5806. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Federal Employees Union, Local No. 130, William A. Smith, secretary, 4 Mount Vernon Street, Charlestown, Mass., urging passage of the Welch salary increase bill (H. R. 6518); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5807. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Flora M. Merrick and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., in favor of increases of pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5808. By Mr. HOGG: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Harry C. Frank and 30 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., asking immediate and favorable action of Congress on House bill 433, to increase pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5809. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of W. F. Sims, president of the Hillsboro Dry Goods Co., of Hillsboro, Tex., opposing Senate bill 1752, to prevent printing of return address on stamped envelopes by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5810. By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Petition of members of the Kiwanis Club, Webster, S. Dak., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5811. By Mr. KVALE (by request): Petition of Rev. Anthony Scholzen, Bird Island, Minn., protesting against enactment of legislation proposing to discontinue governmental printing of return cards on stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5812. By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of citizens of Newark, Irvington, and vicinities, protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5813. Also, petition of the Pride of Peter Cooper Council, No. 74, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Newark, N. J., protesting against any measure to increase the number of immigrants now allowed to come into this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5814. By Mrs. LANGLEY: Petition of residents of Floyd County, Ky., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5815. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., indorsing bills and measures providing for increase in pensions to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5816. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of District Council of New York City, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, favoring the passage of the Bacon bill (H. R. 11141); to the Committee on Labor.

5817. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society, Church of Our Lady of Lourdes, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Curtis-Reed bill; to the Committee on Education.

5818. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, favoring enactment of House bill 9195; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5819. By Mr. STEELE: Petition of 19 citizens of Atlanta, Ga., asking that steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5820. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition signed by Grace M. Loughenry and some 69 citizens of Columbus, Franklin County, Ohio, urging enactment of legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5821. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Howard Garrison and 82 others, of Ellensburg, Wash., and vicinity, urging an increase in pensions to widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5822. Also, petition signed by Anna Watson and 34 others, of Pullman, Wash., urging increase in pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5823. Also, petition signed by members of the Grand Army of the Republic Woman's Relief Corps and Daughters of Civil War Veterans, of Ellensburg, Wash., urging an increase of pension to Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5824. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of William Preston and other residents of New Haven, Conn., and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5825. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of 199 citizens of Massachusetts, against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5826. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, urging Congress to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5827. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of citizens of Sandy Hook, Md., urging immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded needy and suffering veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

FRIDAY, *March 23, 1928*

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 22, 1928)

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

DEATH OF SENATOR WOODBRIDGE N. FERRIS

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow and regret that I announce that my colleague, Senator FERRIS, of Michigan, expired at 6.15 this morning from an attack of bronchial pneumonia. I may say that he had the affection and regard of all Senators. He was modest, sincere, and earnest. At a future time I shall ask the Senate to set apart a day on which fitting tribute may be paid to his life, character, and public services.

I send to the desk resolutions, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read by the Chief Clerk.

The resolutions (S. Res. 180) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WOODBRIDGE N. FERRIS, late a Senator from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed as the committee under the second resolution the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART].

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 24, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, *March 23, 1928*

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

The Rev. Charles Tilton, D. D., of Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations, before the mountains were brought forth, before Thou hadst ever formed the earth and the world. Even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God; in Thee we live and move and have our being, and Thou upholdest all things by the word of Thy power. Master of life and men, be Thou present in this assembly to-day to lead and to guide in all the counsels and deliberations of this hour. May every act be begun, continued, and ended in Thee. Thou art the guide of all the universe; Thou tellest the stars by their name, and yet Thou dost note the sparrow's fall with tender sympathy. Thou rulest the nations, and yet Thou leadest the babe by the hand and hearest the faintest cry of infancy and old age. May Thy gentleness make our Nation great. Bless, we pray Thee, these assembled Representatives of our Nation from every part of the land. Bless their homes, bless the towns and cities and States from which they come. Bless, we pray Thee, the President of the United States; guide and direct his steps, and may his life

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

and health be precious in Thy sight. Bless every citizen of our land. Bless the stranger that is within our gates. Make our Nation, O God, a blessing to all the nations of the earth; and may the blessings of Heaven rest upon us and all fellow citizens. May brotherly love prevail in all our borders, and may every moral and social virtue and truth cement us. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

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

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 22, 1928, they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7224. An act to extend the time for the refunding of certain legacy taxes erroneously collected;

H. R. 7927. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission of the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Atchafalaya River at or near Melville, La.;

H. R. 7932. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7944. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8093. An act for the relief of John Rooks;

H. R. 8311. An act to provide for the naming of a mountain or peak within the boundaries of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., in honor of Hon. John E. Raker, deceased;

H. R. 8542. An act to provide for the construction of a hospital at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California;

H. R. 8543. An act to provide for the construction of a school building at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California;

H. R. 8824. An act to provide for the protection of the watershed within the Carson National Forest from which water is obtained for the Taos Pueblo, N. Mex.;

H. R. 8887. An act for the relief of Victorina Mesa, of Cavite, P. I.; and

H. R. 8897. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundred and thirtieth Street in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois," approved March 21, 1924.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, CHEYENNE RIVER AND STANDING ROCK RESERVATIONS

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 9860, a House bill with Senate amendments, and move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon calls up the bill, which the Clerk will report, together with the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9860) to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government-land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, is this a privileged motion?

Mr. SINNOTT. It is a House bill with Senate amendments. It has already been considered in the House.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I understand that and make a parliamentary inquiry. I want to know whether this is privileged.

Mr. SINNOTT. This is a Union Calendar bill which has been considered in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that this is a House bill with Senate amendments, and does not require consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. That does not answer my inquiry. Is it a privileged motion to concur in the Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It is a motion to concur?

The SPEAKER. Yes; to concur in the Senate amendments. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM TYLER PAGE

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made over the radio on February 22, 1928, on the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birthday of George Washington by the Hon. William Tyler Page, the secretary of the commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. UNDERHILL. What is it?

Mr. HAWLEY. An address delivered by Hon. William Tyler Page on George Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech:

CELEBRATION OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. PAGE. Several years ago Congress established a commission to be known as the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington, the short name for which is the George Washington Bicentennial Commission. The commission is composed of 19 members. The President of the United States is chairman, and the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are members ex officio. The other members are Senator S. D. FESS, vice chairman; Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas; Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia; Senator THOMAS F. BAYARD, of Delaware; Representatives W. C. HAWLEY, of Oregon; JOHN Q. TILSON, of Connecticut; JOSEPH W. BYRNS, of Tennessee; and JOHN N. GARNER, of Texas. The commissioners by appointment of the President are Mrs. Anthony Wayne Cook, of Pennsylvania, honorary president general of the Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; Mrs. Mary Sherman, of Colorado, president of the Federation of Women's Clubs; Henry Ford, of Michigan; Col. Hanford MacNider, of Iowa; C. Bascom Slemp, of Virginia; Edgar B. Piper, of Oregon; Bernard M. Baruch, of New York; and Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, of Massachusetts, who is also historian of the commission.

The executive committee is composed of the congressional members and three of the presidential commissioners. Also there are committees on relations with state commissions, on the participation of women, on a commemoration plan, on relations with historical and other learned societies, on relations with business organizations and fraternities, on publication, on educational methods and library work, and on observances and pageants. The commission is authorized by act of Congress to prepare a plan and a program for signalizing the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington and to give due and proper consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to them, and through such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of plans prepared by State commissions, or by bodies created under appointment by the governors of the States and by representative civil bodies, and if the participation of other nations be deemed advisable to communicate with the governments of such nations.

Last year on the anniversary of Washington's birthday President Coolidge, as chairman of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, delivered an address to the American people in the presence of the two Houses of Congress, in which he invited their cooperation. This was followed by a concurrent resolution of Congress inviting the legislatures and the governors of the States and Territories to cooperate with the United States commission in such manner as may seem to them most fitting, to the end that the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of him who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen"—the pioneer, the soldier, the statesman, the husbandman, the exemplar of American citizenship, George Washington—may be commemorated in the year 1932 in such manner that future generations of American citizens may live according to the example and precepts of his exalted life and character and thus perpetuate the American people.

In response to this invitation of Congress the States have displayed great interest, and already about one-third of the States have authorized the creation of State commissions, and other States will follow in line when their legislatures again meet. The preliminary work of the commission has been one of organization. A large number of plans and suggestions have been submitted to the commission, some for memorials, others for pageants, and still others for domestic and international expositions.

While all of these propositions will be given consideration, the commission has kept clearly in mind the concept of the character of such a celebration expressed by the late Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University. Doctor Eliot was greatly interested in the proposed commemoration, and not long before he died he suggested that the celebration should be spiritual, not materialistic. It should be directed, he said, in large measure to the rising generation, not to the passing or the past. It should appeal to the thinking people, not to the careless or indifferent. Its aim should be to increase the number of Washington disciples and followers in and for the struggles of the future.

With this concept in mind it has seemed that an exposition in the old sense, a great display of material achievements and resources ought not to be planned; also, that this celebration should not be interna-

tional, but distinctly and thoroughly all American—a get together of America with a common heritage and with a common people. However, individuals and groups of nationals of other countries believing in and devoted to the principles of Washington and grateful for his example and mighty deeds for the promotion of liberty and justice among mankind will have ample opportunity to give expression to their convictions without the aid of an international celebration, with its attendant expense and glamor.

It is also thought that the celebration ought to meet the vital needs of America and that these needs are not material but spiritual in a broad sense. Not more inventions, but more consciousness of that for which America stands. Not more materialism, but more conscience and adherence to the fundamental ideals of which George Washington was the foremost exemplar. It is seriously suggested, therefore, that the program of the year 1932 center about the coming together for serious consideration of vital things of the brains and leadership of the entire Nation, of all the States, and of all parties, creeds, and classes—a great family reunion of America at the homestead of its illustrious fathers.

A comprehensive plan has been adopted by the commission, embracing the publication of the writings of George Washington and the publication of monographs, to be known as the George Washington bicentennary series, dealing with every phase of his life and character.

These works are in course of preparation under the direction of the historian. When available to the people of the United States they will possess authentic, accurate, and authoritative information concerning the man whose birth is to be commemorated. With this material the purpose is to make an intensive nation-wide campaign of education on the life, ideals, and deeds of Washington, and of the great underlying principles of the American Republic. This campaign could be made a part of the program of the schools, colleges, churches, civic bodies, women's groups, labor groups, etc., and of the press of the Nation. This would mean the education of the leadership of the Nation in the needs, purposes, and plans of the movement and the enlistment of every State, city, and group.

In this connection also it is proposed to have a system for competitions based on the study of George Washington material to be arranged through State commissions and auxiliaries. This would include prize essays with local and national competitions and possibly the awarding of national prizes for the five works on Washington adjudged to be the best, the awards to be made during the year 1932.

The most outstanding suggestions of permanent physical memorials are the proposed highway between the city of Washington and Mount Vernon, the completion of the Washington Memorial by the erection of a substructure or terrace, the completion of the George Washington Memorial Building, the foundation of which was laid in 1921, and the restoration of Wakefield, the birthplace of George Washington, in Westmoreland County, Va.

Congress may itself provide for one or more of these proposed memorials, but the commission has not as yet adopted any memorial project. The Washington Memorial Building, it is understood, will be financed by private subscription. This is also true to some extent of the plan to make Wakefield a national shrine, the National Wakefield Association having obtained consent of Congress to build a replica of the house in which George Washington was born.

The commission has under consideration a general plan, nation-wide in its scope, as the basis upon which each and every organization and individual can adjust themselves. This plan has in mind that the proposed celebration is to be one in which every American citizen and every organization should participate and have some part, leaving details to be arranged and perfected by State commissions.

It is thought that with the cooperation of the States and with every kind of organization in this country the two hundredth anniversary of his birth in 1932 can be made a wonderful and dignified commemoration in keeping with the simplicity and greatness of the life and character of George Washington.

JURIES IN FELONY CASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to a bill I have introduced to-day to regulate the separation of juries in felony and capital cases, and a brief statement in regard to the bill.

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes; my own remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill:

[H. R. 12350, Seventieth Congress, first session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 20, 1928.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill to regulate the separation of juries in felony cases in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by adding after section 919 thereof two new sections, as follows:

"SEC. 919a. The jury empaneled and sworn to try any capital offense shall not be permitted to separate until discharged according to law from further consideration of the case, except that in any such case where the presiding judge is of the opinion that absolute necessity requires separation he may permit such jury to separate temporarily to such extent as he may deem necessary.

"SEC. 919b. The jury empaneled and sworn to try a felony not capital shall not be permitted to separate until discharged according to law from further consideration of the case, except that the presiding judge may permit such jury to separate to such extent as may be agreed to by the prosecuting attorney and the attorney or attorneys of record for the defendant."

STATEMENT

Mr. Speaker, the practice has prevailed in the courts of the District of Columbia—probably always in the trial of felony cases less than capital and for several years in capital cases—to allow juries to separate during the trial of such cases.

The object of this bill is to put an end to such practice and to keep the jury together when trying a capital case, except a jury trying such a case, under the terms of the bill, may be permitted to separate temporarily in cases of absolute necessity; and likewise to keep the jury together when trying a felony case less than capital, though the bill provides the jury may be permitted to separate during the trial of such case if the attorney for the defendant and the Government consent.

The common law which is in force in this District requires the presiding judge in the trial of a capital case to keep the jury together. I am reliably informed this law has been ignored by the judges trying capital cases for several years.

Under the common law the presiding judge, when trying a felony case less than capital, may in his discretion permit separation of a jury, notwithstanding the attorney for the Government and the defendant may object to such separation.

In the case of the Government against Louis Phillips, charged with conspiracy to defraud the United States Government, the jury was allowed to separate, though the trial covered a period of several weeks. A verdict of not guilty was rendered.

In the case of the Government against Fall and Sinclair, charged with conspiracy to defraud the United States Government, the jury was allowed to separate. On account of charges that the jury was being tampered with a mistrial was declared.

ARTICLE BY HON. FRANKLIN F. KORELL

Mr. CRAIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by incorporating in the RECORD an article written by our colleague, Mr. KORELL, of Portland, Oreg., in the last issue of the National Republic.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAIL. Mr. Speaker, the unsurpassable beauty and the great potentiality of the Pacific coast have been the inspiration of many articles. We of California are always glad to have the attractions and the opportunities of the Pacific coast brought to the attention of the American people. We believe that it is important that all who read shall know what a wonderful country we have out there. Of course, we of California believe that nature has been more generous with the gifts she has bestowed upon California than any other section of the globe. We do not believe that the attractions of any other place can so much as equal them. However, when we are forced to it we sometimes acknowledge that our neighboring States of Oregon and Washington have much beauty and grandeur, and that they, like California, have been blessed with a wonderful climate, and we know that these States are inhabited by an intelligent, industrious, enterprising, and patriotic people.

As a sort of invitation to the world to make a trip to the Pacific coast, and particularly to the State of California, I shall refer in connection with my remarks to the leading article appearing in the April issue of the National Republic. The article was written by our colleague and my friend, Hon. FRANKLIN F. KORELL, Representative in Congress from Oregon. The article is entitled "Land of history and promise." It calls attention to the fact that Oregon is a Commonwealth of scenic beauty and of almost limitless resources carved out of the great Northwest. Oregon is a great State, and Portland, its leading city, is a great metropolis; and I would not appear to minimize this importance. Of course, Oregon is sort of a backyard for the great Commonwealth of California, and everything which this article states, or which anybody can

say, in praise of Oregon can be said with equal force for the whole Pacific coast, especially for the great State of California.

