put into operation on or before a certain date.

The construction and operation of a sewage-treatment plant by the city of Albany has relieved to a considerable extent the load which has been placed upon the Hudson River. The river broadens out considerably below the city and many relatively large tributary streams which drain large sparsely populated sections discharge into the river. Below Albany the sewage from the cities and villages is generally discharged into the river without treatment. This practice has been followed, and generally without nuisance, owing to the large dilution afforded the sewage and to the fact that below Poughkeepsie the river is unsuitable for a drinking water supply as a result of the effect of the salt of the ocean. With the increasing use of the river for bathing purposes the necessity of providing for the treatment of the sewage from the municipalities is evident. The department has advised the Hudson River State Hospital, the sewage from which is discharged without treatment into the Hudson between the intake of the water supplies for the institution and the city of Poughkeepsie, respectively, to make a request to the legislature for funds to construct a sewage-treatment plant. A similar recommendation has been made in connection with the treatment of the sewage from the Matteawan State Hospital at Beacon. The sewage from the State training school for girls at Hudson has been treated in a sewage-treatment plant for over 10 years.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER WATERSHED

The drainage area of the Susquehanna River comprises nearly one-eighth of the area of the State and is second only to the Hudson in extent. There are only two lakes of any considerable size on the watershed, both of which are located near the headwaters of the river. About 75 per cent of the drainage area is devoted to agriculture and dairying. There are seven cities on the watershed, of which Binghamton and Elmira are the largest. None of these cities nor any of the villages which have sewer connections provide for the treatment of the sewage before its discharge into the stream. However, the sewage from the State institutions at Bath and Oxford and the wastes from the Endicott-Johnson factories at Johnson City are treated before their discharge into the streams. Steps have been taken by the department, however, to require treatment of the sewage from the municipalities, and to this end plans have been approved for sewage-treatment plants for Oneonta, Elmira, and Corning. Norwich has submitted for approval plans for a sewage-treatment plant and Binghamton has such plans now in course of preparation. When the disposal plants for these municipalities are constructed and put in operation there will be no sources of serious sewage pollution on this watershed.

OSWEGO RIVER WATERSHED

The drainage area of the Oswego River occupies the entire central portion of New York State. The "Finger Lakes" and Oneida and Onondaga Lakes are included in the watershed. The drainage area is rather thickly settled and contains many important cities and a large number of villages. Among the larger of these municipalities are Syracuse, Rome, Oneida, Auburn, Geneva, Ithaca, Canandaigua, Oswego, and Fulton. The sewage from Syracuse is passed through a sewage-treatment plant before its discharge into Onondaga Lake. About two years ago Canandaigua installed a plant for the treatment of its sewage and Oneida has just completed and put into operation a sewage-treatment plant. A portion of the sewage of Auburn is passed through treatment plants before its discharge into the tributaries of the Oswego and a part of the sewage of the cities of Oswego and Fulton is treated before its discharge into the Oswego River. Ithaca has a plant for the treatment of the sewage of the city before its discharge into Cayuga Lake, but Geneva and Rome provide no treatment of their sewage. In addition to the municipalities referred to above the following villages located upon the Oswego watershed operate sewage-treatment plants: Seneca

Falls, Lyons, Newark, Penn Yan, Waterloo, East Syracuse, and Eastwood.

In addition to the beneficial effect of the sewage-treatment plants, the enactment of rules and regulations by this department for the protection of water supplies derived from some of the lakes and streams upon the Oswego watershed has resulted in a general improvement of the lakes and streams. Rules and regulations have been enacted for such municipalities as Canandaigua, Ithaca, Auburn, Rome, Syracuse, and others.

GENESEE RIVER WATERSHED

The only city on the watershed of the Genesee River is Rochester, with a population of about 300,000. The sewage, which was formerly discharged into the river from this city, has been intercepted and conducted to a sewage-treatment plant near Lake Ontario, and is discharged after treatment into this lake. The number of sewer villages on the watershed is comparatively small and the amount of sewage pollution is accordingly small. The villages of Avon, Mount Morris, and Dansville have plants which treat the sewage from the villages before its discharge into the stream. The conditions upon the watershed are improved also by the enactment of rules and regulations for the protection from contamination of the water supplies for several villages, including Avon, Geneseo, Perry, and Nunda, as well as the supply for the city of Rochester. One of the most frequent sources of pollution upon the Genesee watershed is the wastes from cheese factories and creameries. The pollution by these wastes is not serious, generally, but it often causes local nuisance near the vicinity of the factories. The Genesee may be considered, therefore, in a generally satisfactory condition with the exception of the creation of minor nuisances, intermittently, near a few villages which have not as yet installed sewage-treatment works.

MOHAWK RIVER WATERSHED

The Mohawk River drains the east-central portion of New York State. It rises about 40 miles east of Lake Ontario and empties into the Hudson River a little above Troy. The principal tributaries are East and West Canada Creeks from the north draining the southwestern portion of the Adirondacks, and Schoharie Creek from the south. A large percentage of the population on the watershed resides in cities and villages located on the Mohawk River. The amount of immediate pollution reaching the river is, therefore, relatively large. The water power available on the Mohawk and its tributaries has led to the location of numerous factories in the cities and villages. These factories discharge large quantities of wastes into the streams. The largest amount of waste comes from the cotton and silk mills, each discharging more or less bleachery agents and dyestuffs. The woolen mills, carpet mills, and leather factories discharge large amounts of organic matter. Except below Johnstown, Little Falls, Amsterdam, Dolgeville, and Utica, where local nuisances are at times created, the condition of the river is, generally speaking, fairly satisfactory.

The city of Utica has just had plans prepared for a complete sewage-treatment works for the city. Sewage-treatment plants have been built at Frankfort, Gloversville, and Schenectady. These plants have naturally improved conditions below these cities and villages.

In general it may be said that the Mohawk River receives sufficient pollution at most of the centers of population to produce grossly polluted water for limited distances below the various outlets. Self-purification in the river leads to the elimination of a large amount of this polluting material, so that physical nuisances are not produced at many places. The extent of the bacteriological pollution is such, however, that the raw Mohawk River water can not be used at any place for potable purposes.

BLACK RIVER WATERSHED

The Black River through its tributaries, the Moose and Beaver Rivers, drains portions of the Adirondack wilderness, comprising many small lakes. Except for Watertown, the only city upon the watershed, and for several small villages the population is well scattered. Owing to the wooded nature of the watershed and to the water power afforded by the falls in the river, numerous pulp mills and industrial establishments have located along the river. These mills discharge large amounts of wastes into the river, causing considerable pollution in the immediate vicinity of the outlets. Many of the mills have filed reports with the department as required by law. Watertown obtains its water supply from the river, and in view of the discharge of the sulphite wastes into the stream the water is found very difficult to treat before it is delivered to the consumers.

The amount of sewage discharged into the river is very small except at Watertown, Carthage, and West Carthage. These communities have sewer systems and discharge their sewage into the river without treatment. Plans have been approved by the department for a sewage-treatment plant for Carthage, and the department has just required West Carthage to have plans prepared for a sewage-treatment plant for that village. The construction of sewage-treatment plants for these villages will eliminate the principal sewage menace of the Watertown water supply.

DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED

The Delaware River watershed in New York State is of a relatively rural character, the principal occupation being farming. There are

many dairies on this area and about 60 or 70 creameries and cheese factories. A large amount of the milk is shipped without manufacture. There are about 20 plants engaged in the manufacture of wood alcohol and 2 tanneries upon the watershed. There is only 1 city (Port Jervis) and 13 incorporated villages upon the watershed. Aside from the concentration of population at these points, the watershed is sparsely populated. During the summer, however, a large number of tourists and vacationists visit this section of the State.

The wastes from many of the creameries are discharged into the streams without treatment. Where nuisances resulting from such discharge have come to the attention of the department, the creameries have been required to provide at least settling-tank treatment of the waste water and washings and to discontinue the discharge into the streams of whey and skim milk, the usual source of the nuisance. In regard to the wastes from the acid factories, it may be said that the pollution of the streams by these wastes, which was very serious 15 years ago, has been practically eliminated.

Many of the villages upon the watershed have no sewer systems and consequently there is very little direct discharge of sewage into the river except through an occasional private sewer. Some of the villages, such as Liberty, Monticello, Stamford, and Hobart, which have sewer systems, provide for the treatment of the sewage before its discharge into the stream. The sewage from Port Jervis is discharged into the river without treatment, and, aside from the fact that local objectionable conditions exist at times, no nuisance occurs as a result of such discharge, which is at the State line. A few miles below all evidence of the sewage discharge has disappeared.

AU SABLE RIVER WATERSHED

The Au Sable River drains one of the most beautiful sections of the Adirondack Mountains. The watershed is made up of forest-covered mountains, the mecca of tourists and vacationists. The permanent population upon the watershed is very small and is located principally at Lake Placid, Au Sable Forks, Keeseville, and Au Sable Chasm. Lake Placid village has a public sewer system, the sewage from which is passed through a sewage-treatment plant before its discharge into the stream. The other villages have only private sewers, from which the sewage in small amounts is discharged into the Au Sable without treatment.

The principal source of pollution of the Au Sable River is the wastes from the pulp mill of the J. & J. Rogers Co. at Au Sable Forks; a mill has been operated by the company at this point for many years. For a long time all of the sulphite wastes were discharged directly into the river, but for the past 10 years all of the concentrated sulphite wastes and the first washings, amounting to over 125,000 gallons per day, have been treated in evaporators for the manufacture of materials used for tanning, for road binder, and core binder. As a result the pollution of the river has been lessened materially.

For many years Keeseville obtained its water supply from the river below the point of discharge of these wastes, but a new water supply derived from an upland stream has been secured.

ALLEGHENY RIVER WATERSHED

The watershed of the Allegheny River is largely wilderness; the population is small and scattered, outside of the cities and villages. There are three cities on the watershed—Jamestown, Olean, and Salamanca—having a total population of about 70,000. Except near these cities, where the pollution is objectionable, the conditions on the watershed are fairly satisfactory so far as sewage pollution is concerned. The pollution of the streams by factory wastes, tannery wastes, and oil wastes is objectionable at certain points, more particularly below Jamestown, Salamanca, and Olean, respectively. Olean has two disposal plants, which treat the sewage from a portion of the city, and Jamestown is planning to install a sewage-disposal plant to treat the entire sewage of the city in the immediate future.

OSWEGATCHIE RIVER WATERSHED

The watershed of the Oswegatchie River is very sparsely settled and densely wooded. The only city upon the watershed is Ogdensburg, and in view of its location at the very mouth of the river, its effect upon the watershed is unimportant. There are several villages upon the drainage area, Gouverneur being the largest of these. The sewage from this village is discharged into the river without treatment, but has no particular effect upon the river except as it produces a local nuisance. The other communities have only short lengths of semipublic or private sewers.

The wastes from pulp and paper mills and occasionally a creamery or cheese factory contribute visibly to the pollution of the stream. The water naturally has a dark color, due partly to the vast swampy areas drained by the river and partly to the industrial wastes.

RAQUETTE RIVER WATERSHED

The Raquette River rises in a densely wooded, sparsely settled section of the Adirondacks. There are no cities and only four incorporated villages upon the watershed. The pollution of the Raquette River by sewage is therefore not large. Potsdam, Norwood, and Massena have public sewer systems and Tupper Lake has private sewers, the sewage from which is discharged into the river without treatment. Other

sources of pollution on the watershed are the pulp mills and lumber mills, which discharge sulphite wastes and sawdust into the river. The effect of the discharge of the sewage and wastes into the river is apparent in most cases only for a short distance below the outlets.

Piercetield, Potsdam, and Norwood obtain their water supplies from the Raquette, but the consumers do not as a rule use the water for drinking purposes.

CONCLUSIONS

From this résumé it is evident that a considerable improvement in the sanitary condition of streams in New York State has been accomplished. Among the outstanding improvements has been the construction and operation of sewage-treatment plants by many of the large cities and villages of the State. The enactment by the department of rules and regulations for the protection from contamination of 100 public water supplies in the State has been responsible for the preservation of the relative purity of many streams.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 178) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 178) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman a question? Is this bill now on the Senate calendar?

Mr. LEAVITT. It just came over from the Senate this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. LEAVITT, Mr. SPROUL of Kansas, and Mr. HAYDEN.

LANDS ON SANTA YSABEL RESERVATION, CALIF.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8186) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in California to be added to the Santa Ysabel Reservation, and authorizing an appropriation of funds therefor, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is no matter that comes before the House about which there should be greater care and more opportunity for scrutiny than in connection with Indian legislation and upon matters affecting the Indians. In this case the House passed a bill the other day by unanimous consent, a bill that otherwise, probably, would not have gotten up for consideration, a bill authorizing money to be used for the purpose of buying land for a certain tribe of Indians in California. There was nothing else in the bill. That bill has gone to the Senate, and, as I understand it, the Senate has attached to it an amendment not at all germane, the amendment providing for the consideration of claims of several tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, an entirely unrelated matter. What merit there may in that proposition, I do not know. I feel that the bill for those claims ought to take its regular course; it ought to be reported by the gentleman's committee; it ought to come up in the House in the regular way, and ought to be considered on its merits. Whenever a provision like that is hitched on as a rider to something entirely unrelated it gives it a peculiar appearance. For one I do not propose that that kind of legislation as to Indian affairs shall be successful, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to this bill going to conference, although I will withhold that objection if the gentleman from Montana can assure the House that the House conferees will not accept the extraneous matter that has been put in this bill by the Senate.

Mr. LEAVITT. I will say to the gentleman that the amendment placed on the bill by the Senate is a matter which really should be considered not by the Committee on Indian Affairs but by the Committee on the Public Lands. The purpose in asking for a conference is to prevent the bill from passing with that amendment in it without the fullest sort of consideration.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have every confidence in the gentleman. My desire now is to put a stop right here to that kind of rider legislation, and if the gentleman could assure the House that the House conferees will not accept the extraneous matter contained in this particular Senate amendment I shall not object.

MR. LEAVITT. I can not speak for the other two conferees, but my opinion is that this matter should be thoroughly considered by the Committee on the Public Lands and handled there in the regular way.

MR. CRAMTON. Then I suggest that the gentleman, for the present, withdraw his request, and until such time as he can speak with definiteness for all of the conferees.

MR. LEAVITT. I will be glad to do that. Mr. Speaker, through an arrangement with the gentleman from Michigan, I withdraw the request for unanimous consent until I have had an opportunity to confer with my committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved bills of the following titles:

On March 27, 1926:

H. R. 7979. An act granting to the Yosemite Valley Railroad Co. the right of way through certain public lands for the relocation of part of its existing railroad.

On March 31, 1926:

H. R. 7741. An act to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River near Geneva, Geneva County, Ala., on State Road No. 20;

H. R. 8040. An act granting the consent of Congress to the reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of an existing bridge across the Missouri River at or near Fort Benton, Mont.;

H. R. 8514. An act granting the consent of Congress to Missouri State Highway Commission to construct a bridge across Black River;

H. R. 8598. An act granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Morehouse Parish, La., or the State Highway Commission of Louisiana to construct a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at or near Point Pleasant, in Morehouse Parish;

H. R. 8909. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Barry, State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the White River; and

H. R. 8910. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Barry, State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the White River.

On April 1, 1926:

H. R. 2830. An act to legalize a wharf and marine railway owned by George Peppler in Finneys Creek at Wachapreague, Accomac County, Va.; and

H. R. 3925. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States."

On April 2, 1926:

H. R. 9007. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Cairo Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate bridges across the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers at Cairo, Ill.; and

H. R. 9599. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Louisville, Ky., to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near said city.

On April 3, 1926:

H. R. 3834. An act to amend section 65 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend invitations to foreign governments to be represented by delegates at the International Congress of Soil Science to be held in the United States in 1927.

SALE OF CERTAIN ABANDONED TRACTS OF LAND AND BUILDINGS

MR. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 7178, authorizing the sale of certain abandoned tracts of land and buildings, and agree to the Senate amendment.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7178, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the amendment of the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Senate amendment was read.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

MR. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the purpose of this bill as it originally passed the House, on a favorable report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, was to authorize the disposition of property that the Government had abandoned in so far as its use was concerned.

MR. ELLIOTT. Yes. It is property under the control of the Treasury Department.

MR. LANHAM. The Senate amendment simply provides that in case some of that property may be needed by other departments of the Government that instead of a sale a transfer may be made to such department.

MR. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

So the Senate amendment was agreed to.

BIRTHDAY OF REPRESENTATIVE TILSON

THE SPEAKER. Before proceeding with the Consent Calendar the Chair will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to take the chair. [Applause.]

MR. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, and you, my colleagues, I take the floor for the first time since my election as Speaker to make an announcement which, I know, will be of interest to you. To-day is the birthday of the gentleman from Connecticut, the able leader on the majority side. [Applause.] Sixty years have passed since that happy event. To look at him one could scarcely believe that that can be the fact, but it is in the record in his own handwriting. [Laughter.] Time has dealt kindly with him, though, for in rugged vigor, both mental and physical, he is surpassed by but few men in this House. [Applause.]

In all the years I have been here I can think of but few men who have so steadily progressed onward and upward not only in the respect but in the affection of his colleagues, and in wishing him health and happiness and continued prosperity throughout his life. I am sure I am merely echoing the sentiments of every man here. [Prolonged applause, the Members rising.]

MR. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority in particular, I beg to join in felicitations to the gentleman from Connecticut upon this anniversary of his birth. [Applause.] And may I not say, as a Tennessean, and especially in behalf of Tennesseans, the fact that this very happy event occurred in our State is not to us a matter of regret. [Applause.]

I congratulate the gentleman whose conduct as the leader of his party along political lines is marked by a candor and a strict integrity of action which causes him to command the respect of all of us [applause]; whose high character causes him to be universally esteemed and whose agreeable personal qualities elicit the affections of all with whom he comes in contact. [Applause.]

MR. TILSON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House, I wish to express my very sincere appreciation of the most generous words just spoken by our beloved Speaker and by the distinguished minority leader.

I am not going to make a speech and thereby possibly spoil all the good things they have said about me. It will serve the purpose better to simply express to you my sincere appreciation and thanks for this demonstration of a personal character. I shall, however, take advantage of the occasion to thank you all for your cooperation and assistance in carrying out the important business of this House; for after all, that is the matter in which I am most deeply concerned. I am glad to say that thus far the entire membership of this House, without regard to parties, have joined with me and cooperated with me in making the fine record this House has made to date. Therefore I take this occasion to thank you for this cooperation and to add that we are now ready to proceed with the business of the House. [Applause.]

CONSENT CALENDAR

LUMMI INDIAN RESERVATION, WASH.

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 61) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of a road on the Lummi Indian Reservation, Wash.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MR. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, which is No. 79 on the calendar, may be passed over without prejudice.

MR. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the second time this bill has been passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked that it go over with a view to completing an inquiry for information on account of a possible objection, which is not completed and will do me an injustice unless it is completed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

KAW RESERVATION IN OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7083) authorizing the sale and conveyance of certain lands on the Kaw Reservation in Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8725) to establish the warrant grade of pay clerk and the commissioned warrant grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, and chief pay clerk in the United States Marine Corps.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to ask the gentleman what this is going to cost.

Mr. COYLE. The immediate effect, Mr. Speaker, of this bill is a slight saving to the Treasury of the United States. The positive cost will not begin at all until the end of several years from the present time—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, just one moment. The Secretary of the Navy in his report shows that in the seventh year it will cost \$18,736; eighth year, \$21,677; ninth year, \$22,367; and the tenth year, \$29,747. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the press notices which say the President is sending for the Speaker and the majority leader and the steering committee, if not daily, weekly, and admonishing them that this Congress must stop passing bills that take money out of the Treasury. Where is his line of demarcation?

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker, may I answer that objection on this basis? It is my understanding that that last figure is the maximum added cost under this bill; and in addition to that—

Mr. BLANTON. Has the Bureau of the Budget approved this bill?

Mr. COYLE. The Bureau of the Budget has approved this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Bureau of the Budget has approved it, I shall not stand in the way of it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman know that the Army field clerks are coming in for the same kind of bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to stand in the way of a bill of this character if the Bureau of the Budget says, "Let it pass."

Mr. COYLE. The gentleman is correct in that statement. The Bureau of the Budget has approved this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the warrant grade of pay clerk in the United States Marine Corps is hereby established, appointments thereto to be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy. Officers in said grade shall have the same rank, pay, allowances, and other benefits as now are or may hereafter be allowed other warrant officers in the Marine Corps. All pay clerks hereafter appointed shall be warrant officers. Pay clerks now in the Marine Corps shall be warranted as pay clerks under the provisions of this act and shall take rank in accordance with their present dates of precedence.

That the commissioned warrant grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, and chief pay clerk in the Marine Corps are hereby established, and that marine gunners, quartermaster clerks, and pay clerks shall after six years from the date of warrant be commissioned chief marine gunners, chief quartermaster clerks, and chief pay clerks, respectively, after passing satisfactorily such examinations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, and when so commissioned they shall have the same rank, pay, allowances, and other benefits as now are or may hereafter be allowed commissioned warrant officers of the Navy: *Provided*, That for the purpose of computing the six-year

period of service required for promotion from warrant to chief warrant rank, all service as pay clerk, warrant officer, and commissioned officer in the Marine Corps and all active service for purposes other than training rendered during the period from April 6, 1917, to December 31, 1921, under a temporary appointment as a pay clerk, warrant or commissioned officer in the United States Marine Corps, or as a pay clerk, warrant or commissioned officer in the United States Marine Corps Reserve, shall be counted: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed so as to reduce the pay, allowances, emoluments, or other benefits that any person now in the service would have received but for the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the total number of warrant officers and commissioned warrant officers shall not exceed the total number of warrant officers and pay clerks now authorized by law.

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

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

AMENDING ACT DONATING PUBLIC LANDS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1250) to amend an act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth section of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, as amended by the act approved March 3, 1883, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That all moneys derived from the sale of lands aforesaid by the States to which lands are apportioned, and from the sales of land scrip hereinbefore provided for, shall be invested in bonds of the United States or of the States or some other safe bonds; or the same may be invested by the States having no State bonds in any manner after the legislatures of such States shall have assented thereto and engaged that such funds shall yield a fair and reasonable rate of return, to be fixed by the State legislatures, and that the principal thereof shall forever remain unimpaired: *Provided*, That the moneys so invested or loaned shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished (except so far as may be provided in section 5 of this act), and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

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

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

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF HANA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4799) to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the district of Hana, on the island and county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. JARRETT] as to the form of the bill, I ask that it may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF LAND WITH THE LEO SHEEP CO., OF RAWLINS, WYO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1462) permitting the Leo Sheep Co., of Rawlins, Wyo., to convey certain lands to the United States and to select other lands in lieu thereof in Carbon County, Wyo., for the improvement of the Medicine Bow National Forest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, this is a bill authorizing the exchange of land outside of the national forest under supervision of the General Land Office for certain lands that are in certain national forests. The Agricultural

Department recommends the exchange, which gives them an additional amount of land. The Interior Department has control of the land that is to be given this company, and it says:

I am without information regarding the necessity of the proposed legislation and am not informed as to the relative value of the lands or the merits of the exchange proposed. Unless there is some particular administrative reason therefor, I am opposed to the enactment of legislation authorizing an exchange involving lands outside of a national forest. Therefore I recommend that S. 1462 be not enacted.

In view of that statement of the department I will be glad if we could have some further information concerning this exchange.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was passed over at the request of the gentleman from Michigan on the last unanimous-consent day, I visited the Secretary in person and Judge Finney, the Assistant Secretary, and ascertained that there was no particular objection to this particular bill. But there was a consistent policy of the Department of the Interior against making any such exchanges of land with the Department of Agriculture unless there were administrative reasons justifying it.

At the time the Secretary sent the letter to the Public Lands Committee he did not have before him the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, which to some degree at least did state the administrative reasons. I call attention to these reasons as set out in the last report, No. 437, in which the Secretary says:

This measure is similar to other legislation which has been enacted to authorize exchanges, in that the lands to be conveyed must be chiefly valuable for national forest purposes and the lands selected shall not exceed them in value. The department has found that much good can be accomplished through the consolidation in Government ownership of those natural units of forest-producing lands. Such laws enable the Forest Service to simplify many administrative problems and provide much better fire protection.

Since public interests would be promoted through legislation of this character, the department would recommend favorable consideration of the measure.

I conceive that to be a sufficient administrative reason to answer the question. In addition, we have a later statement from Secretary Jardine to this effect:

In view of the fact that the land is within the exterior boundaries of the Medicine Bow National Forest and that some of it is forest-producing land which, if protected, would eventually produce a larger and more valuable forest asset, it is the belief of the forester that it would be in the public interest to acquire this land by exchange in the manner proposed in Senate bill 1462.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Forest Service is always ready to accept more land, but when they are asked to give up lands as when more lands are wanted to add to a park they are rather reluctant. I have not noticed that Congress has been very ready to take land away from the forest reserves unless the Forest Service gave express consent.

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. WINTER. In response to that I wish to say that at the present time there is pending a bill to which the Forest Service has given its consent that would transfer over 300,000 acres in Wyoming in the Teton Forest Reserve to the Yellowstone National Park.

Mr. CRAMTON. In exchange for some other lands, and the event that the gentleman speaks about is quite amazing, because it is the first progress in that direction that we have been able to make in a number of years. However, leaving that aside, I think, as a matter of good legislative policy, that in these minor matters the department that is responsible ought to give its approval before we act. I have talked with Governor Spry, the Commissioner of the Land Office, who says that he feels in a case like this that the party that wants the exchange ought to make that fact known to the Land Office some time in advance and thus give them an opportunity to examine the land involved or which is to be exchanged and that for which it is to be exchanged; and if it is a fair proposition and there are good administrative reasons for it, the department will approve of it. I do not want to cause any embarrassment to my friend from Wyoming [Mr. WINTER] or any inconvenience, and in view of his statement quoting the Secretary of the Interior upon this I am not going to object to the bill. I do suggest to the Committee on Public Lands, however, which has reported this bill, that in the future we ought to give the Interior Department an opportunity to examine these matters and not make a report upon them unless they have been given their opportunity. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon delivery to the Secretary of the Interior by Leo Sheep Co., of Rawlins, Wyo., of its properly executed deed or deeds conveying to the United States of America the lands of Leo Sheep Co., in sections 11 and 15, the north half of section 23, and the north half of the south half of section 23, township 18 north, range 82 west of the sixth principal meridian, containing approximately 1,760 acres, within the Medicine Bow National Forest, Wyo., the said company shall be authorized and permitted to select not to exceed an equal value of public lands of the United States within townships 13, 14, and 15, in range 90 west of the sixth principal meridian, in Carbon County, Wyo.: *Provided*, That in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture the interests of the United States will be benefited by such exchange of lands: *And provided further*, That the lands proposed to be conveyed to the United States are found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be chiefly valuable for national forest purposes.

SEC. 2. That when the title to the lands herein described shall have reverted in the United States pursuant to the foregoing provisions, and selection of lands in lieu thereof has been made as above by Leo Sheep Co., the Secretary of the Interior shall cause a patent to issue conveying such selected lands to Leo Sheep Co.; but in such patent there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits within said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same.

SEC. 3. That lands conveyed to the United States under the provisions of this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become a part of the national forest within the exterior boundaries of which they are situated, and shall be subject to the control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

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

PURCHASE OF LANDING FIELD NEAR LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1144) authorizing the Secretary of War to acquire a tract of land for use as a landing field at the air intermediate depot near the city of Little Rock, in the State of Arkansas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that either the original Senate bill be approved or else the amendment which I shall offer that the land be paid for out of the proceeds of the sale of other lands be agreed to. However, the Senate bill as it came to us is perfectly satisfactory if the committee amendment be rejected. Will the gentleman accept that?

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can see the position that I am in. I introduced a bill and Senator ROBINSON introduced a bill, as the gentleman knows, which provided that the \$100,000 should be appropriated out of funds derived from the sale of Government property at Picron. There was some objection on the part of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget because it created a revolving fund in the War Department, and to comply with his suggestion an amendment was offered which has been incorporated as a committee amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that the War Department got itself into this situation; and, after all, it is up to us to do the legislating and not the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Senate bill as it came over to us, Senator ROBINSON's bill, is quite satisfactory, and that would use the funds of the sale of the lands right in that locality. I do not see why the gentleman can not accept that.

Mr. RAGON. The gentleman realizes the position that I am in.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly. The gentleman wants this land purchased, does he not?

Mr. RAGON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think the Senate or House bill will do that.

Mr. RAGON. And I thought so, or I would not have introduced that kind of a bill.

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

Mr. RAGON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Is it clearly understood, if this bill is permitted to come up now without objection in this way, that the committee amendment will not be agreed to and that the bill as passed by the Senate will be the bill agreed to? Is that clearly understood?

Mr. RAGON. I can only say this much to the gentleman that with the influence of himself and others on his side that would undoubtedly be done. Personally, I have no objection to that procedure, but under the circumstances I shall have to conform to the policy suggested by the Budget Bureau; I feel that I am committed and therefore can not consent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection that I have made to the bill.

Mr. RAGON. I would not want anyone to think that I am blowing hot and cold with the War Department and the Director of the Budget, who have been very kind to me and very considerate of the rights of my people.

Mr. BEGG. Oh, nobody can ever accuse the gentleman of doing that. With that understanding, that the committee amendment will not be agreed to and that the bill as originally passed in the Senate will be passed here, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object in order to get some information, if the Senate bill becomes a law and certain 36½ acres of land are sold in accordance with the Senate bill, how much is it expected will be realized.

Mr. RAGON. The gentleman misunderstands the situation. The 36½ acres are to be purchased from the proceeds of the sale of the picron-acid plant, amounting to more than 400 acres. My recollection is that Senator ROBINSON stated a while ago that the entire purchase price was something over \$300,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the picron-acid plant been sold?

Mr. RAGON. The sale was consummated last week.

Mr. CRAMTON. And it brought some \$200,000?

Mr. RAGON. I think that it brought above \$300,000.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. CRAMTON. What becomes of that money?

Mr. BEGG. It goes into the General Treasury.

Mr. CRAMTON. Just a moment. What becomes of it?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It will go into the General Treasury.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does it go for new construction of Army posts as in the Hill bill?

Mr. RAGON. No; the purpose of this original bill is to take \$100,000 of that money and apply it to the purchase of this additional landing field.

Mr. CRAMTON. The only difference I see between the bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as reported by the committee is that as it passed the Senate the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] is sure of getting his money, and as it has been reported by the committee there is only an authorization, and the gentleman is a long way from getting his money, but if my friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] and my friend from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] are anxious to expedite the payment of the \$100,000 I shall not get in their way.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. So far as that is concerned, the War Department and every other department of the Government say they need it. I am not questioning whether or not they need it. I am simply taking their word by allowing them to sell one piece of property and buy another. If they sell 5,000 acres and buy 3 acres and feel in their executive discretion that the 3 acres are more valuable than the 5,000 acres I have no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is to make sure that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] gets his money, but I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized to acquire, at a cost not to exceed \$100,000, a tract of land, 66½ acres in area, for use as a landing field at the air intermediate depot, near the city of Little Rock, in the State of Arkansas, and the purchase price of said land shall be paid by the Attorney General out of the proceeds of the sale of the Government property at Picron, said property comprising 400 acres of land heretofore donated to the Government by the citizens of Little Rock at a cost of approximately \$300,000.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purchase of not to exceed 75 acres of land adjoining the present lands occupied by the air intermediate depot in Little Rock, Ark., and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to make said purchase."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

USE OF INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS FOR PAYMENT OF INSURANCE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9099) authorizing the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for payment of insurance premiums for protection of the property of the tribe against fire, theft, tornado, and hail.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand this is land, or improvements on the land?

Mr. LEAVITT. It is the property of the Indians in the form of buildings and other personal property.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Whom is it done through—the Indian agent?

Mr. LEAVITT. Through the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do you only insure against tornado now?

Mr. LEAVITT. In many ways, to the advantage of the Indians. But the comptroller has ruled that you can not do it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How do the Indians feel about it?

Mr. LEAVITT. They are favorable to it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Have they been consulted.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; they were present and were consulted.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate bill 2530 be considered in place of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill 2530 be considered in place of the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I should, in fairness, state that the Senate bill has an addition of four or five words at the end of it. It adds after the word "hail" the words "earthquake, and other elements and forces of nature."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I suppose they are usual in that locality?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the funds of any tribe of Indians under the control of the United States may be used for payments of insurance premiums for protection of the property of the tribe against fire, theft, tornado, hail, earthquake, and other elements and forces of nature.

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the similar House bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9351) extending the period of time for homestead entries on the south half of the diminished Colville Indian Reservation.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the period provided by law for the filing of homestead entries upon the lands of the south half of the diminished Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, as provided in the act of Congress approved March 22, 1906, as amended by the act of Congress approved March 9, 1922, be, and is hereby, extended for a period of five years from and after the 4th day of September, 1926.

With a committee amendment as follows:

On line 7 strike out the word "March" and insert in lieu thereof the word "May."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

PROSECUTION OF CLAIMS BY CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 134) authorizing the Cherokee Indians, the Seminole Indians, the Creek Indians, and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians to prosecute claims, jointly or severally, in one or more petitions, as each of said Indian nations or tribes may elect.

The title of the resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of Congress approved March 19, 1924, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Cherokee Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes"; the act of Congress approved May 20, 1924, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes"; the act of Congress approved May 24, 1924, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Creek Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes"; and the act of Congress approved June 7, 1924, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes," shall be construed to permit the claims of the Cherokee Nation or Tribe, the Seminole Nation or Tribe, the Creek Nation or Tribe, and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations or Tribes, to be prosecuted by each of the respective nations or tribes, jointly or severally, in one or more petitions, as each of said nations or tribes may elect.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2 strike out all of lines 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 down to and including the word "elect" and insert "permit each Indian nation or tribe mentioned in said acts of Congress to prosecute its claims in a single suit or to bring a separate suit on one or more claims as its attorney or attorneys may elect: *Provided*, That the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations or Tribes may jointly or severally prosecute their claims."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. J. Res. 134) which I introduced is for the purpose of authorizing the Five Civilized Tribes, namely, the Cherokees, Creeks, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws, to institute and prosecute separate suits upon separate causes of action under the jurisdictional bills enacted during 1924. Since Congress passed these bills attorneys have been employed on behalf of the several tribes and they are prepared to file suits upon a number of claims against the Government but are not prepared to bring all of the suits in one bill for each of the various tribes.

To illustrate, if either of the tribes mentioned has two or more causes of action, this resolution is intended to permit said tribe or nation to bring a suit upon one or more causes of

action, jointly or separately, without waiting to join all causes of action in one petition. Accountants are at work going over the books of the departments, and I am informed are not yet ready to report upon all claims which the tribes may have against the Government.

This resolution permits them to file any suits which they have prepared and will permit each tribe to bring any additional suits within the time granted in the original jurisdictional bills; but all suits must be filed within five years from the date of approval of the respective jurisdictional bills. This resolution does not enlarge the time or jurisdiction of the original acts. All that is desired and all that is intended to be done is to permit each of the tribes to bring separate suits upon separate causes of action if the attorneys employed think it advisable, without waiting to join all causes of action in one suit.

It will be noted the last proviso of the resolution authorized the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations to prosecute their suits jointly or severally. The reason for this is that the original jurisdictional act approved June 7, 1924, authorized these two tribes to prosecute their claims jointly, and these tribes, having joint and undivided interest in certain claims, should be permitted to bring suit either jointly or severally. I am anxious for these tribes to have their claims fully and speedily presented.

The affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes have been about wound up. All rolls were completed on March 4, 1907. Their lands have all been allotted, and most of their tribal property, except some school property belonging to the Creeks, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws, and the coal and asphalt deposits belonging to the Choctaws and Chickasaws, has been disposed of. All their money has from time to time been distributed per capita.

When such claims as may be filed against the Government have been adjudicated and the school property and coal and asphalt deposits have been disposed of, the affairs of the tribes are ready to be finally wound up.

I have been impatient with the ineffectual efforts made to dispose of the coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaws and Chickasaws. I have repeatedly insisted that these deposits should be extensively advertised in such a way as to bring the very highest prices to the tribes. The first agreement was made with the Choctaws and Chickasaws in 1897 and ratified in 1898, 28 years ago, and yet but little of these deposits have been disposed of.

It is estimated that one-third of the original enrolled members of these tribes are dead, and great difficulty is found in determining some of their heirs.

It is urged that because of the financial depression the time has not been opportune to sell these deposits. However, Congress has enacted all the necessary legislation and it is now an administrative matter. It rests with the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. I believe I voice the sentiment of the Choctaws, who in part I represent, when I say they are anxious to have their affairs wound up and the coal and asphalt deposits sold, so as to bring the very highest price obtainable. No good can come from further delay. These deposits must be sold some time. Why not during the lifetime of the original allottees, so that they may receive the benefit? The responsibility is upon the Interior Department. If I had the responsibility, I would advertise these deposits in such a way as to attract the attention of all persons interested and I would sell them and divide the money per capita among the enrolled members of the tribes.

It is estimated that all claims provided for under the jurisdictional bills referred to should be instituted and finally adjudicated within the next five years, and within that time all the coal and asphalt deposits could be sold and all other property converted into cash and distributed per capita to the enrolled members of the tribes.

The members of these tribes are citizens of the United States and are taking an active part in all matters pertaining to the development of the State of Oklahoma. The State is interested in the sale of these deposits, and especially the localities in which these deposits are found, because the development of these properties will bring additional capital to the development of these properties, increase the population, and the money expended will benefit all the people, Indian and white, in the surrounding cities, and in addition these properties will be placed upon the tax rolls and measurably lower the tax rates, local, county, and State.

I am in this way bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House and the Department of the Interior, and pointing out our responsibility, and as a final word I want to again urge that these coal and asphalt deposits be disposed of.

at the very earliest date consistent with securing a fair price for these Indians, so that the development of the sections of the State in which they are located will no longer be retarded.

I submit no official of the Government and no Member of Congress, if he were interested in winding up an estate, would remain silent and be satisfied if his share of the estate were withheld from him for 23 years. In brief, so far as the proceeds from the coal and asphalt deposits, that is the case with the Choctaws and Chickasaws.

PAWNEE INDIAN SCHOOL PLANT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1834) providing for a remodeling, repairing, and improving the Pawnee Indian school plant, Pawnee, Okla., and providing an appropriation therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which is being taken care of in a pending appropriation bill, and, therefore, I object.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2274) providing for the promotion of a professor at the United States Military Academy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman from New York going to object to this bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is any gentleman from the Military Affairs Committee present to tell us the necessity for this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over and retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over and retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF AN ACT OF CONGRESS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5353) to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 876).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in carrying out that provision in the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 876), which authorized the construction of a "United States post office and land office at Chamberlain, S. Dak." upon a site to be acquired for that purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury may have said building so constructed as to omit accommodations for the land office.

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

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

UNITED STATES MARINE HOSPITAL RESERVATION, DETROIT, MICH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9875) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the United States marine hospital reservation and improvements thereon at Detroit, Mich., and to acquire a suitable site in the same locality and to erect thereon a modern hospital for the treatment of the beneficiaries of the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1924.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly within the next 10 years we are going to have hospitals on our hands. There are a number of vacant beds now in many of our Government owned and controlled hospitals, and for that reason I object.

REMISSION OF FINES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9511) authorizing the Postmaster General to remit or change deductions or fines imposed upon contractors for mail service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman from New York going to object to this bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not see any necessity for the remission of fine once they are imposed.

