

which to-day should aggregate eight instead of five billion dollars, the decline of our merchant marine, excessive tariffs, the unchecked growth of paternalism and bureaucracy, the suppression of crime, indefinite presidential tenure, administration reform, restoration of rule by the people, the loss of all vision and high ideals, the lack of basic policies, and the bold attempt to conduct popular government on the single doctrine of sordid materialism.

The Democratic and independent opposition can only dislodge the insolent forces in power by unity, harmony, and teamwork at every stage. They can rally wholeheartedly in support of many great and inspiring issues, such as those just recited. Strife and dissension will be fatal. They must proceed instead with the knowledge that the great body of Jeffersonian Democratic doctrines of liberalism in importance is greater than any of its parts; that the combined forces supporting them are greater than any element or group or individual. With the subordination of single, minor, and personal considerations, and with unselfish, united effort to fight for general reform can and will succeed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 7011. An act to detach Okfuskee County from the northern judicial district of the State of Oklahoma and attach the same to the eastern judicial district of the said State;

H. R. 8229. An act for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the sixth judicial circuit;

H. R. 8725. An act to amend section 224 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 9020. An act to amend an 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;

H. R. 9022. An act to authorize the town of Alderson, W. Va., to maintain a public highway upon the premises occupied by the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va.;

H. R. 9049. An act to amend section 227 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 9051. An act to amend section 1 of the act of February 22, 1875, entitled "An act regulating fees and costs, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 9052. An act to amend section 6 of the act of May 28, 1806.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 20, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, January 19, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God, we praise Thee that Thou art love. Thou hast taught us that the sublimest and greatest obligation of the soul is love. In the radiance of this virtue the humblest, the greatest, and the best men of earth have walked. So enrich our souls that out of them this gift shall flow until no shadow falls between us and our fellow men. O Spirit Divine, descend upon us and make us willing to help the right win and the best prevail. Take our gifts and make them Thine. Take our reason that it may ever seek the truth; take our will and make it free; take our heart and rest it on the bosom of the Father; take our imagination and merge it with the ideal of Thy beauty. The anchor of a good man is love! When at our desks, when in the forum, in the street, in business, or in the rest and quiet of home, may it hold. Amen.

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

MODIFICATION OF THE PROHIBITION LAW

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have to-day introduced two bills for the modification and liberalization of the prohibition laws of the United States within the limitations of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution. I have done so not with the conviction that these measures, if enacted into law, will solve the liquor question in this country,

but as a first step in a program leading to that end. The problem, one of America's greatest, will never be solved until the eighteenth amendment has been repealed and legislation substituted that will aid in the movement for a correction of the evils of liquor and not, as the present laws do, aggravate those very evils.

There can be no doubt that the increasing social enlightenment in this great country, and, in fact, throughout the whole civilized world, demands an elimination of the abuse of alcohol. I am firmly convinced that further advancement will make of liquor a social outcast. This is proper and should be the ultimate aim.

This great object, however, can not be accomplished by legislation. Some kinds of legislation will assist, but it is primarily a social and moral problem. Social advancement comes and must come from an awakened consciousness within the people and not imposed from without, as by a law adopted, at best, at a doubtful time and by doubtful means.

The most pronounced effect of the adoption of the eighteenth amendment and the methods resorted to in attempting to enforce the Volstead law has been to discredit the whole Federal Government and create a rising resentment against any participation by the Federal Government in the internal affairs of the country. This reaction, growing rapidly, is seriously handicapping the enactment of legitimate and needed legislation by Congress to regulate for new problems the very nature of which must be under Federal supervision because of their interstate character. But so far has advanced this rising fear of an increasingly powerful centralized government, largely due to direct and indirect results of prohibition, that public opinion, striking out in self-protection, is refusing to sanction even needed new legislation by the Federal Government.

Even the majority of those who to-day support prohibition under the misapprehension that it means temperance are rising against the tide of increasing Federal encroachment of the rights of the people in local and State affairs. The very principle of the sovereignty of the individual States, a most necessary thing in a country so large and diverse in its local interests as the United States, is threatened by this tendency of the central Government of usurpation of the functions of local self-government.

This movement of substituting the Federal for State government if carried on, and it will be unless checked by vigorous public opinion, will surely mean the dissolution of this great Republic, for it can not continue half republic and half autocratic. It must be one or the other. In the hope of starting the movement back to the basic principles of a republican form of government and put a stop to this trend toward autocracy I offer two bills, both designed to restore the original principle of the proper relationship between the Federal Government and the State governments.

One bill, under the provision of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States that Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce the amendment by appropriate legislation, provides that the definition of intoxicating malt and cereal beverages shall be left to each individual State.

The bill further provides that each of the several States shall have the right by its own enactments to determine who may prescribe liquors for medicinal purposes and the nature and quantities that may be prescribed.

It is an insult to the medical profession of the country, an unwarranted interference in medical practice, and a tragedy of conceit for the Government to regulate by law the discretion of the individual doctor in prescribing medicine. Why not prescribe the number of medical books in his library, the number of medical instruments he may have, the amount of disinfectants he may use in a given month? There is as much reason to regulate the limits of all medicines a doctor may prescribe as to single out one medicine—liquor—and regulate that. The amount of medicine that would be necessary for one doctor, with a small country practice in a sparsely settled community, might be grossly inadequate for a doctor in a city with a large practice. The amount necessary for a young doctor just starting his practice bears no relationship to that necessary for an older doctor with a large practice. The Government recognizes the value of liquor at times, for in a Washington newspaper of December 21, 1927, there appeared a picture of four sailors of the American Navy carrying four cases of alcoholic liquor aboard a naval ship to be taken out to the rescue ship *Falcon*, from which diving operations were conducted for the attempted rescue of those aboard the ill-fated *S-4*. Are there any such ardent prohibitionists that they would object to this means of combating exposure of those courageous divers? But if alcoholic stimulant was needed then, there are many other occasions when it is needed. Who

can devise legislation that can exactly anticipate each such emergency and prescribe by law for it? Now, either we recognize liquors as a medicine and then proceed to set ourselves above the medical profession in medical knowledge and prescribe for a doctor's patients by law without ever seeing his patients or we say liquor is not a medicine, but that we will permit the medical profession to be licensed bootleggers, only we prescribe the extent of their bootlegging operations. Either interpretation is a disgrace to the country and an unwarranted blight on the medical profession.

The other bill stipulates, also under the provisions of the eighteenth amendment, for concurrent enforcement by Congress and the several States that the Prohibition Unit of the Federal Government and its agent shall confine their activities to interstate violations, and that enforcement within the States shall be the responsibility of the people of each State. This is a proper distribution of the functions of both divisions of government.

The proper function of the Federal Government is to regulate matters between States, but within the sovereign limits of the individual State the people of that State should enforce the laws. This also makes for an equitable distribution of the costs of enforcement. There is no reason why the people of one State where the prohibition law is widely obeyed and where, therefore, there is little need of great expenditure for enforcement, are forced to bear a disproportionate share of the cost of enforcement in some other State, where public opinion is such that a great expenditure of money is necessary in an attempt at enforcement.

This is all wrong and entirely unfair. The burden of the cost of enforcement should rest upon those who cause the burden. If my bill becomes a law, the people in dry States will not be paying the costs of enforcement in wet States.

Furthermore, to-day when a great effort is being made to reduce the burden of Federal taxes, the cut in the cost of enforcement to the Federal Government, both direct and indirect, would be a very substantial contribution to the cause of tax reduction. It is estimated that the direct saving in the reduction of the appropriation for Federal enforcement of prohibition, if the operations were limited to interstate violations would be from one-half to four-fifths. This would amount to from six to ten million dollars and the indirect saving would be many times that amount, as well as releasing the Federal courts to a large extent from the roll—and stigma—of cluttered police courts to the important business of expediting Federal litigation. The position to which we have reduced our Federal courts is no credit to the people of the United States. The sooner we return them to their proper dignity, the better it will be for the stability of the whole Government.

You can not belittle and discredit the courts of a nation and at the same time maintain proper and necessary respect for its government.

There will be no enforcement until the responsibility for enforcement is brought closely home to the people locally. The Federal Government in local matters is something apart and detached from the people. There can not be dual responsibility in the matter of enforcing the laws within the States.

There will be neither respect nor "obedience to two masters." Either the States must enforce the law within the States or the Federal Government must assume the whole burden. The present divided system means divided responsibility and results in chaos and no enforcement. Let us stop playing. Either return to the States themselves the right and sole responsibility of enforcing the prohibition law within the States or turn the whole job over to the Federal Government and go about it seriously. Appropriate the half billion dollars a year that is necessary and really try to enforce prohibition.

Let us be honest about this thing. There is no prohibition in this country, nor can there be under present conditions. Not questioning the sincerity of the Prohibition Unit of the Federal Government, it is a physical impossibility to enforce it with the present limited equipment and number of men available from present appropriations.

I would rather, under my oath of office to enforce the laws of the country, vote for an appropriation of \$500,000,000 than for the present sum asked of twelve or thirteen million, which will simply be wasted in a Lilliputian effort to slay the giant.

I shall vote for appropriations, and for liberal appropriations to enforce prohibition while it remains on the statute books, but only so long as constitutional, legal, and decent methods are employed.

My oath of office and my conscience will compel me to refuse to vote a dollar if proof is shown that illegal, dishonest, and indecent methods are employed. I shall not support attempted enforcement if methods are used that are contrary to fundamental Americanism and the very Constitution itself.

Such methods as wire tapping, meter reading, inducing men to violate the law so that these men can be arrested for the sake of making a "record," merely show the desperation to which the prohibition forces have been driven in a futile effort to enforce an unenforceable law that is in opposition to public opinion. The recent election in Detroit, always one of the great law-abiding cities of the Nation, should be a warning to the people of the whole country. The fact that 48 per cent of the people of Detroit have come to the point where they voted for a candidate whose platform was that he would not even attempt to enforce the law is most significant. It should be the sounding of the tocsin! Why the people of this country are in virtual rebellion. It is not the fate of the cause of temperance that hangs in the balance, but the very continuance of this Government.

The United States is a hundred times more in danger of destruction through internal collapse as a result of the growing trait of national hypocrisy, largely as a result of prohibition, than from outside aggression.

Our wealth and enormous resources act as a protection from outsiders, but only accentuate our internal dangers. Never is there such need for individual and national intellectual honesty as in the face of great wealth and prosperity.

More civilizations have been destroyed in wealth than poverty; because the resultant easy life from prosperity breeds moral hypocrisy. On top of this growing condition in the United States we add gasoline to the fire by virtually legalizing and socially approving this hypocrisy in regard to prohibition. This spreads to every phase of our national life. The remedy is personal and national honesty.

Let us honestly face this prohibition question. A large portion of the people are in revolt. Let us either enforce the law or change it to meet the needs of the present social stage of the people.

While the law remains, put the enforcement up to the people by putting the responsibility up to them, or if the Federal Government is to meet the situation do it honestly. Admit the state of revolt, use the Army and the Navy, call out the National Guard, appropriate a half billion, or a whole billion if necessary, and either enforce the law or admit it can not be enforced. Anything short of this is hypocrisy, and hypocrisy of the worst kind, for it is undermining the whole fabric and structure of our social and political organization.

Why is this not done? Because the political proponents of prohibition are afraid of the test. They are afraid to tell the country just what it will really take to enforce prohibition. They are afraid to admit that they put over, under the stress and hysterical emotion of a great war, a law intended to be a moral reform before the people themselves were ready for it. The fact that such drastic and desperate methods are necessary to really enforce prohibition proves that the people were not ready and that public opinion does not support national prohibition.

But even if prohibition should be enforced by such methods—an army of Federal spies in our homes, offices, and clubs, supported by the armed forces of the Nation—granting that it did not cause the overthrow of our Government—it would not be desirable. Such prohibition would not represent any moral or social advancement.

If people are to make any strides forward in morality it must be by more than legal restraint, for if that restraint be suddenly removed then the morality goes a glimmering, and society is worse off than in the beginning.

True social advancement must be by moral education. Such progress as is thus made is independent of laws and can not be destroyed by a sudden change in the law. Some day the world will see total abstinence, but it will be voluntary abstinence not legal prohibition, and the great intermediate step toward that goal is temperance. Temperance is the moderate use, the elimination of the abuse, and not prohibition.

The proper regulation of liquor, such laws as are supported by public opinion and therefore can be enforced, coupled with unceasing educational work on the evils of the abuse of liquor, offer the only hope for accomplishing a real victory against liquor.

The only hope of the success of prohibition was that the next generation would know nothing of liquor. Who, foreseeing the actual tragic results, though, would have ever voted for prohibition?

The boys and girls who were from 7 to 10 years old when prohibition was passed and knew little, if anything, about liquors, to-day know more than the generation of their parents ever knew about it. To-day they not only know about it, but they know how to make it. They see it in their homes; they help make it; they are taught to circumvent and disrespect the law right in the very citadel of the sanctity of law and order—

the home. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Seymour Lowman, in charge of prohibition enforcement, an able administrator, recently said publicly: "The young men and women of the country form one of the most serious bars to enforcement." The children are not to blame. It is the generation that produced that condition and that refuses to correct it.

We should admit our mistake and be courageous enough to humble our vanity that refuses to admit infallibility in law making and turn about and start over in the right direction. The American people are not going to accept this stupid blunder that our penchant for making the world good by law has led us into. Perhaps it is as well. We would, indeed, be a spineless people to submit to such an intolerable law. The only way, however, is to enforce the law the best possible in the meantime and change it just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so. Otherwise the danger is that the people, tiring of the political Gordian knot, tied by hypocrisy and political expediency, will take the short cut and slash the knot by nullification. That is the real danger of nullification. To try to change the law is not nullification; and these alleged dries who set up the hue and cry of "nullificationists" against those who wish by orderly process to change the law display the most cowardly type of insincerity and hypocrisy. They know that the Congress that makes a law can change that law any time it sees fit. Is it any more nullification to ask for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment now than it was to ask for its original adoption? Not a bit.

The American Bar Association is asked by its committee on criminal law and criminology to investigate the prohibition law and its administration because, it reports, "the criminal class which has been developed to evade the prohibition law is engaging in all manner of other crimes" and that the "official protectors" of the criminals have to protect them in their other crimes as well. This brings on, the report said, "a general lawlessness with killings, robberies, and the rest, and with few arrests, few convictions, and a rising distrust of the courts and officials generally among the people." This hardly sounds like praise of the prohibition law and its results. Is the American Bar Association a nullificationist? Yet, we are told that any one who criticizes prohibition is a nullificationist.

The real purpose of crying nullification is to raise a smoke screen to hide the tragic failure of prohibition.

The thing has gone so far now that there must be a clean sweep, and a start over again. It is tragic that we have to surrender the results of a hundred years' work for temperance in which great strides were made, because of this assinine attempt at prohibition. Assistant Secretary Seymour Lowman, a few weeks ago, also told a gathering at the Luther Place Memorial Church in Washington that "temperance and sobriety, rather than complete prohibition, should be the keynotes of the dry organizations' campaign to uphold the amendment."

This is an honest confession. Prohibition is a failure and the amendment is slipping. We must talk, not prohibition but temperance, to save the amendment. But why save it? If it does not accomplish the purpose, why not repeal it, and openly work for temperance. Those who scoff at the idea of bringing back legalized liquor to fight the evils of liquor should pause and consider the great principle of fighting fire with fire. That is the method of fighting forest fires. The rampant fire is controlled by a regulated fire. It is the principle employed by the medical profession—vaccination. Liquor must again be licensed so that it can again be brought under control to fight the growing colossal menace of the illegal liquor traffic and the dominance of the bootlegger. The saloon is gone and gone forever. Even the repeal of the eighteenth amendment would not mean the return of the saloon. It is not the saloon we are fighting, it is its insidious successor, multiplied many times, the blind pig or speak easy. If we took one-tenth of what prohibition cost us and used it for the purpose of educating the youth of the country away from liquor, we would do a hundred times more effective work for social advancement than we can ever do with any amount for so-called enforcement.

This matter should be put to the test—a vote. If the sentiment of the country is so overwhelmingly dry, as prohibition proponents allege, then they should welcome a show-down, and by the voice of the people put an end to the question.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 672) entitled "An act for the purpose of rehabilitating farm lands in the flood areas."

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 19. An act for the relief of Frank Topping and others; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 341. An act for the refund of estate tax erroneously collected; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 457. An act to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 472. An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 496. An act for the relief of M. Zingarelli and wife, Mary Alice Zingarelli; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 516. An act for the relief of Minta Goike; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 593. An act for the relief of W. H. Presleigh; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 601. An act for the relief of James E. Van Horne; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 904. An act for the relief of Rosa E. Plummer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1113. An act for the relief of O. H. Chrisp; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1114. An act for the relief of James B. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1120. An act for the relief of Ella H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1121. An act for the relief of Grover Ashley; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 1133. An act for the relief of John F. White and Mary L. White; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1193. An act granting certain rocks or islands to the State of Oregon for park purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1279. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise and settle certain suits at law resulting from the subsidence of First Street east, in the District of Columbia, occasioned by the construction of a railroad tunnel under said street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1284. An act amending the act approved April 30, 1926, entitled "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"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1288. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William W. Danenhower; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1312. An act to change the name of the Utah National Park, the establishment of which is provided for by the act of Congress approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 593) to the "Bryce Canyon National Park," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1336. An act for the relief of Benjamin F. Spates;

S. 1358. An act for the relief of the heirs of George E. Taylor, deceased;

S. 1362. An act to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Harry Simpson;

S. 1442. An act for the relief of Brewster Agee;

S. 1542. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Scott;

S. 1543. An act for the relief of Kate Canniff;

S. 1622. An act for the relief of the estate of John Stewart, deceased; and

S. 1766. An act for the relief of R. H. King; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1795. An act for the relief of Fannie M. Hollingsworth; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1798. An act concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; and

S. 1801. An act in reference to writs of error; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Gunnison-Mayfield Land & Grazing Co.; and

S. 1959. An act to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy jurisdiction over oil and gas leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior on lands in naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1981. An act for the relief of the owner of Dry Dock No. 6; and

S. 2005. An act for the relief of W. P. Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2032. An act for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 2363. An act for the relief of Richard Riggles; and

S. 2365. An act for the relief of G. W. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. OLIVER of Alabama, is leaving to-day with the subcommittee and will be away until Sunday to inspect the Hampton Roads naval base and the S. S. *Saratoga*. I ask that leave of absence be granted to him until Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

NOTICE OF AN ADDRESS ON FLOOD CONTROL AND CONSERVATION

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise simply for the purpose of making an announcement, that Prof. Clark Mickey, of the engineering department of the State University of Nebraska, will speak in the caucus room of the House Office Building, on the third floor, Friday evening at 8 o'clock p. m. on the subject of flood control and water conservation.

The subject is the great one that will attract our attention during this session of Congress. Professor Mickey has given much engineering thought and consideration to it. I am glad to extend an invitation to all Members of the House, and others who may be interested, to attend.

ESCORT FOR NAVY DEAD

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter which I think the House ought to consider. I introduced a bill (H. R. 9503) on Tuesday, January 17, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to send a suitable escort with the Navy dead.

A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to provide an escort for the bodies of deceased officers and enlisted men

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to furnish a suitable naval escort to the place of burial for the bodies of officers or enlisted men who have lost their lives in the naval service. Such expenses as are incurred for this purpose shall be made out of appropriations provided therefor by Congress: *Provided*, That section 1587 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed.

At the present time the Army sends an escort with men who die in the military service. There is no provision of law authorizing the transportation at Government expense of the naval service to accompany the remains of officers or enlisted men who die while in the service.

Section 1587, United States Revised Statutes, provides:

Sec. 1587. (Funeral expenses.) No funeral expense of a naval officer who dies in the United States, nor expenses for travel to attend the funeral of the officer who dies there, shall be allowed. But when an officer on duty dies in a foreign country the expenses of his funeral, not exceeding his sea pay for one month, shall be defrayed by the Government, and paid by the paymaster upon whose books the name of such officer was borne for pay.

The above-quoted law is applicable to officers only. The Comptroller of the Treasury (11 Comp. Dec. 181), as indicated on page 905 of Laws Relating to Navy, Annotated, has held that this section—

was clearly intended to prohibit the payment of any and all expense of travel to attend the funeral of a naval officer who dies in this country. There is no exception or reservation in the statute; it can make no difference in what capacity the officer attends the funeral, whether in connection with a battalion of cadets or as an individual, the prohibition is equally effective and the expense can not be allowed.

There is no law prohibiting the assignment of an enlisted man to accompany the remains of an enlisted man who dies in the naval service. However, I am informed by Medicine and Surgery—chief clerk—that enlisted men are not designated for that purpose because of the fact that there is no appropriation from which payment of their traveling and subsistence expenses could be made while so engaged.

Article 1841, Navy Regulations, 1920, subparagraph 4, provides:

(4) The remains of naval dead shall be prepared for interment or for shipment to their homes under the supervision of an officer, who shall determine by final inspection in each instance that the work of embalming, cleansing, shaving, and dressing have been competently per-

formed, and that the encasement, clothing, etc., meet all the requirements of the occasion and comply with the terms of the contract.

The naval appropriation act for the current fiscal year, approved March 2, 1927 (44 Stat. 1289), provides, under the heading "Care of the dead"—

for funeral expenses and interment or transportation to their homes or to designated cemeteries of the remains of officers (including officers who die within the United States) and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, of members of the Nurse Corps, reservists on active or training duty, and accepted applicants for enlistment, civilian employees of the Navy Department and Naval Establishment who die outside of the continental limits of the United States, and former enlisted men who are discharged while in naval hospitals and are inmates of said hospitals on the date of their death; for funeral expenses and interment of the remains of pensioners and destitute patients who die in naval hospitals; for purchase and care of cemetery lots; for removal of remains from abandoned cemeteries to naval or national cemeteries or to their homes, including remains interred in isolated graves at home and abroad, and remains temporarily interred, \$75,000: *Provided*, That the above provision shall apply in the case of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who die while on active duty.

From an examination of the foregoing laws and regulations it will be observed that there is no existing provision of law authorizing the escort of the remains of persons who die in the naval service by persons thereof, nor is there any appropriation made by Congress out of which such transportation expenses could be defrayed.

The Surgeon General has stated that there has been a great deal of criticism of his service because they send no escort with the Navy dead.

The body of John Fennell, of Lowell, Mass., who died in the S-4 disaster, was sent by express from Boston to Lowell, Mass., with no escort. I know the Navy had no fund for that purpose, and I am sure it would be the wish of the House to provide such fund and that authorization be given to the Secretary of the Navy to send an escort with the Navy dead.

We have heard some of the Navy Department criticized by the families of the men who died in the S-4 disaster, but I want to say that Mr. and Mrs. William Fennell, the father and mother of John Fennell, and my constituents, in spite of their terrible grief have never uttered a complaint against the Navy and have never made a criticism of the care that their boy was given. The boy gave his life in the service, he worked for the service, he died in the service, and I believe his family has taken the attitude about his tragic death that every man who died in the S-4 disaster would wish his family to take. We all have reason to be very proud of John Fennell and his family. John Fennell gave his services for his country willingly and ungrudgingly. He gave his life for our flag, and he and his family have done nothing to dim the glory of his sacrifice. [Applause.]

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9481) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9481, with Mr. DOWELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL]. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, in August and September of this year I visited the Hawaiian Islands and at the request of the Secretary of the Navy I was furnished with the destroyer *Burnes*, which gave me an opportunity of visiting every harbor and every island of the Hawaiian group. Therefore I intend at this time to impart to you my conclusions and tell you what I saw there and what I think is beneficial to the Government.

The United States of America was exceedingly fortunate in acquiring the Hawaiian Islands. The strategic location, the fertility of the soil, and the character of the people living on them make this group of Islands most valuable to our country.

AMERICANISM PREVAILS THROUGHOUT THE ISLANDS

If there is any doubt in the minds of those who live in the States as to the loyalty of those who live on the Hawaiian Islands, it should be dispelled. True Americanism exists in

every part of each island, and only from the fact that the older generation of the Japanese require their children to attend a Japanese school after the hours of the public school, there would be no interference with true Americanism from even this source. But the Japanese boy and girl will soon rebel from attending Japanese schools and will become thoroughly Americanized and will discontinue the use of the Japanese language. The next generation, which will be the third, will undoubtedly populate these islands with a mixed people that will speak only one language and honor one flag.

DECLINE OF THE HAWAIIAN RACE A TRAGEDY

The greatest tragedy of the islands is the eventual extinction of the pure Hawaiian race—a happy, courageous, and lovable people, who gave the islands their essential character, who made them the land of song and poetry—but the intermarrying with other races is gradually decreasing the full-blooded Hawaiians. The passing of a race of people with such culture, charm, and lovable nature should be the regret of the Nation. Their place is being taken by part Hawaiians who in many cases have the high qualities of both races.

The Hawaiian Islands, composed of Hawaii, Maui, Oahu, and Kauai, which are the principal islands, together with Molokai, Lanai, and Niihau only sparsely settled, and Kahoolawe, which is uninhabited, secondary islands not under government of their own, make the entire group.

GOVERNMENT OF ISLANDS SATISFACTORY

The four principal islands are divided into county and city governments and all well organized. They have good roads, good sanitary conditions, and excellent water supply.

The capital of the entire group is Honolulu on the island of Oahu.

The entire group have the privilege of electing a senate with 15 members and a house of representatives with 30 members, who function similar to our State legislatures.

The governor and secretary are appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

While other officers and commissions are appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Territorial senate, the judges of the supreme and circuit courts are appointed by the President.

The district magistrates are appointed by the chief justice of the Territorial supreme court.

In addition to these Territorial courts, there is also a United States district court with two judges, appointed by the President of the United States.

The voters elect a Delegate to the United States who is a Member of the United States House of Representatives and has all the rights and privileges of a Representative except the right to vote.

The people of the islands are happy and contented with this form of government.

SCHOOLS PROGRESSIVE AND PATRIOTIC

The schoolhouses are excellent buildings and well equipped. The teachers are of high character, and the students are alert and busy as bees.

While speaking to them in the high school at Hilo, the person being at least 80 per cent Japanese, when I said, "I am not French, although my ancestors were, and you are not Japanese or Hawaiians, although your ancestors are; you and I alike are Americans and should follow the Stars and Stripes," I received strong applause, and I am sure that Americanism will progress in the islands and be supported by all racial groups. [Applause.]

SUGAR AND PINEAPPLES TWO BASIC INDUSTRIES

The two basic industries are sugar and pineapples. The sugar grows in the valleys or level land and requires vast quantities of water and fertilization, while the pineapple grows on the high land, or mountain side, needs no irrigation, and very limited fertilization.

In raising pineapples, after the land is prepared and planted, mulch paper to a large extent is placed over the entire field. The pineapples are planted through the paper. The paper serves to hold the moisture in the ground and keeps the weeds from growing, and after the crop is harvested it acts as a fertilizer. The first crop of pineapples matures in from 20 to 22 months; the two succeeding crops will follow and mature in 12 months without replanting. Plantations usually produce but one staple crop.

The sugar industry has grown by leaps and bounds during the past 32 years. In 1895 the production of sugar was 150,000 tons, while in 1926 it was 787,246 tons, and is estimated to exceed 800,000 tons in 1927. The valuation of this crop is \$67,872,940.

During all this period the sugar industry has had the benefit of a protective tariff.

The planters have formed a cooperative working agreement with labor, which has been very beneficial. They have organized experiment stations, which have played an important part in its growth.

FERTILE SOIL AND IRRIGATION NECESSARY FOR SUGAR RAISING

The fertility of the soil has also made sugar very productive. The price of sugar affects the prosperity of the islands. When the commercial value reaches 4½ cents per pound everybody becomes prosperous, because the planter divides the profits with the employee, and each of them participates in the prosperity.

On one sugar plantation, and not one of the best, I saw the records. The cost charged against the plantation for producing sugar was \$397 per acre. The gross receipts were \$603 per acre, showing a net profit of \$206 per acre in 18 months.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Is all of it cane sugar or is some of it beet sugar?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. All cane sugar.

I quote these figures to indicate the true value of the land. However, this large production has not come about without a great outlay of money for irrigation, without which much of the land would not produce sugar at all.

It takes large quantities of water, which is obtained from two sources—mountain streams by means of ditches and underground basins by means of wells and pumps.

I had the opportunity of going down in one of the wells of the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co. This well is situated 120 feet above sea level. The pumping units are installed in underground chambers at the bottom of a vertical shaft which is 115 feet deep. The size of the shaft is 8 by 14 feet; the underground chambers are 22 by 35 feet, with an 11-foot ceiling, all lined with reinforced concrete 8 inches thick.

One hundred and forty feet of tunnel underground brings the water to a central basin and by pumps 40,000,000 gallons of water every 24 hours is raised to the surface and used for irrigation purposes.

While at the bottom of this well, having descended in an Otis elevator, I found myself 115 feet underground with living conditions as good as on top and a much more delightful temperature.

This well alone cost \$150,000, and there are more than 300 irrigation wells of similar type on the islands.

PINEAPPLE INDUSTRY OF RECENT GROWTH

While this history of sugar runs back for a hundred years, the Hawaiian pineapple is of recent growth. During the last 25 years it has grown from nothing to \$35,000,000 per year.

Hawaii leads the world both in quality and production of canned pineapple. Oahu Island has always been the center of pineapple production, but to-day pineapple companies are operating on each island.

ISLANDS ARE PROFITABLE TO UNITED STATES

Besides these two industries, coffee, rice, and bananas thrive. Livestock is also one of the principal industries. In fact, all available land is being utilized for agriculture, which is making the islands extremely rich and an important asset to the United States Government not only from a tax-paying standpoint but from a trading standpoint. They buy extensively from the States. The income tax from the islands in 1926 amounted to \$6,797,074, and customs receipts for that year amounted to \$1,748,241.

This summary is given for the purpose of showing the necessity for the development of the harbors of these islands. The future prosperity of the Territory of Hawaii depends upon two things: First, a protective tariff; and second, transportation by sea and by individual railroads and highways on each island.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think it would be interesting to state at this point in the gentleman's speech that, since the United States has taken over the islands of Hawaii, the Government has expended there for public works something more than \$16,000,000, exclusive of expenditures for the Army and for the Navy. During the same period there has been paid into the United States Treasury from the customs receipt and as income taxes from the Hawaiian Islands more than \$126,000,000. So, financially, the people of the United States are something more than \$110,000,000 to the good in the taking over of the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman spoke about the stock-raising industry in the Territory of Hawaii. I simply want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the largest herd of registered cattle anywhere is on the Parker ranch in Hawaii.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes; the Parker ranch.

EACH ISLAND SHOULD HAVE A GOOD HARBOR

I have visited every harbor of any consequence on the islands, and after a careful survey of the respective islands I have come to the conclusion that each of the principal islands should have at least one well-developed harbor, with a full depth of 35 feet, safeguarded with a breakwater, and equipped with sufficient terminals to accommodate all boats, regardless of size, that may desire to enter the harbor. The Government should do its part on these harbors and at once, because the Territorial government is already doing its share. They are building terminals in anticipation of the deepening of the harbors. I shall, for your information, take up each of these harbors and give you a vision of the possibility of each one: Hilo Harbor, at the city of Hilo, on the east coast of the island of Hawaii, is a large and excellent harbor, but it needs the completion of the breakwater, which, when completed, will be 10,300 feet in length. Seven thousand nine hundred and sixty feet of this breakwater has been built, leaving a balance of 2,340 feet to complete the project. The dredging to make this channel 35 feet in depth is proceeding slowly. The development of this, the largest island, depends upon the building of Hilo Harbor and two additional small harbors, one on the south and one on the west coast. The city and Territorial governments have done more than their share in building terminals and advancing money for other purposes.

Kahului Harbor, serving the island of Maui at Wailuku, is a small harbor, but when completed will be adequate to take care of the commerce of the central part of the islands, which is growing rapidly, consisting of sugar, pineapples, and livestock.

At the present time there is one large terminal, with sunken freight tracks, conveyors, and well-equipped wharfage for loading and unloading, but it is not sufficient to accommodate the commerce. So the Territorial government is adding to the present wharf and is building another terminal on the opposite side of the harbor in anticipation of the Government making the appropriation of \$1,250,000 to complete the breakwater so as to leave a clear opening of 600 feet at the entrance and dredge the harbor to a uniform depth of 35 feet. Early completion of this harbor will be of great assistance to the future prosperity and industry of the island.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield again just there?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does not the gentleman agree that if these harbors he speaks of were developed it would so materially add to the health and income of the people of Hawaii, and consequently increase the receipts of the Treasury of the United States as to soon pay for the developments?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Four times over.