Mr. KORELL's article can be read with interest and profit by the people of this country. I know that it will be appreciated by the people of California, and particularly by the people of my own home, the city of Los Angeles, whose population has increased with such unprecedented rapidity and whose borders are being extended so rapidly in all directions that in area, at least, it is now the greatest city in the world. Los Angeles is looking forward with pleasant anticipation to the day which will no doubt be in the near future when it shall annex the beautiful and thriving city of Portland, Oreg., as another one of its suburbs.

The article is as follows:

LAND OF HISTORY AND PROMISE—OREGON IS A COMMONWEALTH OF SCENIC BEAUTY AND ALMOST LIMITLESS RESOURCES CARVED OUT OF THE GREAT NORTHWEST

It is easy, even for a layman, if he is acquainted with the subject, to write of the great State of Oregon, with its lofty and majestic mountains, its wide and sweeping plains, its fertile valleys, plunging waterfalls, and the beautiful river which forms its northern boundary. For Oregon is a State of great natural beauty, of tremendous—one might say almost endless—resources, with a history which forms one of the most interesting chapters of the great romance of our western empire. Oregon's greatest mountains are the beautiful Cascades, gleaming with perpetual snow, with Mount Hood, at an elevation of 11,225 feet, towering above; the Three Sisters, Mount McLoughlin, Mount Jefferson, and other historic peaks which are only a little less imposing. Its most beautiful river is the Columbia, which looms so large in the history of the Northwest. And in addition to its imposing mountains and fertile valleys, there are great plains to the east.

The average elevation of Oregon is 3,300 feet, which is just about right for comfortable and energetic human existence. The State's climate is variable, with a humid, mild, and even temperature along the coast and a dry and variable condition east of the mountains. And Oregon has as many kinds of soil as it has climate; clay loams, enriched in the river bottoms by deposits from the streams; reddish clay in the southwest; and in the east a gray soil, lacking in humus but easily worked and containing an abundance of the elements which make the growth of vegetation easy and practicable.

In area Oregon is the ninth State of the Union; in extent, 95,607 square miles. It is eighty times as large as Rhode Island. Two Ohios could be put into it with enough left for Maryland. Oregon is twice as large as the State of New York and a third larger than all of New England.

In the valleys west of the Cascades and along the Columbia River are to be found some of the richest agricultural regions in the world. Oregon is famous for its fruits, and there is much wheat and grazing land on the sweeping plains. Its forests are notable and form one of its great natural resources. Its fisheries, with the Columbia standing at the top, are world famous. Its manufacturing and commerce are growing rapidly due to the working of its tremendous resources—but I shall have more to say of this a little later on.

The history of Oregon is the history of the development of the great Northwest—a region teeming with nascent ideas and potential accomplishment. It is full of romance and adventure, of fighting, of the enduring of hardships, and of the struggles of the early pioneers to reclaim the land from the wilderness and make it a part of the United States.

Legend tells us that the early Spaniards were the first white men to visit the Oregon region and they may have arrived there shortly after Balboa's discovery of the Pacific Ocean. Francis Drake was there in 1579 and took possession of that part of the coast in the name of Queen Elizabeth, calling it "New Albion." In 1774 Juan Perez sailed up the west coast to 54° north latitude and made perhaps the first real exploration of the Oregon coast. In 1778 Jonathon Carver published in London a book of travels in which he claimed that there was a great river in the Northwest called the Oregon, but added that no white man had seen it and the information came from Indians. For years intrepid explorers sailed the waters of the Pacific searching for the fabled river.

Finally in 1792 Capt. Robert Gray, an American, discovered the long-sought river of tradition and named it after his ship *Columbia*. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Oregon region was claimed by Spain, by Great Britain, and by the United States. In 1805 Lewis and Clark, under the direction of President Jefferson, crossed the mountains and went down the river to the Oregon coast.

American and British fur traders, attracted by the immense profits to be made, invaded the new region and established trading posts there as early as 1808. After the War of 1812 a dispute naturally arose between Great Britain and the United States over the ownership of the Oregon country. In 1819 Spain, still the owner of California, waived to the United States its claim of all territory north of 42° latitude. For the next 20 years the history of Oregon is the story of the rivalry between British fur traders and American immigrants. Fortunately for the Americans, the British did not desire to settle the country but to use it only as a game preserve. In the end the American policy of settling it proved the most profitable and enduring.

Things changed rapidly after 1832, when four Indian chiefs journeyed from the Oregon country to St. Louis to get a copy of the white man's Bible. Immediately a wave of missionary zeal was aroused, and hardy enthusiasts of the Methodist, the Presbyterian, the Roman Catholic, and other Christian faiths went into Oregon to convert the heathen redskins. The first white women to arrive were the wives of Marcus Whitman and Henry Spalding, who journeyed there with their husbands in 1836.

The early law of the region was British—the rules and regulations of the Hudson Bay Co.—but in 1843 the settlers at Champoeg, in the Willamette Valley, by a vote of 52 to 50, organized a provisional government, first with an executive committee of three citizens, and then, two years later, with a governor. In the first set of laws were included many of the provisions of the ordinance of 1787, including the article against slavery.

In 1843 came the great immigration which has been immortalized in song and story. It started when 900 men, women, and children set out from Independence, Mo., in covered wagons and made the journey to the new country safely after enduring many hardships and perils. From that time on immigration steadily increased, and then came the demand for the location of the boundaries of the Western Territories. In 1844 the Democratic National Convention declared that the United States had full title to all of Oregon, and "54–40 or fight" became the campaign slogan of the year. The Democrats won, and President Polk in his inaugural message claimed title for the Nation to all the Oregon Territory. For a time it seemed that war might result from the disagreement, but finally a treaty was drawn up by James Buchanan, Secretary of State, and Richard Packenham, the British envoy, and this was ratified by the American Senate and by Great Britain. The treaty was in the nature of a compromise and fixed the American boundary at 49° north latitude.

The organization of the Territory was held up temporarily by the proslavery forces in Congress, but in 1847 Indian outbreaks in Oregon spurred Congress to action, and on August 14, 1848, a bill was passed providing for a Territorial government, the new Territory including the present States of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington and parts of Montana and Wyoming. The Territory of Washington was created in 1853. The people of Oregon Territory voted for statehood in 1856. Next year the people ratified a State constitution which they had drawn up, and on February 14, 1859, Oregon was admitted as a State, with its present boundaries.

In 1862 gold was discovered in eastern Oregon and southern Idaho. A great rush followed. Then came the pony express, to be succeeded by the railroads in the early eighties.

Since then Oregon has developed and prospered as only American Commonwealths seem able to prosper and develop under constitutional representative government. Its great natural resources are being rapidly brought into use. To-day they are paying rich tribute to the brain and brawn of mankind, adding bounteously to the needs and comfort of human life.

But an article on Oregon would not be complete without something concerning its chief city, its principal port and industrial center. I refer, of course, to Portland, one of America's choice cities. Portland, internationally known as the City of Roses, is a thriving community of more than 350,000 people, and if its present growth continues it will soon have a population of 600,000 and a metropolitan area embracing a million people.

In 1916 the postal receipts of Portland were $1,201,262. In 1926 they aggregated $3,900,887, an increase of over 150 per cent in 10 years. The figures for 1927 have not been made available as yet by the Post Office Department.

Over 105,997 building permits were issued by the city between 1920 and 1927. Their aggregate value showed an increase of over 231.2 per cent in building during this period and an increase in the value of residence building of over 356.5 per cent. During the seven years immediately preceding 1927 the public-school enrollment increased 24.8 per cent, and the school-age census showed an increase of 27.3 per cent.

Any record of the city's growth within the last few years would not be complete without some mention of its industrial development.

Portland is situated at the confluence of the Willamette and the Columbia Rivers. It is in the very heart of the world's richest agricultural sections. It possesses a geographical position that is steadily attracting manufacturers who are obliged to give consideration to the question of transportation costs in connection with the operation of their business. It is a natural gateway of outlet for the export wealth of that vast tributary area, so named the Inland Empire, likewise sometimes called the Columbia River Basin.

The territory served by the port of Portland contains roughly 250,000 square miles and has a population that is conservatively estimated as 4,281,816 people. The products from this great hinterland come down to the city over the only water-grade route through the mountains of the Pacific coast. Portland is the great central market and seaport of the Pacific Northwest. Freight moves to it from all points of

the Columbia River Basin. As this empire of natural resources is developed, so will all the products of mines and forests and farms grow into a steadily increasing volume of traffic for exports through the city as its gateway. In recognition of the obviously lower costs of operation of rail lines hauling freight by water grade, correspondingly favorable rail rates have been obtained for Portland and their justification maintained by various decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Portland is the greatest originating seaport in the world. In 1926 its record of water-borne commerce showed that 3,148,211 tons of domestic freight were handled, an increase of 134.4 per cent over the figures for 1920.

One million eight hundred sixteen thousand five hundred and thirty-seven tons of foreign freight were handled over the same period, an increase of 256.9 per cent. Fifty-three steamship lines are now giving regular service from the port. A few years ago there were less than a half dozen. Rail transportation has shown a corresponding increase and expansion.

I mean by greatest originating port that Portland produces more of the products that it transports than any other port. To be specific, one-third of the total standing timber of the United States is in the State of Oregon to-day, of which Portland is the outstanding center. Sixteen per cent of all the grain in the United States is produced in the Northwest, of which over 58 per cent is shipped out by boat via the port of Portland. Pulpwood, wool, mohair, flax, fruits, and vegetables are other products produced in large quantities for many basic industries. The agricultural production of the Columbia country, of which Portland is a great central market and seaport, amounted to $544,821,000 in 1926.

Between 1919 and 1926 bank clearings increased from $1,652,950,830.27 to $2,103,846,193.06, a record of growth that has not been surpassed or equaled by any other city in the Northwest. Pay rolls were increased in 1927 by upward of $1,659,700.

Portland is the first city of the United States in manufacture and export of lumber, first in export of wheat, second in export of apples, and fourth in flour. It is the first primary wool-export port and the second largest wool market. It leads the Pacific coast as livestock market, in the manufacture of woolen textiles, flour, automatic stokers, automatic motive hoists, locomotives, pulp, and paper. It is the first in the Pacific Northwest in total foreign-commerce tonnage and its leading jobbing center.

Let me say further that Portland is a city of substantial buildings, of good schools, and comfortable homes situated near some of the most beautiful scenic spots in America. Its broad green lawn and rose-bordered gardens are world renowned. And better even than all this, it is a typically American city, a city of progressive people, a city of home atmosphere, refinement, patriotism, and culture.

I have tried to tell you something briefly of the reasons I am proud of my great home State and my beautiful home city. But in order really to appreciate these you ought to come and visit us out on the Pacific coast. You will be impressed by our mountains and valleys, by our beautiful drives along the Willamette and Columbia Rivers, and by our thriving cities and towns. And, best of all, our people will greet you with cordial good will, a hearty welcome, and a spirit in keeping with the bigness and richness of our wonderful country. You will love to linger and long to return to Oregon.

I am not trying to maintain that Oregon has all the beauties and blessings of the Nation. Each section has its scenic spots, its sound American people, its fine traditions, and its material advantages. But we believe that we have our portion of these and we will be glad to share them with you whenever you may honor us with a visit.

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK B. MURPHY, OF OHIO

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday my friend and colleague, Mr. MURPHY, of Ohio, a Methodist and a thirty-third degree Mason, delivered an address at the banquet of the Ancient Order of Hibernians at the Willard Hotel in this city. I ask the privilege of printing that speech in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech:

THE IRISH IN AMERICA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, what a priceless heritage is ours as we assemble here to commemorate and keep bright the memory of one whose influence upon our blood is ever increasing with the onrush of the years. What a heritage is ours when we think of St. Patrick, a leader of men, a teacher and a benefactor of mankind. What a heritage is ours when we realize that in our blood runs the resiliency of character that does not know defeat; a resiliency of character that may be down, but, to use the vernacular of the day, is never out. Yes, my Irish fellow citizens, it is a real honor to me to have the privilege to join with you all in this happy occasion, and as my mind drifts back over the history of our fair land, the land we love so well—America—I see a ship landing on the rockbound coast of New England, after being buffeted by the stormy Atlantic for many days; and on that ship there are two Irish families—one headed by William Mullens, the other by Christopher Martin. Then my mind drifts to the romantic side of Irish character, and I see the name of a daughter of William Mullens written in the perfume of romance, as Priscilla, on the memorable occasion when John Alden spoke to her of the love of a friend of his, retorted, "Speak for yourself, John Alden." Ah, who but a bright-eyed Irish colleen would have taken the initiative as she did in those early days? Yes; two Irish families came over on the *Mayflower* and they have written the story of romance. Then others followed in their course, and still others came, until sprinkled throughout all of the Colonies a healthy group of Irish people could be found laughing, working, thriving, becoming good citizens wherever they might be found. And then there came a time when the liberty-loving people, who had left lands overseas to find a land where they might worship God according to their own conscience, decided that America should really be a land of the free, and 12 of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence were Irishmen. We find all through American life the imprint of Irish character. I have not the time to enumerate here the outstanding Irish who have made patriotic history in the struggles of this fair land of ours, because wherever there was a war being fought for freedom or for liberty there could be found the Irishman fighting side by side with the other struggling men of earth, seeking liberty always.

History does not record where Irish soldiers ever fought to place any other people in subjection, and throughout the struggle for our own independence many high places of responsibility and confidence were held by Irishmen; and as we think of St. Patrick's Day we find that it has been held in high esteem by the Irish people in all the countries of the world. And on March 17, St. Patrick's Day, 1737, I find that 20 Irish Protestant gentlemen met in the city of Boston, Mass., to honor the memory of St. Patrick and pay tribute to his noble character and formed the Charitable Irish Society. This was the first public observance of St. Patrick's Day which is recorded.

I also find a very interesting matter of history, in that two Masonic lodges were named for this God-loving Christian Irish saint, namely, St. Patrick Lodge of Freemasons at Johnstown, N. Y., and a lodge located at Portsmouth, N. H., in 1780. I find on March 17, 1771, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, located at Philadelphia, Pa., was organized with 30 members. Of those who formed this society there were Catholics, Presbyterians, Quakers, and Episcopalians. Those were trying days for all the people who had assembled here at that time, but they all had deep in their hearts a sincere desire to build a country where each and all might live, a country that all could love, a country that offered equal opportunity at the starting point to the rich and to the poor alike, to build a country where the rewards would be measured only by the ability to achieve. Yes; we Irish people are unusually blessed by reason of that which stimulates our blood, for no other human beings have survived so much unhappiness and so much long-continued disaster without degeneration.

I find that in March, 1790, the first Hibernian society was formed for the relief of the emigrants in the city of Philadelphia, and at the meetings of this society it was the custom to offer toasts, many of which are patriotic and romantic. One toast I noticed was a toast to Ireland:

"May the virtues of her children be ever an honor to her name."

Another toast was offered to the good women:

"The solace of man in adversity—his pride and comfort in days of prosperity."

At another time the following toast was offered:

"The shamrock and the shillelah, both emblems of Erin—with one we crown our mirth, with the other we drub our enemies."

Another toast runs—

"The Irish nature is like the Irish climate—it smiles, making up for its tears. In such a nature there is no despair."

Yes; in all the ages the Irish have had unconquerable souls and have had the ability that no matter how they might be thrown to the earth they invariably would turn their faces to the sun, and as they saw its gleams and felt the warmth of its rays new hope would enter their hearts and they would smile as they would think of the day that they knew would come. And so you and I have lived long enough to see the dawn of a better day for our people; 'tis not all that we would have it to be, but I had the thrill of my life as I joined with others in extending a welcome to a group of Irish gentlemen who were the guests of our Nation and were unusually honored by our Government by permitting them to enjoy the privilege of the floors of Congress and there meet in person your Representatives.