Mr. BLANTON. Then let the gentleman object, so that we may go on with something else.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this statement: This bill reenacts section 3962 of the Revised Statutes under which deductions or fines may be changed or remitted in the discretion of the Postmaster General. The practice has always been that he has done that as to these little fines that are assessed for failure to fully perform a contract, but the Comptroller General has recently held that the law does not permit him to do that. This bill merely adds to the statute enough to authorize the Postmaster General to perform that service.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The Treasury Department, with respect to post-office buildings, comes nearer getting 100 per cent value on the dollar than any other department of the Government, and that is so because when they make a contract with the contractor they hold him to it. I am one of those who is backing up the Comptroller General in his opinion, and I intend to object. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] will object, so as to save me that trouble.

Mr. BAILEY. I just want to say this further, the only difference in the present arrangement and the proposed arrangement is that when a mistake has been made it is now necessary to go through a lot of red tape for remitting a penalty of \$2 or \$5.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. When a fine is imposed by the Postmaster General, we have the right to assume he has gone into the facts, and that the case is settled, and I do not think it is right that a man should be able to afterwards go around and see somebody in order to have the fine remitted. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York is correct in the main, but conditions arise which are unusual and impose hardships upon a contractor, conditions which in no way could have been anticipated or avoided. The strict letter of the contract and of the law, as it is now on the books, does not permit the Postmaster General to modify the contract or to show the contractor any leniency, all of which puts the Government of the United States in the position of being a harsh contractor, as it often is the slowest debtor.

Officials of the department without authority under the law often see the need of modification of contracts, see the need of showing leniency in granting some concession, but they have no authority under the law to accede to anything. This bill, if enacted, will give an opportunity for the Postmaster General when occasion arises to use some discretion.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York insist upon his objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have objected, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

EXCHANGE OF LAND, BOISE, IDAHO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 431) providing for the conveyance of certain land to the city of Boise, Idaho, and from the city of Boise, Idaho, to the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Boise, Ada County, Idaho, for enlargement of the State capitol park, and for no other purpose, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the alley running east and west through block 54, in which is located the post-office site in the said city: *Provided, however*, That the city shall not have the right to sell and convey the said premises, nor to devote the same to any other purposes than as hereinbefore described, and shall not erect thereon any structures or improvements except such as are incidental to boundaries and ornamentation as part of the State capitol grounds; and in the event that said premises shall not be used as part of the said State capitol grounds, and cared for and maintained as such, the right, title, and interest hereby authorized to be conveyed shall revert to the United States: *Provided, also*, That the city of Boise shall convey to the United States for alley purposes, in accordance with a resolution of the city council of Boise, April 25, 1922, a strip of land in said

block 54 as now laid out for such purposes, commencing at the northeast intersection of the post-office side (addition) with Jefferson Street; thence south 55 degrees 6 minutes east with said Jefferson Street 16 feet crossing said alley; thence south 34 degrees 54 minutes west 78.6 feet along the curb line as built to a point; thence curving to the left using a radius of 20 feet a distance of 18.8 feet to a point; thence curving to the right using a radius of 53.65 feet a distance of 51.25 feet to the north line of the said post-office site; thence north 55 degrees 6 minutes west a distance of 46.45 feet to a point; thence north 34 degrees 54 minutes east a distance of 138 feet to the place of beginning.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 8, page 1, after the word "west," strike out "through" and insert in lieu thereof "in."

Line 2, page 2, after the word "State" strike out "capital" and insert in lieu thereof "capitol."

Strike out all after the word "purposes," where it occurs in line 10, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Commencing at the northeast intersection of the post-office site (addition) with Jefferson Street; thence south 55° 6' east with said Jefferson Street 16 feet crossing said alley; thence south 34° 54' west 78.6 feet along the curb line as built to a point; thence in a reverse curve, following the curb now in place to a north lot line of said post-office site; thence along said lot line, northwesterly, approximately 46.45 feet to the intersection of said north lot line with the westerly line of said 16-foot alley; thence along said westerly line of said 16-foot alley to the point of beginning."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

SAVANNAH, GA., MASONIC LODGE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Solomon's Lodge, No. 1, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Savannah, Ga., the minute book of the Savannah (Ga.) Masonic Lodge.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Librarian of Congress is hereby authorized to return to Solomon's Lodge, No. 1, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Savannah, Ga., the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge, which is contained in one bound volume, duodecimo, now in the manuscript division of the Library of Congress, marked "Savannah Masonic Lodge, 1757," the said manuscript having been identified as originally the property of the said lodge.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 4, strike out the word "numbered" and insert therefore the word "number"; and in the same line strike out the word "ancient."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Solomon's Lodge, No. 1, Free and Accepted Masons, of Georgia, the minute book of the Savannah (Ga.) Masonic Lodge."

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

POWER BOAT AND STAR ROUTES IN ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8192) authorizing the designation of postmasters by the Postmaster General as disbursing officers for the payment of contractors, emergency carriers, and temporary carriers, for performance of authorized service on power-boat and star routes in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That postmasters may be designated by the Postmaster General as disbursing officers for the payment of contractors, emergency carriers, and temporary carriers, for performance of authorized service on power-boat and star routes in Alaska.

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

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

GATES AND PIERS IN WEST EXECUTIVE AVENUE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 54) authorizing the removal of the gates and piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the State, War, and Navy Building.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I objected to this bill the last time it was called, but the chairman of the committee assures me that in his judgment it ought to pass, and I am not prepared to put my judgment against his, and I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. This bill requires three objectors. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital is hereby authorized, in the interest of safety to the public, to remove the gates and piers now standing in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the State, War, and Navy Building.

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

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

GARABED FREE-ENERGY GENERATOR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) to amend section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States," etc., approved February 8, 1918.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I want to call attention to the fact that the original resolution provided "That any sale or attempted sale by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian or by his representative or assigns of any interest in or any title to said discovery or invention, or any part thereof, prior to the approval of the same by said commission of scientists, shall be illegal, invalid, and void." There is no punishment provided in this resolution. I have an amendment that I shall offer that provides a punishment of three years' imprisonment if any person attempts to sell any interest in the patent before it is proved.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman think the whole business is another fraud?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; but I have failed to obtain three objections to this bill, and therefore I am doing the best I can.

Mr. BLANTON. I so understand, and it ought to be put in the wastebasket now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) to amend section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, etc., approved February 8, 1918

Whereas Garabed T. K. Giragossian claims to have discovered or invented a method whereby unlimited energy can be utilized with practically no expense or labor; and

Whereas a source of illimitable costless energy can be an incalculable blessing to the public, by enhancing the productivity of industry and land, and by furthering the advancement of art and science, as it can provide freely an inexhaustible source of nitrate and furnish water from rivers, wells, etc., for irrigation, as well as creating the highest efficiency in travel and transportation through the elimination of the expense or labor for motive power; and

Whereas the United States will have the right and privilege, free of charge or expense, to utilize for the Government's own use the persistently claimed discovery or invention to be known as the "Garabed" free-energy generator; and

Whereas Public Resolution No. 21, Sixty-fifth Congress, contained a clause which long before had entirely fulfilled its function, as it became the source of many obstructions and difficulties as set out in the claimant's two memoranda dated February 11, 1918, and May 23, 1921, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of those dates, and same clause

made it impossible to secure such a commission who would agree to bring in a report in accordance with the provisions of said resolution, thereby making the demonstration of the discovery impossible under the resolution: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That section 3 of Public Resolution No. 21, Sixty-fifth Congress (H. J. Res. 174), approved February 8, 1918, entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, etc," be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the words "and that he is the first and original discoverer or inventor thereof," and the words "and that he is the original discoverer or inventor thereof," and the following be inserted after the word "resolution": "and that any invention or discovery similar to the claim of Garabed T. K. Giragossian shall not have come into actual and general public use and demonstrated in a substantial manner to be feasible and practical prior to the demonstration of the 'Garabed' as it is prescribed and authorized in the resolution, and provided also that the 'Garabed' is not electricity"; so that the section will read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That if such demonstration shall, in the opinion of the said scientists, prove the practicability of said discovery or invention, and that it can substantially effect the purpose set out in section 1 of this resolution, and that any invention or discovery similar to the claim of Garabed T. K. Giragossian will not have come into actual and general public use and demonstrated in a substantial manner to be feasible and practical prior to the demonstration of the 'Garabed' as it is prescribed and authorized in the resolution, and provided also that the 'Garabed' is not electricity, the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian shall be recognized by the United States Government as the original discoverer, inventor, and legal owner of the invention or discovery and of any improvements pertaining thereto that may be made by the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian. The certificate of said commission of scientists to the effect that said discovery or invention is practicable, as aforesaid, shall constitute the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian the legal owner of and entitle him to all the rights and benefits of said discovery or invention for a period of 17 years. The right is reserved to the said Garabed T. K. Giragossian, his heirs and assigns, to take out patents for his aforesaid discovery, invention, or for any improvements or device pertaining thereto."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LAGUARDIA: On page 4, at the end of the resolution, add the following: "That any person or persons making any sale or offering for sale or attempting to sell any interest in or title to said discovery or invention contrary to the provision of section 7 of Public Resolution No. 21, Sixty-fifth Congress (H. J. Res. 174, approved February 8, 1918), shall be guilty of a felony and liable to punishment for a term of not less than three years."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, this is the best that I can do to protect the public in the event that the invention is not what it is claimed to be.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is the practice of the House, I think, not to insert *whereas* in resolutions. Whether invariably followed or not I am not aware, but it is the better practice not to encumber the statute books with them, as they serve no good purpose. I move to strike out the paragraphs beginning with "whereas."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I recall that when I was a member of the Committee on Patents several efforts were made to get the Committee on Patents to report out a measure of this kind. The committee declined to report such a bill, if for no other reason than it was such a very unusual and dangerous precedent for Congress to, by special act, give a patent to an individual instead of compelling him to go to the Patent Office, like all other inventors must do. This old gentleman gave as a reason why he did not go to the Patent Office for a patent on his alleged invention was that he was afraid somebody would steal his invention or his idea. In other words, he did not have a sufficient amount of confidence in the Patent Office. This resolution declares that he is the original and sole inventor, but we do not know whether he is or not. We do not even know what his alleged invention is. If he has a patentable invention and is in fact the original inventor of the idea or device, whatever it is, he can go to the Patent Office and obtain a patent. I want to respectfully submit to you gentlemen that this is a very extraordinary and a very dangerous precedent that we are proposing to establish.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I agree with the gentleman, but I have done the best I could in offering an amendment that would protect the public. I think it is a very dangerous precedent for Congress to establish.

Mr. BEGG. There is nothing to be alarmed about. The gentleman from Tennessee knows that his party passed this bill during the administration of Wilson. The reason that it was not serviceable was, I think, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Stafford, offered an amendment in conference. I do not see how there can be any damage done by this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. In reply to the gentleman I want to say that during the war when the Government was seeking all inventions that might help to win the war Congress did pass a resolution in which they authorized a committee of Government scientists and officials to investigate and if they found it to be valuable for our defense to pay compensation therefor, and so forth. But the resolution, as reported then, contained a provision that Garabed was the original and sole inventor, but that was stricken out. That is the worst feature of this resolution. You are proposing to amend the original resolution by striking out the language which you said really destroys the effect of it, and it did, and by arbitrarily declaring that this man was the original and sole inventor. I am not defending the passage of the original resolution, but there was some excuse in time of war, and at that time Congress declined to declare that he was "the original and sole inventor," but proposed to appoint a commission to investigate the merits of his invention and apply it to war purposes if they thought it was justifiable.

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

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Suppose it develops that this man has what he claims he has; is he not entitled, if nobody in the world to-day knows of it, to a certificate saying that he is the original inventor? Where is the damage?

Mr. DAVIS. Here is the point. Why does he not go to the Bureau of Patents and present his claim for a patent on his invention just like any other citizen is required to do? If his invention is patentable and he is the original inventor, he can there obtain a patent.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman knows better than I do that there have been many honest men with patents who never have been able to protect themselves under the patent laws of this country if somebody with a powerful lot of money wants to fight them and nullify the patent. That is done every year, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. DAVIS. That is an argument against the system.

Mr. BEGG. The system needs to be corrected.

Mr. DAVIS. Here you are proposing to single out a certain individual and give him special legislation for an alleged invention, when his reason for not going to the Patent Office is that he has no confidence in the Government officials in the Patent Office. I say that we ought not to recognize any such excuse as that or set any such precedent. The same argument the gentleman makes would apply to any impeachable inventor who was unable to pay the fees and employ lawyers to put through his patent on an invention, or to market his invention when he did procure a patent.

Mr. BEGG. I think the gentleman made an erroneous statement a moment ago when he said that the reason the gentleman did not want to go to the Patent Office is because he does not have confidence in the patent officials. That is not the reason at all.

Mr. DAVIS. That is the reason that he gave before the Committee on Patents a few years ago.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will permit, this may be all a fake. I do not know; but suppose that the radio inventor had come before Congress upon a similar proposition, we would have laughed at him. If it is a fake, the Government is not damaged, and if it is a benefaction to the human race, the gentleman from Tennessee will be proud of it, and will be one of the first to claim credit for voting for the bill. I do not see why a thing that can damage no one ought to be frowned on.

Mr. DAVIS. I insist that the damage is in setting a dangerous precedent at this time.

Mr. BEGG. But that has been already set by the gentleman's own party.

Mr. DAVIS. Not at all. When that original resolution was passed through the House, Garabed refused to make a demonstration before the Government officials, as authorized, and the reason he did so was because the resolution as adopted did not declare that he "was the sole and original inventor," and we declined to do it because we did not know and did not want to set any such precedent; and we do not know now, and yet we are undertaking to establish that fact instead of the Patent Office doing it.

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

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Did not this so-called inventor refuse to submit his claim to the scientists during the war?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; that is the fact. The gentleman from Virginia was a member of the Committee on Patents. This man has been coming before the Committee on Patents year in and year out, and the money that he has spent in staying around here would have been sufficient many times over for him to employ lawyers and prosecute his claim before the Bureau of Patents.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEHLBACH) there were—ayes 38, noes 32.

So the joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEGG) there were—ayes 43, noes 36.

So the joint resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1226) to amend the trading with the enemy act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. This bill requires three objections to strike it from the calendar. Are there any other objectors? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Re it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended, is amended by inserting between paragraphs (3) and (4), of subsection (b), of section 9, a new paragraph to read as follows:

"3. (a) An individual who was at such time a citizen or subject of Germany, Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary, and that the money or other property involved, or the principal thereof, was acquired by such individual while a bona fide resident of the United States and where such individual shall be a bona fide resident of the United States at the time of the return of his money or other property to him; or."

With the following amendment:

Page 1, strike out—

"3. (a) An individual who was at such time a citizen or subject of Germany, Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary, and that the money or other property involved, or the principal thereof, was acquired by such individual while a bona fide resident of the United States and where such individual shall be a bona fide resident of the United States at the time of the return of his money or other property to him; or."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

(3A) An individual who was at such time a citizen or subject of Germany, Austria, Hungary, or Austria-Hungary, and that the money or other property concerned was acquired by such individual while a bona fide resident of the United States, and that such individual, at the time of the return of the money or other property, is a bona fide resident of the United States, and that such individual, at least one year prior to the date upon which this amendment becomes effective, declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, or of the Philippine Islands, in the manner prescribed in the naturalization laws; or.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEA of California: Page 2, line 6, in the committee amendment, after the word "Hungary," insert the words "or not a citizen or subject of any nation, State, or free city."

In lines 10 and 11 of the committee amendment, page 2, strike out the words "at least one year."

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, the trading with the enemy act as it now stands authorizes the return of property to citizens of neutral and allied countries. It has developed that there are a few cases in which property is owned by people who are not citizens of any country, and in order to correct that feature of the law, the amendment I offer is submitted to the House.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman in charge of the bill enlighten the House, if he can, as to the prospect of

dealing with other provisions of a kindred nature, where the bill works a hardship? I am interested in similar bills pending before the gentleman's committee to accomplish similar purposes.

Mr. LEA of California. The general bill for the return of alien property, on which hearings began this morning, proposes to make complete return of the property, so far as German property is concerned, withholding, however, the property owned by residents of Austria and Hungary.

Mr. LUCE. This bill refers to Austria and Hungary?

Mr. LEA of California. No. It does not cover the case of Austria and Hungary in the way that a general bill would. The general bill does not deal with Austrian property, because so far the Mixed Claims Commission has not passed on the American claims against Austria and Hungary.

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

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. It has not passed upon the claims of Austria and Hungary because the time for filing them has not yet expired?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes. The Mixed Claims Commission has not had the opportunity up to this time.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will this proposed legislation interfere with the work of the two subcommittees that held subcommittee meetings this morning?

Mr. LEA of California. Not at all. The legislation in this amendment is entirely consistent with what is already in the trading with the enemy act. It in no way affects the property held by resident citizens of Germany, Austria, or Hungary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCREYNOLDS: Page 2, line 14, after the word "are," insert a new paragraph to read as follows: "3b. Any individual who was not a subject or citizen of Germany, Austria, Hungary, or Austro-Hungary, and who is now a citizen or subject of a neutral or allied country, or".

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the purpose of this amendment is merely to take care of a few parties who were not nationals of any country at the time the property was seized. We did not have an opportunity to present this to the committee, because there was no hearing. Senator Sutherland, the Alien Property Custodian in a letter to the chairman of the committee on March 12, approved the amendment in the words offered and recommended that the bill be passed with this amendment.

It has evidently been the purpose of Congress to take care of parties occupying this position prior to this legislation. The act passed in 1920 providing for the restoration of property read:

A citizen or subject of any nation, state, or free city other than Germany and Austria.

At the time this property was taken this party was not a citizen of any country. He had been a citizen of Germany, but he surrendered his citizenship in 1883 and moved to Switzerland. The first construction, under Attorney General Palmer's office, in a case similar to this, after the act of 1920 was passed, was construed that it was the purpose of Congress to take care of that class of citizenship, and in one case he so decided; but after the change of administration, under Attorney General Daugherty, they held that it must be construed strictly, and as this party was not a citizen of any country the act—although the evident purpose of Congress was to take care of them—was not broad enough. Now I am informed by the Alien Custodian's office that only two parties are involved so far as they have knowledge at present.

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

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In the case of property seized belonging to a national of a country with which we were at peace, why can he not immediately recover the property?

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. That law went further and provided that any party in the enemy's country during the war could have their property seized, and many American citizens who were in the enemy's country during the war had their property seized.

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

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Your bill does not in any way legalize or validate the return of property in the so-called American Metals case, which has resulted thus far in one indictment?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Not at all. This gentleman surrendered his citizenship in 1883, as I say, and went to Switzerland. The reason why his property was seized was because he made a trip through the enemy's country during the war. The act of 1923, which returned \$10,000 to Austrians and Hungarians and those who were not citizens of any country, did not benefit this man because at that time he had become a citizen of a neutral country. Now, in the treaty between Germany and the United States providing for the holding of property of their nationals for the payment of claims of individuals this could not be applied, because this man was not a national of Germany, so that the holding of this property would be confiscation. I feel that the members of the committee who have this matter in charge will not oppose this amendment.

Mr. LEA of California. The gentleman from Tennessee has correctly stated the situation in reference to his amendment. I support only those amendments approved by the Alien Property Custodian, and he has approved of this amendment. It is consistent with the general purpose of this committee amendment. It is consistent with the existing terms of the trading with the enemy act. It affects but a small number, and I feel that the amendment may fairly be allowed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

BARNEGAT LIGHT STATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1746) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer the Barnegat Light Station to the State of New Jersey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. APPLEBY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. As the gentleman desires to speak I shall reserve it.

The SPEAKER. This bill requires three objections.

Mr. APPLEBY. Mr. Speaker, this bill (Barnegat Light) was stricken from the calendar on March 15. I would like to call the attention of the House to the report which accompanies the bill.

In order to preserve the old light tower and site considerable expenditures will have to be made for protective works. The State of New Jersey has appropriated a sum of money for this work, but is unable to use the appropriation until title is vested in the State.

This bill is an enabling act inasmuch as it provides for the transfer of the Barnegat Light Station to the State of New Jersey so that the appropriation may become available for the maintenance of the light.

The last paragraph of the bill provides as follows:

That this transfer is authorized to enable the State of New Jersey to maintain this reservation for historical purposes and for the preservation of the lighthouse tower, and that if the State should not continue to use the reservation for these purposes, the said reservation and tower shall revert to the United States.

I might state that this light station is not similar to the light station in Florida, inasmuch as this land is not valuable; in fact, there is less of it now than there was in 1857 when the Government acquired it, because the Atlantic Ocean has taken a great deal of the sand out to sea. The Sixty-seventh Congress made an appropriation of \$120,000 for the Barnegat Light, but that appropriation was used in the Great Lakes, so the Government was saved all of that expense, and gentlemen interested in economy should not object to the passage of this bill, in my judgment. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey to the State of New Jersey the Barnegat Lighthouse Reservation, N. J., and tower thereon, the reservation being described as follows in deed of April 22, 1857, from John Ashley Brown to the United States:

All that certain tract or lot of land situate, lying, and being on Long Beach, in the township of Union, county of Ocean, and State of New Jersey, being a part of the tract of land conveyed by Jacob D. Harring and wife by duly executed deed under their hands and seals, dated the 2d of April, A. D. 1851, and recorded in the clerk's office of the county of Ocean at Toms River, in book 2 of deeds, page 108, to Joseph Brown in fee, and by the said Joseph Brown and wife conveyed to the said John Ashley Brown in fee by deed duly executed under their hands and seals, bearing date the 16th day of April, A. D. 1857, reference being had to said deeds as will more fully appear, and is bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of a lot of land belonging to the United States, running south 2 degrees east 850 feet to a stake or stone, thence north 88 degrees east 528 feet to a stake or stone, thence north 2 degrees west 850 feet to the southeast corner of the lot belonging to the United States, thence along the line of the said lot 528 feet to the place of beginning, containing 10 acres, more or less, together with the right of way over the said John Ashley Brown premises and the free passage of persons to and from said premises conveyed by these presents, with any and all kinds of teams, carriages, wagons, or other vehicles from any landing place now used or hereafter to be used either upon the bay, inlet, or ocean side, with the free use of said landings upon said premises, subject to the following conditions: That is to say, the said party of the second part shall restrict the keepers of the lighthouse and other improvements about to be erected upon said premises, or any other persons, from keeping a grocery store, tavern, or boarding house thereon: *Provided*, That the United States reserves the right for the Lighthouse Service to maintain a light in the tower or at such other place on the reservation as the needs of navigation may require, and the right to enter upon the reservation by the most convenient route for the purpose of maintenance of said light or lights: *Provided further*, That this transfer is authorized to enable the State of New Jersey to maintain this reservation for historical purposes and for the preservation of the lighthouse tower, and that if the State should not continue to use the reservation for these purposes the said reservation and tower shall revert to the United States.

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

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

COMPLETION OF THE MEMORIAL TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) to authorize the completion of the Memorial to the Unknown Soldier.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Three objections are necessary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McKEOWN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. And I object, Mr. Speaker.

AMEND SECTION 71 OF THE JUDICIAL CODE AS AMENDED

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3932) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 71. (a) The State of Arkansas is divided into two districts, to be known as the western and eastern district of Arkansas.

"(b) The western district shall include four divisions, constituted as follows: The Texarkana division, which shall include the territory embraced on July 1, 1920, in the counties of Sevier, Howard, Little River, Pike, Hempstead, Miller, Lafayette, and Nevada; the El Dorado division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Columbia, Ouachita, Union, Ashley, Bradley, and Calhoun; the Fort Smith division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Polk, Scott, Logan, Sebastian, Franklin, Crawford, Washington, Benton, and Johnson; the Harrison division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Baxter, Boone, Carroll, Madison, Marion, Newton, and Seearcy.

"(c) Terms of the district court for the Texarkana division shall be held at Texarkana on the second Mondays in May and November, for the El Dorado division at El Dorado on the fourth Mondays in Janu-

ary and June, for the Fort Smith division at Fort Smith on the second Mondays in January and June, and for the Harrison division at Harrison on the second Mondays in April and October.

(d) The clerk of the court for the western district shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Texarkana, Fort Smith, El Dorado, and Harrison. Such offices shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of the court.

(e) The eastern district shall include four divisions, constituted as follows: The eastern division, which shall include the territory embraced on July 1, 1920, in the counties of Desha, Lee, Phillips, St. Francis, Cross, Monroe, and Woodruff; the northern division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Independence, Cleburne, Stone, Izard, Sharp, and Jackson; the Jonesboro division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Crittenden, Clay, Craighead, Greene, Mississippi, Poinsett, Fulton, Randolph, and Lawrence; and the western division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Arkansas, Chicot, Clark, Cleveland, Conway, Dallas, Drew, Faulkner, Garland, Grant, Hot Spring, Jefferson, Lincoln, Lonoke, Montgomery, Perry, Pope, Prairie, Pulaski, Saline, Van Buren, White, and Yell.

(f) Terms of the district court for the eastern division shall be held at Helena on the second Monday in March and the first Monday in October; for the northern division at Batesville on the fourth Monday in May and the second Monday in December; for the Jonesboro division at Jonesboro on the first Monday in May and the fourth Monday in November; and for the western division at Little Rock on the first Monday in April and the third Monday in October.

(g) The clerk of the court for the eastern district shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Helena, Batesville, Jonesboro, and Little Rock. Such offices shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of the court."

SEC. 2. The following acts are hereby repealed:

(a) The act entitled "An act to fix the time for the holding the term of the district court in the Jonesboro division of the eastern district of Arkansas," approved September 8, 1914; and

(b) The act entitled "An act to transfer certain counties in the several judicial districts in the State of Arkansas," approved March 4, 1915.

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

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

JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5006) to detach Hickman County from the Nashville division of the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee, and attach the same to the Columbia division of the middle judicial district of said State.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Hickman County, of the Nashville division of the middle district of the State of Tennessee, be, and the same is hereby, detached from the Nashville division and attached to and made a part of the Columbia division of the middle district of said State.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "State," insert the following: "Provided, That witnesses attending court at Columbia shall be paid mileage for the shortest and most direct route from the home of the witness."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

TERMS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT AT LEWISTOWN, MONT.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7378) providing for the holding of terms of the United States district court at Lewistown, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 92 of the Judicial Code of the United States be amended by the addition of the following: "Lewistown on the third Mondays in January and June: Provided, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Lewistown are furnished free of all expense to the United States. Causes, civil and criminal, may be transferred by the court or a judge thereof from any sitting place designated above to any other sitting place thus

designated, when the convenience of the parties or the ends of justice would be promoted by the transfer; and any interlocutory order may be made by the court or judge thereof in either place."

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

JUDICIAL CODE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8126) to amend section 103 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the language contained in the letter of Judge Albert W. Johnson, in which he states:

At present a clerk is authorized for Harrisburg, but we have no use for one there; but we are seriously in need of one at Lewisburg.

I note that the bill, in lines 10 and 11, provides that the clerk of the court for the middle district shall maintain an office, in charge of himself or a deputy, at Lewisburg. Now, why not amend that language so as to read that the clerk of the court for the middle district shall maintain his office at Lewisburg instead of Harrisburg? The judge of the court says there is no need of a clerk at Harrisburg but there is need of one at Lewisburg. So why not amend the bill in conformity to this situation? This could be done by striking out the word "an" in line 11 and substituting the word "his" and then strike out "in charge of himself or a deputy" in line 11.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think all that could be worked out without amending the bill. I would not like to accept that amendment.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BERNIS], who introduced the bill—

Mr. BEERS. I do not altogether see the object—

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman will allow me to finish the statement I was making, if there is no need for the clerk at Harrisburg, the idea is that Judge Johnson will utilize his services at Lewisburg. The judge lives at Lewisburg and is making a heroic effort to catch up the business and conduct the business of the middle district without asking for an additional judge. We had a bill providing for an additional judge in the last Congress, but the judge has said to us he does not think it will be necessary and thinks he can manage without having an additional judgeship created.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania the only reason I make this suggestion is because the judge himself in his letter to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee stated that the clerk at Harrisburg is not needed.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like very much to have the bill passed in its present form, because it has the approval of the judge, and I am quite sure he will adjust the matter and bring the clerk from Harrisburg down to Lewisburg. The only authorization we want in this bill is the establishment of a clerkship at Lewisburg.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9829) to amend section 87 of the Judicial Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 87 of the Judicial Code, as amended, be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 87. That the State of Massachusetts shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Massachusetts.

Terms of the district court shall be held at Boston on the third Tuesday in March, the fourth Tuesday in June, the second Tuesday in September, and the first Tuesday in December; at Springfield on the second Tuesday in May and December; at New Bedford on the first Tuesday in August; and at Worcester on the first Tuesday in March and the third Tuesday in September: Provided, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Springfield, New Bedford, and Worcester shall be furnished free of expense to the United States: And provided further, That all writs, precepts, and processes shall be

returnable to the terms at Boston and all court papers shall be kept in the clerk's office at Boston, unless otherwise specially ordered by the court, and the terms at Boston shall not be terminated or affected by the terms at Springfield, New Bedford, or Worcester.

"The marshal and the clerk for said district shall each appoint at least one deputy to reside in Springfield and to maintain an office at that place."

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

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

POWER-PLANT BUILDING, BUREAU OF STANDARDS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5358) authorizing the construction by the Secretary of Commerce of a power-plant building on the present site of the Bureau of Standards, in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, some of us would like to get some information about this proposition from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the old power plant at the Bureau of Standards was erected there when they had only two buildings. The bureau has now grown until there are 20 or 22 buildings there and the old power plant is wholly inadequate and out of date. For two or three years the department has been recommending that a new plant be built, and when one is built it will cause the place to be operated at a much less cost than it is now. It is very desirable from an economical standpoint as well as from the standpoint of the efficient operation of this bureau that a new power plant be constructed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why was it not possible for the gentleman from Indiana and his committee to make provision for these buildings under the omnibus public building bill which you passed a few days ago affecting buildings in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would say to the gentleman that buildings of this character are not the ones that are contemplated under the provisions of that bill.

Mr. MADDEN. How much is this building going to cost?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from Indiana ought to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Bureau of Standards is now buying power from the outside. If they can increase that power plant they will not be compelled to buy this power, and the plant will pay for itself in 10 years.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that. That is the usual argument which is made when the question of putting up a new building is involved. There is another thing I have noticed in the report, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] on this proposition. I notice in the report there is filed a letter from the Bureau of the Budget dated January 18, 1924, in connection with this proposal, which contains the following language:

I have presented this matter to the President, who has instructed me to advise you that the legislation which you propose is not in conflict with his financial program, providing that the legislation pertaining to the power house and the master-track scale will not involve the necessity of any appropriation either during this current or the next fiscal year.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is a report that came up on the bill in the last Congress. This is not the first time this bill has been up.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand; but the gentleman, as chairman of the committee, filed this letter along with the other data in the case.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit me to ask a question right in conjunction with that matter?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I want to question the wording of this bill. Has the Department of Commerce the money to build this plant?

Mr. MADDEN. No; they have not.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

Mr. BEGG. Then how can you authorize them to contract for something for which the money has not been appropriated?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object for the time being, or until we can find out how the money is going to be raised.

Mr. BEGG. That is the point I wanted to raise exactly.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. BEGG. At the foot of the calendar, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have recently passed a public buildings bill appropriating \$165,000,000, and certainly they can provide for building whatever they need here, and I therefore object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the bill remaining at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

CONSTRUCTION OF A MASTER-TRACK SCALE AND TEST-CAR DEPOT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5359) authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of a site and the construction and equipment of a building thereon for use as a master-track scale and test-car depot, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, this is the same kind of a proposition to the one we just disposed of. I do not think it could be done even if we passed it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ERECTION OF A FEDERAL RESERVE BANK BUILDING IN BALTIMORE, MD.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 191) authorizing the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond to contract for and erect in the city of Baltimore, Md., a building for its Baltimore branch.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McKEOWN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland how much this is going to cost.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. One million and twenty-five thousand dollars. The amount to be expended is under the direction of the Federal Reserve Board. They will have control of it.

Mr. McKEOWN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 191) authorizing the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond to contract for and erect in the city of Baltimore, Md., a building for its Baltimore branch

Whereas the building in the city of Baltimore, Md., now owned and occupied by the Baltimore branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, is inadequate for the business of that institution, which is being conducted in three buildings, so that a considerable portion of its money and valuables must be kept in vaults other than its own and a large part of its work done in rented quarters, which entails additional risk and expense as well as inconvenience to the member banks and the general public served by the said Baltimore branch; and

Whereas the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond purchased before the 3d day of June, 1922, and owns a lot situated at the northwest corner of Lexington and Calvert Streets, in the city of Baltimore, Md., suitable for the erection of a banking office adequate for the needs of the said Baltimore branch, but had not begun the erection of a building thereon; and

Whereas the cost of construction of a suitable building, as estimated from plans caused to be prepared by the directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, will not exceed \$1,025,000: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond be, and it is hereby, authorized to contract for and erect in the city of Baltimore a building for its Baltimore branch, provided the total amount expended in the erection of said building shall not exceed the sum of \$1,025,000.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the resolution add the following proviso: "Provided, however, That the character and type of building to be erected, the amount actually to be expended in the construction of said building, and the amount actually to be expended for the vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures for said building shall be subject to the approval of the Federal Reserve Board."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all the whereases may be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that all the whereases may be stricken out. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, the resolution (H. J. Res. 191) introduced by me on the 8th of March authorized the erection by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, the fifth Federal reserve district, of a branch bank in Baltimore, Md. The amount authorized to be expended upon said bank is \$1,025,000, which according to an amendment recommended by the committee must be expended under the authority of the Federal Reserve Board as to the building, vault, and equipment.

The capital stock of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond amounts to \$6,000,000, of which about \$1,600,000 was furnished by the banking interests under the supervision of the Baltimore branch. It has a surplus of \$11,919,000 and deposits of \$72,887,000 and in addition has paid into the United States Treasury as taxes \$4,566.06. This fifth Federal reserve district comprises the States of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, all of West Virginia with the exception of six counties, and the District of Columbia, and operates but one branch bank, being that at Baltimore, through which nearly one-third of all the business of the district is performed. This immense volume of business through the Baltimore branch when established March 1, 1918, was conducted in the building formerly known as the National Mechanics Bank. Subsequent amendments to the Federal reserve act greatly enlarged the scope of the system and soon rendered these quarters inadequate.

Under the act approved May, 1920, the Baltimore branch bank absorbed the former business transacted by the United States subtreasury at Baltimore and assumed all its functions. The appropriation of nearly \$17,000 for subtreasury employees in Baltimore was discontinued, saving that much to the National Government at Baltimore alone, for which service nothing was paid the bank.

The branch bank at Baltimore continued to grow by reason of the rapid increase of business and population at Baltimore and through the gradual assumption of other duties under the Federal reserve system. It had taken over the bank and vault of the subtreasury in the customhouse at Baltimore, and in 1924 it was compelled to seek further space for the use of its check-collection department, and rented half of the third floor of the Hearst Tower Building at an annual rental of \$9,200. This addition gave temporary relief, but at the same time it made business more intricate and less effective, because it was divided into three places, i. e., the main office at South and Redwood Streets, formerly the National Mechanics Bank; the third floor of the Hearst Tower Building; and the old subtreasury space and vaults in the customhouse.

The branch bank at Baltimore when organized had 2 officers and 27 employees, while at the close of 1925 it had a number of officers and 190 employees. I insert here a statement showing the volume of work conducted by the Baltimore branch in comparison with that performed by other cities of the Union:

Comparison of volume of operations in major departments of Federal reserve branch banks for year ended December 31, 1925

Year ended Dec. 31, 1925	Baltimore	Detroit	Buffalo	New Orleans	Cincinnati	Pittsburgh
Number of member banks in branch zone	155	125	85	58	217	342
Number of nonmember banks in branch zone	261	244	83	33	307	233
Average number of officers and employees	190	162	128	76	155	229
Total number of discount applications handled	2,349	1,978	2,604	1,129	None.	None.
Total number pieces of securities received and delivered	23,902	55,080	31,393	55,326	72,531	66,953
Total number United States Government coupons paid	766,945	641,149	266,447	320,321	1,429,326	1,281,836
Total number pieces of currency received and assorted	45,391,734	58,623,596	39,481,000	24,511,413	32,164,793	52,205,269
Total number pieces of coin received and counted	121,631,009	12,147,519	18,554,357	19,780,592	66,389,462	33,622,838
Total number of checks handled	17,586,238	17,251,010	11,437,386	3,546,294	16,725,567	21,650,558
Total number of noncash collection items handled	67,770	88,335	158,397	22,008	17,293	28,414
Total number of wire transfers	29,544	31,187	13,592	10,250	21,933	15,923

It is the purpose to sell for about \$200,000 the present location, formerly the old National Mechanics Bank, which was purchased in 1918, and to convert this into the treasury of the Richmond Federal reserve system—more correctly speaking, the fifth Federal reserve district. The aggregate floor space now occupied by the Baltimore branch in its three locations is 15,321 square feet, whereas the floor space in the new building when completed will aggregate 26,064 square feet. It is estimated that at this time the branch bank will not require more than 23,605 square feet, but an incomplete story will be provided, so that when the business increases to that extent this floor, being the fourth floor of the new building, may without very much expense be completed in such way that it will be most useful to the bank.

The amount of \$1,025,000 may at first blush appear large, but this is somewhat because the architect has provided that additional floor for future use, and has also provided for the construction of the building in such manner that six more stories may be added without the necessity of strengthening, or additional walls; in other words, this building of five stories is being built sufficiently strong that it will comply with all building codes should it ever be found advisable or desirable to construct six additional stories upon the building thus erected.

The branch bank will be erected at the northwest corner of Lexington and Calvert Streets upon a lot purchased in 1920 before realty values became so high, which lot is 100 by 125 feet. Just across the street on the adjacent corner is the large white-marble courthouse of Baltimore, while diagonally across is the Baltimore post office, which also houses the Federal court. One block away is the white-marble city hall, and across the street therefrom is now being erected the city hall annex, at a cost of \$2,000,000. I mention these buildings to show that a most central location has been secured for the bank in what is actually the hub of this great metropolis.

The building will occupy the whole lot. The principal entrance is from Lexington Street, opposite the courthouse. It will be constructed of Indiana limestone, similar to all banks erected by the Federal reserve system. There will be but little ornamentation except in the main banking room on the first floor, where all extravagance even there has been eliminated. The building will be fireproof and will be constructed so that all space may be made available, and likewise changeable in

the event certain relocations may be necessary. The fifth floor will contain a lunch room, a hall where conventions of bankers may be held, rest room, study, and other provisions for the general welfare of the personnel. The combination auditorium and lunch room will be found especially advantageous for the employees and for meetings of banks, small conventions, and bank conferences and will permit a more frequent interchange of ideas between the officers and employees and of various banks of the Federal reserve system.

Now, for this great metropolis, Baltimore, which is now the seventh largest manufacturing center in America. Its population now aggregates over 800,000, and more than 62 per cent of the homes are occupied by their owners. It will be remembered that in February, 1904, a great fire swept over Baltimore, completely destroying its business section and wiping away many millions of dollars, for which \$80,000,000 of insurance was paid. Many sympathetic messages were received from the mayors of great cities, and financial help offered, but the mayor of Baltimore answered that Baltimore would be able to take care of her losses and to rebuild. Since that time an entirely new business section has sprung up. Values have advanced enormously, and a new interest and more progressive spirit has followed in its wake.