KAUAI ISLAND GARDEN SPOT OF GROUP

Kauai Island is the farthest from mainland and is in fact the garden spot of the Hawaiian group. It has 547 square miles of mountains, canyons, and plateaus, wonderful seashore, and a number of beautiful beaches. It has three distinct harbors, but none of sufficient size or with facilities to accommodate commerce.

So it has been decided to complete the Nawiliwili Harbor, which requires the extension of its breakwater and deepening the channel.

The Territorial government is now building wharves and terminals, using the dredging material to make land for commercial purposes. When this harbor is completed it will be one of the best, will take care of all of the commerce of the island, and will attract large vessels that do not stop at the island at the present time.

HONOLULU HARBOR USED BY ARMY AND NAVY

Honolulu Harbor is the main shipping harbor of the entire group of islands, and of course it takes care of most of the incoming and outgoing freight; besides it accommodates all of the Pacific passenger boats and is used by the Navy and Army to a large extent. It is already crowded, and with the growth of Honolulu its capacity will be inadequate. Private interests have already dredged a channel 100 feet in width and 2,800 feet in length, connecting Honolulu Harbor with Kapalama Basin.

This channel should be 400 feet in width and 3,000 feet in length. It will cost approximately \$775,000 to complete this

work, but I regard it as a necessity and a project that should receive the attention of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Congress of the United States.

By making this connection it will give opportunity for immediate needed wharfage and a future building plan. The Territorial government is prepared to build the wharves and terminals and do additional dredging whenever and wherever it is necessary.

No city the size of Honolulu has been so progressive in building terminals of the latest design.

The Aloha Pier, which is just being completed, is a gem and would be a credit to any city in the United States. We should encourage such wonderful enterprise.

PEARL HARBOR

Pearl Harbor is a Navy base, yet it is not a Navy base.

Three harbors exist within a radius of 10 miles in length. Honolulu Harbor is quite restricted as to area, but the Territorial government has built a number of splendid wharves and piers, which accommodate the very considerable in-and-out traffic and are particularly useful for liners which are in port but a short time and discharge their cargo hurriedly in order that they may be on their way.

Recently private interests have cut a channel 100 feet wide from Honolulu Harbor proper to Kapalama Basin, another area of water equally as large as Honolulu Harbor. The channel itself, leading from the sea to this area, is called Kalihi Channel.

This for immediate use, as I have stated previously, should be cut 300 feet in width exclusive of the 100 feet already completed. The time will come when it should be 1,000 feet in width and should be extended in a general westerly direction into Kalihi Harbor as necessity requires, with the possibility that it may even at some future date reach Pearl Harbor on which the naval base is located.

By promoting a project of this kind the cost would be comparatively small because the material dredged could be placed on flat land and it would almost pay for the labor. The land that could be made by this construction of the extended Kalihi Harbor and channel outlet into the ocean would accommodate in and out shipping and such industry as requires water front in connection with ocean shipment.

Pearl Lochs, which make up the naval harbor known as Pearl Harbor, form a beautiful sheet of water; which, however, is somewhat deceptive from the deep ship point of view in that a great part of the lochs is still in shallow water.

The entrance to the lochs was originally quite shallow and the channel crooked.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. I fully agree with the gentleman as to the development of Pearl Harbor. Has there been any estimate of cost made as to the development of the other harbors which the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. They are all projects that have already been passed upon. The only thing remaining is to get the necessary appropriation.

Mr. ARNOLD. An estimate of cost has been made?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Contracts have been recently let for deepening and straightening this channel in order that it may accommodate capital ships, which have not heretofore been able to come to the navy yard.

This channel will be 600 feet wide and 45 feet deep from the entrance bar to a point opposite Fort Kamehameha where the swell no longer exists and from which point it will be 40 feet deep to the navy yard and a turning basin just west of the navy yard between the navy yard and Ford Island, which is the Navy aviation center.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman perhaps is also aware that at the present time it is not possible to take into the harbor, under its own steam, a major naval vessel.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. That is correct.

From the navy yard and turning basin the channel loops entirely around Ford Island with a depth of 35 feet, so that deep-draft ships will be enabled to come not only to the navy yard but to navigate entirely around Ford Island, as there is some additional deep water available to anchor in all of the upper part of the East Loch.

This channel will be very helpful but will not give a sufficient expanse of water for the whole fleet. And additional dredging should be prosecuted even after this channel is completed in order that there may be area for fleet assembly in time of stress.

The Fort Kamehameha Reservation borders the ocean on the Honolulu side at Pearl Harbor and extends for 3 miles along

the beach. Most of this area is swamp land which the dredging operation will reclaim. When this land is reclaimed it will make a wonderful aviation field for the Army. An appropriation to purchase this site for Army aviation should be made.

The principal reason why long-distance overseas efforts have not proceeded beyond the Hawaiian Islands lies in the fact that there is no sufficient long take-off for planes heavily loaded with fuel as they must be for a flight of several thousand miles. So, by perfecting this field with dredging this will be accomplished.

NAVAL BASE OF FIRST IMPORTANCE

Our naval base is an outstanding reason for our acquisition of the islands, advancing the defense of the Pacific coast as it does more than 2,000 miles into the Pacific Ocean. The work that is being done is converting a site for a naval base, putting it actually into a naval base, but much remains to be done and appropriations should be generous and continuous until an adequate base is established. Otherwise, the country is unjustified in maintaining as it does a very considerable portion of the Army on the island of Oahu.

The naval base is, at the present time, sorely in need of berths for ships along the navy yard water front. There is now but one considerable wharf in front of the shops for ship-repair purposes, and ships must be brought close to the shops for materials and for labor for economical repair and upkeep. There should be forthcoming in the next appropriation bill funds for a ship-repair basin. The shops are fairly adequate for the time being, but they must in time be extended to meet the conditions.

There are two things that must be settled and at once: First, the improvement of the water front, and second, the settlement of the question as to Ford Island for aviation purposes.

THE NAVY SHOULD HAVE EXCLUSIVE USE OF FORD ISLAND

At the present time the War and Navy Departments are using Ford Island for a flying field. The growth of aviation has been so rapid and it is now so well recognized as an arm of defense that arrangements must be made to use it for the protection of the islands. The number of projects for both the Army and Navy are such as to cover for each more space than is available on Ford Island. So, it is my belief that the Army, which is well supplied with land, should be moved off Ford Island entirely and it should be given up to the Navy for their exclusive use. Ford Island will furnish none too great facilities for an assembly, repair, and training base for the Navy. Besides, it is in the midst of the Navy activities, and true economy requires that the naval air base be adjacent to the navy yard in order that facilities there may be available without duplication.

I would suggest that the Navy should have full jurisdiction within the limits of Pearl Loch.

In Pearl Harbor, at the present time, there is one dry dock of sufficient size to dock the largest warships, and one small marine railway suitable only for such craft as submarines.

So there should be additional dry-dock equipment to accommodate all of the ships that go to Pearl Harbor. It is true that there are many shallow areas in Pearl Harbor which must eventually be used by dredging them to the depth necessary.

In the development of Pearl Harbor ship berths will be made by exactly the reverse process to that used in ordinary commercial harbors, where piers are in general carried out from the fast land, thus encroaching upon the water area.

At Pearl Harbor such cuts will be made by dredging into the shoal areas or even into the fast land in some cases, and the dredging spoil must either be carried to sea or deposited in low areas lying well back of the present water front.

COMPLETION OF NAVY BASE MEANS SAFETY OF PACIFIC COAST

It is the belief of those who are well posted on Pearl Harbor that every available area will be needed for the fleet. It is my belief that the United States Government should not delay in completing the depth of the channels leading to the harbor and deepening the harbor to its full area, increasing the capacity of the wharves, building the necessary slips for berthing of vessels, increasing the shops to the strength necessary to take care of up-to-date naval base, moving the Army from Ford Island, and giving the entire island to the Navy, completing the necessary buildings out of cement, and conclude by making this the greatest Navy base of the world. And I can assure the Congress of the United States, if this is done, this Nation will be safe from any attack in the Pacific. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me now, please?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I have been much interested and much pleased with the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House and as the chairman of its subcommittee on yards and

docks, and after having carefully inspected Pearl Harbor on two different occasions and studied the needs thereof, I commend the speech of the gentleman from the State of Illinois to the careful consideration of every Member of this House. The gentleman has the facts, he has presented them in a fine and splendid way, and in such a way as to reflect credit upon a Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman prefaced his remarks—and they were full of information for the House—with a statement that the Secretary of the Navy had kindly furnished him—

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I did not say that. Do not put that in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. Or that the Navy—

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I did not say that. I said at the instigation of the Secretary of the Navy I was furnished with it. Do not misquote me, please.

Mr. BLANTON. At the instigation of Secretary Wilbur?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I did not say that.

Mr. BLANTON. At the instigation of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I did not say that.

Mr. BLANTON. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Just repeat my words and not anything else. Do not put anything in the RECORD that I did not say.

Mr. BLANTON. Whatever the gentleman said, he said he was furnished with the destroyer *Burnes*.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I will cease to yield if you try to put something in the RECORD I did not say.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I decline to yield further.

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

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Not on that basis.

Mr. BLANTON. I will get my own time directly to discuss the matter.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. All right.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Newton] six minutes.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to the appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission. We all realize that rate making is a legislative function. We can not do that ourselves, and so we have created the Interstate Commerce Commission as our agent for that purpose. The commission being our agent, we ought to be extremely solicitous about the way the commission is furnished in the way of funds to carry out our work. During the past five or six years there has been considerable trouble with the Director of the Budget in not allowing to the commission the funds the commission requested. There has been considerable progress made from time to time in raising the Budget figures. That has been largely due to the work of the subcommittee and the support the House has given it in overriding the Budget. The Budget has gradually become more liberal, but there is still room for improvement. This year the commission requested \$81,000 more than what was in the Budget estimate for 25 more attorney-examiners, so that they could keep up more currently with their own work. The figures show, as will be seen on page 428 and on of the hearings, that if the commission was to do nothing else, if there were to be no other cases filed for the next 23 months, it would take them all that time to dispose of cases now pending before the commission.

These are very important matters; in some cases they mean the life of the industry affected. I have in mind a particular matter brought to my attention last fall where until the commission could render a decision in a particular case the factory could not open up, because they did not know anything about whether they could reach the market.

There is no work more important, more vital to the interests of the country than the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission—

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON. Certainly.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Has the gentleman any idea of how many cases are pending before the commission?

Mr. NEWTON. I will give that to the gentleman in a moment. In 1923 the formal cases of suspension and investigation were 1,455. In 1927 that figure had risen to 2,017, an increase of 562. In formal cases disposed of in the period of 1922 there were 1,201 during that year. In 1927 there were 1,465, making an increase of 264. In 1922 the formal cases pending were 1,953, and in 1927 that figure had risen to 2,721, an increase of 768.

The informal cases filed in 1922 were 5,641, and in 1927 that figure had increased to 8,628, an increase of 2,987.

Under these circumstances it is apparent that they can not get up with their work unless they are given more and competent help. They can only absorb a certain number of additional help every year. If they take on men above a certain number they can not train them properly.

Now, when they ask for 25 more attorney-examiners it seems to me that Congress ought to grant the request.

I appreciate the position of the subcommittee. They do not like to continually override the Budget, but I am in hopes that either in the House or at the other end of the Capitol there will be granted \$81,000 additional that the commission requested. It is only in that way that they can keep up this work.

Mr. GOLDER. What is the status of the matter as far as the House is concerned?

Mr. NEWTON. The subcommittee granted everything within the estimate of the Budget. They made some slight addition in the item of printing, so that they can keep the reports more up to date. This is a matter that can be passed upon either by the House or the other side of the Capitol. [Applause.]

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise to talk about a matter that is of much importance not only to the people of the Mississippi Valley but to the entire country.

The flood of 1927 was the greatest recorded in the history of the Mississippi River. This flood was preceded by months of unusual rain, but it is doubtful whether such rainfall a decade ago would have caused such high flood levels in the Mississippi River.

Primarily these flood levels are the immediate consequence of raising the height of the levees on the banks of that stream.

But the amount of flood water coming down that great river has actually increased in volume in the last 10 years, for during that time those States which are drained by the Mississippi River have been extensively engaged in establishing and completing various drainage projects. As this drainage work progressed, swamps, sloughs, and other depressions which for centuries had been natural reservoirs were drained and the water which formerly accumulated in those reservoirs was, by drainage ditches and canals, rapidly carried to the rivers of the Mississippi Valley.

The rainfall during the latter part of 1926 and the early part of 1927 may have been unusual, but it was nothing more than one of nature's readjustments. For nearly two years a drouth prevailed both in the United States and in Canada. On two occasions this House passed bills temporarily removing the tariff on cattle so they could be driven to Mexico for water. During the same time the level of the Great Lakes fell so far below normal that much damage was done to the ports of those inland seas.

Nature can not escape the law of averages. And so in obedience to this inexorable law, an unusual drouth was broken by an equally unusual rainfall.

Rare, indeed, is the fall of the year when there is not a low water stage of the Mississippi River. But in November and December, 1926, a full river was waiting for the spring rise, which always comes in the early part of the year.

The story of the flood of 1927 has been often told. Vicksburg, where I live, situated on the Yazoo River where it flows into the Mississippi, was in 1927 perhaps more nearly the flood center than any other city in the lower valley. It was the nearest place of refuge for thousands of unfortunate flood sufferers. It was the headquarters of the Red Cross not only for Mississippi but for parts of Louisiana and Arkansas, and that great humane organization registered at Vicksburg over 32,000 refugees.

In that place at 3 o'clock in the morning I have seen one boat unload over sixteen hundred refugees. I vividly recall one afternoon, when the last rays of the setting sun had turned to burnished gold the rippling waters of that vast inland sea at the foot of the hills of Vicksburg, a large barge loaded with human freight came slowly into port. Upon that barge were hundreds of half-famished negroes, many of whom had been taken from the roofs of their submerged homes. Just before the city of refuge was reached that great throng of homeless, hungry unfortunates fell upon their knees, and over the waters there came to us from the melodious throats of hundreds of negroes the familiar words, "Praise God, from Whom all Blessings Flow."

Several times on crowded barges, crazed by suffering, exposure, and hunger, some poor unfortunate refugee would go

insane and in his raving frenzy either indiscriminately attack those nearest him or else attempt to throw himself overboard.

In less than 24 hours after the levee broke, Greenville, Miss., a city of approximately 17,000 inhabitants, was under water. Thirty days afterwards, riding in a motor boat over one of the streets of that city, I was unable to touch bottom with a 6-foot oar.

Over a month after the land was overflowed I rode in a motor boat all day and saw nothing to vary the monotony of that waste of water save an occasional half-demolished house with a hole cut in the roof, showing where the unfortunate dwellers had rushed to safety. Under those destructive waters were some of the finest and most improved plantations in America. On every 20 acres or less before the flood there stood substantial dwellings and outhouses, but now all were washed away and had disappeared.

In that one county alone over twenty-five hundred houses were torn from their foundations, while the loss in cattle and livestock was so great that it can only be estimated.

But these material losses, distressing though they were, sink into insignificance before the appalling tragedy of 1927—the heavy toll of human life exacted by that flood. Mr. Chairman, earthly possessions may be swept away and disappear forever, but through industry, ingenuity, and skill vanished fortunes may return again.

But all the strength and power of this mighty Government and all the industry, ingenuity, and skill of its brave and resourceful people can never bring back and restore to their families and friends even one of the hundreds of unfortunate human victims whose untimely deaths made the flood of 1927 "the greatest peace-time calamity in the Nation's history."

After years of toil and sacrifice the people of the Mississippi Valley believed that the problem of flood control of the great river at last had been solved. With gratitude toward the Federal Government for all it had done, and with pride in the realization that by their own achievements, which had resulted in an expenditure of over \$290,000,000, they themselves had helped to bring about this happy consummation, they felt that their anxiety was over and that they could now reap the reward which years of labor and toil and sacrifice had placed within their grasp.

But the flood of 1927 came. It did what no other flood did. It interrupted over 3,000 miles of railroad transportation, flooded over 12,000,000 acres of land in 174 counties in seven States, and carried on the tawny bosom of its rushing waters far more than the homes and the worldly possessions of the people of the Mississippi Valley. As flood levels never before even dreamed of were reached, there vanished the hope and the confidence which for generations had sustained them.

It was not the material loss caused by that great flood which accomplished that which no other flood could ever do. It was not the sufferings and hardships of those who were forced to climb to the roofs of their submerged homes and indefinitely wait for rescue. It was not the financial loss of those who saw their cattle and livestock drown before their eyes and the accumulated savings of a lifetime swept away. The flood of 1927 did far more than this. It destroyed the hopes of over half a century, and, breaking down their morale and fortitude, took the very heart out of the people of the Mississippi Valley.

Gazing upon that vast inland sea whose raging waters had rendered over 700,000 people homeless, and knowing that they were unable to further help themselves, they realized that after years of endeavor and exertion, after hundreds of millions of expense, of taxation up to constitutional limitation for flood protection, all their strivings of the past had been vain and useless.

Realizing this, there came the awful fear that they would be forced to abandon the homes they had wrested from the wilderness, homes in which their children were born and around whose firesides clustered the recollections of years of sacrifice and toil.

They feared that they would have to abandon those homes and turn back to the trackless jungle that great section of our country, more fertile than the far-famed Valley of the Nile, unless the strong arm of the Federal Government could be extended; for after the flood levels of 1927 had been reached they realized that the Federal Government alone was the only earthly power that could control the rushing waters from the Alleghenies to the Rockies, which, draining over 30 States, poured into the cornucopia of the lower Mississippi Valley.

President Coolidge tells us in his message to Congress that the owners of lands behind the levees should pay a proportionate part of the expense of building these levees. He further said—that an extraordinary concession from the plan adopted in relation to irrigation, where the general rule has been that the lands benefited should bear the entire expense, has already been made to the owners of lands behind these levees.

He also said:

It is the land of this region that is to be benefited. To say that it is unable to bear any expense of reclamation is the same thing as saying that it is not worth reclaiming.

I am sure that the President of the United States is sincerely anxious to do all he can to prevent another great national disaster like that of 1927. He expressed his sympathy to us in many ways. In less than 24 hours after the levee broke we had assurances from him that he would do all in his power. He sent one of his great secretaries down to help us, Mr. Hoover, who did splendid work, but I regret that the President believes the building of levees to keep within its bounds a mighty river, whose drainage area is equal to over 40 per cent of the entire United States, a river whose watershed embraces 31 of these States and two Provinces in Canada, a river upon whose ample bosom in 1926 there floated over 17,000,000 tons of commerce, valued at over \$700,000,000. I regret that he believes that the building of levees to hold back the waters of such a river is a reclamation project.

With all deference to the opinion of the President of the United States, there is, to my mind, a great difference and distinction between reclamation and levees. Reclamation creates, while levees retain and protect.

Reclamation begins after levees are built. Reclamation adds value to that which is valueless. Levees protect that which has value. Reclamation gives something to the man that he never had. Levees keep the river from taking away from the man something he already had.

Reclamation takes a sandy desert and converts it into fields of wondrous beauty and marvelous fertility. Levees protect farms, cities, railroad tracks, stations, terminals, factories, telephone, telegraph, and electric power lines from being destroyed.

Does a road built up through a swamp reclaim that swamp? Do the levees take one gallon of water off of the lands behind them? Do they reduce by one dollar the cost of preparing these lands for cultivation?

When the sturdy pioneers drove the aboriginal Indians from the plains of the West, did they by so doing reclaim those lands, or did they make it possible for settlers to come in and make those great plains one of the garden spots of the world?

Building a levee on the bank of a stream does not clear the land behind it of standing timber nor drain from it its surface waters nor prepare it for cultivation.

Levees do not reclaim lands. All that they do is to make possible the development of the lands behind them. Levees made it possible for over 6,000 miles of railroad tracks and over 50,000 miles of electric power, telephone, and telegraph lines to be built.

They made it possible for the development of farm lands which, in 1926, produced over \$250,000,000 of farm products. They made it possible for populous cities and thriving towns and busy factories to be found all over the Mississippi Valley.

Levees made all this possible, and they justified the issuance of bonds for concrete highways, drainage districts, and other land improvements, but they did not reclaim one acre of that vast territory drained by the Mississippi River.

President Coolidge tells us that it is the land of this region that is to be benefited, and that the land so benefited must pay for part of this reclamation.

The Presidency of the United States is the greatest political office in the world. Though many channels of information and many avenues of investigation, denied to any other citizen of the United States, are open to the holder of that high position, yet, owing to the manifold and complex interests continually arising in the greatest country in all the world, it is impossible for one man, no matter how well informed he may be, to have an actual personal knowledge of every subject.

It is therefore a source of much regret that the varied and many duties of the Chief Executive of the Nation were such that the President was unable to spare the time and visit the scene of the great disaster of 1927.

Had he been able to do this, I am sure that the first-hand information he would have secured would have convinced him that the owners of lands behind those levees had reached the end of their resources and were utterly unable to meet the demand he has imposed upon them.

The land behind the levees is only a small part of the property that is to be benefited. Cities, towns, factories, railroad tracks, terminals, stations, telegraph, telephone, and electric-power lines are also benefited, for it is impossible to protect the lands without protecting them, and it is impossible to protect them without protecting the lands upon which they are situated.

Hundred of millions of dollars from citizens all over the United States are invested in mortgages on land, in bonds, and in factories and public utilities of the Mississippi Valley.

In mortgages on lands and in bonds other than levee bonds, there is an outstanding indebtedness of over \$770,000,000. The assessed valuation of the property so mortgaged and bonded is less than \$815,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. As a matter of fact, would not the benefit accrue to the whole country?

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman's question is very apt. There is \$770,000,000 invested in mortgages on land and in bonds and \$45,000,000 is still outstanding of levee bonds. Now, the assessed valuation of the lands so bonded and so mortgaged aggregates \$815,000,000.

In addition to this, millions of dollars are invested in the securities of the various railroad, telephone, telegraph, and electric-power companies by citizens who live in every part of the United States, for the local ownership of these securities is negligible.

The man from New York, the man from California, and the men from 40 other States in this Union are just as much interested in seeing their property in the Mississippi Valley protected from ruin and overflow as the man from Mississippi or Louisiana or Arkansas who owns the land immediately behind these levees.

The Manufacturers Record asks this pertinent question:

Is it then just or reasonable to require the farmers who live on the land in the seven affected States to pay a special assessment on their particular form of property, while exempting the owners of the other forms of property who live in the other 41 States?

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. GOLDER. Assuming that the suggestion made by the President is a fair one, are the people along that territory in a position at this time to finance the building of the necessary protection?

Mr. COLLIER. They are not. They have reached the end of their resources. If the plan suggested by the President is a fair one, that the local interests should contribute a part of the cost, even though what is done is for the purpose of maintaining navigation in the greatest artery of trade and commerce in the world—and in 1926, which are the last figures I have, there passed down that river over 17,000,000 tons of commerce, valued at over \$700,000,000—if that view should be taken of it, the people living behind those levees have already expended \$290,000,000, and the Federal Government has expended for that same purpose less than \$70,000,000. I ask you, gentlemen, after they have already contributed \$290,000,000, or over four times as much as the Federal Government has contributed, in the name of high heaven how much more do you want those people to contribute whose homes have been washed away, whose cattle and livestock have been destroyed, who are now prone and helpless and have reached the end of their resources. How much more do you want those people to contribute?

In the early days of the Republic the entire country was in the scope of a President's vision. George Washington sent three messages to Congress, all relating to the commerce and navigability of the Mississippi River. He did not let the matter rest with these messages, for later he sent Thomas Pinckney to the Spanish Court for the sole and express purpose of entering into negotiations with Spain for the enjoyment of these rights.

"Dipping into the future as far as human eye could see," Thomas Jefferson made the Louisiana Purchase, and by the mere stroke of a pen added more millions of leagues of permanent territory to his country than any conqueror had ever done by the sword. One of the compelling factors which actuated the purchase of that great domain was the important part the Mississippi River would play in the commerce and national defense of the country.

The infant Republic was destined to soon become one of the great powers of the world. With the vast development of our almost unlimited resources, it was impossible for any President to have a personal understanding of every problem, no matter how important it may have been. The opinions, therefore, of those who had personal knowledge are of special value.

Clay, Lincoln, and Garfield lived in the Ohio Valley and had first-hand information. Henry Clay in an impassioned burst of oratory in the United States Senate once said:

The Mississippi River with all its tributaries constitute a great system, and if the system be not national, I should like to know one that is national.

Abraham Lincoln tells us that—

The most general object I can think of would be the improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

He then gave one of those illustrations for which he was famed, when he stated there was no difference in principle between driving a pirate from the tracks of commerce on the ocean and the removal of a snag on the Mississippi.

For—

Said he—

each is done to save life and property, and to use the waterways for the purpose of developing commerce.

President Garfield said that—

The statesmanship of America must grapple with the problem of this mighty stream; it is too vast for any State to handle; too much for any authority other than that of the Nation itself to manage.

President Roosevelt knew the Mississippi River and the Mississippi Valley. He had frequently visited the cities and towns in that valley, and he had on more than one occasion hunted bears in the swamps of that river.

His constant thirst for knowledge useful to him in his high place, together with his familiarity with that section, entitled him to speak with authority. He said after one of his visits to the Mississippi Valley, "We"—the Nation—"must build the levees and build them stronger and more scientifically than ever before."

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that those living behind the levees on the Mississippi River have already expended for flood protection over \$290,000,000, or more than four times as much as the Federal Government has for this purpose. Yet it is manifest that if the owners of those lands had never spent one dollar toward levee building it would still be the duty of the Federal Government, in the interest of navigation and commerce as well as in the interest of justice and humanity, to take charge of a situation which by reason of the magnitude of the undertaking and the complexity of its interests is far beyond the control of any local authority.

Each of the great political parties has repeatedly affirmed this principle.

Speaking through their various platforms the Republican Party declared:

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare.

The Democratic Party declared:

We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem. The preservation of the depth of its water for the purpose of navigation, the building of levees to maintain the integrity of its channel, and the prevention of overflow of land and its consequent devastation, resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property imposes an obligation which alone can be discharged by the Federal Government.

Surely no one will deny that upon the Federal Government alone rests the responsibility of maintaining navigation upon the Mississippi River. If levees are essential to proper navigation, then it is the duty of the Federal Government, whether the land behind those levees is suitable for agricultural purposes or not, to build those levees.

I shall ask permission, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the Record extracts from what the engineers have stated along that line, as I do not care to take up the time of the House with reading all these different extracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Bernard and Totten in their report of the Mississippi River in 1822 advised the construction of levees solely in aid of navigation.

Lieutenant Colonel Suter, of the United States Engineers, stated in 1880 before a committee of Congress that the permanent improvement of the Mississippi River for navigable purposes without levees was impossible.

The Mississippi River Commission states in their report of 1882—

that levees would produce a maximum effect in channel improvement at a minimum of cost.

Colonel Leach, of the United States Corps of Engineers, gave before a congressional committee an illustration of how the erection of a levee at Plum Point Reach, above Memphis, improved the navigable depth of the river.

General Kingman, a former Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, said at one of the hearings before Congress:

I should consider that the levee is a very important means of improving navigation.

Colonel Townsend, one of the ablest engineers of his time and president of the Mississippi River Commission, stated:

My own view of the effect of levees on stream flow is that they tend to remove irregularities and make the slope more uniform.

Mr. Chairman, if the building of levees are essential to good navigation, why should they be singled out for local contributions? Engineers have repeatedly declared that building levees, revetting banks, dredging channels, and removing snags are all essential to good and proper navigation.

Has anyone ever advocated the payment of local contributions from riparian landowners for revetment work? Revetment is not only essential to navigation, but incidentally the landowners are benefited, for revetment prevents the banks from caving and the lands from being washed away.

Who has ever insisted that the landowners shall be assessed to pay part of the cost of dredging the channel of the Mississippi River? Yet the landowner receives an incidental benefit, for the deeper the channel the more water the river will hold, and to that extent will be less likely to overflow adjacent lands.

Removing snags from the channel prevents accident and permits boats to navigate the Mississippi River without the fear of destruction. If these snags were permitted to remain, a boat would be afraid to venture from the shore. The landowners would therefore in many instances have no way of getting their products to market and consequently land values would decline. Therefore removing snags from the bed of the river incidentally benefits riparian landowners, but where is the man who will insist that the landowners pay to the Federal Government a proportionate part of the cost of the removal of snags?

When the Federal Government dredges a harbor and makes it possible for that harbor to be open to the commerce of the world, railroads will immediately establish terminals which will inevitably result in an incidental benefit to lands situated on the water front which will be enhanced in value.

Is there a Member of this Congress who will say that because lands in the vicinity of that harbor will be enhanced in value that the Federal Government should discontinue keeping that channel open to the commerce of the world until the owners of those lands which have been incidentally benefited shall pay part of the cost of dredging and keeping open that harbor?

If a mob were to assemble in one of our largest States and invade a weaker State in such force that the invaded State was unable to drive it back, would that be only a local matter, or would it not be the duty of the Federal Government to intervene and protect one of its States from the unlawful aggressions of the citizens of another State?

When a great devastating enemy, the cruel waters from nearly half of this Union invade a section of our country, destroying not only lands and property but the lives of American citizens, is that a matter of local concern? Shall this great Government of ours, the richest and most prosperous in the world, and which at the same time is the hope and the envy of all Christendom, protect its own citizens? During the greatest war of all the ages our Government not only financed itself but its allies. When Europe was threatened with financial disaster, it extended across the water a helping hand, and reestablished European credit, balanced European budgets, and stayed the further depreciation of European currency.

Shall the strong arm of that Government be extended to ward off those cruel waters, or shall that great Government stand idly by until the families of those who have lost their lives together with others whose accumulated savings of a lifetime have been swept away, shall again dig into their now empty pockets and pay to that Government a sum of money which conflicting authorities might determine would be their cost of repelling the attack of the rushing waters from nearly half of the United States and from part of the Dominion of Canada?

Has any city, town, or State in America jurisdiction over any part of the Mississippi River? No boat can sail upon its bosom, nor can a pilot direct its course without each first securing the consent of the Federal Government. Not one single place from Lake Itasca to the Gulf can this mighty river be bridged without the approval of the Federal Government.

When the city of New Orleans wished to cut the Poydras Levee on the other side of the river to prevent a catastrophe which might have resulted in loss of life and destruction of property fearful to contemplate, the great State of Louisiana and the metropolitan city of New Orleans were both helpless in the face of that awful danger and could make no move until sanctioned by Federal authority.

If it be the policy of the Federal Government, the wisdom of which I have yet to hear denied, to exercise control over every part of the Mississippi River, does not this exclusive right to absolute control carry with it a corresponding duty to keep that river within its bounds?

From the remotest antiquity rivers have played an important part in military activities. The Mississippi River is a part of our system of national defense. In the event of war, or in a great national emergency when it might be necessary to expeditiously transport men and supplies to and from the West to the East, for a situation to recur like that of 1927, when from Cairo to below the plains of Chalmette practically all railway and highway traffic was indefinitely interrupted might result in injury incalculable and irreparable.

Divided effort and divided responsibility can no longer control the Mississippi River.

Even if the citizens of the lower Mississippi Valley were able to pay a proportionate part of the expenses of flood control, would it be wise policy on the part of the Federal Government to force them to do this? Contributions from local communities would make them partners of the Government and would entitle the contributors to a voice in the way these moneys jointly contributed might be spent.

We would again be confronted with a score or more of different levee districts each striving to outbuild the other. Rich communities will build stronger than their weaker neighbors. Some communities may not be able to contribute at all, or else may fall behind with their contributions. What, then, will be the attitude of the Federal Government? A chain is no stronger than its weakest link. Would the Federal Government stop work on that levee until those living behind it made their contributions? If that were done, a gap might be left through which the water might rush 500 miles, and overflow those whose levees had been built to standard grade.

One of the greatest problems of the levee system is the proper location of levees. This problem has not only been one of the utmost concern to those whose lands are taken for that purpose, but it has also been the subject of great divergence of engineering opinion. No local authority will ever locate a levee behind a town to be destroyed by the flood. Yet the importance of the proper location of a levee may make this imperative.