I find that for more than 200 years the young men of Ireland fled its shores and dispersed themselves all over the world. This period in the history of Ireland was known as the "flight of the wild geese," and I suspect that my father might have been included in that group, because he came to America many years ago along with thousands of others, and in the early year of 1729 I find that there were 9 Irish emigrants to 1 of all other nations of Europe combined.

And what a wonderful account the offspring of those early Irish emigrants has given of their blood. We find them leaders in every human activity. We find them doing the things that could not be done.

We find at least six American Presidents had more or less of a Celtic strain in their veins. President Jackson, whose parents came from the County Down; President Arthur, whose parents were from Antrim; President Buchanan, whose ancestors were from Donegal; and President McKinley, whose ancestors also came from Donegal. Theodore Roosevelt boasted among his ancestors two direct lines from Ireland; and the ancestors of President Polk came from Donegal. Woodrow Wilson was also of Irish descent.

In the realm of invention we find Fulton, an Irishman's son, giving to America priority in the conquest of the seas. We find that the presiding genius of the greatest telephone system in the world is Theodore Vail. We find Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, was the grandson of an Irishman. Henry O'Reily built the first telegraph line in the United States. John W. Mackey is the president of the Commercial Cable Co. We find the submarine was invented by John P. Holland, another Irishman. McCormick, the man who has made the work on the farm light and comfortable, invented the mowing and reaping machine.

In industry we find the great James A. Farrell at the head of the United States Steel Corporation. We also find James J. Hill, the great pioneer builder of railroads. We find the name of James F. Ryan, another great industrial and financial leader. I might go on indefinitely naming these leading Irishmen.

In the judiciary there have been many shining lights of Irish origin. The Supreme Court of the United States was graced by the person of Edward D. White as its Chief Justice, and he was the grandson of one of the rebels of ninety-eight. Justice McKenna also adorned this great seat of learning and justice. There are many other names that might be added to those I have mentioned. There have been many governors of the various States of Irish origin, and it remained for an Irishman to do the unusual thing in politics by representing in the United States Senate three different States of this Union, and Senator Shields was a native of the County Tyrone.

We find among the great editors of our country the name of Henry W. Grady, of the Atlanta Constitution; and Horace Greeley, of the New York Tribune; and the Olivers, of the Pittsburgh Gazette; and O'Neill, of the Pittsburgh Dispatch; Thomas Gill, of the New York Evening Star; and many others whose brains and patriotism have helped shape the national life of this fair land of ours.

In the field of poetry we find Theodore O'Hara, the author of that immortal poem The Bivouac of the Dead; Thomas Dunn English, author of Ben Bolt; Father Abram Ryan, "the poet priest of the South"; and James Whitcomb Riley, whose voice has been silenced by death, but whose songs will be sung as long as intelligence lasts.

Irishmen have shown their very great ability in the handling of great projects. They have been great builders, and among the names that come to me at this time are those of John D. Crimmins, of New York; John B. McDonald, builder of the New York subway; and John Roach, the famous shipbuilder of Chester, Pa.

And when it comes to music, what Irish person will ever forget the name of Victor Herbert? And those who have listened to the marvelous rythm of the band of Patrick Gilmore will ever have a sweet memory. And never as long as Irishmen live will the golden notes that comes from the marvelous throat of John McCormack be forgotten.

And right here in Washington each time you look toward the Capitol and see the colossal statue of America, which graces its Dome, you think of Thomas Crawford, who executed the same, and who was born in New York of Irish parents.

And when we look at the beautiful sculpture of Augustus St. Gaudens our memory goes back to Dublin, the place of his birth. There are many others that might be mentioned.

Ireland has given to America many eminent churchmen—four American cardinals, Hayes, Gibbons, Farley, and O'Connell; many archbishops, bishops, and other high dignitaries. History has given to an Irishman, Francis Makemie, of Donegal, the credit of founding Presbyterianism in America. Among noted Presbyterians of Irish birth was James Waddell, known as the Blind Preacher of the Wilderness; Samuel Finley, president of Princeton College in 1761, was a native of Armagh; and John Blair Smith, famous as a preacher throughout the Shenandoah Valley, and the first president of Union College, 1795, was of Irish descent. There are many others.

We also find many of the cities of the United States have been founded by men of Irish origin. Sixty-five places in the United States are named for people bearing the Irish prefix "O," and upward of 1,000 after the "Mc's." There are 253 counties in the United States and approximately 7,000 places called by Irish family names. There are—

Dublins	24
Waterfords	21
Belfasts	18
Tyrones	16
Limericks	10
Antrims	9
Sligos	8
Derrys	7
Corks	6
Kildares	5

Many of the prominent families in our country have been founded by emigrant Irishmen. I shall not undertake to name them, because it would take too much time. However, I shall encroach upon your time to mention one of the notable Irishmen of to-day. I would not be fair to our race if I did not bring to your attention the name of MARTIN B. MADDEN, an Irishman, who wields more power by reason of his position in our Government than any other one man. We are all proud of his work, because his life is typical of our race. I wish I had more time to tell you of this truly wonderful man and his career. It is one of the outstanding romances of our land of opportunity.

I have refrained from touching on the long list of Irish fighting men, many of whom fought shoulder to shoulder with the father of our country in the days of the Revolution, and from that time down to the World War they have given wonderful accounts of their ability.

While our soldiers were in France a colonel came out one morning after his regiment had been on a long, tiresome parade and said that he would like to have 75 volunteers to do an unusual and dangerous piece of work—or 25 Irishmen would do.

May I call your attention, just for a moment, to the wonderful influence of the Irish people on the home life of this Nation? Present-day discussions of social questions have no place or standing in the thought or plans of the Irish people. As I stand here my mind goes back to the days of the development of this country, when these eminent Irish built the great railway systems of our country and participated in every way in the development and upbuilding of the same and the prosperity which has made America great. In every community where these unsung Irish have congregated they have left their impress by their lives of industry, frugality, and piety, raising large families on a meager income, but with feelings of buoyancy and hope, and firm faith in God. How well they planned can never be measured, because the ambition of the Irish race is so insatiable and so hopeful always that a country where they live must be an active, living, growing place; and so the national life of America has felt the influence of this great race of people, who, for more than 750 years, fought a losing fight for the freedom of their own beautiful little gem of the sea, the Emerald Isle, and home of our ancestors.

And so to-night I congratulate you, as I congratulate myself, on being permitted to be here in a country where we work together, all for each and each for all, to the end that happiness, prosperity, and peace may always gladden the hearts and homes of those who call America their own.

Good night.

RELIEF OF ARAPAHOE AND CHEYENNE INDIANS

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3343 and pass it. It is identical with one reported from the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 3343, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state whether or not this action has been agreed to by the ranking minority member of his committee.

Mr. LEAVITT. The bill was reported from the committee by the unanimous vote of all members present, and Judge EVANS, who was the ranking minority member present, although not the ranking minority member of the committee, has agreed to this action.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the bill been before the House?

Mr. LEAVITT. It has been unanimously reported by the House committee and has been on the Union Calendar for several days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 667 of volume 44 of the Statutes at Large (44 Stat. L. 764) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That the time within which suit or suits may be filed under the terms of the act of Congress of June 3, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 738), is hereby extended for the term of one year from the date of the approval of this act for the purpose only of permitting the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Tribes of Indians residing in the States of Wyoming, Montana,

and Oklahoma to file a separate petition or suit in the Court of Claims for the determination of any claim or claims of said tribes of Indians to the whole or any part of the subject matter of any pending suit, or to file other suits hereafter under the terms of said act; and the court is hereby authorized to render final judgment in such suits: *Provided*, That unless such petition be filed in the suit or suits authorized by said act within the time herein stated all right of intervention by the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Tribes of Indians therein shall be forever barred."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. When was this right granted to these Indians in the first instance?

Mr. LEAVITT. It has been about three years that their attorneys have had the right to file this case under the present law.

Mr. BEGG. Why is it necessary to keep extending this right at every session of Congress?

Mr. LEAVITT. For the protection of the Indians in cases where the work has not been done as it should have been done.

Mr. BEGG. I am not, of course, going to object to the passage of the bill, but it seems to me the case should have been filed within the year and that at each session of Congress we ought not to be asked to extend the time. I remember that once or twice before we have extended this right.

Mr. LEAVITT. Only once or twice and never before in the case of these Indians.

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

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ROAD CONGRESSES

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 31, to provide that the United States extend to the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses an invitation to hold the sixth session of the association in the United States, and for the expenses thereof, favorably reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I objected to this resolution yesterday, but I have looked over it this morning and I want to withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and is hereby, authorized and requested to extend to the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses an invitation to hold the sixth session of the association in the United States, either in 1929 or 1930, as the association may determine.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of such session, including printing of reports, compensation of employees, transportation, subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence—notwithstanding the provisions of any other act—and such expenses as may be actually and necessarily incurred by the Government of the United States by reason of such invitation in the observance of appropriate courtesies.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the resolution by striking out the words "notwithstanding the provisions of any other act."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of Texas: On page 2, in line 3, strike out the words "notwithstanding the provisions of any other act."

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the reason for offering that amendment is that we now have a general law which regulates per diem and subsistence, and the provisions of the general law are liberal enough, and I do not think we ought to bring in a resolution which would set aside the general law. I do not see any reason why this resolution should be an exception to the general law that governs all of these expenditures. If we engraft one exception to the general law, we are liable to be asked to make many more, resulting in extravagant expenditures of public money.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not agree to this amendment. I would not object to it if it were not for the fact that the resolution will then have to go back to the Senate and go into conference, which would delay it. The United States has intimated that it proposes to invite this congress to Washington; they are holding it off, but they can not hold it any longer than the 1st of April.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. All that will have to be done will be for the Senate to accept the amendment and then it will become a law.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, I will leave it to the House, but I do not think we ought to send it back. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. What is the purpose of the provision as it now stands in the resolution?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The purpose of the provision is this: This expenditure is entirely in the hands of the President, and the sum of $25,000 is appropriated for the expense of printing the reports of this congress and whatever other expenses there may be, such as entertainment, subsistence of delegates, and so on. There is no intention to expend anything lavishly, and certainly the sum of $25,000 is not an excessive amount for the expenses of the congress. There will be very little entertainment, as a matter of fact; most of the entertaining will be done by the different organizations interested in road building.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The amendment which I have offered would not govern the expenditures for entertainment, but if anyone discharging the duties provided for by the resolution should put in a claim for subsistence or per diem they will be governed by the general law, whereas if the provision that is now carried in the bill were permitted to stay in the general law would not govern.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not think the gentleman need have any fear about this.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I am very much in sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I remember that just a year ago we raised the per diem allowance for every Government employee away from his post of duty. Now, why should we open the gate in this instance and increase the allowance and thus set a precedent?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and this was unanimously reported by that committee. I do not see why the gentleman should object to it now on the floor of the House.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to say to the gentleman that as a member of the Committee on Roads the matter has been discussed there and the Bureau of Public Roads is strongly in favor of this resolution. They state that there is another measure pending, to which the gentleman alluded the other day, under which they propose to build four transcontinental roads from this country to Mexico.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Two of them going through the district of the gentleman from Texas and two of them west of his district. That is a measure of great importance, and this conference, the Bureau of Public Roads states, follows up their program, and I think this is a very important measure.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It will be of profit to all of the countries attending the congress, and the gentleman from Ohio need have no fear of any extravagance, because the matter is entirely within the control of the President. I hope the House will not agree to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUDSPETH. As I understand, this resolution follows up the other proposition and is very important.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman is correct. The other is for attendance at the Pan American Congress, to be held at Rio Janeiro, Brazil, next year—1929.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make one observation. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] said this was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I happen to be fortunate enough to be a member. This is quite true, but unfortunately for me I was not present when this measure was reported out, hence I can not be tied by the responsibility of the gentleman from Maryland. So far as trusting the President is concerned, yes, I would trust him to the end of the earth, but the President will have nothing whatever to say about whether they are going

to spend $7 a day or $17 a day, and if $25,000 is not enough I know what will happen. They will come in and ask for more. Personally, I see no reason for breaking the law for a group of fellows who are going to have a "joy time" at this convention, any more than to break it for the Government employee who is honestly putting in his time every day in the year and then is called upon to leave the city because of his duties.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I would like to ask the gentleman how he can consider this a "joy time," when there are delegates coming here to discuss the very important question of good roads in connection with Mexico, Nicaragua, and the other countries to the south of us. How can that be termed a junket?

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman from Texas will read the report of this congress when it is over, he will find a major portion of the expenditure has been put in for social activities.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; I know that speech has been made by my friend from Ohio here for years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You can not have a lot of social activity at $7 a day.

Mr. BEGG. We do not want them.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is the same old speech the gentleman has been making for years, and he is making it when running for governor out in Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I am not running for Governor of the State of Texas, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one question of the gentleman from Texas. Am I to be a member of the entertainment committee?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not know of a better one they could place on such a committee, I will say to my friend, and it would not be a junket if the gentleman was there.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK of Texas) there were—ayes 23, noes 52.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, and make the point there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 100, nays 235, not voting, 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—100

Abernethy	Davis	Howard, Okla.	Pou
Allgood	Deal	Huddleston	Quin
Arnold	De Rouen	Hull, Tenn.	Ragon
Aswell	Dickinson, Mo.	Jeffers	Rankin
Ayres	Dominick	Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn
Begg	Doughton	Jones	Reed, Ark.
Bell	Driver	Kincheloe	Romjue
Black, Tex.	Edwards	King	Rubey
Blanton	Fletcher	Kvale	Sandlin
Bowling	Fulbright	Lanham	Sumners, Tex.
Box	Fulmer	Lozier	Summers, Wash.
Brand, Ga.	Garner, Tex.	Lyon	Taber
Briggs	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Underhill
Browning	Gasque	McDuffie	Vinson, Ga.
Busby	Gilbert	McKeown	Vinson, Ky.
Byrns	Gregory	Major, Ill.	Ware
Canfield	Green, Fla.	Major, Mo.	Warren
Cannon	Griffin	Milligan	Weaver
Cartwright	Hammer	Moore, Ky.	White, Colo.
Chapman	Hardy	Moorman	Whittington
Clarke	Hastings	Morrow	Williams, Mo.
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Ala.	Nelson, Mo.	Williams, Tex.
Collins	Hill, Wash.	Norton, Nebr.	Wilson, La.
Cox	Hoch	Oliver, Ala.	Wingo
Crisp	Howard, Nebr.	Parks	Wright

NAYS—235

Ackerman	Celler	Drane	Greenwood
Adkins	Chalmers	Dyer	Griest
Aldrich	Chase	Eaton	Guyer
Allen	Chindblom	Elliott	Hadley
Almon	Christopherson	England	Hale
Andresen	Clancy	Evans, Calif.	Hall, Ill.
Andrew	Cochran, Pa.	Evans, Mont.	Hall, Ind.
Arentz	Cohen	Faust	Hall, N. Dak.
Bacharach	Cole, Iowa	Fenn	Hancock
Bachmann	Cole, Md.	Fish	Hawley
Bacon	Collier	Fisher	Hersey
Barbour	Colton	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Hickey
Beck, Wis.	Combs	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Hoffman
Beedy	Connery	Fitzpatrick	Hogg
Berger	Cooper, Ohio	Foss	Holaday
Black, N. Y.	Cooper, Wis.	Free	Hooper
Bland	Corning	Freeman	Hope
Bloom	Crail	French	Hudspeth
Bowles	Cramton	Frothingham	Hull, Morton D.
Bowman	Crosser	Furlow	Hull, Wm. E.
Brigham	Crowther	Gambrill	Igoe
Browne	Cullen	Garber	Irwin
Buchanan	Dallinger	Gardner, Ind.	Jenkins
Buckbee	Davenport	Gibson	Johnson, Ill.
Burtness	Davey	Gifford	Johnson, Ind.
Butler	Denison	Glynn	Johnson, Tex.
Carss	Dickinson, Iowa	Golder	Johnson, Wash.
Casey	Douglass, Mass.	Green, Iowa	Kading
Kahn	Mansfield	Rainey	Swank
Kearns	Mapes	Ramseyer	Sweet
Kelly	Martin, La.	Ransley	Swick
Kemp	Martin, Mass.	Reed, N. Y.	Swing
Ketcham	Mead	Reid, Ill.	Tarver
Kiess	Menges	Robinson, Iowa.	Tatgenhorst
Knutson	Merritt	Rogers	Temple
Kopp	Michener	Rowbottom	Thatcher
Korell	Miller	Sanders, N. Y.	Thompson
Kurtz	Montague	Sanders, Tex.	Thurston
LaGuardia	Moore, Va.	Schafer	Tilson
Lampert	Morehead	Schneider	Timberlake
Lankford	Murphy	Sears, Fla.	Tinkham
Lea	Nelson, Me.	Sears, Nebr.	Underwood
Leatherwood	Nelson, Wis.	Seger	Updike
Leavitt	Newton	Selvig	Vincent, Mich.
Leech	Niedringhaus	Shallenberger	Wason
Lehlbach	Norton, N. J.	Shreve	Watres
Letts	O'Brien	Simmons	Watson
Lindsay	O'Connell	Sinclair	Welch, Calif.
Linthicum	Oldfield	Sinnott	Weller
Lowrey	Oliver, N. Y.	Smith	Whitehead
Luce	Palmisano	Snell	Williams, Ill.
McFadden	Parker	Somers, N. Y.	Williamson
McLeod	Peavey	Speaks	Winter
McMillan	Peery	Spearing	Wolverton
McReynolds	Perkins	Sproul, Ill.	Wood
McSweeney	Porter	Stedman	Woodruff
Maas	Prall	Steele	Wurzbach
Magrady	Pratt	Stobbs	Yon
Manlove	Purnell	Strong, Kans.	