Its port is one of its greatest assets. In tonnage it has advanced to the position of the third port in the United States, exceeded only by New York and slightly by New Orleans. When the World War broke out it had 12 steamship lines trading to 18 foreign ports; to-day it has 27 such lines with 38 steamship services to practically all the great ports of the world. Baltimore handles more westbound tonnage through the Panama Canal than any other city of the Union, some 657,511 cargo tons to the Pacific coast, more than 100,000 over that of New York and about 300,000 tons over that of Philadelphia.

I merely mention these facts about the city of which I am so proud, my home city, and of which I have been honored in representing during eight terms of Congress, to show you the absolute necessity of this branch bank and what it will mean not alone to Baltimore but to the entire fifth Federal reserve district.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the bill providing for the erection of a Federal reserve bank building in Baltimore, Md., introduced by Representative LINTHICUM, of Mary-

land, and which has just this moment passed the House, is of very great importance. It passed the House without any objection, and therefore neither Mr. LINTHICUM nor I deemed it necessary to speak upon it at that time, but it is of so much local interest and is so intimately associated with the enormous growth of Baltimore that I feel it is very proper to call attention to several matters in reference to it. I do this at this time because the bill will soon come up in the Senate and there are certain matters which should be clearly set forth in reference to the necessity for the final passage of this bill. I received last week the following telegram from the acting mayor of Baltimore:

BALTIMORE, MD., March 19, 1926.

Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL,

1312 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.:

Please do everything in your power to have the joint resolution which has been introduced authorizing the erection of a Federal reserve bank building in Baltimore duly adopted.

HOWARD BRYANT, Acting Mayor.

A few days before this I received the following communication from the Federal Reserve Board in Washington:

MARCH 16, 1926.

Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: In the absence of Governor Crissinger, I acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 13 asking to be advised of the present status of the proposal of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond to erect a building in Baltimore to house the branch Federal reserve bank in that city. In reply thereto, I would state that resolutions have been introduced in both the Senate and House authorizing an expenditure for this purpose in excess of the amount which the bank may spend without congressional approval. The resolution introduced in the Senate is known as S. J. Res. 66 and that introduced in the House as H. J. Res. 101.

The board has been requested by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency for an expression of its views on the proposal, and in the course of the next day or two the board will doubtless comply with his request.

WALTER L. EDDY, Secretary.

The offices of the Baltimore branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond are now situated in three separate buildings in scattered locations in Baltimore City. The need for a new building in which its operations can be centralized for safe and economical comfort is imperative. The following statement was prepared by the bank officials and will be of interest to the House:

The volume of business of the Baltimore branch has decidedly outgrown its present building at the corner of South and Redwood Streets. This has been demonstrated by the fact that every available space is occupied, and in 1921, when the functions of the United States sub-treasury at Baltimore were assumed by the Baltimore branch, there was no space in its building or vault accommodations for the conduct of the sub-treasury business, so an arrangement was made to continue it in the Baltimore customhouse. Further, in 1924 it became necessary to rent additional quarters on the third floor of a near-by office building for the use of the check-collection department. Moreover, of the 15,321 square feet of floor space which the branch is using, only 8,137 square feet are in its present building, 4,017 square feet being rented in the Hearst Tower Building and 3,167 square feet and a vault being in the customhouse, the latter temporarily assigned to the branch.

The fifth Federal reserve district comprises the States of Maryland, West Virginia (except six counties), Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and the District of Columbia. The head office of the Federal reserve bank of the district is at Richmond, Va., which operates only one branch office, that at Baltimore, Md. The Baltimore branch has for its territory Baltimore city, the State of Maryland,

and 30 counties in West Virginia. It is a complete Federal reserve banking unit and is rendering in large volume a valuable public service through the 416 commercial banking offices in its territory. It performs practically all functions conducted at the head office, including the making of loans, discounting of paper, supplying of currency and coin, collecting of checks, drafts, notes, and other instruments, effecting telegraphic transfers of funds, holding securities in safe-keeping, etc.

When the Baltimore branch, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, was established on March 1, 1918, the building of the former National Mechanics Bank, situated at the corner of South and Redwood Streets, was purchased for its use, and after minor alterations and improvements, the building met its requirements for several years. However, subsequent amendments to the Federal reserve act greatly enlarged the scope of the Federal reserve bank operations and with the enormous growth in volume of work and functions performed by these institutions, the building and the vaults of the branch became inadequate.

Under the provisions of an act of Congress, approved May, 1920, the Baltimore branch of the Federal reserve bank absorbed, during January, 1921, the former United States Subtreasury at Baltimore and assumed its functions, and inherited its 73 years' accumulation of subtreasury records, canceled United States Treasury warrants, etc. Inasmuch as the performance of the subtreasury functions required considerably more working space and vault facilities than provided in the Baltimore branch building, at South and Redwood Streets, the Treasury Department agreed, under a temporary arrangement, that the Federal reserve bank might use, for the conduct of its money department, the quarters in the United States customhouse building, situated at Gay and Water Streets, previously assigned to the Baltimore Subtreasury.

The continued growth of the other departments of the Baltimore branch by June, 1924, made it imperative for the branch to secure relief from the seriously overcrowded and congested condition which existed at its South and Redwood Streets office, and a half of the third floor of the Hearst Tower Building, situated at the corner of Baltimore Street and Guilford Avenue, was rented for the use of the check-collection department at an annual rental of \$9,200. The space thus released by the check-collection department in the South and Redwood Streets building was assigned to other departments at that office in which the congestion had previously been most serious.

While this move temporarily provided relief, nevertheless it created the undesirable condition of operating the institution in three separate buildings at scattered locations, the main office being at South and Redwood Streets, the money department two and one-half blocks away at Gay and Water Streets, and the check-collection department one and one-half blocks away on the third floor of the Hearst Tower Building. In addition to the inconveniences of thus operating the branch bank in separate buildings, there is also involved a considerable risk in handling currency and securities, which could be eliminated if all operations were centralized in one building. The cost of maintaining separate forces of guards for the money department, at Gay and Water Streets, and for the securities department at the main office (South and Redwood Streets), is also an item of consideration. Undoubtedly, substantial economies could be effected in the protection department, and the liability involved in handling currency and securities materially reduced if the branch occupied only one building. Further, it would tend to the development of the utmost efficiency in organization and other economies of operation.

The staff of the Baltimore branch, when organized, consisted of 2 officers and 27 employees. Due to the additional functions assumed, together with the very largely increased number and volume of transactions now handled by the branch, it has been imperative to make additions to the staff from time to time until for the year ended December 31, 1925, the average number of officers and employees of the Baltimore branch was 190.

The statement below, as of December 31, 1925, reflects the volume of work conducted in the more important departments of the Baltimore branch, with corresponding data for other Federal reserve bank branches more or less comparable in size.

Comparison of volume of operations in major departments of Federal reserve branch banks for year ended December 31, 1925

Year ended Dec. 31, 1925	Baltimore	Detroit	Buffalo	New Orleans	Cincinnati	Pittsburgh
Number of member banks in branch zone	155	135	85	58	217	342
Number of nonmember banks in branch zone	261	244	83	33	307	258
Average number of officers and employees	190	162	128	76	155	229
Total number of discount applications handled	2,349	1,978	2,004	1,129	None	Nona.
Total number pieces of securities received and delivered	23,902	56,080	31,303	55,326	73,531	66,958
Total number United States Government coupons paid	766,945	641,149	266,447	320,321	1,469,326	1,281,836
Total number pieces of currency received and assorted	45,391,734	58,623,596	39,481,030	24,511,413	32,164,703	52,205,260
Total number pieces of coin received and counted	121,631,009	12,147,519	18,554,397	19,789,592	56,309,962	33,022,838
Total number of checks handled	17,586,238	17,251,010	11,437,386	3,546,294	16,725,567	21,650,558
Total number of noncash collection items handled	67,770	88,535	158,397	22,008	17,293	28,414
Total number of wire transfers	29,544	31,187	13,592	10,259	21,033	15,923

It will be noted from the preceding statement that in the aggregate the volume of transactions conducted through the Baltimore branch exceeds that of all other branches listed except Pittsburgh. In some cases the Baltimore branch volume is several times that of the other branches; notably the volume of checks collected by the Baltimore branch shows more than five times that of the New Orleans branch, necessitating a proportionately greater number of employees.

The unsatisfactory condition of operating the Baltimore branch in three separate buildings, the inadequate space, and antiquated construction of the vaults used are accurately reflected by opinions of competent and independent authorities as summarized in the following extracts quoted from each of the periodic reports of examination of the Baltimore branch made by the Federal Reserve Board's examiners:

MARCH 22, 1919

"Building: Exceptionally good light and ventilation; modern and ample."

"Vault: Fairly modern, capacity sufficient for present requirements."

NOVEMBER 1, 1919

"Building: Mezzanine put in to meet requirements for additional space."

"Vault: No change since last examination."

JULY 17, 1920

"Building: Quarters are adequate to meet needs. Lot purchased for erection of new building."

"Vault: Inadequate."

MAY 21, 1921

"Building: Since last examination the Baltimore branch has taken over the Baltimore Subtreasury, and the bank's money department now occupies the quarters and vaults in the customhouse building formerly used by the subtreasury."

"Vaults: In the customhouse building not modern; afford fair protection and are adequate for present needs. Vaults in banking house (South and Redwood Streets) fairly modern; provide ample space."

JANUARY 7, 1922

"Building: Building owned at corner of South and Redwood Streets serves all departments of branch except the money department, which occupies space in the customhouse building; appears adequate for present needs. The building owned, after all available space is used to the best advantage, does not afford adequate working quarters."

"Vaults: Vaults in money department in customhouse building are not of modern type; afford fair protection and adequate in size to meet needs. Vault in banking house used for protection of securities fairly modern; affords sufficient space at present, but would not take care of a material increase in volume."

OCTOBER 28, 1922

"Building and vaults: No change since last examination."

APRIL 21, 1923

"Building and vaults: Office quarters are apparently inadequate and vaults in banking building and subtreasury building are of antiquated construction."

JANUARY 26, 1924

"Buildings and vaults: Office quarters are inadequate and vaults in banking building and subtreasury building of antiquated construction."

SEPTEMBER 20, 1924

"Buildings: Branch now occupies space in three separate buildings, the transit department having been moved to a separate building since last examination. While space is adequate, it is inconvenient and inefficient for the different departments to be so separated."

"Vaults: Of antiquated construction."

APRIL 20, 1925

"Buildings: Branch operates in three buildings."

"Vaults: No change since last examination."

The aggregate floor space, including vaults, in the three buildings now occupied by the Baltimore branch is 15,321 square feet. In addition to being in scattered locations, this space is shown above to be inadequate and the vaults of obsolete construction and inadequate.

In 1920 the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, purchased property 100 by 125 feet at the corner of Calvert and Lexington Streets for a building for the Baltimore branch. This site was selected after a careful survey of available properties in the financial district of Baltimore as the most suitable in points of size, exposure for a bank building, and convenience for the operations of the branch and the public. It is at the northwest corner of an open space, diagonally across from the post office and across Lexington Street from the city courthouse, in which the police department has its headquarters. The city hall is one block east. These important public buildings emphasize the permanency of the value of this site for the purpose for which it was acquired. The Baltimore branch, therefore, has a building too small to house its present operations, which are necessarily conducted in three separate buildings in scattered locations; these buildings will not accommodate

further expansion of the business; the vaults are inadequate and of obsolete construction; and the bank owns a suitable lot for the erection of a new building, which is essential to the efficient, economic, and safe conduct of the business of the Federal reserve system passing through the Baltimore branch. Including rent, taxes, repairs, and maintenance, in fact, all expenses except interest, the carrying charges for the present properties are about \$37,000 per annum. The same charges for items of expense in connection with a new building are estimated at \$43,000 per annum. This slightly increased cost seems more than justified by the additional space provided for the growing needs of the branch, entirely apart from the inconveniences, expense, and risk now incurred, which would be eliminated if all operations were centralized in one building.

In making the plans for such a building it is only proper to consider and provide for further increase in the operations of the branch, and in this connection it is well to point out a few facts in reference to the city of Baltimore. Some years ago there was no proportionately large industrial growth in Baltimore. Take, for example, the five-year period from 1899 to 1904. This growth was small, but the five years 1904 to 1909 showed a marked increase; 1904 was the year of Baltimore's disastrous fire and over \$80,000,000 of insurance money was paid into the city to rebuild its business district. Many people suffered losses, but, nevertheless, Baltimore started then on a new era of industrial growth.

Baltimore is now the seventh largest manufacturing center in America. The increase in the capital investment in manufactures in Baltimore from 1914 to 1924 exceeded 200 per cent. Its population has increased at a greater rate within the last five years than ever before; it is now over 800,000, and one striking feature is that more than 62 per cent of the homes are owned by their occupants. This has a desirable influence on the labor conditions.

Baltimore's port is one of its greatest assets. Since the inauguration, by official departments, of actual export and import cargo tonnage statistics for all United States ports, the true status of Baltimore as a great foreign-trade gateway has been adequately visualized. In actual tonnage volume, Baltimore has advanced to the position of the third foreign-trade port of the United States, being exceeded by New York and slightly by New Orleans. Prior to the World War, Baltimore was served by 12 steamship lines, trading to 18 foreign ports; at present there are 27 steamship lines, with 38 steamship services, to practically all, or over 100, of the world's important foreign ports.

Among Baltimore's recent achievements is the development of her intercoastal business. Baltimore handles more westbound tonnage via the Panama Canal to the Pacific coast than any other city. For the year 1924 the port shipped 657,511 cargo tons to the Pacific coast, as compared with New York's 518,551 tons and Philadelphia's 354,340 tons. Baltimore has the largest export grain elevator capacity in the United States.

The few points mentioned are examples of Baltimore's recent growth. The great industrial development in Baltimore obtains throughout the present branch territory, accompanied by a corresponding increase in the banking resources of this district, which indicates its substantial and diversified industrial and commercial character. Its continued and greater growth is inevitable.

In view of all of these circumstances, the directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond and of the Baltimore branch are convinced of the wisdom of constructing permanent banking quarters, plain and substantial in character, for the operation of the Baltimore branch.

The advantage to the Baltimore branch in conducting its operations in its own building will necessarily increase as its growing operations necessitate the acquiring of additional space. It is a pertinent fact that during the year 1925, when practically all Federal reserve banks and branches were operating in their own buildings, their expenses were \$2,270,000 less than in 1923, when many of the banks occupied leased quarters not entirely adapted to the needs of these banks. The economy of conducting Federal reserve bank operations in one building owned by the bank and designed for the conduct of its banking operations is specifically set forth by the experience of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

Having in mind the serious consequences which so often result from the erection of a building without careful provision for future expansion, the plan for the proposed Baltimore branch building has arranged for such future expansion in two particulars, namely, (a) provision has been made for a reasonable amount of extension within the proposed structure, enabling departments which outgrow their original assignments of space to develop additional facilities at very slight, if any, expense by merely relocating departmental lines, or finishing certain portions of one floor which the original plans will leave in the rough; (b) to provide for more elaborate expansion, which will probably be necessary some day, the foundations and columns are planned strong enough to carry six additional stories, and careful studies have been made of the final design to insure that the carrying out of this plan, whether 10 years or 50 years hence, will involve no difficulties of a practical nature and will not mar the dignity and appearance of the structure. The initial cost of both these provisions is nominal.

The floor space available in the proposed new building for the Baltimore branch, including vault space, is 26,064 square feet. Careful estimates of the floor space required for all departments of the Baltimore branch at the time of occupying the new building is 23,005 square feet; one floor, unassigned and unfinished (to be finished when needed for expansion) comprises 6,050 square feet of working space. The building is described briefly as follows:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED NEW BUILDING FOR USE OF BALTIMORE BRANCH,
FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF RICHMOND

The present plans contemplate a basement and five-story building, plus a mezzanine floor in a portion of the main story. The building occupies the entire lot on the main floor, but sets back on the west side above this level, so that all exposures are forever assured of abundant light and air. The principal entrance is from Lexington Street, approximately opposite the city courthouse, and there is also a driveway entrance to the shipping court at the entrance corner of the Lexington Street facade, so that deliveries of cash and securities can be handled at the most convenient grade.

With the exception of the necessary driveway, shipping courts, and heating plant area, the entire space in basement, first, and mezzanine floors is devoted to the executive, currency and coin, and security departments of the bank, and to other clerical departments having most contact with local member banks and the public. The main floor, where almost all of the contact with the banking public takes place, has been given a simple but dignified architectural character, this room being almost the only spot in the entire building where the treatment provides for anything more than the plainest fireproof office-building construction. Even in this main banking room great care has been taken to avoid extravagance or even the appearance of extravagance, and the appearance of architectural dignity will be obtained more because of its symmetry, size, and proportion than by reason of elaborate treatment in marble, bronze, or stone.

The second and third floors will be simple, fireproof, office-building space, with one variation from what we are accustomed to in buildings of this type, in that practically no interior partitions will be provided. After careful study, it has been determined that better working conditions will be obtained by having these floors almost entirely open, dividing the various departments only by aisles or simple railings, thus making it very easy to readjust or expand the various departments without the necessity of expensive alterations in the building.

The fourth floor will be left as an open and unfinished loft space for the present. It is provided to enable the bank to extend its facilities or rearrange its departments in the future, at least up to a certain point, without having to enlarge the shell of the building. The cost of inserting this unfinished loft space in a building of this kind, leaving out all flooring, plaster, and interior finishing, means an astonishingly small increase in the total cost of the building. When developed later it will enable the bank to provide for necessary future expansion at far less expense than would be involved in any other method.

The fifth floor is devoted to lunch room, auditorium, kitchen, rest room, study, and other provisions of general welfare for the personnel. The main feature of this floor is the combination auditorium and lunch room. Not only will it fill a long-felt need when serving as a lunch and assembly room for the employees of the bank, but it will also afford an assembly room for meetings of banks, small conventions, and banking conferences, and will serve as a general point of contact between the institution and its member banks on all occasions when they look to the Federal reserve system for counsel and advice.

The exterior of the building is designed in a style which conforms with the Federal reserve banks in general. It will be constructed of limestone, with simple wall surfaces, grouped windows and stone belt courses and cornices, but avoiding the extravagance of exterior columns or pilasters. Special attention has been paid to the scale of the courthouse and adjacent buildings and to the necessity of harmonizing with the general lines of the important group of Federal, State, and city buildings near by.

The Linthicum bill just passed is of great importance to Baltimore, and I hope it will be promptly passed by the Senate.

ARTILLERY RANGE AT FORT ETHAN ALLEN, VT.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2752) for the purchase of land as an artillery range at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to call attention to the fact that I regret that I shall have to object because of the interest that a former beloved colleague who has gone to the other end of the Capitol has in this bill. But this continual buying and selling by the War Department—buying for a big sum and selling for a small sum—I do not think there is any necessity for it.

I can cite the gentleman to a place in the district of my colleague [Mr. HUBSPETH], in Texas, where you can get the finest artillery range in the world for about one-tenth of what you

will pay for this, and it would be not so very far from Fort Sam Houston at San Antonio and Fort Bliss at El Paso, where you could have artillery practice all the time. You can get there necessary land and mountain ranges for artillery purposes for one-tenth of what this will cost.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I hate to do it, but I am going to object.

Mr. BRIGHAM. If the gentleman will yield, would it be good business to transport these troops, over 4,000 of them, from Fort Ethan Allen to San Antonio, Tex.?

Mr. BLANTON. How many did the gentleman say?

Mr. BRIGHAM. Between 4,000 and 5,000 troops.

Mr. BLANTON. Why could not they train 4,000 or 5,000 troops there this summer as they did there last summer?

Mr. BRIGHAM. If the gentleman has read the report of the Secretary of War in reference to this bill, he will note that the War Department has rented a tract of land for this artillery range with the privilege of purchase.

The land can be bought now at a figure which is of advantage to the Government. It will pay the Government to buy rather than to rent. The reason why the troops can not train there indefinitely is because the options on this land expire January 1, 1927, and it may be impossible to rent it thereafter.

Mr. BLANTON. We passed a blanket bill giving the War Department authority to sell property which they declared was worth \$20,000,000, but which, in my judgment, will total \$50,000,000, and to keep that money in a special fund in the Treasury as a revolving fund to be spent by the War Department. We authorized them to sell property all over the United States, and now we are proposing to give them another sum to buy more property.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Every corps area in the United States, I am informed, has its artillery range except this corps area. I think this corps area is entitled to an artillery range, so that the Field Artillery can practice there.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am surrounded by the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, the members of the Banking Committee, and various others—"wets" and "drys"—and I will for the present withdraw my objection.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Further reserving the right to object, I have been giving some investigation to this bill, but have not completed it. Will the gentleman let it go over until the next consent day?

Mr. BRIGHAM. We are anxious to have this bill passed, so that we can save next year's rental of the property.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I think we can get at it at the next meeting of the committee and have time in the meantime to investigate it. I ask unanimous consent that it may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. And I ask unanimous consent that it may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK BUILDING IN DETROIT, MICH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) authorizing the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago to enter into contracts for the erection of a building for its branch establishment in the city of Detroit, Mich.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much is to be expended?

Mr. HOOPER. Six hundred thousand dollars. That is \$400,000 less than the Baltimore proposition. We need the bank building very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) authorizing the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago to enter into contracts for the erection of a building for its branch establishment in the city of Detroit, Mich.

Whereas the building in the city of Detroit now occupied under lease by the Detroit branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago is inadequate for the business of that institution, which is being conducted in three separate locations, so that the larger portion of its moneys and valuables must be kept in vaults other than its own, and this entails the serious hazard in transferring large sums of moneys through the streets, inconvenience to member banks, and large increases in overhead; and

Whereas the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago had purchased before the 3d day of June, 1922, and now owns a lot situated at the northeast corner of Fort and Shelby Streets in the city of Detroit, Mich., suitable for the erection of a banking office adequate for the needs of said Detroit branch, but had not begun the erection of a building thereon; and

Whereas the cost of construction of a suitable building as estimated from plans caused to be prepared by the directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago will not exceed \$600,000: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago be, and it is hereby, authorized to enter into contracts for the erection of a building for its Detroit branch on the site now owned, provided the total amount expended in the erection of said building, exclusive of the cost of the vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures, shall not exceed the sum of \$600,000: *Provided, however*, That the character and type of building to be erected, the amount actually to be expended in the construction of said building, and the amount actually to be expended for the vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures for said building shall be subject to the approval of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike out all of the whereases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a brief statement in order that the Record may be understood. Of course, the Members of the House are familiar with the fact that these Federal reserve bank buildings are constructed out of the capital and surplus of the Federal reserve bank, but some one reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might get the impression that they are being built out of public funds. Therefore, I think it is well that it be said here for the Record that these buildings are constructed not out of funds from the Treasury of the United States, but out of the capital and surplus of the Federal reserve banks.

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

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But indirectly all of this capital and surplus really comes out of the people of the United States?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The capital of the Federal reserve bank belongs to the member banks, because it was subscribed and paid in by them. The surplus has been created out of the profits of the Federal reserve banks, which they have been permitted to set aside as surplus after the payment of franchise tax to the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. I know, but the depositors and borrowers of the country after all make possible the capital and the surplus of this Federal reserve bank. It is the banking business of the country that makes it possible.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am in thorough sympathy with the idea and purpose of Congress retaining control over the matter. In fact, I think much extravagance could have been avoided in some of the Federal reserve cities in the matter of Federal reserve bank buildings if the cost of the buildings had been left up to Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will have to get busy mighty quick then, because we have lost control already in the tremendously large salaries that are paid and in the great expenses and the extravagance and waste connected with these banks. The gentleman has a big job on his hands if he expects to help Congress to regain control.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I think myself that some attention should be given to that question. I have no doubt that some of the salaries paid to certain officers of the Federal reserve banks by order of their boards of directors are too high.

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

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman's colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] should understand that his statement that this comes out of the people of the country does not apply with reference to these banks any more than it would to an individual bank in his home town building its own building out of its own capital and surplus.

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

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is a big wholesaler in his State—

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, no; not big. I am interested in a business enterprise of very moderate size.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has there a big wholesale plant, and when he has to carry over the farmers down there and discount their paper through the local banks, if the Federal reserve bank could give the local bank a little lower discount rate the gentleman's customers would get the benefit of it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am just as earnest as I know my colleague is in seeing that economy is used in these buildings and in all other operations of the Federal reserve banks. I want them to be of greatest possible service to the public whom they serve. I think that we have now limitations in the law that will insure greater economy in the matter of buildings than was the case before Congress stepped in and asserted its control over building operations.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the Record to get a misinterpretation of the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. What a bank has invested of its capital and surplus in the building can not possibly affect the discount rate.

Mr. BLANTON. But what the reserve bank pays in enormous salaries to its officers and what it wastes in improper running expenses do affect the discount rates.

Mr. WINGO. Those things would affect the dividends but not the discount rates.

Mr. BLANTON. If they did not spend so much on salaries and extravagances they could have a lower discount rate than they do; that would benefit all borrowers.

Mr. WINGO. The discount rate is not fixed by the thing that the gentleman has in mind. To-day we have a reserve in the Federal reserve system of over 70, and I think it is 75, whereas the required reserve is only 40. They could loan to the farmers of Texas, if they present through their member banks eligible paper, more than the farmers of Texas will ever ask in the way of commercial loans, and this bill will not affect that question at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, which has already passed the Senate, should receive the support of the House. It does not call for an appropriation but merely gives permission to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago to build, from its own funds, a bank for its Detroit branch. Similar resolutions have been adopted permitting the New York Federal Reserve Bank to build at Buffalo and the Richmond Federal Reserve Bank to build for its branch at Baltimore.

The need for such a building for the Detroit branch is imperative. The amount asked, \$600,000, is very moderate. Detroit has become a great metropolis. The Federal reserve branch bank does an enormous and rapidly increasing business. In 1925 it received 17,308,000 checks; it received and counted in currency \$58,624,000; it received and counted in coin \$12,148,000. It occupies a most important place in the financial life of Detroit and the State of Michigan.

This vast business has been done under serious handicaps. The present home of the bank is entirely inadequate for its needs. The business is being conducted in three separate locations; large portions of its money and securities must be kept in vaults other than its own; and this, of course, entails danger and great inconvenience.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago already owns land situated at the northeast corner of Fort and Shelby Streets, in the heart of the business and financial district of Detroit and, subject to the supervision and approval of the Federal Reserve Board, will build there a building suitable to the needs of the bank and of the rapid growth of Detroit.

This resolution has the full approval of the Federal Reserve Board; the sum sought to be authorized is less by \$400,000 than that sought by the Richmond bank for the smaller city of Baltimore, and I hope that the House may allow the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago to provide its Detroit branch with a home suitable to the needs of the Nation's fourth city.

ADJUSTMENT OF WATER-RIGHT CHARGES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10429) to adjust water-right charges, to grant certain other relief on the Federal irrigation projects, to amend subsections E and F, of section 4, act approved December 5, 1924, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

TERMS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9305) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the Judicial Code as amended be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 101. The State of Oklahoma is divided into three judicial districts, to be known as the northern, the eastern, and the western districts of Oklahoma. The territory embraced on January 1, 1925, in the counties of Craig, Creek, Delaware, Mayes, Nowata, Okfuskee, Osage, Ottawa, Pawnee, Rogers, Tulsa, and Washington, as they existed on said date, shall constitute the northern district of Oklahoma. Terms of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma shall be held at Tulsa on the first Monday in January, at Vinita on the first Monday in March, at Pawhuska on the first Monday in May, and at Bartlesville on the first Monday in June in each year: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Pawhuska and Bartlesville are furnished free of expense to the United States.

“The eastern district of Oklahoma shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of January, 1925, in the counties of Adair, Atoka, Bryan, Cherokee, Choctaw, Coal, Carter, Garvin, Grady, Haskell, Hughes, Johnston, Jefferson, Latimer, Le Flore, Love, McClain, Muskogee, McIntosh, McCurtain, Murray, Marshall, Okmulgee, Pittsburg, Pushmataha, Pontotoc, Seminole, Stephens, Sequoyah, and Wagoner. Terms of the district court for the eastern district shall be held at Muskogee on the first Monday in January, at Ada on the first Monday in March, at Okmulgee on the first Monday in April, at Hugo on the second Monday in May, at South McAlester on the first Monday in June, at Ardmore on the first Monday in October, at Chickasha on the first Monday in November, at Poteau on the first Monday in December in each year, and annually at Pauls Valley at such times as may be fixed by the judge of the eastern district: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding said court at Hugo, Poteau, Ada, Okmulgee, and Pauls Valley are furnished free of expense to the United States.

“The western district of Oklahoma shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of January, 1925, in the counties of Alfalfa, Beaver, Beckham, Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cimarron, Cleveland, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Ellis, Garfield, Grant, Greer, Harmon, Harper, Jackson, Kay, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, Major, Noble, Oklahoma, Payne, Pottawatomie, Roger Mills, Texas, Tillman, Wichita, Woods, and Woodward. The terms of the district court for the western district shall be held at Oklahoma City on the first Monday in January, at Enid on the first Monday of March, at Guthrie on the first Monday of May, at Mangum on the first Monday of September, at Lawton on the first Monday of October, and at Woodward on the first Monday of November: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Mangum are furnished free of expense to the United States: *And provided further*, That the district judge of said district, or in his absence a district judge or a circuit judge assigned to hold court in said district, may postpone or adjourn to a day certain any of said terms by order made in chambers at any other place designated as aforesaid for holding court in said district.

“The clerk of the district court for the northern district shall keep his office at Tulsa; the clerk of the district court for the eastern district shall keep his office at Muskogee and shall maintain an office in charge of a deputy at Ardmore; the clerk for the western district shall keep his office at Guthrie and shall maintain an office in charge of himself or his deputy at Oklahoma City.

“Sec. 2. The present senior judge of the eastern district of Oklahoma be, and he is hereby, assigned to hold said court in the said eastern district, and shall exercise the same jurisdiction and perform the same duties within the said district as he exercised and performed within his district prior to the passage of this act. That the present judge of the western district of Oklahoma be, and he is hereby, assigned to hold said court in the western district of Oklahoma, and shall exercise the same jurisdiction and perform the same duties as he exercised and performed within his district prior to the passage of this act. That the present junior judge of the eastern district of Oklahoma be, and he is hereby, assigned to hold said court in the said northern district, and shall exercise the same jurisdiction and perform the same duties

within the said district as he exercised and performed within his district prior to the passage of this act. Each of said judges and courts shall in other respects have all the power and authority, civil, criminal, equitable, or otherwise, which is conferred by law generally upon the district courts of the United States and the judges thereof.

“Sec. 3. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint for said northern district of Oklahoma a district judge upon the death, disability, or retirement of the district judge who is hereby assigned to said northern district.

“Sec. 4. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint for said northern district of Oklahoma a marshal and a district attorney. A clerk and deputy clerks shall be appointed and may be removed in the manner provided by law.

“Sec. 5. The jurisdiction and authority of the courts and officers of the western district of Oklahoma, and of the courts and officers of the eastern district of Oklahoma as heretofore divided between them by the order of the senior judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit of the United States over the territory embraced within said northern district of Oklahoma, shall continue as heretofore until the organization of the district court of said northern district, and thereupon shall cease and determine, save and except in so far as the authority of the junior judge of said eastern district is continued in him as judge of said northern district, and save and except as to the authority expressly conferred by law on said courts, judges, or officers, or any of them, to commence and proceed with the prosecution of crimes and offenses committed therein prior to the establishment of the said northern district, and save and except as to any other authority expressly reserved to them or any of them under any law applicable in the case of the creation or change of the divisions or districts of district courts of the United States.

“Sec. 6. Any party to any civil action, suit, or proceeding, including proceedings in bankruptcy, which is pending in the said eastern or western district and the prescribed venue of which would have been in said northern district had such district been constituted at the time such action, suit, or proceeding was instituted, may, by filing notice of such desire in the office of the clerk of such eastern or western district, as the case may be, cause such action, suit, or proceeding to be transferred to said northern district, and upon the filing of such notice the cause shall proceed in the said northern district as though originally brought therein. The clerk in whose office such notice may be filed shall forthwith transmit all the papers and documents in his court pertaining to such cause to the clerk of said northern district, and he shall also, with all reasonable dispatch, prepare and transmit to such last-named clerk a certified transcript of the record of all orders, interlocutory decrees, or other entries in such cause, with his certificate under the seal of the court that the papers sent are all that were on file in said court belonging to the cause. For the performance of his duties under this section the clerk so transmitting and certifying such papers and records shall receive the same fees as are now allowed by law for similar services to be taxed in the bill of costs and regularly collected with the other costs in the cause; and such transcript, when so certified and received, shall henceforth constitute a part of the record in the cause in the court to which the transfer shall be made. With such transcript shall be remitted all deposits in the hands of the clerk to the credit or account of such cause. The clerk receiving such transcript and original papers shall file the same. In case the permissible prescribed venue of any such action, suit, or proceeding would, at the option of the plaintiff, have been in either the said eastern district or in the said western district, though said northern district had then been constituted, then such suit, action, or proceeding shall not be removed to said northern district except upon consent of all of the parties thereto, which consent shall be filed with the clerk in lieu of the notice of transfer above specified and shall have the same effect.”

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it. Mr. McKEOWN. Does that leave anything in the bill at all? The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. From my hearing of the bill, as it was read, the amendments seem to cut out all except the enacting clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are still left pages 1, 2, and 3, and part of page 4.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

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: “A bill to amend paragraph 1 of section 101 of the Judicial Code as amended.”

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next one.

CONTROL OF FLOOD WATERS OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9957) authorizing a survey for the control of excess flood waters of the Mississippi River below Point Breeze in Louisiana and on the Atchafalaya outlet by the construction and maintenance of controlled and regulated spillway or spillways, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made, and estimates of the costs of such controlled and regulated spillway or spillways as may be necessary for the diversion and control of a sufficient volume of the excess flood waters of the Mississippi River between Point Breeze and Fort Jackson in Louisiana, in order to prevent the waters of said river exceeding stages of approximately 10, 17, 18, 19, and 20 feet on the Carrollton gauge at New Orleans, and of approximately 46, 47, and 48 feet on the gauge at Simmesport on the Atchafalaya Outlet, and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to cause the Mississippi River Commission to transmit to him all engineering records, data, field notes, and such other information in its possession as he may deem desirable and useful in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to use \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, from funds heretofore appropriated for flood control, Mississippi River, to carry out the objects and purposes of this act: *Provided*, That no spillway shall be constructed as a result of the survey authorized by this act whereby the waters of the Mississippi River would be diverted into Mississippi Sound.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to report to the Congress as soon as practicable the results of the survey authorized by this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CUSTOMS WAREHOUSE AT SAN JUAN, PORTO RICO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9314) to provide for the enlargement of the present customs warehouse at San Juan, Porto Rico.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the enlargement of the present customs warehouse at San Juan, P. R., so as to provide necessary and convenient accommodations for customs offices at that point, and that the total cost of all extensions, enlargements, improvements, changes, and repairs shall not exceed the sum of \$230,000, said amount to be paid as needed out of duties collected in Porto Rico, as an expense of collection under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed, was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CUSTOMS BUILDINGS IN PORTO RICO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9831) to provide for the completion and repair of customs buildings in Porto Rico.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the completion and repair of customs buildings in Porto Rico, under allotments provided by the acts of Congress approved January 10, 1920, and June 7, 1924, respectively, the sum of \$7,700, and that he be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay Contractor Antonio Higuera the sum of \$1,826.80 for extra work performed in addition to the amount of money available under allotment provided by the act of January 10, 1920, and that he be likewise authorized and directed to reimburse said contractor the sum of \$300 for balance due him for furnishing labor, equipment, and materials to test foundations before building the new customhouse at San Juan, Porto Rico, act of January 10, 1920, all said amounts to be paid out of duties collected in Porto Rico as an expense of collection, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CONSTRUCTION OF A ROAD ON LEECH LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9907) authorizing an expenditure of \$6,000 from the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for the construction of a road on the Leech Lake Reservation.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if this sanitarium is an Indian hospital?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exclusively for Indians?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So that this road is to be used by Indian patients?

Mr. KNUTSON. By the Indians, and the money expended on the road is to come from Indian funds.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understood this was a private sanitarium.

Mr. KNUTSON. No. It is an institution maintained by the Government for the treatment of the Chippewas of Minnesota.

Mr. LEAVITT. The committee is in favor of this bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I was under the impression that it was a private institution.

Mr. KNUTSON. No. It is a Government institution supported from the Chippewa Indian funds.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the patients are Indians?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the road to be built with this money entirely on the reservation, or only partly on the reservation?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that we have completed the road as far as we can under the law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the road entirely on the reservation?

Mr. KNUTSON. To answer that in the affirmative would not be quite correct. This reservation has been abolished, but the land is all Indian land. We have only one reservation in Minnesota now, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill as reported by the committee is, in effect, not an appropriation with reference to a road on an Indian reservation. If it had reference to a road on an Indian reservation, no further legislative authority would be necessary. That authority already exists under the Snyder Act, and all the gentleman would have to do would be to get an item in an appropriation bill. If it is a road off of a reservation, then legislative authority is necessary, and that, I presume, is the occasion for this bill.

I wonder whether the gentleman will accept an amendment so that it will simply be an authorization for an appropriation?

Mr. KNUTSON. May I have the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] proposes to amend this bill so as to make it an authorization.

Mr. MADDEN. And that is what it should be.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee what possibility there is, or probability, of there being another deficiency bill, because this is very urgent.

Mr. MADDEN. It is altogether likely there will be one; but, of course, we are not making any promises in that regard.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not asking the gentleman to pledge himself.

Mr. BLANTON. If we stay in session until May 15, we are liable to have two or three of them.

Mr. KNUTSON. In view of what the two gentlemen have stated, I accept the amendment the gentleman from Michigan proposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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 the sum of \$6,000 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. p. 642), said amount to be used for the construction of a road on the Leech Lake Reservation from the Chippewa sanatorium at Onigum to connect with State Highway No. 34, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That Indian labor shall be employed as far as practicable.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the sum of \$6,000 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. p. 642), is authorized to be appropriated for the construction of a road on the Leech Lake Reservation from the Chippewa sanatorium at Onigum to connect with State Highway No. 34, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That Indian labor shall be employed as far as practicable."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY POSTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10275) authorizing appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object. This bill involves \$7,020,000.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. It does not involve any appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. It involves proposed construction that will cost \$7,020,000.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. The money is already there.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that. But I want to save that for a while.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. It is not an appropriation. It is only an authorization.

Mr. BLANTON. I intend to object and save the Appropriations Committee some trouble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4007) to amend an act approved June 20, 1910, entitled "An act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what this is all about.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain the bill. The object of this bill is to permit the State and Federal Governments to exchange lands within the forest reserve of New Mexico. At the present time the State has certain sections within the forest reserve and scattered throughout the forest reserve that it can not lease.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," approved June 20, 1910, be, and the same is hereby, amended, subject to the consent to the terms hereof by the State of New Mexico, by adding the following: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to accept on behalf of the United States, title to any land within the exterior boundaries of the national forests in the State of New Mexico, title to which is in the State of New Mexico, which the said State of New Mexico is willing to convey to the United States, and which shall be so conveyed by deed duly recorded and executed by the governor of said State and the State land commissioner, with the approval of the State land board of said State, and as to land granted to the said State of New Mexico for the support of common schools with the approval of the State superintendent of public instruction of said State, as to institutional grant lands with the approval of the governing body of the institution for whose benefit the lands so reconveyed were granted to said State, if, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, public interests will be benefited thereby and the lands are chiefly valuable for national forest purposes, and in exchange therefor, the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may give not to exceed an equal value of unappropriated, ungranted, national forest land belonging to the United States within the said State of New Mexico, as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and be acceptable to the State as a fair compensation, consideration being given to any reservation which either the State or the United States may make of timber, mineral, or easements.