President Garfield was right when he said that the control of the Mississippi River is too vast for any State to handle, and too much for any authority other than that of the Nation itself to manage. If this control is too vast for any State to handle, how much more vast will be the difficulty if this control, even in part, were delegated to a score of different levee districts, some rich, some poor, each looking out for its own interests and each dominated more or less by local politics.

Whether the Federal Government insists or does not insist upon the local interests contributing 20 per cent of the cost of building levees on the Mississippi River, it is certain that these overflowed communities are now impoverished and are utterly unable to meet these demands. They have reached the end of their resources. Of the \$290,000,000 expended by local interests there is still outstanding a bonded indebtedness of \$45,000,000. In addition to this these overflowed lands are heavily bonded for drainage systems, concrete highways, schoolhouses, and other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, commerce decrees, humanity urges, duty impels, common sense dictates, and justice demands that absolute, complete, and entire control of the floods of the Mississippi River and its tributaries be vested solely and alone in the Government of the United States.

As one who was present in the affected territory during the entire period of the flood, I wish in behalf of the people whom I in part represent to express our sincere appreciation of the work accomplished by that great humane organization, the Red Cross, and the kind sympathy of the people from all over the United States which was so freely and so substantially extended during that great disaster.

The Red Cross needs no encomium from me or from anyone else. Its noble work speaks for itself. Its kindly ministrations and its charitable deeds are engraved upon the hearts of millions of its beneficiaries. To the people of the Mississippi Valley in the darkest hour of their history, the Red Cross indeed and in truth was the great mother. God alone knows what would have happened to those hundreds of thousands of poor unfortunates, who utterly destitute were driven from their homes had it not been for the work of the Red Cross and the generous contributions of food and clothing which from all over the United States came into the flood-stricken area.

As long as the memories of the greatest flood disaster in our Nation's history survive, just so long will the people of the Mississippi Valley hold in grateful and affectionate re-

membrance the magnificent work of the Red Cross, and the unselfish, bountiful generosity of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of the Mississippi Valley do not come before this Congress as suppliants. By their toil and sacrifice they built levees long before the Federal Government contributed one dollar for that purpose. Never recognizing the right to force them to pay for the incidental protection, they might receive from the building of a levee essential to the proper navigation of the greatest artery of trade and commerce in the world, yet they cheerfully and willingly contributed of their means until their resources were exhausted.

I challenge the pages of American history to show where a braver battle was ever waged than the fight made by the citizens of the Mississippi Valley. Interrupted by frequent and repeated inundations, they carried on. Raising their levees higher and higher, building cities and towns, erecting school houses and churches, completing roads and highways, establishing factories, and preparing for cultivation millions of acres of land, they made their part of the country one of the greatest wealth-producing, taxpaying sections of America.

By persistent effort, by tireless perseverance, and by working and striving, and by striving and working, they met and conquered the mighty forces of nature, and it was only when these tremendous forces were aided and supplemented by the hand of man did they at last give up the unequal struggle.

They ask for no subsidies. They make no demand for reparations. They do not ask the Federal Government to restore to them one penny of the \$400,000,000 of property destroyed forever by that flood. They do not ask the Federal Government to pay one dollar on the \$45,000,000 of levee bonds outstanding. They do not ask the Federal Government for aid to rebuild their demolished homes, nor to restock their depleted farms.

They know that divided effort and divided responsibility can no longer control the flood waters of the mighty Mississippi, but that this great task can be accomplished only by unified effort and unified responsibility. Such effort and such responsibility can be vested only in the Federal Government.

If this is done, if the Federal Government takes charge, if that restless river is controlled, a brave and resolute people, by industry and toil, will rebuild their wrecked and ruined homes, pay off the mortgages on their devastated lands, redeem the bonds for which those lands are pledged, and convert a valley of desolation and ruin into a garden of happiness, prosperity, and contentment. [Applause.]

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the President made a great speech in Havana—great in its expression of friendship and good will toward our sister republics, great in its idealism, great in its praise of the principles of self-government and of human liberty. And then, even as he spoke, the newsboys cried on the streets, "Forty Nicaraguans killed by American marines."

The President spoke of friendship and respect for weaker nations and at the same time a bloody war which he has been carrying on for 12 long months, without the consent of the people of the United States, was being waged in Nicaragua. He spoke of chivalry and of kindness and of brotherly love. What a pity that his action does not square with his words. The words were brave, the action is not brave. The words were fine and noble, the action is of tyranny and of oppression.

The newspapers say that he closed his great speech with a scriptural quotation:

The letter killeth, while the spirit giveth life.

I like to have our Presidents use scriptural texts when it shows their faith in religion. I like for them to show familiarity with the Bible. But I would rather that Presidents and other public men in quoting Holy Writ should stick to something having a relation to their performances, and which finds its expression in deeds, not in empty words. As having a real appositeness and significance I would have commended a text to the President, which he will find in II Samuel, chapter 20, verse 9:

And Joab said to Amasa, art thou in health, my brother? And Joab took Amasa by the beard with the right hand to kiss him.

But Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's hand: so he smote him therewith in the fifth rib, and shed out his bowels to the ground, and struck him not again; and he died.

I would have our rulers not to quote pious texts when they are resolved upon oppressive courses of conduct. I would at least have them to be frank and honest enough to state their

real purposes to the world. It is just such exhibitions as that of the President at Habana that are gaining for us the name of being the arch hypocrites of the age.

THE WORLD CALLS US "HYPOCRITE"

To-day the newspapers of the whole world are sneering at the President's speech. Even the British press sneers at his hypocrisy, and, oh, when perfidious Albion may have warrant to sneer at the hypocrisy of another nation surely there is none left so poor to do us "reverence."

I find an editorial in one of my home papers, the Birmingham Age-Herald, which expresses the thought which seems to have come to disinterested observers everywhere. The editorial discusses Mr. Coolidge's Habana speech, and then says:

It is perhaps too much to have anticipated from such a source dynamic counsel or forthright leadership, but Mr. Coolidge might at least have sought to give the impression that he was not talking in a vacuum.

And the editorial writer goes on with what is a real literary gem:

How little the United States has resorted to force, how much we have respected the sovereignty of small nations, how deeply we are attached to the principle of self-government of others, how free we are of delusions and military grandeur, how slow to anger and how merciful we have been, how completely we have clung to the spirit of the law, and how utterly we have sought to promote consideration and good will in our international policy, let Nicaragua prove to the world.

And, I might add, "and let Haiti, let Santo Domingo, let Colombia, and let the Philippines," and so on and on, "prove to the world." It is wicked enough to oppress a smaller nation. The wickedness of doing so is infinitely magnified by the pretense that we are doing no wrong.

WHY WE ARE IN NICARAGUA

What are we doing in Nicaragua, anyway? Why are we there? The people do not know. They ask me, they ask everybody here, why we are in Nicaragua. Unfortunately from no official source does Congress know. Congress has been told little more about the real reasons for being in Nicaragua than have the people of the country.

Our Committee on Foreign Affairs has refused to investigate the subject. They have refused to ask the administration for the true facts. They prefer to servilely submit to the purposes of the State Department.

The President has addressed the subject in his two last messages to Congress, but to the candid mind the conclusion is irresistible that little of the true story has been told. In his message to Congress of January 10, 1927, the President assumed to tell us why he had sent the marines to Nicaragua. I have the message here and have searched carefully through it. I will read the extracts by which in his involved style he related what he desired Congress and the country to believe were his reasons for sending them.

After at some length reciting a situation alleged to have existed in Nicaragua he told us that the Secretary of State had called upon the Secretary of the Navy in these words:

I have the honor to suggest that war vessels of the special service squadron proceed as soon as possible to the Nicaraguan ports of Corinto and Bluefield for the protection of American and foreign lives and property in case that threatened emergencies materialize.

And that naval vessels and marines had been sent accordingly. He also stated that—

During the last two months the Government of the United States has received repeated requests from various American citizens, both directly and through our consuls and legation, for the protection of their lives and property. The Government of the United States has also received requests from the British chargé at Managua and from the Italian ambassador at Washington for the protection of their respective nationals.

He next proceeded to discuss the bonded debt of the Nicaraguan Government, and stated that some millions of dollars of the bonds were held by "American citizens." Who the American bondholders were he did not state, but it is generally believed that they are a certain group of New York bankers.

He also said:

There is no question that if the revolution continues American investments and business interests in Nicaragua will be very seriously affected, if not destroyed. The currency, which is now at par, will be inflated. American as well as foreign bondholders will undoubtedly look to the United States for the protection of their interests.

And later, summing up:

Manifestly the relation of this Government to the Nicaraguan situation, and its policy in the existing emergency, are determined by the facts which I have described. The proprietary rights of the United

States in the Nicaraguan canal route, with the necessary implications growing out of it affecting the Panama Canal, together with the obligations flowing from the investments of all classes of our citizens in Nicaragua, place us in a position of peculiar responsibility.

And, finally, the President closed his message with—

The United States can not, therefore, fail to view with deep concern any serious threat to stability and constitutional government in Nicaragua tending toward anarchy and jeopardizing American interests, especially if such state of affairs is contributed to or brought about by outside influences or by any foreign power. It has always been and remains the policy of the United States in such circumstances to take the steps that may be necessary for the preservation and protection of the lives, the property, and the interests of its citizens and of this Government itself. In this respect I propose to follow the path of my predecessors.

Consequently, I have deemed it my duty to use the powers committed to me to insure the adequate protection of all American interests in Nicaragua, whether they be endangered by internal strife or by outside interference in the affairs of that Republic.

Analyzing the President's statement we find that he excuses the sending of our forces into Nicaragua on four grounds: First, the protection of the lives and property of American citizens; second, the protection of British and Italian nationals; third, for the protection of the canal concession; and fourth, to pacify Nicaragua in the interest of American and foreign bondholders.

Now, as to the first of these reasons let it be said that not a single instance of danger to the life of an American citizen has been cited. Not an American civilian has been killed or injured. Not an instance of damage to any physical property owned by Americans has been related. It has been charged recently that there was no danger to American lives or physical property. The administration has been challenged in vain to disclose any such instance. No one now claims that any American civilian has actually been injured nor his property destroyed. We are impelled, therefore, to believe that "life and property," as used by the President, is a euphemism for bonds and evidences of debt.

Also, the facts are quite persuasive that the British and Italian requests for protection were merely perfunctory courtesies, and that none of their nationals were actually in danger.

As to the canal concession, let me say that neither of the Nicaraguan factions disputed it. Neither sought to take it away. We were not in physical possession of any actual ground for the construction of the canal. Its final location has not been considered, and no particular territory set apart. The concession needed no protection. The matter was not involved in the revolution. The President's reference to it was obviously made merely to strengthen a weak case.

INTERVENTION IN THE INTEREST OF BONDHOLDERS

Of all the reasons stated by the President, only one was real, the fourth. Without doubt, the interests of the bondholders were seriously jeopardized. A country torn by revolution is in no shape to meet its interest payments. The pacification of Nicaragua was clearly to the interest of its creditors. There we have the key to the situation. It may be clearly deduced from the President's message, and from such facts as have leaked out through the press, that the real purpose of our marines in Nicaragua is to pacify the country, restore order, and make the bondholders secure in their debts. Our intervention in Nicaragua, and the protectorate which we have established, was to enable American bondholders, and foreign bondholders, if any there be, to receive their interest payments.

Subsequent events have tended to confirm the belief that our Nicaraguan mission is merely that of a bill collector. As soon as Congress adjourned, the international bankers began to reap the fruits of the President's sowing. I read from an Associated Press dispatch of a few weeks ago:

Nicaragua obtained a loan of \$1,000,000 in New York last March, for the purpose of retiring certain outstanding obligations. It was equally divided between J. & W. Seligman and the Guaranty Trust Co., and was in the form of a banker's credit. The loan was for one year, at 6 per cent, and the State Department's information is that repayment will be completed by June 1.

The dispatch further states:

The State Department survey of economic and financial conditions in Nicaragua, on which a future policy may be formulated, is being conducted by Dr. William W. Cumberland. Such a survey was proposed by President Diaz with the approval of both Nicaraguan political parties as the starting point for adoption in Nicaragua of a comprehensive financial program. This program would cover not only emergency needs due to the civil war, but also the execution of much-needed public works, such as the railway from the capital to the Atlantic coast.

Negotiation of another loan to Nicaragua by American bankers probably will not await the outcome of a Nicaraguan economic survey now being made for the State Department, although that survey probably will furnish the basis for a department policy toward later borrowings.

Although department officials do not know the exact status of conversations understood to be already in progress in New York, and will make no official comment regarding them, it is known here that Nicaragua may regard it as necessary to arrange without much delay for an emergency advance of \$1,000,000 or \$1,500,000 to help organization of the national guard and restoration of order.

That dispatch is quite illuminating. Never has been given the name of a single American citizen whose life was in danger in Nicaragua. Repeated efforts have been made to ascertain who they were, and where they were, and what the danger was. The challenge has been issued that there has been none such. The administration, which is possessed of all the facts, though challenged to name them, has not permitted to escape the censorship the statement of a single life or a single dollar's worth of property that has been jeopardized by the Nicaragua revolution.

All that has come out is that conditions down there were unstable and American bondholders were in danger of losing some of their investments unless we stabilized and pacified the country. And the bankers have continued their loans and now they plan new loans all under the guardian eye of our imperialistic Department of State.

In the President's message to Congress of December 6, 1927, we have his latest pronouncement on the Nicaraguan situation. Referring to conditions in China he said:

We have been compelled to send naval and marine forces to China to protect the lives and property of our citizens.

And in the next paragraph he said as to Nicaragua:

We are confronted by similar conditions on a small scale in Nicaragua. Our marine and naval forces protected our citizens and their property and prevented a heavy sacrifice of life and the destruction of that country by a reversion to a state of revolution. Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, was sent there to cooperate with our diplomatic and military officers in effecting a settlement between the contending parties. This was done on the assurance that we would cooperate in restoring a state of peace where our rights would be protected by giving our assistance in the conduct of the next presidential election, which occurs in a few months. With this assurance the population returned to their peace-time pursuits, with the exception of some small roving bands of outlaws.

STIMSON IN NICARAGUA

Which is to say that the President sent Mr. Stimson to Nicaragua. Stimson called in Moncada, and possibly others active in the revolution on the Liberal side, and read the riot act to them; told them that they must surrender their arms and equipment and disband, promising them in return that our forces should supervise an election to be held next August, at which the majority should be permitted to choose a President for Nicaragua.

It is rumored that Moncada was also promised that he should be elected as the next president, but it would seem unnecessary to have bribed him with such a promise, as the threat was that if the Liberals did not submit our troops would take the field against them. So that, of course, Moncada had to submit. There was no alternative for him and his associates.

Yes; there was an alternative—the alternative of desperation, the alternative which Sandino chose—to fight on and to die fighting, and in the meantime to be called an "outlaw."

The President claims that by the Stimson strong-arm methods he "prevented a heavy sacrifice of life." American lives? No; Nicaraguan lives, so that they might be able to pay taxes to satisfy the claims of American bondholders. Nicaraguan lives! Yet our marines have been forced to take 1,000 Nicaraguan lives and to wound 2,000 more in pacifying the country and carrying out the Stimson agreement.

The President admits in his last message that the marines are not now required in Nicaragua for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens. He admits that their sole function now is to pacify the country, to keep it quiet and supervise the election. That is why our marines are there. That is what they are doing. The country must be pacified so that the bonds will be paid and so that American bankers may continue to make loans to Nicaragua and be able to collect them with interest.

LETTER FROM FATHER OF SERGEANT HEMPHILL

The reaction of the people of the United States to the situation is fairly expressed in the letter which the father of Sergeant Hemphill, who lost his life in the recent fighting, wrote to the President a few days ago, in which he said:

Mr. CALVIN COOLIDGE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: According to dispatches of to-day (January 3) from Managua, my son, Sergt. John F. Hemphill, was killed in action against General Sandino's loyal troops.

For the death of my son I hold no malice or ill will toward General Sandino or any of his men, for I think (and I believe 90 per cent of our people agree with me) that they are to-day fighting for their liberty as our forefathers fought for our liberty in 1776, and that we as a Nation have no legal or moral right to be murdering those liberty-loving people in a war of aggression. What we are doing is nothing less than murder for the sole purpose of keeping in power a puppet President and acting as a collector for Wall Street, which is certainly against the spirit and letter of our Constitution.

My son was 29 years old, served three years of his third enlistment, survived honorable service through the World War against Germany, only to be officially murdered in a disgraceful war against this little nation.

My father served through the Civil War, my two grandfathers died in action in the same war, and I am proud of their records, so this is not from the pen of a red radical but from one who loves justice and fair play.

I have four sons, and if necessity arose I would be willing to sacrifice not only all four sons but my own life as well in a war of defense, but I am not willing to shed one drop of blood in a war of aggression, such as this one is.

You have lost a son and know the sorrow, and we as a Nation mourned with you in your hour of grief. Suppose that son had fallen, as my son has, a victim to the greed of Wall Street, would you feel that the financial gain was worth the cost?

JOHN S. HEMPHILL.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I have read this agreement entered into between the factions in Nicaragua as negotiated by Mr. Stimson. It provides that the United States shall supervise an election in Nicaragua. It seems to me to be a treaty. I am at a loss to know how the Chief Executive thinks he has a right to put into effect a treaty without its approval by the Senate.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Section 2 of Article II of the Constitution of the United States forbids any agreement binding upon the United States to be made without the consent of the Senate. It requires all treaties and other international agreements to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. Under that clause of the Constitution any officer of the United States who assumes to bind the United States by any agreement with a foreign country without the consent of Congress is guilty of usurpation and of a violation of both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is it not a fact that President Wilson sent a gentleman from Minnesota, by the name of John Lind, to Mexico under somewhat similar circumstances without any confirmation by the Senate?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What does it matter? No doubt there are precedents. Is it possible that usurpation is any less hateful because there have been other usurpations? Does the gentleman take the position that violations of the Constitution may be legalized as a matter of habit and that a usurpation upon the part of one President excuses the usurpation of power upon the part of another? [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that Mr. Lind did not execute an agreement with a sovereign nation to supervise an election in that country.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Of course, the cases are not parallel. But what does it matter whether they are or not? I have no patience with those partisans who seek to excuse the misconduct of their party associates by charging that a member of the other party has also done wrong. I condemn usurpation whether it be by the President of my party or any other party. I did not fail to condemn the President of my party for exceeding his constitutional powers. I was one of the first to condemn him, and I am sure I will not withhold my condemnation of the immeasurably smaller and weaker man who now happens to occupy the presidential chair. [Laughter and applause.]

The Constitution, as expressed in section 2 of Article II, also requires that the approval of the Senate must be secured by the President to validate all appointments of those who represent us in foreign countries. The President did not have the consent of the Senate to Mr. Stimson's appointment. His nomination was never submitted to the Senate, was never considered, and was never confirmed. By appointing Stimson as his repre-

sentative to bind the people of the United States the President again violated the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution. Also, the Constitution as found in section 8 of Article I clothes Congress with the exclusive function of declaring war. In carrying on the war in Nicaragua without the consent of Congress the President is violating the spirit of the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY].

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is in the bill under consideration an item making appropriations for the Shipping Board and with reference to that item, and the Shipping Board more particularly, I desire to make some comment.

In order that we may refresh our recollection as to the aim and purpose of the merchant marine act of 1920, I want to read an excerpt from the preamble:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce—and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine—and the United States Shipping Board shall in the administration of the shipping laws keep always in view this purpose and object as the primary end to be attained.

I think that nobody more than myself appreciates the almost insurmountable obstacles which have confronted the Shipping Board in its attempt to follow out the purpose and the spirit of this act. And I desire at the outset to express my appreciation and to convey my congratulations to the board that for the year beginning September 1, 1926, and ending October 31, 1927, under their administration of the American Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, the number of voyages of our American ships have been increased 23 per cent and the tonnage handled 22 per cent, while the actual operating losses have been reduced 20 per cent.

At this point I should like to read to the House a brief excerpt from the last message of the President:

The Shipping Board is constantly under pressure, to which it often yields, to protect private interests rather than serve the public welfare. Our exporters and importers are both indifferent about using American ships.

I thought it might be well for us to have a concrete instance of what the President was referring to, and the matter is of such significance and perhaps of such importance that I will not trust myself to speak of it in detail except as I quote from the public records of the United States Shipping Board.

On January 6, last, a telephone message came from the Hill requesting some of the commissioners of the Shipping Board to come to the office of the chairman of this subcommittee—the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Wood—now in charge of this bill, there to meet certain gentlemen. The commissioners invited to this meeting, or present, at least, were Chairman O'Connor, Commissioner Smith, and Commissioner Plummer. Arriving at the office of Mr. Wood, the record states, they found awaiting them the following:

Ex-Governor Miller, of New York, general counsel for the United States Steel Corporation; Mr. Thomas, president of the Steel Corporation's Isthmian Line—

A line of ships operated by the United States Steel Corporation in the Indian trade—

Vice President Phillips, of the Bemis Bag Co., and resident Calcutta agent of that company, an American company; Mr. Lilly, of Norton & Lilly Co., shipping agents of Sir John Ellerman's British line of ships; a representative of the American Manufacturing Co.; and one other.

Congressman Wood stated, so says the record, that he had called this meeting to see if there was any way by which to iron out the difficulties now existing between the Shipping Board, foreign steamship lines, and these other gentlemen in the Calcutta jute-burlap case, and to prevent a rate war, which would be so disastrous to all involved and so expensive to the United States.

Let me say that the Ellerman Lines have been running to Calcutta for some years. The United States Steel Corporation operates a line of ships which make four sailings each year to that port. There is a cargo of some 600,000 tons of jute burlap bags purchased in India by American dealers or importers and shipped out of the port of Calcutta, and the United States Steel Corporation never having increased its sailings above four a year and having made no inroads upon this foreign transportation of American commerce, the Shipping Board, having in mind the spirit of the merchant marine act, which enjoined it upon

them to operate fleets of vessels sufficient in number to carry the greater part of American commerce, approached the Ellerman Lines, or the English agent, Lilly, of Norton & Lilly—who, by the way, is also the agent of the United States Steel line, the Isthmian line. They said, in substance:

Now, we have a line of ships coming up through Australia, going on through the Suez into the Mediterranean, and as we come past India we have trouble in getting return cargo. Will you give us one-fourth—not the greater part of the American commerce as the act enjoined it upon them—but they said, "Will you give us the privilege of carrying one-fourth of this American-bought jute burlap bagging and avoid a rate war?" The reply to their overtures was made by Sir John Ellerman, president of the English lines. "This business does not belong to you Americans; we built it up. You keep out of it." In other words, the American Shipping Board was given to understand that they must face a rate war or keep out of the Calcutta trade.

All through these negotiations the Isthmian Line made no attempts to increase its sailings until it was discovered that the United States Shipping Board actually intended to put a line of ships into Calcutta and had asked for 16 out of the 69 sailings from that port each year.

Then these British lines said, "If you will keep out of this Calcutta sea trade we will increase the sailings of the United States Steel ships by 15 sailings (thus giving them a total of 19 sailings a year), and there will then be no rate war." The United States Shipping Board in substance said, "Why permit the Isthmian line to have these sailings and promise no rate war, but threaten us with rate war if the American Shipping Board ships come in with 16 sailings? The Isthmian ships are as much American as are our own ships. Why the discrimination? Again, we ask you to give us the chance to carry one-fourth only of the American commerce from Calcutta to North Atlantic ports. Their answer was, "No; hands off." The English agency of Lilly & Norton still continues to act for the United States Steel Corporation Isthmian Line and the Ellerman English Line.

But the Shipping Board has since established an agency of its own in Calcutta to solicit commerce and shipping. They have started American ships across the seas in pursuance of the spirit of this act and are now competing for American commerce from Calcutta.

They now offer to carry this jute bagging for \$4 a ton. But on the morning of January 13, 1928, there appeared the following news item:

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, January 13, 1928]

CUNARD CLOSES JUTE CONTRACT AT \$4.50 TON RATE—AGREEMENT CONTAINS SCALE 50 CENTS ABOVE ROOSEVELT'S; BUYERS HOLD BACK IN ANTICIPATION OF FURTHER CUTS

The Cunard Line and members of the Jute and Gunnies Importers' Association recently closed contracts for the first quarter of 1928 on a basis of approximately \$4.50 a ton on jute and gunnies moving from Calcutta to Boston and New York.

This rate is 50 cents above that quoted by the Roosevelt Line, Shipping Board operators of the American India Line, which, shortly before the first of the year, slashed the rates from \$7.90 to \$4 a ton upon failure to reach an amicable agreement with the foreign lines controlling most of the 650,000 tons of bagging material being imported yearly for American firms.

Although the Jute and Gunnies' Association is made up of practically all the American importers of these commodities, it is understood that they voluntarily pay a 50 per cent premium per ton to the Cunard Line over the low rate of \$4 quoted by the Shipping Board.

Why this cooperation of American business with foreign shippers to defeat the establishment of an American merchant marine?

Now, the United States Steel Co. has formerly made tentative overture to buy the ships which the Shipping Board contemplated putting into the Indian trade. But the board voted unanimously not to entertain any offers for bids for this line until it was an established line. The reasoning of the board was that if so powerful a corporation as the United States Steel Corporation could not make it profitable to sail more than four times a year into Calcutta, surely no private concerns would make a reasonable bid for ships to compete in that field until a carrying trade in American bottoms had been built up. So they said, "We will continue our sailings." They were right. I commend them for the faithful performance of their duty under the merchant marine act of 1920.

And now on the noon of the day when this Shipping Board was appearing before our subcommittee and asking for the appropriations that meant life or death to it, certain Members are summoned to this private conference to find present this

distinguished array of United States Steel representatives, English shipping agents, and American shippers, to whom I have referred, and another proposal that they sell out is made.

Little wonder that the President in his last message referred to pressure brought upon our Shipping Board.

Ex-Governor Miller having stated—

Says the record—

that he was the counsel for the United States Steel Corporation, said in substance, that as a result of the "big stick swinging" by the board, the foreign shipping lines had now become more yielding in their attitude and finally had agreed that they would permit the Isthmian Line—

The United States Steel Line—

which heretofore had only been able to maintain four voyages per annum from Calcutta to North Atlantic ports, to have 15 additional sailings, or one less than 16 sailings which the Shipping Board had asked; but that the foreign shipping lines would not permit in this service any sailings by Shipping Board vessels.

The question immediately arose in my mind, what is the relationship between this Isthmian Line owned by the United States Steel Corporation and these British lines, that the British lines will permit them to go into this business, but will not let the Shipping Board, enjoined by the Congress to go forward and establish a merchant marine upon the high seas, have anything to do with this commerce?

Let us follow the report. It reads:

Why foreign shipping men preferred the Isthmian ships to the United States Shipping Board ships was not explained, although commented upon. Ex-Governor Miller said that this rate war would compel the Steel Corporation to take its ships out of this trade because they could not stand the loss that would be involved, and that the effect of a rate war in this trade would extend to their other services, particularly to their Gulf service, and be detrimental as well to their fleet generally.

One of the first suggestions Governor Miller made was that if this rate war continued, instead of allowing their ships to be driven out of the trade the Steel Corporation might find it necessary to bring an injunction restraining the Government from operating ships in that trade. He was thereupon reminded of what the Supreme Court had just decided in the Western Union case, and the chairman remarked that he would be glad to take the matter before the court, the Congress, or the public.

The proposal of Governor Miller that his company should apply for an injunction was undoubtedly based on the philosophy that the Government ought not to be in competition with private interests in trade. We are all agreed that when the Shipping Board shall have established business sufficient to justify sailings enough to carry the major part of our commerce then the ships operated by the Government shall be disposed of and they shall be operated by private interests.

But we should continually bear in mind the preamble of the merchant marine act. We must first establish sufficient lines, establish sufficient business, before we can be assured of a merchant marine sufficient to carry "the greater portion" of our own commerce. Private firms are not going to make attractive bids for our ships until these lines are established, and we do not propose to give ships away as we should have to when only one bidder is interested.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. I will. I always yield to my friend, for I know he is interested in the merchant marine.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman has made an interesting statement that the House and the country ought to have. Does the gentleman believe in the action of the subcommittee in cutting the Budget figures more than \$1,400,000 below the amount approved by the Budget?

Mr. BEEDY. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. I wanted to lead up to that at the close of the remarks that I am making. I want first to cite this instance of pressure on our Shipping Board, to which the President referred in his message, and the indifference of the American shippers to the use of American ships.

Let me continue with this record:

Meeting the declaration that the Shipping Board started the rate war, Chairman O'Connor emphatically advised these gentlemen that the Shipping Board never had started a single rate war, and attention was called to the unyielding attitude of the foreign shippers set forth by the declaration of Sir John Ellerman that the American had no right in this business whatever—that it belonged to the British ships.

Governor Miller insisted that the rate war was started by the Shipping Board, and Mr. Plummer reminded him of the old legal principle that "He who makes it necessary for me to draw my gun is the aggressor."

When he attempted to impress Congressman Wood with the great losses which this rate war would bring upon Shipping Board vessels Governor Miller was reminded that on the contrary the rate war would be an advantage to the Shipping Board fleet because at present these Shipping Board vessels are coming from the East only partly loaded and that any cargo secured from Calcutta at a rate which more than paid the stevedore and port charges would be a financial benefit.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. By whom were they denied?

Mr. BEEDY. By the English lines.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. At this conference?

Mr. BEEDY. No; this was through correspondence.

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

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. BEEDY. The report continues:

Asked by Mr. Wood if this line was not losing money at the present time, he was informed that it was.

It was distinctly pointed out that to offer these vessels for sale before we had made our position in that trade secure and while the foreign shippers and shipping men would permit no American ships excepting those of the Isthmian Line to share in this business through a foreign agent, without a rate war, meant that the only possible purchaser of the line under present conditions would be the Steel Corporation; but if these Americans, who obviously have the power, would let a share of their cargoes be brought to the United States in American flag vessels, the trade could be stabilized and the service be put in a condition to sell within one year; for the rate war would end at once.

As I understand the present situation, when American purchasers of foreign goods attempt to say anything about the method of transporting those goods, it is claimed that the foreign vendors insist that the purchasers have no right to determine the means of transportation, but that they may select the shipping lines. The Shipping Board says, in substance, if that is true, why is it not right that American vendors here do not have the right to say how their goods shall be transported to Europe? What we are asking American importers and purchasers of Indian products to say, says the Shipping Board, is that they want these products or a part of them, one quarter of them, from Calcutta, to be brought in American ships. The report continues:

Two or three times references were made to the fact that these importers who are having the great bulk of their raw material brought into this country in foreign ships are the beneficiaries of our protective tariff; and when at last Mr. Thomas declared there was no connection between the methods of transportation employed by these manufacturers and the protective tariff, Mr. Plummer remarked that there certainly was; that he has been an advocate, on the stump and in the press, of a protective tariff for many years, but if these American manufacturers persisted in having their raw materials delivered to them from foreign vessels, he would demand that he have his linoleums and other similar products delivered from foreign mills; and asked what the answer would be when that proposition went before Congress and the public.

I do not know what your answer would be, but I think that if great industries in this country, which have grown up under the benevolent laws passed by my own party, with a keen desire to develop American industry and to afford employment to American labor, are now unwilling to cooperate with the American Congress to establish a merchant marine on the high seas, I, myself shall look with less sympathy upon their demands for protection from this Congress. [Applause.]

I realize, however, that one must not be carried away by his emotions. I realize that there are millions of laborers to be affected by a denial of tariff protection to industry to-day. If I were sure of the proper course to pursue I would punish every great industry that has benefited by the tariff and that now, because of a selfish desire to sail just enough of its own ships to take care of its own products and thus deny the independent steel producers of this country American ships to take their products into foreign markets—I say I would punish them severely. I now invite the cooperation of the great United States Steel Corporation and other American industries which have profited by the American tariff, even at a temporary sacrifice perchance, to cooperate with the United States Shipping Board, the creature of the American Congress, that we may yet establish on the high seas an American Merchant Marine adequate to the needs of "the major portion" of American commerce. [Applause.]

The report then goes on to say that Chairman Wood remarked that there seemed to be some feeling between the parties and that they were not accomplishing anything, and that the meeting had better adjourn. And thus ended this

meeting which, in my judgment, would have been more properly held in the offices maintained by the Government for the transaction of business with the United States Shipping Board.