NOT VOTING—99

Anthony	Douglas, Ariz.	Kent	Sabath
Auf der Heide	Doutrich	Kerr	Sirovich
Bankhead	Dowell	Kindred	Sproul, Kans.
Beck, Pa.	Doyle	Kunz	Stalker
Beers	Drewry	Langley	Steagall
Bohn	Englebright	Larsen	Stevenson
Boies	Eslick	McLaughlin	Strong, Pa.
Boylan	Estep	McSwain	Strother
Brand, Ohio	Fort	MacGregor	Sullivan
Britten	Frear	Madden	Taylor, Colo.
Bulwinkle	Gallivan	Michaelson	Taylor, Tenn.
Burdick	Garrett, Tenn.	Monast	Tillman
Burton	Goldsborough	Mooney	Treadway
Bushong	Goodwin	Moore, N. J.	Tucker
Campbell	Graham	Moore, Ohio	Vestal
Carew	Hare	Morgan	Wainwright
Carley	Harrison	Morin	Welsh, Pa.
Carter	Haugen	O'Connor, La.	White, Kans.
Clague	Houston, Del.	O'Connor, N. Y.	White, Me.
Connally, Tex.	Hudson	Palmer	Wilson, Miss.
Connolly, Pa.	Hughes	Quayle	Woodrum
Curry	Jacobstein	Rathbone	Wyant
Darrow	James	Reece	Yates
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robsion, Ky.	Zihlman
Dickstein	Kendall	Rutherford	

So the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCSWAIN] is engaged on the Muscle Shoals legislation and therefore absent.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Gallivan.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee.
Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Connally of Texas.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Bankhead.
Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Tillman.
Mr. Beers with Mr. Woodrum.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Kent.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Mooney.
Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Sullivan.
Mrs. Langley with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. McLaughlin with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Wyant with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Stalker with Mr. Boylan.
Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania with Mr. Steagall.
Mr. Hudson with Mr. Carley.
Mr. Frear with Mr. Wilson of Mississippi.
Mr. Dowell with Mr. Hare.
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Palmer with Mr. Moore of New Jersey.
Mr. Darrow with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Rathbone with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Anthony with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Hughes with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.
Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Rutherford.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Auf der Heide.
Mr. Campbell with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Robsion of Kentucky with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Clague with Mr. Jacobstein.
Mr. Vestal with Mr. Larsen.
Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Curry with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Reece with Mr. Goldsborough.
Mr. Britten with Mr. McSwain.
Mr. James with Mr. Eslick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

A similar House resolution was laid on the table.

A motion by Mr. LINTHICUM to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. 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 naval appropriation bill. Pending that, I wonder if we can not limit general debate. From conversation I have had with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] I find that we both have requests for about five hours' further general debate. I ask unanimous consent that general debate be continued for five hours, to be controlled as heretofore by the gentleman from Kansas and myself.

Mr. AYRES. Will not the gentleman modify his request and make it not exceeding five hours?

Mr. FRENCH. Not exceeding five hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the time for further general debate be limited to not exceeding five hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if it is expected to continue with this bill to-morrow?

Mr. FRENCH. My understanding is that we will continue to-morrow.

The motion of Mr. FRENCH was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12286) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 15 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, one of the most amazing developments since the limitation of the naval armament conference of 1921–22 has been the consistent and persistent attacks to undermine the confidence of the American public in the accomplishments of that conference. In my opinion the treaty of Washington for the limitation of armament in 1921–22 was the greatest step forward in the direction of peace and understanding since the armistice. [Applause.]

However, for reasons that are hard to explain, attempts have been made and are still being made by professional big-navy men to make the people of this country believe that we sacrificed our Navy, that we scrapped our ships and other nations did not scrap theirs, that our interests were betrayed by former Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, and that we conceded everything and got nothing in return. It is time that the noise and propaganda of the Navy jingoes should be answered and that the motive of the attacks should no longer be concealed from the public.

Now, what are the facts? The facts are that for the first time in the naval history of Great Britain she agreed to recognize our demand as a great industrial and exporting nation to equality on the high seas, and thereby prevented competitive building of capital ships. The acceptance of the 5–5–3 ratio by Great Britain meant that as far as battleships and battle cruisers were concerned, and all other naval vessels above 10,000 tons, there should be a parity between the United States and Great Britain.

In the six years that have gone by since that conference was ratified the Government of the United States has saved one and one-half billion dollars, or approximately $250,000,000 a year, on the proposed building program and the maintenance which would have been necessary for the ships that were scrapped and for those that were on the proposed naval program.

That is only a matter of finance, but the Coolidge program of economy would have been a myth without the ratification of the Washington limitation of naval armament. If we had continued with the proposed program of $250,000,000 a year there would have been no tax reduction. But the biggest thing about that conference was the fact that overnight when we adopted the 5–5–3 ratio all thought of war and talk of war between Japan and the United States disappeared. [Applause.]

At that time and prior to it the papers were filled with all kinds of jingoistic propositions about the danger of war between Japan and the United States. Almost overnight the situation changed and the papers now rarely contain any reference to the possibility of war with Japan. Those are the outstanding results of the Washington conference, which has done so much for the peace of the world. Notwithstanding the facts the big-navy men on every occasion have continued to denounce the naval limitation conference and have tried to make the public believe that we have betrayed our own best interests. The criticism has been so rampant that a former admiral of our Navy went as far as accusing Mr. Hughes of being a pacifist. What is it they want? What do they mean? Do they mean that they wanted the United States to proceed and build the biggest navy in the world, to enter into competition with Great Britain to build more of these $40,000,000 battleships? Why, it seems to be taken for granted by those gentlemen of the big-navy persuasion that we could have gone ahead and built the biggest navy, the biggest number of battleships and battle cruisers, and that Great Britain would have made no effort to compete with us. You must remember that Great Britain has $18,000,000,000 invested in foreign countries and the United States only has $13,000,000,000 invested.

Is it conceivable that in any race for naval armament between the United States and Great Britain that she would have failed to continue to build these big battleships? Of course not. I do not like to make predictions—fools rush in where angels fear to tread—but I predict that within 50 years the limitation of naval armament conference of 1921–22 which established the 5–5–3 ratio will be regarded as the most important event in our day and generation since the World War.

Under that agreement it is proposed that we should have a new limitation of armament conference in 1931–32, and instead of replacing these battleships on the 5–5–3 ratio which provided for 18 battleships over 10,000 tons each, for England and the United States, and 10 for Japan, I suggest for respectful consideration when this new conference comes around, and it may be reached before 1931, that we do not replace those battleships, but that we reduce by one-half that number, making it 9 instead of 18 for Great Britain and the United States and a proportional reduction for Japan on the same 5–5–3 ratio. We would then have identically the same amount of protection, the same amount of national defense, if it was accomplished proportionately, and we would save to the taxpayers of this country $400,000,000 in replacements, and $20,000,000 annually in maintenance for the battleships that are not replaced.

I thought some Member of the House should answer the statements made in the House that the Limitation of Naval Armament Conference was a farce. That assertion was made not only by the big-navy men, like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], but it was made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE], who stated that limitation of naval armament of 1921–22 was a farce.

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

Mr. FISH. No; I have not the time. I am sorry. If I get through I shall be glad to yield. Unfortunately, the Washington Limitation of Armament Conference did not include the so-called light cruisers under 10,000 tons. Those cruisers are misnomers. They are not light cruisers at all. They cost as much as battleships cost before the war. Their 8-inch guns are as powerful and hard hitting as the 12-inch guns on battleships before the war. They have a speed of 35 knots, which is far in excess of battleships before 1914.

Mr. FRENCH. And cost twice as much.

Mr. FISH. Unfortunately, we were unable—England, Japan, and the United States—to come to an agreement on a 5–5–3 basis for the limitation of these so-called light cruisers, which really should be known as the Washington type of cruisers. England went ahead immediately after the conference to build up her cruisers of 10,000 tons, not in violation of the letter or the spirit of the conference, because no agreement was reached upon that.

A year ago I introduced a resolution in the House carrying out the request of the President, providing for an appropriation of $75,000 to send delegates to the preparatory commission on disarmament to be held in Geneva under the auspices of the League of Nations. That conference was a misnomer. It was not a disarmament conference. It was not even a limitation of armament conference. It was a conference composed of a score of nations under the auspices of the League of Nations, many of whom have no navies at all, to discuss a sort of general disarmament, or, rather, an agenda for a general limitation of land, sea, and air armaments. The Members of the House took occasion to say in advance that there would be no useful result from that conference. I had to defend it on the floor of the House, and I made the statement then, which I repeat now, that we had to attend it as a matter of good faith or we could have been justly accused of not being sincere in our efforts to limit naval armaments. What happened? The conference was held. These little nations, with no navy at all, got together and blocked any proposition that had to do with the limitation of naval armament. As a consequence of the failure, the President

of the United States called a conference at Geneva of Great Britain, Japan, the United States, Italy, and France. Italy and France refused, but sent observers.

The United States' delegates went to this conference to try to extend the 5-5-3 ratio to auxiliary vessels. They carried out the orders of the President. They did everything in their power to reach an agreement on the 5-5-3 basis for auxiliary vessels, but failed through no fault of their own. The main point on which the conference broke up was the insistence of the British delegates that the 8-inch guns be scrapped and 6-inch guns be adopted. That would have meant that Great Britain could have armed all her merchant marine with 6-inch guns and thus controlled the seas for generations to come. The limitation of armament conference of 1921-22 specifically provided that cruisers under 10,000 tons could have 8-inch guns, and naturally we were not going to concede any change to Great Britain, because we realized in advance that, with her control of merchant ships, if we did concede that, there was no use of discussing any more the question of light cruisers, because England could convert her entire merchant marine into light cruisers with 6-inch guns. I want to take this opportunity to put into the RECORD a letter written by Lord Cecil, one of the British delegates, who places the entire blame for the failure of the three-power naval conference not upon the American delegates, as stated by some Members of this House, but solely upon the British cabinet. [Applause.]

I am going to read from Lord Cecil's letter to the London Times extracts which appeared in American newspapers:

"To judge by the debate in the House of Commons," he says, "there seems still some doubt as what actually occurred in the three-power conference at Geneva last summer," and then requests the privilege of restating the case "as I know it."

BRITISH-JAPANESE PROPOSALS

"After prolonged negotiations, the British delegates, in agreement with the Japanese made certain proposals," writes Lord Cecil. "These comprised a figure for the total tonnage of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, and the limitation of 10,000-ton cruisers for the British and Americans to 15 or less, with a proportionate number for the Japanese."

I want the chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Affairs to take note of "to 15." Further:

So far the Americans said they saw no insuperable objection to an agreement—which, in diplomatic language, meant they would agree if they could get nothing better. The British also proposed that cruisers other than 10,000 tonners should be limited to 6,000 tons, carrying 6-inch guns. This the Americans rejected. They wanted 8,000-ton cruisers instead 6,000 and 8-inch guns instead of 6-inch. I disagreed with the Americans, but I thought the difference far too small to justify a breakdown to the negotiations.

QUESTION OF COMPROMISE

In any case, though, a compromise should be attempted, and on this point Mr. Bridgeman and I were absolutely as one. Accordingly we made three proposals successively. The first suggested that we should seek to limit the agreement to the year 1931, since till that date the Americans would be fully occupied in catching up with our built or building 10,000 tonners. Next we proposed a compromise on the basis of 7-inch guns. Thirdly, we urged that the question of the caliber of the guns for second-class cruisers might be left unsettled—it could not become actual for the United States for some years—on the understanding that if the United States definitely decided to build cruisers carrying 8-inch guns other than the 10,000 tonners, they should give us notice and a further conference could be held if we so desired. I thought and think that there was a very good chance that this would have been accepted.

ALL COMPROMISE REJECTED

All these suggestions of a compromise were rejected by the cabinet, though both Mr. Bridgeman and I supported them.

[Applause.]

I believe the attacks made on Ambassador Gibson, Admiral Hilary Jones, and the American delegates by Members of Congress for the failure of the three-power naval conference held last summer at Geneva to be most unfair and not warranted by the facts. It can be most emphatically stated that the American delegates conformed in all respects to the treaty of Washington and made every effort to extend the 5-5-3 ratio to light cruisers and auxiliary vessels.

I am not one of those who delight in twisting the lion's tail simply to hear him roar. I believe in cordial good will and friendship between the two great English-speaking countries, but I can not escape the conclusion that the British cabinet committed a serious blunder, and a blunder is often worse than a crime, by overreaching in their demands, and are largely to blame for the approaching competition between the three great naval powers as regards the building of light cruisers. Although I can not conceive of war between Great Britain and the United States under any circumstances, yet competitive armaments have always been the greatest factor in creating misunderstandings, suspicion, and enmity between nations. Let us hope that this misunderstanding can soon be rectified, or at least let us strive toward that objective by showing our good faith and willingness to enter into another conference.

It must be obvious to anyone who has read Lord Cecil's letter to the London Times that the blame for the failure to reach an agreement to limit light cruisers rests entirely upon the British Government. Lord Cecil, who was one of the British delegates, expressly states that the cabinet directed him and his colleague, W. C. Bridgeman, the First Lord of the Admiralty, to offer no compromise on the 8-inch gun question. Lord Cecil further states that three other suggestions for a compromise were rejected by the cabinet, "though both Mr. Bridgeman and I supported them."