That authority is hereby vested in the President temporarily to withdraw from disposition under the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. p. 847), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L. p. 497), lands proposed for selection by the State under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. Where sections 2, 16, 32, and 36, within national forests, legal title to which sections is retained in the United States under the provisions of section 6 of the said act of June 20, 1910, and which sections are administered as a part of the said national forests for the benefit of the said State of New Mexico, have not already been tendered as base for indemnity selection under sections 2275 and 2276, United States Revised Statutes, and where such sections of land, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, are chiefly valuable for forest purposes, upon surrender by the State of New Mexico of the right to make lieu selections and of all claim, right, or interest in or to said sections upon and in the event of elimination from the national forests, the Secretary of the Interior, in consideration of such surrender, may, in his discretion, give to the State of New Mexico not to exceed an equal value of unappropriated, ungranted, national forest, or other Government land belonging to the United States within the said State of New Mexico, as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior and be acceptable to the State as a fair compensation, consideration being given to any reservation which either the State or the United States may make of timber, mineral, or easements.

That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may establish regulations and a procedure for appraising the values of the lands owned by the United States and by the State and for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That all lands acquired by the State of New Mexico under the provisions, and all the products and proceeds of said lands, shall be subject to all the conditions and trusts to which the lands conveyed or surrendered in lieu thereof are now subject. All lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become parts of the national forests within which they are situated.

SEC. 4. That pursuant to section 10, Article XXI, constitution of the State of New Mexico, the consent of the United States is hereby granted for amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico in accordance with the provision of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 1, after the word "forest," strike out the comma and the words "or other Government."

In line 3 strike out the words "or the Secretary of the Interior."

Beginning in line 8 strike out all of lines 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

On page 4, line 5, after the word "forest," strike out the comma and the words "or other Government."

In line 8 strike out the words "or the Secretary of the Interior."

In line 12 strike out the words "the Secretary of the Interior and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, the passage of House bill 4007, permitting the State of New Mexico to enact legislation to exchange its State lands, now located within the boundaries of the national forest reserve, for other land upon the extreme outer edge of the boundaries of the national forest is a very beneficial measure to the State. It enables it to own its land in a compact body, and likewise the national-forest land will be in a compact body. This, in my opinion, will prove of much benefit to the State in permitting the successful leasing and sale of the State land now located within the national forest.

The exchange is upon an equal value basis and permits the State to select either grazing or agricultural land, or bodies of forest land, in exchange for the timberland now owned by the State. This permits a classification to be placed upon the timberland at its proper value, and valuations to be placed upon the grazing or agricultural lands at their present value: thus in many cases granting to the State much more land than it now possesses.

Consideration is expressly conferred in the bill to permit a valuation on any timber or mineral that may be contained in the State land, and an additional value fixed on the land in the exchange.

The present method of handling the State lands within the boundaries of the national forest has not been advantageous to the State for the reason that it has been impossible to lease or sell scattered sections in the national forest reserve to advantage, while a body of land can be leased or sold at the maximum price. It has not been possible for the State to guard against forest fires or to safeguard and protect the timber, and in the sale and cutting of the same it has been necessary for the State in many instances to operate through the Forest Service of the Government, a method which the Governor of New Mexico says has been embarrassing to the State and to the Government officials in the handling of the adjacent lands.

The State land commissioner of New Mexico says that in the handling of these State lands within the boundaries of national forests it has cost more in State administration than the revenue derived therefrom. The State can not, with these scattered lands, set up the proper system to successfully handle the same and receive the proper return that the State is entitled to receive from the land.

The exchange upon an equal value basis will be of material benefit to the State, in owning its land in a body, to operate and supervise it at a minimum cost; it will be of equal advantage to the Forest Service by eliminating conflicting interest within the boundary of the national forest, so that all the rules of the Forest Service can be properly applied.

Another important element will be put into uniform operation; that is, the timber, so necessary to the conserving of our moisture, as snow and rain, will be carefully guarded with the purpose and system of maintaining and replenishing the forest, which is so essential to the future water supply of the State.

This the State can not successfully carry out, due to the expense incident thereto. Too, the scattered lands have only that value that the public could place upon same for utility, located as they are in many cases far from railroad facilities. They have no real immediate value, while to the Government and to the State, for the watershed protection, they have a fixed and permanent value, which reaches the highest purpose under the uniform method of the Government Forest Service.

I have expressed myself publicly concerning the Government Forest Service upon many occasions, and I desire now to do so again upon this occasion, in preserving and supervising the protection, care, and growth of timber in the mountain regions of our arid western country. The Government, through this bureau, is admirably exercising a function of government that is rendering a great service to man.

It is from these high western mountains that our great rivers find their sources. It is the timber, protected upon the mountains and at the source of the headwaters of these streams,

that holds the snow and rain, that feed the springs and rivulets that make up the mighty rivers, whose waters finally reach down and across the plains. Remove this forest protection and destroy the timber and you will see destruction wrought to your plains and valleys below.

The forest, under proper protection, affords a home and shelter for wild life of all kinds. Remove it and your wild life is gone. The great hunting and fishing of the western mountain forest can be maintained indefinitely under our present forest supervision.

While I am a great believer in the right of the State to supervise and control the assets and property of the State, I will gracefully acknowledge that in forest protection and supervision the States have signal failed. This is one function of the Government that must be under a national system of control and be exercised through national authority.

All available remaining timberland now held as public land should pass as quickly as possible into our national forests, to be controlled in the interest of the country as a national asset. If properly handled it will be a safeguard for our future supply of timber, water, and a preserve for wild game; this without expense to the Government and returning to the Government an asset of more value than the cost of operation.

The restoring of the timber over denuded areas is very important. The State is not equipped for doing this, and the Government Forest Service is so equipped. Many areas comprised within the State lands sought to be exchanged require actual tree planting.

It is truthfully said that fire protection is the greatest problem; the State is entirely without the equipment and established system to cope with this evil, and with its scattered land could not establish a successful system of protection. The National Government is fully prepared for that purpose, and with this protection renders the highest aid to the State, namely, the forest is the reservoir for the moisture which safeguards the water supply of the State, the forest becomes a place of recreation for the people of the State, and lastly the forest is the protection of the game and fish of the State.

The National Government has by its system of forest control advanced in an educational line of cooperation with the people, until now the majority of thinking citizens are looking to our national forests as our great national asset—an entirely different view from that heretofore held. It was not realized, and many of our citizens do not now realize, that in the destruction of the forest they tended to destroy all life with it, to lessen the water supply, to increase floods, to destroy fertility of soil by permitting rains, unchecked by the forest, to wash away the virgin soil that it took nature millions of years to produce, to destroy the navigability of our rivers, and, above all, to destroy wild game and fish. Thus man's pleasure and food supply were lessened. The one system that is checking and bringing back this lost wealth is the Government Forest Service.

What would become of the great reclamation projects of the Government in our western country, where \$200,000,000 of the funds of the Government are invested, and where untold wealth is being brought back to the people in crop production? Should the forest be destroyed, or lessened in extent, the water supply for these projects and others to follow would fail. Two wonderful assets of the people would be of much less value without timber, and those are land and water. One of the most successful ways of stemming the flood is by the forest growth; that holds the moisture and permits it to gradually percolate through the soil and back into the channels of the streams.

Thus, in exchanging the State land in this bill, the State is not only getting full value but, in my opinion, double value in having the land exchanged utilized for the highest value to the State under national-forest supervision.

OREGON & CALIFORNIA RAILROAD AND COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9306) amending section 5 of the act approved June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 218), so as to authorize the sale of timber on class 3 of the Oregon & California Railroad and Coos Bay wagon road grant lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 218), and as amended and extended by section 3 of the act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. L. p. 1179), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

And provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion and in the manner now provided for the sale of timber on lands of class 2, sell the timber on any of the lands of class 3 which at the time application to purchase the timber is filed have been subject to entry for a period of at least two years and are not embraced in an application or entry, such sale of the timber not to preclude the disposal of the land under laws applicable thereto, subject to the right of the purchaser of the timber to cut and remove the same.

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

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

MUNICIPAL AVIATION FIELD, TUCSON, ARIZ.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2029) to authorize the use by the city of Tucson, Ariz., of such public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 2029) to authorize the use by the city of Tucson, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to lease to the city of Tucson, Ariz., for the establishment and maintenance of a municipal aviation field, sections 26 and 27 in township 14 south of range 14 east, G. and S. R. B. and M., Pima County, Ariz., containing 1,280 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. That said lease shall be for a period of 20 years, and be subject to renewal for a like period, on condition that the city pay to the United States a rental of \$1 per year for the use of the said land: *Provided*, That Government departments and agencies operating aircraft shall always have free and unrestricted use of said field and the right to erect and install upon said land such structures and improvements as the heads of such departments and agencies may deem advisable, including facilities for maintaining supplies of fuel, oil, and other materials for operating aircraft, and that in case of emergency, or in event it shall be deemed advisable, the Government of the United States may assume absolute control of the management and operation of said field for military purposes.

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

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

BRIDGE BILLS

Mr. BURTNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that together with the next bill, Consent Calendar No. 276, there may also be considered various and sundry bills which I will list in a moment, all of which appear on the Consent Calendar and which pertain either to the granting of consent by Congress for the building of bridges across navigable streams or pertain to the extension of time within which bridges may be built, for which consent has already been granted by Congress; and I ask that, in so far as the reports show committee amendments, that all the committee amendments may be agreed to under one vote and that the question on the passage of the bills be put under one vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that all the so-called bridge bills and bills granting extensions of time for the construction of bridges may be considered en bloc, including the committee amendments to said bills. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to include the toll bridge bills? I understand there are two or three toll bridge bills on the calendar.

Mr. BURTNES. The list I have includes practically all the bridge bills that are upon the calendar, including those for toll bridges. Of course, I take it the gentleman from Wisconsin understands that our committee has followed its general policy and no bill is reported authorizing collection of tolls except with amendments which provide for taking over these toll bridges at any time by the States or by the adjoining municipalities, and within a certain number of years the bridges can be taken over at a reduced measure of damages. The policy of the committee is to procure free bridges at the earliest possible moment, but not to deprive communities of bridge service in the meantime.

Mr. SCHAFER. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman enumerate the bills.

Mr. BURTNES. I intend to do so. The bills to be enumerated are those that I understand are not controversial and do not include the Poteau Dam bill with which the gentleman from Oklahoma is probably concerned.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Nor the Columbia River.

Mr. BURTNES. The bills are as follows:

Consent Calendar 276, H. R. 9494; Consent Calendar 277, H. R. 9503; Consent Calendar 278, H. R. 9505; Consent Calendar 279, H. R. 9506; Consent Calendar 280, H. R. 9461; Consent Calendar 282, H. R. 10121; Consent Calendar 283, H. R. 10244; Consent Calendar 284, H. R. 10246; Consent Calendar 319, S. 1809; Consent Calendar 321, H. R. 9758; Consent Calendar 322, H. R. 10001; Consent Calendar 323, H. R. 10090; Consent Calendar 324, H. R. 10164; Consent Calendar 325, H. R. 10169; Consent Calendar 326, H. R. 10351; Consent Calendar 327, H. R. 10465; Consent Calendar 328, H. R. 10470; Consent Calendar 332, H. R. 9348; and Consent Calendar 333, H. R. 10637.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman include Consent Calendar 281?

Mr. BURTNES. Consent Calendar No. 281 is omitted because another committee amendment is to be submitted in place of the committee amendment as reported.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the bills just listed include a number not on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. BURTNES. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not so understand it.

Mr. BURTNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw from that list the bill on the Consent Calendar 322, H. R. 10001, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WYANT], who has reported the bill, has an amendment to offer not in the committee report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report all the bills mentioned en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9494) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Gainesboro-Red Boiling Springs road in Jackson County, Tenn.

A bill (H. R. 9503) granting permission to the State Highway Commission of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn., on the Sayannah-Selmer road.

A bill (H. R. 9505) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Waverly-Camden Road between Humphreys and Benton Counties, Tenn.

A bill (H. R. 9506) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.

A bill (H. R. 9461) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande between Eagle Pass, Tex., and Piedras Negras, Mexico.

A bill (H. R. 10121) extending the time for the completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River in Ramsey County, Minn., by the city of St. Paul.

A bill (H. R. 10244) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Fox River in the State of Illinois, on State Road No. 18, connecting the villages of Yorkville and Bristol in said county.

A bill (H. R. 10246) to authorize the commissioners of McKean County, Pa., or their successors in office, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River at a certain location where a highway known as State Highway Route No. 211 crosses said river at a location within the limits of the Borough of Eldred or not distant more than one-half mile north of said Borough of Eldred, McKean County, Pa.;

An act (S. 1809) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Vincennes, Knox County, Ind.

A bill (H. R. 9758) granting the consent of Congress to Harry E. Bovay to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Vicksburg, Miss.

A bill (H. R. 10090) granting the consent of Congress to Alfred L. McCawley to construct, maintain, and operate bridges across the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers at Alton, Ill., on the Mississippi, and at or below Halls Ferry or Muscys Ferry on the Missouri River.

A bill (H. R. 10164) granting the consent of Congress to Cape Girardeau Chamber of Commerce (Inc.) to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Cape Girardeau, Mo.

A bill (H. R. 10169) granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio.

A bill (H. R. 10351) granting the consent of Congress to the Natchez-Vidalia Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Natchez, Miss.

A bill (H. R. 10465) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Rhode Island or to such corporation as the State of Rhode Island may grant a charter to construct a bridge across Mount Hope Bay at the mouth of the Taunton River between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island.

A bill (H. R. 10470) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Little Falls, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the southeast corner of lot 3, section 34, T. 41 N., R. 32 W.

A bill (H. R. 9348) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River near Steubenville, Ohio.

A bill (H. R. 10657) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge over the Ohio River near Steubenville, Ohio.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House bills were ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, were read the third time, and passed; and the Senate bills were ordered to be read a third time, were read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the several bills were passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1002) granting the consent of Congress to H. J. Stannert, Harry Weis, and George W. Rockwell to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River from a point in the city of Sunbury, Northumberland County, to a point in the township of Monroe, in Snyder County, in the State of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendment and at the request of the committee offer the following amendment to the bill—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman's amendment contain the usual recapture clause in the case of toll bridges?

Mr. WYANT. Yes.

Mr. BURTNES. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman simply desires to submit a committee amendment adopted subsequent to the reporting of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendment, and offer an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand that has been agreed to by the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYANT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to H. J. Stannert, Harry Weis, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between a point in the city of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., and a point opposite in the township of Monroe, Snyder County, Pa., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled, 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 13, 1920, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act. The construction of such bridge shall not be commenced, nor shall any alterations in the plans for the same be made either before or after its completion, until the plans and specifications for the bridge, or for alterations in the plans thereof, have been submitted to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, and approved by them as being adequate for the volume and weight of traffic that will pass over it.

"SEC. 2. After the completion of such bridge, the State of Pennsylvania, or any political subdivision or subdivisions thereof within or adjoining which such bridge is located, may at any time jointly or severally acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interests in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or condemnation in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation. If at any time after the expiration of 25 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value, (2) the actual cost of acquiring

such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 per cent of all the other cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

"SEC. 3. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the State of Pennsylvania, or any political subdivision or subdivisions thereof, as provided in section 2 of this act, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, in fixing the rates of toll to be charged, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide as far as possible a sufficient fund to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid for such bridge and its approaches within a period of not to exceed 25 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient to pay the cost of acquiring the bridge and its approaches, and any interest that shall accrue or money borrowed for that purpose shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept, and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

"SEC. 4. The said H. J. Stannert, Harry Weis, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, shall immediately after the completion of such bridge, file with the State Highway Department of Pennsylvania, a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion cost.

"The said highway department may, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate the cost of constructing the same and for such purpose the said H. J. Stannert, Harry Weis, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the financing and the construction thereof. The findings of the State highway department as to the cost of the bridge shall be conclusive, subject to review in a court of equity for fraud or mistake.

"SEC. 6. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the said H. J. Stannert, Harry Weis, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

"SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The 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.

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

RETIREMENT FOR THE NURSE CORPS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8953) to provide for the retirement of the Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman from Tennessee would let this go over. I have not had time to read the bill. One of the provisions is in harmony with the general retirement act which permits the voluntary retirement at the end of 30 years' service. But in another place it permits the voluntary retirement at the age of 50 years if there had been 20 years' service.

Mr. REECE. I think I can explain that the way it was explained by the surgeon of the Navy.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will let this go over. It is too important a matter to be passed by unanimous consent and I will have to object to it. It may be that the next time I shall be in a position to help the gentleman.

Mr. REECE. Of course, I will let it go over, but the Senate has passed the identical bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I dislike to embarrass the gentleman, but next time I may be able to help him.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STORAGE OF WATERS OF NORTH PLATTE RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10356) to provide for the storage for diversion of the waters of the North Platte River and construction of Casper-Alcova reclamation project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have this bill passed over without prejudice, retaining its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1924

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6238) to amend the immigration act of 1924.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COINAGE OF COPPER 1-CENT PIECES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8267) to authorize the coinage of copper 1-cent pieces to aid the preservation of the birthplace of the world's best loved poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the committee in charge of this had any report upon the bill from the department. The report does not show. [After a pause.] In the absence of that information, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES—OREGON TRAIL

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8306) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the heroism of the fathers and mothers who traversed the Oregon Trail to the far West with great hardship, daring, and loss of life, which not only resulted in adding new States to the Union but earned a well-deserved and imperishable fame for the pioneers; to honor the 20,000 dead that lie buried in unknown graves along 2,000 miles of that great highway of history; to rescue the various important points along the old trail from oblivion; and to commemorate by suitable monuments, memorial or otherwise, the tragic events associated with that emigration—erecting them either along the trail itself or elsewhere, in localities appropriate for the purpose, including the city of Washington.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are two questions that I would like to ask. I see the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] is present. Would it not be satisfactory, in view of the comprehensive character of the title of the bill to simply strike out all after the enacting clause and just pass the title? But I do not want to embarrass the gentleman, and I shall come to my next question. As in the case of the former bill, the report of the committee does not show that there has been any report upon this bill from the department. This is an administrative matter of some importance, and the House ought not to be asked to act without a report from the department. Has there been any report made by the department?

Mr. MILLER. There has been.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the gentleman that report? Could he give it to the House?

Mr. MILLER. The report was made verbally at the time of the hearings, and the gentleman can get that in the hearings.

Mr. CRAMTON. Are the hearings here?

Mr. MILLER. They are available at the committee room.

Mr. CRAMTON. In the absence of something before the committee at that time, I shall have to object. I do not believe the House ought to be asked to act in an administrative matter without a formal statement from the department.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will reserve his objection, I think I can answer his questions satisfactorily. The Department of the Treasury is against practically all legislation of this character in respect to the coinage of special coins in commemoration of special events. They have no serious objection, however, to the passage of this particular bill. It is on the same basis exactly as the Stone Mountain act, and all that have been passed by this Congress providing for the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of great national events.

Mr. CRAMTON. How does the number provided for in this act compare with the number provided for in the Stone Mountain act, for instance?

Mr. MILLER. I think it is about the same as the Stone Mountain act. I am not exactly familiar with the number in that former act, but some gentlemen on the other side of the House can give us the number.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the department stated definitely that the coinage of these 6,000,000 special coins will not embarrass the coinage system in any way or present any administrative difficulties?

Mr. MILLER. It will present no administrative difficulties of any character or kind, and the department has so stated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And in the Stone Mountain case, as in every other previous case, was it not the practice to deliver all of these coins to the society interested?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the Oregon Trail and in memory of the pioneers of the far West there shall be coined at the mints of the United States silver 50-cent pieces to the number of not more than 6,000,000; such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

Sec. 2. That the coins herein authorized shall be issued only upon the request of the executive committee of the Oregon Trail Memorial Association (Inc.), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York; and upon payment by such executive committee, for and on behalf of the Oregon Trail Memorial Association (Inc.), of the par value of such coins, it shall be permissible for the said Oregon Trail Memorial Association (Inc.) to obtain such coins upon said payment all at one time or at separate times and in separate amounts, as it may determine.

Sec. 3. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coinage or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin, or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

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

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

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I objected to the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6238) to amend the immigration act of 1924. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Committee on Immigration, tells me that that bill is all right. I withdraw my objection to it and shall ask unanimous consent that we may return to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 288 on the calendar.

Mr. BEGG. I shall have to object unless I can have some explanation of that. How many people are supposed to be in this condition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The number is quite limited. The situation is here by reason of the fact that the quota law failed to provide for nonquota conditions. If the quotas are small they are returned. It is a matter that is badly needed.

Mr. BEGG. Are the department and the Bureau of Immigration in favor of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and the State Department also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to returning to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the immigration act of 1924 is amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of subdivision (d) and by striking out the period at the end of subdivision (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or" and by adding after subdivision (e) a new subdivision to read as follows:

"(f) A woman who was a citizen of the United States by birth and who prior to September 22, 1922, lost her citizenship by reason of her marriage to an alien."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF SETTLERS IN LAKE COUNTY, FLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8714) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to equitably adjust disputes and claims of settlers and others against the United States and between each other arising from incomplete or faulty surveys in township 19 south, range 26 east, Tallahassee meridian, Lake County, in the State of Florida.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman from Arkansas going to introduce an amendment to protect the holder of the land where we are asked to charge for improvements that the man himself put on the land? That was taken up in the committee, was it?

Mr. DRIVER. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the bill itself provides that in the appraisal of the land the improvements are not to be taken into consideration.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is no danger of a man who has built up a homestead being ousted?

Mr. DRIVER. No. He is fully protected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to equitably adjust disputes and claims of settlers, entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees of the United States, their heirs or assigns, against the United States and between each other arising from incomplete or faulty surveys in township 19 south, range 26 east, Tallahassee meridian, Lake County, in the State of Florida, and to issue directly or in trust as may be found necessary or advisable patent to such settlers, entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees, their heirs or assigns, for land claimed through settlement, occupation, purchase, or otherwise in said described area, preserving as far as he may deem equitable to those claimants now in possession of public land the right to have patented to them the areas so occupied: *Provided*, That a charge of \$1.25 is to be made for each acre or fraction thereof of Government land patented under this act: *Provided further*, That rights acquired subsequent to the withdrawal of December 23, 1925, shall not be recognized or be subject to adjustment hereunder.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept any and all conveyances of land for purposes of adjustment and to make all necessary rules and regulations in order to carry this act into effect.

With committee amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "Provided," strike out "That a charge of \$1.25 is to be made for each acre or fraction thereof of Government land patented under this act" and insert "That a charge of not less than the appraised value of the land, exclusive of any improvements placed thereon, be made for each acre or fraction thereof of Government land patented under the provisions of this act, except that adjustment may be effected by exchange of lands patented for lands substantially equal in area, in which event payment shall be required of the difference in appraised values where the value of the land owned by the Government exceeds that of the land offered in exchange."

On page 2, line 23, strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept any and all conveyances of land and to cause all necessary surveys to be made to effect the purposes of this act. All adjustments hereunder

shall conform to the approved plats of such survey or resurvey, and no other survey will be recognized."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

FUNDS OF FORT PECK AND BLACKFEET INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1550) to appropriate certain tribal funds for the benefit of the Indians of the Fort Peck and Blackfeet Reservations.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the funds placed to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation and of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., under authority of the nineteenth paragraph of section 11 of the Indian affairs appropriation act approved May 18, 1916, shall bear interest from such date until withdrawn at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, both principal and interest to be subject to expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of said Indians or payment to them, in his discretion.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "subject to expenditure" and insert "distributed."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, as to the committee amendment which has just been reported, I had an agreement with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] that that committee amendment should be rejected, so as to place the money in the Treasury subject to appropriation rather than to leave them in the discretion of the department to expend them.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. I will state that I have agreed to that, because of the fact that otherwise the bill will be objected to. This will put the bill in the same form as that in which it passed the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Interior" strike out the words "for the benefit of" and insert the word "to," and after the word "Indians," on line 1 of page 2, strike out the words "or payment to them, in his discretion" and insert "in accordance with existing law."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, as a substitute for the committee amendment I move that the same language be stricken out as in the committee amendment, together with the words "to said Indians," and insert in lieu thereof "in accordance with existing law."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 1, line 10, after the word "Interior," strike out the words "for the benefit of said Indians or payment to them in his discretion" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in accordance with existing law."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, that is necessary in order to conform to the other amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

FORT DEARBORN

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9964) releasing and granting to the city of Chicago any and all reversionary rights of the United States in and to the streets, alleys, and public grounds in Fort Dearborn addition to Chicago.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any and all reversionary right, title, or interest which the United States now has in and to any and all of the streets, alleys, or public grounds in Fort Dearborn addition to Chicago in the southwest quarter of fractional section 10, township 38 north, range 14 east of the third principal meridian, in Cook County, Ill., and any and all right, title, or interest which the United States may hereafter acquire in or to any of said streets, alleys, or public grounds, or any part thereof, by virtue of the vacation or alteration of the same, or any part thereof, or by reason of any change in the use thereof, or any additional burden placed thereon, be, and the same hereby are, released and granted to and vested in the city of Chicago, to be held by it upon the same tenure and subject to the same conditions and limitations on which it now holds other streets, alleys, and public grounds within its boundaries dedicated by private individuals.

SEC. 2. An emergency existing, this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

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

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

PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY ADJACENT TO LOWELL CREEK, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) to authorize the Secretary of War to expend not to exceed \$125,000 for the protection of Government property adjacent to Lowell Creek, Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like some information. As I understand, this bill does not carry an appropriation but it authorizes the Secretary of War to expend \$125,000 from some funds he may have. I presume that is from his river and harbor fund. It does not come from the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and I do not know how generally satisfactory it may be to them. I would like to know definitely as to that proposition. Where is this money coming from that he is to expend? Is there anyone in a position to explain to the House?

Mr. CURRY. It comes out of the lump sum appropriated for rivers and harbors for Alaska.

Mr. CRAMTON. Out of a lump-sum appropriation specifically made for Alaska and not out of the general rivers and harbors appropriation?

Mr. CURRY. A lump-sum appropriation for Alaska.

Mr. CRAMTON. And is not considered a new appropriation?

Mr. CURRY. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to expend not to exceed \$125,000 for the regulation of Lowell Creek, Alaska, for the protection of the buildings, terminal grounds, etc., of the Alaska Engineering Commission and the Alaska Road Commission, the Department of Justice, the United States Signal Corps, and other Federal property within or adjacent to the town of Seward, Alaska, from damage due to floods and overflows of said Lowell Creek.

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

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

OVERLAND COMMUNICATION ON THE SEWARD PENINSULA, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was house joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) authorizing the improvement of the system of overland communications on the Seward Peninsula, Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CURRY. Will the gentleman permit the bill to stay on the calendar?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be retained on the calendar without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to ask unanimous consent that it retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. And that the bill retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CAMP SHERMAN MILITARY RESERVATION, OHIO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7470) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the New York, Chicago, & St. Louis Railway Co., its successors, or assigns, a perpetual easement for railroad right of way over and upon Camp Sherman Military Reservation in the State of Ohio.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant and convey to the New York, Chicago, & St. Louis Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio, its successors or assigns, a perpetual easement, 100 feet in width, over and upon the property belonging to the United States at Camp Sherman in the State of Ohio, and upon the payment of such compensation therefor, as may be approved by the Secretary of War, with full power to locate and construct railroad tracks, sidings, switches, stations, and other appurtenances thereon and to use said property for any and all purposes appurtenant to its business: *Provided*, That no part of the property granted and conveyed by the Secretary of War for the purposes aforesaid shall be used for any other than railroad purposes, and that when said property shall cease to be so used it shall revert to the United States of America.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words, "and directed."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Ohio," insert the words, "at such location."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

INCREASE OF PENSIONS FOR SPANISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. ROBISON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 8132) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes, with an amendment striking out section 4 of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 8132, with an amendment. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits which so incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$50 a month and not less than \$20 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be rated, and such

pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage of this act, upon proof that the disability or disabilities then existed and shall continue during the existence of the same: *Provided*, That any such person who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll and entitled to receive a pension of \$20 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 68 years, \$30 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 72 years, \$40 a month; and in case such person has reached the age of 75 years, \$50 a month: *Provided further*, That any soldier or sailor or nurse of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China relief expedition whose name is on the roll at the time of the passage of this act, or shall thereafter be placed thereon under the act of June 5, 1920, or under that act as amended by the act of September 1, 1922, at a rate of \$12 a month, shall be automatically placed upon the roll at the rate of \$20 a month; and those receiving \$15 a month shall be placed upon the roll at the rate of \$25 a month; and those receiving \$18 a month shall be placed upon the roll at the rate of \$30 a month; and those receiving \$24 a month shall be placed upon the roll at the rate of \$40 a month; and those receiving \$30 a month shall be placed upon the roll at the rate of \$50 a month: *Provided further*, That all leaves of absence and furloughs under General Orders, No. 130, August 29, 1898, War Department, shall be included in determining the period of pensionable service: *Provided further*, That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of this section be, and hereby are, extended to and shall include any woman who served honorably as a nurse, chief nurse, or superintendent of the Nurse Corps under contract for 90 days or more between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, inclusive, and to any such nurse, regardless of length of service, who was released from service before the expiration of 90 days because of disability contracted by her while in the service in line of duty.

SEC. 2. The widow of any officer or enlisted man who served 90 days or more in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China relief expedition, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, inclusive, service to be computed from date of enlistment to date of discharge, and that all leaves of absence and furloughs under General Orders, No. 130, August 29, 1898, War Department, shall be included in determining the period of pensionable service, and was honorably discharged from such service, or, regardless of the length of service, was discharged for or died in service of a disability incurred in the service in line of duty, such widow having married such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the passage of this act, shall, upon due proof of her husband's death, without proving his death to be the result of his Army or Navy service, be placed upon the pension roll from the date of such husband's death, provided such death shall occur subsequent to the passage of this act, otherwise from the date of filing her application therefor under this act in the Bureau of Pensions, at the rate of \$30 a month during her widowhood. And this section shall apply to a former widow of any officer or enlisted man who rendered service as hereinbefore described and who was honorably discharged, or died in service due to disability or disease incurred in the service in line of duty, such widow having remarried either once or more after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine, if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage has or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband or husbands or by divorce without fault on the part of the wife. Such pension shall commence from date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage of this act, and any such former widow shall be entitled to and be paid a pension at the rate of \$30 a month, and any widow or former widow mentioned in this section shall also be paid \$8 a month for each child under 16 years of age of such officer or enlisted man, and any such widow or former widow now or hereafter pensioned at a lower rate shall be entitled to and paid pension at the rate herein provided; and in case there be no widow or one not entitled to pension under any law granting additional pension to minor children the minor children under 16 years of age of such officer or enlisted man shall be entitled to the pension herein provided for the widow from the date of the father's death, provided such death shall occur after the passage of this act, otherwise from date of filing application in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage of this act, and in the event of the death or remarriage of the widow or forfeiture of the widow's title to pension the pension shall continue from the date of such death, remarriage, or forfeiture to such child or children of such officer or enlisted man until the age of 16 years; and any such minor or helpless children now or hereafter pensioned at a lower rate shall be entitled to and be paid pension at the rate herein provided: *Provided*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless the pension shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability; and this proviso shall apply to all pensions heretofore granted or hereafter granted under this or any former statute: *Provided further*, That when a pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child, or to a child or children under the age of 16 years, a widow or former widow shall not be entitled to a pension under this act

until the pension to such child or children terminates unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and upon the granting of pension to such widow or former widow payment of pension to such child or children shall cease, and this proviso shall apply to all claims arising under this or any other law.

SEC. 3. Any soldier, sailor, or marine, or nurse now on the pension roll or who may be hereafter entitled to a pension under the act of June 5, 1920, or under that act as amended by the act of September 1, 1922, or under this act on account of his service during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or China relief expedition, who is now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of \$72 a month, provided such disabilities are not the result of his or her own vicious habits: *And provided further*, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any national or State soldiers' home shall be paid more than \$50 per month under this act.

SEC. 4. That the increase in the rate of pension herein provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the pension roll or who are now in receipt of pension under existing law, shall commence at the rate herein provided on the 4th day of the month following the date of approval of this act: *Provided, however*, That further increase in the rate allowed under section 1 of this act because of increased disability found to exist shall commence from the date of the filing of application for such increase in the Bureau of Pensions, and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner: *Provided*, That when an honorably discharged veteran of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China relief expedition is receiving the benefits of hospitalization in any institution under the control of the Government no portion of the pension which may have been granted to him shall be deducted for his care and maintenance therein or for the benefit of any home or hospital or any fund thereof.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as "The Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll," as provided by the act of April 27, 1916, but any pension or increase of pension herein provided for shall be in addition thereto, and no pension heretofore granted under any act, public or private, shall be reduced by anything contained in this act.

SEC. 6. No claim agent, attorney, or other person shall contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for service in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting claims for the increase of pension provided for in this act; and no more than the sum of \$10 shall be allowed for such service in other claims thereunder, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall, directly or indirectly, otherwise contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for service in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under this act or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension allowed or due to such pensioner or claimant under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall for each and every offense be fined not exceeding \$500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 7. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby modified and amended only so far and to the extent as herein specifically provided and stated.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demanded a second.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add further to the request that the ranking Democrat on the Pension Committee may be permitted to control the 20 minutes on that side unless there is some person against the bill who desires time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman who demands a second is in control of the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Urshaw] is the ranking Member on our side and I ask unanimous consent that he may control the time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the bill (H. R. 8132) now before us, is known as the Knutson bill. Hon. Scott LEAVITT, of Montana, and others introduced bills. Our Committee on Pensions, after extended hearings and a most thorough investigation, unanimously

agreed on the provisions set out in H. R. 8132, and requested our chairman, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, to introduce the bill H. R. 8132, and after further consideration this bill was by unanimous vote of our committee ordered to be favorably reported by me to the House. The demand for this legislation has not come from those alone who will benefit by it, but it has received almost universal approval by all classes of citizens of the Nation who are familiar with the facts. Practically every Member of the House has expressed approval, most of them in writing, of this legislation, and have further earnestly expressed their desire to have an opportunity to vote for it. In fact, I have not heard any Member of the House express opposition to it and I indulge the hope that it will receive the unanimous vote of the House. In my seven years or more of service in the House of Representatives I do not recall any measure that has been able to command such earnest and unanimous support.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Speaker of the House and our distinguished floor leader, Colonel TILSON, for giving us the opportunity to bring this bill before the House and afford the Members of the House an opportunity to express themselves. I know the just cause of these veterans and their dependents has appealed to the Speaker and the floor leader and I know they heartily approve this bill and will do what they honorably can to promote its being written into law. I also wish to thank each member of our Committee on Pensions for their very effective support and all the Members of the House for their cooperation in bringing this matter to a vote. The author of the bill, Mr. KNUTSON, who is a real friend to the veterans, has worked without ceasing to secure justice for these veterans.

Col. Carmi A. Thompson, the present commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, has worked most earnestly and effectively in bringing the cause of these veterans and their dependents to the House; Past Commanders in Chief C. W. Herrick and Albert D. Aleorn, Quartermaster General James J. Murphy, Adjutant General Ralph H. Carroll, members of the national legislative committee for the United Spanish War Veterans, and Mrs. Marie C. Williams, president general of the National Auxiliary of the United Spanish War Veterans, and her associates, have given unstintedly of their time and efforts in promoting this just and splendid piece of legislation. Time will not permit me to mention the various State commanders and the members of their staff, the commanders of the various camps and their staff, and the many thousands of veterans throughout the country who have contributed so much to the success of this legislation. These veterans and their dependents deserve this just recognition. There has been a feeling throughout the country that the veterans of the Spanish-American War and their dependents have been neglected, that they have not received the recognition given to the veterans and their dependents either of the Civil War or the World War, and while this recognition has been more or less tardy, this bill brings to them substantial justice and places them on an equality with the veterans and dependents of other wars.

I wish to thank Capt. W. L. Mattocks, one of the editors of the National Tribune, for his untiring efforts. He has been on the job all of the time pleading the cause of these veterans and their dependents. No man has done more to bring to the Members of the House the information and facts establishing the merit of this legislation for his comrades and their dependents. I am sure that every member of the Rules Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, are heartily in favor of this legislation.

WORTHY CAUSE—FAR-REACHING RESULTS

I find many people who have greatly underestimated the services of the veterans of the war with Spain, Philippine insurrection, and Chinese Boxer rebellion. It was the first time in our history that American soldiers and sailors were called upon to go to foreign soil and distant seas to fight for the freedom of other peoples. It was the first American war in which all the soldiers and sailors from private to general and admiral were volunteers. [Applause.] The President called for volunteers. They came pouring in from North, South, East, and West. In fact, thousands and thousands more offered their services to their country than could be accepted. The young manhood of America wanted to avenge the *Maine*, free Cuba, and force the iron heel of despotism from the Western Hemisphere. [Applause.] There never was a more generous response to the call of our country for service and sacrifice. I remember very well the spirit in which President McKinley's call was received in my own section of the highlands of Kentucky. In one instance it was known that a hundred recruits would be ac-

cepted from a certain county, and more than 300 boarded the train that would carry the recruits to Lexington, Ky. It was necessary to stop the train and force 200 of these fine, patriotic young men to get off. I remember one big, fine, tall highlander who was put off this train and with some forceful language stated that he could not be kept out of the war in that way. He declared his intention of walking to Lexington, a distance of about 130 miles [applause], and he was last seen following that train in the direction of Lexington. He did get in and helped to whip the Spaniards at San Juan Hill. [Applause.] What took place in that immediate section was taking place in every part of the Nation.

The Spanish Government had a large force of trained, seasoned veterans in Cuba. In a few brief weeks a much less number of these splendid American boys fought their way into Cuba, and in a few days Spain had been brought to her knees, the *Maine* had been avenged, and Cuba was set free. In a few brief weeks the American soldiers, sailors, and marines at Manila Bay, San Juan Hill, and Santiago, by their dash, courage, and blood, had written a new and brilliant chapter on the pages of American history. [Applause.] They had gone forth at the call of their country and had brought the Stars and Stripes back in honor and in victory. [Applause.] America had been talked of as a world power. Our fine American boys made it an established fact. This was accomplished so quickly and so completely that many of us have overlooked the sacrifices that were made. It is a fact and the records of the War Department show that there were more casualties according to the number involved in that war than there were in our forces, either in the Civil War or in the World War. It was the first time that our defenders had been called to long service in tropical climates. Our boys not only suffered in battle but they died by the thousands because of fevers in the tropical climates of Cuba and the Philippine Islands, and in camps, and thousands of them contracted malaria and other diseases that have since rendered them helpless and hopeless cripples. I am sure that each Member of this House has observed, as I have observed in my own congressional district, quite a number of Spanish War veterans who are now confined to beds of affliction as helpless cripples because of their services in that war, and because of the small pension they are now receiving they can not have proper medical or other attention for themselves, much less a support for their families. The legal period of this war extends from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902. The average term of service of the Civil War veteran was 11 months, of the World War veteran 9 months, while that of the Spanish-American War veteran was 14 months.

A UNITED COUNTRY

We did not enter the Spanish-American War for conquest, but to avenge the heroes of the *Maine* who were brutally murdered in Habana Harbor, to stop the butchery of women and children, the oppression to the people of Cuba and the Philippine Islands, and to drive this monster of Spanish autocracy from before the door of free America [applause], but as a result of this war we did add to our possessions. It is estimated that these possessions and other property that came to us by reason of the war are of the value of more than \$8,000,000,000, while the cost of the war was \$1,200,000,000. We increased our annual trade from Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands millions of dollars. When all of these are taken into consideration, I think we can truthfully say that the Spanish-American War did not and will not cost the American taxpayer any sum, either to pay for the war or to provide pensions for these veterans and their dependents.