Mr. Chairman, in the afternoon succeeding this interview in the office of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Shipping Board again went on with its pleas for funds to carry on. I think the motives of the chairman of the subcommittee that held this conference in his office were of the very highest, but I am going to say to him that I think the officials of the United States Steel Corporation were keen enough to understand that, to say the least, it would be very embarrassing to these commissioners to be dragged into such an interview and be forced to confess that they were entering a line of business that was unprofitable, at 1 o'clock, and then have to come back before this committee at 3 o'clock and ask for money to continue the business.

I think the officials of the United States Steel Corporation were keen enough to understand that it would be a pretty severe test of the stamina and character of the members of the United States Shipping Board to go into that conference and resist their overtures and refuse to sell out for nothing, as it were, to one bidder, and get out of this line of trade in Calcutta, rather than come back and ask for more money to carry on.

The Shipping Board, under the advice of its experts, had asked for \$14,500,000 for next year, but the Budget, as it always does, pared them to the bone, and allowed them only \$13,688,000. But this subcommittee cut them another million and gave them only \$12,000,000. Now, I ought to be explicit about this. The board has an income of \$400,000 a year, so that they have \$12,400,000 as a shipping fund to operate the fleet.

What is the psychology of a reduction at this time, when the great industries of the Nation, in cooperation with foreign shipping lines, are exercising the pressure that the President refers to, to keep our ships off the seas? What is the psychology of another cut below the Budget recommendation? The foreign shippers are going out to their consumers and saying, "Your Congress evidently intends to put your Shipping Board out of business as fast as it can. There is no other conclusion we can come to about it. It must mean that this American line of ships, now competing with us temporarily, will die after this year. You had better stay with us and give us your shipping."

These American shippers do not want to get in wrong with the foreign shipowners, and that we can demonstrate by our appropriations in this House, unless we intend to stand behind the Shipping Board and maintain our fleets to carry the greater portion of our commerce to foreign ports, we merely give aid and comfort to the enemies of an American merchant marine. [Applause.]

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the following title:

H. R. 6053. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road, in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.

The committee resumed its session.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1929

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have introduced to-day two resolutions, both being introduced at the solicitation of constituents in my district, regarding the sale of fertilizer at this time. The information which I have is such that I think at least it very strongly tends to show that the fertilizer corporations of this country are not only unfair to the farmers, but they are actually violating the law with reference to the antitrust provisions now in force. Not only this, but they have, in my judgment, and I believe in the judgment of many others who are perhaps in a better position to pass upon the question than I am, been unduly advancing the prices of the commodities they are offering to sell and which they are selling to farmers at this time.

As an illustration, last year the fertilizer concerns in my locality were selling, delivered in my home city, a 9-2-3 grade of fertilizer at \$17 per ton f. o. b. that city. This year the companies are selling the same fertilizer at \$23.99, an increase in round figures of \$7 per ton over the price of last year. They sold last year a 12-4-4 grade of fertilizer at \$24 a ton at this point, and they are now selling, and offering to sell at this

same point, the same grade of fertilizer at \$32.12. It is strange indeed that they sell at the same price and at these unusual figures.

You will observe that this is an increase in price ranging from \$7 to more than \$8 per ton, and if you will figure the percentage of increase you will see that it is extremely large.

So far as I am aware, or advised, there is no increase in the cost of the commodities composing these fertilizers which would warrant such an increase.

Certainly the condition of the farmers who are using these fertilizers, and who propose to use them, are not such that they are able to pay for the commodities at these advanced prices; and, mind you, these are cash prices. There is no element of risk involved. It is a cash proposition. As a rule our farmers are forced to pay for their fertilizers when they get them or else pay an additional price of something like \$8 to \$10 a ton for the commodity if they obtain credit.

The press of my State recently carried the statement that the cotton acreage would be increased this year, that the recent cold in that locality and other sections had killed all of our winter grain crops. It is now too late to plant those lands in any similar grain as a crop to be grown in the early spring and summer months. It is too late to plant rye and wheat and oats. Most of the lands were seeded with oats. Realizing that many planters having these lands broken and in many instances already fertilized, some one put out the report that they proposed to put such lands in cotton. Immediately the price of cotton declined, as the press story goes, and the price of fertilizer was increased, the fertilizer companies taking advantage of a misfortune which had overtaken these already oppressed and almost bankrupt farmers in my section. They immediately increased the price of the commodities which they must use in their farm operations.

Not only that, but the prices at which they are selling and the prices given out by the various companies dealing in that section are such, I think, as to convince almost any impartial mind that there is a common understanding among the companies as to what prices they will receive for their commodities. Instead of putting the commodities on the market at the lowest price at which they can furnish them, evidently they are putting them on at the highest price they think the farmers will stand and for which they will be able to raise the cash.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The gentleman stated at the outset of his remarks that he thought these fertilizer people were violating our antitrust laws. Can the gentleman call to mind any evidence of a sincere attempt on the part of the present administration to enforce our antitrust laws?

Mr. LARSEN. I regret very much that I am not in possession of information that would benefit the gentleman materially along these lines. I did, however, hear one of the gentlemen over in the other end of the Capitol make a speech a few months ago in which he stated that owing to an investigation which he had procured within the last few years the fertilizer companies had been brought to task and that large fines, in many instances, had been imposed upon them. I do not know just what the amount of the fines were, nor of my own knowledge do I know that fines were imposed. I understand some penalties were imposed either by agreement with the Department of Justice or through the courts in Baltimore. One of the resolutions which I introduced to-day requests information from the Attorney General regarding the matter to which the gentleman from Oklahoma now calls my attention.

I do not know under what administration these offenders were punished or whether or not the administration was at all responsible for their punishment, but I do understand punishment was inflicted. I hope to have that information brought to the attention of the Congress, and to the attention of the people of the United States through the Department of Justice, showing us just what has been done, and not only what the penalties were but so far as possible what offenses, if any, were committed by the fertilizer concerns.

I was about to address my remarks, when I yielded to the gentleman from Oklahoma, to the similarity of prices at which these fertilizer concerns are selling and offer to sell their commodities. For instance, I have here the prices that are quoted by some of the companies doing business in my State. The Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corporation is offering phosphate at \$17 a ton. The F. S. Royster Guano Co. offers the same commodity for \$16.99, just a difference of 1 penny on a ton. I do not know how they could figure that difference, nor why they so figured it, but they have probably concluded that the best way to manipulate the matter was to make a little immaterial difference and thus avoid the charge of being in a com-

bine. Three other companies offer to sell 16 per cent phosphates at identically the same prices and delivered at the same point, \$17.82, the Empire State Chemical Co., at Athens, Ga., \$17.82, Ethredge Guano Co., of Atlanta, Ga., and \$17.82, the Southern States Phosphate & Fertilizer Co., delivered at the same point.

Now, gentlemen, it is very queer to me that all these companies would have identically the same prices on the same articles delivered at the same point. The circumstances are such as to at least raise the presumption that there is a common understanding between them, that they will sell for the highest price they can possibly get. Not only do they sell for the highest price they can get, but they sell at identically the same price. The quotations of the various companies are so nearly the same there must be a common understanding among them. That common understanding is not for the welfare of the public, and especially farmers who are forced to use fertilizers in the cultivation and growth of their crops.

The farmers in my section, in many instances, mix their own fertilizers. Where they mix fertilizers they usually use phosphate and mix it with potash or some other such commodity. The Empire State Chemical Co., operating at Athens, offers to sell at a given point in Georgia nitrate at \$53, while a competitor offers to sell the same commodity at \$52.95. But there is a little differential in the haul and in the transportation company over which these articles would be delivered at this same point. So you will see, gentlemen, that when it comes to these commodities that go into the mixtures, where farmers prefer to mix their own fertilizers, the commodities cost them substantially the same amount. When they mix them with cottonseed meal or whatever they propose to use, they find the cost the same. When it comes to the various grades I have mentioned, the prices are identically the same, and the figures I have given are taken from the prices of a half dozen different concerns.

Now, gentlemen, as before stated, I have introduced to-day two resolutions. I am not asking that we appoint any committee in this House to investigate the matter.

I do not want to burden the Senate or the membership of this House with a congressional investigation, nor do I desire to burden the public with such an investigation except through our regular constituted channels. All I want is a department of this Government which has been created for the express purpose to make the investigation and to report its findings—I refer to the Federal Trade Commission. The Federal Trade Commission has the right under the Federal Trade Commission act, section 6, subsection (d), to make this investigation upon direction of the President or either House of Congress and report the facts relating to any alleged violations of the antitrust acts by any corporation. I am simply asking that these resolutions be voted out by the House and that the Federal Trade Commission conduct the investigation and make its report, and that the Department of Justice, which I am referring to in another resolution, advise the House what has been done within the past five years along the lines of the information sought by the gentleman from Oklahoma a few moments ago, and I hope, gentlemen, you will use your influence in seeing that these resolutions are passed. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to take these few minutes to discuss the subject of bridge legislation and to advise the House of the policies that have been adopted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and the Committee on Commerce of the Senate in reference to bridge legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. At this juncture, if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman is about the best-informed man we have in the House on bridge legislation, and has had charge of such legislation here for several years. Practically all of the Members are interested in the matter and might want to hear him. Does not the gentleman want us to get a quorum here? We now have about 30 Members on the floor. I will make a point of order that will get the gentleman a quorum, if he does not mind it. I would like for more of the Members to hear the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I appreciate the attitude of my friend from Texas, but I would rather go ahead.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me make the point and call them in from the cloakrooms and then I will withdraw it. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DENISON. I do not want to take up the time of the committee for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON. Now that the Chair has counted and the Members have come in, I withdraw the point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DENISON. At one time or another almost every Member of the House and of the Senate is called upon to introduce bills for the consent of the Congress for the construction of a bridge over some navigable waterway. It is a matter that has become of very great importance not only to the House but to the country.

At the last Congress I discussed at some length the question of bridge legislation and the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over our navigable waterways. My remarks can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 30, 1926. I do not want to go into the details of that subject again at this time. I simply will make the following general statement:

Jurisdiction over the waterways of the country in England was in the Crown for the purposes of commerce. All navigable waterways were considered as belonging to the Crown. When the Colonies in this country were settled jurisdiction over the navigable waterways of this country was also in the Crown of England. At that time it was held that such jurisdiction extended up the rivers as far as the tidewaters reached; but in the course of time, by analogy the jurisdiction of the Crown was held by the courts to extend up the waters of the various rivers and the arms of the sea as far as they were navigable.

When the Colonies won their independence from Great Britain this jurisdiction passed to the various Colonies; and when the Colonies got together in the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution was adopted the commerce clause was inserted in it by which the Federal Government was given the right to regulate commerce between the States and with foreign nations. In other words, by the commerce clause of the Constitution the States surrendered their jurisdiction over all navigable waterways to the Federal Government, and since then the Federal Government has had absolute and exclusive jurisdiction over all the navigable waterways of this country.

Until the Federal Government chose to exercise such jurisdiction in a regulatory way it was considered that the different States had concurrent jurisdiction over those waterways within their respective boundaries, subject to be changed at any time whenever the Federal Government chose to act.

Mr. MORROW rose.

Mr. DENISON. I will yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. MORROW. Have not the Federal courts held that such jurisdiction upon navigable waters and streams also extends to the tributaries with respect to the question of commerce and also for impounding waters that can be used for other purposes?

Mr. DENISON. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Illinois state right there what is the latest, acceptable definition of a navigable stream?

Mr. DENISON. The question of what constitutes a navigable waterway is one of law and of fact; but wherever the history of the stream shows that it at one time or another has been used for commerce, for the transportation of persons or property, it is a navigable waterway. For instance, if it was used in the early days by the pioneers as a highway for moving property, logs, or other property, or for transporting persons, it is classed as a navigable waterway, although, as a matter of fact, it may not now be navigable at all.

But we all know that in the early days before there were highways and before there were railroads the rivers of the country were the only substantial method of transportation in the inland country; and so the courts hold now that all those streams that were at some time used for transportation of persons or property may be classed as navigable waterways and the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction over them.

Mr. BLANTON. And what about potential navigability?

Mr. DENISON. They are not classed as navigable waterways unless at some time in their history they were used for that purpose. It does not matter that they are not now used for navigation or that they are not in their present state capable of being used for navigation; but if they have at some time been used as a highway for transportation they are classed now as navigable waterways.

In 1890 the Congress chose to assert its jurisdiction and to exclude the right of the States to construct or permit to be constructed buildings or bridges or other obstructions in the navigable waterways of the country; and then later in the act of March 3, 1899, the Congress, in section 9 thereof, enacted this provision:

That it shall not be lawful to construct or commence the construction of any bridge, dam, dike, or causeway over or in any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, navigable river, or other navigable water of the United States until the consent of Congress to the building of such structure shall have been obtained and until the plans for the same shall have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War.

Now, by that act the Federal Government through Congress asserted its jurisdiction and declared its exclusive jurisdiction over all navigable waterways of the country.

On March 23, 1906, Congress passed what is known as the general bridge law governing the construction of bridges over navigable waterways. This, in brief, is the principle and generally accepted source of the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over navigable waterways, and it is a very great and far-reaching power that was surrendered by the States to the Federal Government.

Let me here digress just a moment to call to the attention of the House another source of jurisdiction by which the Federal Government is now recognized as having the right to regulate the construction of bridges and the collection of tolls that are charged for the use of bridges. Having jurisdiction over the navigable waterways of the country, the Federal Government, in granting franchises for the construction of bridges over them, may grant or withhold the privilege as it pleases; and in granting the privilege it may impose such reasonable conditions as it chooses. In the exercise of this power, the Federal Government can impose such conditions with reference to the construction of the bridges and their management and the collection of tolls for their use as it chooses.

But on July 11, 1916, Congress passed the first Federal aid road act, and since then has passed several other Federal aid road acts, under which the Federal Government has contributed several hundred million dollars to the States to aid in the construction of improved roads for the transportation of interstate commerce and for facilitating the movement of the mails, and for military purposes. With the improvement of roads and the development of motor transportation on the highways, most of the highways of the country have come to be used as channels for the transportation of interstate commerce, and to this extent the States have lost their exclusive right to regulate them and the Federal Government has acquired certain rights in connection with the highways whenever it chooses to exercise its powers.

In Indiana a drainage district organized under the laws of that State undertook to cut a drainage ditch across the Lincoln Highway, which it had the right to do under a State law, without making provision for repairing the highway with a permanent bridge. The Federal Government went into a United States court and asked for an injunction to prevent the drainage district from tearing up the highway. The injunction was granted, and the case was appealed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, where the decision of the lower court was affirmed. In the course of its opinion the court said (U. S. v. Babcock, 6 Fed. Rep. 161):

The Government of the United States is one having jurisdiction over every foot of soil within its territory, and acting directly upon each citizen, * * * to which is committed power over interstate commerce and the transmission of the mail. The powers thus conferred upon the National Government are not dormant, but have been assumed and put into practical exercise by the legislation of Congress. In the exercise of those powers it is competent for the Nation to remove all obstructions upon highways, natural or artificial, to the passage of interstate commerce or the carrying of the mail. It is said that the jurisdiction heretofore exercised by the National Government over highways has been in respect to waterways, the natural highways of the country, and not over artificial highways, such as railroads; * * * but the basis upon which rests its jurisdiction over artificial highways is the same as that which supports it over the natural highways. Both spring from the power to regulate commerce.

If this principle is true as to artificial highways such as railroads, why is it not likewise true as to artificial highways such as the national highway known as Lincoln Highway, which is recognized as a primary interstate highway and upon which the Government has expended many thousands of dollars?

In the case of *Duke v. The Michigan Commission* (266 U. S. 570) the court held that a statute of the State of Michigan which authorized its public-utilities commission to require persons using its highways for the transportation of interstate commerce to obtain a certificate as a common carrier was unconstitutional, the court saying:

But it is well settled that a State has no power to fetter the right to carry on interstate commerce within its borders by the imposition of conditions or regulations which are unnecessary and pass beyond the bounds of what is reasonable and suitable for the proper exercise of its power in the field that belongs to it.

In *Buck v. Kuykendall* (267 U. S. 307) the court held that a statute of the State of Washington which required persons using the highways of that State for the transportation of interstate commerce to obtain a certificate of convenience and

necessity before doing so was unconstitutional and void when applied to persons engaged in the transportation of interstate commerce. In the decision the court held that such a statute defeats the purpose of Congress expressed in the legislation giving Federal aid for the construction of interstate highways. In *Bush Co. v. Malloy* (267 U. S. 317) the court held that a Maryland statute requiring persons engaged in interstate commerce to obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity before using the highways of the State was unconstitutional and void.

These decisions show the trend of the courts in recognizing the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the highways of the different States that are now used for the transportation of interstate commerce and United States mails. And as a result of this additional source of jurisdiction the Federal Government can, when it chooses, regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waterways that are constructed as connecting links on Federal-aid highways or other highways of the States that are used for the transportation of interstate commerce and the United States mails.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and Committee on Commerce of the Senate are the committees that, under the rules, have jurisdiction of this subject. It may not always be a pleasant duty to perform, but it is the duty of these committees to consider all bridge legislation. If bills are filed for the consent of Congress to construct a bridge over a navigable waterway, it is the duty of this committee to consider it and report it, or refuse to report it, to the House. Until the time comes when the question shall be sufficiently settled in the public mind that Congress can know what provisions ought to be enacted into a general law, so that we can wisely pass new general legislation covering all questions connected with the construction of bridges, we will have to continue the policy of considering and passing individual bridge bills as they are presented by the Members.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. COLTON. Referring back to the navigability of streams, has the gentleman found any rule determining the exact meaning of navigability?

Mr. DENISON. There is no standard—it depends on the facts and circumstances disclosed in each case. The Supreme Court has held that the question as to whether or not this river or that river shall be considered a navigable waterway depends on the history of the river and the use that has been made of it for travel and transportation.

Now, this question of bridge legislation was a very few years ago considered of little importance. In fact, four or five years ago we only had one form for all bridge bills—just a short consent statute permitting the bridge to be built. In fact, no bridges were built except railroad bridges and now and then a municipal bridge in some city or a town.

But with the great change in methods of transportation, with the development of improved highways and motor transportation, this question of the construction of bridges has, within the last few years, grown to be of very great importance to the country. Therefore, your committee has had to give a great deal of study to the provisions that should be included in the franchises that Congress grants for the construction of bridges.

Now, I want to discuss for the information of the House and the country the policies that govern your committee in the preparation of the forms that these franchises should take.

In the first place, let me say that the committee wishes to encourage the construction of free bridges wherever they can be built. Of course, we all understand that there are what are known as free bridges, where no charge is made for their use, and there are toll bridges, where a toll is charged.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is favoring and encouraging the construction of free bridges wherever they can be built. That is the first policy of the committee.

In the next place we do not grant any exclusive right to private individuals or private companies to construct toll bridges. I could go into that question in detail and discuss it at great length if I had time. I think it ought to be apparent to every one of us why it would not be wise for Congress to grant to private individuals or to private corporations exclusive rights or monopolies for constructing bridges over navigable waters at particular places. If we should do that, if we should undertake to decide between various parties asking for the right to build a bridge over a river at a particular place, and if we should grant the right to one and refuse to grant it to another—as soon as it was granted it might immediately become maybe of great value and might become an object of traffic and speculation among unscrupulous promoters.

We want the country to understand that no one need pay any promoter a single dollar for a bridge franchise, because he can always come to Congress and get one for nothing.

We do not want to follow any policy which will place a commercial value on bridge franchises, that will result in trading them after they are granted, and which would encourage attempts to use improper methods to obtain them.

The only way you can avoid that is to let the public know that Congress will not grant any monopoly, any exclusive right to construct bridges over any of the rivers or other navigable waters of the country. When we grant such a franchise to an individual he knows and the public knows that if any other responsible party comes to Congress and asks for a franchise to build a bridge near the same place, Congress will freely grant him the right to do so.

There is one exception to this rule: If the public asks for the privilege of building a bridge at a certain location and if some private individual also asks for the right to do so, we give preference to the public as a matter of course.

In other words, if a State wants to build a bridge, or if a city or a county is asking for a franchise to build a bridge, we give preference to public authorities; and when we grant authority to the public to build a bridge at a particular place, we will not grant a similar right to any private individual or corporation. With that exception, we grant no exclusive right and I am sure the Members of the House, when they reflect upon this, will understand and approve the wisdom of that policy.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. What has been and what is now the policy of the committee when there are two bills seeking to secure a permit between two points?

Mr. DENISON. If one of the bills is filed asking for the consent of Congress to a public authority like a city or a State or a highway commission, and the other is to a private company or individual, we give preference to the public authority.

If the permits are asked for by two private individuals, and Members of the House or of the Senate come before us and upon their responsibility recommend the granting of the permits, it is the policy of our committees to grant them both and then let the business judgment and the business ability of the two individuals or two groups of individuals and public sentiment determine who shall build the bridge. So far as the Federal Government is concerned, it is entirely satisfactory if they build two bridges. It is a matter of business that must determine how many bridges shall be built and who shall build them. We could not safely follow any other policy.

We can not and will not give an exclusive privilege or monopoly to private individuals to construct toll bridges, and if two or more people obtain permits to build bridges at or near the same place, the one who has the business ability and the money and public sentiment back of him is going to build it, and he is not going to let anybody else scare him out of it. It is the same principle that governs in other business matters. Congress does not attempt to limit the right to some one or another group to build a hotel or an apartment building on one of the streets of our city. That is a business matter, and anyone who wants to can build such a structure. In the construction of bridges we do not want to say that any particular individual shall be given an exclusive right to construct a toll bridge at an important river crossing.

We will grant him the permit to do it, and then if he has the money and the ability and if public sentiment is back of him, he will build it, and he will not let anyone else scare him out of it by a mere threat to build another bridge.

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

Mr. DENISON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the gentleman's committee ever given consideration to the question of conferring upon the War Department, without investigation by the Congress of all of these particular bills, a general blanket authority to issue permits to individuals or other associations or highway commissioners the right to construct bridges across navigable streams?

Mr. DENISON. Of course, our committee has given very careful consideration to that subject.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The reason I ask that is that the passage of these bridge bills is largely a matter of legislative mechanics. It takes up a good deal of time of the committee and on the calendar. I would like to hear the gentleman's observations on that phase of the matter if he has given it any consideration.

Mr. DENISON. As I just stated, Congress has exclusive jurisdiction of this important subject. Of course, we can delegate that authority to some bureau or some official of the

Government, if we are willing to surrender our control over the subject. That is a question for the wisdom of Congress. Bills are now pending for that purpose. I myself during the last Congress filed a bill to get rid of this whole subject. My committee at one time thought we would like to get rid of it, that the Congress ought to get rid of it and delegate the whole subject to some bureau or some official of the Government. We have already delegated to the War Department the right to pass upon the plans and specifications of bridges, and before any bridge can be built, the plans and specifications must be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War; but the more I have studied the subject, the more doubt I have as to the wisdom of delegating our jurisdiction to control the subject to any bureau or any official of the executive departments of the Government. There might be danger of abuse; there might be danger that the agency to whom we delegate the authority would give exclusive or monopolistic privileges, and there are other dangers it is not necessary to go into.

I have not yet come to the conclusion that it would be wise for the Congress to surrender this important jurisdiction and delegate it to some one individual or some bureau of the Government. We may have to do it sooner or later. There is legislation now pending for that purpose. My colleague on the committee, Mr. BURNES, has a very good bill which provides for that policy, now pending before the committee. But before we can do that it is the duty of Congress to lay down the principles which shall govern the bureau or other official in the exercise of such a duty and to provide by general legislation the principles which shall govern in the exercise of that duty.

We are now in a transitory period in the construction of bridges, where we have not been able yet to reach an entire agreement on the question of policy. As soon as we have done that, have reached a general agreement about policies, we can then perhaps pass general legislation covering the whole subject and delegate the authority to some agency of the Government to grant all bridge franchises.

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

Mr. DENISON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no greater or more important committee, in my opinion, than the committee to which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois belongs, and I hope it will never bring in legislation delegating the power of Congress to any bureau in that way.

Now, leading out from Wichita Falls, between Texas and Oklahoma there are two highways leading to toll bridges, and elsewhere between Oklahoma and Texas you find highways leading to toll bridges and toll ferries. There is one leading out of Dallas, and when you pass Denison and get to the Oklahoma line you have a toll bridge to cross or else you would have to cross on a toll ferry, and I could mention others between Texas and Oklahoma where you have a lot of toll bridges to cross. When you go out of Texarkana on the main highway northeast you soon strike the same proposition. I hope the gentleman's committee will act cooperatively with the Committee on Agriculture, which handles the good roads proposition, and see to it that on all these main highways that connect States steps shall be taken to provide free bridges. They are just as much needed segments of the highways as any other portion of the highways.

Mr. DENISON. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that it is the policy of our committee to favor free bridges wherever possible. But, gentlemen, there are places where free bridges can not be constructed and where they will not be constructed. Let us take as an illustration bridges over the Mississippi River between Illinois and Iowa and between Kentucky and Missouri, and so forth. Those are not State bridges. They are interstate bridges. The Federal Government is not going to build those interstate bridges. It costs from \$2,000,000 to \$5,000,000 to build one of them. We are aiding the States in constructing good roads in a limited way now, but it will bankrupt this Government if we ever enter upon the policy of building interstate bridges.

Mr. BLANTON. Yet the finest free interstate bridge in the country is that between St. Louis and East St. Louis, across the Mississippi River.

Mr. DENISON. Yes. The city of St. Louis is taxing its people to pay for a free municipal bridge as a municipal investment. It has been a good investment to the city of St. Louis. But there are not many cities that can do what the city of St. Louis did.

Mr. BLANTON. Take, for instance, the section of highways in both Texas and Oklahoma, where the Government matches dollar for dollar with the States. If the Government put up dollar for dollar with Texas and with Oklahoma in that way for bridges, many of the States would be in favor of free bridges and would vote money to match dollars with the Federal Government.

Mr. DENISON. No; I think it would be just the opposite. The people of Cairo, in my district, wanted to get a bridge across the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. I was asked to come to Congress and ask for a Government appropriation for that purpose. I filed such a bill in two Congresses and urged it as strongly as I could, but I did not get even a smile from anyone representing the Federal Government to approve such a policy. Why? The moment the Federal Government enters upon the policy of constructing interstate bridges it will be sure to cost the Government billions of dollars. There are many great waterways in this country, and Congress has not yet reached the point where we are ready and willing to enter upon that kind of a policy. Since the Federal Government is not willing to enter upon the policy of building these expensive free bridges, and so long as there is no prospect of the States doing it, we may properly, I think, permit private capital to build toll bridges.

Mr. BLANTON. As one of the economists of the House, I am ready to vote for a measure that will have the Federal Government match dollar for dollar with the States of Texas and Oklahoma and with all other States similarly situated, to build free bridges as needed segments of interstate highways. If those bills are ever brought on the floor of the House I think the House will favor them.

Mr. DENISON. I have tried that; at the same time that I filed a bill here asking for aid of the Federal Government to construct bridges across the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers at Cairo I made inquiries from time to time of the Highway Departments of the State of Illinois, the State of Kentucky, and the State of Missouri to see if they would join with the Federal Government and appropriate funds to construct free highway bridges over those rivers at Cairo. I received no encouragement. Those States had no funds to use for that purpose. They were all using all they could raise for the construction of improved roads within their respective borders. They were unwilling to levy taxes upon their people to raise funds to construct expensive free bridges to cross the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. So it is the judgment of your committee that the time has not yet come when States will, by general taxation, raise funds to construct free bridges over the interstate rivers along their borders. When all of the improved highways that are needed are constructed, and when the people of the States are willing to be taxed to build bridges over the great rivers of the country, we may then expect free State-owned bridges. But until that time comes, we will have to depend upon private capital to build such improvements whenever public sentiment demands them.

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

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is there not now a tendency for the States and subdivisions of States to finance the construction of bridges by issuing bonds? Is not that the modern method?

Mr. DENISON. There has been an attempt to do that in a few cases. There are some of them now trying to do it, by asking Congress to confer authority upon them to borrow money, when they have no such authority under their State law. The committee has given very careful attention to this subject, and we feel that there are places in this country where the people need the bridges and where the public authorities can not or will not raise the funds necessary to construct them. Until that can be done by the public authorities we feel that franchises should be granted to private individuals to build the bridges with private capital. And let me say this: There is some sound argument in favor of such a policy.

If we are to build a bridge across the Mississippi River at Cairo, for instance, the farmers and business men who live in the upper part of the State will probably never see that bridge and never use it; and there are those who believe that it would not be right to tax all the people of the State several million dollars to enable tourists and others to cross the river at Cairo on a bridge instead of a ferry.

There are a great many people who believe that the people who use bridges should pay for them instead of taxing the people generally for that purpose. Why should the farmers of the State of Illinois be taxed to build a free bridge across the Mississippi River? And why should the people of south Texas and all over the State of Texas and the people of the State of Oklahoma be taxed to build a free bridge, or several free bridges, between the two States? Why not let the tourists and the people who use those bridges pay for them, amortize their cost, and then make them free?

Mr. BLANTON. If my friend will yield, there are thousands of Texans who every year cross that free bridge over the Mississippi into East St. Louis. There are thousands of them every year.

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

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to leave that subject before I complete it. The policy of our committee is that when we grant the right to an individual or to a corporation to build a bridge with private capital, we protect the interests of the public in various ways. How do we do it? I want to go over that subject briefly.

In the first place, you understand that the Federal Government can regulate the tolls that may be charged. There is never one of these bridges built except at a place where there is a ferry and there is nobody who can regulate the ferry charges. A ferry is an old, antiquated, and unsafe method of crossing rivers, and there is no authority to regulate the tolls that are charged on an interstate stream. On the contrary, when a bridge is built, the tolls can be regulated by the Federal Government; and if the company or individual that builds the bridge charges tolls that are unfair, that are too high or unreasonable, anyone can make complaint to the proper Federal authority, an investigation will be made, and the Federal Government has the right to reduce the tolls. So the tolls charged on such bridges are subject to Federal regulation.

Mr. RAMSEYER. By whom and how?

Mr. DENISON. I will show the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is, by whom? What officials or what group of officials?

Mr. DENISON. The act of March 23, 1906, contains this provision, and every bridge in the United States over a navigable waterway that has been built by the consent of Congress since March 23, 1906, is subject to this provision of law.

Mr. GARDNER of Indiana. Are not the bridges built prior to that time under the regulation of the Federal Government?

Mr. DENISON. Not if they were built before March 23, 1906. Here is the provision in the act of March 23, 1906, under which the Secretary of War may regulate the tolls that are charged on any toll bridge constructed under that act:

If tolls shall be charged for the transit over any bridge constructed under the provisions of this act, of engines, cars, street cars, wagons, carriages, vehicles, animals, foot passengers, or other passengers, such tolls shall be reasonable and just, and the Secretary of War may, at any time, and from time to time, prescribe the reasonable rates of toll for such transit over such bridge, and the rates so prescribed shall be the legal rates and shall be the rates demanded and received for such transit.

So nobody should be afraid of the charges that will be made on a toll bridge, because at any time the tolls become unreasonable or the public feels that the tolls are too high complaint can be made to the Secretary of War, and he will have an investigation made immediately. He has informed us time and again that that is his policy, and it is the policy he carries out. He will have an investigation made as to the expense of operating the bridge and its cost. After doing that he will fix the tolls at what will be reasonable and just, and they can not thereafter charge any larger tolls than he fixes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In my State of Kentucky, on the eastern Dixie Highway and on the southern Dixie Highway—two transcontinental highways that extend entirely across the country—there are two bridges. One of them, I understand, cost \$16,000, and last year the returns from tolls amounted to \$126,000. Now, the Federal Government has spent millions of dollars in bringing business to that bridge, and I want to know how you can reach fellows of that kind.

Mr. DENISON. I will tell the gentleman. That is a typical case and a great many of the Members do not understand situations like that. Let me tell you how to handle that situation. If that bridge has been built by the consent of Congress since March 23, 1906, and it is over a navigable waterway of the United States, I suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky to file a complaint with the Secretary of War, or have anyone else do it, and call his attention to the fact that they are charging unreasonable tolls to cross that bridge, and I will guarantee you will get a reduction in the tolls if they are found to be unjust or unreasonable.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But suppose that bridge was built before March 23, 1906. The Federal Government has built roads to each of these bridges which bring business to them, and I want to know how we are going to reach them?