The apparent Nelsonian attitude on the part of the British cabinet, backed by an age-long tradition of Britannia rules the waves and supported by a Tory government, made an agreement based on a numerical or tonnage parity for light cruisers, evidently too much to be expected in spite of the mutual desire of both the American and British people. The blame for the failure to reach an agreement to limit light cruisers rests not on the American delegates but squarely on the British Government, and there is no escape from this conclusion.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, in considering the naval appropriation bill and its provisions we can not escape giving some thought to the situation in Nicaragua. The bill itself provides a large appropriation for the maintenance of our marines in that Republic. We know that a general election is to be held, under the supervision, if you please, of an American Army general, to be assisted in the supervision and manning of the polls by armed marines.

Last year I had the matter up with the Secretary of State, and I suggested that if the people of Nicaragua asked for some supervision and assistance in the matter of their election, in that event the Secretary of War should find volunteers, men and women of the United States, who could go down there and give the people the assistance that they may request.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that in my time the Clerk read the letter which I have this day written to the Secretary of State along those lines.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 23, 1928.

Hon. FRANK B. KELLOGG,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On October 5, 1927, I took the liberty to write and suggest that if the United States were to supervise the general election in the Republic of Nicaragua, such supervision should be conducted by civilians and not by a military force.

You were good enough to write me on October 6, 1927, that the idea which I put forward "had already suggested itself to the department and will certainly receive most serious consideration."

According to news items it would appear that entire supervision has been placed in the hands of a general of the Army, and the plans call for the use of armed marines to supervise, assist, and otherwise control the election.

Permit me to state, Mr. Secretary, that universal suffrage and the secret ballot are absolutely inconsistent with uniformed marines and fixed bayonets. The two can not be harmonized. It is still possible to rehabilitate the confidence of the people of Nicaragua in the United States Government. If there is to be a supervision of the election, if a request should come from all parties interested, then why not select a group of civilian volunteers, experienced, disinterested, and unarmed. Such a change would surely have a wholesome effect on the people of Central America.

In this instance, strange as it may seem, it is the majority of the people of Nicaragua who desire protection at the polls, an honest election, and a fair count.

I beg serious consideration to this suggestion. It means a great deal to the peace and contentment of the Western Hemisphere. This is the opportunity where we can render real service to Nicaraguans if they really desire assistance in their election and specifically ask

for it. In that event, let a group of American men and women go down who have not been spoiled by diplomatic training and who would cheerfully go to their tasks open-mindedly and whole-heartedly and not goose step to the polls armed to the teeth.

I am, sir,

Sincerely yours,

F. LAGUARDIA.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Now, Mr. Chairman——

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

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have the assurance that the gentleman can have more time. We are considering an appropriation bill. I have endeavored to ascertain what extraordinary expense has been incurred consequent upon our proceedings in Nicaragua. Has the gentleman information on that point?

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

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand that the last deficiency bill carried a million dollars, and if my information is correct they did not desire to go into detail at that time because they did not know how much cost the expeditionary force in Nicaragua would entail.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that last year, in February, 1927, I wrote the Secretary of the Navy with reference to the cost of what we were doing in Nicaragua, and I had a letter from him under date February 10, 1927, from which I quote:

> Referring to the expense to which this Government is put on the coast and in the territory of Nicaragua, there is no added monetary expense because of the present employment of these naval forces, since the cost of their pay and provisions is already a fixed charge, and the amount of fuel consumed is probably about the same as would be used in the usual activities of the ships in cruising and training.

Now, as I understand, we are told that the expense has ran into several million dollars, due to our activities there. My own view is without contesting the principle of protecting American lives and property, that the great original mistake made by our Government was in sending such an enormous force to Nicaragua and the coast of Nicaragua. In this very letter of February 10, 1927, the Secretary states that at that time there were 13 vessels in Nicaraguan waters, with 176 officers and 2,272 men. My own firm conviction is that much of the trouble we have had and much of the trouble we are having now is due to the tremendous and unnecessary display of force which we made when we started our present course in the latter part of 1926.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is absolutely correct. But aside from that, aside from the matter of cost there is a great principle involved here, and that is that the people of a sovereign state, the free citizens of a republic, are entitled to conduct their own elections without the supervision of an armed force of another country. [Applause.]

There are means and ways of protecting American property, assuming that American property is endangered, and there are means and ways of protecting American lives, assuming that they are endangered; but I submit that there is no justification for using the pretense of protecting American life and property by sending an armed force down to control the election of a free people in a republic.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Let me say further that in the Wilson administration and in the Harding administration it was found entirely sufficient to send a small body of marines there. But as soon as we gave the situation an aspect of real war the psychological effect was most unfortunate. Resentment and hatred were stirred and conditions rapidly went from bad to worse, and what has happened I need not rehearse. The picture is one no one can view with satisfaction.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say that the fallacy of using the armed forces of the United States in interfering with the internal affairs of the sister Republics on the Western Hemisphere is bipartisan, because the conduct of the Wilson administration in the occupation of Haiti was as outrageous, as uncalled for, and as unnecessary as our present attitude in Nicaragua.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. The gentleman makes it appear that we are going down there of our own volition to impose force upon those people. Is it not true and ought not the gentleman to state that we are going down there upon the invitation of the responsible government, and that we are going down there to help them?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If there is a responsible government, then we have no business there. It was stated here that we sent marines down there because there was no responsible government. You can not have the two.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. On the invitation of an irresponsible government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If it is on the invitation of an irresponsible government, then give them the assistance that they ask for, a fair, impartial supervision of their polls by means of civilians and not by fixed bayonets and bombing planes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Has there been any loss of American lives there except among the marines?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course not; but that is inevitable. If you start a fight you are bound to invite a return fire.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], a member of the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think what the gentleman from New York has said calls for a statement of what the facts are and what the situation is in Nicaragua. I think the people of this country should know and understand what it is.

From 1912 down to August, 1925, we had 100 marines in Nicaragua. There was not any trouble just as long as they stayed there. We took them out in August, 1925, and in September following, trouble began. In response to requests in the fall of 1926 from American citizens made to the State Department for the protection of their life and their property we sent some marines down there. We sent marines because we can send marines into another country without getting into war.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HERSEY. Answering the gentleman from New York, what would a lot of picnickers do down there without a gun?

Mr. TABER. They could not do anything except, perhaps, to aid a revolution.

Mr. HERSEY. That is right.

Mr. TABER. And that is the kind of folks who would go down there and it would make more trouble instead of less trouble.

Here is the situation a little further: Former Secretary of War Stimson went down there last summer and all the factions got together; they agreed they would lay down their arms if the United States would take charge of the election and see that it was put through on the square. The United States agreed to do this. Things began to quiet down; almost all of the different revolutionary groups came in and laid down their arms and the situation looked as though we were able to withdraw some of our troops and they took quite a group of our marines away from there. Then some more of these bandits broke loose and began to make attacks on the American marines and not the marines upon them. That called for more troops, and that is why we have more down there now.

Our country, in good faith to the world, in good faith to itself and for the sake of the preservation of peace, must do nothing else than to see that they have a fair election down there. We do not want to send there a lot of people who will volunteer to go down as civilians, who would be powerless to carry out our promises. We want to see that our promise to those people is carried out and that there is a square election in Nicaragua. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman stated we could send armed marines into Nicaragua and have them take the action they have taken without getting into a state of war?

Mr. TABER. Why, certainly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can the gentleman suggest any rule of international law that permits one country to send an armed force, even if you call them marines, into another country, take control of the government, become engaged in an armed conflict and not call it war?

Mr. TABER. That has always been so.

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WINTER. We are there on the invitation of all parties for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. WINTER. We are not there of our own will but we are there upon the invitation of all parties concerned.

Mr. TABER. That is just it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. After you have an election under those circumstances how long will it hold?

Mr. TABER. If we do not take charge of the election and see that it is on the square, I am fearful that conditions will rapidly become worse and no one can tell what serious consequences will follow. If the election is honestly supervised, as we have promised, I am hopeful orderly government will proceed and that our marines may withdraw.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it the purpose of the administration to make poll holders out of the marines and have them act in that capacity down there with guns?

Mr. TABER. The marines are there to see that there is a fair election.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In other words, the registrars and poll holders will be marines with guns?

Mr. TABER. That is not so. The marines will simply see that the election is honestly conducted.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I simply want to say that I am glad the Republican Party is converted to honest elections—even in Nicaragua.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman in favor of honest elections in New York City?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Surely; and always have been.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We need the marines down there.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I am very glad to help turn from the smaller questions of war to the more important ones of peace, realizing that questions of marines in Nicaragua and Haiti have but small relation to the material welfare of the United States in comparison with the questions that I shall discuss with you and those which you have had largely in your minds for some time.

I want you to notice this little map here [indicating], because I am going to refer to the subject matter of it. The yellow portion represents the semiarid section of the United States, superimposed on a map of the United States. The brown portion represents the flooded section of last year. The yellow portion is about 244,000,000 acres, and the flooded portion some 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 acres. This portion [indicating] has a capacity to hold at least 2 or 3 feet of water, and the number of rivers that pass over it that can help to make a flood is innumerable. The semiarid portion has never been wet down since the white man has been there, and probably for several thousand years before that time.

This country has always been afflicted with droughts and floods. I am going to deal with droughts and floods especially with reference to that great territory between the Rockies and the Alleghenies known as the Mississippi Valley watershed. From each of these mountain ranges tending toward the central and south sweep the congested waters from the smaller flood areas and together make the immense problems of flooding, that at times call forth the largest of type in our papers, in declaring the sum total of human suffering and money damage occasioned by the great concentration.

And then, throughout this entire district there is not a county but that at some time during the year needs more water for agricultural and domestic uses. No more water falls by rain and snow than is needed for those purposes.

East of the mountains on the west side there is an especially large district known as semiarid. It is approximately 2,000 miles long and 350 miles wide. Contrary to the course of the waters forming at the northward and rushing to a common center at the Gulf, hot winds form at the south end of this strip and extend their influence clear into Canada. Times over, the amount of damage occasioned by the floods is the damage occasioned by the droughts. The flood is more spectacular. People are killed outright by the floods. Buildings and stock are washed away by them. People are gathered together in high places in tents and box cars by the hundreds of thousands. Livestock and growing crops are carried along with houses, fences, and all that is within its path. All these things get into the headlines of the papers. And the accounts following the headlines are glowing and known to all the readers of the press. But the drought creeps on day after day until the culmination of the hot winds destroy the growing crops and the pasturage, and the farmer knows that he has lost another year out of his existence, except that he must go still further into debt, and the interest money will pile up day and night.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Yes; just for a moment.

Mr. GARBER. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that it would be very interesting to call attention to the soil of the semiarid plains region and to note that some day it will be perhaps the most prolific and the most productive section of the United States.

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Yes; it is a wonderful soil.

Where the drought is extensive because of its far-reaching effect, bankers and business men fail because the farmer has failed that year, and often his farm passes to the real title holder, the mortgagee.

Wherever large watercourses meet there may be expected a great flood. It was so at Kansas City, Pittsburgh, Sioux City, and others might be stated. Dayton is in a place of danger; Cairo, Little Rock, many others might be named, including, of course, New Orleans. In fact, wherever there is a low place of a great watershed there is a place of danger.

The floods last year on the Red, White, Arkansas, St. Francis, with the help of waters from the Missouri, Mississippi, Ohio, and their tributaries, occasioned probably four or five hundred million dollars damage. In the neighborhood of 300 lives were lost. Many business men, bankers, farmers, were ruined, because of the immediate and after effects of the floods. This loss of life and of damage was in spite of the fact that everyone knows, who has given the matter thought, that all of the waters that might be called crests of the flood waters were needed in the watersheds where they originated, and because of the lack of foresight and good business judgment they were allowed to escape and run wild. The question arises, Why have these waters so badly needed where they are precipitated, been allowed to so escape and run away and cause such havoc? The answer is very simple. We have no intelligent, disinterested officers to study and take leadership in these questions of drought and flood control. The question at once comes, Have we not turned these lines of inquiry over to our engineers to study and report and take leadership on these matters? The answer is also very simple. Yes; but they have not been properly educated in the right kind of engineering as many civil engineers have. And there is no place for growth in Army engineering on strictly civil engineering lines. And there is much of snobbery in Army engineering, and there has been much of Army life prejudice, and not an open-mindedness in our Army engineers.

They have had handed down to them old lines of thought, and intrenched themselves anew in their old ditches. Apparently they have had little use for the welfare of the citizen and his problem. They have refused to consider even those problems that were submitted to them for solving, those related to kindred and required civil engineering.

Now, these are pretty severe indictments, are they not? Yes; and they should not lightly be made, and would not be at this time at all were it possible to discuss the questions that relate to the storage and uses of water without doing so.

I make this bold assertion that it has been the policy of the Government adopted by Congress for a number of years past, when surveys for a district were called for, to demand from these engineering servants of ours a report as to navigation, flood control, agricultural uses of water and power. I make this bold statement, which I shall seek to prove later in this address, that the Army engineers deliberately avoided the interests of the American people because of the influence in some relation to their concerted hostility to the reservoir system of flood control and its benefits, and I will bring the question down very closely to the influence of the growing power control in and of the United States. Necessarily, I will have to be somewhat at random, but still attempting something of a coherency in the discussion. I will reserve the question of lack of duty to the latter part of this argumentation. We start out with the fact of floods, and of the further fact that owing to the startling nature of the 1927 floods there was a wholesome and general demand for comprehensive flood control legislation. Now, what was the meaning of that demand? Was it that we should concentrate the Nation's wealth and efforts to fix on the country a perpetual flood system? Were the floods from the West and the North and the East to be welcomed and concentrated, and then by gigantic effort spewed into the Gulf of Mexico? No; it was not that. That would not be flood control. The demand was, if possible, that there should be a doing away with floods. That there should not be any need of

throwing out into the Gulf, because, if possible, these waters were by the composite thought of the people of the country intended not to form devastating floods. This is not a new question. For years the people of this country have had an abiding faith in a great system of reservoir control of flood waters and in putting them to practical uses for mankind. There have been many heroes in the fight for conservation of our water resources. Who does not know, in public or private life, of the years of great effort of Senator Newlands, which finally culminated in apparent victory for reservoir flood control?

Who has not known of the secret murder of that law after Senator Newlands's death? Who has not heard of the cry of anguish going up from nearly a million throats in the flooded districts, not for a spewing out into the Gulf, but for a doing away of the eternal flood threat? Who has not heard of the cry of distress of the people in the Great Plains country, when the blighting hot winds from the south were not tempered by the waters that rushed by, and which cries were for help from a condition, and not a theory? Two years ago the drought in the Great Plains country cost that section at least a billion and a half dollars, besides resulting in great consequential damages to bankers and business men. The pastures burned. Small grain was only in part harvested, and then with small result. A great deal of corn was not even cut for fodder. Many herds of fine dairy cattle were shipped to the stockyards because the owner could not afford to ship in feed by railroad to winter them over. Every intelligent man, who has given an intelligent study to the questions of flood and drought control, knows that there is but one system of drought and flood control, and that is the reservoir system. One of the most eminent engineers that this country has ever produced—I refer to Mr. Stevens—has said on one of these great related questions:

> I have not read in detail the report of the reservoir board, but it seems inconceivable to my mind that in many thousand miles of tributaries, large and small, on the Mississippi River, that some way can not be found or there should not be found at least one where a reservoir can not be put in which will materially afford some relief from flood control. I do not say that it can not. My mind is open. I do not know, but it looks singular to me. I do not believe the reservoir board, which went into the question, I think, in June, 1927, could possibly have studied, at least to any extent or detail, the possibilities of the reservoir system.