The wounds on account of the great struggle between 1861 and 1865 had not entirely healed. These Spanish-American boys, whose fathers and grandfathers had either worn the blue or the gray, and many of whom had worn either the blue or the gray themselves, flocked to the standards of the gallant Gen. Joe Wheeler, Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, General Grant, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, and others, and as they marched up San Juan Hill, and swept from the seas at Santiago and Manila Bays the Spanish fleets, they healed forever the scars of 1861 [applause] and this Nation became and has ever remained 48 great, sovereign States, united not merely by the bonds of the Constitution, but united in heart and mind, with one great purpose, with one loyalty and one flag, leading the world in potential wealth in man power and in the paths of peace, justice, and righteousness. [Applause.] If these veterans had accomplished no more than this, they would forever deserve the lasting gratitude of our country, and they and their dependents should ever be the objects of our love and affection.

We should throw about them the arm of this mighty, rich Republic and draw them close to the Nation's heart, so that they, their children, and grandchildren may forever rejoice because of their devotion and sacrifice to their country.

We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars annually to provide for the national defense. My friends, I want to see our country prepared on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea, to be able to successfully defend our country whenever and wherever assailed, and to protect even its humblest citizen in his constitutional rights in every land and on every sea. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, if this great Republic is ever destroyed, it will not be through forces from without, but it will be through forces within. I know of no way, my friends, to make more secure our national defense than that we let it be known to the brave sons of this Republic that we will protect and care for those who have borne the heat of the battle, their widows and orphan children. It has been said many times, and it is true, that a nation that will not protect its protectors and defend its defenders should not and will not be protected or defended. [Applause.]

I recall, and I know that you recall, the feeling of uneasiness and uncertainty when we scanned every paper that a great Spanish fleet was somewhere in eastern waters and that our American fleet would have to meet the Spanish fleet in mortal combat. Can you ever forget how you were thrilled when the good news was flashed across the world on May 1, 1898, that Admiral Dewey and his men had met and in a few brief moments had completely annihilated the Spanish fleet, and how we were inspired when we heard the story of Sampson and Schley in Santiago Bay and Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders storming San Juan Hill and General Funston, Capt. Jack Pershing, and their heroic men in the Philippines. The American boys from Bunker Hill to Flanders Fields, on land and sea, have never known defeat. In all the brilliant and patriotic accomplishments in all these years, were there any more unselfish, more loyal, more brilliant than those of the veterans for whom we are called on now to legislate? They acted generously, spontaneously, quickly, and patriotically. [Applause.]

After nearly 28 years of more or less neglect, should we not feel happy to-day to have an opportunity to recognize them and to provide in a measure for the comfort of themselves and their families in their declining years? May I not indulge the hope that we will to-day act with the same unanimity with which they responded in 1898. If the Congress and the people of the Nation will treat our defenders fairly, the life of the Republic will be secure. [Applause.]

We see here daily something of the type and character of the men for whom I am speaking. Our own distinguished and beloved floor leader, Col. JOHN Q. TILSON, was one of the boys of 1898. Our colleagues CORDELL HULL, of Tennessee; EARL MICHENER, of Michigan; SCOTT LEAVITT, of Montana; Gen. JOHN SPEAKS, of Ohio; GEORGE HUDDLESTON, of Alabama; WILLIAM A. OLDFIELD, of Arkansas; JOHN D. FREDERICKS, of California; WILLIAM N. VAILE, of Colorado; RICHARD P. FREEMAN, of Connecticut; LLOYD THURSTON, of Iowa; LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM, of Massachusetts; ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan; W. FRANK JAMES, of Michigan; L. C. DYER, of Missouri; ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN, of New York; J. M. WAINWRIGHT, of New York; EDMUND N. CARPENTER, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM R. COYLE, of Pennsylvania; TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; H. M. WURZBACH, of Texas. Each one of whom is a worthy comrade and representative of that distinguished company of 1898. Each one of whom has served with distinction in this House.

We must not forget that thousands of the boys of 1898 again answered their country's call in the World War. They are calling you and me to-day. I know you will respond.

Section 1 of this bill grants a pension of not less than \$20 nor more than \$50 per month to such persons, and provides that those who served in the military or naval service less than 90 days shall have title to the pension if they were discharged on account of disability contracted in service in line of duty. This section of the bill also provides for an automatic increase of the rates as follows: The \$12 rate to \$20, the \$15 rate to \$25, the \$18 rate to \$30, the \$24 rate to \$40, and the \$30 rate to \$50. The percentage of increase as to all classes is exactly the same.

Section 1 further provides that veterans attaining the age of 62 years will receive a pension of \$20 per month; 68 years of age, \$30 per month; 72 years of age, \$40 per month; and 75 years of age, \$50 per month.

There are a small number of nurses who served in Cuba and the Philippine Islands during the Spanish-American War. They are pensioned under the present law, the same as the veterans; this grants to them the same increase as is granted

to the veterans. There are only a small number of these nurses.

Under the act of September 1, 1922, the widows, remarried widows, minor children under the age of 16 years and helpless children mentioned in section 2 of this bill are now entitled to a pension of \$20 per month and \$4 per month additional on account of each child, and such pensions commence from the date applications therefor are filed in the Bureau of Pensions.

Under section 2 of this bill the rate will be \$30 per month with \$8 per month additional on account of each child. Under the act of September 1, 1922, the widow has title only if she was married to the soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the date of approval of that act, but under this bill she will have title if married any time before it becomes a law, and her pension will be allowed from the date of her husband's death, if his death occurs after the approval of this act, and otherwise from the date her claim is filed under the act in the Bureau of Pensions.

If there be no widow, or one not entitled to pension under any law granting additional pension to minor children, the minor children will be entitled to the pension provided for the widow from the date of the father's death, if such death occurs after the passage of this act; and in the event of the death or remarriage of the widow, or forfeiture of the widow's title to pension, the pension will continue from the date of such death, remarriage, or forfeiture to such child or children until 16 years of age.

Provision is also made in this bill for the continuance of the pension in the case of a minor child who is insane, idiotic, or otherwise permanently helpless during the lifetime of such child or the period of such disability.

Section 3 of the bill provides a rate of \$72 per month for persons now pensioned or who may hereafter be pensioned under the act of June 5, 1920, or under said act, as amended, or under this act on account of his or her service who are or may become helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, provided their disabilities are not the result of their own vicious habits, but it is also provided in the bill that no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any national or State soldiers' home shall be paid more than \$50 per month under this act.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the increased rate of pension provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the roll, or who are now in receipt of a pension, under existing law shall commence on the 4th day of the month following the approval of the act.

It further provides that further increase in the rate allowed under section 1 of this act because of increased disability found to exist shall commence from the date of filing application for such increase in the Bureau of Pensions instead of from the date of the medical examination. This section also provides that the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

It is also provided by this section that when an honorably discharged veteran of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition is receiving the benefits of hospitalization in any institution under the control of the Government, no portion of his pension shall be deducted for his care and maintenance therein or for the benefit of any home or hospital.

Section 6 provides that nothing in this act shall affect or diminish the additional pension to those on "the Army and Navy medal of honor roll," or reduce the pension of any other person coming under the provision of this act.

Section 7 provides that no claim agent, attorney, or other person shall contract for or demand or receive or retain a fee for service in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claims for the increase of pension provided for in this act; and no more than the sum of \$10 shall be allowed or received for such service in other claims thereunder.

SECTION 4 CUT OUT

Section 4 provided an increase of pension for the maimed veterans of all wars except the World War and for veterans of the Regular Establishment. This section was cut out at the request of these same maimed veterans and their organizations. They have a bill that deals solely with an increase of pension for them. This bill passed the Senate and is now before the Invalid Pensions Committee of the House. These veterans appealed to our Committee on Pensions to cut out this section, and, agreeable to their request, this was done.

The Spanish War veterans desired this section to remain in, so far as they were concerned.

Some Members and other persons desired to know why the Civil War veterans and their dependents were not included in this bill. To this we wish to say that the Grand Army of the Republic, at their national encampment in the fall of 1925, passed a resolution requesting that their pension bill be not included in the pension bill of the veterans of any other war or wars. It was at their special request that their bill was not included in this bill; and, furthermore, our committee, which is the Pension Committee of the House, does not have jurisdiction in pension matters affecting Civil War veterans and their dependents. The Invalid Pensions Committee of the House alone has jurisdiction of bills of this character.

Some Members and others desired to know why we did not include the Indian war veterans and their dependents in this bill. They, too, requested our Pension Committee not to include them in the pension bill of any other veterans; and you will observe that this bill deals alone with pensions for the Spanish War veterans and their dependents because of the request of the veterans and their representatives of other wars.

SPANISH WAR VETERANS GETTING OLD

The average age of the Spanish War veterans is now about 52 years. Only a small number of them are under 50 years, and many of them are above 75 years of age. There are now 115,000 Spanish War veterans on the pension rolls, 22,000 Spanish War widows, and 14,000 minor children. The increase amounts to \$18,453,528 annually. There are more Spanish War veterans on the pension rolls to-day than there are Civil War veterans. Thousands of Civil War soldiers are passing away every month. Their average age now is nearly 83 years, and in a very short time none of these defenders of the Republic will be left. They have been and are a wonderful benediction to the Nation, and we should lose no opportunity to afford them every comfort in their declining years. Age and disease are placing thousands of Spanish War veterans on the rolls. Thousands of them are helpless. This relief has not come too soon. I do not think we could authorize the expenditure of any sum that would mean more to our country than in giving this just recognition to this fine army of loyal and devoted American patriots and their dependents. Let us make it unanimous. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the time we long have sought. I believe the entire membership of the House favor this bill. Its purpose is to do justice to the veterans of the Spanish-American War, and remove the discrimination that exists against them in existing law.

Veterans of other wars and their dependents are more generously provided for than those who served during the war with Spain. This should not be so. The Government should show no favoritism. The same spirit of patriotism has prompted the soldiers of all wars, and a generous Government should reward all alike. [Applause.]

As a member of the Committee on Pensions, I have been deeply interested in the proposed legislation, and one of the reasons prompting me to desire service on this committee was to aid in seeing that these veterans receive just recognition.

While there are some provisions of the bill that I might have changed, it represents the combined judgment of the committee, and I shall heartily support it.

The total number of individuals who served in our war with Spain is about 400,000. Every one of these was a volunteer, and the hearings before our committee disclosed that the average term of service of the Spanish-American War veteran was 14 months, while in the Civil War the average service in the Union Army was 11 months, and in the World War only 9 months.

Under the existing law—

all persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States, including women who served in the Nurse Corps, during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits which so incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$30 a month and not less than \$12 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

Section 1 of this bill increases the minimum rate from \$12 to \$20, and the maximum rate from \$30 to \$50. It further provides that there shall be an automatic increase in the amounts now being received, as follows: Those receiving \$12 a month shall be increased to \$20 a month; those receiving \$15 to \$25; those receiving \$18 to \$30; those receiving \$24 to \$40; and those receiving \$30 a month shall be increased to \$50 a month.

Section 3 of the bill provides that those veterans who "are now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of \$72 a month, provided such disabilities are not the result of his or her own vicious habits."

Civil War veterans are now allowed \$72 a month when their condition is such that they have become so helpless as to require the aid and attendance of another person, and this provision, therefore, gives the same privilege to Spanish-American War veterans as is already given to veterans of the Civil War.

Section 2 increases the pensions received by the widows of these veterans from \$20, the amount they now receive under the law, to \$30 per month (being the amount widows of Civil War veterans now receive), and also increases from \$4 to \$8 per month the amount such widow shall be paid for each child of the deceased veteran who is under 16 years of age.

It further provides that in case the minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless, the pension of such child shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability.

All increased rates under the bill, as applied to those now on the pension rolls, will become effective on the fourth day of the month following the approval of this bill.

Section 7 of the bill limits the fee that shall be paid to an attorney or other person for preparing or prosecuting claims under this law to \$10, and makes it a penal offense to charge or receive more for such services.

A quarter of a century has passed since our war with Spain, and a majority of those now living who served our country in that conflict have reached middle age. Many have passed it. The average age of enlistment of those participating in this war was much higher than that in the World War or in any other war that our country has had. It is high time, therefore, if this Government is to rectify the discrimination that has heretofore existed against these soldiers, that the law should be changed, and I am hopeful that this bill may be passed by a unanimous vote of the House.

There is one other class of soldiers who have been discriminated against in our pension laws. I refer to those who served in the Indian wars and on the frontiers in the early days; and the Committee on Pensions is now considering a bill which will materially increase the pensions of these men also. They are not large in numbers, but they served their country faithfully and risked their lives in defending the frontiers against depredations, and it is to be hoped that before this Congress adjourns justice may be done to this class of veterans also.

Believing as I do in the Democratic slogan of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," I shall not be satisfied until our Government applies this maxim in its pensions to the soldiers of all wars. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the chairman of our committee, the author of the bill, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that has been allotted me I can not go into details with reference to the so-called Knutson bill to grant increase in pensions to veterans of the Spanish war, Philippine insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion. It is not necessary for me to amplify the eloquent remarks of my friend and colleague [Mr. Robson] on the heroism and gallantry of those who responded to the call in 1898. I do wish, however, to call to the attention of the House the inequality in pensions now existing, and which was briefly touched upon by my good friend from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

According to the last annual report of Pension Commissioner Scott, I find that the average annual pension paid to Civil War veterans in 1925 is \$506.25, the average for all wars is \$423.67, whilst the average for Spanish war veterans is only \$208.74. These figures should convince all that the veterans of the last-named war are being discriminated against.

Mr. Speaker, there has at no time been any opposition to this legislation on the part of any Member of the House. Our Speaker has from the first been sympathetic, so has the Republican floor leader [Mr. TILSON]. In my first talk with them and with individual members of the steering committee, and

also the Rules Committee, I have found the kindest possible feeling existed. I was assured that this legislation would be brought up as soon as the appropriation measures were out of the way in the House and that promise has been faithfully kept. Outsiders, in their zeal for the early passage of this legislation, have circulated reports that at times were not well founded and which gave rise to groundless fears. Happily we are shortly to see concrete evidence of the unanimity with which this legislation is regarded and that should forever allay the feelings of doubt that have been created through the overzealousness of some of its friends.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of this committee I am going to repress much of my own ardor of interest concerning this bill, out of deference to my colleagues, several of whom have asked for time. I ask our friends who are inclined to call for a vote before the end of the fixed time of 20 minutes on a side to remember that that time has been agreed upon, and we feel that it would be unworthy silence toward such a worthy cause to let this bill come to a vote without some expression of our personal and patriotic gratitude.

I favor the passage of this bill giving increased pensions to the Spanish-American War veterans as a tardy act of simple justice, as well as national thanksgiving, to these long-neglected patriots and defenders of this Nation. Adding to the luster of their heroism on the battle field, the Spanish-American War veteran has shown a beauty of patience in standing aside while his comrades in other wars have received the bounty of the Government, and I love to put into italics the beautiful truth uttered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] when he declared that the great and wonderful asset that is given to America as the result of this war has come largely in the inspiring fact that the sons of the gray and the sons of the blue fought side by side at San Juan Hill and buried in the trenches around Santiago the bickerings of an unhappy past as they had never been buried before. [Applause.]

Through all the years since that brief but brilliant struggle they have not only added luster, as I have said, to their heroism in camp and on the field of battle by their noble spirit of self-effacement, but they enriched our whole American life like a positive Gulf stream of patriotic loyalty. I have marveled at their patience. It has been a tonic in patriotism to see these brave men who threw themselves forward on the battle's front, humbly and unselfishly holding backward for nearly three decades, while the heroes of other wars have been bountifully fed at the table of Uncle Sam. But now the Spanish-American veterans are growing old; their heads are turning gray; their needs are increasing with the years; and it is to be hoped that the press announcement of the President's opposition to this bill as the result of a program of economy is greatly exaggerated or wholly wrong. If we are not going to bestow pension justice to the soldiers of the Spanish-American War, then the United States of America might as well go out of the pension business.

Let me lay emphasis upon the fact that the Nation's greatest asset from the Spanish-American War was not the acquisition of the vast new territory for which we never intended to fight, but it was the birth of a great new national fellowship.

When the sons of the Blue, from the wind-swept North, and the sons of the Gray, from the sun-kissed South, fought side by side beneath the flag of our reunited country, they taught this old war-torn world a new lesson in national brotherhood and fellowship that it had never seen before. But as a son of the South, taught around a family altar, to love the flag of our common country, I am naturally proud of the fact that the sons of the South kept the gods busy naming heroes in that memorable conflict—that it was an old Confederate warship, the *City of Nashville*, that took the first trophy in the contest with Spain—that it was Fitzhugh Lee, whose name was the synonym of "that little Republic that rose and fell without a crime," as Henry Grady described it, that represented this Nation to the last ditch of danger in the harbor of Habana; that it was Worth Bagley, of North Carolina—bless his martyred young memory—who gave up his brave, young life as the first sacrifice on the altar of that war; that it was Victor Blue, of South Carolina, who counted his life but trash for the glory of the flag he loved; that it was Hobson, of Alabama, who threw his fearless life into the vortex of death in one of the most amazing acts of heroism the world has ever seen; that it was "Fighting Joe" Wheeler, of Alabama and Georgia together, who went on a stretcher into battle that he might inspire his soldiers, side by side with Theodore Roosevelt, to fight and die for the Stars and Stripes!

And never again, thank God, since the priceless fellowship of the once-sundered sections in the Spanish-American and

the great World War, will any man, North or East or West, ever ask a son of the South if we are loyal down there to the most beautiful flag in all the world.

I ask for the yeas and nays in order to let the country, the Senate, and the White House know how overwhelmingly this House favors this tardy justice to the veterans of the Spanish-American War. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, without attempting to quote the language, I have always been in sympathy with that sentence in Mr. Lincoln's second inaugural address wherein he declared it to be the duty of our Government to care for him who has borne the heat of battle and for his widow and orphan; and in my attitude toward legislation since I have been a Member of this House I have sought to follow in spirit as well as in letter the advice of that great inaugural address. [Applause.]

It has been my pleasure to support all measures which have been adopted here in the last 13 years in behalf of the veterans of the Civil War. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I helped to draft most of the legislation now on the statute books in behalf of the veterans of the World War. I have heretofore supported legislation in behalf of the veterans of the Spanish-American War. These veterans have been peculiarly and admirably patient in their reception of the attitude of Congress toward them. They engaged in a war which made us for the first time a world power and gave us larger recognition among the other nations of the world.

I am glad to be able now not only to express my approval of this measure in its entirety, but to express my appreciation of the committee which has brought it out and my regret that we have been unable sooner to recognize in true measure the soldiers of the Spanish-American War. These were the first American soldiers to fight on a foreign soil. They fought to liberate a people bent under the yoke of oppression. They were the first to carry the emblem of our own national conceptions across the waters and plant it in the soil of a people depressed by centuries of injustice. These soldiers came from not one section, but from all sections. They welded the North and South into a closer reunion than was ever possible before. The sons of those who followed Grant and Lee fused in this war into a stronger, better Americanism; they bound up the wounds of past years; they made easier and surer a closer understanding and fuller conception of the unity of our nation. [Applause.]

They have suffered without complaint. They have no doubt at times felt that they were lost to view, if not forgotten. The act which we are about to pass is a tardy recognition of the obligation which a grateful nation owes them. Let us now discharge that duty in ungrudging measure. Let us say to these silent heroes of the Spanish-American War, "The years have not dimmed the glory of your achievements, nor erased them from our memory. We shall endeavor to care for him who has borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan." [Applause.]

I shall cast my vote for this measure with great pleasure, and I hope it may be unanimously adopted; that it will be speedily enacted in the Senate, and that it may meet with Executive approval at the other end of the Avenue. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KOPP], a member of the committee.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as we all know, the veterans of the Spanish-American War have not had their just deserts. Some time ago it was my privilege, as a member of the Committee on Pensions, to assist in favorably reporting this bill to the House. I am deeply gratified that without further delay we shall now have the opportunity to vote for its passage. I hope not a single vote will be cast against it. Among the American people there is but one sentiment in reference to this bill, and the action of this House should be unanimous.

The boys of 1898 have never overemphasized or unduly pressed their claims. On the contrary, they have been exceedingly modest and remarkably patient. They have been most considerate. It is always a pleasure to do justice to anyone, but this is particularly true when justice has been long delayed. With glad hearts we can, and will, support this bill.

We sometimes think of the Spanish-American War as a minor conflict. This is a great error. In it, including the Philippine and Chinese rebellions, we had over 450,000 men—more than four times as many as were engaged in the war with Mexico.

These men were taken to climates to which they were not accustomed and were compelled to live under conditions to

which they were not injured. As a result they suffered not only the casualties of battle, but also suffered frightfully from disease. The death rate was exceptionally high, even for war. Many of those who returned home were physical wrecks—their health was gone, their bodies were broken. Some, indeed, were little more than living skeletons. The men engaged in that war were heroes and are entitled to the everlasting gratitude and honor of the American people.

In its influence the Spanish-American War was very far-reaching. It made us a world power—it demonstrated that we were the greatest and strongest nation in existence. It did more than that. It revealed to all mankind the high purpose of the American people. That war brought liberty to millions that were downtrodden and oppressed. It was a war for freedom, and such a war will always have a sacred place in American history.

The Spanish-American War reunited our country. When the son of Grant and the kinsman of Lee fought together in 1898 in defense of the Stars and Stripes, the differences that had arisen in the Civil War subsided and disappeared. It was then evident that the Union had become, as Daniel Webster hoped, one and inseparable.

I like the spirit of the Spanish-American War veterans and commend it to the country. Their representatives appeared before our committee. These representatives advised us of the sentiments that prevailed among their comrades. Speaking for themselves and their comrades, they asked nothing for the able-bodied veterans. Their whole plea was for the disabled. They appealed to us to give all the benefits to those who by reason of infirmities could not longer endure the heat and burden of the day. It was a fine and generous spirit and won our love and admiration.

Briefly the bill provides that all persons who served 90 days or more and who have been honorably discharged, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which so incapacitate them for the performance of manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support, shall be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$50 a month and not less than \$20 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

When they reach certain ages they will be presumed to be disabled and will be entitled to the following pensions without any further showing, namely: At 62, \$20 a month; at 68, \$30 a month; at 72, \$40 a month; and at 75, \$50 a month. Those who are, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person shall receive \$72 a month. Widows will be entitled to \$30 a month. There are other provisions in the bill, but the foregoing are the most important ones.

It is estimated that the increases provided for will cost annually \$18,453,528. That may seem like a large sum, but it will be a very wise expenditure. Nothing will do more to foster ardent patriotism than a liberal policy toward those who served the Nation in time of war. No money will make larger returns to the security of the Nation than that expended for just pensions. But even if we received no benefit from these pensions in the future, I would still be in favor of paying them, for I look on them as a sacred obligation for which we have received full value in the past. What obligation could be more binding upon the conscience of a nation than that written in the hardships and sufferings of its soldiers? All contend that the bondholders should be paid. I agree; but I insist that the bond written in ink is no better than the bond written in blood. The nation that will not protect its defenders is unworthy of the name.

Our pension policy is supported by the highest authority. In Lincoln's second inaugural address, which is one of the masterpieces of the ages and which is inscribed upon the walls of the great memorial erected in his honor in the Nation's capital, he appealed to the American people—

To bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle; and for his widow and his orphan.

That sublime sentiment will always permeate the hearts of the American people.

This bill follows the precedents and requires 90 days of service unless the disabilities are of service origin. This requirement has been firmly imbedded in our pension legislation and is found in all of the acts relating to Civil War pensions. In this bill I think the required time should have been reduced below 90 days, and I urged the committee to make such a reduction. I believe members of the committee would have

felt disposed to reduce the time had it not been for the many previous pension acts requiring a service of 90 days. Some feared that the overturning of so many precedents by such a reduction might imperil the bill. As the Spanish-American War was short, I think the required time should be short also. To illustrate the effect of the 90 days' requirements, permit me to cite a case from my own district. The Sixth Iowa Battery was organized in my district at Burlington, Iowa, by Capt. Frank S. Long, a capable and efficient officer. Many of the young men of that vicinity joined this battery. They were eager to do their part. Their purpose was to serve throughout the war. They enlisted with that understanding.

The Government at first made a call for such a battery, then acceptance of the battery was delayed and the battery was not actually inducted into the service of the Federal Government until July 8, 1898. It was mustered out on September 5, 1898, not because the term of enlistment had expired or the men had asked to be discharged but because hostilities had ceased. Those who were members of that battery can not make any claim to a pension nor can their widows or orphan children. This seems to me like a great injustice and I hope that in the not distant future this injustice may be corrected. The members of this battery did their full duty and should be given generous consideration.

At the present time the average age of the Spanish-American War veterans is about 52 years; some are considerably older and a few are somewhat younger. As a body, they have reached the time when their infirmities will seriously interfere with their earning capacity. There are now on the pension rolls in round numbers 115,000 Spanish-American veterans, 22,000 widows, and 14,000 minor children. As time goes by disabilities and deaths will increase and these numbers will inevitably become larger. How important, then, that adequate provision should be made at this time for these veterans and their dependents.

I rejoice over the assured passage of this bill, but I deeply regret that we can not at the same time show our undying gratitude to the surviving veterans of the Civil War who through the years have been affectionately known as "The Boys in Blue."

Once they were a mighty army, with undaunted courage and unexcelled heroism fighting their way to victory under Grant and Sherman and Sheridan and Thomas and Meade and Logan and our other great commanders. Now but few remain. Ninety-five per cent of them have already passed to the Great Beyond. Those who are still with us are, on an average, more than 83 years of age. They can not long survive. Whatever is done for them must be done quickly. They are dying at a rapid rate. Every day more than 50 of these veterans are mustered out. In the cemeteries of the land "taps" are continually being sounded for these gallant defenders of the Nation's life. Why does Congress hesitate to increase their pensions? Why does it falter in its duty to the men who saved the Union? For many years the pensions of the Civil War veterans were a mere pittance. Surely we can be just to them when they have passed fourscore years. I plead for them and their widows. It will be our last tribute. Let not Congress adjourn until that tribute has been generously paid.

In considering pension legislation, we think of the future as well as of the past. It is a solemn subject. Will war's alarm again sound throughout our land? We cherish the hope that our boys will never again be summoned. We pray for universal and abiding peace, but through all the ages sacred will be the soil where sleep the heroes of our country. How beautiful the words of the poet:

Nor shall your story be forgot,
While Fame her record keeps,
Or Honor points the hallowed spot
Where Valor proudly sleeps.

[Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the passage of this measure will be justice belated for nearly 20 years. No one can give any good excuse why there should be the present discrimination against the veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows and minor children. All will admit that they are entitled to just as much consideration as the veterans of any war. This bill will do for them what should have been done years ago.

PRODDING DOES GOOD

It will be remembered that on March 26, 1926, from this floor I called the attention of the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge to a rumor that it had been decided that

this bill should not become a law during the present Congress, and I then asked the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] the question: "Can the gentleman promise that before adjournment we shall get this bill passed?" And he replied: "The gentleman has every reason to believe that we will be able to get it up in the regular order." I then said: "We are now passing our last supply bill. When the Senate gets through with the supply bills we know what will happen. Congress will adjourn, and it ought to adjourn. If we do not get this Spanish-American War veterans' bill into the other Chamber pretty soon, it will not pass for another year, and for another year the veterans of the Spanish war will suffer injustice." And I then wound up by saying: "When the gentleman lets this Congress adjourn, and we go over for another year, with this injustice continued, we will hold the gentleman's committee responsible."

I commend the committee that it has been able to get the Speaker of the House to recognize the committee to call this bill up under suspension of the rules, for it will be passed by practically a unanimous vote. I know of no opposition against it.

WE MUST NOT STOP AFTER PASSING IT

Our duty is not all done when we pass this bill here in the House. We must all see to it that it shall promptly pass the Senate. It must not be pigeonholed there. It must not be shunted aside. There must be no camouflage about this measure. There must be no make-believe. The administration must not play with these veterans. It must not let this bill pass the House and then let it die in the Senate. It must come through the Senate and must be signed by the President before this Congress adjourns, and each one of us should see to it that this is done. We must all go to our Senators and urge them to take prompt action. And the vote of this House will demonstrate to the President that we all mean business about this measure.

JUSTICE TO RANGERS AND INDIAN FIGHTERS NEXT

And we must see to it that before this Congress adjourns we must pass a similar measure adjusting the discrimination which is now shown to rangers and Indian fighters who protected our borders on our southwestern frontiers in early days. We are treating them worse than stepchildren. We must do them justice.

I desire to thank my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW], who is the ranking member of the committee on this side, for granting me this time. He is always generous to a fault. It is gratifying, indeed, that he has sufficiently recovered from his recent illness to resume his faithful duties here in Congress. He is a most wonderful human, scattering sunshine and hopefulness wherever he goes. He has rendered a splendid service to his country. His inspiring messages have been heard by Christian men and women from one end of the United States to the other. His life has been an unselfish ministration to others. It is but fitting that he should have charge of one-half of the debate on this bill, which is to do belated justice to worthy men, their widows, and orphan children.

Now, what are we going to do; just pass this bill and stop? I am just as much concerned about its welfare after we pass it as I am before. The beneficiaries of this bill will get none of its benefits until it passes the Senate and is signed by the President. It is easy for a bill of this kind to die in the jam of adjournment. I am looking to those Republicans who have charge of legislation here to see that that does not happen. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT].

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Speaker, this bill may properly be termed an act of delayed justice to the veterans of the Spanish-American War and their dependents. They have not been treated with the same consideration, as regards pension legislation, as the veterans of other wars. It has been said that this is due to the fact that we have not as many Spanish-American War veterans as veterans of other wars, but whatever the cause, the opportunity has now arrived to wipe out the discrimination. Our Government has always been the most liberal in the world in the matter of pensions to those who stood ready to sacrifice their lives in its defense. Being the richest country, we can afford it; furthermore, this policy constitutes an assurance to all those who shall defend the country in war, that a grateful Nation will not be unmindful of their needs in time of peace.

Under the present laws of June 5, 1920, and September 1, 1922, pensions are granted for service between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, this being legally established as the period of the war with Spain, in order to make eligible for pension those

who served in the Philippine insurrection and China relief expedition. Pensions range from \$12 to \$30 per month, depending on the degree of disability. The present law also contains a provision for service pension ranging from \$12 per month at age 62 to \$30 per month at age 75. According to the last report of the Commissioner of Pensions, the average pension to a soldier of the Civil War is \$754.01 per annum, and the average of soldiers of the Spanish-American War is \$193.98. Of course we can not at this time put them on an equality so far as service pension goes, on account of the difference in ages, but the present rates are inadequate for disability. It is enough to say that at present the amount payable for total disability is only \$30 per month.

As a member of the Committee on Pensions I can say that we have worked diligently to draft a bill that will be just to the veterans and their dependents, and just to those who have to foot the bill. We have raised the \$12 minimum to \$20 and the maximum \$30 to \$50. We have also provided automatic increases to those now pensioned as follows: Those receiving \$12 are raised to \$20; \$15 to \$25; \$18 to \$30; \$24 to \$40; \$30 to \$50. We have also inserted the same provision now existing for veterans of the Civil War, that where a veteran, by reason of age or physical or mental disability, becomes helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, the rate shall be \$72 per month. We have also raised the pension of widows from \$20 to \$30 per month, and raised the allowance for children under 16 from \$4 to \$8 per month. The bill further provides that if a child before the age of 16 is mentally or physically helpless, the pension shall be continued during the life of such child or until the disability ceases. If the widow remarries, her pension ceases; but if the subsequent marriage is terminated by the death of the husband or by divorce without the fault of the wife, she again acquires a pensionable status.

The committee feels that it is presenting a carefully drawn and just bill, which is entitled to the support of every Member of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill, the purpose of which is to increase the pensions of the Spanish-American War veterans, of the Philippine insurrection, and of the Chinese-Boxer rebellion, placing them and their widows and orphans somewhat on an equal footing with the veterans of other wars. They are advancing in age, and on account of the advance in the cost of living since their pension rates were fixed, I consider it a most meritorious measure. [Applause.]

The existing law grants pensions to these veterans of from \$12 to \$30 per month who are suffering from mental or physical disabilities of a permanent character, not the result of vicious habits, which incapacitates them for manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support.

This bill provides for an automatic increase of the rates as follows: The \$12 rate to \$20, the \$15 rate to \$25, the \$18 rate to \$30, the \$24 rate to \$40, and the \$30 rate to \$50. The percentage of increase to all is exactly the same.

The existing law provides certain rates for those who have attained certain ages—62, 68, 72, and 75. This bill provides a pension of not less than \$20 nor more than \$50 per month for such persons.

The existing law provides a pension of \$20 to the widows of these veterans and \$4 per month for each minor child under the age of 16 years. This bill provides \$30 per month for the widow and \$6 per month for each minor child under the age of 16 years. There are other changes which I can not discuss for the lack of time.

It will not be denied that the veterans of other wars and their widows have been more generously treated than the veterans of the Spanish War. This, all will agree, should not be. No favoritism should be shown by the Congress. These veterans and their dependents have been denied just recognition all these years. I am glad to know that the prospects are now so favorable for the correction of this injustice. Some have underestimated their services. It should be remembered that it was the first time American soldiers were called upon to go to foreign soil to fight for the freedom of other people. Not only that, but it was the only American war in which all of the soldiers, both privates and officers, were volunteers. They came from every part of the country at the call of the President. Many more than could be accepted. They were eager to avenge the *Maine*, free Cuba, and drive out despotism from the Western Hemisphere.

While Spain had a large trained army in Cuba, still it only required a much smaller army of American volunteers a few days to avenge the *Maine* and to free Cuba. [Applause.]

While all this was accomplished quickly, still the records of the War Department show there were more casualties according to the number involved than in either the Civil or World War. Their suffering was not confined to battle, but thousands died from fever in the tropical climate, and thousands of others contracted malaria and other diseases, which rendered them helpless and unable to support themselves and families and secure medical treatment.

The legal period of this war extended from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902. The average term of service of the Civil War was 11 months, of the World War 9 months, while that of the Spanish-American War was 14 months.

We did not go into this war for conquest. We did it to avenge the brutal murder of the crew of the *Maine* when it was sunk in Havana Harbor, and put an end to the cruel oppression and murder of innocent women and children in Cuba and the Philippine Islands by Spanish despotism.

While, as I have said, we did not enter this war for conquest, however, the possessions which came to us as a result of this war have been estimated at \$8,000,000,000, and the cost of the war in dollars only amounted to \$1,200,000,000. Besides, as a result of the war our additional trade from the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and Cuba amounts to many millions of dollars. So in reality this war did not cost the American taxpayers anything, and hence our Government can well afford to provide at least as liberal pensions for these veterans and their widows and minor children as it has for the veterans of the other wars.

Let us not forget another great service rendered by this volunteer army of about 400,000 men—that is, the healing of the bitterness created between the North and the South from 1861 to 1865. The descendants of those who wore the blue and the gray and many of those who had worn either the gray or the blue themselves rallied to a common cause, marched under one flag, and bravely followed the leadership of such gallant generals as Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, Gen. Joe Wheeler, General Grant, and Col. Theodore Roosevelt. This service of itself is deserving of the lasting gratitude of all the American people. [Applause.]

Now after a quarter of a century after the close of that war we should deem it not only a duty but a privilege to provide as far as we can for the support and comfort of these patriots and their dependents.

I am delighted that out of a membership of 435 in this House not a single voice has been heard in opposition to this bill. I hope and believe that when the roll is called not a single vote will be recorded against it but that it will be passed by a unanimous vote. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. APPLEYB].

Mr. APPLEYB. Mr. Speaker, gentlewomen and gentlemen, as a member of the Committee on Pensions, and having attended the hearings before the committee, I have come to the conclusion that the bill up for discussion, known as the Spanish-American War Pension bill, should have your entire approval.

In order to discuss pensions, it will be well to state that the war with Mexico began April 24, 1846, and ended May 30, 1848. There are 17 soldiers of the Mexican War and 1,257 widows drawing pensions to-day. Practically all the defenders of the Nation in the Mexican War were volunteers.

The Civil War began April, 1861, and ended April, 1865, of four years' duration; volunteers of service, 62 per cent, drafted in service, 38 per cent, with an average pension paid out per each man in the service of \$28, a pay of \$13 per month, and with some bonuses running from \$300 to \$600, and general land grants; and the number of men engaged in the conflict was over 2,200,000 with an average term of service of 11 months.

The Spanish War, including the Philippine war and the Chinese rebellion, began April, 1898, and lasted for four years and two months, with slightly over 450,000 men in the conflict, with an average term of service of 14 months at \$15 per month for the soldier, with 100 per cent volunteers, and an average paid out by the United States Government in pensions of \$21 each, and no bonuses.

The World War began April, 1917, and ended November, 1918, duration of one year seven months, with 5,000,000 men involved and an average of nine months' service, and most of the time the pay of the soldier was \$30 per month; consisting of 36 per cent volunteers and 64 per cent drafted men.

Having served my country in the World War for 22 months, it occurs to me that the veterans of the Spanish-American War, all of whom were volunteers, and 61 per cent were in foreign service against 46 per cent in the World War, have not been treated with the same consideration that men have had in other wars, and the proposed bill will help remedy this injus-

tice, and I trust this bill will become a law as introduced. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentleman, the seeming enthusiasm for this bill sounds very much like an old country revival meeting after the hardest sinner in the town has stood up and gotten religion. Everybody is strong for the Spanish War veterans' bill. I am delighted to know that although action is tardy that the House at last will do this simple act of justice. The Spanish-American War was a little war. A great many of the soldiers did not do any fighting, but it was not their fault. However, they all had to eat embalmed beef and drink water that was gotten from surface wells by driving a pipe in the ground a few feet. These soldiers of the Republic have been denied just recognition of their services for many years. I am delighted to know that the Congress is remedying that act of injustice and oversight, and I trust that the bill will pass this House by a very large majority, and may receive action somewhere else of a favorable character, and I hope that the Director of the Budget will not find that it is incompatible with the economy program of the administration. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT], the author of House bill 98. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana is recognized.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take the floor for one reason only, and that is to make it plain that those of you who wrote to veterans of the Spanish-American War in your districts that you would favor House bill 98, the bill I had the honor to introduce at the beginning of this Congress, and the consideration of which resulted in reporting out this bill we are considering now, will to-day fulfill that pledge by voting for the pending bill.

This bill is the result of consideration of different measures proposed, and it meets the approval of the national legislative committee of the United Spanish-American War Veterans, of which I have the honor to be a member.

It is a little embarrassing for one who was a soldier in that war to take the floor after so many fine things have been said about us. You will find no veteran of that war, however, who claims to be a hero. We were simply the fortunate ones who were of the right age and the right physical condition, so that when the country needed men we were able to respond, "Here am I; send me." [Applause.] I repeat, you will redeem your pledge in behalf of House bill 98 when you vote for the measure now before the House. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER], a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, what is the use of making a speech when everyone in the entire Chamber is in favor of the measure? I can not see any purpose of it unless it is to let the people at home know we are for the bill.

As a member of the subcommittee of three who prepared this bill it is useless for me to say that I favor the bill, as do all the balance of the members of the committee. I hail from a section of the Union that pays very little attention to pensions except compensation for World War veterans. The Spanish-American War veterans in my district, quite a number of them, have never even applied for a pension from the Government, although some of them are entitled to pensions under the present law.