Mr. DENISON. I will tell the gentleman how to do that. If the bridge was built way back yonder before there was any regulation of these matters, there may be certain vested rights

which we have to accept; but I advise the State of Kentucky to take \$16,000 more and build a free bridge right by the side of that one, and that will stop it. Congress will grant the State or county a franchise for that purpose any day.

Mr. BLANTON. May I correct one statement which the gentleman inadvertently made?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; if I made one.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will investigate, he will find that in the case of every ferry that is on an interstate highway connecting two States the War Department does assume control over it. It controls its rates, it controls the number of trips it makes per day, it controls the time it must begin these trips, and the time it must stop.

Mr. DENISON. My friend from Texas is usually pretty accurate—

Mr. BLANTON. I checked that up this past summer and I had the owners of such ferries to tell me that the War Department does control them and does cause them to give certain service; for instance, I recall a ferry down in Missouri, particularly, that was caused to make more trips and to reduce its charges.

Mr. DENISON. I can not yield any further. I will state that if the gentleman will point out the law under which the War Department regulates the tolls on ferries, I will be pleased to have him do so. I do not think there is such a law.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the department does it, under the law that gives the Government control over navigable streams.

Mr. DENISON. I want the gentleman to point out the law to me by which they do it. The Department of Commerce regulates the navigation of all rivers and requires certain things as to service, but they do not control the tolls that are charged, as I understand it.

Mr. BLANTON. The War Department assumes control under the general law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is that the only remedy the gentlemen of the committee have thought of that is within the law—to build a new bridge right by the side of the old one which is charging excessive tolls?

Mr. DENISON. Would not that be an effective remedy?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That would be an effective remedy, perhaps.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, the gentleman understands if that bridge was lawfully built with private capital, we can not confiscate it; and if it was built before there was any such law as the present one, we can not regulate its tolls.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It seems to me when the Federal Government has spent \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 to bring the business to that bridge, when it did not have any business practically at all until the Government spent that money, we ought to be able to take hold of it. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. If the gentleman from Kentucky can figure out any legal remedy under the Constitution I will be glad to have him do so and insert it in the RECORD. I am trying to state what I think is the law; and I will say if that bridge was built by the consent of Congress, Congress has no doubt reserved the right to repeal, alter, or amend the law granting it; and if that bridge was built by the consent of Congress, my friend the gentleman from Kentucky can file a bill to repeal it and, if the bill can be passed, the Secretary of War will make them tear down the bridge; and he can make them do that at their own expense under the law.

Mr. BLANTON. And what is to prevent us from condemning it under the power of eminent domain as a needed national-highway proposition?

Mr. DENISON. There is nothing to prevent us from condemning it if there is any sufficient Federal reason for doing so.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what we ought to do. We ought to exercise the right of eminent domain.

Mr. DENISON. I suggest to the gentleman that he start proceedings for that purpose if he wants to.

I want now to go ahead and continue my discussion briefly of the policies of our committee in granting these franchises to protect the interests of the public.

First, I said we can regulate the tolls and fix them, if necessary, to make them reasonable and just.

Second, we put in every bill that we pass a provision giving the right of recapture to the public. In other words, we give to the Federal Government or to the State government or any political subdivision with which the bridge is connected the right to go into court and condemn the bridge and take it over for the purpose of making it free.

Then we limit the amount that has to be paid, after a certain time, in order to do this; we provide that if the State government wants to take over the bridge after a certain time it can do so without having to pay for any going value,

or any prospective profits, or any earning power, but it can take it over by paying the actual value of the physical structure, less deterioration.

This fully protects the public, so that if at any time the States or the municipalities get into a condition where they can financially do so, they can go into court by proper condemnation proceedings and take over the bridge if they want to make it a free bridge.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ELLIOTT). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Now, in addition to this right of recapture which fully protects the public, we think, we require the person who builds a toll bridge or the company that builds a toll bridge to file a sworn, itemized statement of every element of cost that enters into it. They have to file this statement with the Secretary of War as soon as they complete the bridge, and we are now requiring them to file the statement of costs with the highway department of the State in which the bridge is located; and if it connects two States, they have to file the statement of costs with the highway departments of the two States.

Then we provide that at any time within three years after the completion of the bridge the Secretary of War may make an investigation of this statement of costs; we further provide that upon the request of the highway department of either of the States, the Secretary of War shall make a full inquiry and investigation of the statement of costs, and then it is his duty to find what is the reasonable cost of the bridge—not only the actual cost but the reasonable cost—and whatever he determines to be the reasonable cost is the cost that shall govern in case the public decides to take the bridge over by condemnation. We fix the measure of damages as based upon the cost of the bridge, so that we protect the public against padding of costs, against exaggeration of costs, and against any fraudulent statement of costs.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENTZ. Has the gentleman ever had brought to his attention by the Panamanians the question of building a bridge over the Panama Canal?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; I have.

Mr. ARENTZ. What does the gentleman think about it?

Mr. DENISON. A bridge over the Panama Canal is a very serious question. It involves questions of national defense that are very important.

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman knows that there is a place called Bouquet?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. When Lindbergh wanted to go there the only way he could go was to either fly or go by boat. It seems to me that it would only be fair play to meet the demands of transportation to give them a bridge so that they might cross from the northern part to the southern part of their country.

Mr. DENISON. We have a splendid ferry service there now that answers all present needs of the people. We may some time find a safe way to build a bridge over the canal.

Now, let me go a little further as to the protection of the public against what some think may be an imposition by private toll-bridge owners.

If an individual or company has been given the consent of Congress to build a toll bridge, we have the right to regulate the tolls to be charged the public at any time; and if the public does not want to go ahead and buy the bridge in order to make it free, Congress stands ready at any time to give the public a franchise to build another bridge by the side of it.

We are not only putting all these provisions to protect the public in every franchise we grant to build toll bridges, but in every bridge bill Congress reserves the right to repeal, alter, or amend it at any time. The Government can compel the owners of any bridge to change it, or remove it if it interferes with or obstructs navigation.

So, the Federal Government reserves full control over the subject, and under the policy which the committee has adopted in granting these franchises we have taken every possible precaution to protect the public; and we only grant franchises to private individuals when there does not seem to be any probability of a bridge being built by the public authorities.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe that the provision reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal is sufficiently broad to justify granting another permit alongside of the one already built?

Mr. DENISON. I do. Congress has absolute control over it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Has it ever been tested?

Mr. DENISON. The right to do it has never been questioned.

Now, let me state in conclusion. There are many cases where the States themselves can not build free bridges; they can not or will not tax their people to build expensive bridges over the rivers, especially those on their borders. They are using all the money they can get to improve their roads. It may be long years before many of the States can raise funds to pay for the free highway bridges over interstate waterways. There is ample capital in this country that is now ready to be invested in improved bridges. Your committee sees no reason why, under such circumstances, private capital should not be allowed to be invested in order to give the people better and more modern methods of crossing the rivers of the country.

I have seen statements in the newspapers within the last few days to the effect that American citizens invested last year \$2,000,193,000 in foreign countries. In other words, that vast amount of American capital has sought investment abroad for a lack of opportunities for investment in this country. Much of it, no doubt, was invested for the purpose of providing public utilities and for other progressive developments in those countries. Some of us think that it would not be at all unwise to permit some of this capital to be invested in improved methods of crossing the rivers of this country, provided that in permitting it to be done, we prevent the public from being exploited and we preserve to the public the right to regulate the charges for the use of such bridges and save to the public the right to recapture them for the purpose of making them free.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANLOVE. I want to state that I have had four cases before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in presenting municipal bills for different counties in my district, and that I am personally much obliged to the chairman and the committee for the active and expeditious manner in which the business has been transacted.

Mr. DENISON. That is very kind of the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. The suggestion I had in mind was the fact that the American investment of \$2,000,000,000 and more in Europe annually is probably responsible for all of the sentiment we hear expressed about canceling the debts of foreign nations to the United States.

Mr. DENISON. And it would not be a bad policy to encourage the investment of that American capital at home.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The gentleman has expressed the conviction that the Federal Government is invested with exclusive jurisdiction over the navigable waters of the United States, that power coming under the interstate and foreign commerce clause of the Constitution. As a corollary of that conviction, does the gentleman hold that there is an exclusive obligation upon the part of the Federal Government to control the waters of navigable waterways so as to prevent floods?

Mr. DENISON. I just spoke for an hour and a half before the Flood Control Committee to-day, and I expressed my views that it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect the people of the Mississippi Valley from floods, and that the Federal Government ought to do so from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. If there be exclusive obligation upon the part of the Federal Government, has the Congress the legal right to impose upon the States and compel them to accept a division of that jurisdiction?

Mr. DENISON. That is going into another question which I am sorry I will not have time to discuss now. I will say I do not think the Government can compel the States to pay any part of the expense required for flood control.

In conclusion, the committee has prepared a series of standard forms for bridge bills. They are, we believe, improvements over the forms used heretofore. There is an agreement between the committees of the Senate and the House upon these forms. All of these provisions to protect the public interests are inserted in these forms. I shall insert them, with the consent of the committee, in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and they will, no doubt, be made a public document, so that each Member of the House and the Senate can have them; and if in preparing bills for bridge franchises over rivers in their respective districts, the Members will consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and follow the form that fits the facts in the particular case, the bill will meet the approval of the House and the Senate committees, and so far as those two committees can control the matter, will receive the approval of the House and the Senate.

Those forms proposed for bridge bills are as follows:

FORMS FOR BRIDGE BILLS

1

(Form for publicly owned free highway bridge, intrastate)

A bill granting the consent of Congress to the _____ (Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the _____ River at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the _____

(Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

2

(Form for publicly owned free highway bridge, interstate)

A bill authorizing the _____ (Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the _____ River, at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the _____

(Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the _____ (Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) all such rights and powers

to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

3

(Form for publicly owned toll bridge, intrastate)

A bill granting the consent of Congress to the _____ (Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the _____ River, at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the _____

(Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) to construct, maintain, and operate a

bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed _____ years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be

so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

4

(Form for publicly owned toll bridge, interstate)

A bill authorizing the _____ (Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the _____ River, at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the _____

(Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon _____ (Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said _____ (Insert the name of the State, county, city, or highway department) is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed _____ years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

5

(Form for privately owned toll bridge, intrastate)

A bill authorizing _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the _____ River at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of _____ any political subdivision thereof within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located,

or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation, in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of _____ years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, 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 cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests 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 _____, or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of section 2 of this act, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed _____ years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating 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 _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Department of the State of _____ a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and at the request of the Highway Department of the State of _____ shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 2 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, 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. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

6

(Form for privately owned toll bridge, interstate)

A bill authorizing _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the _____ River, at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of _____, the State of _____, any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of _____ years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, 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 the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall be taken over or acquired by the States or public agencies or political subdivisions thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed _____ years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. The _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War and with the highway departments of the States of _____ and _____, a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of the highway department of either of such States shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 4 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, 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. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

7

(Form for privately owned toll bridge, international)

A bill authorizing _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the _____ River, at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in _____.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of _____ needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of _____, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of _____ applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act, is hereby granted to _____, its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, 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. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

8

(Form for railroad bridge)

A bill granting the consent of Congress to the _____ Company to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the _____ River at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the _____ Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to _____ Company, its successors and assigns, and any party 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 to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such party.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

9

(Form for railroad bridge, international)

A bill granting the consent of Congress to the _____ Company, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the _____ River at or near _____.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the _____ Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the _____ River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near _____, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the approval of the proper authority in _____.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act, is hereby granted to ----- Company, its successors 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. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

10

(Form to extend the times for constructing a bridge)

A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the ----- River, at or near -----

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the ----- River, at or near -----, authorized to be built by -----, by the act of Congress approved ----- are hereby extended one and three years respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] should not only receive the congratulations of the House upon his splendid work with reference to bridge legislation but that he should receive the commendation of the country. I feel certain that when the recapture clause which he initiated in bridge legislation comes to be known and understood by the people of the country and benefits of its provision secured by the public he will receive the plaudits of the country for that pioneer work.

The independent offices appropriation bill for 1929 (H. R. 9481) has been laid before the Congress for its consideration. This bill, carrying appropriations for 26 independent agencies of this Government, would appropriate \$526,193,111 toward their maintenance for the fiscal year of 1929. The agencies of government involved are as follows:

Executive.	Federal Power Commission.
Alaskan Relief.	Federal Radio Commission.
Alien Property Custodian.	Federal Reserve Board.
American Battle Monuments Commission.	Federal Trade Commission.
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.	General Accounting Office.
Board of Mediation.	Housing Corporation.
Board of Tax Appeals.	Interstate Commerce Commission.
Bureau of Efficiency.	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
Civil Service Commission.	Public Buildings and Public Parks.
Commission of Fine Arts.	Smithsonian Institution.
Employees' Compensation Commission.	Tariff Commission.
Federal Board for Vocational Education.	United States Geographic Board.
	United States Shipping Board.
	United States Veterans' Bureau.

The subcommittee which prepared this measure was composed of Mr. WILLIAM R. WOOD, of Indiana, chairman; Mr. EDWARD H. WASON, of New Hampshire; Mr. JOHN W. SUMMERS of Washington; Mr. THOMAS H. CULLEN, of New York; and myself.

The work in its preparation was most pleasant and interesting, but it is a work of responsibility; because of which, I feel it obligatory upon me to present a report to the Congress of certain facts and conditions which developed in the preparation of the bill. Owing to the subject matter involved, of course, it is impossible to develop the entire work or any considerable portion thereof. I will call to your attention certain matters which I think of interest to the Congress not only in connection with the bill under discussion for the next few days but in respect of other legislation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

In regard to the appropriation dealing with the maintenance of the Executive offices, it would appear that there is carried in this bill \$91,280 less than the appropriation for the current fiscal year. That comes about because there was struck from

this bill the sum of \$90,000 carried for this year to defray expenses of the litigation involved in the cancellation of the oil leases. As a matter of fact, for the maintenance of the Executive Mansion and grounds, the bill carries a slight increase. There is an increase in the salaries for personnel amounting to \$1,220. There is a decrease of \$2,000 in the heating item. That heat item is carried in another bill. The heat for the Executive Mansion has been obtained from the State, War, and Navy Building. Of course, that means no saving to the Treasury of the United States. It is a mere matter of bookkeeping. An appropriation of \$437,180 is carried for this activity.

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

This agency requests appropriation for one person, namely, the Alien Property Custodian. The Budget submitted its estimate in the sum of \$7,500 per annum. The committee increases this amount to the sum of \$10,000. I think that it is a reasonable charge for the responsibility and the proper discharge of official conduct.

It is an easy matter to attack this increase on the ground of economy. It can be said that the service of the present custodian, former Senator Howard Sutherland, has been secured for the lesser sum; and an argument might be presented that there are lessened duties involved. On October 31, 1927, there has been property aggregating the sum of \$615,000,000, which had been in the possession of the Alien Property Custodian. To that date, \$350,000,000+ had been paid out to claimants; of this amount, more than \$16,000,000 was represented in interest and income derived from this property. Of this aggregate amount, some \$58,000,000— was paid out under the Winslow bill wherein the amount of the claim was limited to \$10,000.

On October 31, 1927, there was property aggregating \$265,000,000— on hand. Of this amount, there was cash invested, used for working capital, in the sum of \$300,000. No interest was being collected upon this item. This amount is smaller than any similar fund at the close of any year since the passage of the law. Likewise, the amount of cash with depositaries in the small sum of \$25,000+ as compared with the high mark, at the close of the year, of \$2,600,000+, in 1923. According to the record presented to us, this office, beginning with November 1, was made self-sustaining, which is explanatory of the decrease in the appropriation requested from that which was carried for the current fiscal year. That amount was \$98,000. This is made possible by a change in the charges against the property and income in possession of this office. Heretofore the charge has been 1 per cent on income and one-fourth of 1 per cent on principal cash. Under the new plan the charge would be 2 per cent on income; nothing on receipts of principal, but 2 per cent on principal paid out. With this charge written off, Senator Sutherland states that the property will net an interest earning of 3½ per cent or more at the time of its return.

There has been a reduction in the number of employees between June 30, 1926, and October 31, 1927, of 55 in number; and an annual reduction in salaries of \$63,000+.

The total cost of the office, including the charges preferred and collected from the property in income in their hands, to wit: \$1,500,000+, is the sum of \$5,500,000+.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

This commission has been empowered by Congress to construct fitting memorials in Europe in honor of our soldier dead now sleeping on foreign soil and to commemorate their unsullied sacrifice for country. The project is now well under way and consists of eight chapels erected in the cemeteries abroad, three large memorials and five smaller memorials commemorating the combat activities in the Army, two large memorials and three smaller memorials commemorating the work of the Navy, one memorial for the Service of Supply at Tours, France; one joint Army and Navy memorial to be erected in Rome; and two bronze tablets, which will mark the general headquarters of the American Expeditionary Forces at Chaumont, France, and the headquarters of the First Army at Souilly, France.

The chapels will be located in the following cemeteries:

Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, near Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, France.

St. Mihiel American Cemetery, near Thiaucourt, France.

Ois-Aisne American Cemetery, near Fere-en-Tardenois, France.

Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, near Belleau, France.

Somme American Cemetery, near Bony, France.

Flanders Field American Cemetery, near Waereghem, Belgium.

Suresnes American Cemetery, at Suresnes (near Paris), France.

Brookwood American Cemetery, at Brookwood, England.

With reference to memorials outside of the cemeteries, the three largest ones will be erected at Montfaucon, on Montsec, and near Chateau-Thierry, France.

The five smaller battle-field monuments will be located as follows:

On Blanc Mont Ridge, in the Champagne region, France.
Near Bellicourt, France.
At Cantigny, France.
At Audenarde, near Ypres, Belgium.

In the city of Tours, France, a monument will be erected to the Services of Supply.

One of the large naval memorials will be erected at Brest, France, and the other in England. The three smaller naval memorials will be located at Gibraltar, at Corfu, Greece, and at Ponta Delgada, in the Azores.

In the chapels nearest the field of activity, where a most distinguished class of American soldier—the missing in action and the unknown—lost their lives, these soldier dead will have their names inscribed.

There are 3,177 in this class. The epitaph now carried on the crosses to the known soldier dead will be preserved in the chapel. The epitaph of the Unknown Soldier will be there. It is:

Here lies in honored glory an American soldier known but to God.

The authorization for this work is \$3,000,000, and it is stated that the plans of the commission will be within this limitation. Incidentally, I inquired if the commission was satisfied with the chapels and memorials so designed, and we were told that they were considered suitable and appropriate and in keeping with the dignity of our Nation.

This item carries an appropriation of \$700,000. It is the hope of the commission that this work will be completed in the fiscal year 1930.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman there?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman what is the estimated cost of this memorial work we are doing in France?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I can give the gentleman the estimated and the authorized cost. The entire project is to be carried through at an expense of \$3,000,000 according to the program of the American Battle Monuments Commission, under the congressional authority.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I ask the question for the reason that I have a bill, as the gentleman knows, proposing the construction of a memorial shrine on the battle field at Chalmette, La., and I put the cost as an estimate at \$250,000. I just wanted to see if the figures relatively would correspond.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It occurs to me that the project in regard to that battle field is a splendid one, and I can assure the gentleman that it has my hearty cooperation.

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION

The foundation and substructure of the Arlington Memorial Bridge is practically finished; a contract for the superstructure has been made and the stone therefor, in large part, is on hand, cut, and ready for use. We are told that they are keeping pace with the schedule originally planned and that the bridge will be completed in 1930 or 1931. The authorization for the bridge is \$7,500,000. This bill carries for this item \$2,300,000. Upon pages 30 to 33, inclusive, of the hearings there is a detailed and itemized statement of the expenditures of this commission, closing with November 30, 1927. This amount is \$2,656,809.05.

This bill would carry the same number of employees at the same salary appropriated for 1928.

UNITED STATES BOARD OF MEDIATION

This is the first year of the life of this activity. Work in the field was begun October 1, 1926.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, there were 265 cases submitted to it. Eighty-one of these cases were settled without the necessity of setting up a board of arbitration; 57 were settled through mediation; 15 were withdrawn through mediation, and 9 were withdrawn voluntarily. One hundred and sixteen cases were adjusted so far as the responsibilities of the Board of Mediation are concerned. Of this last class, 32 cases were submitted to arbitration, of which number 15 had been concluded by awards and, since the beginning of the fiscal year, several other arbitrations have been concluded. There were 3 cases of which the board did not take jurisdiction.

At the end of the year 149 of the total of 265 cases received remained unsettled. Of this number, 92 had been assigned for mediation.

There are two general classes—those involving wages, rules, and working conditions falling in one group, and the so-called

grievance cases which fall in the second group. There have been 85 of these so-called grievance cases submitted for adjustment, but there does not seem to have been disposition of any considerable number of them. The explanation for the delay in the complete adjudication of such cases is the failure of the individual or group alleging the grievance and the employer in agreeing upon the matter in which the adjustment board will be set up. The law provides that such board will be set up by the employer and the party aggrieved.

Under the statute, when mediation fails it is the duty of this board to induce the parties to the mediation to enter upon an arbitration agreement. If the dispute goes to arbitration and an award is made, it may be entered in the Federal court as a judgment of court. There has been only one appeal from an arbitration award. It was made by the carrier. There are five less employees to be paid under this bill, with a consequent reduction of \$20,910 in salaries, than were appropriated for in 1928.

The appropriation seems to be \$42,098 less than that carried in the bill for the present fiscal year, which is made up of the decreases in salaries and in the appropriations for the arbitration board.

The record discloses that arbitrations are ascending in numbers. Their costs have run between a minimum of \$228.25 and a maximum of \$14,606.80. With only \$33,000 to run them past July 1, it is very evident that the amount carried in this bill will be considerably insufficient. So it is very probable that the total cost for 1929 will exceed that of 1928.

There is a rent item in connection with this activity to which I would call attention. The quarters of this board are located in the Earle Building. They use 7,057 square feet of space, for which they pay the sum of \$13,800—a rate of \$1.94 per square foot.

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

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. I asked the question the other day, but could not get an answer as to approximately how much the Government pays for rentals in the District of Columbia.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I have not been able as yet to reach the sum total, but it is my purpose to procure that and to convey the information to the House.

BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

The amount carried in this bill is \$720,740, which is \$7,960 in excess of the appropriation for the present fiscal year. This increase is added amount for printing and binding the opinions of the board.

The work of this board has sped up considerably in comparison with the work of previous years, yet there remains much more to be done to make their work current. In 1925, they disposed of 995 cases in written findings of facts and opinions; in 1926, 990; in 1927, about the 2,000 mark in formal opinions. In November of this year, 496 new cases were filed and 516 were actually closed.

It might be well to show that up to December 1 of this year there had been filed with this board 32,598 cases; 13,776 actually closed. At the time of the hearing there were 16,310 cases awaiting trial with an added number of 1,615 pending the outcome of the negotiations between the commissioner and the taxpayer. This made a total of 17,925 cases on the docket awaiting trial. Of this number, there are some 1,800 involving one question affecting the Osage Indians. The chairman of the board estimated that 25 per cent of the cases on the docket would be settled without trial. He informed us that they were hearing cases now that were from eight months to a year old. In the present tax bill a provision is carried which, if enacted into law, would authorize the board to write memorandum opinions in cases of no special importance, or purely fact cases, without the necessity of separate findings of fact. This would speed up their work to some degree.

It is interesting to note that cases of any amount are considered by the board, \$0.83 being the smallest amount involved. The average case involves \$20,000 and the docketed cases involve approximately \$750,000,000.

There was some discussion at the hearings in respect of the disposition of old records. It seems that they are kept current for six months. Some suggested that after the specified time, some said three years and some five, that these records might be destroyed. It occurs to me that the value of these records for future use, both in civil and criminal proceedings, has been underestimated by those who would acquiesce in their destruction. It is a court record involving in many instances millions of dollars, and might well be useful either on the part of the

Government or on behalf of the taxpayer. It occurs to me that the same practice should be followed here that is followed in the Supreme Court, namely, the preservation of the entire record upon which the case in that court is adjudicated.

The rent item for this activity is \$57,000. It represents an increase of \$5,750 for added space over 1928. Quarters for this activity are in the Earle Building and, while the record is rather indistinct, the lowest average per square foot is \$1.89.

There is no reduction in personnel contemplated, with an increase in salaries of \$11,940.

BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY

This item carries \$210,350, which is same amount as present year. There is a decrease of four employees which, with the increase of salaries, makes a net reduction on salaries of \$3,000.

I realize that there is considerable opposition developed to the work of this bureau and particularly as it affects the District of Columbia. It is an easy matter to realize the attitude of the departments, especially those in the District, toward their work. I am frank in the statement that while I have not had the opportunity to make an exhaustive study of the work of this bureau, from what I have seen of it I am inclined to think that its function is a much-needed work.

In the Bureau of Engraving and Printing they made recommendations for a new method of handling bank note currency orders in the wetting division, which resulted in the saving of one clerk. A new method of examining currency backs reduced the spoilage to a very marked degree. There was saved in 1927 more than 9,000,000 sheets of distinctive paper plus the cost of the previous printing operation. Including the cost of the paper, the labor, and ink required to print backs aggregate \$13.04 per thousand. Deducting the total amount charged against the printers for spoilage in 1927 of \$558.40, there is a saving of \$135,000. According to the testimony of Mr. Brown, there has been a saving of more than \$100,000 in the numbering division, due to recommendations of this bureau.

At the present time the matter of using paper wipers on the presses in lieu of rag wipers is being tested out with apparent success. Not only is finer work done, but there is a saving of approximately 50 per cent of the ink. Incidentally, they are experimenting now with a defibering machine that not only will recover all the old bills but will be able to take care of the paper toweling.

The plates are now being made for the making of the smaller-size currency, which will probably be put into circulation next year. It is estimated that this innovation will make a saving of about \$2,000,000 a year.

A movement was instituted to permit purchase, in bulk, of food supply for Federal Government organization in the District which effected an annual saving estimated at \$25,000. In connection with the purchase of supplies for the Government, though it developed there was some effort at coordination in the purchase of supplies in the District, there is an opportunity to effect a saving of much money by some attention to this work by the Congress as it affects other purchases.

Investigations into the various departments of the District government, which were made at the requests of various committees of Congress, the commissions of the District, and the Budget Bureau, there were several investigations into the activities of the District. From the noise which has gone up it is evident that the estimated annual saving in this work of some \$160,000 has not been pleasing to certain persons in the District. In the hearings is a specific statement of the investigation made with the consequent savings.

Relative to automobile tags, it is shown that whereas they cost approximately 15 cents per pair last year, a tag this year manufactured by a plant which cost \$17,250, for which the appropriation was made by Congress, will cost 11 cents this year, inclusive of depreciation and amortization of the cost of the plant.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

This bill carries an appropriation of \$1,098,752, a decrease of \$100,000+ over the appropriation for the preceding year. There seems to be an increase of about 31 additional employees. There is an increase of traveling expenses of \$12,000.

The increase in the salaries is due, in the main, to additional examinations with the accompanying typists, clerks, and so forth, necessitated by the increase in the commission's work, due to legislation in the Sixty-ninth Congress. This additional employment will cost \$45,060. The promotions pay \$15,000.

During the last fiscal year 5,974 other eligibles were summoned for finger printing in New York City, 893 of whom for apparently obvious reasons failed to appear. Of those who appeared 122 were identified as having arrest record, who had made false statements in their applications concerning such

arrests, and approximately 300 more were similarly identified, but who had not made false statements. The value of this work is obvious. This item will extend the fingerprint work to other cities with an increased appropriation of \$6,000.

There is an item of \$8,000 for research and examination tests; and \$4,000 for one person to have charge of the New York City office. This does not entail a full increase of \$4,000, as heretofore the secretary at New York has been detailed from the customs service. He did part-time service.

The rent item for the Civil Service Commission is \$22,992. The rate per square foot is \$0.51½.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The item for this activity is the same which was appropriated for 1928, namely, \$7,300. According to their report to us by way of the hearings, the quantity of work which they were called upon to do was very considerable. The manner in which it was done is strictly a personal conclusion.

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The total amount carried in this bill for this item is \$3,675,000, as compared to \$3,648,240 for the present fiscal year. There is an increase of 80 employees; an increase in salaries, supplies, travel, and so forth, of \$75,460 as compared with this year; \$1,300 in printing; \$50,000 less in the employees' compensation fund than in 1928.

The longshoremen's compensation act in the main is responsible for the increased personnel and increased allowance for personal service.

Under the Federal act of 1916 there have been about 20,000 claims a year filed. The number of injuries under the longshoremen's act was estimated at 40,000 a year. Rent of buildings is for quarters of the district offices. In 12 cities the average per square foot is \$1.07.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Apparently there is an increase in personnel of 29 and a consequent increase in salaries of \$80,340. As a matter of fact, there is no increase in personnel working under this commission nor in salary allowances. Heretofore personnel has been detailed to this commission from various departments and their salary paid from the department from which they were detailed. Now it is proposed to put them under the commission itself without increase in pay. It should inure to the benefit of the commission in morale. There is no increase in the total amount appropriated.

Under the act the commission is authorized to collect reasonable annual charges for the purpose of reimbursing the Government for the administration of the act. There is an administrative charge against licenses on a basis of the primary horsepower of the projected license. The charge is 10 cents a horsepower for the first year, 15 cents for the second year, and for the third and every year thereafter 25 cents per horsepower.

FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

This item carries an amount of \$80,560, with an increase in personnel of some 10 persons. The increased appropriation is \$28,374. However, it is a new institution.

A very interesting discussion of the general subject was presented to the committee. It was shown that there were only 89 wave lengths for broadcasting which could be used in the United States; that there were approximately 680 broadcasting stations in this country. Twelve of the wave lengths allocated to this country are being shared between Canada and the United States. Canada has six wave lengths, which they may use exclusively, while we have 77.

The commission pointed out that radio was only a small part of the radio picture. We insert an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. Caldwell, acting chairman of the commission, setting forth the activities who are desiring to go upon the air.

The paper referred to is as follows:

Wide interest has been aroused in the public hearings on the radio short-wave situation announced by the Federal Radio Commission to be held at Washington, beginning at 10 a. m. January 17, 1928.

Many different groups have requested opportunity to present their claims to be assigned channels in this part of the radio spectrum. Among those applying to be heard are:

- Newspaper services.
- Communication companies, domestic and transoceanic.
- Airplane operating companies.
- Navigation companies.
- Railroads.
- Department store chains.
- Electric railways.
- Interurban bus systems.
- Electric power transmission systems.
- Mining and oil companies.

Lumber companies.
Farm cooperative organizations.
Motion-picture producers.
Police and fire alarm systems.
Forest and watershed patrols.
Ranch owners.
Remote resorts and hotels.
Operators of facsimile transmission services.
Radio manufacturers.
Television inventors.
Radio broadcasters.
Packers and shippers.
Geologists.

In addition, representatives of the Army and Navy and of other Government services which operate or supervise short-wave communication systems, ship compasses, ship beacons, fog signals, airplane services, airplane beacons, and miscellaneous short-wave systems are also expected to attend and to tell of the developments which they are making and which might be affected by assignment of near-by short-wave channels to commercial services.

In view of the many and diversified applicants of short-wave channels already in sight, and since the present hearings are arranged to aid the commission in formulating future policies for the assignment of short-wave channels, all persons appearing at the hearings will be asked to discuss, initially, only the general claims of their respective classes of service to recognition in the short-wave bands, reserving their own specific applications for presentation at the close of the general discussion.

Representatives of each class of service applied for will be particularly invited to discuss:

- (1) The dependence of such service upon short-wave radio rather than wire or other means.
- (2) The humane, social, and economic importance of their proposals.
- (3) The number and position of channels believed available for such service.
- (4) Power required and interference likely to be caused to other services and other countries.
- (5) The probable total number of applications which will be made for such service within the next five years by all applicants in their class.

All persons who feel that they can contribute information for the benefit of the commission are invited to be present and to take part in the discussion.

O. H. CALDWELL, *Acting Chairman.*

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Appropriation for this activity is \$3,820,000, which is \$23,400 less than the appropriation for the present fiscal year. There is a reduction of five employees and total salary reduction of \$15,000. There is a reduction of \$22,400 for contingent expenses and a reduction of \$1,000 on the printing.

HOUSING CORPORATION

The appropriation for this item is \$475,750 or \$88,486 less than for the past fiscal year. This is due to a decrease in office force in the District of Columbia of one person, an auditor, at a salary of \$3,000 per year; \$7,000 due to the closing of certain field offices. These offices so discontinued are New London, Waterbury, and Bridgeport, Conn.; Niagara Falls and Watervliet, N. Y.; Alliance and Niles, Ohio; and Craddockville, Va.