Again:

> You asked why I think the proper time has not elapsed. I answer by saying from very high authority that I had it on the 15th day of June, 1927, that much data remained to be collected before a plan could be evolved.
>
> On the same authority, on August 30 and September 16, I was advised that this data had not been collected. Presumably, then, after that date, possibly as late as October 1, the data were collected, or supposed to be, which allowed from that time until the end of November to prepare a plan. Now, I can not conceive, with my wide experience with engineers, extending over half a century, that any body of men, with the additional data that could be collected within four or five months, can in six weeks or two months prepare plans which will cover all possible future contingencies on the Mississippi River.

I will here state that Mr. Stevens used the Mississippi River as synonymous with the great watershed.

A quotation from Mr. Grunsky, the noted hydraulic engineer, who—and the same may be also said of Mr. Stevens—is a past president of the American Society of Civil Engineers:

> Reservoirs should be constructed in practically or on practically every stream in the United States. There is no natural resource which the country has which is of greater value than our waters; and the United States, wherever a river is an international river, an interstate river, or a navigable river, should make a plan for the regulation of the stream and should pay for the cost of carrying out the work of regulating whenever it is shown to be economic, feasible, and timely. I think this is fundamental.

Probably the closest student of reservoir control that we have in the United States is George H. Maxwell. Engineers throughout the country regard him as an authority as to this branch of engineering. He is absolutely satisfied that floods are an unnecessary condition except in local instances. Professor Mickey, who also appeared before the committee, has been a student of these questions for many years. He is head of the civil engineering department of the University of Nebraska. He is well satisfied that the impounding of flood waters in the different flood areas where they originate will do away with great floods and that the utilization for the purposes of mankind will do away with great droughts. Mr. Blake, who has studied these questions for 16 years in connection with the Arkansas and Canadian Rivers, is well satisfied that from every standpoint the impounding of waters in the originating flood areas is absolutely practical from every standpoint, not only to the most economical, but highly beneficial to the Nation at large.

Taft, Roosevelt, and Wilson have all urged the impounding of water, the application of their uses, and the prevention of their unbridled damage.

Perhaps I should state some of the benefits from reservoir control outside of the prevention of floods: Waters will have great uses all over the watersheds, but especially in the Great Plains. There will be found 244,000,000 acres of land, at least half of which so lies that water from the rivers, after impounding, can be placed upon and into them. The capacity of this soil to hold water is at least 2 feet of water to the acre. The land of this strip has never been wet down since the white man has been there. The reason for the destruction of the crops is because of lack of subsoil moisture. The land lies with a substantial drop to the east and south, by reason of which water from the reservoirs can be readily turned upon it. One good wetting down a year will mean a good crop the next season. The reservoirs there situated, if the water supply is unusual, can be emptied two or three times, and thereby have the greater capacity to take up water. But waters will have value that will be very largely reimbursive in every section of the United States. Another benefit from the impounding by reservoir of waters will be found in some instances where power may be developed, and will, the same as in many of the agricultural districts, entirely reimburse the Government and minister to the welfare of the people. Another benefit will be to the navigation of our rivers. All of our navigable rivers suffer more or less from low water unless they are affected by tidewater. With reservoir control the water will be taken out of the river at flood time—that is, the crest of the floods—and as much more as is necessary; this, of course, in the early high-water season generally. It will be returned to the rivers in the low-water months, thus bringing stability to the flow of our waters. The only thing that the lower Mississippi needs for navigation is the low-water month supply of additional water.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. At what point would you build the dams to control the waters?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Wherever that is necessary. There are reservoir sites in every watershed.

When the water is applied to the soil it comes back by way of a thousand springs, thus removing the force of the flood and adding to the low-water period. Let me give you an illustration of a western river. I refer to the Platte in Nebraska and Wyoming. There the Pathfinder Dam, costing a little over a million dollars, has a capacity of a million acre-feet of water. Waters from the dam are carried to Scotts Bluff County, Nebr. The beneficial effects to the soil may be stated as raising the valuation of the county from $800,000 to about $40,000,000. Its effect on the river has been to take out 45 per cent of the river at high-water period, and to add 47 per cent in the low-water period, and to prevent over 700,000 acre-feet from getting into the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers at all. Another benefit will be by reason of taking out the rushing flood waters to largely stop erosion into the rivers from the soil. Each year about a billion cubic yards of silt starts from the farms by way of erosions on its way to the Gulf. About that amount goes each year into the Gulf. No one knows just how much, but approximately. With the stoppage of erosion the rivers will have more capacity each year for the carrying off of the water and be able to function with greater effect. This speech presumes that each of the hearers has read Judge DRIVER's report to the Flood Control Committee from the reservoir subcommittee. Its argument I regard as unanswerable. Anyone desiring to read it who, unfortunately, has not will be given a copy on asking, of course, as long as my supply lasts. This report absolutely proves that all of the rivers that lead into the lower Mississippi River may be so controlled that they will have no more water from Cape Girardeau to Cairo down than they want for agriculture and navigation. The river at Cairo by taking out 720,000 cubic feet a second, which is absolutely practical, from the rivers that feed into it, for a few days, may be reduced at that point 12 feet, thus not only relieving the river to its easy capacity, but making Cairo absolutely safe and draining southern Illinois. By reservoir impounding of the Red, White, and Arkansas, not only will those sections be made entirely safe but the lower valley will be absolutely saved to agriculture and permanent navigation. Now, with all these benefits to be derived from flood control by the reservoir plan, what can we say of the benefits to be derived from any of the Jadwin, Potter, or Jones plans? Not a solitary thing or advantage. Will the cost be any

cheaper by any of those plans than by the reservoir plan? No free-minded man so takes it.

All of the friends of reservoir control believe that we can have that ample control with an outlay within $600,000,000. Each one of those who, on investigation have favored the reservoir plan, believe that at least two-thirds and perhaps more will be reimbursive by the sale of water and by the sale of the reservoirs themselves, which in many instances can be effected, and the Government still maintain control over the reservoirs for flood-control purposes. If so, the net expense to the Government will be $200,000,000, and no great floods anywhere in the valley. What will be the prospective expense or outlay by reason of the adoption of any of the Jadwin, Potter, or Jones plan? There is practically no difference in any of them. Eventually the same treatment must follow up the main tributaries of higher levees and more revetment work. No one believes that any one of these plans can be carried out for anything like a billion dollars. When completed, there will be an annual upkeep charge of at least $25,000,000 a year. And some years a good deal more. Now, the $25,000,000 a year upkeep charge is the same as an interest charge on more than $600,000,000 of dead capital in addition. And it is all dead capital. There is no reimbursement anywhere; and while these works at such enormous expense are spewing this great national asset of ours out into the Gulf is there any assurance of stability? No; not any. Their own works provide for disaster, expect it, and anticipate it, and seek to throw that burden of damage occasioned by their premeditated damaging waters onto the States where their intended breaks take place. What effect will their plans have on the lower valley? Let us keep in mind as we make this inquiry that the reservoir-control system is intended to benefit every community where reservoir control is to be exercised. Again, let me ask, what will the effect of any of these hellish plans be on the innocent bystander? Well, one thing it is going to do is to make the few that remain sleep every once in a while on the high ground again. They will not keep their families there nor their cattle nor their horses. They will not have their pigs or chickens. They will not build even any houses there without the consent of General Jadwin or his successors in the office, because it may interfere with the Government's use of these flood waters, and such act may be followed not only by a fine but imprisonment. It is going to cause a second exodus of the Acadians, descendants of those that Longfellow wrote about in his beautiful "Evangeline." They are mostly gathered together down there in the old community, the place where they were dumped off by the British when they were carried away from Nova Scotia.

Their home country where they have lived so long is to be used for water run-off purposes and dedicated to muskrats and moccasin snakes, and they are going to have a second exodus. Fifty-five thousand people are going to be driven away from home, while about 6,000,000 acres which should be dedicated to the best of agricultural and rural life are going to be turned into swamps. Around 13 or 14 cities and villages are to be ruined. Some 400 miles of paved and improved highways will have to be built over again. Many miles of railroads must be elevated. Churches, schoolhouses, telephone systems are to be despoiled. Many districts that are heavily bonded will have a double burden put on the little good land remaining. And for what? To satisfy the obstinacy or the cupidity of one man on men who do not care for the pulsing of the human heart.

I came from a section of the country that may be called the "lost country." Up in Nebraska. That is in the Great Plains country. The country of the heavy products, the long hauls, and the high freight rates. No part of the United States can thrive without navigation. With navigation they will get a low rate. Without navigation, the producers will pay for the low rate given those who have it. The railroads of the Northwest so far have been able to prevent the improvement of the Missouri River, and so we do not get the reduced competitive rates but pay extra to make up for those who do. The great western railroads are owned by those in close implication who own the great western power companies. Stick a pin in either and the other also feels the pain. The power companies are determined that reservoirs of any kind shall not be constructed, even for flood control. They fear that such flood-control reservoirs will develop into power plants. We have Army engineers who look to graduation from their department to find fat jobs of management in power companies. The question is, Can a man serve two masters? Let us look at the situation a moment and see if the American people have had a square deal. Let us see if the people who believe in the reservoir control of flood and droughts have had a square deal. If they have, then anything is a square deal. The Army officers and the power companies both have been opposed to reservoir flood control. Not all of them, but it is fair to say a great many of them. General Jadwin has made a strenuous effort to retain power and authority in his hands over the questions I am now discussing.

Following the great flood's development he was in the forefront reaching out for authority. At the great Chicago convention he was there, and the resolutions as first prepared had no word of comfort for reservoir control. A threat was made to take the question out on the floor, and a promise was made looking to some degree of hope to be held out to those in favor of reservoir flood control. At once after that convention General Jadwin named the committee or commission, rather, to inquire and report as to the value of reservoir flood control, and he placed Colonel Kelly at the head of the commission. Who is Colonel Kelly? Why, he was one of the brightest, if not the brightest, of the Army engineers. Several years ago he was in communication with the power companies that do business in New York and Canada looking to a place of control and management as the result of meditated employment. He asked leave for retirement. It was refused him, as he had not reached the age of retirement yet. He then asked for an indefinite leave of absence, and it was accorded him at half pay, which he is still drawing. He at once took up his employment at a much higher rate of salary with the power company. The question arises, Can a man serve two masters? General Jadwin knew that the one paying Colonel Kelly the least salary was the United States of America. He knew of the battle of power companies against reservoirs, yet he appointed Colonel Kelly to that place.

I may tell you here of some farmers who tried to add a power plant to the Guernsey Dam for their own use. An injunction was brought against them by the power people, and the judge only last week dissolved the temporary injunction. It was their own capital, and their own property was bonded for the entire debt. The whole system had been running there as a reservoir-control proposition. They built the new Guernsey Dam for storage purposes and started to use the power, and they were faced with an injunction from these same people.

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

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I regret I did not hear the earlier part of the gentleman's discourse, but could the gentleman tell us briefly what were the conclusions of Colonel Kelly in his report?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman renew that question at the end of my remarks if he does not find it covered?

Mr. CARTER. I will be very pleased to do so.

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. I will say that every engineer, including Colonel Kelly and all the rest, agrees that the ideal control is reservoir control. Apparently one might have expected a favorable report from Colonel Kelly's commission if there had not been the question of expense. They had no report on a single reservoir or on any group of reservoirs that would justify them in making a statement about them. To show to what extent this is true, I asked one of them if he did not favor reservoir control. He said, "Yes; except for the terrible expense." I asked, "How much do you think it will cost?" and he replied, "Billions and billions of dollars." I said, "Will you give us some data that will go to make up the sum total of your billions and billions?" He would not. A few days later I renewed the question when he was on the stand, and he came down to $1,200,000. That may have been for all the north country not taking in the Arkansas and the Red, but it was all guesswork.

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

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. Right in connection with the reservoir system of control, which I assume is indorsed by the common sense of all who have investigated and thought about the question, will the gentleman develop somewhere in his very able speech the constitutional authority to couple up and warrant the reservoir control as a part of one general, national program of flood relief and conservation?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. I can not do that right here because I have not the time to discuss it. I simply take it for granted that the authority is there. If I had more time, I would be very glad to develop that.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. No; I will not. There is no man in all the world to whom I would rather yield, but I am not going to have time to finish what I want to say.

The investigation and report of the reservoir commission, of course, was a farce. It was expected to be a farce when he was appointed. During the time that the commission was investigating, or pretending to investigate, the sites, the south-

ern Appalachian power conference was held, being a convention of kindred souls, if corporations have souls, engaged in the power business. Resolutions were passed demanding that the Government work of flood control should be confined to the lower stem of the Mississippi. The report of Colonel Kelly's commission was a fraud on the American people—at least against the welfare of the American people and its great remaining asset. It pretended to report on something like 500 reservoirs. As a matter of fact, it did not have proper data as to a single one. No effort was made to get in touch with those who knew, with State engineers or university engineers that knew of the watersheds of their respective States. Some reservoirs picked out as available for sites were known to be absolutely unfitted, and others that were available as valuable prospective sites for flood control were passed up without mention. General Jadwin knew that their old-fool ideas of levee protection had to be junked, and said so to the Flood Control Committee. In his heart he knew that those ideas of levees only were chargeable with the great flood-water damages and death losses, yet he clung tenaciously to his opposition to flood control by way of reservoirs. After years of failure on levees only, and after being compelled to junk his past theory with reference to them, which no one would swallow any longer and which there was a general revolt against, he refused even to consider reservoirs, with their wonderful beneficial results and effects as believed in by their proponents, and simply added the different spillway and diversion channels to send the waters to the Gulf after they were concentrated in the lower Mississippi.

You Members know to what purpose the lower Delta below New Orleans is dedicated to? I will tell you. It is the greatest fur-bearing district in the world. The fur business of that section is greater than that of United States and Canada. It is greater than that of Canada and Alaska. It is greater than that of Alaska and the United States. It is the home of the Hudson Bay seal. What is the Hudson Bay seal?

It is the great American muskrat. Should any one of the plans I have been denouncing—that is, the Jones plan, the Jadwin or Potter plans—be adopted, 3,000,000 acres of valuable farm land will, along General Jadwin's past ideas of levees, be junked. Three million acres more will be overrun by backwater and human life there will cease, where it should be the richest agricultural part of the United States. It will become the home of the great Hudson Bay seal industry of the United States, and men will fight and battle for trapper's licenses to ply their trade where formerly the hum of industry, both ordinary business and agriculture, was the song of the land. The sound of the steel trap as it springs its jaws on the great American Hudson seal will be heard, and the pitiful squeak will echo abroad as the licensed Hudson seal hunter brings down his club, opens his trap, and walks off with the only product where once was splendid agriculture and where the Arcadians dwelt in peace for hundreds of years before they were driven out a second time by act of Government.

An excuse has been given me by an honored citizen of New Orleans for the refusal of the Army engineers to consider the benefits to navigation by way of stabilization of flow, by reason of impounded waters from reservoir control, and by reason of benefits from power from such control, and by reason of benefits to agriculture by reason of that control, and which excuse is that owing to the urgency of the situation they did not feel called on to go any further than getting rid of the lower waters by reason of diversion channels, and did not feel required to go thoroughly into reservoir control with its intended benefits. But this excuse can not go. They did know that all of those four flood questions of flood control, navigation, power, and benefits to agriculture were firmly bound together by the Government and had been for years. That responsibility they can not evade. Any private employer that would send out a trusted agent to report on four great kindred questions and who would only get from such agent a report on one, and that the most expensive, and that the most damaging, and that losing sight of the three great by-products of his general enterprize would discharge such a faithless agent in a moment. Especially when he would discover that the agent had been receiving much greater compensation than he was paying from a sly and foxy competitor in the business.