I think this is a wise measure, somewhat delayed, to say the least, and should have been enacted probably years ago. As a matter of justice, the more that I have considered this legislation the more I believe in it, and I heartily favor it as a matter of justice to the survivors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition, and the widows and minor children and helpless children. I hope you will all vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the state of the time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has two minutes more and the gentleman from Georgia has six minutes.

Mr. UPSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KINDRED], and then I will leave to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] all the time I have left after the gentleman from New York finishes. I leave it to his mercy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

MR. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I desire to express my hearty support of this measure for the relief of Spanish-American War veterans and their widows and dependents, and I congratulate these veterans of the House of Representatives on the fact that we are finally at this time to do justice, simple justice, long delayed, to those worthy veterans. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

MR. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I will simply say to the gentlemen on the other side that our Democratic friends are as generous as the Spanish-American War veterans. They do not even ask for their full time. We yield to you all the rest. We are unanimous. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

MR. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Vare].

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

MR. VARE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have been a Member of this House since April, 1912, and have supported every pension bill and every compensation bill for all the soldiers of the several wars. I believe this bill to be a meritorious measure, and I am extremely hopeful that those on this side of the House, as well as our friends on the other side, will give this bill their unanimous approval.

I hold it not only my duty but it will be a very great personal pleasure to cast my vote in favor of more liberal pensions for the veterans of the Spanish War and their widows and children.

Opinion differed at the time as to whether our country should have fought that war. But there was only one mind as to the motive of our boys who "carried on." They heard their country's call and answered it. It was the same noble spirit of patriotism that took Young America into the World War.

The men who served in the Spanish War, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition, and the women who as nurses volunteered in the same high spirit have waited long and patiently for what was due them. I congratulate them all to-day. I am glad by my vote to continue my record of adequate recognition and Federal aid for all who have offered their lives for our country.

With many other of my colleagues, I am to-day making a very personal and particular effort to assist all our veterans when they come to me with their individual cases. I would like to take this opportunity of acknowledging my appreciation of the huge, and it would seem sometimes, almost overwhelming task of General Hines, Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, and his able corps of assistants.

Not a day goes by but either by mail or personal visit there come to my office requests by World War veterans to take up with the bureau their particular case. We do not always get just what the veteran thinks he should have. We do get fair hearings, and I am glad to say that many a veteran is able to testify to the assistance which I, like my colleagues, give these boys in getting their needs properly presented to the bureau and followed up. [Applause.]

MR. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the Members of the House for just a moment you will notice that section 4 of this bill has been cut out. That section was cut out at the request of those who would be benefited by that section. There is another bill pending in the Congress which they prefer, and they requested our committee to cut out section 4.

I wish to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I have found no opposition to the bill in this House, either from the Rules Committee or the steering committee, from the Speaker, or from the floor leader, or from any source whatever. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

[By unanimous consent, all Members were granted five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.]

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. RobSION] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

MR. UPSHAW. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are asked for.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE SPEAKER. Those who are in favor of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 368, nays 0, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—368

Ackerman	Allgood	Anthony	Aswell
Adkins	Almon	Appleby	Auf der Heide
Aldrich	Andresen	Arentz	Ayres
Allen	Andrew	Arnold	Bacharach

Bachmann	Foss	Leibbach	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacon	Frear	Letts	Sanders, Tex.
Bailey	Free	Lindsay	Sandlin
Bankhead	Freeman	Linthicum	Schafer
Barbour	French	Little	Schnelder
Barkley	Frettingham	Lowrey	Scott
Beck	Fuller	Juce	Sears, Fla.
Beers	Fulmer	McClintic	Sears, Nebr.
Begg	Furlow	McDuffie	Seger
Bell	Gambrell	McFadden	Shallenberger
Bixler	Garber	McKeown	Simumos
Black, N. Y.	Gardner, Ind.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair
Black, Tex.	Garnier, Tex.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinnott
Bland	Garrett, Tenn.	McLeod	Smith
Blanton	Garrett, Tex.	McMillan	Smithwick
Bloom	Gasque	McTeynolds	Snell
Boles	Gibson	McSwain	Sonners, N. Y.
Bowles	Gifford	McSweeney	Sosnowski
Bowling	Gilbert	MacGregor	Speaks
Bowman	Glynn	Madden	Spearling
Box	Golder	Magee, N. Y.	Sproul, Kans.
Boylan	Goldsborough	Magee, Pa.	Stalker
Brand, Ohio	Goodwin	Magrady	Stedman
Briggs	Graham	Major	Stephens
Brigham	Green, Fla.	Manlove	Stobbs
Browne	Griest	Mansfield	Strong, Kans.
Browning	Hadley	Mapes	Strong, Pa.
Brunam	Hale	Martin, La.	Summers, Wash.
Buchanan	Hall, Ind.	Martin, Mass.	Summers, Tex.
Burdick	Hall, N. Dak.	Mead	Swank
Burtness	Hammer	Meuges	Swartz
Busby	Hardy	Merritt	Sweet
Butler	Hare	Michener	Swing
Byrns	Harrison	Miller	Taber
Campbell	Hastings	Milligan	Taylor, Colo.
Canfield	Haugen	Mills	Taylor, N. J.
Cannon	Hawes	Montague	Taylor, Tenn.
Carpenter	Hawley	Montgomery	Taylor, W. Va.
Cars	Hayden	Mooney	Temple
Carter, Calif.	Hickey	Moore, Ky.	Thatcher
Carter, Okla.	Hill, Ala.	Moore, Ohio	Thomas
Chalmers	Hill, Md.	Moore, Va.	Thompson
Chindblom	Hill, Wash.	Morehead	Thurston
Cole	Hoch	Morgan	Tilman
Collier	Hogg	Morin	Tilson
Collins	Holiday	Morrow	Timberlake
Colton	Hooper	Murphy	Tincher
Connally, Tex.	Houston	Nelson, Mc.	Tinkham
Connery	Howard	Nelson, Mo.	Tolley
Connolly, Pa.	Huddleston	Newton, Minn.	Trendway
Cooper, Ohio	Hudson	Newton, Mo.	Tucker
Cooper, Wis.	Hull, Tenn.	Norton	Tydings
Corning	Hull, William E.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Underhill
Cox	Jacobstein	O'Connell, R. I.	Underwood
Coyle	James	O'Connor, La.	Updike
Cramton	Jeffers	Olfeld	Upshaw
Crisp	Jenkins	Oliver, Ala.	Vale
Crosser	Johnson, Ind.	Oliver, N. Y.	Vare
Crowther	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker	Vestal
Crumpacker	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Vincent, Mich.
Curry	Johnson, Wash.	Patterson	Vinson, Ga.
Darrow	Jones	Peavey	Vinson, Ky.
Davenport	Kahn	Perkins	Voigt
Davis	Kearns	Phillips	Wainwright
Deal	Keller	Porter	Wason
Dempsey	Kelly	Pou	Watson
Dickinson, Mo.	Kemp	Prall	Weaver
Dietkstein	Kerr	Pratt	Wefald
Dominick	Ketcham	Purnell	Welsh
Doughton	Kiefler	Quin	Wheeler
Douglass	Kless	Ragon	White, Kans.
Dewell	Kincheloe	Rainey	White, Me.
Driver	Kinrad	Ramseyer	Whitehead
Dyer	King	Rankin	Whittington
Eaton	Knutson	Ransley	Williams, Ill.
Edwards	Kopp	Rayburn	Williams, Tex.
Elliot	Kunz	Reece	Williamson
Ellis	Kurtz	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, La.
Eslick	Kvale	Reid, Ill.	Wilson, Miss.
Esterly	LaGuardia	Robinson, Iowa	Wingo
Faust	Lampert	Robison, Ky.	Winter
Fenn	Lanham	Rogers	Wolverton
Fish	Lankford	Romjue	Wood
Fisher	Larsen	Rouse	Woodruff
Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Lazaro	Rowbottom	Wright
Fitzgerald, W. T.	Lea, Calif.	Ruby	Wurzbach
Fletcher	Leatherwood	Rutherford	Wyant
Fort	Leavitt	Sabath	Zihlman

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—63

Abernethy	Dickinson, Iowa	Hull, Morton D.	Rathbone
Beedy	Doyle	Irwin	Heed, Ark.
Berger	Drane	Johnson, Ill.	Shreve
Brund, Ga.	Drewry	Johnson, Ky.	Sprout, Ill.
Britten	Evans	Kendall	Steagall
Bulwinkle	Fairchild	Kirk	Stevenson
Burton	Flaherty	Lee, Ga.	Strother
Carew	Fredericks	Lineberger	Sullivan
Celler	Funk	Lozier	Swoope
Chapman	Gallivan	Lyon	Walters
Christopherson	Gorman	Michaelson	Warren
Clague	Green, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Watres
Cleary	Greenwood	O'Connor, N. Y.	Weller
Cullen	Griffin	Peery	Woodrum
Davey	Hersey	Perlman	Yates
Denison	Hudspeth	Quayle	

So, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Fairchild with Mr. Woodrum.

Mr. Shreve with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Denison with Mr. Gallivan.
 Mr. Kendall with Mr. Hudspeth.
 Mr. Gorman with Mr. Steagall.
 Mr. Swoope with Mr. Warren.
 Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Chapman.
 Mr. Beedy with Mr. Brand of Georgia.
 Mr. Rathbone with Mr. Cleary.
 Mr. Sproul of Illinois with Mr. Carew.
 Mr. Funk with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
 Mr. Hersey with Mr. Reed of Arkansas.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Quayle.
 Mr. Burton with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Dickinson of Iowa with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Bulwinkle.
 Mr. Irwin with Mr. Cullen.
 Mr. Johnson of Illinois with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
 Mr. Watres with Mr. Drewry.
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Sullivan.
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Greenwood.
 Mr. Green of Iowa with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. Walters with Mr. Weller.
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
 Mr. Clague with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Berger.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Peery.
 Mr. Strother with Mr. Lyon.
 Mr. Kirk with Mr. Lozier.
 Mr. Morton D. Hull with Mr. Evans.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague Mr. Doyle were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. GALLIVAN is ill with influenza. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague Mr. PERLMAN were present, he would vote "yea." He is absent because of sickness in his family.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues Mr. CULLEN and Mr. GRIFFIN were present, they would vote "yea." Both of them are necessarily absent. I also desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. CLEARY, is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote for the bill.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement. If Mr. CELLER and Mr. SULLIVAN were present, they would vote in the affirmative. They are unavoidably absent.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. REED of Arkansas is detained on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same announcement as to my colleague Mr. LYON, of North Carolina.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues Mr. CAREW and Mr. O'CONNOR, of New York, have been unavoidably kept away from the city. If they were present, they would both vote "yea."

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same announcement with reference to my colleague Mr. QUAYLE, of New York.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same announcement with reference to my colleague Mr. WELLER, of New York. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleagues Mr. FLAHERTY, Mr. FREDERICKS, and Mr. LINEBERGER, of California. They are unavoidably absent; but if they were present, they would vote "yea."

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague Mr. CHAPMAN is absent because of the illness of his mother. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that if my colleague Mr. STEVENSON were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague Mr. HUDDSPETH were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. ROBISON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague Mr. KIRK were present, he would vote "yea." He is unavoidably detained.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. BRIGGS. No; I just came in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, if I had the opportunity, I would vote "yea."

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that if my colleague Mr. CLAGUE were present he would vote "yea." He was called home on a very important matter.

Mr. PARKER and Mr. UNDERHILL rose.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands tellers. As many as are in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-five Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

AMENDMENT OF THE MATERNITY ACT

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7555) to authorize for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1928, and June 30, 1929, appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1921.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1921, is amended by striking out the words "for the period of five years" wherever such words appear in such section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "for the period of seven years."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Connecticut to 20 minutes.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON]. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to go to a vote without debate. [Applause.]

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is too important to be passed upon by this House without discussion. My only regret is we are limited to 20 minutes on the side, because it can not be properly discussed in that time. So far as I am concerned I shall not give up any of the time I have in opposition to the bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I was perfectly willing to forego making any remarks myself if I could get the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] to do likewise.

This is a bill to amend the maternity and infancy act, or Sheppard-Towner bill, for a period of two years. The act authorized an appropriation of \$1,240,000 annually, of which \$240,000 was to be apportioned equally among the several States accepting the terms of the act. The remaining sum of a million dollars was to be pro rated among the States in accordance with the proportion which their population bears to the total population of the United States. No part of this million-dollar sum is to be paid until it is matched annually by at least a like sum from the State receiving the appropriation.

The act had its origin in the desire of the women of the country to have the Federal Government cooperate with the several States in the hope of bringing about a material reduction in the infant mortality and maternity death rates. Both were considerably higher in our country than in some of the European countries.

The law was drawn so as to permit each State to be the originator of its own plan and methods, subject only to the general supervision of the Federal Government for the purpose of seeing that the plans proposed by the States were reasonably appropriate to that end. An examination of these plans will show that they differ not only in detail but in general scope. Some of the States have different problems to meet and different sums of money available to carry on the work. Among the activities common to all of the States are the establishment and maintenance of child-health centers for mothers and babies, prenatal conferences for expectant mothers, home visits by doctors or nurses, education through literature, classes, lectures, moving pictures, and so forth.

In brief, the main purpose of the act is to acquaint the States with the problem with the idea of stimulating them in correcting it. In other words, it is in the nature of an experiment or a demonstration. The work has been conducted—

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How many of the States of the Union refused to participate in this work?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Forty-three States out of the 48 States of the Union have voluntarily come within the terms of the law and are receiving the benefits of the act. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Some of the States are willing to pay their own bills, are they not?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do not know about those States, but I do know that 43 States out of the 48 States have accepted the terms of the act and are conducting the finest kind of work under it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have not the time to discuss the bill in detail, but I desire to call attention to the printed hearings, which are very much to the point, and to the report of the committee which is brief, but at the same time thorough. The Members can there ascertain an account of the progress of the work, and what has been accomplished.

For example, during the years 1924 and 1925 there were held throughout the country 33,701 of these child-health conferences. At these conferences mothers came voluntarily—some in the rural districts came many miles—with their small infant children for the purpose of having them examined. In this two-year period over 500,000 children were examined at these conferences. During this period nearly 10,000 prenatal conferences were held at which over 75,000 prospective mothers attended and received valuable advice and instructions from skilled physicians and trained nurses. In addition to this over 519,000 home visits and demonstrations were made in the remote areas of the country. Mind you there was no compulsion about this at all. It was all voluntary. Let me quote from page 9 of the hearings from the testimony of Miss Grace Abbott, chief of the Children's Bureau, and as such, chairman of the Federal Board of Maternal and Infant Hygiene:

The aims of all the States have been an extensive campaign of education throughout the whole State, with at the same time intensive campaigns looking to putting the work on a permanent locally supported basis have been undertaken in an increasing number of counties. So that, too, has been the object right along. One thousand six hundred and ninety-one permanent infant-welfare centers have been established on this basis and 263 prenatal centers of this type established.

The midwife instruction and supervision has been, generally speaking, a regular feature of the work in States in which midwifery is a problem, and 35,592 midwives have been enrolled in the midwife courses of instruction.

One hundred and twenty-seven thousand and twenty-nine mothers have been attending the mothers' classes that were organized and 4,362 "little mothers" classes for the children between 10 and 15 have been organized.

These figures, which I give as an indication of the activities of the staff of the States, are in no sense representative of the amount of work that has been done. The constant effort has been not to do the work through the State staff but to get the work locally done, and primarily the conferences held have been for demonstration and educational purposes for the community.

As a result of this legislation and the hearty cooperation of the States great progress has been made along this line. Ten States which at the time of the passage of the act conducted no work of this kind are now doing most excellent work, while others which then did but little have considerably extended their activities. Since the operation of this act there has been a substantial decrease in both the infant mortality and the maternity death rates. This will be shown by the following tables:

INFANT MORTALITY IN THE UNITED STATES, BY STATES, 1915-1924

The rates given below show the number of infants who died during the first month of life per 1,000 live births. They are for the States in the birth-registration area, i. e., the States whose registration of birth is 90 per cent complete, according to the findings of the vital statistics division of the Census Bureau.

State	Infant mortality rates per 1,000 in the birth registration area in—									
	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924
Entire registration area	100	101	94	101	87	86	76	76	77	72
Urban	103	104	100	108	89	91	78	80	78	73
Rural	94	97	88	94	84	81	74	72	76	71
California					70	74	66	71	73	67
Urban					64	68	60	64	66	62
Rural					79	83	75	81	83	74

State	Infant mortality rates per 1,000 in the birth registration area in—									
	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924
Connecticut	107	101	94	107	86	92	73	77	77	69
Urban	103	101	93	105	86	93	72	77	77	67
Rural	119	101	96	112	87	88	79	77	75	77
Delaware								98	100	94
Urban								93	100	91
Rural								103	101	100
Florida										83
Urban										90
Rural										81
Illinois									76	82
Urban									81	85
Rural									68	77
Indiana					85	87	79	82	71	65
Urban					100	104	88	96	79	73
Rural					73	77	74	72	66	61
Kansas					77	80	70	73	63	63
Urban					98	100	88	92	73	78
Rural					73	73	65	67	59	57
Kentucky					87	93	82	73	62	60
Urban					103	119	105	90	70	67
Rural					85	90	82	70	60	57
Maine					105	108	93	101	91	86
Urban					109	128	107	99	89	83
Rural					104	102	89	91	82	77
Maryland					121	120	140	105	104	94
Urban					120	118	146	98	87	85
Rural					122	123	135	115	103	102
Massachusetts					101	100	93	113	88	81
Urban					103	103	99	115	90	82
Rural					92	87	91	104	82	78
Michigan					86	93	88	89	90	79
Urban					93	106	97	97	100	81
Rural					78	87	80	81	82	75
Minnesota					70	70	67	71	66	59
Urban					77	78	75	79	71	59
Rural					67	66	64	67	66	56
Mississippi									68	68
Urban									95	87
Rural									66	67
Montana									70	71
Urban									78	72
Rural									68	71
Nebraska									64	59
Urban									86	74
Rural									58	54
New Hampshire					110	115	110	113	93	88
Urban					131	133	132	124	101	97
Rural					89	97	86	102	85	99
New Jersey									74	79
Urban									74	71
Rural									74	77
New York					99	94	91	97	84	86
Urban					102	97	93	88	85	78
Rural					89	83	85	93	77	67
North Carolina								100	102	84
Urban								124	124	75
Rural								113	97	89
North Dakota										67
Urban										68
Rural										67
Ohio								92	94	90
Urban								103	100	94
Rural								87	85	76
Oregon								63	62	51
Urban								69	60	50
Rural								59	63	52
Pennsylvania					110	114	111	120	100	97
Urban					110	114	113	130	99	99
Rural					110	114	109	128	101	95
Rhode Island					120	111	168	126	(1)	93
Urban					118	116	169	127	(1)	94
Rural					123	93	101	118	(1)	86
South Carolina								113	116	93
Urban								139	150	127
Rural								111	112	92
Utah								66	66	74
Urban								62	69	69
Rural								71	69	75
Vermont								85	86	78
Urban								118	121	117
Rural								81	79	73
Virginia								98	103	91
Urban								129	145	105
Rural								91	93	87
Washington								69	69	63
Urban								62	67	59
Rural								75	71	67
Wisconsin								78	79	80
Urban								92	99	94
Rural								69	67	71
Wyoming										73
Urban										80
Rural										64

¹ Dropped from the birth-registration area.

MATERNAL MORTALITY (DEATHS FROM PREGNATAL CAUSES) IN THE UNITED STATES, BY STATES, 1915-1924

The rates given below show the number of mothers per 1,000 live births who died from causes connected with childbirth from 1915 to 1924. They are for the States in the birth-registration area; i. e., the States whose registration of births is 90 per cent complete, according to the vital statistics division of the Census Bureau:

State	Maternal mortality rates per 1,000 in the birth registration area in—									
	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924
Entire registration area.	6.1	6.2	6.6	9.2	7.4	8.0	6.8	6.6	6.7	6.6
California					8.0	7.7	6.8	7.2	6.7	5.9
Connecticut	5.6	4.9	5.1	7.5	6.2	6.8	5.3	5.7	5.7	5.7
Delaware							6.3	6.6	8.4	7.7
Florida										12.1
Illinois								6.3	6.4	6.2
Indiana				7.2	10.4	8.4	8.7	6.9	6.6	5.8
Iowa										6.0
Kansas					7.6	11.4	8.2	8.4	6.4	7.6
Kentucky					6.0	8.0	6.3	6.4	6.3	6.1
Maine	6.8	7.8	6.7	8.6	8.6	8.5	7.4	7.6	8.7	8.2
Maryland					6.4	6.8	9.5	8.4	7.6	6.6
Massachusetts	5.7	6.0	6.5	9.2	7.1	7.5	6.5	5.9	6.0	6.6
Michigan	6.7	6.8	7.4	8.6	7.7	9.3	6.9	6.9	7.0	6.5
Minnesota	5.2	5.5	5.6	7.8	6.7	7.9	5.7	4.9	6.0	5.0
Mississippi							9.5	8.3	8.8	9.5
Montana								7.9	7.5	6.6
Nebraska							7.1	6.6	5.8	6.3
New Hampshire	6.1	7.2	7.0	7.8	8.0	7.1	6.2	6.5	7.4	6.1
New York	5.9	5.4	5.7	8.0	6.2	6.9	6.3	6.0	5.7	5.9
New Jersey							5.9	6.4	5.7	6.2
North Carolina					8.2	10.8	9.3	10.0	7.3	8.0
North Dakota										5.7
Ohio					7.1	9.7	7.4	8.0	7.2	6.6
Oregon					10.1	9.4	7.4	8.3	6.9	6.5
Pennsylvania	6.4	7.0	6.5	10.5	6.8	7.8	6.8	6.2	6.6	6.3
Rhode Island	6.6	5.8	6.3	9.8	(1)	(1)	7.1	5.5	6.3	6.3
South Carolina					11.2	12.2	9.8	10.7	9.7	10.8
Utah					5.9	8.6	8.4	7.9	7.3	5.5
Vermont	6.1	7.8	6.3	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.3	7.4	7.0	8.1
Virginia					8.2	10.7	8.2	8.6	7.0	7.2
Washington					7.4	9.9	8.6	9.2	7.8	7.9
Wisconsin					5.7	6.0	4.8	6.7	5.8	6.0
Wyoming								7.1	7.3	9.8

¹ Dropped from the birth-registration area.

Of the 15,000 maternal deaths in the United States in the year 1923, 37.5 per cent were due to puerperal septicemia, while 26 per cent were due to albuminuria and convulsions. These are preventable, yet they caused two-thirds of the maternal deaths in that one year.

The act has been a success. Forty-three States are working under it, and in doing so have initiated and carried out their own plans to meet their own problem in their own way and in their own State. There has been no so-called Federal interference whatever. Within the States local communities have been led to share the responsibility, for in some of the States there has been the matching of State funds by local funds. In view of the showing made we ought not to let the work end when the five-year period expires in 1927. To do so would mean the dropping of much of the work that has been so recently commenced. Eventually the States ought to assume this burden themselves, but that is going to take time, especially for some of the States. Until more is known as to this the committee felt, after hearing the evidence, that the act should be extended. The fact is that the work has been so well done that I challenge anyone who has interested himself in the subject at all to appear here before this House and deny that any part of this work has not been well done. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the sole objection in the hearings went to the question of Federal policy. Of course, this question was raised originally, but the committee then decided to report the bill favorably, and this House sustained their action. This ought to end the matter, at least in view of the fact that the work is so well conducted and the amount involved is so small. Certainly it is not large when compared with some of the other twenty-odd Federal aid appropriations to which no objection, at least no serious objection, is made when they come before us annually.

This question of Federal aid is not new in our history. It dates back to the very beginning and antedates the Constitution, for Federal aid was granted even in the days under the Confederation. Federal aid in our country has taken three distinct forms:

1. Direct donations or gratuities to the States for specific purposes.

2. Direct donations or gifts to the States for specific purposes, but upon condition that the State receiving the donation carry out the condition in the grant.

3. Direct donations or gifts to the States for specific purposes, upon condition that the State carry out conditions in the grant, and where one of the conditions required the matching of the Federal gift by at least an equal sum by the State.

Under the first plan Federal land grants were made for educational purposes, internal improvements such as the building

of roads, bridges, canals, erecting of State capitols, and other State public buildings. The second plan was commenced during the days of the Civil War with the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, wherein land grants were made to the States upon condition that the State use the gift in the establishment and maintenance of an agricultural school. This was followed in 1887 by the Hatch Act, whereby each land-grant college provided for in the Morrill Act was given a certain additional sum conditioned upon the establishment of an agricultural experimental station.

The third plan was first put into effect in 1911. This plan involved the matching of the Federal grant of money by at least a like sum from the State. The idea was that this method would tend to stimulate greater activity on the part of the States. Among the Federal-aid acts which have been passed and which embody this general principle of the matching of Federal funds are the following:

The Weeks law for forest-fire prevention. Act of March 1, 1911.

The Smith-Lever Act for agricultural extension work. Act of May 8, 1914.

The good roads act. Act of July 11, 1916.

The Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education. Act of February 23, 1917.

The Chamberlain-Kahn Act for the suppression of venereal disease. Act of July 9, 1918.

The industrial rehabilitation act. Act of June 2, 1920.

The Federal highway act. Act of November 9, 1921.

The Sheppard-Towner or maternity and infant welfare act. Act of November 23, 1921.

The Clarke-McNary Act for the protection of forest lands, etc. Act of June 7, 1924.

If you will refer to the report, you will find a more complete statement on page 10 of a number of other Federal-aid provisions with the amount of the annual appropriations.

The Secretary of Labor, in whose department is contained the Children's Bureau, recommends the passage of this extension act. In addition there appeared before the committee in active support of this measure many of the great women's organizations of the country, including the—

General Federation of Women's Clubs of the United States.

American Child Health Association.

National Women's Trade Union League of America.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America.

National Council of Women (Inc.).

National League of Women Voters.

National Consumers' League.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me again recur to the question of Federal aid. It is apparent from glancing over the statute books and along the pages of our history that this question is not a new one. I can appreciate the viewpoint of those who differ on this general question as a question of sound Federal policy. I do not want to see the Federal Government encroach upon the States. But let me say there should be consistency on the part of those who oppose this on the question of sound Federal policy. Those who willingly vote \$80,000,000 every year for good roads on a similar plan for matching by the States ought not to deny \$1,000,000 to assist in lowering the death rate of the expectant mothers of the land. Those who willingly vote substantial sums of money annually in assisting the States in getting rid of the boll weevil, thereby assisting the cotton farmer, ought not to deny an appropriation to assist the States to decrease our infant mortality rate. Those who will declaim so vehemently this afternoon against the Federal Government aiding the States in doing something to better the health of the mothers and babies of the land ought not to continue to agitate and vote for hundreds of thousands of dollars annually as Federal aid to the States for the purpose of protecting cattle from disease and hogs from cholera. Those who willingly vote Federal aid to prevent the spread of moths and the ravages of foreign beetles ought likewise to be willing to prevent the ravages of perfectly preventable childbirth diseases which account for 10,000 maternal deaths annually.

Men, there is but one side to this question if we are consistent. I submit the question with these brief remarks and yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there was so much disorder a good many of us did not hear the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the House do now adjourn, and has demanded a division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 27, noes 240.

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

Mr. MERRITT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW].

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a perfect example of what happens when Congress sacrifices its better judgment and allows the creation of a new bureau.

In 1913 Congress was asked to establish a bureau of research in the Department of Labor to study the problems of infancy and maternity. Such studies were being carried on in the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department, and there was no need to duplicate that organization in another department. I have before me a number of the pamphlets dealing with maternity and infancy issued by the Public Health Service, and I will read some of their titles: "Breast Feeding Her Baby," "Motherhood," "Bottle Feeding for Babies," "The Summer Care of Infants," "Measles," "Whooping Cough," "The Care of Your Baby," "Nutrition in Childhood." But Congress was told that it would only cost \$32,000, and there were a lot of persistent agitators, some of them seeking Government employment, and Congress yielded. The Childrens' Bureau of the Department of Labor was established to duplicate the activities of the Public Health Service, but it only cost \$32,000 for the first year.

Then what happened? Were the agitators now installed in the Childrens' Bureau content to remain a fact-finding agency, a scientific bureau to do that which the Public Health Service had been doing better than they could ever hope to do? Were they content with the appropriation of \$32,000 per year? Not at all. They wanted to exercise direction and control over the handling of these matters in the States, and some genius among them discovered the possibility of applying to their particular field the 50-50 system which had been used in public-road building. So they came to Congress in 1921 with the argument that if they could have a little money to distribute on a 50-50 basis for a few years, they could educate the backward States in the care of babies and mothers in childbirth.

They only wanted about a million dollars and they only wanted it for five years and by that time their hopes would be realized. Again Congress yielded, and now four years have elapsed, and they are here again and asking for an extension of this appropriation for two years more; but if you will read the hearings, you will discover that this will not mark the end, that they expect to be back in two years more asking for a further extension, and that they are not even willing to admit that their purposes will be accomplished in another five years. Those in charge of the Children's Bureau have no idea of ever abandoning this Federal-aid proposition. Vice President Marshall disclosed the essence of the whole proposition when he said that the trouble with Federal bureaus was that once established the bureau grew and grew until it became a whole bedroom suite. The Children's Bureau, which in 1913 cost \$32,000, to-day demands an appropriation more than forty times as large.

If you will examine the statistics presented by the Children's Bureau in the hearings as to the rate of infant mortality in the different States, you will discover how thoroughly futile has been their activity. Five States have refused to accept the 50-50 benefits authorized by this act—Kansas, Illinois, Connecticut, Maine, and Massachusetts. The figures furnished by the Children's Bureau do not demonstrate any remarkable results from Federal aid. They show that the highest infant mortality occurs in States that are receiving Federal aid, like Delaware and South Carolina, which are over 10 per cent, and that the infant death rate is considerably below the average in States that have refused Federal aid, like Kansas, where the rate is only a little over 6 per cent, and Illinois and Connecticut. Statistics would seem to indicate that if you want to preserve the babies you would do well to avoid Federal aid. I hope that Congress will to-day put an end to this futile extravagance. [Applause.]

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this is a real farce. When you make a farce out of a serious thing the people have a right to think that we are unworthy. Of course, every man here is a serious-minded man when he is in his proper senses, and he is nearly always in his proper senses. When a serious subject is here for consideration it ought to be considered seriously. This is not a constitutional amendment,

and those who think constitutional amendments sometimes are forced on a people have a chance here to express their opposition to a thing that does not meet with the approval of several States. The State from which I come refuses to be bound by this sort of legislation. [Applause.] And through its legislature it has refused to accept any of the funds appropriated from the Federal Treasury for this purpose. [Applause.] It has returned the money that was granted to it on the ground that the State is quite competent to perform the functions that are proposed to be performed under this act.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. What is the use of yielding?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I simply wanted to correct the gentleman as to the return by Illinois of the funds. They refused to take them.

Mr. MADDEN. At first they gave Illinois \$5,000 and Illinois returned it. Now, I think this is a sort of legislation that ought not to be enacted. We have had it on the books for almost five years.

The appropriations have been made for the last year under the authority of the act unless it is renewed. It ought to be stopped. The women of the country that I know are quite competent to look after their own maternity affairs. [Applause.] They do not want the Government of the United States to mix into their home life.

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No. They can run their own homes and their own family affairs, and the more we insist upon that the higher standard of family life we will have. [Applause.] Let us have independence of thought.

Why should we be supervised in everything we do? They told us they needed some supervisors to tell the American housewife how to make cottage cheese. My mother made cottage cheese before the Department of Agriculture ever heard of it. I am opposed to the further continuance of this activity. [Applause.]

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, this is a fine occasion to test out the sentiment of gentlemen who are opposed to bureaucracy. If every man in this House who has made a speech against a bureaucratic government will vote against this bill, we will defeat it overwhelmingly. [Applause.] What do you mean by it? All over this House on both sides gentlemen recognize that they are running this Government now chiefly with bureaus. Here is a bureau which we started five years ago. It is about to die, and they are coming here and asking us who have stood up against bureaucratic government to give it more life. If all of the men in this House who believe in Jeffersonian principles and local self-government will stand up to their beliefs, we can defeat this bill.

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

Mr. TUCKER. Oh, no; the gentleman will pardon me. This bill not only ought not to be renewed but it ought never to have been passed. [Applause.] I make the further statement, and gentlemen may take it to their hearts and consider it.

If the number of men in this House who have told me that such a bill ought never to have been started will vote against this bill we will defeat it. Why do you want to continue it? Have we come to the time, as I said the other day, and as my honorable friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has just said, when we are actually attempting to make old Uncle Sam the midwife of every expectant mother and when the child arrives to make the old man the wet nurse for the baby? More than that, it is not needed. Go to old Virginia. From the city of Winchester to the city of Bristol, 250 miles down that beautiful valley, 30 years ago there was not a hospital in that whole country. To-day, in order to meet the needs of maternity and infancy, there is a hospital in every town and in some villages in that country. Now that the people at home have supplied the need, there are some people who want to establish a bureau and keep it going with many employees and big salaries, and they come here and persuade this committee to bring this bill in. Gentlemen of the House, you have no idea what this bill means. It gives the management of the whole matter to the Children's Bureau. The bill gives outright to each of the States \$5,000, and then gives \$1,000,000 to the States according to population, provided that each State shall match the amount given by the Federal Government, and this Children's Bureau here in Washington, having the administration of the whole affair, controls absolutely not only the \$5,000 given each State but also the amount each State, out of its own revenues, con-

tributes to match the Federal Government's gift. Let any man answer how a Federal agency (or the Children's Bureau) gets the power to manage and control State taxes. Judge Marshall says it can not be done. But who is Judge Marshall that he should be considered in these days as compared to the insistent lobbyists who have haunted these corridors demanding this legislation in the name of humanity?

The same elements are behind this bill that forced the child labor laws through Congress that it has taken us 10 years to get rid of. But we will, if the bill is passed, fight until it is repealed.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

MR. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

MR. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I supported and voted for the bill for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, which was approved November 23, 1921, known as the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act. That act is permanent legislation, but the appropriation authorized under section 2 of the act was for a five-year period, which expires June 30, 1927. The only purpose of the bill now under consideration is to authorize the continuing of this appropriation for the fiscal years 1928 and 1929.

For the purpose of the Budget estimates next autumn and in order that the State legislatures, meeting in January, 1927, will know what funds will be available, it is necessary that this bill be passed at this session. This bill, according to the report of the Secretary of Labor, in whose department the act is administered, has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and he has presented it to the President, and the President has advised that it is not contrary to his fiscal policy. This act has accomplished all that its supporters claimed for it. The work is just getting under way in the States and hence it would be very wasteful of the money and efforts already expended if the appropriations were not extended at this time.

No one will claim that any form of waste could be more serious than the unnecessary deaths of infants and of mothers in childbirth. Hence I claim the hearty cooperation of all agencies, both public and private, in reducing the unnecessary loss of life is most desirable and necessary. [Applause.]

The so-called Sheppard-Towner Act authorized an expenditure of \$480,000 to be equally apportioned among the several States, and for each subsequent year for five years \$240,000 to be similarly apportioned, and an additional sum of \$1,000,000 to be apportioned, \$5,000 to each State and the balance to be prorated in accordance with the proportion which their population bears to the total population of the United States. It was provided that no part of the million-dollar fund should be paid until it was matched by a like sum from the State receiving the appropriation. The combined fund was to be used for the general purposes above expressed. Each State, however, was to be the originator of its own plans and methods, subject only to general scrutiny and approval by the Federal Government to see that the plans were reasonably appropriate to that end.

The State plans are in consequence different not only in detail but in general scope. They have different problems to meet and different sums of money available to carry on the work. But among the activities common to all may be mentioned the maintenance of child health centers for mothers and babies, prenatal conferences for expectant mothers, home visits by doctors or nurses, education through literature, lectures, classes, and so forth. At the health centers and prenatal conferences doctors and nurses are present to advise mothers and to examine children.

PROGRESS OF THE WORK

There are 43 States that have accepted the terms of the act and are cooperating with the Children's Bureau in the effort to reduce the maternal and infant mortality. Most of these States accepted in the legislative session of 1923. Louisiana did not accept until 1924, Vermont and Rhode Island until 1925. The only States not now accepting and working with the bureau in this activity are Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Illinois, and Kansas. In 1924 the act was extended to Hawaii, and Hawaii has also accepted the terms of the act, so there are 43 States and Hawaii.

The amount available for the States under the act is \$1,190,000. In round numbers the States have accepted \$716,000 from the 1923 appropriation, \$884,000 from the 1924 appropriation, \$958,000 from 1925, and up to date in 1926, the fiscal year 1926, \$732,197. There will be more accepted in 1926 than there

was in 1925, so that, roughly, a million dollars is being expended in this work annually.

Miss Grace Abbott, Chief of the Children's Bureau and chairman of the Federal Board of Maternal and Infant Hygiene, and, therefore, in charge of Federal activities in the administration of the act in a report of the work during the fiscal year 1925 shows 18,154 child-health conferences held by 43 States administering the Federal funds, with 290,846 infants and children of preschool age examined and 607 children's health centers established through the efforts of the States; 3,781 prenatal conferences with 36,690 women in attendance and 65 permanent prenatal centers established. The report also shows that midwife classes were held in 19 States, with an attendance of 10,693, and that 8,047 women completed the course of instruction. There were 370,591 homes visited and home demonstrations made by Sheppard-Towner nurses in 1925. Mothers' classes were attended by 31,529 women, and 1,362 "Little Mothers" classes were organized for girls between 10 and 15 years of age.

We all remember that the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act had its origin in the desire of the good women of the country to have the Federal Government cooperate with the several States in bringing about a material reduction in the infant and maternity death rates, which were much higher than in some of the European countries. As a result of this legislation and hearty cooperation of the most of the States, splendid progress has been made. There has been a very substantial decrease in both the infant and maternity death rates since this act went into operation.

The health commissioner of the State of Virginia indorses this legislation in a telegram to Representative MOORE of Virginia, and says that it has been the greatest help in the rural sections of that State, and that it would be a disaster to give it up now. In 1918, before this law was in operation, 103 children out of every 1,000 in the State of Virginia died in infancy, but in 1924, after it went into operation, only 77 out of every 1,000 died in infancy in that State. The same thing has happened in many other States.

Taking the United States as a whole, in 1920, which was the year before the enactment of this law, the number of children who died in infancy amounted to 86 out of every 1,000 in the United States. In 1924, three years after the passage of this law, the death rate among children in the United States had been reduced from 86 to 71 per 1,000. This is a reduction of nearly 20 per cent in less than four years. [Applause.]

This measure is not only indorsed by the Secretary of Labor, in whose department it is administered, but it has the active support of many of the great women's organizations of the country, including—

General Federation of Women's Clubs of the United States.

American Child Health Association.

National Women's Trade Union League of America.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America.

National Council of Women (Inc.).

National League of Women Voters.

National Consumers' League.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

No criticism or objection has been made before the committee which reported this bill, or on the floor of the House during this discussion as to the work itself or the manner in which the law is being administered. Objection, however, has been raised, but solely on the grounds of Federal policy. Similar objections were made in 1921, when the original bill was under consideration. Nevertheless it was enacted. That, it would seem, should settle the question, especially since so much good has been accomplished with such a small amount expended. It is being administered by the Children's Bureau. No new bureau was created.

Federal aid to the States is no new question. A majority of the States have received Federal land grants of one form or another for educational purposes, aggregating more than 114,000 square miles. Grants have also been made of different lands for internal improvements, such as roads, canals, erection of State capitols, and other public buildings. Also to the States for railroads which were then in process of building, or to the railroads direct, a vast portion of the Government domain covering millions upon millions of acres.