Some of these offices were consolidated with others. The main item in the reduction being (\$76,886) a lesser amount appropriated for the maintenance, operation, and management of the hotels which seems to be very faithfully taken care of under the direction of Mrs. Sumner.

In the hearings it developed that there are four buildings in the District of Columbia under their jurisdiction which are occupied by other than Government hotels. The juvenile court of the District of Columbia occupies one building—four floors—19,564 square feet of floor space. Two buildings with floor space of 56,592 square feet are occupied by the National Guard, District of Columbia.

The Housing Corporation informs us that this space is furnished these District activities free of rent, the District paying a service charge. They pay what is supposed to be their proportion of the coal cost and their proportion of the ice cost. It seems that the Public Buildings Commission was the source of authority for the use of these buildings by the District activities.

The operation of the laundry has been handled skillfully. The departments not having their own laundry are using it. All departments sending more than 50,000 towels per month during the last year were given a reduced rate of \$0.40 per

100, and yet the laundry operated at a profit of about a thousand dollars. A further reduction has been made, and this year the same rate was given to departments having 25,000 or more towels per month. There were laundered 2,500,000 towels and 59,000 miscellaneous pieces.

Before this laundry got into this game the average cost per 100 for the laundry of towels was \$1.17. The lowest cost was \$0.68 and the highest cost about \$2. It is figured that there was a saving of \$5,000 last year in its operation.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The appropriation carried for this item is \$600,000, an increase of \$50,000 over appropriation for the last fiscal year.

There is a new item of \$30,000 for monoplane to be used in connection with flight reach. Heretofore biplanes alone have been used in this connection. There is a slight increase in personnel and salary charge in the District and likewise in the field.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON] if he can give me information as to what was done in respect of the \$75,000 to construct an additional wind tunnel. Does the gentleman know whether that is carried in the bill?

Mr. WASON. I do not think it is.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. As I recall it, when it left the subcommittee the bill was to carry \$75,000 for this new wind tunnel, which we thought would be of real benefit to this research work. I might say in regard to the wind-tunnel work that this country seems to occupy a position of preeminence. England has sought from us information in regard to this work and is building a similar wind tunnel.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS

A total of \$2,584,980 is carried in the bill. This is an increase of \$130,510 over the bill for 1928. An item of \$30,000 under the item of "services" shows an increase of 21 persons, with increased salary of some \$13,970.

Under the item of "general expense" we find an increase of \$116,540. This commission has taken over several buildings, namely:

Emory	\$22,000
Canal Street garage	12,000
Kalorama Road garage	13,000

There is an item of \$10,000 for new elevator in the Winder Building that seems to be needed; an item of \$7,000 for uniform for the guard, which is defended upon the ground that their salary is \$85 per month.

It is very interesting to review the cost of rents under this activity. I will insert a table showing the rental cost, floor space, date received for operation, and cost per square foot:

Name of building	Rental	Floor area (square feet)	Date received for operation	Cost per square foot
Civil Service	\$21,875.00	37,566	July 1, 1923	\$0.514
Commerce	21,875.00	149,689	do	.354
Emory	20,000.00	72,000	July 1, 1927	.224
462 Louisiana Avenue	12,000.00	45,760	July 1, 1924	.21
Hurley-Wright	75,000.00	70,048	July 1, 1927	.854
Interstate Commerce	72,068.00	136,142	July 1, 1923	.364
Justice	75,000.00	88,056	do	.904
Labor	24,000.00	67,984	do	.274
Walker-Johnson	40,000.00	67,250	Mar. 27, 1914	.374
Earle Building	68,964.70	35,454		1.94
Canal Street garage		12,000		
Kalorama Road garage		13,000		

The upper floor of the Canal Street garage is to be used as files for the General Accounting Office, which moved out of a building in the Mall when it was torn down. The lower floor is being used for garage purposes. It houses 44 Department of Agriculture cars, and 7 machines of the General Accounting Office.

The Kalorama Road garage is being used for some 89 machines of the departments, 5 State, 12 Veterans' Bureau, 1 Trade Commission, and 4 Alien Property Custodian cars.

TARIFF COMMISSION

This bill carries appropriation of \$754,000 for this activity, an increase of \$68,000 over present year. There is an increase in personnel of six persons and total increase in salaries is \$10,690. The major portion of the increase is in travel transportation which includes per diem in lieu of subsistence. I thought it might be of interest to the membership to insert a summary table of reports by the Tariff Commission to the President for purposes of section 315 of the tariff act of 1922, showing the action of the President thereon:

Summary table of reports to the President by the United States Tariff Commission for purposes of section 315 of the tariff act of 1922, showing the action of the President thereon
[Prepared as of January 1, 1928]

Investigation No.	Commodity	Date instituted	Nature of request	Date of hearing	Date of report to President	Action by the President	
						Nature of action	Date of proclamation or statement
1	Oxalic acid.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Increase and decrease.	Nov. 5, 1923.....	Dec. 19, 1924	Increase 4 cents to 6 cents per pound.....	Dec. 23, 1924
2	Diethylbarbituric acid and derivatives (Barbital or Veronal).....	do.....	Increase.	Nov. 7, 1923.....	Nov. 6, 1924	Basis of assessment changed to American selling price; no change in duty.	Nov. 14, 1924
3	Barium dioxide.....	do.....	Increase and decrease.	Nov. 9, 1923.....	May 14, 1924	Increase 4 cents to 6 cents per pound.....	May 19, 1924
4	Casein.....	do.....	Decrease.	Aug. 13, 14, 1923; Sept. 25, 1923; June 23, 1924.	Mar. 15, 1926	(¹).....	
6	Potassium chlorate.....	do.....	Increase and decrease.	Nov. 14, 1923.....	Apr. 2, 1925	Increase 1½ cents to 2¼ cents per pound.....	Apr. 11, 1925
7	Sodium nitrate.....	do.....	Increase.	Sept. 10, 26, 1923; Oct. 6, 1923.	Apr. 26, 1924	Increase 3 cents to 4½ cents per pound.....	May 6, 1924
9	Iron in pigs.....	do.....	do.....	Apr. 20, 1926.....	Feb. 2, 1927	Increase 75 cents to \$1.125 per ton.....	Feb. 23, 1927
11	Paintbrush handles.....	do.....	Decrease.	July 17, 1923; Sept. 6, 1923.	Oct. 2, 1926	Decrease 33¼ per cent to 16¼ per cent.....	Oct. 14, 1926
12	Sugar.....	do.....	do.....	Jan. 15-18, 21-24, 1924; Mar. 27-28, 1924.	(July 31, 1924 Aug. 1, 1924 Nov. 14, 1924 Nov. 17, 1924 June 12, 1925)	Action postponed.....	June 15, 1925
13	Cotton warp-knit fabrics.....	do.....	Increase.	Nov. 16, 1923.....	do.....	No change.....	Oct. 3, 1925
14	Cotton warp-knit fabric gloves (knit on a warp-knitting machine).....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
15	Cotton hosiery.....	do.....	do.....	Nov. 20, 1923; Jan. 10, 11, 30, 1924.	Dec. 22, 1926	(¹).....	
16	Wall pockets.....	do.....	do.....	July 24, 1923.....	Oct. 1, 1925	No change.....	Do
18	Linseed oil.....	May 4, 1923	Increase and decrease.	Mar. 5-7, 1924.....	Mar. 3, 1925	Report returned to commission, additional information requested.	Feb. 6, 1926
21	Phenol.....	do.....	Decrease.	Jan. 24, 25, 1924.....	Oct. 7, 1927	Decrease from 40 per cent on American selling price and 7 cents per pound to 20 per cent on American selling price and 3½ cents per pound.	Oct. 31, 1927
22	Cresylic acid.....	do.....	do.....	Jan. 24, 25, 1924; Feb. 14, 1924.	June 15, 1927	do.....	July 20, 1927
24	Print rollers.....	do.....	Increase.	Jan. 29, 1924; Feb. 4, 5, 1924.	(Oct. 7, 1925 Oct. 24, 1925 Nov. 16, 1925 Apr. 17, 1926)	Increased 60 to 72 per cent.....	June 21, 1926
25	Taximeters.....	do.....	do.....	Feb. 12, 26, 1924; Mar. 12, 1924.	(Oct. 1, 1925 Oct. 15, 1925 Nov. 16, 1925)	Basis of assessment changed to American selling price; rate changed from \$3 per meter and 45 per cent ad valorem to \$3 per meter and 27.1 per cent ad valorem.	Dec. 12, 1925
29	Magnesite and magnesite brick.....	Aug. 11, 1923	Increase and decrease.	Oct. 1, Dec. 5, 1923; June 21, 22, 1926.	July 6, 1927	Crude magnesite, increased ½ cent per pound to 1½ cent per pound. Caustic calcined: Increased ½ cent per pound to 1½ cent per pound.	Nov. 10, 1927
33	Wheat and wheat products.....	Nov. 14, 1923	Increase.....	Nov. 26, 27, 1923; Feb. 18, 19, 25, 26, 1924.	Mar. 4, 1924	Wheat increased from 20 cents to 42 cents per bushel. Flour increased from 78 cents to \$1.04 per 100 pounds. Mill feeds decreased 15 per cent to 7½ per cent.	Mar. 7, 1924
26	Gold leaf.....	Apr. 5, 1924	do.....	May 18, 28, 1925.....	July 22, 1925	Increased, 55 cents to 82.5 cents per 100 leaves.	Feb. 23, 1927
37	Man's sewed straw hats.....	May 29, 1924	do.....	June 12, 1924; May 4, 1925; May 14-16, 1925.	(July 17, 1925 Feb. 4, 1926)	Increase from 60 per cent to 88 per cent ad valorem on straw hats valued at \$9.50 or less per dozen.	Feb. 12, 1926
38	Butter.....	July 14, 1924	do.....	Apr. 21, 22, 1925.....	(Feb. 25, 1926 Mar. 2, 1926)	Increase from 8 cents to 12 cents per pound.....	Mar. 6, 1926
39	Swiss cheese.....	Aug. 9, 1924	do.....	Dec. 11, 1925.....	Aug. 16, 1927	Increase from 5 cents per pound but not less than 25 per cent ad valorem to 7½ cents per pound, but not less than 37½ per cent ad valorem.	June 8, 1927
40	Halibut.....	Aug. 11, 1924	do.....	Aug. 10, 11, 1925.....	Nov. 2, 1925		
43	Rag rugs.....	Apr. 24, 1925	Increase.	July 20, 1926.....	July 15, 1927		
44	Bobwhite quail.....	May 19, 1925	Decrease.	Sept. 10, 1925.....	Sept. 28, 1925		
48	Methanol.....	July 24, 1925	Increase.	June 17, 1926.....	Oct. 25, 1926	Decrease from 50 cents to 25 cents per bird.....	Oct. 3, 1925
63	Cherries.....	Mar. 22, 1927	do.....	June 28, 29, 1927.....	Nov. 25, 1927	Increase from 12 cents to 18 cents per gallon. Increase from 2 cents to 3 cents per pound.....	Nov. 27, 1926 Dec. 3, 1927

¹ Report now under consideration by the President.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It is interesting to note that of these commodities, paint-brush handles, phenol, and bobwhite quail are the only commodities upon which the tariff has been reduced by action of the Chief Executive.

For the information of the House, I will insert three tables which embrace the commodities upon which application for purposes of section 313 have been filed with the commission:

TABLE I.—Commodities upon which applications have been received but concerning which no final action has been taken by the commission

UNDER SECTION 315

Paragraph No.	Commodity	Nature of request
SCHEDULE 1.—Chemicals, oils, and paints		
5	Hydrogen peroxide.....	Increase.
27	Ethyl benzol.....	Decrease.
28	Indigo, natural.....	Do.
28	Certain coal-tar dyes.....	Do.
36	Licorice root.....	Adjustment of duty.
42	Casein glue.....	Decrease.
44	Inks, printing lithograph.....	Increase.
48	Licorice extract.....	Adjustment of duty.

TABLE I—Continued

Paragraph No.	Commodity	Nature of request
SCHEDULE 1.—Chemicals, oils, and paints—Continued		
50	Chloride of magnesium.....	Increase.
71	Decolorizing carbons.....	Do.
75	Oxide of iron.....	Do.
77	Varnish.....	Decrease.
80	Nitrate of potash.....	Increase.
83	Glauber's salts.....	Do.
83	Formate of soda.....	Do.
91	Titanium potassium oxalate.....	Do.
SCHEDULE 2.—Earths, earthenware, and glassware		
202	Tiles.....	Increase.
206	Pumice stone.....	Decrease.
207	China clay.....	Increase.
208	Mica.....	Do.
212	Chemical stoneware.....	Decrease.
213	Graphite.....	Increase and decrease.
214	Diamond dyes.....	Decrease.
214	Feldspar.....	Do.
218	Clinical thermometers.....	Increase.

TABLE I—Continued

Paragraph No.	Commodity	Nature of request
SCHEDULE 2.—Earths, earthenware, and glassware—Continued		
218	Clinical thermometer blanks	Increase.
218, 230	Glassware	Do.
229	Electric-light bulbs	Do.
229	Tungsten electric lights	Do.
230	Stained-glass windows	Do.
231	Vitrolite	Do.
232, 233	Finished marble	Do.
233	Agate rings for fishing lines, unmounted	Adjustment of duty.
235	Travertine stone	Increase.
SCHEDULE 3.—Metals and manufactures of		
302, 305	Tungsten	Increase.
303, 304	Bars of iron and steel	Do.
304	Beams	Do.
304	Billets	Do.
304	Ingot	Do.
308	Steel sheets	Do.
309	Steel plates	Investigation under
312	Angles	Increase.
312	Channels	Do.
312	Girders	Do.
312	Joists	Do.
312	Light shapes	Do.
313, 314	Bands	Do.
315	Wire rods	Do.
316	Wire	Do.
318	Wire cloth	Do.
325	Anvils	Do.
328	Corrugated furnaces	Decrease.
331	Upholstery nails	Investigation under section 315.
331	Wire nails	Increase.
339	Utensils	Investigation under section 315.
342	Umbrella frames	Increase.
343	Crochet needles	Do.
343	Latch needles	Do.
344	Agate rings for fishing lines, mounted	Adjustment of duties.
344	Fishing tackle	Increase.
348	Snap fasteners	Do.
354	Pen and pocket knives	Decrease.
359	Surgical instruments	Do.
366	Parts of automatic pistols	Do.
368	Escapements	Do.
372	Machine-made tools	Increase.
372	Hosiery machines	Decrease.
372	Woolen cards	Increase.
382	Aluminum foil	Do.
399	Christmas tree light reflectors	Do.
399	Wire netting	Do.
SCHEDULE 4.—Wood and manufactures of		
403	Cabinet logs	Decrease.
403	Cabinet lumber	Increase.
403	Logs, lignum-vite	Decrease.
403	Veneers of wood	Do.
403	do	Increase.
407	Reed and willow products	Do.
407	Willow furniture	Do.
410	Spring clothespins	Do.
410	Wooden cigar molds	Do.
SCHEDULE 7.—Agricultural products and provisions		
701	Beef	Increase.
701	Cattle and livestock	Decrease and increase.
701, 705, 706	Beef and beef products	Increase.
701	Live and dressed cattle	Do.
706	Canned meat	Do.
706	Canned and other prepared meats	Do.
707-710	Dairy products	Do.
710	Cheese and substitutes therefor	Do.
710	Cheddar cheese	Do.
710	Swiss cheese without eye fermentation	Do.
711	Ornamental birds	Decrease.
711	Game birds	Do.
711, 712	Live or dressed turkeys	Increase.
717-718	Fish	Decrease and increase.
717	Salmon	Decrease.
718	Dried fish	Increase.
718	Stockfish	Do.
718	Kipperd herring	Decrease.
719	Finnan haddie	Do.
720	Sardines	Increase.
720-721	Fish, canned	Decrease.
721	Caviar	Increase.
723	Buckwheat	Do.
725	Alimentary pastes	Do.
736	Raspberries, wild	Decrease.
736	Blueberries	Do.
737	Cherries, glacé	Increase.
739	Citron, candied	Do.
742	Currants	Adjustment of rates.
744	Olives	Increase.
746	Pineapples	Decrease and increase.

TABLE I—Continued

Paragraph No.	Commodity	Nature of request
SCHEDULE 7.—Agricultural products and provisions—Continued		
751	Cut flowers	Decrease.
751	Cut narcissus flowers	Increase.
751	Iris	Do.
756	Desiccated coconuts	Do.
759	Imitation sliced almonds	Do.
761	Navy beans	Do.
761	Alfalfa seed	Do.
761	Clover seed	Do.
767	Split peas	Do.
767	Dried peas	Do.
771	Turnips	Do.
772	Celery	Do.
772	Sweet peppers	Do.
773	Pickled onions	Do.
775	Cocoa butter	Do.
777	Hay	Do.
778	Hops	Decrease.
779	Cloves and stems	Do.
SCHEDULE 9.—Cotton manufactures		
903	Nankin ticking	Increase.
903, 906	Cotton shirtings	Decrease.
903, 904	Cotton cloth	Investigation under sec. 315.
906, 921	Cotton manufactures	Do.
912	Cotton, woven labels	Duty on American selling price.
913	Cotton gloves	Investigation under sec. 315.
915	Handkerchiefs, ornamented or unornamented	Duty on American selling price.
918, 1016, 1430	do	Decrease.
918, 1016, 1430	Heavy coat lining	Increase.
SCHEDULE 10.—Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of		
1001	Crin Vegetal	Decrease.
1001	Hemp	Increase.
1022	Rice-straw rugs	Do.
1023	Cocoa mats	Do.
SCHEDULE 11.—Wool and manufactures of		
1101	Camel hair	Decrease.
1101	Wool, Class III	Do.
1107	Worsted yarn	Increase.
1108, 1109	Worsted cloth	Do.
1108, 1109	Woven fabrics	Investigation under sec. 315.
1111	Blankets	Do.
1114	Gloves and mittens	Do.
1115	Wearing apparel for male attire	Increase.
1119	Wool crepe	Do.
SCHEDULE 12.—Silk and silk goods		
1206	Hatter's plush	Decrease.
SCHEDULE 13.—Papers and books		
1304	Cellucotton	Increase.
1305	Decalcomanias	Do.
1305	Paper with coated surfaces	Decrease.
1307, 1308	Tapestries	Duty on American selling price.
1310	Maps	Decrease.
1310	Rag books	Do.
1313	Paper tubes for textile purposes	Increase.
1313	Fly ribbon	Do.
SCHEDULE 14.—Sundries		
1402	Lacrosse sticks	Decrease.
1403, 1428	Beads, necklaces, pendants, etc., of synthetic phenolic resin	Increase.
1403, 1430	Beaded bags	Decrease.
1406	Straw braids	Increase.
1411	Agate buttons	Do.
1412	Cork insulation in slabs, boards, etc.	Do.
1412	Cork tile	Do.
1414	Toy novelties	Do.
1420	Silver-fox skins	Decrease.
1420	Sheepskin baby-carriage robes	Adjustment of duties.
1420, 1421	Hatters' fur and rabbit skin	Decrease.
1428	Swivels and rings for watch chains	Increase.
1430	Real lace (drawn work)	Decrease.
1432	Leather leggings	Increase.
1434	Raw gut	Decrease and increase.
1435	Gas mantles	Decrease and duty on American selling price.
1443	Pipe organs	Increase.
1443	Wood wind musical instruments	Do.
1451	Crayons or fusains	Decrease.
1453	Motion-picture films	Increase.
1456	Umbrella handles and canes	Do.

TABLE II.—Subjects not listed for investigations
UNDER SECTION 315

Schedule	Para- graph No.	Commodity	Status
Schedule 1.—Chemicals, oils, and paints.	1	Formic acid.....	Withdrawn.
	2	Aldehyde derivatives.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
	5	Ichthyol.....	Do.
	7	Ammonium chloride.....	Do.
	24	Chloral hydrate.....	Withdrawn.
	25	Calcium arsenate.....	Possible production in this country small.
	27	Novadelox or benzol peroxide.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
	28	Biological stains.....	Informally suspended.
	39	Quebracho extract.....	Do.
	42	Agar-agar.....	No domestic production; informally suspended.
	42	Fish glue.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
	59	Cajuput oil.....	Informally suspended.
	61	Mustard oil.....	Do.
	71	Boneblack.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
	73	Lampblack.....	Do.
	83	Salt.....	Do.
	87	Strontium nitrate.....	Do.
	302	Manganese.....	Withdrawn.
		Ferromanganese.....	
	340	Jeweler's saws.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
Schedule 3.—Metals and manufactures of.	343	Needle cases.....	Informally suspended.
	355	Cutlery of stainless steel.....	Withdrawn.
	358	Razor blades.....	Referred to Treasury Department.
	372	Spindles and flyers.....	Informally suspended.
	399	Aluminum pigeon bands.....	Do.

TABLE II.—Continued
UNDER SECTION 315—continued

Schedule	Para- graph No.	Commodity	Status
Schedule 4.—Wood and manufactures of.	410	Furniture.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
Schedule 7.—Agricultural products and provisions.	711	Wild or game birds.....	Informally suspended (see bobwhite quail, Table II, par. 711).
	749	Plantains.....	Informally suspended.
	761	Sorghum seed.....	Do.
	766	Mushrooms.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
Schedule 9.—Cotton manufactures.	912	Spreads and quilts.....	Withdrawn.
	903	Fine cotton cloth.....	Do.
Schedule 11.—Wool and manufactures of.	1108	Bedford cord.....	Informally suspended.
Schedule 14.—Sundries.	1401	Asbestos shingles.....	Do.
	1406	Harvest hats.....	Referred to Treasury Department.
	1410	Horn buttons.....	Informally suspended.
	1411	Agate button molds.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
	1420	Furs and fur skins.....	Withdrawn.
	1428	Mesh bags.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
	1430	Ladies' trimmed hats.....	Do.
	1431	Pigskin.....	Referred to Treasury Department.
	1431	Buckskin.....	Informally suspended.
	1432	Moccasins.....	Do.
	1443	Titze-Kunst-harmonium.....	Commission voted no investigation warranted at present time.
Schedule 15.—Free list.	1504	Cream separators.....	On free list.
	1589	Hides.....	Do.
	1607	Shoes.....	Do.
	1662	Dried shrimp.....	Do.
		Yachts.....	Informally suspended.

TABLE III.—Investigations instituted and present status thereof,
UNDER SECTION 315

Schedule	Para- graph No.	Commodity	Date ordered	Present status
Schedule 1.—Chemicals, oils, and paints.	1	Oxalic acid.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Report submitted to the President Dec. 19, 1924. The President proclaimed increase in duty from 4 cents per pound to 6 cents per pound Dec. 29, 1924.
	1	Tartaric acid.....	Mar. 4, 1927	Field work completed.
	4	Methanol.....	July 24, 1923	Report submitted to President Oct. 5, 1926. The President proclaimed increase of duty from 12 cents per gallon to 18 cents per gallon Nov. 27, 1926.
	1, 5	Amino acids and salts.....	Aug. 11, 1923	Investigation temporarily suspended.
	5	Diethyl barbituric acid and derivatives thereof (barbital).	Mar. 27, 1923	Report submitted to the President Nov. 6, 1924. President proclaimed that the rate of 25 per cent ad valorem be based and assessed upon the American selling price. Nov. 14, 1924.
	5	Sodium silicofluoride.....	July 24, 1925	Final report in preparation.
	9	Cream of tartar.....	Mar. 4, 1926	Field work completed.
	12	Barium carbonate.....	Jan. 8, 1926	Final report in preparation.
	12	Barium dioxide.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Report submitted to the President May 14, 1924. President proclaimed increase in duty from 4 cents to 6 cents per pound May 9, 1924.
	19	Casein.....	do	Final report sent to President.
	20	Whiting.....	May 26, 1927	Field work completed.
	27	Phenol.....	May 4, 1923	Report submitted to President Oct. 7, 1927. President proclaimed decrease in rate of duty from 40 per cent based on American selling price and 7 cents per pound to 20 per cent based on American selling price and 3½ cents per pound, Oct. 31, 1927.
	27	Cresylic acid.....	do	Report submitted to President June 15, 1927. President proclaimed decrease in rate of duty from 40 per cent based on American selling price and 7 cents per pound to 20 per cent based on American selling price and 3½ cents per pound, July 20, 1927.
	28	Synthetic phenolic resin.....	do	Investigation temporarily suspended.
	39	Logwood extract.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Final report before commission.
	42	Edible gelatin.....	July 24, 1925	Final report in preparation.
	42	Glue.....	do	Field work completed.
	53, 54, 55, 701	Animal and vegetable oils and fats ¹	Feb. 8, 1924	Hearing held.
	54	Linseed or flaxseed oil.....	May 4, 1923	Report submitted to the President. ²
	80	Potassium chlorate.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Report submitted to the President Apr. 3, 1925. The President proclaimed increase in duty from 1½ cents per pound to 2¼ cents per pound Apr. 11, 1925.
	80	Potassium permanganate.....	May 26, 1927	Field work completed.
	83	Sodium nitrite.....	do	Report submitted to President Apr. 26, 1923. President proclaimed increase in duty from 3 cents to 4½ cents per pound May 6, 1924.
	83	Sodium phosphate.....	do	Field work completed.

¹ Includes 10 oils upon which specific application has been made.² Report returned by the President with request for additional information.

TABLE III.—Investigations instituted and present status thereof—Continued

Schedule	Para-graph No.	Commodity	Date ordered	Present status
Schedule 2.—Earths, earthenware, and glass-ware.	204	Magnesite and magnesite brick.....	Aug. 11, 1923	Investigation of caustic magnesite and magnesite brick temporarily suspended. Investigation of crude and caustic calcined magnesite completed. Report submitted to President July 6, 1927. The President proclaimed increase in duty on crude magnesite from $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 cent per pound to $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound; and an increase in the duty on caustic calcined magnesite from $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound to $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 cent per pound, Nov. 10, 1927.
	201			
	207	Fluorspar.....	Jan. 8, 1926	Final report in preparation.
	211	Table and kitchen china and earthenware.....	Mar. 19, 1925	Field work completed.
	212			
	218(217)	Perfume and toilet bottles.....	May 26, 1927	Do.
	219	Window glass.....	do.	Domestic field work completed.
	222	Cast polished plate glass (extension of mirror plate investigation).	May 5, 1923	Hearing held. Additional data obtained. Second hearing held.
	223	Mirror plates.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Do.
	235	Granite.....	July 24, 1925	Final report in preparation.
Schedule 3.—Metals and manufactures of....	301	Pig iron.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Report submitted to President Feb. 2, 1927. President proclaimed increase in rate of duty from 75 cents per ton to \$1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per ton, Feb. 23, 1927.
	362	Swiss pattern files.....		Investigation temporarily suspended.
	368	Taximeters.....	May 4, 1923	Report submitted to President Oct. 1, 1925. President proclaimed increase in duty from \$3 per meter and 45 per cent ad valorem to \$3 per meter and 27.1 per cent based on American selling price Dec. 12, 1925.
	375	Metallic magnesium.....	July 27, 1923	Investigation temporarily suspended.
	383	Gold leaf.....	Apr. 5, 1924	Report submitted to President July 22, 1925. President proclaimed an increase in duty from 55 cents to 82 $\frac{1}{4}$ cents per 100 leaves (not exceeding equivalent of 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ by 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches). Additional duty on leaves exceeding this size in same proportion, Feb. 23, 1927.
	396	Print rollers.....	May 4, 1923	Report submitted to President Oct. 7, 1925. The President proclaimed increase in duty from 60 per cent ad valorem to 72 per cent ad valorem June 21, 1926.
	401	Logs of fir, spruce, cedar, and western hemlock.	July 2, 1923 Apr. 1, 1924	Preliminary hearing held Aug. 6, 1923, in re authority of commission to investigate this paragraph Oct. 12, 1923, reported to President and investigation discontinued; Apr. 1, 1924, investigation ordered at request of President. Final report in preparation. (See Seventh annual report, pp. 13, 14, 72-85.)
	410	Paintbrush handles.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Report submitted to President Oct. 2, 1926. The President proclaimed decrease in duty from 33 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent to 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent Oct. 14, 1926.
	410	Bentwood chairs.....	Apr. 23, 1925	Hearing held.
	501	Sugar.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Reports submitted to President July 31 and Aug. 1, 1924. Statement issued by President on June 15, 1925.
Schedule 5.—Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of.	503	Maple sirup and sugar.....	Feb. 25, 1927	Hearing held.
	504	Rare sugars.....	Aug. 11, 1923	Investigation temporarily suspended.
Schedule 7.—Agricultural products and provisions.	707	Milk and cream.....	Mar. 4, 1926	Field work completed.
	709	Butter.....	July 14, 1924	Report submitted to President Feb. 25, 1926. The President proclaimed increase in duty from 8 cents per pound to 12 cents per pound Mar. 6, 1926.
	710	Swiss cheese.....	Aug. 9, 1924	Report submitted to President Apr. 16, 1927. President proclaimed increase in duty from 5 cents per pound but not less than 25 per cent ad valorem, to 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound but not less than 37 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem, June 8, 1927.
	711	Bobwhite quail.....	May 19, 1925	Report submitted to the President Sept. 28, 1925. On Oct. 3, 1925, the President proclaimed a decrease in duty from 50 cents each to 25 cents each.
	713	Eggs and egg products.....	Aug. 4, 1926	Field work completed.
	717	Halibut.....	Aug. 11, 1924	Investigation completed.
	724	Corn.....	June 24, 1927	Field work in progress.
	729	Wheat and wheat products.....	Nov. 4, 1923	Report submitted to President Mar. 4, 1924. President proclaimed change of rate of duty on wheat from 30 cents to 42 cents per bushel; wheat flour, semolina, etc., from 78 cents to \$1.04 per 100 pounds; bran, shorts, and by-product feeds, from 15 per cent ad valorem to 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem, Mar. 7, 1924.
	730			
	737	Cherries.....	Mar. 22, 1927	Report sent to President, Nov. 25, 1927. President proclaimed increase in duty from 2 cents per pound to 3 cents per pound Dec. 3, 1927.
Schedule 9.—Cotton manufactures.	757	Peanuts.....	May 26, 1926	Domestic field work completed.
	760	Cottonseed.....	do.	Do.
	760	Flaxseed.....	Aug. 4, 1926	Do.
	760	Soy beans.....	May 26, 1926	Do.
	768	Onions.....	July 23, 1926	Do.
	770	Fresh tomatoes.....	June 10, 1927	Field work completed.
	770	Canned tomatoes.....	do.	Domestic field work completed.
	770	Tomato paste.....	Oct. 14, 1927	Do.
	915	Cotton gloves of warp-knit fabrics.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Reports submitted to President June 12, 1925. Statement issued by President Oct. 3, 1925.
	915	Cotton warp-knit fabric.....	do.	Investigation completed.
Schedule 14.—Sundries.....	920	Cotton hosiery.....	do.	Hearing held.
	1430	Lace.....	Oct. 25, 1923	Investigation completed.
Schedule 10.—Flax, hemp, and jute.....	1022	Rag rugs.....	Apr. 24, 1925	In progress.
Schedule 11.—Wool and manufactures of.....	1116	Oriental rugs.....	Oct. 28, 1926	Report submitted to President Oct. 1, 1925. Statement issued by President Oct. 3, 1925.
Schedule 13.—Papers and books.....	1313	Wall pockets.....	Mar. 27, 1923	Field work completed.
Schedule 14.—Sundries.....	1402	Imitation pearls.....	May 26, 1927	Field work completed.
	1429	Men's sewed straw hats.....	May 29, 1924	Report submitted to President Feb. 4, 1926. The President issued proclamation increasing rate of duty on straw hats valued at \$9.50 or less per dozen from 60 per cent to 88 per cent. Duty on other straw hats remained unchanged Feb. 12, 1926.
Schedule 14.—Sundries.....	1419	Artificial flowers, fruits, etc. ¹	Mar. 27, 1923	Investigation temporarily suspended.
	1454	Smokers' articles of synthetic phenolic resin.....	May 4, 1923	Do.
Schedule 14.—Sundries.....	1454	Brierwood pipes.....	do.	Field work completed.

¹ Includes applications on lace curtains and mosquito bars.² Includes applications upon 2 specific commodities.