Yet these things are all known to the administration. By the President. By the Secretary of War. And I have heard no word of rebuke. Either General Jadwin is running the administration in the relation referred to without reference to the welfare of the country or the administration is dictating to him. In any event he is a subaltern. He is an underling. The ultimate responsibility is not his. If George Washington had continued Benedict Arnold at West Point after his doings were known, of which the American people complained, no more fault could have been found with him than can justly be charged to those who keep on paying a salary to one who seeks to welcome the flood waters to the lower Mississippi and to toss them like worthless things out into the Gulf when they are a priceless heritage to the American people in so many different ways. Because anyone knows that if the people shall so far forget themselves as to expend anything like a billion dollars to perfect a plan such as is any of the pernicious plans referred to, to throw those waters out into the Gulf, it will be a long time before that same American people can be prevailed upon to spend several hundred million dollars for a comprehensive control of floods by a reservoir system, however beneficial it may be. There is only one plan of comprehensive flood control and that is by reservoirs in the areas where the floods originate and to that plan only, can I lend my consent. [Applause.]

Mr. MAJOR of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAJOR of Illinois. I understand that there is a flood control bill reported to the House; does the gentleman know what has become of it?

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. It has not come to the House yet, I think it is possibly waiting perfection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, for more than a hundred years efforts have been made to change the meeting date of Congress, abolish the short session, and change the inaugural date by a constitutional amendment.

During the past six years the so-called Norris amendment has appeared before committees of House and Senate in 14 different forms, all of which indicates the hazards of changing the Constitution.

If the last proposal submitted to the House was clothed in proper language and with proper safeguards, then we have had 13 opportunities to do it the wrong way since 1922.

The "lame duck" resolution that came before Congress a few days ago struck out the Norris amendment entirely and rewrote it in new language. Part of this language was then stricken from the resolution on the floor of the House and at another place new language was added. The vote was then taken during great confusion on a rehashed document that, so far as I have learned, had the full approval of no one. The usual comment was, "It can be straightened out in conference." The whole procedure raises many serious questions. It may be a great many years yet before the "lame duck" Congress is abolished by constitutional amendment.

I have, therefore, introduced H. R. 11991, which reads as follows:

[H. R. 11991, Seventieth Congress, first session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 12, 1928.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 11991) to appoint a day for the annual meeting of the Congress required by the Constitution

Be it enacted, etc., That beginning with the year 1929 the Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be at noon on the second week day after the 4th day of March. In the year 1933, and every fourth year thereafter, the Congress shall also assemble at noon on the second Monday in February.

If this bill were enacted into law, the "lame duck" Congress would be immediately abolished, and that is the desire of the people.

It accomplishes most of real value that is proposed by the constitutional amendment. My proposal could be enacted into law in an orderly way by a majority vote of both Houses and the approval of the President within 30 days, whereas a proposed amendment has failed for a century.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROMJUE. I realize that the gentleman from Washington is very much interested in correcting this matter in the way he thinks it ought to be corrected. I want to call his attention to the language in his bill. You can by legislation change the time of the beginning of the session, but you can not change the time of the beginning of the term except by constitutional amendment.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. My bill does not change the two-year term of any Member. It is drawn to conform to the provisions of the Constitution—but to make the meeting date as early as possible without a constitutional amendment—by putting it two days after the inauguration of the President, "the second week day" fixes dates so the convening of Congress and the inauguration of the President will not occur at

the same hour and so that the convening of the Congress will never fall on Sunday.

Mr. ROMJUE. The date is the beginning of the session?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; it has to do with the sitting of Congress and not with the length of the term.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What committee has charge of your bill?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It has been referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What is the membership of that committee with reference to Democrats and Republicans?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I do not remember—this is not a political issue and I have given that no thought.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It is not a political issue, but the gentleman realizes that the majority of the committee is Republican. If you do not get the legislation, the responsibility is bound to be due to the Republican organization.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman can go before the Judiciary Committee with me in behalf of the bill.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I am in favor of the legislation. I think it ought to be had. But I do not want the gentleman to convey the idea to the country that anyone is responsible except the present Republican organization of the House.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I can not accept that statement, since this has been a matter of controversy for a great many years and through many administrations. I think the thing which the country really desires is that Congress shall convene at the earliest reasonable date after the election of the new Congress, and that is what I have provided for in this short bill.

Mr. ROMJUE. Does the gentleman's bill provide any limitation on the session?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It does not limit the length of session.

Mr. ROMJUE. There is no limitation?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. No; not on the session of Congress.

My bill is so phrased as to convene Congress as soon after election as it can be done by law and at the same time avoid the assembling of Congress on the day the President is inaugurated or on a Sunday. The bill also provides for the assembling of Congress once in four years on a date two days prior to the date fixed by the Constitution for canvassing the electoral vote for President and Vice President. Thus the orderly procedure under the Constitution is in no way violated; the newly elected Congress would begin to function 4 months after its election instead of 13 months after election, as at present, and the lame-duck Congress would be abolished without delay.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the Commissioner from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA].

Mr. DAVILA. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Members of the House I desire to read the following cablegram that I have just received from Porto Rico:

[Cablegram]

SAN JUAN, P. R., *March 22, 1928.*

Hon. FÉLIX CÓRDOVA DÁVILA,
Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

A concurrent resolution was adopted to-day by the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico to address the following cablegram to the President and the Congress of the United States through the Resident Commissioner of Porto Rico in Washington [Hon. FÉLIX CÓRDOVA DÁVILA]: "In view of the letter addressed by President Calvin Coolidge through the Governor of Porto Rico, Hon. Horace M. Towner, to the presiding officers of the two houses of the legislature, Antonio R. Barceló and José Tous Soto, the Senate and the House of Representatives of Porto Rico resolve to intrust the two latter exclusively with such reply as it is urgent and proper to make to said letter and to request the Congress of the United States to appoint a congressional committee to investigate the political, economical, and social conditions of Porto Rico. Said committee to hold public hearings where it shall hear all such citizens who request to be heard and who offer to present such data and documents as may be necessary to clarify the facts and to do the justice which is due to Porto Rico. It is further resolved to request Congress to extend the term established by law for the adjournment of the present legislative session for such time as may be necessary to receive the committee and aid it in its mission."

(Signed) ANTONIO R. BARCELÓ,
President of the Senate.
(Signed) JOSÉ TOUS SOTO, *Speaker.*

The authority to dispose of and make needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States is vested by the Constitution in Congress. The power granted to Congress by the Constitution carries with it duties and responsibilities that are impossible to escape. We already know the views of the administration and at last we know the views of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. But that is not enough; it is our desire that conditions in Porto Rico be thoroughly investigated by a committee of Congress composed of members conscious of their duties and really interested in the study of our problems and in working a solution to our present difficulties. We want open hearings so that the members of the committee will not be approached by anybody in secret conferences to state their own private views. Secret conferences are always dangerous, especially in Porto Rico, where there are men who do not dare to publicly state their views but always are ready to intrigue for their own selfish interests.

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

Mr. DAVILA. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As the gentleman probably knows, a few days ago I introduced a bill providing for the election of a governor by the electors of Porto Rico. I also provided in that bill that the governor, in order to qualify, should be a native of Porto Rico. I know how eager the gentleman is to serve his Territory, and I know that he will help in getting the committee at least to give us a hearing. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives of Porto Rico passed resolutions approving my bill, and the speaker of the house and the president of the senate were kind enough to send me cablegrams to that effect. I am in communication with them, and I expect they will send a delegation here if we can get a hearing. It seems to me that the million people of Porto Rico are entitled to a hearing, and are entitled to an election of their own governor. Surely, that is the sentiment of the people of this country.

Mr. DAVILA. Certainly; we are entitled to it, but I am afraid that we will not get that hearing from the Committee on Insular Affairs in this session of Congress.

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

Mr. DAVILA. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has always been treated courteously by the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. DAVILA. That is true.

Mr. KNUTSON. The members of the committee have the highest regard for the gentleman. I do not think the gentleman's statement is warranted. The Committee on Insular Affairs is always willing to consider bills that have been referred to it, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] will have no difficulty, I am sure, in getting a hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Commissioner from Porto Rico has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. While I do not assume to speak for the Committee on Insular Affairs—I see no other members of the committee on the floor at the present time—I assure the gentleman that the gentleman from New York will have a hearing whenever he asks for it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the delegation wants to come from Porto Rico; and the gentleman will help us get the hearing?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Porto Rico is a member of the committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And so is the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DAVILA. I am not making any criticism of the Committee on Insular Affairs, but it is my honest impression that at this time we are not going to obtain any favorable decision by the committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman realizes that the session is dragging along to an end.

Mr. DAVILA. I know that.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is more than half over, but I am sure that this bill that the gentleman from New York introduced will be expedited as much as possible, in view of the fact that Congress will probably adjourn in six or eight weeks.

Mr. DAVILA. I introduced a bill along the same lines at the beginning of the session, and no hearing has been had on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Porto Rico has again expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, in order that the membership of the Congress may have in convenient form for ready reference, there is herewith printed a statement compiled from official records showing what remarkable results for the benefit

of the taxpayers have been obtained by the action of the Congress in connection with matters of appropriations. The record is a splendid one, and the fact that Congress has quite uniformly appropriated less than the Budget estimates called for is a fact not generally understood or appreciated by the public. In the period of years covered by the tabulation the House has been fortunate in having as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN, whose experience, counsel, judgment, and courage have been of inestimable value in the conduct of the finances of the Nation.

Fiscal year for which appropriations were made	Budget estimate	Appropriations	Decrease in appropriations under Budget estimates	Net decrease in appropriations under Budget estimates
Sixty-seventh Congress, first and second sessions:				
1923 regular annual, permanent, and indefinite	$3, 924, 586, 066. 78	$3, 751, 917, 629. 14	−$172, 668, 437. 64	
Supplemental and deficiencies for 1922 and prior years	467, 571, 992. 68	327, 878, 638. 05	−139, 693, 354. 63	
Total	4, 392, 158, 059. 46	4, 079, 796, 267. 19	−312, 361, 792. 27	−$312, 361, 792. 27
Sixty-seventh Congress, third and fourth sessions:				
1924 regular annual, permanent, and indefinite	3, 714, 602, 281. 19	3, 706, 779, 083. 12	−7, 823, 198. 07	
Supplemental and deficiencies for 1923 and prior years	236, 411, 166. 57	233, 492, 860. 49	−2, 918, 306. 08	
Total	3, 951, 013, 447. 76	3, 940, 271, 943. 61	−10, 741, 504. 15	−10, 741, 504. 15
Sixty-eighth Congress, first session:				
1925 regular annual, permanent, and indefinite	3, 632, 173, 054. 96	3, 622, 125, 959. 19	−10, 047, 095. 77	
Supplemental and deficiencies for 1924 and prior years	160, 974, 906. 47	161, 997, 365. 16	1, 022, 458. 69	
Total	3, 793, 147, 961. 43	3, 784, 123, 324. 35	−9, 024, 637. 08	−9, 024, 637. 08
Sixty-eighth Congress, second session:				
1926 regular annual, permanent, and indefinite	3, 747, 876, 017. 78	3, 736, 124, 595. 31	−11, 751, 422. 47	
Supplemental and deficiencies for 1925 and prior years	416, 402, 528. 03	415, 557, 454. 60	−845, 073. 43	
Total	4, 164, 278, 545. 81	4, 151, 682, 049. 91	−12, 596, 495. 90	−12, 596, 495. 90
Sixty-ninth Congress, first session:				
1927 regular annual, permanent, and indefinite	3, 961, 470, 187. 42	3, 953, 628, 990. 08	−7, 841, 197. 34	
Supplemental and deficiencies for 1926 and prior years	454, 709, 266. 73	455, 834, 399. 73	1, 125, 133. 00	
Total	4, 416, 179, 454. 15	4, 409, 463, 389. 81	−6, 716, 064. 34	−6, 716, 064. 34
Sixty-ninth Congress, second session:				
1928 regular annual, permanent, and indefinite	4, 022, 971, 757. 60	4, 014, 988, 936. 40	−7, 982, 821. 20	
Supplemental and deficiencies for 1927 and prior years	195, 792, 534. 01	196, 022, 416. 18	229, 882. 17	
Total	4, 218, 764, 291. 61	4, 211, 011, 352. 58	−7, 752, 939. 03	−7, 752, 939. 03
Total reductions				−359, 193, 432. 77

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I want to talk for a short period of time on the very important matter—the American merchant marine—which we are now considering before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which committee I am a member. I believe it is the general idea of the great majority in this country that we should have an adequate merchant marine, but the session is now dragging on to a close and I think it should be called to the attention of the Congress, and also to the attention of the country, that unless there is some coordination of opinion and some getting together by the various elements, all proclaiming a desire to have an adequate merchant marine, this session of Congress will adjourn without anything being done. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Senate, by a very large majority, passed the Jones bill, which, in effect, leaves the matter in the hands of the Shipping Board, providing that the Shipping Board shall not sell any of the vessels except by unanimous vote of the entire board, and providing that there shall be a replacement and reconditioning of the ships, and that there should be loans and other aids to the merchant marine, and that in the allocations of the operations of the ships the Shipping Board shall distribute them, as far as possible and without detriment to the service, among the various parts of the country.

Now, we find before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House that three distinguished leaders on the majority side of the House have introduced bills which are now being considered by that committee, to wit, the chairman of the committee, Mr. WHITE of Maine, and Mr. WOOD, of Indiana, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. WAINWRIGHT. These bills are now being considered by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The authors of these several bills all claim that they want a merchant marine, but the bills on the House side are diametrically opposed to the position of the Senate. There is an irreconcilable conflict, and unless there is some getting together and concert of minds the result will be that at the end of this Congress there will be no legislation on this most important subject.

Now, we find the President holding a position which is probably different from that of Mr. WOOD or that of Mr. WHITE of Maine or that of Mr. WAINWRIGHT or from the position of Senator JONES on the Senate side of the Capitol.

Now, what are we going to do? The House bills provide for aid. While they do not call the aid a subsidy, yet in effect it is a subsidy. Now, the very minute that you write into a bill anything that has even the look of a subsidy you are going to find that there will be a large membership of the House that will not support it. That was tried during the Harding administration, and the Lasker bill, while it passed the House here by a reasonable majority, was defeated in the Senate.

Now, there are a few fundamental things that we can all get together on. In the Jones bill the shipping act of 1920 is reaffirmed, particularly section 1, to this effect:

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 serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States; 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, in so far as may not be inconsistent with the express provisions of this act, the United States Shipping Board shall, in the disposition of vessels and shipping property as hereinafter provided, in the making of rules and regulations, and in the administration of the shipping laws keep always in view this purpose and object as the primary end to be obtained.

The White bill, the Wood bill, and the Wainwright bill each have substantially the same provision, and I take it that Congress would be practically unanimous on this provision in the Jones bill.

Among the things that are controversial and which have brought up great agitation on the part of many people in this country is the proposition to discard and throw into the junk pile a large number of ships that are now owned by the Government. Well, the country might as well understand, and the House might as well understand that no such proposition as that can ever become a law, because the Senate has affirmed by a very large vote its opposition to any such measure, and it would be a crime to pass any such law when the people have been taxed to the amount of nearly $3,000,000,000 to build up a large fleet here. It would be a crime to junk those ships for the purpose of giving the shipyards and shipbuilding interests vessels to build. We might as well now forget that, and so far as any subsidy is concerned, I can only speak for myself and

for such Members in this body as I have heard express themselves when they say that they certainly would not favor at this session of Congress any subsidy to the merchant marine.