Among the Federal aid acts, which have been passed by Congress, and which embody this general principle of matching Federal funds with the States, are the following:

The Weeks law for forest-fire prevention. Act of March 1, 1911.
The Smith-Lever Act for agricultural extension work. Act of May 8, 1914.

The good roads act. Act of July 11, 1910.

The Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education. Act of February 23, 1917.

The Chamberlain-Kahn Act for the suppression of venereal disease. Act of July 9, 1918.

The industrial rehabilitation act. Act of June 2, 1920.

The Federal highway act. Act of November 9, 1921.

The Sheppard-Towner or maternity and infant welfare act. Act of November 23, 1921.

The Clarke-McNary Act for the protection of forest lands, etc. Act of June 7, 1924.

We appropriate millions of dollars each year to aid the States in road construction; millions more to assist the States in getting rid of the boll weevil, to aid the cotton-raising farmers, and for the purpose of protecting cattle and hogs from disease, and to prevent the spread of moths and the ravages of foreign beetles, all of which I heartily indorse.

I am unable to understand how any Member of this House who favors and votes to appropriate many millions of dollars for the purposes I have enumerated can oppose the expenditure of only \$1,000,000 a year to assist the States in reducing the infant and maternity death rate. While we are protecting hogs and cattle from the ravages of disease, let us protect the mothers and babies from the ravages of preventable childbirth disease which accounts for the death of more than 10,000 every year. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the maternity and infancy law has proven a godsend during the five years of its operation. It has saved the lives of mothers and infants in large numbers. Different States administer the act in different ways. However, child-health centers for mothers and babies, prenatal conferences for expectant mothers, home visits by nurses and doctors, education through literature, lectures, classes, and movies are conducted by all.

The States have initiated and carried out their own programs under the supervision and with financial aid from the Children's Bureau of the Federal Government.

Some idea of the good work that is being done may be obtained from the following statement by Miss Grace Abbott, Chief of the Children's Bureau and chairman of the Federal Board of Maternal and Infant Hygiene, and therefore in charge of Federal activities in the administration of the act:

Reports of the work during the fiscal year 1925 show 18,154 child-health conferences held by 43 States administering the Federal funds, with 290,846 infants and children of preschool age examined and 607 children's health centers established through the efforts of the States; 3,781 prenatal conferences, with 36,630 women in attendance, and 65 permanent prenatal centers established. The reports also show that midwife classes were held in 19 States, with an attendance of 10,693, and that 8,947 women completed the course of instruction.

There were 370,591 home visits and home demonstrations made by Sheppard-Towner nurses in 1925. Mothers' classes were attended by 31,529 women, and 1,362 "little mothers" classes were organized for girls between 10 and 15 years of age.

PREVENTABLE DEATHS

But the field is large and the work is only begun. There were 15,105 maternal deaths in the United States in the year 1923. Of this number, 5,637 (37.5 per cent) were due to sepsis (puerperal septicemia), commonly known as child bed fever; 3,929 (26 per cent) were due to albuminuria and convulsions. These two main causes (sepsis and albuminuria) are in large measure preventable, yet it will be observed that in 1923 they caused two-thirds of the maternal deaths. In other words, two-thirds of the mothers dying in 1923 from causes related to childbirth lost their lives from a disease or condition that could have been avoided. The remaining 5,519 deaths (36.5 per cent) were due to other conditions not so obviously preventable, as puerperal hemorrhage, accidents of pregnancy, accidents of labor, and other puerperal conditions.

WOMEN AROUSED

Mothers, parent-teacher organizations, and club women of my State are thoroughly aroused to the importance of conserving the lives of parturient mothers and young infants. The following table, which shows a higher per cent of deaths among American mothers than occur in any other country except Chile, should shock to action every true American citizen:

Maternal mortality (deaths from puerperal causes) in the United States and certain foreign countries¹

[Latest figures available, Jan. 2, 1926]

Country	Year	Deaths from puerperal causes per 1,000 live births
Australia	1923	5.1
Belgium	1922	5.4
Chile	1923	7.4
Denmark	1923	2.6
England and Wales	1924	3.7
Finland	1920	3.6
Germany	1923	5.2
Italy	1923	2.7
Irish Free State	1922	5.7
Japan	1922	3.3
The Netherlands	1923	2.3
New Zealand	1924	5.0
Norway	1921	2.2
Scotland	1924	5.8
Spain	1921	5.1
Union of South Africa	1923	4.5
United States birth-registration area	1924	6.8
Uruguay	1923	2.7

¹ Compiled from official sources.

In 1915, of every 1,000 live-born babies in the United States, 100 died during the first month. In 1924 the deaths were reduced to 72 per 1,000. In the State of Washington only about 54 died during the first month, but this number should be reduced. We have suppressed hog cholera and tick fever for a generation. Mothers and babies have been too long neglected.

The following statement shows the activities in my State:

SUMMARY OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DURING 1925

Administrative agency, department of health, division of child hygiene. Staff: Director (physician), 1 staff nurse, 1 county nurse, 3 clerks (1 part time), 1 publicity worker (part time).

Activities—Child-health conferences: Forty-three, in rural communities at which 3,799 examinations were made. The child hygiene division has cooperated with one of the big department stores in Seattle in holding a weekly child-health conference. The number of examinations at these conferences was about 70 each week. A series of lectures on prenatal and child care is given in connection with the conferences.

Prenatal conferences: Six, with an attendance of 259.

Mothers' classes: Thirty-one class sessions, with a total attendance of 1,125.

Dental conferences: Four examinations were made by dentists who volunteered their services.

Group demonstrations: Seventeen. These consisted of demonstrations in various phases of child care held in connection with the mother and baby health schools.

New child-health centers established, 3.

Correspondence course: At the close of the year 257 women were registered for the course in the hygiene of maternity and infancy.

Lectures and talks by staff members, 120.

Literature distributed: More than 8,500 bulletins distributed.

Exhibits provided for two communities, also for nurses' institute, various conventions of women's organizations, and county fairs. A special diphtheria-prevention exhibit was prepared.

Permanent organizations in the way of child-hygiene committees are being formed in all counties. These include county health officers, county nurses where available, local physicians, presidents of parent-teacher associations, county federations of women's clubs, and other lay workers.

An article has been prepared every week to syndicate for 197 newspapers and articles every month for several magazines.

An attempt has been made in three counties to develop mother and baby schools, although this has been difficult, since the work depends upon the time which local physicians can give to it. Demonstrations concerning infant care, confinement needs, and proper nutrition form a part of the course.

The director of the division has aided in the conducting of a series of pediatric programs before the county medical societies, arranged by the infant welfare committee of the State medical association.

Definite improvement in correction of dental caries is noted and some improvement is apparent in infant feeding in the rural communities, although the latter is still very unsatisfactorily cared for. The physical examinations also show the widespread neglect of vaccination and of toxin-antitoxin administration, the prevalence of rickets, tonsil and adenoid enlargement and infections, of goiter in certain localities, and of dental caries.

The establishment of three new local infant clinics as a result of work done by the State bureau was reported.

We are now asked to extend the Federal supervision of this very important activity for another two years. I am satisfied this act is saving the lives of mothers and babies. I am for it.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, my purpose in rising at this time is in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER]. He tried to leave the impression with the House that if this bill becomes a law it will put an army of Federal doctors, nurses, and midwives into the field to travel all over the country in maternity and child welfare work.

At the present time the staff of the maternal and infant hygiene division of the Children's Bureau, which is in charge of the administration of this act, includes three doctors, three nurses, an auditor, and two clerks. That is the entire personnel of the bureau. No one can deny the fact that this law has accomplished wonderful results in maternity and infancy cases throughout the length and breadth of our land. I listened very attentively to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. We all admire him for the splendid service he renders to the country in demanding economy of Government expenditures, but I call his attention to the fact that we appropriate millions and millions of dollars to send out information in regard to the care of cattle and horses and hogs, and that we appropriate millions of dollars to kill the boll weevil and things of that character, but when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brings in this bill extending the time for two years of an act for the care and welfare of women and children, which requires a very small appropriation of money, we hear objection raised to it on the floor of the House. I just wanted to state that I, for one, believe that it is more important that our Government be interested in the care of the mothers and the infants of our country than it is to be interested in hogs and cattle. If it is necessary, in order to come within the Budget requirements and to carry out the administration's economy program, to reduce the expenditures for Federal aid projects, let these reductions be distributed proportionately among all these projects. Vital as are good roads and the agricultural interests of the Nation, they are no more vital than the lives and health of the womanhood and childhood of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there is no more difficult or dangerous problem before the country to-day than the gradual impairment of the States' sovereignty and the extension of the Federal power. Whether the House be inclined or not to extend the Federal powers in this particular instance, surely it should treat so grave a question with seriousness and mature consideration.

The committee concedes in its report that this was an experiment and that as a demonstration it had been a complete success. Why, then, continue it? The States have established the machinery. They themselves are functioning adequately to-day. The amount of money involved is insignificant and of itself inadequate for the work which must be financed by the States. But the question of policy, the constitutional question involved, gentlemen, is of transcendent importance.

The time has come for the Congress and for the people of the United States to take the long view in these matters, to look at the ultimate consequences, and stop giving way to the immediate desire of the moment by invoking the Federal power.

With startling rapidity the Federal Government has taken over, one after another, a number of functions originally reserved to the States, and has steadily impaired the dignity, the power, and the sovereignty of our State and local governments. Gentlemen, that is striking at the very corner stone of our institutions, because, as I read the history of our country and the history of foreign nations, the safety and strength of our institutions is due not so much to the powers granted to the Federal Government as to the powers reserved to the States [applause]; to the jealousy with which the home-rule principle was safeguarded; to the regard held by the founders for the principle that the closer the government is to the people the better the government, and that the best way to strengthen and foster self-government is to build up self-reliance and independence on the part of an individual citizen by placing on him direct and intimate responsibility.

Gentlemen, if that principle was recognized as fundamental when we were a Nation of 3,000,000 of people, homogeneous, having a common economic and social viewpoint that would necessarily obtain with a people almost wholly addicted to agricultural pursuits, how much more necessary is it to-day,

when we have a vast population drawn from all parts of the earth, when within our borders are found all forms of economic activity, ranging from the simple agricultural community to our great commercial and industrial cities, and when a variety of climate necessarily produces a variety of customs, habits, and pursuits?

That such a nation can ever be governed from a single distant center is something to me inconceivable. And yet that will be the inevitable result of the constant encroachment by the Federal Government upon the jurisdiction of the States.

From my standpoint the most important need in the country to-day is the improvement and strengthening of local institutions. But how can that be brought about if the people are to be taught to look constantly to Washington for assistance and to the extension of the Federal powers, rather than to rely on their own initiative and responsibility for the solution of those problems which fall clearly within the jurisdiction of their State and local governments?

I am opposed to this bill not because I am not in complete accord with its purposes and objects, but because it represents, in my judgment, a step in the wrong direction and a further infringement by the Federal Government on the sovereign powers of the States. [Applause.]

Mr. MERRITT rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were in the last House remember that there was a somewhat similar scene to this when the so-called child labor amendment was passed; a very heavy vote, a very heavy majority, more than two-thirds were in favor of it. You will also remember that the reception of that child labor amendment when it went to the States was not quite so unanimous; in fact, it was almost unanimous the other way. That shows, I think, that the sentiment of this country is very strongly in favor of the principle of the reserved rights of the States, which my colleague from New York [Mr. MILLS] has just so ably advocated.

Now we have exactly the same principle in this bill, only, I think, to a more extreme extent. The fact that we are asked to appropriate a million dollars per year shows that we are contending more for a principle than objecting to an expenditure.

We were asked to pass the maternity bill five years ago with a five years' limit. Now they come before us and ask for an extension of two years. I suppose you gentlemen think, as you might readily think, that the idea of the promoters of the bill is that at the end of the two years the experiment will have been sufficiently established so that the States can attend and will attend to their own affairs; but not at all. Listen to Miss Abbott, the very able superintendent of the Children's Bureau, who has administered this bill, I am glad to say, with great skill and efficiency. The following is from the hearings:

Mr. NEWTON. Do you consider that the two years is sufficient?

Miss ABBOTT. Well, I do not consider it sufficient if it is to end at the two-year period. I did not think in asking that period of time that that was the intention either of the Secretary or the President.

Further on Mr. LEA of California asked her this question:

What time would you specify for a certainty that, in your judgment, the United States should remain in this work?

Miss ABBOTT. Well, I do not want to specify for a certainty.

Mr. LEA. Do you think four years?

Miss ABBOTT. No; I would rather say five as the time that the Government would without question need to continue the work.

So, gentlemen, if you pass this bill you are practically making this subvention to the States, for attending to their own affairs, perpetual.

I should like, if I had the time, to read what is in the minority report and bring to your attention the absurdity of the whole business. The very smallness of the amount of money involved, which is given to you as an argument, is, to my mind, an argument on the other side. Why, for instance, should two great States, New York and Pennsylvania—who pay in taxes to the United States \$900,000,000 a year, showing that they have ample resources to take care of their own children—be granted a subvention of about \$90,000 from the United States? The whole thing is obviously absurd.

It seems to me a pity that these gentlemen—who must know from a study of the Constitution that the domestic affairs of the State should be left to them, and there is certainly nothing more domestic than looking after their own children—should insist that those affairs be supervised and assisted by the United States. There is no more reason why we should give a subvention to the mothers and children than there is that we should continue to take care of children when they get to

5 and 10 years of age. There is no more reason why we should take care of the children than that we should supply playgrounds, schools, and everything that is required to bring these children to adult life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I appreciate the anxiety of the Members of the House to vote on this bill, and I anticipate it is going to be adopted by an overwhelming majority; but there are some facts, I think, that I ought to take the time to insert in order that men who vote for this bill may know exactly what has been accomplished in the five years since the law was originally enacted.

My observation and experience here in this House and elsewhere has been that in most cases gentlemen who inveigh against what they call the encroachment of the Federal power upon the States usually oppose similar activities on the part of the States back at home. So I think, in a large measure, those who oppose this activity on the ground that it is a so-called encroachment upon the rights of the States would be likewise opposed to the activity if they were in the legislature of their own States and called upon to vote on the question. [Applause.]

My good friend from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] referred to the fact that this created a bureau five years ago. The Children's Bureau, which administers this law, has been in existence for many years. There was no new bureau created when this law was passed five years ago, but the Children's Bureau was charged with the duty of enforcing and administering this law and it has done so with such signal success and admiration that the 43 States which are now taking advantage of it are almost a unit in indorsing it. [Applause.] The gentleman from Virginia refers to some constitutional inhibition. Let me call his attention to what is going on in the State of Virginia with reference to the administration of this law. In 1920, the year before this act was passed, the death rate among children who died in infancy in the State of Virginia was 84 per thousand; in 1919, the year before that, it was 91 out of every thousand; in 1918, it was 103 out of every 1,000.

In 1918, 103 children out of every 1,000 in the State of Virginia died in infancy, but in 1924 that death rate had been so reduced in the State of Virginia that only 77 out of 1,000 children died in infancy. That law has been so successful in that State that I have in my hand a telegram from Mr. Ennion G. Williams, who is the health commissioner of Virginia and the head of the health department. It is addressed to my good friend and his colleague from Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. In that telegram he uses this language:

I strongly indorse the Sheppard-Towner Act. It has been of the greatest help to our rural sections. It would be a disaster to give it up now.

ENNION G. WILLIAMS,
Health Commissioner of the State of Virginia.

[Applause.]

This is the verdict of the State of Virginia upon this law, expressed through the health department of that State.

Mr. TUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only seven or eight minutes. I would like to yield, but really I have not the time. However, I will yield to my friend.

Mr. TUCKER. I would like to say to my friend that I thoroughly indorse Doctor Williams's administration of his affairs in Virginia and that the number of hospitals and the number of private enterprises to save human life there are increasing and have increased every year for the last 25 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to know that. Now, I want to give some of the results of this law with reference to the whole country.

It has already been stated that 43 out of the 48 States have accepted the provisions of this act by making appropriations to meet the amount of money paid out by the Government. Taking the United States as a whole, in 1920, which was the year before the enactment of this law, the number of children who died in infancy amounted to 86 out of every 1,000 in the United States. In 1924, four years after the passage of this law, the death rate among children in the United States had been reduced from 86 to 71 per 1,000. This is a reduction of nearly 20 per cent in less than four years.

Mr. ANDREW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only a few moments, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREW. I wanted to ask if that does not prove that the death rate on the average is lower in the States which

have refused the Federal benefits than in those which have accepted it?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not true. Because only five States have refused to accept the provisions of the law.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman yield to me? The gentleman has yielded to others, and I hope he will yield to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHALMERS. I want to say to the House that I voted for this law in 1921, and I see no reason to change my mind. There are thousands of children alive in this country to-day who would not be alive if this law had not been passed. There are thousands of children in the United States to-day who now see who would be blind if the law had not been passed. There are thousands of children in the United States to-day who can walk upright who would be cripples if the law had not been passed. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman's question answers itself. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I can not yield any further; I am sorry. I would like to give the House the benefit of a few facts I have here.

In the year 1924 there were 15,547 child-health conferences held in the United States under the provisions of this law. In 1925 there were 18,164 child-health conferences held in the United States, making a total in the last two years of 33,701 conferences held in various parts of the United States to discuss child health under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for just a short question?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am afraid to yield any more.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I just want to ask the gentleman to give us the statistics with respect to the five States that did not take advantage of this law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not happen to have them at my finger's end, but they are set out in the report. There has been some decrease in those States, but in some of them it was small.

In that same period, 1924-25, more than 594,000 children were examined for defects in health, and not a single one of them was dragged into any health conference or any health center by the strong arm of the United States. They came there either voluntarily or were brought there by their parents, who desired to use this activity in order to find out whether their children were defective or needed treatment.

I will say further that these activities are carried on by the health departments of all the States. There is no imposition upon them on the part of the United States Government. The law itself provides that these activities shall be carried into effect by the State departments of health in all the States. There is no desire to be autocratic. There is no compulsion about it. There is no desire to impose this activity of the Government on any family. There is no Government midwife. There is no Government physician who is going around knocking doors down in order to force upon men, women, and children the activities of the United States. But these services are made available, and it is to the credit not only of the desire of our people, but to the success of this law, that more than half a million children who otherwise might have been neglected have been examined under the voluntary provisions of this law during the last two years of its operation. [Applause.]

There have been established in these two years 1,590 child health centers, through the provisions of this act, which are controlled and supervised by the health departments of the States. [Applause.]

More than 74,000 women voluntarily attended prenatal conferences held under this law.

My friends, I am as much interested in the forms of government as my distinguished and able friend from New York [Mr. MILLS]. I have no desire to see the Federal Government encroach unduly or unnecessarily or improperly upon the activities of the States, but while I am interested in the forms of government, I am also interested in the forms of humanity. [Applause.] I think the right of a child to be born perfect and to live in an environment of health is just as vital to the success of our country and to the perpetuity of our race as the maintenance of some form of government which we may use as a fetish every time some welfare legislation like this is put before the people of the United States. [Applause.]

My only regret is that this authorization is limited to two years. I would advise gentlemen of the fact that this is permanent legislation. The Sheppard-Towner bill is a permanent law. It only provided originally for a five-year authorization of appropriations. This merely extends the authorization two years, but the law itself is permanent law. Personally I would like to see it extended for five years, because I believe by that time the activity on the part of the States would have become

so permanent and so engrafted upon the health systems of the States, and the people would have realized its benefits so well that the States should then be able to stand alone in this great activity. However, the bill under consideration only provides for a two-year extension, and I hope it will be voted upon favorably, so that we may send out to the 43 States, and the other 5 if they wish, an extension of this opportunity to take advantage of this cooperation in health work on the part of the Federal Government. [Applause.]

I hope the vote for this measure will be so overwhelming that the country will clearly understand that this Congress is as greatly concerned with the preservation of human life as it is with that of the animals, and that we place at least as much value upon the life of a child as upon that of a boll of cotton. We have for a long time legislated in behalf of cattle and cotton; let us do our duty by the children, who are infinitely more valuable and important than any other thing on this globe. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced he was in doubt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fifty-eight Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The House again divided, and there were 218 ayes and 44 noes.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

DAVID S. MYRIE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which with accompanying papers was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State regarding the claim presented by the Government of Great Britain on behalf of Mr. David S. Myrie for compensation on account of the death of his son, Reginald Ethelbert Myrie, in the Panama Canal Zone on February 5, 1921. I recommend that the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises authorize the appropriation of a sufficient amount to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 5, 1926.

ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL ROAD CONGRESS

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with accompanying papers was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit a report from the Secretary of State upon the desirability of providing for membership on the part of the United States in the Permanent Association of International Road Congresses. The views expressed by the Secretary of State are concurred in by the Secretaries of Agriculture and of Commerce. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress, preferably by joint resolution, authorize an appropriation of not exceeding \$3,000 per annum to enable the United States to accept membership in this important association and such further amounts as may be necessary for the expenses of participation in the meeting of such congresses and of the executive committee thereof.

CALVIN COOLIDGE

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 5, 1926.

SAMUEL RICHARDSON

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and with accompanying papers ordered printed and 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 a claim against the United States presented by the British Government for the death, on November 1, 1921, at Consuelo, Dominican Republic, of Samuel Richardson, a British subject, as a result of a bullet wound inflicted presumably by

a member or members of the United States Marine Corps, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to me on January 11, 1924, and my message to the Congress dated January 14, 1924, which comprise Senate Document No. 20, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, copies of which are furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

Concurring in the recommendation made by the Secretary of State, that in order to effect a settlement of this claim, 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 \$1,000. 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, April 3, 1926.

(Inclosures: Report of Secretary of State, with inclosures.)

FARM PROBLEMS—REPLY TO THE EDITORIAL OF THE WASHINGTON POST OF MARCH 26, 1926

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the farm problem and to print two paragraphs from a newspaper criticism in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. In the discussion relative to farm relief I have listened for some practical proposition from the Democratic side. The only thing I have heard is either a reduction or a doing away with the tariff in order to help agriculture.

Now, I believe this agricultural problem is bigger than politics, and I believe relief should be given regardless of whether or not it benefits one party or the other; but let us see what taking away the tariff will do to agriculture.

As a farmer and student of this question for a good many years my view of the matter is that some lines of agriculture are reasonably profitable now. The milk business is in a fair way. Every farmer in the country has been helped out by the milk situation and there is a tariff on butter and a tariff on milk products and that tariff is working, because we are producing less than we consume; and butter is climbing up over the tariff wall and the price of butter is better in the United States than it is in the rest of the world.

I find that wool production and sheep production in the United States is reasonably profitable and the farmers who are in that business do not need relief; and I find that the tariff protects the wool industry and that wool and lamb and mutton are coming over the tariff wall and that the prices of these commodities are higher in the United States than they are in the rest of the world. I find, also, that the farmers who are raising sugar beets and sugar cane are reasonably prosperous; and I find there is a tariff on sugar and that sugar has to climb up over the tariff wall and that the price of sugar in the United States is higher than in the rest of the world.

Finally, I find that where there is prosperity to-day in agriculture, it is directly traceable to the tariff, and I can not agree with the Democratic Party that the way to right agriculture is to tear down the things in which they are now prosperous.

The best brains of both parties should be applied to this proposition. In my humble view we must make the tariff work on the surplus commodities of agriculture.

A few days ago I said on the floor that I am ready to put a bounty equal to the tariff on surplus products and also that the tariff should equal the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, and further that I am willing to refuse to pay this bounty out of the Public Treasury, but to collect it on the production of the articles affected.

In that same speech before the House I stated that agriculture had suffered in the last five years a loss of about \$20,000,000,000, and the next day I was criticized by the Washington Post in an editorial to the effect that such a statement was unfair unless I stated at the same time that all other lines of activities have suffered a loss since the high peak of 1920.

I now have the figures as to the other lines. The Department of Commerce has furnished me with all the figures on all the lines, so that all the evidence comes from the same source, and I believe the evidence is impartial.

In the first place, the Department of Commerce has made a census of agriculture and they have determined that there is about twenty billions loss to agriculture since 1920. Now they offer me the information relative to the situation of manufacturing plants, mining concerns, railroads, and other public

utilities, and take as a gauge of their condition the selling price of their stocks and bonds.

If all of these interests have declined in the last five years in value just as the land of the country has, then I will cease to say there is a farm problem but that the problem is general.

What I do find is that agriculture has sustained a loss of about 30 per cent of its assets in the last five years and that manufacturing plants, mining concerns, railroads, and other public utilities have increased in value, gauged by the selling price of their stocks and bonds, fully 50 per cent since 1920. This shows the unequal situation that must be adjusted, and I want to bring the farmer up to the high standard enjoyed by the rest of the American citizens and I do not want to bring the rest of the American public down to the level of the farmer.

I append the information as to the values for consideration of the House, and suggest that the Washington Post might take a different position on the matter of agricultural relief if they had real information on the subject:

[From the Washington Post, Friday, March 26, 1926]

FARM VALUES

Discussing the agricultural relief question, a Representative from Ohio said recently:

"Every county in my congressional district shows a loss of from 30 to 50 per cent in farm assets. My State, Ohio, shows a loss of about a billion dollars to agriculture in the last five years, and the United States around \$20,000,000,000 loss. Secretary Wallace's vision was prophetic and his despondency was warranted. Think of one class of our people losing as much as the national debt during the past five years, and twice as much as all the nations of Europe owe us, upon which they ask 62 years of time to pay."

Few persons who discuss the farm and agricultural question take into consideration the fact that all values have depreciated since 1920—not only farms, land and farm property, but all other property, including city homes, railroads, factory property, mills, etc. The depreciation is due not to a loss of real value, but a loss of apparent value due to the increased purchasing power of the dollar.

Value of industrial and rail stocks and bonds compared for the years 1920 and 1925, furnished by the Department of Commerce

(Average value stocks, 25 rail and 25 industrial)

	High	Low
1920	\$94.07	\$62.70
1921	73.13	58.25
1922	93.06	66.21
1923	92.52	77.15
1924	107.23	82.82
1925	138.21	101.16
1926	139.16	120.98

Separating the two you have the values of 25 industrials and 25 rails.

Twenty-five industrials:	Twenty-five rails:
1920 \$117.74	1920 \$58.32
1921 83.83	1921 52.03
1922 89.30	1922 57.98
1923 116.03	1923 65.06
1924 109.82	1924 61.09
1925 138.00	1925 78.05
1926 167.00	1926 89.00

Comparison of values of 40 leading bonds—half industrial, half rail—in 1920 and 1925, secured from the Department of Commerce

	High	Low
1920	\$64.18	\$57.36
1921	64.10	57.75
1922	77.47	70.22
1923	73.76	70.56
1924	76.06	72.15
1925	78.46	76.07
1926	78.59	79.60

WATERWAYS

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address made by Senator WILLIS, of Ohio, on the subject of waterways.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by Senator WILLIS, of Ohio. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Reserving the right to object, this was not delivered in the United States Senate?

Mr. CHALMERS. No; it was in Ohio.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

GREAT INTERNATIONAL WATERWAY IS WASTED TO FLUSH CHICAGO'S SEWAGE

By FRANK B. WILLIS, United States Senator from Ohio

Chicago's continued diversion of water from the Great Lakes system presents one of the most serious economic problems now facing the people of the United States. There is a crying need for serious attention to this greatest water steal in all history. Those who favor continuation of diversion of water from the Great Lakes system through the Chicago drainage canal profess to gain much comfort from correspondence recently had by the State Department with the Government of Canada. Careful inquiry into this correspondence discloses that there is no foundation for the flattering notion which the advocates of the drainage canal proposition lay to their souls. The reply of the Secretary of State to the Canadian Government gives no basis for the claim heralded in various quarters that the United States is defending the continuation of diversion at Chicago. The Secretary points out that the assumption of the Canadian Government that the withdrawal permit granted the Chicago district by the War Department would authorize increased withdrawals can not be confirmed. On the contrary, the Secretary of State does point out that under this very permit the amount withdrawn is to be gradually reduced to not more than 4,167 cubic feet per second.

AN INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM

The whole matter is interesting in that it calls attention to the fact that the unlawful diversion of water at Chicago is not a municipal problem, nor a State problem, nor even a national problem; but really is international in its scope. Canada has as much right to the waters of the Great Lakes system as the United States, and it is entirely proper that the Government of Canada should insist upon the maintenance of its rights.

Indeed, it has been suggested in some quarters that Canada might take steps in the assertion of her rights; that would bring to their senses those who are advocating the continuance of the water steal at Chicago. Plans have been discussed providing for the construction of a canal from Georgian Bay straight across the country to the St. Lawrence. If this were done, its effect upon Great Lakes navigation would be most serious. It must be admitted, however, in fairness, that Canada would have more right to construct such a canal than the United States has to permit diversion of water at Chicago, because by this action suggested on Canada's part water would not be diverted from one system to another, whereas, if the demands of the drainage canal adherents were acceded to, there would be a tremendous permanent diversion of water across a watershed from one drainage system to another.

The arguments being put forth in publicity material sent out by the propaganda organization of the drainage district, have reached the silly stage, as suggested in an editorial in a prominent Ohio newspaper. The argument is made that there is a lowering of lake levels because of shortage in rainfall in the St. Lawrence Basin. It is therefore urged that because there has been a noted lowering of these levels for the reason stated that therefore no attention need be paid to the tremendous diversion now going on at Chicago. In other words, if a man is suffering loss of blood because of a wounded foot he should not object at all if in order to aid him some self-appointed surgeon opens the jugular vein and lets the remainder of the life-giving fluid pour out.

It is undoubtedly true that there are fluctuations in lake levels due to natural causes, and that if there had been no diversion at Chicago there would have been some lowering of lake levels. This fact, however, merely accentuates the importance of decreasing this diversion to the lowest possible minimum. From every quarter evidence accumulates of the undoubted fact that navigation of the Great Lakes, particularly of Lake Erie, is seriously threatened by what has been going on.

ADDING ARTIFICIAL TO NATURAL CAUSES

It needs no technical engineering information to convince a man who owns a little cottage on the lake front and who built his boathouse, naturally on the water's edge, and now finds that his boathouse is several hundred feet from the water, that there has been a tremendous reduction in lake levels. Likewise the captain of a great lake carrier that formerly was able to load his vessel to 21 feet and now is only able to load to between 18 and 19 feet, has positive evidence that lake levels are being reduced.

People who are face to face with actual conditions are unable to look with equanimity on the proposal made by adherents of the drainage-canal plan that for their own selfish purpose people in and about Chicago shall be permitted to continue this water diversion, when it is known that such continuance means ultimate destruction of the navigation of Lake Erie.

Eastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania are the centers of the iron and steel industry of the United States. This industry has developed largely because of facilities for transportation. The ore of Lake Superior and the coal of Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania must meet somewhere if industry is to live.

INDUSTRY DEPENDS ON TRANSPORTATION

The Great Lakes freighter has developed the cheapest and most efficient system of transportation in the world. This transportation is cheap and efficient only when vessel captains are enabled to load their ships to the economic maximum; if they can take on only one-half or two-thirds of a cargo, overhead expenses remaining the same, it must be perfectly evident that freight rates on ore will increase to the prohibitive point. If this unfortunate time should ever come, the iron and steel business that has been built up in eastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania will be transferred to some other point. Indeed, one can scarcely escape the thought that there is method in the madness of some persons who are advocating the continued diversion of water at Chicago.

Lake Michigan is deeper than Lake Erie and would not be so unfavorably affected by lowering of lake levels. All of this might mean that some of these gentlemen have in their mind the idea that the iron and steel business should be moved from the Mahoning and Monongahela Valleys to some point around Lake Michigan. Anyhow, why are the people who chance to live in the Chicago district to be permitted to enjoy an advantage which the people in no other lake city can enjoy?

Why should they be permitted to imperil the health and threaten the industrial life of everybody in the Great Lakes Basin in order that Chicago and its environs should have a cheap method of disposing of its sewage? Shorn of all its verbiage, that is exactly what the proposition means. It is nonsense to claim that a diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second is necessary for navigation purposes through the drainage canal. So far as I know, there will be no serious objection to such diversion as is necessary for the interests of navigation. All engineers agree that 1,000 cubic feet per second is an abundance to take care of navigation in the drainage canal. Why, then, is it insisted that the diversion shall amount to 10,000 cubic feet? The answer must be perfectly evident. It is only for the purpose of creating in the drainage canal a swift current that will dispose of Chicago's sewage and enable Chicago to develop power at Lockport.

The people of the United States have the idea that the water power of the country belongs to the people and not to any particular city that may happen to grab it. The whole country is interested, and properly so, in the development of navigation of our internal waterways. It is most unfortunate, however, that the Mississippi Valley Association in its recent meeting at St. Louis committed itself to the defense of Chicago's claim for 10,000 cubic feet per second through the drainage canal. All that navigation needs is 1,000 cubic feet per second. Why should those interested in waterways seek to strengthen the waning cause of drainage-canal advocates by making the absurd claim that 10,000 cubic feet is necessary, particularly when this claim is in flat contradiction of information that can be furnished by any engineer acquainted with the situation.

While thinking of developing navigation we must not lose sight of the fact that already there exists upon the Great Lakes that which was heretofore pointed out—the greatest system of cheap transportation in the world. What folly to destroy this system in order to experiment with the development of another! By no stretch of imagination could the traffic going through the Chicago Drainage Canal approach that which now goes through the Detroit River. I am one of those strongly in favor of the development of inland waterways, but with such vigor as I may possess I shall actively oppose any such plan as that advocated by the Mississippi Valley Association in its claim for the diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second.

International comity, engineering facts, and a sense of decency and fair play demand that at the earliest possible moment the diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the drainage canal shall be brought down to the minimum required for navigation purposes through that canal.

It should further be noted that if water-power development is to be considered, vastly more power can be developed in the Niagara Falls region than at Lockport. The plan proposed by the drainage canal advocates means a loss in hydroelectric power development of more than 400,000 horsepower. The latest reports show that Lakes Michigan and Huron were 1.09 feet lower last December than the low stage of a year ago, which was 2.3 feet below the normal for 10 years. Lake Erie is 1.3 feet below the average of November stage for the last 10 years.

If this illegal, uneconomic, and selfish policy is to be continued, the industrial life of a great section of our country is seriously imperiled and millions of people are subjected to a burden in order that a relatively few in and about Chicago may enjoy advantages not vouchsafed to them by nature nor warranted by any law.

TRANSPORTATION RELIEF

Mr. MCLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SOSNOWSKI] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a radio speech which he delivered the other evening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SOSNOW-

SKI] may be permitted to print in the Record a speech that he delivered over the radio. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOSNOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I insert the following speech, which I delivered over the radio April 3, 1926:

It is my purpose to-night to visit with you for the time allotted me on the question of transportation relief.

Transportation is always a vital question. At the present time it is acute.

Transportation is as old as time and increases in importance as civilization progresses.

I shall confine my remarks to the matter of a deep channel connecting the Great Lakes with the ocean down through the St. Lawrence River.

The problem of this development has been proposed and studied for more than 100 years.

There is now such congestion of traffic in New York Harbor—especially during the rush seasons—that the Great Lakes territory is laboring under a traffic handicap almost unbearable in getting out to the markets of the United States and of the world.

The development of the St. Lawrence River for deep shipping is vital to all the people of our whole country.

Development of the St. Lawrence River means that the ocean shore line of the country will be practically doubled. Doubling the shore line of the country will have a tremendous effect on the economic growth of the entire country.

You will recall from reading your history that most of the great civilizations have been near the ocean.

Developing the St. Lawrence means moving the ocean for deep-navigation purposes inland 2,000 miles.

It means making ocean ports of such cities as Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Toledo, Cleveland, and Detroit. It means giving these great industrial centers ocean freight rates.

It means bringing each and every part of the whole country closer together, so far as transportation is concerned. And finally it means developing every possible water transportation that is available for the whole country.

The development of the St. Lawrence River for deep seagoing vessels is practicable, feasible, and workable, and there is an economic need for this development at this time.

I make the above statements on the best of authority, and first I want to call your attention to the fact that the St. Lawrence River is now actually being used by ocean-going vessels.

In 1925 the official records show that some 65 vessels, loaded at foreign ports, sailed in through the St. Lawrence River, on through the Great Lakes, and unloaded at some lake port.

The record also shows that these same vessels loaded again at a lake port and went back through the same route and across the ocean to a foreign port.

And, second, I wish to call attention to the fact that this St. Lawrence route has been studied in an honest and conscientious way by real students.

It has been studied from the viewpoint of finding the facts as to whether or not it will be workable with a 25 or 30 foot depth in the channel.

In 1919 the States bordering on the Great Lakes began to feel the lack of transportation facilities, so a few men from each of these States, led by Charles P. Craig, of Duluth, got together for the purpose of studying the problem of a way out to the sea.

After most thorough and painstaking study and research these men formed what is known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association.

With the information which they had compiled these men went to the legislatures of some 18 States, and after presentation of the facts and careful consideration, these States, by joint resolution of their legislatures, indorsed the plan of having the St. Lawrence River deepened for ocean-going navigation.

So the question of feasibility, practicability, usability, and need have all been worked out by men competent to pass upon matters of this kind.

When you first think of making the St. Lawrence River navigable for ocean-going vessels it seems that it would be an almost impossible thing to do.

However, when a survey is made of the facts the job of connecting the Great Lakes with the ocean by way of the St. Lawrence River is not a big task for the United States Government, not a big task even for the 9,000,000 people of Canada, and so not even a sizable job for the two countries working together.

May I briefly describe the St. Lawrence River for you? Starting from the ocean and coming in to Montreal there is 1,000 miles of distance. For all of this distance there is now a 30-foot channel. From Montreal on into Lake Ontario is about 175 miles. For this distance there is a 30-foot channel all the way except 33 miles, and for this 33 miles there is now a 14-foot channel.

Or, to state the matter in another way, there is only 33 miles left to be deepened to have a channel so that 30-foot draft vessels can come from the ocean down the St. Lawrence into Lake Ontario.

Lake Ontario and Lake Erie are now connected by the Welland Canal, which has a depth of 14 feet.

Canada is building a new Welland Canal. This new canal will be 27 feet in depth.

So when we analyze the situation you readily see that making the St. Lawrence River navigable for ocean-going vessels is not a big job. It is not a big job for two big governments. It is not half as big a job as the building of the Panama Canal, and Uncle Sam built that without having to miss a single meal.

The engineers say—and they are the best engineers from Canada and the United States—that the cost of completing the 33 miles of channel 30 feet in depth will be, in round numbers, \$270,000,000.

This not only furnishes navigation, but will put in the works and install the machinery so that there can be turned out a 1,400,000 electric horsepower.

The electric power is needed in both Canada and the United States.

The thing that appeals to me in this connection is that the development of the electric power makes this a bankable proposition. Some money will come back from this to the Government, as well as it being a benefit to the people.

Primarily, you understand, this is a navigation project, but it happens that power can be developed and that the return from the power will carry the financial load.

To state it another way, the St. Lawrence River development can be carried on without the laying of additional taxes.

Not so with the proposed ship canal route across New York State.

The minimum possible cost for this is \$631,000,000—all to be paid by Uncle Sam. The engineers say there is a \$30,000,000 annual upkeep and no by-product—electric power—to help pay the bill.

Then, too, this New York route has 179 miles of confined channel length from Oswego to the Hudson River. In the canal there will be 31 locks, and over the canal 82 bridges.

These bridges would all have to be opened every time a boat went through, and, mind you, this is not taking into consideration the way from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario around Niagara Falls.

If this is built, there will be 25 or 30 miles more of confined channel and a lot more bridges and eight or nine locks.