In connection with rent item for the headquarters of the commission in Brussels, I ascertained that there was floor space aggregating 1,157 square feet so used at a cost of \$0.62 per square foot.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

I would like to call your attention to the Federal Trade Commission. Before I get down to a discussion of the bill as it affects this activity, I feel impelled to refer to certain language that is on page 9 of the report. This language reads as follows:

A limitation has been carried upon the appropriation for salaries and general expenses of the commission, and attention is called to the fact that under this limitation no investigation that does not relate to alleged violations of the antitrust acts may be undertaken upon the request of either House of Congress unless directed by concurrent resolution.

I am compelled to take issue with that statement in view of the opinion of the Comptroller General and the Attorney General of the United States. I am perfectly free to grant that Mr. Wood, chairman of the subcommittee, takes the opposite view.

I quote from the report:

Testimony given before the committee indicated that many of the investigations directed by the Federal Trade Commission had no relation to matters involved in interstate commerce, merely being economic investigations, and the attention of the Congress is called to this misdirected energy of the commission.

Now, I can not agree with that language. I do not think it meets with the approbation of a majority of the members composing the subcommittee.

I do not think there should be an effort made to put pressure upon the Comptroller General or the Attorney General (if another opinion might be requested), and have it represented to them that this was the unanimous thought of the committee. So far as I am concerned, I disavow any agreement with the language involved.

The appropriation for this activity is in the sum of \$963,000, which is a decrease of \$21,350 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. There is a decrease in personnel of two persons, with a consequent lessening of the appropriation of \$2,930, and a decrease in travel expenses in the sum of \$10,000.

The commission for its convenience has four major divisions, namely, legal, export trade, administrative, and economic. It is the latter division which drew the fire of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood, chairman of this subcommittee]. It seems that during the summer the commission initiated certain inquiries which the distinguished chairman felt were beyond their jurisdiction in virtue of a certain limitation which he had placed upon an appropriation bill, but from the record, it appears that Attorney General Sargent did not interpret the limitation as Mr. Wood interprets it.

The four inquiries concerning which much discussion was had are designated as follows:

- Resale price-maintenance inquiry;
- The blue-sky inquiry;
- The du Pont inquiry; and the
- Price-bases inquiry.

BLUE-SKY SECURITIES INVESTIGATION

Several years ago a report was prepared and submitted to the commission correlating the law of the various States upon this subject. It seems to have been relegated to the background and had not been kept current. This inquiry merely brought the former report down to date. It involved a very inconsiderable sum, and because of the many complaints which come before the commission growing out of the issuance of fraudulent securities, it seems to me that it was necessary work and within the power of the commission.

DU PONT INQUIRY

This resolution resulted from the fact that E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., from published financial reports, had a large investment in General Motors, and that this same du Pont company had acquired a large holding in the United States Steel Corporation. This inquiry was to ascertain the relationships, direct or indirect, among these corporations tending to bring them under common ownership, control, or management, with information as to the proper economic consequences of such community of interests.

There was a very considerable difference of opinion between the chairman [Mr. Wood] and Commissioner Myers as to whether this information stirred up a fuss or abated one, or whether it caused depreciation in the value of the stocks on the market or enhanced it. Being interested to know just what

effect it had on the market value, I caused to have inserted in the RECORD a statement showing the market value a couple weeks prior to the announcement that the inquiry would be had, and some two weeks subsequent thereto. It seems that the market value of all these stocks were gradually rising prior to the announcement and continued the upward trend. In each instance stocks reached a higher price after the announcement than they had on the day of the announcement or several days prior thereto, and have continued the upward trend up to the date of the hearing. I do not feel that the inquiry had any detrimental effect upon the value of the stock in question. It is the function of the commission under the law to ascertain if there has been any violation in any of the antitrust statutes. Subsection a of section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission act is additional authority for the inquiry.

Mr. McDUFFIE. May I ask the gentleman, Was that investigation initiated by the commission itself or in answer to a resolution of one of the Houses of Congress?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It was initiated by the commission itself. In this connection I might say that the Federal Trade Commission replaced what was designated as the Bureau of Corporations in the Commerce and Labor Department. The Bureau of Corporations came into being in 1902, and its sole function was investigating questions of this character. Why, it was the Bureau of Corporations that was the main weapon in the hands of the "trust-busting" Theodore Roosevelt. Their economic investigations were his right arm—his big stick in his endeavor to prevent monopolistic control.

PRICE-BASES INQUIRY

Referring to the price-bases inquiry, the reference of Mr. Humphrey to it is rather unusual. Originally he questioned the power of the commission to initiate the inquiry. Upon his attention being called to the fact that it might have jurisdiction, he agreed that it had the power under proper resolution, but that the particular resolution involved was not sufficient upon which to base the inquiry, but it developed near the conclusion of his second appearance before the committee that his real objection to the inquiry was he was fundamentally opposed to the policy.

The Pittsburgh-plus case was decided by the Federal Trade Commission some time in 1924, and Mr. Van Fleet, who was formerly a member of the commission—I do not know whether he was a member when he testified before the committee last year or not—but Mr. Van Fleet stated that the Pittsburgh-plus case saved to the consumers of the West \$30,000,000. Some one in that connection said that if the Federal reserve bank building—

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Over what period of time was that saving of \$30,000,000? I think that would be the annual saving.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I took it to be an annual saving, but I wanted to be exact, and I found the language of the testimony simply said \$30,000,000. It was either an annual saving or the saving from the time of the decision up to the time he testified before the committee.

One gentleman at that hearing—I do not know whether it was Mr. Van Fleet or not—said it was estimated that if the Federal reserve bank in Chicago had been constructed at a time subsequent to the deciding of the Pittsburgh-plus case there would have been a saving of \$60,000 in that building alone.

Prior to the decision of the Federal Trade Commission it was the policy of the steel corporations to sell steel in this way: A firm in Chicago would give a consumer a price. It was the Pittsburgh price plus the freight between Pittsburgh and the destination of the steel.

Undoubtedly the Pittsburgh-plus case saved much money to the consuming public, particularly in the Middle West and the West. Of course, it can not be determined as to what benefit will be derived from this study, but it seems to me to be authorized both by law and the purpose for which the commission was created.

In other words, if the steel were coming out of Chicago, you can see that not only were the Pittsburgh interests protected but the steel selling company would receive as an added profit the difference between the freight from Pittsburgh to the point of consignment and the freight from his shipping plant to the point of consignment.

There seems to be several methods of arriving at sale prices. There is the Pittsburgh-plus method; there is the factory base method, making the factory price f. o. b. plus the freight to the consignee. The automobile companies give you the price f. o. b. Detroit, and they charge for freight on the machine from that point to the place of consignment.

Then there is the delivered-price method—that is, if a firm in Washington is selling merchandise consigned to San Francisco it sells at a delivered price—that is, the same price as if it were selling to some one in Baltimore. Of course, the purchaser in Baltimore is going to pay a part of the freight on the purchase shipped to San Francisco.

I submit that the price-bases inquiry is not only a legitimate inquiry but a proper inquiry to be made by the Federal Trade Commission.

There is one other inquiry. It is the resale maintenance-price inquiry. I am frank to say that I was not much impressed with the resale maintenance-price inquiry, but irrespective of my personal opinion I am confident that it was within the power of the commission to institute it.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

For this activity the appropriation is \$944,162, which is \$15,549 less than appropriated for the current fiscal year. The cost of general administration, to wit, \$32,500, is carried in this bill, whereas heretofore it had been paid by Smithsonian private income. This item is made up of salary for 16 employees and other administrative expenses. The endowment which may be designated "Smithsonian funds," is \$1,385,279.75; the invested funds of the Freer bequest, \$4,171,880.61.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Now, as to the Interstate Commerce Commission the amount is \$326,569 more than was carried in the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. BRIGGS. How much less does the gentleman say the appropriation is for the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. \$326,569.

Mr. BRIGGS. To what item does that apply?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The main item is in the valuation work of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is because the valuation has made such progress?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I would not say that. The work of valuation has not been finished, but I think that will carry it along in conformity with the policy of the commission.

Mr. BRIGGS. The other activities of the commission have been adequately provided for—they are provided sufficient funds to carry on so that the commission will not be hampered in conducting their necessary inquiries?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. They tell us that in the formal complaint department they are much in need of more attorney examiners; that there is quite a congestion in that quarter, but the appropriation for this activity has been going up and up, and it was the judgment of the subcommittee that this appropriation would be adequate.

Mr. BRIGGS. The part I am interested in is that the inquiries will not be unnecessarily delayed; that the action of the commission will not be unnecessarily hampered by having insufficient staff so that the question of freight rates can be promptly disposed of.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I think the gentleman expresses his views very well, and they are my views. I have no desire to hamper the work of the commission. But we thought after careful study that they might get along as well under this amount as they would if we had increased the appropriation. The increase of \$263,000 would not go to that work; it would go to the valuation work.

Mr. BRIGGS. In other words, the committee has endeavored to provide enough money so that on the rate question the commission can discharge its duties promptly and satisfactorily?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The commission feels that they should have additional attorney examiners, and these examiners work in the cases to which the gentleman refers. As I recall it, Commissioner Lewis stated that the work of valuation was going along very well.

Mr. BRIGGS. Of course, I feel that these rate problems presented to them for decision ought to be provided for so that the commission can reach a decision within a reasonable period. These questions have got to be so very important to the various interests throughout the country that the commission ought to be adequately staffed.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. There is an increase in the general expense item of \$103,900, which is made up of increased personnel and other miscellaneous expenses. Twelve thousand seven hundred and forty-five dollars is added in the travel expense of the employees in the field. There is \$80,000 less appropriated for printing and binding.

VETERANS' BUREAU

The amount carried in this bill for this activity, \$526,193,111; \$7,715,303 less than appropriated for the current fiscal year.

There is a decrease in salaries and expense of two and a half million dollars. There is a total decrease in the personnel of some 12 persons, but there is an increase in salaries for the personnel of the departmental service, and the field service, of \$470,846. There is an increase in military and naval compensation of \$7,100,000; a decrease in military and naval insurance of \$7,250,000.

There is a decrease in the appropriation for medicine and hospital service of \$3,600,000 and decrease in hospital facilities and service of \$1,000,000.

There is one point to which I desire to call the attention of the committee, and that is in regard to the hospitalization of veterans. As I understand it, the tubercular load has reached its peak, but the neuropsychiatric load has not reached its peak. I made the statement a few days ago that the peak would not be reached until 1935, but I was informed by a gentleman, whom I consider an authority, that the neuropsychiatric peak will not be reached until 1940. The World War Veterans' Committee, which has charge of this legislation, reported to this House at the last session a blanket authorization, which would have provided a number of hospitals that would take care of these neuropsychiatric cases. They are having hearings and will soon report to the House another hospital bill. It seems to me that some plan ought to be worked out whereby these hospitals can actually be constructed within the lifetime of the soldiers.

I am not prone to find fault, but time is going on. I was told one time by a commission in Kentucky that a certain thing had to be governed by the fiscal year, but I told them that in my country we live by the calendar year and did not live by the fiscal year. But the point I want to call to your attention is this: Kentucky is the center of a very large area that has no neuropsychiatric hospital facilities. The southern part of Indiana, Illinois, part of Ohio, West Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky comprise the area to which I refer. Twice the World War Veterans' Committee has reported to this House a hospital bill which would relieve this area; once a separate bill for Kentucky; and in the last session, in this blanket bill, they had a million-dollar, 250-bed neuropsychiatric hospital for Kentucky. My position is if the neuropsychiatric veteran has a service-connected case, he has been entitled to hospitalization all these years, and is entitled to hospitalization now. He ought not to have to wait an additional two years to get facilities. In that area you can not get facilities for cases of that kind. The general hospital does not take them, and the tuberculosis hospital does not take them, and the Chillicothe hospital (neuropsychiatric) is overflowing. The load in Ohio alone is more than sufficient to take care of it. In fact, there is an increase provided in the hospital bill for Chillicothe for neuropsychiatric cases. I hope that some time in the near future we will see a realization of this need.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

The amount carried in this bill is \$12,888,750, which is \$1,250 less than appropriated for the present fiscal year. It is \$1,400,000 less than the estimate of the Budget for 1929. From the testimony before us it would appear that the fiscal year of 1927 was the most successful year in its history. It would seem that in the five months of the present fiscal year ending November 30, 1927, there has been a considerable improvement in its operation. We quote from the statement of Mr. O'Connor, chairman of the Shipping Board:

OPERATING RESULTS OF MERCHANT FLEET CORPORATION

The operating results of the Merchant Fleet Corporation during the past year have been the most successful in its history, notwithstanding there has been a slight decrease in the amount of salaries.

The most recent statement which we have prepared on operating results covers the five months ending November 30, 1927, compared with the corresponding five months of the previous year, and indicates a reduction of over \$1,800,000 between these two periods. This is an improvement of about 26.5 per cent and results principally from the smaller voyage losses reported for freighters and combined passenger and cargo vessels, and from increased profits for voyages of the vessels of the United States lines. Revenues for these services for the period from July to November, 1927, are better than they were in the same period last year, and reductions in operating expenses have been made which also contribute to the improvement in results. The laid-up fleet expenses have also been reduced during the past six months at the rate of about \$500,000 per annum.

During the year ending June 30, 1926, the board operated an average of 262 vessels, carrying 9,596,614 tons of freight at an operating deficit of \$19,606,608. During the year ending June 30, 1927, it operated 301 vessels, carrying 11,245,963 tons of freight, at an operating deficit of \$15,926,411; thus while increasing the number of vessels in operation, it carried 1,600,000 more tons of American commerce at a reduction in cost of \$3,680,000.

We quote further from his statement:

REDUCTION IN OPERATING DEFICIT

The reduction in cost to the United States for the establishment of equitable ocean freight rates, regular and dependable sailings of American-flag ships, is graphically shown by the table depicting the steady decline in operating deficit of the Government-owned fleet from nearly \$43,000,000 during the fiscal year 1923 to nearly \$16,000,000 during the fiscal year 1927.

PERCENTAGE OF DRY CARGOES CARRIED

As an indication of the trend of foreign commerce of the United States in respect to the flag under which this commerce is transported, I submit herewith a statement showing the percentage of overseas dry cargo carried in American and foreign flag vessels and the percentage of all cargo carried. This shows the calendar years 1921 to 1926, and from January to June, 1927. The table indicates that on the overseas dry cargoes, which excludes tanker cargoes and cargo termed "nearby" foreign (which is to and from the West Indies, Central America, and Canadian ports) during the calendar year 1921, American-flag vessels carried 31 per cent. During the calendar year 1926 they carried 21 per cent, and for the first six months of the calendar year 1927 they carried 33 per cent. The overseas dry cargo is that part of our foreign commerce which is subject to the most competition from foreign ships, and it is to the carrying of this cargo that the Shipping Board is bending its greatest efforts.

SALE OF VESSELS

During 1927 the board sold 50 individual vessels and 2 for restricted operation. Recently the board authorized the advertising for sale of the three large Pacific coast services, namely, the American Oriental Line, the Oregon Oriental Line, and the American-Australia Orient Line.

LAI-D-UP FLEETS

During the past few months our laid-up fleets have been reorganized, with the results that our request for funds for liquidation expenses for 1929 was reduced to \$2,250,000 or \$750,000 less than was granted for the present fiscal year. These expenses for 1926 were \$3,432,000, and it is estimated they will be less than \$3,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Liquidation expense includes cost of laid-up fleet, sales, and a certain percentage of administrative expense not strictly chargeable to operation.

On December 1 the board held a total of 803 vessels, of which 312 were assigned to operators, 5 on bareboat charter or loaned to other Government departments, and 491 were inactive or laid up.

SHIPPING BOARD

The total sales value of these 52 ships sold by the Shipping Board during the fiscal year 1926-27 is \$6,990,936.50. The dead-weight tonnage of these vessels is 346,550, approximately \$20 per ton.

Originally there were some 2,400 vessels under their control, and disposition has been made of all of them except 803. Fifty-two were disposed of during the past fiscal year. The 803 vessels are made up of the following:

Cargo vessels	751
Passenger vessels	13
Refrigerator vessels	14
Tankers	11
Tugs	12

The United States Line at present, consisting of five vessels and four tankers, is under the direct operation of the Merchant Fleet Corporation. The other vessels are operated by operating companies. In connection with United States Line, there is a limitation concerning this bill looking toward the addition of reconditioned boats for this line, namely, the *Mount Vernon* and the *Monticello*. The cost of reconditioning is not to exceed \$12,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 is to be loaned from the construction loan fund. Passing over the question of their loaning money to themselves, about which I express no opinion, I will discuss the proposed reconditioning of these vessels.

It is stated to us in the hearings that the addition of these two vessels, after reconditioning, to the United States Line will round out the line permitting of weekly sailings from New York. It is proposed that the vessels will have a speed of not less than 20 knots. The vessels in question are 20 years old, but the report from the chief surveyor of the American Bureau of Shipping places the life of the *Mount Vernon* after reconditioning at a minimum of 10 years' service. The *Monticello* does not seem to be in quite such excellent shape as that of the *Mount Vernon*, but this same authority opines that she can operate as a passenger vessel for 10 years.

With the speed proposed, General Dalton stated that the mail revenue alone would amount to \$1,380,000 for the two vessels. He further stated that the two ships could not be built to-day for less than \$25,000,000. It seems that they were designed and built as naval auxiliaries by the German Gov-

ernment, and that the hulls alone are worth \$4,500,000 as they stand, to reproduce.

I have been laboring under the opinion that the net profit which these two vessels would earn after reconditioning is a much larger sum than that which is carried in the report. The report states that the sum of \$400,000 would be earned per annum by each vessel. I asked the chairman of the subcommittee to inform me if those figures are correct, or if the testimony of General Dalton on that point is correct. I am frank to say that if the language of the report, which says that each vessel would earn \$400,000 per annum after reconditioning, is correct, then I am not in favor of reconditioning them, because they are only going to last 10 years, and you would have a return of only \$8,000,000 from the two vessels.

In page 716 of the hearings, General Dalton stated before the subcommittee that these two boats would return \$2,550,000 per year more than the expenses. Would the gentleman from Indiana kindly inform us in respect to that?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to what he stated:

I should like to go just a little bit further in explaining this situation to the committee respecting the reconditioning of these two vessels. The overhead administrative expense of the United States Lines, in the first place, would not be appreciably increased. It is just as easy to run eight ships as it is to run six ships so far as the general overhead administrative expense is concerned. There might be a slight amount extra necessary in connection with advertising probably, which we have taken care of.

In order to be perfectly fair in determining the profit in operation of \$1,278,809, for each vessel, if reconditioned, we have set up as an administrative charge against the United States Lines \$227,629 per year for each of the two ships. That is entirely out of proportion to what the actual cost would be, but in setting up any statement of this kind we have tried to be very conservative.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. If the gentleman will continue on he will find my source of authority relative to the statement regarding \$2,550,000 for the operation of these two boats.

Mr. WOOD. The gentleman will remember that there could be checked against them what their expense might be, but we should take into consideration the operation of the entire fleet.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. But the \$227,639 administration charge is against the profit. I think a goodly portion of that should be taken out. That would make profit of even a larger sum.

Mr. WOOD. If the gentleman will recall, if we had these two ships, which would give us two weekly sailings instead of one, we could get more profit on the other ships.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes. But General Dalton said that the earnings from the operation of these vessels would exceed the expense by \$2,550,000 a year. I was rather stunned when I saw the statement that a "very careful estimate indicated that each vessel would approximate \$400,000 per annum after reconditioning," because General Dalton said they would earn a profit of \$2,550,000; and that took into consideration the administration charge of \$227,629 for each vessel. Later on in his testimony he said if they could accomplish only three-quarters of their estimate they would have a profit of \$1,900,000 a year for the two vessels.

Mr. CULLEN. The gentleman should remember that notwithstanding the spending of that money as a general proposition, it would round out the lines of the fleet, and the lines themselves would show a profit; and that would be the best thing to do.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman, but it was on the basis that that return was going to be approximately \$2,550,000. In another part of the testimony General Dalton said these boats would earn \$1,248,000 each. I recall those figures.

Mr. WOOD. But General Dalton added this to what the gentleman has already said:

That is based on a very conservative estimate, and included, of course, a very large mail business which we are sure we could get. We have a 24-hour differential in our favor, so that we could compete with the six and one-half day foreign ships, our greatest competitor. But if we could only accomplish three-fourths of our estimate we would then have coming into the line as a profit over the cost of operation about \$1,900,000 per year for the two vessels. Out of that profit on operations there could be replaced the amount drawn from the loan and construction fund.

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

Mr. CULLEN. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. That grew out of the misunderstanding of a question I asked General Dalton in an earlier part of the testimony, when I asked him what the increased profit would be. He misunderstood me. If you follow that through on the next succeeding page, page 718, you will see he goes back to this other proposition. He says:

I referred only to the profit on the reconditioned vessels in the amount of \$1,278,000 for each vessel, which is independent of the other vessels of the United States Lines.

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

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Who is responsible for the discrepancy in that statement regarding the income of \$400,000?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. In my opinion, that is an error.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. In the record it was stated by those in authority that after 10 years of use in first-class activity these vessels would also be good for another 10 years.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. That was particularly true with respect to the *Mount Vernon*.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It was especially true that one and the other was not expected to go out of service at the end of 10 years, so that some allowance should be made in the value of the vessels at the end of the period, and some consideration should be given to the fact that some of the other vessels are tied up now and are not earning anything.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I favored the reconditioning of these vessels as a business proposition. There was an endeavor to make a picture that these vessels would be valuable in time of national distress. I am not particularly impressed with that phase of it.

In checking up the personnel end of this bill, I find that there is an increase in the average number of employees for the activities in the bill of some 659 persons; and a reduction of 273 persons. The increased personnel, therefore, would be 385 persons.

In summing up this bill is \$7,715,303 less than the appropriations for 1923 and under the Budget estimate with \$1,300,691 to spare. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOWELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9481 and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDRESS OF HON. LEONIDAS C. DYER

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Missouri Society of Washington, D. C., held in the hall of nations at the Washington Hotel on Saturday evening January 14, 1923, an address was delivered by Hon. LEONIDAS C. DYER, Representative in Congress from Missouri, on the subject of China, on which occasion were present several hundred Missourians, including Gen. John J. Pershing, and also Dr. Sao-Ke Alfred Sze, Minister from China, and Madame Sze.

Realizing the value of the information gained by Mr. DYER during his personal visits and extensive travels in China, as outlined in this splendid address, I ask unanimous consent to have the same printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech made by his colleague, Mr. DYER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

CHINA

Mr. DYER. China, on the opposite side of the earth to us, is much like the United States in its area and size, China being slightly larger than the United States. The Chinese are principally engaged in agriculture and have been so for a long time. However, there are now many of them living in the larger cities and engaging in other pursuits. The Chinese are a quiet people and not apt to become excited.

Their religion, if such it may be called, is Confucianism. Confucianism may be better said to be a system of morals. The real name of Confucius was from his family name, Kung. He was called Kung the Master, Kung Fu Tze. That combination of syllables was too difficult for European tongues, and so it was latinized into the form with which we are familiar. The great teacher was born in Shantung in 551 B. C. and died there in 478, and his grave is one of the sacred shrines of China. Some of his teachings were: "The father who does not teach his son his duties is equally guilty with the son who neglects them." "Let the government be good and the

people will be good." "The great God has conferred even on inferior people a moral sense, compliance with which would show their nature invariably right." He taught the brotherhood of mankind when he said, "Within the four seas all men are brothers." He taught the "silver rule," which is negative as contrasted with the golden rule of Jesus, saying, "What you would not have another do to you, do not do to him," but is a noble precept none the less. It would have amazed him to be told that millions would one day render him worship. Yet for at least twelve hundred years in the Temple of Confucius in Peking the Emperor twice a year offered sacrifice. Twice a year also in 1,560 temples similar observances have been carried on for more than a millennium.

In Asia, which includes China, Japan, and India, live practically two-thirds of the world's population—1,816,000,000. All of the religions of the world have come from Asia. This includes our religion. More people belong to the Christian religion than any other, numbering 700,000,000. The Confucians number 300,000,000; Mohammedan, 235,000,000; Buddhist, 200,000,000; Hindu sects, 217,000,000; and Shintoist, 25,000,000.

The civilization of China is the oldest in the world, and was a contemporary of Greece, Egypt, and Rome. From 2000 B. C. to 1842 A. D. the Chinese were a happy and a prosperous people. During this time they made great accomplishments. They invented lenses from crystals, mariner's compass, gunpowder, printing, and paper making. They made great contributions to literature and art, to religion and philosophy, to morals and ethics, to trade and commerce, to business and banking, to the domestication of useful plants and animals, and other conquests over nature, including human nature. Other great accomplishments by the Chinese of that period was the building of the great wall, the Ming tombs, the Temple of Heaven, the Hall of Classics, the Forbidden City, the gorges of the Yangtze, and the works in paper, porcelain, silk, jade, cloisonné, carpets, etc.

The Chinese have never been a warlike people. China has always taken the position that people were good, and that they could be governed and reasoned with by moral persuasion. Europe took for granted that people were evil and that they could only be controlled by force. The Chinese have relied upon reason rather than force. The Chinese went along under their splendid system of morals and government during this whole period. They were prosperous and happy. Marco Polo, who visited the Imperial Government at Peking in the thirteenth century, reported that he had never seen such refinement, hospitality, and evidences of peace in government and prosperity. Marco Polo came to China from the most refined part of Europe at that time, and hence his opinion is worth much.

Things went along in this fashion in China until about the beginning of the eighteenth century, at which time India was being gradually absorbed by European powers. Sea adventurers, including pirates, at this time began to reach China. They mistreated the peaceable Chinese and forced trade with them to the disadvantage of the Chinese. Among the things that these Europeans forced upon the Chinese at this period was opium. This evil became so great that the Emperor tried to stop it. In trying to do this he endeavored to limit foreigners to the port of Canton. He also endeavored to put through restrictive measures concerning missionaries. This caused trouble between Europe and the Chinese and brought on China's first real trouble, the war with England, 1840-1842. This war is known as the opium war, due to China's desire to prevent the smuggling of opium into China. China was defeated by England in this war, with the attendant loss of Hong Kong and the forcible opening to trade with Canton, Amoy, Fuchau, Ningpo, and Shanghai, and the payment of a \$21,000,000 indemnity.

Following this came demands from other European countries, as well as Japan, for slices of the Chinese territory and special privileges. Among these was the setting aside of Chinese territory in various cities and ports to foreign governments for the establishment of national settlements, the foreigners to have their own courts and laws. These continued demands upon China by foreign powers, and China's inability to withstand them, due to military weakness, brought about serious trouble among the Chinese themselves and an antiforeign feeling. Although China has had a population during thousands of years, estimated at 400,000,000, never had she up to this time had a larger army than 100,000. China had never needed a large army, because the chief characteristics of the Chinese were peace and good will among its own people and its neighbors in Asia. This antiforeign feeling and desire to overthrow the ruling force in China because they had lost "face" in yielding to the foreigners brought on what is known as the Boxer uprising. For this the powers demanded an indemnity of \$300,000,000. The Chinese are still paying this to many of the powers. I am proud to say that my own country has declined to accept any of this money. The continued demand of the foreigners and the granting of concessions to them by the weak Imperial Government of China finally resulted in the revolution of 1911 and the establishment of the Republic of China. The Chinese people had not had sufficient experience and knowledge to establish a real republic. The result has been that so-called

war lords, or militarists, have largely taken over China, and, in most instances for their own gain, have kept China in a turmoil, exhausting the resources of the country in maintaining armies. However, at this time there is a real national spirit in China, and we can look for unity of the people who wish to save China for the Chinese and to have a government of its own people that will work for the happiness and prosperity of the nation.

We of this country are anxious to see China put its house in order and make for itself great prosperity and happiness. The United States has never demanded of China any concessions or "spheres of influence." We are anxious to help the Chinese in every way possible. Our interest in China is, in part, for trade and commerce. The United States is a country of great wealth, it now being estimated to be about \$400,000,000,000. This Nation is now producing on our farms and in our factories more than we can consume at home. We need markets for this overproduction. Asia, the Pacific, and China contain our best opportunity. The United States exported last year products to the value of \$4,007,000. We imported products, many of which were raw materials for use in our factories and mills, to the value of \$3,891,000,000. Three billion dollars of these imports came in free of duty. With China our trade is substantial and is increasing.

Our first effort to engage in trade and commerce with China was in 1784. On February 22 of that year a ship that measured 360 tons, called the *Empress of China*, sailed from New York with a cargo of ginseng, a root grown in North America, and which is of great value in China for medicinal purposes. This ship reached Canton on August 23, taking six months to make the trip from New York to China. This ship disposed of its cargo of ginseng and purchased silks and tea from the Chinese, which it disposed of on its return. On this ship, the *Empress of China*, when sailing from New York on August 23, 1784, was Major Shaw, who carried with him a commission from President George Washington as consul and commercial agent of the United States Government at Canton. Our trade with China, in these early days, was good and so continued until our Civil War. After the close of that war we again entered the trade with China and have continued it more or less ever since.

Modern China may be said to have begun in the year of 1890, the Chinese not showing any special signs of a desire for western commodities until that date. China's total foreign trade—imports and exports—increased from about \$91,000,000 in 1865 to \$115,000,000 in 1895. By 1915 it had increased to \$550,000,000, and in 1926 had reached a grand total of \$1,832,726,000.

The change in the character of the trade is even more noteworthy than the growth in volume. In 1880, for example, the imports of China consisted of opium, 40 per cent; cotton piece goods, 30 per cent; metals, 5 per cent; whereas in 1925 the imports, amounting to about \$800,000,000 gold, consisted of cotton goods and cotton yarn, 9 per cent; raw cotton, 7 per cent; kerosene oil, 7 per cent; metals, 4 per cent; tobacco and cigarettes, 4 per cent. Opium had dropped out of China's legitimate imports completely. Kerosene imports, which had amounted to 3,500,000 gallons in 1880, reached in 1925 a total of 258,000,000 gallons. By 1925 a total of the main commodities was only 37 per cent of the whole—less than the opium alone in 1880—the remaining 63 per cent being made up of a great number of the articles that contribute to the necessities of modern economic life.

The exports of China show a somewhat similar change, with a total of \$650,000,000 gold for 1925, consisting of raw silk, 20 per cent; beans and bean products, 18 per cent; raw cotton, 4 per cent; skins, hides, and furs, 4 per cent; peanut and peanut products, 3 per cent; the remaining 51 per cent was made up of such varied exports as egg products, tungsten, antimony, vegetable oils; with tea no longer an export factor of first importance.

In the earlier years Great Britain had an overwhelmingly predominant place in China's trade, but in recent years the United States and Japan have been rapidly crawling up. The United States is especially predominant in two or three particular lines; in petroleum, for example, and soft-wood lumber, cotton-piece goods, and automobiles. It is also a fact that American canned goods are rapidly increasing in use in China, as well as fresh fruits and vegetables from the United States in spite of the fact that China has a remarkable selection of vegetables and fruits. In 1925 almost 30,000,000 boxes of American oranges were imported into Shanghai alone. American flour has also become one of the important imports. It is evident from these facts that the trade with China is rapidly increasing. A much greater increase in trade with that country and the Orient at large is to be anticipated, coming from an increasing population, added wants and desires of the people, and especially perhaps from added purchasing power.

According to an article appearing in the November Bulletin of the American Chamber of Commerce in Shanghai, the United States led all countries in the foreign trade of China with the exception of Japan for the year, 1926, the customs figures for which are now available. The following statistical table which was specially prepared for the bulletin tells the story of what happened in China's foreign trade last year:

	Imports from China	Exports to China	Total of imports and exports
Japan.....	\$336,909,441	\$211,740,889	\$548,650,330
America.....	187,647,086	150,113,103	337,760,189
Hong Kong.....	124,472,673	93,802,031	218,274,704
Great Britain.....	116,269,419	55,835,783	172,105,202
British India.....	79,191,013	15,922,101	95,113,114

The article which accompanied the foregoing table stated that if the three totals for goods of British origin—Hong Kong, Great Britain, and British India—are added together the total would exceed that for the United States; but, on the other hand, a considerable percentage of the commodities handled by Japan are exported to or imported from the United States, and although not mentioned in the Bulletin, it is also a fact that a considerable portion of the trade of Hong Kong with China which is all listed as "British" is either of American origin or destined for American consumption. The writer of the foregoing calls attention to certain interesting phases of American trade with the Orient with which the public is not generally familiar. For example, the average layman believes that the United States buys more from Europe than from any other continent, whereas, as a matter of fact, America buys more from Asia than from Europe. During 1926 Asia furnished 31.6 per cent of America's, which was a larger percentage than in any previous year and over twice as great as during the average of the pre-war years 1910-1914. We are also told that America's trade with China is greater than with Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, Colombia, and many other smaller countries, and that the volume of America's trade to and from China exceeds that of any country in South America.