Now as to some of the advantages of the St. Lawrence River: A clever engineer recently said, "Nature never makes a mistake."

You rather feel like agreeing with this statement when you look at the map of the world.

I mean the round world we live on, not the flat one we look at and think about.

I am going to take the liberty to suggest that at your convenience you look at a globe and notice again the location of North America on this globe.

You will discover again that the St. Lawrence River does not point toward Iceland, as you thought it did, but toward England.

You will find that England is as far north on the world as the mouth of the St. Lawrence River.

You will realize, too, that the nearer you get to the North Pole the shorter the distance around the world.

All this is very simple and understandable, and it all has a lot to do with world trade and world marketing.

Detroit, my home city, is at the west end of Lake Erie. To go from Detroit to Liverpool it is about 400 miles shorter if you go all water through Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, then down the St. Lawrence River, then across the ocean, than it is to go by rail to New York City and then across by boat.

When you think of these facts—the location of Detroit, its nearness to the great trade territory—you get some idea of the importance of the St. Lawrence from the standpoint of navigation.

Nature did not make any mistakes when the world was made and North America given its place.

I think we ought to have thoroughly in mind the purpose of a deep-sea way from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean.

This purpose is to relieve that portion of the United States which now has no communication or connection with deep shipping. I refer to the Great Lakes territory.

You will recall, too, that this great agricultural country is the part of the United States at the present time that does not have the advantage of ocean rates, and all students agree that the ocean is the base for all freight charges.

If you will again think of the map of the United States you will recall that the East has the Atlantic Ocean, the South has the Gulf, and the West has the Pacific Ocean.

When the St. Lawrence is opened for ocean-going vessels, then the north portion of the United States will have the sea as a base for their freight charges.

A large portion of the food products of the United States is produced in the Great Lakes territory.

New England is interested in getting this grain shipped to them at the cheapest possible freight charge.

We do, however, produce a surplus of food products in the United States. They have to be shipped abroad to be sold. Better than 70 per cent of this excess is shipped either to Liverpool or northern Europe, so a low freight charge to our European market is vital to the whole country.

Vital because our competitors in this line already have a cheap transportation charge by ocean to these same markets.

The prosperity of the farmer affects the prosperity of all the country—the East, the South, and the West—and by reducing the freight charge on export food products we will serve all the people of the United States.

Some of the opponents to the development of the St. Lawrence route raised the question of national defense. They argue that if we join with Canada in opening up the St. Lawrence River it will endanger this country in case of attack or a war with some country other than Canada.

This contention is so absurd that it seems hardly worthy of consideration.

However, since it has been raised, I want to refer to it.

For over 100 years Canada and the United States have had 4,000 miles of unguarded boundary line; not a gun, not a fortress, not a soldier has been stationed on either side of the line.

Equally is it true that for a hundred years the two Governments have jointly been interested in developing the boundary waters between the two countries. Sometimes Canadian money has been spent making developments on our territory, and sometimes our money has been spent in development works wholly on Canadian territory.

The fact of the matter is that the channel used by the boats in the Detroit River is almost wholly over in Canadian territory. This development has been carried on under treaties between the two Governments.

So for many, many years Canada and the United States have, to use a common expression, had a partnership interest in the development of the boundary waters between the two countries.

The Welland Canal is wholly within Canadian territory.

Under treaty we have the right to use that canal; our ships go through this canal, and have for many, many years, without paying toll.

In the last war, before we got into the conflict, Canada used the connecting waters between Lakes Superior and Huron. To do this they had to cross American territory. Did anyone hear of the Germans protesting that these were neutral waters?

No question was raised on this subject, and no question could be raised on the subject, because of treaty rights between the two Governments.

Now our opponents, seeing that the development of the St. Lawrence for navigation and trade is inevitable, raise the question of national defense and hope thereby to scare the American people from this great improvement.

Surely, no one is going to seriously think that there is danger of conflict between Canada and the United States.

It is unthinkable that there could be war between these two nations.

Therefore to raise the question of national defense and put a burden of millions upon millions of dollars onto the American people without any benefits is proof positive that the opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence is purely selfish.

The fact of the matter is it will be a step forward in the national defense if Canada and the United States join in developing the 33 miles in the St. Lawrence River wholly in Canadian territory, for when we have put our money in we will have a title interest and the right to use freely and for all purposes.

This great St. Lawrence is not to be developed as a means of national defense but as a contribution to peace and good will between our country and our neighbor to the north.

It is to be developed so that our ships can sail to every port of the world, and those of us who have served our country in time of war know that if the American flag can sail the high seas, going to every port, that the danger of future war will be lessened.

The big, patriotic thing to do is to develop the St. Lawrence River so that the great Northwest can get out to the sea, to world markets, and so that our flag can be seen at every port.

SPANISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the vote cast by the House of Representatives to-day on the bill increasing the pensions of Spanish War veterans, 368 to 0 in favor, is unique. No matter how meritorious a measure may be, such a vote very seldom occurs. It practically never happens that there are not on roll call a few reported in opposition to a bill. The unanimity of expression of the House is the best evidence possible of the recognition by the Members of the merits of the bill in question. For many years the subject of increasing pensions for veterans of the Spanish War has been before Congress, but until this week those deserving veterans of a war concluded more than a quarter of a century ago have been knocking in vain at the doors of Congress for such consideration as their service deserved. It is therefore very gratifying to me

to have assisted in the passage of this bill. The Spanish War veterans in western Massachusetts have for many years been assured of my hearty support for the increases of their pensions. Whenever they have been mentioned, my memory harks back to Montauk Point and the haggard men of our section who were encamped there upon their return from active service in Cuba. Western Massachusetts has always been proud of its military record. I do not need to speak of the prompt service of our companies on the Mexican border in 1916, or their being part of the first organization of former State troops to go overseas in 1917. The veterans of 1898, many of them fathers of the boys of 1917 and 1918, have the same enviable record of service and of suffering. We have often heard the brevity of the Spanish War referred to. This was truly fortunate for those who remember the physical wrecks who were carefully nursed and brought back to Montauk Point, knowing that had their length of service been extended they would have been beyond the power of human aid. Much more could be said in praise of the men of 1898 from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and from the other States of the Union. Actions, however, speak louder than words. The action of the House, though too long delayed, is the proof of the sincerity of Congress and the deserved recognition of the veterans of the Spanish War.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker and gentleman of the House, this is a time many of us have looked forward to, and personally I believe this is one time when the Members of the House will almost unanimously vote for the bill we have up for consideration, known as the Spanish-American War veterans pension bill, or H. R. 8132.

The demand for the passage of this bill has not come from only those who will benefit by it but it comes from all classes who understand the real facts in regard to our Spanish-American War veterans and feel that they have been discriminated against.

Our veterans of other wars have been more generously treated than have the veterans of the Spanish-American War, and the bill that we are considering at this time should have been passed many years ago, for our Government should show no favoritism.

The veterans of the Spanish-American War were all volunteers, and it was known as the great volunteer army, as all the soldiers and sailors from private to general and admiral were volunteers.

When the President sent out the call for volunteers, they came from everywhere, North, South, East, and West. In fact, there were many more volunteers than could be accepted. There never was a more generous response in time of war for service and sacrifice.

This was not a war of conquest but a war to avenge the heroes of the *Maine* who were brutally killed in Habana Harbor and to put a stop to the oppression of Spanish autocracy in Cuba and the Philippine Islands.

Up to that time the wounds of the North and South over the war of 1861 to 1865 had not been healed, but when this great volunteer army came together from the East, West, North, and South, young men whose fathers had either worn the blue or the gray and many of them who had worn the blue or the gray themselves. The past was forgotten, the old scars were healed, and they were bound together as one, fighting for one grand purpose, led by one flag, and with the scars of the past healed forever.

If the veterans of the Spanish-American War had done nothing else except to heal the scars of the war of 1861 to 1865, they would deserve the lasting gratitude of our country, but while we did not enter this war for gain, still, as a result of this war, it is estimated that we did add possessions that came to us by reason of this war valued at more than \$8,000,000,000, while the estimated cost of the war was \$1,200,000,000. But this is not all. As a result of this war we have increased our export trade with Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands millions of dollars annually, and when this is all taken into consideration the Spanish-American War has not cost us anything in a financial way. The cost was human life for some, disabled for life for others, and untold hardships for them all, for when we stop to think about how that war was conducted, how the soldiers had to eat embalmed beef and many other things that should not be fed to even a dog, and when we think of their camp conditions we can not help but feel that the only mistake that has been made is that what is being done now should have been done long ago.

As has been said:

This bill may properly be termed an act of delayed justice to the veterans of the Spanish-American War and their dependents.

The reasons given for this are many, but personally I think the real reason was the fact that they were few in number compared to the veterans of other wars, but whatever the reason might have been we have a bill before us now that when passed will wipe out this discrimination.

There are some of the provisions in this bill that I feel should have been different, but I realize the committee has used their combined judgment in getting up this bill, and I feel it is a good bill and deserving of the support of every Member of the House.

Under the present law all persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States, including women who served in the Nurse Corps, during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits which so incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$30 a month and not less than \$12 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

Section 1 of this bill increases the minimum rate from \$12 to \$20 and the maximum rate from \$30 to \$50. It further provides that there shall be an automatic increase in the amounts now being received, as follows: Those receiving \$12 a month shall be increased to \$20 a month; those receiving \$15 to \$25; those receiving \$18 to \$30; those receiving \$24 to \$40; and those receiving \$30 a month shall be increased to \$50 a month.

Section 3 of the bill provides that those veterans who are now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless, or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of \$72 a month, provided such disabilities are not the result of his or her own vicious habits.

Civil War veterans are now allowed \$72 a month when their condition is such that they have become so helpless as to require the aid and attendance of another person, and this provision, therefore, gives the same privilege to Spanish-American War veterans as is already given to veterans of the Civil War.

Section 2 increased the pensions received by the widows of these veterans from \$20, the amount they now receive under the law, to \$30 per month (being the amount widows of Civil War veterans now receive), and also increased from \$4 to \$8 per month the amount such widow shall be paid for each child of the deceased veteran who is under 16 years of age.

It further provides that in case the minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless, the pension of such child shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability.

All increased rates under the bill, as applied to those now on the pension rolls, will become effective on the 4th day of the month following the approval of the bill.

Section 7 of the bill limits the fee that shall be paid to an attorney or other person for preparing or prosecuting claims under this law to \$10 and makes it a penal offense to charge or receive more for such services.

According to the records, the average age of the Spanish War veterans is 52 years. A few of them are below 50 years and many of them have reached the age of 75 years. There are now about 115,000 veterans and 22,000 widows and 14,000 minor children on the pension rolls. The passage of this bill will mean an extra cost of only \$18,000,000, or approximately that amount.

There is no expenditure that this Congress could authorize that would be more justifiable than the one that will give the Spanish-American War veterans the consideration to which they are justly entitled.

There is no question about the passage of this bill in the House; there is no question about its passage in the Senate; and let us hope that the President, in his wisdom, can see his way clear to sign this bill so that justice can be done to the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Spanish-American War occurred 28 years ago. It had a sudden beginning and a glorious ending. The veterans of that war have not had the same recognition as those who enlisted in the Government service in the other wars.

This bill (H. R. 8132) is intended to correct an injustice by liberalizing the pensions for Spanish-American War veterans. I am glad to give the bill my support.

During the Spanish-American War 400,000 soldiers enlisted in the Government service, and it has been stated in debate that the average length of service of those who enlisted was 14 months, while the average length of service of those in the Civil War was 11 months and in the recent World War 9 months. The average age of those who enlisted in the Spanish-American War is now said to be 52.

Under existing law those veterans who have reached the age of 62 years receive a pension of \$12 per month. The present bill increases that amount to \$20 per month and the maximum rate from \$30 to \$50 per month. The increases provided for under the present bill are to be automatically put in force upon the approval of this legislation.

Section 3 of the present bill provides for those mentally and physically disabled, helpless, and blind, and, as in the case of Civil War pensioners, makes it possible for the pensioner to receive \$72 per month under similar circumstances.

The pension for widows (sec. 2) is increased in the present bill from \$20 per month to \$30 per month, and for each dependent child under 16 years of age widows are to receive \$8 per month instead of \$4. The increases are provided to become effective on the 4th day of the month following the approval of the bill.

This bill has had the earnest and careful attention of the Committee on Pensions and is unanimously recommended by the committee, and I am glad to give it my support.

It has been stated in debate that the last report of the Pension Commissioner shows that the average annual pension paid to Civil War veterans in 1925 was \$506.25, and the average for all wars was \$423.67, while the average pension paid veterans of the Spanish-American War was only \$208.74.

I do not believe in this discrimination against Spanish-American War veterans and this bill is intended to correct that.

When the war broke out in 1898, immediately after the *Maine* disaster and the passage of the resolution by Congress, young men and old men from all sections of our splendid country answered the call to arms, and those who enlisted, it must always be remembered, were volunteers.

We are to-day, in a measure, recognizing their patriotic answer to their country's call with this belated justice.

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Speaker, the men who fought in the Spanish-American War are now of middle age, and some are beyond that period. Every one of them was a volunteer, ready to sacrifice his life for his country, and by their valor was written another glorious page in the book of American history. Notwithstanding the fact that this Nation has always been generous in remembering those who acted as its defenders, there has been for a great many years a discrimination against the men who served in the Spanish-American War in the matter of pension legislation. I am heartily in favor of this bill because it will wipe out this discrimination. It will establish a policy of like recognition for like service.

Under the present law Spanish-American veterans are entitled to pensions from \$12 to \$30 per month, depending on the degree of disability. This is very much less than we are paying to men who served in the World War and much less than we pay veterans of the Civil War. It needs no argument to show the inadequacy of the present law further than to say that a Spanish-American veteran who is totally disabled from earning his living can get no more than \$30 a month. When we take into consideration the fact that the cost of living has very materially increased in late years, it is probable that \$15 or \$20 a month 10 and 15 years ago was as much as \$30 a month is now. Many of these men are crippled and disabled from wounds, malaria, rheumatism, heart trouble, and other diseases which makes it impossible for them to earn a living.

The Committee on Pensions has now reported this bill, which I heartily approve of. This bill makes the minimum monthly rate \$20 instead of \$12 and makes the maximum rate \$50 instead of \$30. The bill also provides for automatic increases to those now on the rolls, as follows: Those receiving \$12 are raised to \$20; \$15 to \$25; \$18 to \$30; \$24 to \$40; \$30 to \$50. The bill also provides that in case of those who are helpless or blind, or nearly helpless or blind, so as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, the rate shall be \$72 per month. This is the same provision which has been made for some years for veterans of the Civil War.

The bill raises the widows from \$20 to \$30 per month and also raises the allowance for children under 16 years from \$4 per month to \$8 per month. This provision is particularly pleasing to me, as anyone who has brought up a family knows what a pittance \$4 per month is.

There has been some controversy on all pension bills as to whether a remarried veteran's widow, when she again becomes a widow or is divorced without her fault, should again be entitled to pension. The committee's report on this meets my views exactly. If the widow of a veteran remarries, she loses her pension. If she did not remarry, the Government would have to keep on paying her pension until she dies. Therefore by her remarriage the Government saves money. Now, then, if her second husband dies or she has to get rid of him by divorce for his misconduct, why should she not again be entitled to pension? The bill so provides, and I consider this provision eminently just and proper.

I am informed that the Commissioner of Pensions has praised this bill as the best drawn pension bill which has come under his observation. By its passage we shall assure the men who served in the Spanish-American War that the country is not unmindful of their sacrifices and that the Republic is grateful to them. We are also assuring every young man in this country that whenever he serves his country in time of war the country will remember him later in life, when he may need assistance.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard public men often speak of America's generosity toward the needy soldiers and sailors who have served in the wars of this Nation. I do not deem it an act of generosity when we provide and care for these men and their dependents through pension legislation. This is merely a just recognition of this country's simple duty toward the men and women and children who are the victims and sufferers of wars. This sacrifice the Nation expects and at times demands of its citizens.

I regret that we have been slow in recognizing our full obligation toward the veterans and their dependents of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion. Our moral obligation to these men and their dependents is even greater when we remember that the soldiers of the Spanish-American War were all volunteers and had so毫不犹豫地 answered the call of their country. Congress now has an opportunity to make amends for this delay of simple justice to these worthy veterans. The bill now before us, if enacted into law, will in a large measure at least help soothe the wounds so long neglected.

By the enactment of this bill into a law you will provide as follows:

Section 1 of this bill grants a pension of not less than \$20 nor more than \$50 per month to such persons and provides that those who served in the military or naval service less than 90 days shall have title to the pension if they were discharged on account of disability contracted in service in line of duty. This section of the bill also provides for an automatic increase of the rates as follows: The \$12 rate to \$20, the \$15 rate to \$25, the \$18 rate to \$30, the \$24 rate to \$40, and the \$30 rate to \$50. The percentage of increase as to all classes is exactly the same.

Under the act of September 1, 1922, the widows, remarried widows, minor children under the age of 16 years, and helpless children mentioned in section 2 of this bill are now entitled to a pension of \$20 per month and \$4 per month additional on account of each child, and such pensions commence from the date applications therefor are filed in the Bureau of Pensions.

Under section 2 of this bill the rate will be \$30 per month with \$8 per month additional on account of each child. Under the act of September 1, 1922, the widow has title only if she was married to the soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the date of approval of that act, but under this bill she will have title if married any time before it becomes a law, and her pension will be allowed from the date of her husband's death, if his death occurs after the approval of this act, and otherwise from the date her claim is filed under the act in the Bureau of Pensions.

If there be no widow, or one not entitled to pension under any law granting additional pension to minor children, the minor children will be entitled to the pension provided for the widow from the date of the father's death, if such death occurs after the passage of this act; and in the event of the death or remarriage of the widow, or forfeiture of the widow's title to pension, the pension will continue from the date of such death, remarriage, or forfeiture to such child or children until 16 years of age.

Provision is also made in this bill for the continuance of the pension in the case of a minor child who is insane, idiotic, or otherwise permanently helpless during the lifetime of such child or the period of such disability.

Section 3 of the bill provides a rate of \$72 per month for persons now pensioned or who may hereafter be pensioned under the act of June 5, 1920, or under said act, as amended, or under this act on account of his or her service who are or may become helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another

person, provided their disabilities are not the result of their own vicious habits; but it is also provided in the bill that no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home shall be paid more than \$50 per month under this act.

Section 4 of the bill provides that the increased rate of pension provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the roll or who are now in receipt of a pension, under existing law shall commence on the 4th day of the month following the approval of the act.

It further provides that further increase in the rate allowed under section 1 of this act, because of increased disability found to exist, shall commence from the date of filing application for such increase in the Bureau of Pensions instead of from the date of the medical examination. This section also provides that the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

It is also provided by this section that when an honorably discharged veteran of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition is receiving the benefits of hospitalization in any institution under the control of the Government, no portion of his pension shall be deducted for his care and maintenance therein or for the benefit of any home or hospital.

Section 5 provides that nothing in this act shall affect or diminish the additional pension to those on "the Army and Navy medal-of-honor roll," or reduce the pension of any other person coming under the provision of this act.

I have given you the full text of the bill as it is explained in the report of the committee. I am satisfied that no such false economy plea which served as the excuse for President Coolidge's veto of last year's pension bill will be tolerated by the Members of this body. Justice demands the immediate passage of this bill.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the provisions contained in H. R. 8132, which increases the pensions of those who served in the Spanish-American War and their dependents.

The average age of the Spanish War veterans is now about 52 years. Very few of them are under 50 years, and a large number of them are above 75 years of age.

One of the things that I have always advocated—one of the proposals that the Socialist Party has repeatedly inserted in its party platforms—is an old-age pension system which would give to all those who are advanced in years and who have contributed, as all workers do, to the material prosperity and wealth of the Nation, a pension which will assure them against starvation when they become too old to work.

The veteran of industry, as well as the veteran of a war, is entitled to that consideration. We pension soldiers because they render service on the field of battle, which is dangerous to life and limb. People understand and approve such pensions.

But under our present industrial system, service in the factory, in the mine, and on the railroads is attended with as much danger frequently as it is on the field of battle. More people are killed in our industries than in our wars. And more people are crippled in our industries than there are in our wars.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor reports that in 21 States out of our 48 there were no less than 599,781 killed or injured in a single year, 1920.

And in one State, Pennsylvania, there were 1,136,060 killed or injured in industry during a period of six years, 1916 to 1921.

In other words, there are more people killed or injured in our industries each year than there are in our wars. The recklessness with which some of our capitalists expose their employees to danger, because it is frequently cheaper to settle with the dependents than to install the necessary safeguards, is one of the saddest commentaries of our present industrial system.

Not only is the industrial worker exposed to the risks that the soldier encounters upon the battle field, but in his labor he contributes to the comfort and well being of the rest of the people.

Any worker who has faithfully labored for a meager wage for 20 years or more has created more wealth than a pension in old age can repay. He has earned the right to be taken care of decently in his old age. The workers have made civilization possible for everybody, and especially for the comfortable classes.

The argument very often met with in advocating an old age pension system is that it is up to the worker to lay aside enough during his working years to keep him in old age.

The trouble with that argument is that the overwhelming majority of the American workers do not earn enough during their working years to live on decently, much less to lay anything aside for their old age.

In 1919 the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics worked out a tentative budget which, in its opinion, was necessary to maintain a family of five in Washington, D. C., at a level of health and decency. The sum fixed by the bureau was \$2,262.47 (\$43.51 a week).

The budget was a modest one. It would provide for the family the following:

1. Nourishing food.

2. Houses in low-rent neighborhoods and within the smallest number of rooms consistent with decency (about four rooms and bath).

3. The upkeep of household equipment, but with no provision for the purchase of additional furniture.

4. Clothing sufficient for warmth, "but with no more regard for style than would permit one to appear in public without slovenliness or loss of self-respect."

Under this budget there is allowed one woolen suit, one woolen dress, and one winter hat every second year, but there is no provision for silk stockings or dresses, and no house slippers. The family could spend \$80 a year for doctor, dentist, and oculist; \$20 a year for amusement and recreation, and that, of course, leaves a vacation in the country out of the question; \$10 for union dues; \$13 for church and religious organizations; and \$52 for incidentals. A small amount could be set aside for insurance and car fare, but practically none for saving.

And yet, limited as are the things that can be purchased under this budget—denying, as the budget does, some of the little things that go to make life more than a mere dreary existence—we find that in the same year the average worker was earning far less than this minimum; that in the year before, 1918, nearly seven out of every eight wage earners were getting less than \$2,000 a year, the average wage being not quite one-half of the minimum wage, \$1,078.

Another budget, considered to be more conservative by some, was prepared in the fall of 1918 by the Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, which fixed \$1,637 as the amount necessary to support a family of five on "a minimum standard of health and comfort." This budget was scarcely above a bare minimum of subsistence. It was revised in November, 1919, to \$1,803, and in August, 1920, to \$1,988.

While the minimum in 1920 was \$1,988, according to this very conservative budget, it was estimated by Prof. Paul H. Douglas in the same year, that in every one of the 12 industries studied by the National Industrial Conference Board, with the exception of the rubber industry, male workers were receiving less than a minimum established by the Philadelphia Bureau. The amount necessary to bring up the deficit in 9 of the 12 industries amounted to between \$300 to \$700, or from 22 per cent to 59 per cent.

And these estimated yearly earnings in the 12 industries were based on the hypothesis that the worker would be employed the full 52 weeks during the year. As a matter of fact, this study was made when there was a good deal of overtime labor. Moreover, the figures given were but averages, which indicated that a large proportion of the workers in each industry obtained less than the average.

I do not wish to go into other features of this problem at this time, but merely to emphasize the fact that a very large section of our working population do not receive a wage high enough to maintain a decent standard of living, and that they certainly can not be expected to lay aside anything to help through the period when they will be too old to work, and when they will be confronted with the alternative of going to a county poorhouse or to starve.

I have referred primarily to the situation of the worker, but the members of the lower middle class—so-called—are not in a much better position. In fact, it is almost as precarious.

The concentration of wealth in this country, as a result of which a handful of the population own most of the wealth of the country—in 1915, 2 per cent of the people owned 60 per cent of the wealth—makes the struggle of the small businessman more difficult each year. Faced on the one hand by the competition he must meet with from those similarly situated, and, on the other, by the exactions which monopoly is everywhere compelling him to submit to, he never knows whether in his advanced years he will not find himself without means of support.

It is practically unnecessary to add that the ills which afflict the industrial worker and the small business man also afflict the farmer, who after a lifetime of saving and labor may find the home he has built for himself and his family sold at public

auction to pay the mortgage debt. The long list of recent failures of small banks in the Middle West bear eloquent testimony to the accuracy of that statement.

Because I believe it is cruel and unjust to expect those who have lived a life of usefulness, creating wealth for others and only eking out a bare existence for themselves, to suffer the indignities, the sordidness, and the misery of the poorhouse when too old to work, I have introduced a bill providing for the establishment of an old age pension system under the supervision of the Federal Government.

The letters I have received from all parts of the country from elderly people who find themselves on the evening of their lives facing the poorhouse and a pauper's grave—people who have had all they could do to get along on their meager earnings in all the years of their toil—are most heartrending. I can think of few things more miserable than to have to spend the few declining years of their lives, as these people must, with nothing but death to offer a means of relief.

At this moment, when we are prepared to do our duty by those who served on the field of battle—a duty which I am glad to perform, as the veterans of the Spanish-American War well know—let us pause to consider the plight of millions of others, equally entitled, equally in need, of our consideration.

I append a copy of the bill I have introduced:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

March 16, 1926.

Mr. BERGER introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 10387) to provide old-age pensions.

Be it enacted, etc., That every person who makes satisfactory proof before the authorities hereinafter designated that he or she (a) has reached the age of 60 years; (b) has been a citizen of the United States for 16 consecutive years; (c) has not been convicted of a felony; (d) if a husband, has not without just cause failed to provide with adequate maintenance his wife and such of his children as are under 16 years of age; or if a wife, has not deserted any of her children under 16 years of age; and (e) is not in receipt of an income from any source, exclusive of the pension herein provided for, which, for the 12 months previous to the filing of his or her application, has averaged \$8 per week, shall be placed upon the pension roll of the United States and be entitled to receive until death a pension from the United States Government provided by an annual appropriation by the Congress. Such pensions shall be graded according to the following schedule:

When the average weekly means of the pensioner from all sources as calculated under the act do not exceed \$8 per week, he or she shall receive a pension of \$8 per week; when the average weekly means of the pensioner from all sources do exceed \$8 but do not exceed \$10 per week, he or she shall receive a pension of \$8 per week; when the average weekly means of the pensioner from all sources do exceed \$10 but do not exceed \$12 per week, he or she shall receive a pension of \$4 per week.

Sec. 2. That every person claiming a pension under this act shall file with the Department of the Interior an affidavit containing such statements as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, who shall also make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 3. That in computing the term of residence above required, such periods of absence from the boundaries of the United States as have been undergone by the claimant while in the service abroad, either civil or military, of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, shall be counted as though the claimant had then lived within the United States.

Sec. 4. That in ascertaining the income above mentioned, account shall be taken—

(a) Of any pension which claimant is already receiving from this or any other Government.

(b) Of the yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to that person, which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used by him.

(c) Of the yearly value of any advantage accruing to that person from the ownership or use of any property which is personally used or enjoyed by him.

(d) Of the yearly value of any benefit or privilege enjoyed by such person.

Sec. 5. That in calculating the means of a person, being one of a married couple living together, the means shall not in any case be taken to be less than one-half the total means of the couple: *Provided*, That when both husband and wife are pensioners, except when they are living apart pursuant to any decree, judgment, order, or deed of separation, the rate of pension for each shall be three-fourths of the rate given in the above schedule.

Sec. 6. That the pension hereunder may be increased or decreased every 12 months, whenever the pensioner's income increases or de-

creases according to the terms of the schedule; and the Secretary of the Interior shall make all needful regulations for providing for this change of rating.

Sec. 7. That this act is amendatory of, and supplemental to, all existing statutes touching pensions, and all such statutes in all respects are hereby declared to apply to and to protect claimant under this act, precisely as though they had been in form incorporated herein.

Sec. 8. That the said pension shall be paid in 13 installments in each year in advance. It shall begin on the date when the claim is filed, and the arrears from that time to the time of the allowance shall, if the claimant be then living, but not otherwise, be paid in a lump sum.

Sec. 9. That in case any person entitled hereunder is an incompetent or is incapable under the law where such person resides, the claim for the pension of such person may be made and the pension may be collected for such person by any person or persons appointed under the local law as guardian, conservator, tutor, or the like, of such claimant.

Sec. 10. That this act shall be liberally administered to effect its purpose, which is to provide, out of the public purse, sufficient income for the old to enable them to enjoy the last remaining years of their lives in such freedom from the fear of want as they have earned by a long service for society as citizens of the Republic.

Sec. 11. That in accord with paragraph 2, section 2, Article III, of the Constitution, and of the precedent established by the act passed over the President's veto, March 27, 1868, the exercise of jurisdiction by any of the Federal courts upon the validity of this act is hereby expressly forbidden.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. HUDESPETH (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas), for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. KING), for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. EVANS, for three days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CLAGUE, for seven days, on account of important business.

To Mr. CULLEN, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. PERLMAN, for to-day, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. BRAND of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CRISP), for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Kentucky), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. DENISON (at the request of Mr. THATCHER) on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

And then, on motion of Mr. TILSON (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 6, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for April 6, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

Agriculture relief legislation.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10:30 a. m.)

To amend paragraph (d) of section 14 of the Federal reserve act, as amended to provide for the stabilization of the price level for commodities in general (H. R. 7805).

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(10:30 a. m.)

To authorize the construction of a nurses' home for the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum (H. R. 10355).

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

Legislation relative to labor disputes in the coal-mining industry.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

For the appointment of certain additional judges (H. R. 10551).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10:30 a. m.)

To repeal the laws authorizing the purchase of uniforms, accouterments, and equipment from the Government at cost (H. R. 3936).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Department of National Defense.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

(9.30 a. m.)

To amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended by adding subsection (f) (H. R. 10353).

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the act of July 5, 1884, relating to the registration of official mail matter of the executive departments (H. R. 8904).

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(10 a. m.)

To revise the boundary of the Yellowstone National Park in the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho (H. R. 9917).

To revise the boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park, in the State of Arizona (H. R. 9916).

To revise the boundary of the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park (H. R. 9387).

To revise the boundary of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington (H. R. 10126).

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the payment of the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, the payment of certain claims of German nationals against the United States and the return to German nationals of property held by the Alien Property Custodian (H. R. 10820).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

422. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, to remain available until June 30, 1927, for refunding automobile and cigar taxes under the provisions of sections 1204 and 1205 of the revenue act of 1926, \$5,250,000 (H. Doc. No. 290), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LIEHLBACH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 7. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes, approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof; with amendment" (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 4539. A bill to establish the standard of weights and measures for the following wheat-mill, rye-mill, and corn-mill products, namely, flours, semolina, hominy, grits, and meals, and all commercial feeding stuffs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10541. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate foreign commerce by prohibiting the admission into the United States of certain adulterated grain and seeds unfit for seeding purposes," approved August 24, 1912, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REID of Illinois: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 10962. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of sundry streams with a view to the control of their floods, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3890. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national arboretum, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3108. An act to amend section 2 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. L. p. 653), as amended by the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. L. p. 1127), entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the ex-

tension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor"; without amendment (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. J. Res. 37. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Territories and other possessions of the United States under the provisions of sections 3, 4, and 5 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor"; without amendment (Rept. No. 778). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. J. Res. 213. A joint resolution for participation of the United States in the Third World's Poultry Congress, to be held at Ottawa, Canada, in 1927; without amendment (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6422. A bill to correct the military record of George W. Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. APPLEBY: Committee on Claims. S. 3077. An act for the relief of John T. Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9606. A bill for the relief of J. J. Houghtaling; without amendment (Rept. No. 774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 10323. A bill for the relief of Lidgewood Manufacturing Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 775). 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 (S. 1828) for the relief of Lieut. (J. G.) Thomas J. Ryan, United States Navy; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 8174) for the relief of Ruth Gore; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1128) granting an increase of pension to Melissa J. Sheffield; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10970) granting a pension to Lydia Ann Henry; 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. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 10972) authorizing the appropriation of \$20,000 for the erection of a suitable monument or other form of memorial at or near Ebenezer Church in Effingham County, Ga., to mark the spot where the Salzburgers settled their colony in 1734; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 10973) to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 10974) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment thereon in claims which the Winnebago Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFFNER: A bill (H. R. 10975) granting the consent of Congress to the Missouri State Highway Commission to construct a bridge across Current River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 10976) to amend the act entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all the surplus lands after allotments," approved May 30,

1908, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 10977) authorizing an appropriation of \$70,000 for the construction of a bridge across the Trinity River and a road to connect therewith within the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation, Calif.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10978) to amend an act entitled "World War veterans' act of 1924"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10979) to regulate the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 10980) to authorize the leasing for the production of oil and gas of certain public lands in Carbon County, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MCLEOD: A bill (H. R. 10981) to provide for the incorporation of nonprofit and nonsecret associations of a national character formed for patriotic or professional purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 10982) to constitute a council of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10983) to authorize the issuance and withholding and secrecy of patents essential to national defense; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10984) to amend the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, so as to permit the Secretary of War to detail enlisted men to educational institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10985) to provide for a council of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 10986) to repeal an act entitled "An act for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1921, and amendments thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 10987) to amend the copyright act of 1909 with respect to radio and broadcasting; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10988) to amend the national motor vehicle theft act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 10989) to amend section 245 of the penal laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 221) requesting the President to propose the calling of a third Hague conference for the codification of international law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINY: Resolution (H. Res. 203) relating to the employment of certain retired officers of the Army; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the municipal government of Tagoloan, Province of Misamis, P. I., favoring independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, favoring the passage of the bill introduced in the United States Senate by Senator BLEASE, of South Carolina, preventing the marriages between whites and negroes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 10990) granting a pension to Richard S. Bacon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. APPLEBY: A bill (H. R. 10991) for the relief of Buchanan & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 10992) granting a pension to Margaret F. Plummer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10993) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 10994) granting a pension to Mary Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 10995) for the relief of G. B. Gibson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 10996) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Powley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10997) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Latch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 10998) granting an increase of pension to John Hester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10999) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 11000) authorizing the payment of the war-risk insurance of John Thomas, deceased; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11001) authorizing the payment of the war-risk insurance of Burton Holmes, deceased; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 11002) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Cragin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11003) for the relief of William L. Morris; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11004) granting a pension to James K. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 11005) granting an increase of pension to Susan McColgin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11006) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Morrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11007) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Edsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11008) granting an increase of pension to Lovina Printz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11009) granting an increase of pension to Barbara North; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 11010) for the relief of Frances L. Dickinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 11011) granting an increase of pension to Ethel Everts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11012) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11013) granting an increase of pension to Ella L. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 11014) for the relief of William Henry Greek; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 11015) for the relief of John Bowie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11016) for the relief of William R. Taylor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 11017) for the relief of F. M. Rose; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 11018) granting a pension to John Gorman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 11019) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Merrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11020) granting an increase of pension to Ann R. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11021) for the relief of Paul Jelha; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 11022) granting an increase of pension to Sue Lacy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11023) granting a pension to Catherine A. Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 11024) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Keons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11025) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Bigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11026) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Wentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11027) granting an increase of pension to Susan Wagener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 11028) granting an increase of pension to Alcindia G. Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 11029) granting a pension to Mary A. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 11030) granting an increase of pension to Jane L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 11031) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11032) granting an increase of pension to Martha Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11033) granting a pension to Sarah White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11034) granting a pension to Richard E. Hibbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11035) granting a pension to Woodson Dezarn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11036) granting a pension to Harrison Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11037) granting an increase of pension to William J. Gentry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11038) for the relief of James M. E. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11039) granting a pension to Tillie Sutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11040) for the relief of Frank B. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 11041) granting an increase of pension to Stephen H. Gill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 11042) for the relief of Don C. Fees; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11043) granting a pension to Emma L. Deam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11044) granting a pension to Roena C. Caskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11045) granting a pension to Grace Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11046) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11047) for the relief of William Childers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATRES: A bill (H. R. 11048) granting a pension to Mary L. Kirlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 11049) granting a pension to Cyrus Biles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 202) authorizing the payment of additional compensation to certain employees of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1633. Petition favoring and urging passage of House bill 8132, providing increased disability compensation for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1634. By Mr. ABERNETHY: Petition of United States Military Telegraph Corps—George A. Henderson, surviving member of United States Military Telegraph Corps—favoring the passage of House bill 6737; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1635. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Warehousemen's Association of the port of New York (Inc.), regarding Senate bill 66; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1636. Also, petition of Miss Margaret J. Brice and Miss Mary F. Brice concerning Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad Co.'s financial condition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1637. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of William M. Silverman, 185 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of House bill 7907 to increase salaries of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1638. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of workmen and manufacturers of the State of Washington, urging a tariff on shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1639. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of May L. Petter, secretary, and 97 members of Women's Relief Corps, Post No. 20, Ortonville, Minn., praying that Congress enact legislation at this session providing for increase in pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1640. Also, petition of the Izaak Walton League of America, Willmar Chapter, Willmar, Minn., for the establishment of a national park in the Ozark Mountains, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1641. Also, petition of several voters of Swift County, Minn., urging passage of House bills 71 and 7479; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1642. Also, petition of members of Dovre Lodge, No. 3, Sons of Norway, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 10, providing for adoption of metric standards; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1643. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 21 residents of Butte County, Calif., protesting against the passage of House bill 7179; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1644. Also, petition of 137 residents of Sonoma County, Calif., protesting against House bill 7179; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1645. By Mr. LEAVITT: Resolutions of the Woman's Club of Bridger, Mont., and the Business and Professional Women's Club of Butte, Mont., favoring extension of the provisions of the Sheppard-Towner Maternity Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1646. Also, resolutions of the Anaconda Anglers' Club, of Anaconda, Mont., expressing opposition to passage of Senate bill 2584, the Stanfield grazing bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1647. By Mr. LINEBERGER: Petition opposing House bills 7179 and 7822, or any other national religious legislation, from Mr. L. W. Jones, of Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1648. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, opposing Senate bill 2808, a bill to increase the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission to 13 members; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1649. Also, petition of George W. Brush, M. D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the increase of pensions to Civil War veterans, their widows, and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1650. Also, petition of the H. D. Bob Co. (Inc.), of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 8653; to the Committee on Labor.

1651. Also, petition of the E. C. Kropp Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the restoration of the 1-cent rate on post cards; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1652. Also, petition of the Motor Inventions Co., of La Crosse, Wis., favoring the passage of the McKellar bill (S. 3544); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1653. Also, petition of the Associated Service Clubs of Hoboken, N. J., against the present Government ownership of piers in Hoboken, N. J., and the increased taxation placed on the city of Hoboken; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1654. Also, petition of George F. Seibert, of Comstock, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Spanish War pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

1655. Also, petition of Hon. Louis A. Cuvillier, member of assembly, State of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 8132, the Knutson Spanish War pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

1656. Also, petition of Dr. Otto U. King, general secretary of the Seventh International Dental Congress, favoring the passage of House Joint Resolution 209, permitting the President of the United States to invite foreign governments to participate in the Seventh International Dental Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1657. By Mr. RAINHEY: Petition of the Women's Relief Corps of Pittsfield, Ill., favoring adequate pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1658. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of Hemet, Calif., protesting against the passage of House bill 7179, for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1659. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Driskell Post No. 200, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, by its adjutant, Z. T. Baum, urging the enactment of legislation raising the pensions of all Civil War veterans to \$72 a month and their widows to \$50; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.