The United States has been the one great power that has shown real friendship for China. This country has called a halt on the other powers in their desire to carve China into "spheres of influence." This fact was evidenced at the Washington conference during the administration of President Harding. The United States Government has two specially great foreign policies. One of these is the Monroe doctrine, which applies to North and South America, and the other the open-door policy, which applies to China. Our open-door policy, specifically declared by Secretary of State John Hay, means that the United States will insist on the preservation of the territorial integrity of China and safeguard to the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all parts of China.

The China trade acts, of which I am the author and which were recently enacted into law, was to further cement the good will existing among Americans and Chinese. It enables them to do business together for their mutual benefit. Americans possess in China a marvelous asset in the good will of the people. Chinese throughout the country look upon Americans as their best friends, because America has always respected China's territorial integrity, prohibited its nationals engaging in the opium traffic, returned \$11,000,000 of its Boxer indemnity, and has 4,000 of its nationals, spending about \$15,000,000 each year, in missionary work in China, including modern educational institutions, medical school and hospital facilities, and general constructive activities.

JOHN W. DWIGHT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to announce the sudden death of a former Member of this House, the Hon. John W. Dwight, of New York. Mr. Dwight was for many years an influential and valuable Member of this House. He had the confidence and friendship of the membership on both sides of the aisle. With the death of Mr. Dwight another of the strong, virile men of the old régime passes on to join Speaker Cannon, Speaker Clark, James R. Mann, Sereno Payne, and many others that we older men so well remember, and whose memory we all revere and respect.

In making this sad announcement I am announcing the death of a very warm personal friend, and my feelings will be shared by many of the older Members of this House.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the older Members of the House I wish to bring a word of tribute, love, and affection for my long-time friend, John W. Dwight. He was the Republican whip of this House when I entered it and was kind enough to make me one of his regional assistants early in my career.

here, so that I had the privilege of working with him and under him. The office of party whip was then an important and powerful one, and he was ideally fitted and equipped for the place. He was the right-hand man of the then all-powerful Speaker, and as such exerted an important influence over the work of the House. By reason of my close connection with him I soon came to have a very deep and genuine affection for Mr. Dwight, which was beautifully reciprocated and which endured to the end. His death brings real sorrow to my heart.

STABILIZING THE BUYING POWER OF MONEY

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech I delivered before the Stable Money Association on the question of stabilizing the buying power of money.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I herewith insert a speech which I delivered before the Stable Money Association at one of its sessions on December 30, 1927, in Washington, D. C., on the important question of stabilizing the buying power of money.

This subject received a great deal of attention not only in the sessions of the Stable Money Association but also from several of the so-called "learned societies," which held their annual meetings during the week between Christmas and New Year. The evils of fluctuating price levels and the instability of the buying power of the dollar have attracted the attention of economists generally, as well as other people interested in public questions. Many believe that the problem can be solved. The legislative proposal which I am sponsoring for the solving thereof is embodied in the bill H. R. 124. My speech is a brief explanation of that measure.

The speech is as follows:

A LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL FOR STABILIZATION

I note from the program that my colleagues, Mr. STRONG and Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, as well as myself, have been assigned the subject Legislative proposals for stabilization, so I assume that each of us are expected to discuss briefly the legislative proposals we have sponsored for the past two or three years and with which our names have become identified.

First let me say that I believe that one of the great needs of our country and the world is the general stabilization of the buying power of money. I therefore favor any move that will tend to bring it about. It is needless to discuss before an audience of this kind the many evils incident to a fluctuating price level, for they are known to all of you. Relief therefrom would stabilize business conditions, would protect the rights of creditors as well as debtors, would largely assure capital and labor a square deal, and avoid many of our serious industrial and social conflicts. Entertaining these views, I naturally approve all efforts made by my friend Mr. STRONG, who follows me on this program, whose purpose it is to instruct the Federal Reserve Board to so conduct its functions as to assist in maintaining a stable price level. I am, however, also interested in going further and procuring legislation which would absolutely insure a stable price level. Whether that can best be accomplished by enacting the bill I am sponsoring or some other is for Congress and the public to decide.

The plan embodied in the Burtness bill rests on the simple theory that the buying power of money varies directly with the magnitude of its units and inversely with their number. This you will note is but an expansion of the classic quantity theory of money, which, variously stated, asserts in effect that "other things remaining unchanged, the buying power of money varies inversely as its quantity." With this old quantity theory our weight-adjustment plan does not, therefore, conflict, for obviously other things do not remain unchanged if the dollar's gold weight is altered.

In other words, H. R. 124 is based on the theory of effecting stabilization by means of changing the weight of the gold-bullion dollar to counteract accordingly the changes from time to time in the actual value of gold itself as measured by its true value—its buying power in other commodities. It recognizes the simple fact that gold, like any other commodity, may vary in value, hence in value, from time to time, depending upon its supply, the cheapness with which it may be obtained, and other economic causes.

We do not claim that this is a new thought or idea. It is one that has been discussed by leading economists for decades. Let me quote a few sentences from an article from the pen of Simon Newcomb which appeared in the North American Review in 1879:

"The main point is that there is no reason why a standard dollar containing a fixed weight of the precious metal should remain of invariable value, but that, on the contrary, we have every reason to suppose that its value does fluctuate. * * * That a standard of value

with the use of which no such thing as general fluctuations in price should be possible is one of the greatest social desiderata of our day no one will deny. * * * All we want is a dollar of uniform value as measured by the average of commodities. * * * The most obvious method of attaining the object is to issue a paper currency which shall be redeemable not in gold dollars of fixed weight but in such quantities of gold and silver bullion as shall suffice to make the required purchases."

No person in the world has done as effective work in familiarizing the public with this general theory as has Dr. Irving Fisher, and I am greatly pleased that we will to-night have the opportunity of hearing him discuss these important problems from his wealth of study and experience.

The specific plan I am sponsoring was formulated in a general way by a western student of the problem, Mr. Dana J. Tinnis, now a resident of Grand Forks, N. Dak., as early as 1896. Its broad general purposes are the same as the Fisher plan embodied in the Goldsbrough bill. Both plans contemplate effecting stabilization by varying the weight of gold in the dollar. In many essentials, however, they are at variance. The proponents of the Burtness bill hold to the view that retail prices are based on wholesale prices, so that tendencies toward change in the retail prices can be measured each day by comparing the day's wholesale prices of all commodities with those of the preceding day and averaging their deviations. The bill accordingly proposes replacement of our one-commodity standard by an all-commodity standard, based on all the commodities on the wholesale market. It employs, therefore, not an index based on certain commodities, but an all-commodity market gauge. We also believe that it is not sufficient to correct maladjustments by occasional changes, annually, bimonthly, or at stated intervals. We desire not small, jerky changes in the price level, but a stable one, hence propose to block the tendency toward change by daily adjustments of the weight of the bullion dollar. Requiring daily adjustments and using a market gauge including all commodities properly weighted are provisions not found, to my knowledge, in any other legislation.

The bill creates a monetary standard division in the Treasury Department to handle construction of the all-commodity unit which is to be the standard of value, and to measure daily the tendency toward change in the price level and block such changes by adjustments of the mint rate. The market gauge is a simple index or gauge of the wholesale market level which shows inversely the daily changes in the buying power of the dollar. Agents are to be employed by the division to ascertain at the close of each business day the ruling wholesale prices in the various markets of the country, which information will be wired to the division. With this information the deviation of the current dollar will be shown. The task of establishing the new mint rate then becomes merely a matter of simple multiplication. We feel that the whole process when established will involve little or no more work and expense than do the daily weather reports.

Provision is made for revising the weightings quarterly. This is to be done on information or trade data furnished direct by the wholesaler on simple forms provided for the purpose. The entire market gauge schedule is to be checked up and necessary revision made annually.

Coinage of gold coins and silver dollars is stopped, and gold and silver minted into bars. Most of the gold in the Treasury is already in that form. A new issue of Treasury notes replaces all Government issues, but not the Federal reserve currency. These new Treasury notes will be stable in value, and should therefore be even more desirable in bank reserves than the metal.

Redemption funds are consolidated and interest-bearing bonds deposited to bring the total reserve, gold, silver, and bonds, up to 100 per cent of the Government money outstanding against it. Par stage for the metallic part of the reserve is gold 40 per cent and silver 10 per cent of the notes outstanding, the silver being valued at its current market price. The Bank of England has not taken advantage of its option to carry a fifth of its reserve in silver, probably because the silver would have to be valued at an obsolete ratio to gold.

The provision for issue of additional notes under certain conditions is so framed that it can not cause inflation but can and will prevent the contraction of which the falling mint rate is a warning. Their issue at certain times thus assists the stabilization process.

There are also provisions for protection of the gold reserve which, I may remark, will be no more needed with the dollar stabilized than at present. I perhaps need not emphasize, therefore, that the proposal does not in any way savor of "greenbackism" or any other scheme of fiat money.

Aside from recognition of the fundamental theory that the buying power of money varies directly with the magnitude of its units, and putting that theory into practical effect to stabilize prices, the purpose constantly borne in mind in the bill is stabilization through prevention of change. It naturally follows that the price stage existing at the time stabilization takes effect should be the mark to which the wholesale price level is thereafter to be held. Stabilizing on any other than the current price level would cause a change at the start more or less

disturbing to business. If our purpose were accomplished, stabilization would appear in its true light as not change but prevention of change, just like the hourly electrical adjustment of clocks by the Western Union to Naval Observatory time.

To make this truly a prevention of change we deem it necessary to include all commodities of commerce properly weighted and to make the adjustments daily. We concede that selecting a relatively few articles are straws in the wind showing the tendency of the price level, but they are only straws in the wind and not a scientific determination. We hold that no index of a part can correctly register the movements of the whole.

The experience of the Bureau of Labor Statistics would seem to bear this out. Its index number was started in 1900 with 250 unweighted commodities. In 1914 the great advance in weighting the commodities was made and the number was increased to 297. By 1921 it was considered necessary to increase the number to 404, and in August, 1927, a further increase to 550 was deemed advisable. Until recently, at least, there has also been a lack of up-to-date weightings. The data of sales for 1909 was used from 1914 to 1921. From then until August, 1927, the weights were based on data for 1919. Last August weights were calculated from sales for the years 1923 to 1925. This is a most remarkable advance in a short time toward securing an accurate index so that the purchasing power of money may be correctly measured. Perfection thereof, however, can only come with the inclusion of all commodities and with weightings that are strictly current.

We do not want spasmodic or occasional adjustments of the price level which we think would be the result if adjustments were made only every few months or at stated intervals. In other words, the alternate pushing of prices up and the pulling of them down to a certain level, while preferable to present conditions, is not the object ultimately desired. Daily tendencies toward change can be scientifically measured and blocked by corresponding change in the weight of the dollar. Let me repeat, the plan is intended to prevent change and therefore daily adjustments are deemed necessary.

We do not deny that much can be done toward stabilization by regulating the volume of money and credits in use. We concede that within certain limits the powers of the Federal Reserve Board are such that acute fluctuations can be mitigated when those powers are exercised intelligently and wisely, although at times a degree of intelligence and foresight not possessed by humans would probably be required. As already indicated, we are in sympathy with the Strong bill, but we note that representatives of the Federal Reserve Board state that for several years now the board has attempted to avoid serious disturbances of the price level. We have, however, not had stability. From January, 1926, to January, 1927, as shown by the index number of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the price level declined from 156 to 146.9, or about 6 per cent. The index for June, 1927, was 143.7, while October, 1927, shows it at 150.1, or an increase in the price level in a four-month period of 6.4 points, or about 4½ per cent. It may well be doubted whether a better showing than this will be shown in the future by this method alone.

Change in the magnitude of the units of money affects their buying power much more promptly than does change in their number. If this statement is accepted as sound and if it is practical to obtain information each day showing any tendency toward change in the price level, then it follows that the plan proposed in the Burtess bill would operate almost automatically; in fact, the administration thereof would be so simple as to be "foolproof." We hope that in submitting it for public consideration we have contributed something worth while toward the promotion of stabilization. Kindly permit me to bespeak for it your earnest and sympathetic study.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 672. An act for the purpose of rehabilitating farm lands in the flood areas.

JOHN W. DWIGHT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my word of tribute to the memory of John W. Dwight. It was my pleasure to know him since I first entered this House, and intimately know him. I traveled through Europe with him. He was one of the most lovable men I ever knew, and in his death the country has lost a most valuable citizen. As a tribute of respect to his memory and the services he has rendered to his country, I move that this House do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 20, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, January 20, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce (H. R. 7940).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(7 p. m.—minority conference room, Senate Office Building)

To consider the various bills concerning the farmers' market site (subcommittee on parks and park grounds).

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory (H. R. 8128).

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce (H. R. 5641).

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To discuss legislation of various reclamation projects.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.—committee room of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions)

Providing for the appointment of a joint committee of Congress to investigate conditions in American Samoa (S. Con. Res. 2).

Providing for the appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report on the conditions and government in Samoa (H. R. 184).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay for the use and occupancy by the Department of Agriculture of the Bieber Building, 1338 B Street SW., Washington, D. C. (S. 1968).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the care of certain insane citizens of Alaska (H. R. 170).

Relating to the appointment of certain Cabinet Officers (H. J. Res. 37).

To relieve the Territory of Alaska from the necessity of filing bonds or security in legal proceedings in which such Territory is interested (H. R. 328).

To limit the period for which an officer appointed, with the advice and consent of the Senate, may hold over after his term shall have expired (H. R. 8112).

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.—caucus room)

A meeting to hear a delegation from the State of Wisconsin; Millard F. Bowen; H. N. Pharr, chief engineer S. Francis levee district, Arkansas; and Alva L. Reynolds, of Long Branch, Calif., discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

(2 p. m.—caucus room)

A meeting to hear N. C. Grover, chief hydraulic engineer, Geological Survey; C. H. Birdseye, chief topographic engineer, Geological Survey, discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

(8 p. m.—caucus room)

A meeting to hear members of the Mississippi River Commission discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

Mr. REID of Illinois has asked that a notice be posted here stating that the Flood Control Committee would conclude its hearings within a few days, and if there are any Senators or Members of Congress who wish to appear before the committee, Mr. REID would like to have them get in touch with him immediately.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

(10 a. m.—room 277)

To amend sections 57 and 61 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909 (H. R. 6104).

To prevent fraud, deception, or improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office (H. R. 5527).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

304. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 300 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 6466. A bill granting a part of the Federal building site at Phoenix, Ariz., to the city of Phoenix for street purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9200. A bill to provide for the appointment of three additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5774. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 445. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement or agreements with the State of Montana and private owners of lands within the State of Montana for grazing and range development, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 320). 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. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8444. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Getchell; with amendment (Rept. No. 315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8789. A bill for the relief of Louis Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8790. A bill for the relief of Frederick Sparks; without amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9161. A bill authorizing the President to reappoint E. C. Callahan, formerly a captain of Infantry, United States Army, a captain of Infantry, United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6394) granting a pension to Joann Thornton; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Dudrow; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9260) granting an increase of pension to Effie M. Livingston; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 9660) authorizing the city of Louisville, Ky., to construct, maintain, and operate a

toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near said city; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 9661) to modify and liberalize the prohibition laws of the United States within the limitations of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9662) to limit the enforcement operations of the Prohibition Unit to interstate offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 9663) authorizing Herman Simmonds, jr., his successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns) to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Tampa Bay from Pinellas Point, Pinellas County, to Piney Point, Manatee County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9664) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hazard, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9665) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pikeville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9666) for the erection of a Federal building at Paintsville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9667) for the erection of a Federal building at Prestonsburg, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9668) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Whitesburg, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 9669) to amend section 300 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 9670) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Pennsylvania as an auxiliary to the Cape Vincent (N. Y.) fisheries station; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 9671) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 9672) authorizing the erection of a monument in France to commemorate the valiant services of the Ninety-third Division of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 9673) granting increased pensions to the widows or beneficiaries of officers and enlisted men of any branch of Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States who are killed in time of peace or war in an aircraft or submarine accident, or who die as a result of such an accident; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 9674) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton," approved March 3, 1927; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9675) to provide aid and encouragement to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to Pawnee Indians in the agricultural and horticultural development of their restricted or trust allotted and inherited Indian lands in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 9676) to authorize appropriations for construction at the Walter Reed General Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9677) to fix salaries of certain judges of the Territory of Hawaii and Porto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 9678) to provide for steel cars in the railway post-office service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9679) to provide further aid to disabled veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9680) providing for a mine rescue station and equipment at Hazard, Ky.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9681) providing for a mine rescue station and equipment at Jenkins, Ky.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9682) to prohibit the United States from prosecuting or convicting any person in any of United States courts of America who has been convicted or acquitted in any of the State courts of the United States of America for the same offense, whether it be for a crime or misdemeanor, of which both the United States and the State courts have jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9683) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, the China relief expedition, or the Coast Guard artillery service of the United States, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9684) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and Army nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9685) to amend an act entitled "An act to revise and equalize rates of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to certain widows, former widows, and children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases," approved May 1, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 9686) to promote the safety of the people by installing automatic train controls on railroads; for determining and installing the most practical control of automobiles at grade crossings; for determining and installing other appliances for the protection of the people; to safeguard the interests of the inventors and the people supporting them in the development of devices and appliances in connection therewith; and to impose penalties and other conditions relative thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9687) to establish a free guide service for the Capitol Building; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 9688) to provide security for the payment of compensation for personal injuries and death caused by the operation of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZIEHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9689) to amend section 115a of an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) exempting from tariff duty all articles imported from foreign countries which are exchanged for American farm products for exportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 9690) for the relief of Leonard Goodwin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9691) for the relief of Hattie Webb Rayner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9692) for the relief of Kelly E. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9693) for the relief of Ben D. Shewalter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9694) granting an increase of pension to Rosa Vinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOHN: A bill (H. R. 9695) for the relief of Anna King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 9696) granting an increase of pension to Livy Moser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 9697) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Kresge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 9698) for the relief of N. H. Thibodeaux and Josephine Thibodeaux; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 9699) for the relief of Benjamin Hagerty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9700) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to James H. Lomasney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9701) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to William L. Sullivan or guardian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 9702) granting an increase of pension to John Anna Wunderlich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9703) granting a pension to Louisa Siples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 9704) granting an increase of pension to Clara McCory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9705) for the relief of Hugh Gibson, an officer of the foreign service of the United States, who, while serving abroad, suffered by theft losses of official funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 9706) granting a pension to Mary C. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9707) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Ohmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9708) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Grigory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9709) granting a pension to James I. Piland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 9710) for the relief of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9711) granting a pension to Laura Hallem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 9712) to amend the military record of Curtis V. Milliman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9713) granting an increase of pension to John T. Brannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9714) granting a pension to Lewis Kimmel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 9715) for the relief of Owen McCuen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 9716) to pay Charles H. Salley, of Salley, S. C., for costs, disbursements, and commission as administrator of the estate of Jim Woodward, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9717) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Fleak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 9718) granting an increase of pension to Ella Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 9719) for the relief of George A. Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 9720) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Yockey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9721) for the relief of Willie G. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9722) for the relief of Allen Nichols; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 9723) for the relief of John M. Hammond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 9724) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9725) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 9726) granting a pension to Anna M. Shoop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 9727) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9728) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9729) for the relief of W. D. Blair; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9730) granting a pension to Samuel Pack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9731) granting an increase of pension to Mourning Sisemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9732) granting a pension to Marge Brandenburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9733) granting an increase of pension to Stella C. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 9734) granting a pension to Dimmis E. Hale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9735) granting a pension to Eloise P. Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORMAN: A bill (H. R. 9736) granting a pension to Kate Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9737) for the relief of Herman C. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 9738) granting a pension to Ellen B. Lasure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9739) granting an increase of pension to Charilla Horbour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 9740) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Burgin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9741) granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Searles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 9742) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9743) granting a pension to Albert D. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 9744) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9745) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9746) granting an increase of pension to Mary Worley Armentrout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9747) granting a pension to Sarah E. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9748) granting a pension to Laura Viney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9749) for the relief of William A. Lyons; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9750) for the relief of Borroum & Bishop, a firm composed of James L. Borroum and Francis P. Bishop, residents of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 9751) for the relief of Robert Y. Garrison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 9752) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9753) granting an increase of pension to Mary O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9754) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Hennon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9755) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9756) granting a pension to Margaret Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9757) for the relief of the Cherrington Hospital, Logan, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9758) for the relief of William J. Rosselot; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9759) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Boseley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2013. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of John Mancini, jr., and 66 other residents of Providence, R. I., opposing compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2014. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition signed by E. H. Anderberg and other residents of Beverly, Haverhill, Danvers, and Merrimac, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2015. By Mr. ARENTZ: Petition of citizens of Bunkerville, Nev., requesting that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune, in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2016. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition from citizens of Centralia, Ill., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2017. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Wichita, Kans., re Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2018. Also, resolution of the Swedish Evangelical Mission Church, McPherson, Kans., with reference to amending immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2019. By Mr. BOIES: Petition signed by citizens of Milford, Spirit Lake, Terril, Dickens, and Sioux Rapids, Dickinson County, Iowa, protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2020. By Mr. BRIGGS (by request): Petition of S. B. Hazel and others, of Montgomery County, Tex., with reference to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2021. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of numerous citizens of Right, Tenn., asking that the pensions of Civil War soldiers and their widows be increased; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2022. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of supervisors and teachers of the William J. Morrison School, of Brooklyn, N. Y., approving the resolution to prohibit the exportation of arms, munitions, or implements of war to any country which engages in aggressive warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2023. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Mrs. R. M. Woodard and 16 other residents of Mineral Center, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2024. Also, petition of Mrs. O. Aune and 25 other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against enactment into law of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2025. Also, petition of Mrs. Earl Patterson and seven other residents of Duluth, Minn., protesting against passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2026. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Whitewater, Walworth County, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2027. By Mr. CRAWL: Petition of approximately 750 citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., against the passage of House bill 78, or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2028. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of residents of Schenectady, N. Y., against compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2029. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78), made by residents of Schenectady, N. Y.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2030. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of citizens of California, against the enactment of Sunday legislation, and particularly against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2031. Also, petition of citizens of the third congressional district of California for higher rates for Civil War survivors and also a \$50 rate for Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2032. By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging early and favorable action on the bill (H. R. 9195) proposing an amendment of sections 2804 and 3402 of the Revised Statutes, permitting the importation of cigars and cigarettes in smaller quantities by parcel post; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2033. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition of citizens of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2034. By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of residents of Des Moines, Iowa, relative to Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2035. Also, petition of residents of Stony County, Iowa, relative to compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2036. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Paxton, Englemin, Greenville, and Taylorsville, Calif., protesting against Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2037. By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Memorial of Camp Washington Council No. 43, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati, Ohio, petitioning for passage of legislation known as the Holaday bill, for the deportation and registration of aliens within the borders of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2038. Also, petition of Cincinnati Chapter L, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, protesting against repeal of the statutory award granted to veterans with a rating of arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2039. Also, petition of Mrs. Phoebe Potts and other adult citizens of Allen County, Ohio, protesting against consideration of House bill 78, providing for Sunday observance in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2040. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of 69 members of the American Legion, Post No. 102, Athol, Mass., urging increased pen-

sions for Civil War survivors and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2041. Also, petition of Mary E. Shaw and various other citizens of East Brookfield, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2042. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of 100 citizens of Idaho, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2043. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Frank W. Whitcher Co., Boston, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of the Columbia Basin irrigation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2044. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of residents of Greely County, Kans., protesting against House bill 78, or any measure restricting Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2045. By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: Petition of C. E. McCullough and other citizens of Peoria, Ill., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2046. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Shannon and other citizens of Peoria, Ill., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2047. By Mr. KEMP: Petition of citizens of Baton Rouge and Clinton, La., favoring increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2048. Also, petition of citizens of Louisiana, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2049. By Mrs. LANGLEY: Petition of Oliver Hackney and various other residents of Pike County, Ky., protesting against the enactment of the Lankford bill for the compulsory observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2050. By Mr. LOZIER: Petition of 132 citizens of Grundy County, Mo., urging more liberal pension allowances to veterans of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2051. By Mr. MAAS: Petition of Charles Zeelan and 103 citizens of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2052. Also, petition of C. S. Stewart and 579 citizens of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2053. Also, petition of Christin Warner and 166 citizens of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2054. Also, petition of C. H. Miller and 87 citizens of St. Paul, Minn., against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2055. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 49 residents of Grand Rapids, Mich., advocating the enactment by Congress of additional legislation for the benefit of veterans of the Civil War and their dependent widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2056. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Burley, Kitsap County, Wash., for increase in pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2057. Also, petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., opposing House bill 78, the Sunday closing law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2058. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the council of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging passage of Dale-Lehlbach bill so as to permit optional retirement of Federal employees after 30 years of service with an annuity of \$1,200 per annum; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2059. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition of Miss Mary Suckerman, of Minneapolis, and others, against Sunday compulsory observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2060. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Chicago, Ill., favoring the elimination of section 611 from the proposed revenue act (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2061. By Mr. RAINEY: Petitions of 106 citizens of Illinois, protesting against any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2062. By Mr. SCHNEIDER: Petition of numerous citizens of Brown County, Wis., protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2063. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Brown County, State of Wisconsin, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78 or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2064. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of Hon. John McCutcheon, Hon. Roy T. Yates, Hon. Isabelle M. Summers, and 130 citizens of Paterson, N. J., and vicinity, favoring increased pensions for Civil War veterans and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2065. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Katie Kah-O-Lid and 46 other residents of White Earth, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other national religious legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2066. Also, petition of A. T. Nelson and 28 other adult residents of Polk County, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or of any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2067. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition from numerous citizens of Erie and North East, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2068. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of 50 residents of Alexander, N. Dak., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2069. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of numerous citizens of Halfway, Oreg., urging action on legislation affording further relief of veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2070. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Milton and Free-water, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2071. Also, petition of 202 citizens of Hood River and Bend, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or any similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2072. By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of voters of Salina, Kans., urging enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2073. Also, petition of voters of Washington County, Kans., urging enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2074. Also, petition of voters of Clay Center, Kans., urging enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2075. Also, petition of voters of Miltonvale, Kans., urging enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2076. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2077. Also, petition of citizens of Riverside, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2078. Also, petition of citizens of Anaheim, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2079. Also, petition of citizens of Santee, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2080. Also, petition of citizens of El Cajon, Calif., and other communities, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2081. Also, petition of citizens of Escondido, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2082. Also, petition of citizens of Buena Park, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2083. Also, petition of citizens of Arlington, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2084. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2085. Also, petition of citizens of Bostonia, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2086. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory

Sabbath observance, and particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2087. By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Arkansas, asking for legislation increasing pensions for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2088. Also, petition of various citizens of Arkansas, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2089. By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition signed by E. C. Ride-nour and other citizens of Glenford, Ohio, in favor of an increase in pension to Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2090. By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of citizens of the tenth Michigan district, against House bill 78, Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2091. Also, petition from citizens of Bay City, Mich., favoring legislation increasing pension of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 20, 1928

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 17, 1928)

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 672) for the purpose of rehabilitating farm lands in the flood areas, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Shortridge
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Simmons
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Smith
Bingham	George	McNary	Smoot
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Steck
Blease	Gillett	Metcalf	Steiwer
Borah	Glass	Neely	Stephens
Bratton	Gooding	Norbeck	Swanson
Brookhart	Gould	Norris	Thomas
Broussard	Greene	Nye	Trammell
Bruce	Hale	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Harris	Phipps	Tyson
Caraway	Harrison	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Watson
Deneen	Kendrick	Sackett	Wheeler
Dill	Keyes	Sheppard	Willis
Ferris	King	Shipstead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH AMENDMENTS

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in both Houses of Congress, in the press, and in other places regarding the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. I desire to give notice that I purpose on next Monday morning, as soon as the routine morning business is concluded, to deliver an address on the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by citizens of Williamsburg, Va., regarding the storage of explosives at Yorktown. It is not a very long petition, and for the information of the Senate I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Virginia in the Congress of the United States:

Your petitioners, the undersigned residents of the city of Williamsburg, Va., respectfully call your attention to the fact that the United States of America during the period of the war activities acquired a tract of land of about 10,000 acres lying between Williamsburg and Yorktown for the purpose, as stated at that time, of establishing a Navy mine depot.

Your petitioners understood the term "Navy mine depot" to mean a place for the storage and handling of explosives needed for the current

use of the Navy; and the amount of high explosives necessary for said purpose, your petitioners are informed, is very small.

Since the establishment of said Navy mine depot the Government has found itself in the possession of large quantities of high explosives consisting of T. N. T. and other high explosives, and your petitioners are informed that they have now stored on this tract of land about 22,000,000 pounds of T. N. T., some of which is in the storehouses already built upon said property, some in the open; and that new buildings are contemplated for the purpose of making this a permanent storage.

Your petitioners realize the fact that it is necessary for the Government to have a certain amount of high explosives on hand, and that some place should be allotted for this purpose. And your petitioners would not object to this area being used as a Navy mine depot, as originally contemplated, but from information that they have the said tract of land is being changed and set aside as a place for the storage of large quantities of high explosives, and that some of the storage buildings now on said property, and others that are contemplated being erected, are within 2,800 feet of the outside property line and not a much greater distance from the only main highway that there is leading down this peninsula from Williamsburg to Newport News.

Your petitioners, also being informed that Congress is now undertaking to definitely decide about some permanent arrangement for the storage of high explosives, respectfully request that you will carefully investigate the tract of land in question. And that if upon an investigation it is found that it would be a detriment for this section of the country for the storage of such large quantities of high explosives that arrangements will be made for the removal of the excess amount of high explosives on said tract of land—if it should be shown that there is an excess—and that proper action be taken to guard the safety of the lives and the property of the people living in this community.

While your petitioners hardly think it necessary, still, they call your attention to the fact that this peninsula is the most historic portion of the United States; that large numbers of tourists are daily visiting this community; that this is not a sparsely settled country, but the historic town of Yorktown lies to the east of this Navy mine depot; that the city of Williamsburg lies to the west and is not more than 3½ miles from the western limits of the Navy mine depot; and that besides the residents of the city of Williamsburg there are two State institutions; namely, the Eastern State Hospital, containing in the neighborhood of 1,000 inmates, and the College of William and Mary, with about 1,200 students.

In consideration of the foregoing facts your petitioners urge that the Navy mine depot at Yorktown be not converted into a place for storage of high explosives in large quantities; that such storage constitutes a continuing menace and operates to retard the growth and prosperity of the community.

Respectfully submitted.

V. M. Teddy, H. M. Stryker, W. E. Topping, T. C. Hall, M. W. Foster, G. T. Brooks, R. S. Brooks, W. L. Thorpe, W. F. Low, R. W. Mahome, J. G. Warburton, B. I. Bell, C. C. Hall, T. T. Rogers, E. M. Gwathryn, Clarence T. Casey, Julian L. Casey, William Wallace, F. H. Geddy, R. W. Lane, jr., W. A. R. Goodwin, Frank Armstead, J. S. Timberlake, A. G. Harwood, sr., T. J. McCracken, W. S. Hitchens, G. W. Brown, J. A. C. Chandler, Mrs. Alice Pollard Stryker, J. M. Henderson, John Garland Pollard.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented a letter from John R. Fordyce, of Hot Springs National Park, and a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Arkansas Real Estate Association, at Little Rock, Ark., favoring the prompt passage of legislation to create the Ouachita National Park in Polk and Montgomery Counties, Ark., which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. KING presented a telegram from the Provo Conservation Association, signed by Mark Anderson, of Provo, Utah, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Smoot grazing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Salt Lake (Utah) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against further consideration of the so-called Swing-Johnson Boulder Dam bill until certain suggested actions have been taken, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. FRAZIER presented the petition of R. E. Swendsen, of Stanley, and 65 other citizens, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for amendment of the existing immigration law with the 1890 census as the basis of computation, and protesting against a national-origin basis of computation, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Spokane, Wash., remonstrating against the operation of the parcel post law as to the rate on postal cards and circular mail as being unjust and discriminatory, and requesting amendment