But I do think that we can get together on the general purposes of the Jones Act as interpreted by section 1 of the act of 1920, and I think we can get together further on the provisions in the House bills, that there should be liberal contracts given to vessels flying the American flag to carry mails across the ocean. And I think we can get together on the further idea that there should be liberal loans made to those who want to engage in building ships at current rates of interest allowed by the Government. Those are things that we can get together on.

One of the troubles with the American merchant marine is the burden that the insurance interests of this country are imposing upon American shipping. The American companies writing marine insurance ought to be ashamed of themselves. It has been demonstrated beyond any question in the hearings before our committee that of these American companies that have been given certain privileges and have been relieved of the operations of the antitrust law by the Jones Shipping Act of 1920, 67 companies throughout the country have formed themselves into a syndicate for the purpose of writing insurance on American ships, and that they are giving preference to ships that fly foreign flags, and in some instances they are giving a preference of as high as 2 per cent on the insurance carried on cargoes and hulls. Now, we can not build up any merchant marine with such a situation as this confronting us. We can not build up any merchant marine and put the ships that fly our flag on the seas if the owners must pay such enormous rates of insurance. It was shown by the hearings that the men who classify these vessels and cargoes for the purpose of fixing insurance rates not only sat upon American boards but they sat on Lloyd's classification board, a board representing British interests.

We find as was brought out in the committee that discriminations are practiced against American ships and their cargoes.

For example, it was shown that the insurance premium on one of the American ships of a certain line was $13,375 in American companies, and but $10,000 in foreign companies, a discrimination of 35.7 per cent in premium, and that, therefore, the owner was virtually forced to insure his vessels abroad, while it was his keen desire to insure them in the United States.

Another owner, in a striking manner, declared that American marine insurance companies are holding up American steamship owners "at the point of a gun and with blackjacks," so to speak, and opposed as he was to the United States Government going into any business he felt that to save American ships from annihilation and being driven from the seas such a course seemed to be the only alternative.

In the closing days of the hearings on this intensely interesting subject, Acting Chairman Edward C. Plummer, of the United States Shipping Board, rose from a sick bed to offer his testimony, having been invited by the committee at my instance, and the statement is of such vital importance at this time that I place in the RECORD in full his statement, as follows:

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER PLUMMER

No legislation designed to restore American shipping to a competitive position in foreign trade will be effective until the extra burdens now imposed upon American ships by marine underwriters are reduced.

These complaints are not new. To my personal knowledge they have been continuous for at least 39 years. Thirty-nine years ago I became secretary of the Bath Board of Trade, of Bath, Me. At that time ships from my home city were still visiting all the great ports of the world, and the names of A. Sewall & Co., Houghton Bros., and others were well known to the entire shipping world. Bath then was a city of shipowners and ship captains, active and retired.

I recall and I remember it so distinctly, because it was the first meeting where I served as an officer of the board, that the principal subject of discussion was the discriminations practiced against American ships by marine underwriters, and a committee was suggested to see what could be done.

During the 21 years that preceded my coming to the Shipping Board I was attorney for the Atlantic Carriers' Association, an association composed of shipping men, and during all of that time the same complaints of alleged discrimination by the marine underwriters against American ships was a burning issue.

It must have been more than 15 years ago—it was some time before the war—that we began coming to Washington to endeavor to secure legislation which would remove this insurance handicap from our ships. Possibly our efforts helped to introduce in the first shipping act, of 12 years ago, reference to the upbuilding of marine underwriting in this country. Professor Huebner, an expert on the subject, was employed, and for years he worked on that subject.

At that time the president of our association had a vast amount of data which he had collected, both here and abroad; and I recall it, as his decided opinion, that there then was such an understanding between the American underwriters and the foreign underwriters that the foreign underwriters had agreed to allow the American underwriters to charge these extra rates against American ships, and that they, the foreigners, would reinsure to such an extent as was necessary, provided this excessive rate was kept on American ships, so that they could receive full rates for reinsuring; but that if Americans should adopt the rates of the foreigners, then the foreign companies would go into the American market and compete for American tonnage at whatever rates were necessary to get the business.

Professor Huebner went into the subject of marine insurance most exhaustively and rendered some very valuable reports. When the Senate, two years ago, directed the Shipping Board to prepare data and suggest legislation for the restoration of an American merchant marine it, of course, included insurance; and our research department has a volume of some 60 pages, prepared under the direction of Professor Huebner, from which compilation I want to read a few excerpts. Says this report:

"For years it (insurance) has been regarded by our competitors as a national commercial weapon to be used effectively in fostering national shipping and in acquiring and controlling important channels of foreign trade that furnish the freight—the lifeblood—upon which a merchant marine must live."

Again:

"Possession of sufficient national marine-insurance facilities is also often desirable for the proper safeguarding of commercial information. Marine insurers, by the very nature of their business, acquire vital trade information, exceedingly important with respect to a given trade, such as the names of consignors, consignees, and carriers, the financial arrangements, costs of production, leading contract terms, and methods of handling the business."

This is in line with the fact so concisely stated by Secretary Hoover in his New York address of four years ago, when he said:

"Nor have our merchants been without the experience of finding that the transport of our goods in foreign bottoms has been taken advantage of by our competitors to learn the details of our trade connections."

Realizing this—and now I am quoting again:

"The American Hull Marine Insurance Syndicate (containing 42 leading American companies and 23 foreign admitted offices as subscribers) was organized in 1920 at the request of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries for the express purpose of taking care of the insurance needed for the general run of American hulls. The American companies subscribing to the syndicates have a combined capital of $131,900,000 and surplus of $278,537,726, or a total of surplus to policyholders of $410,437,726."

Now, quoting from the 1925 report of the superintendent of insurance for New York: "It is estimated that approximately 70 per cent of the ocean marine hull insurance in the United States is placed with foreign companies." "It has been estimated by those presumed to have knowledge of the subject that Lloyds, London, collect insurance premiums from New York State alone to the extent of $10,000,000 per year."

Continuing, this insurance summary says:

"During recent years foreign hull rates have been considerably lower than those quoted by American insurers. Brokers' correspondence with the Shipping Board in connection with the placing of insurance on vessels sold by the board shows that during the past two years foreign hull rates have ranged very generally from 10 to 20 per cent, and sometimes even more, under offers made by the American market. Letter after letter states that the insurance was offered to the American syndicate and declined. In his report for the year 1924 the chief underwriter of the syndicate explained that the syndicate allowed reductions where past experiences seemed to warrant, and that an endeavor was made 'to retain an interest in all business on which we could obtain terms that we felt would let us break even,' and they with surplus more than twice their capital."

How far these American insurers raised their rates over those of foreign companies is indicated by this telegram of August 20, 1925, received by the Shipping Board from the Export Steamship Line:

"In trying to place insurance according to contract and mortgage with American insurance companies, I find that I can insure in the open market at quite a saving in premiums—better than 30 per cent—and we request the board's permission to place insurance in the open market."

This report recommends, among other things: Greater development of protection and indemnity insurance among American underwriters. It says: "This type of coverage is very important to successful vessel operation. It is also important from the standpoint of volume of premiums collected; yet the great mass of this insurance goes to unauthorized foreign insurers. It is therefore suggested that the 'American Hull Marine Insurance Syndicate' might possibly be induced to extend their activities to this important branch of underwriting."

Continuing:

"Owing to insufficiently detailed separation of classes of business, it is impossible to state more than approximately the total volume of American marine and transportation insurance. Best's Insurance Report gives the net marine and inland premiums of the United States, less reinsurance and return premiums, as $68,055,327 for the year 1923. In the year ending December, 1924, the American hull market wrote in premiums about $2,500,000 on ocean-going hulls only. The best estimates are that from 25 per cent to 30 per cent only of the insurance on such American ocean-going hulls is written in the United States, the balance of 70 per cent to 75 per cent being placed in England."

And now I quote from the emphatic report which this Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee made on February 26, 1920. Says this committee: "The situation is an impossible one and must not be allowed to continue. Only 62 direct writing American companies participated in ocean marine insurance during 1918, while 6 additional companies confined their activities to inland and coastwise waters. Moreover, nearly one-fifth of the direct writing American companies were found to be foreign owned or very closely allied by having directors or leading stockholders resident abroad. Approximately two-thirds of the marine insurance written in the United States was found to be controlled by foreign underwriters.

"While the committee favors marine insurance conducted by private interests, it can not be unmindful of present woefully unsatisfactory conditions. The national welfare must be the first consideration. Should the contingency arise that American companies will fail or refuse to cooperate on a comprehensive scale, then your committee is decidedly of the opinion that the Government should remain in the marine insurance business even to the extent of greatly enlarging its operations." That was eight years ago. How much have these companies cooperated? I'll give you a sample:

Acting on the mandate of the merchant marine act that the Shipping Board do whatever it can to encourage the development of marine insurance in the United States, the board, whenever it has made loans, has incorporated in the contract a provision that a certain amount of insurance must be carried in American companies. That provision was contained in the contract covering the insurance of the *California*, a magnificent new ship that has just gone into service.

When she was ready to sail, Mr. Thomas, representing that line, came before the board's loan committee, of which I was a member, and pointed out that while they could get their insurance at 2 per cent from foreign companies, these American underwriters were charging them 2½ per cent. Accordingly they had placed the bulk of their insurance with the foreign companies, and they asked the board to consider the situation. The excessive charge so impressed the committee that it reported to the board that the *California* should be allowed to carry the insurance as it was placed until March 1, in order that the board might join with her owners in ascertaining if a lower rate could not be secured.

The next thing we knew these insurers, possibly having learned that the *California* was not so tightly tied up after all, cut their rate to 2¼ per cent, and cut it before the board had acted on the matter. But Mr. Franklin and Mr. Thomas have asked to come before the board again because they feel that there is no justification for such a large extra charge as one-quarter of 1 per cent amounts to on a $6,000,000 ship, and they will be given a hearing.

Now it happens that after we learned of this new price of 2¼ per cent I wrote a letter, which was approved by the board, advising the owners of the *California*, under the circumstances, to submit to this extra charge of one-quarter of 1 per cent; but in view of what has been stated before this committee, I am frank to say that when Mr. Franklin and Mr. Thomas next appear before our board they will find a very attentive listener in me. I am not an insurance expert; but I don't have to be one to know that if the 2¼ per cent they charged when it developed that the *California* was not sewed up is right, the 2½ per cent they tried to get in the first place was wrong. As no one will deny that P. A. S. Franklin is one of the world's ablest shipping men, "inexperience" can not be dragged into this case.

But the statement of Mr. Page that the way the insurance trio, of which his company is one, makes up its classifications, which are generally followed by the other marine insurance companies in this country, explains a whole lot—particularly why when anything happens to an American ship it is given great publicity; and when it happens to a foreign ship it is overlooked or practically smothered. To illustrate: I was on the *Leviathan*, and some other members of this very committee were also there, when two propeller blades let go.

She still had 14 perfectly good blades left and kept coming right along; but when we arrived we found sensational dispatches of the *Leviathan* being disabled in midocean had appeared in certain papers. And at about that same time one of the biggest foreign liners in the North Atlantic service nearly broke in two on one side and was so badly damaged that she had to be kept at Southampton for a million dollars of repairs because they didn't dare take her around to a shipyard; and yet I never saw a word about that in our metropolitan papers. So that on this newspaper basis of classification that ship is a perfect risk, and the *Leviathan*, because she was falsely reported to have been disabled in midocean, must rate as second class.

Take this South American case: The American-flag vessels in that trade owned by Moore & McCormack are charged from 5 to 12½ per cent, $100 more than is charged on similar cargoes shipped by Lamport & Holt, Prince, or the Houston Line (British lines); and 5 per cent more than is charged on cargoes shipped on similar Norwegian ships chartered and operated by Moore & McCormack. That is, the ships are similar; they are operated by the same firm; but the flags they fly are different; and the ones flying the American flag are the ones that have to pay.

You have heard a whole lot said about the necessity of charging extra insurance on the Export Line because of the inexperience of its operator; and here let me say that I have been looking at shipping men for 40 years, and I will put Mr. Herberman up against any of them when it comes to care, ability, and personal attention to the operating of ships. Now, there has come into my possession a somewhat time-stained paper, which possibly may have been suggested by that enterprising printer who Mr. Page says takes the findings of their triumvirate and distributes them to other insurers. It is headed:

"Recommendations of underwriters' committee in connection with cargo insurance on Shipping Board vessels which have been circulated to underwriters."

The second paragraph states:

"That the named vessels of the Export Steamship Corporation, operating out of North Atlantic ports to ports in the Near East, viz, Greek ports, Constantinople, Levant ports, Palestine, Syrian coast and North Africa east of Bizerta be granted as favorable a basis of classification for rate-making purposes as is granted to any of the following competing lines:

"Oriental Navigation Co., American-Mediterranean Levant Line, Prince Lines, Commercial Steamship Co., National Greek Line, Fabre Line, Ellerman Lines, Furness Withy & Co., Cunard Line."

The letter accompanying this, dated September 1, 1922, written by the Export Steamship Corporation to their shippers and consignees, says:

"Recommendations of the marine underwriters' committee in connection with cargo insurance on Shipping Board vessels under our operation, to the interested marine underwriters, are to the effect that the vessels operated by this corporation out of North Atlantic ports to ports in the Near East and Levant, viz, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Asia Minor, Palestine, Syrian coast and north Africa, east of Bizerta, also the island of Malta, and minor points in this particular territory, be granted as favorable a rate of cargo insurance as is customarily given to the old established foreign lines in this trade."

I call particular attention to this because you heard this matter of experience stressed so much; yet when Mr. Herberman was beginning to operate these lines and was new in the business, they didn't raise the question of experience then—they gave his vessels the same rates as their competitors; and in my opinion they did exactly right. Furthermore, in charging him the rates they now are charging they are, in my opinion, unquestionably wrong.

It looks as if they felt so, for in the Roosevelt case it happens that on June 3, 1927, the operating department of our Merchant Fleet Corporation was informed that "at a meeting of the underwriters interested in the burlap and jute trade held that day it was decided to extend to the American-India and Atlantic-Australia Lines (operated by the Roosevelt Steamship Co.) the same basis of classification extended to its competitors provided certain conditions were complied with." Under date of September 15, 1927, our vice president in charge of operations, Mr. E. A. Kelly, wrote our manager of maintenance and repair at New York City, "in order to comply with the underwriters' requirements without conflicting with cargo arrangements, it is requested that you arrange to have the necessary additional bottles (fire extinguishers) installed on the following types of motor vessels now operated by the Roosevelt Steamship Co.:

	Bottles
William Penn	19
Oscar Daniel type of vessel	23
Los Angeles	4

You will notice there's no talk of experience here; all they seemed to want was more bottles.

It appears that our ships also complied with the requirements of the insurance underwriters as to conditions under which cargoes were to be discharged. So far as our operating department knows—and it is in charge of Mr. E. A. Kelly, a veteran steamship man whose competence nobody will undertake to challenge—we have done everything that has been suggested to us or that the trade requires; and yet that proposition made to us on June 3, 1927, has never been redeemed. There have been promises of consultations with us and of meetings to discuss this situation, but in spite of all the efforts we have made to bring this about that meeting at which we were to discuss the reasons why that understanding of June 3, 1927, had never become effective, has never been revealed. If the best explanation that can be offered for those high insurance charges is the one which I heard here, viz, the

inexperience of the Roosevelt Steamship Co., I do not wonder that there has been no meeting with us; because that statement would not get very far with practical steamship men.

Since preparing this statement, I have received from our operating department the following letter, which I will read:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD
MERCHANT FLEET CORPORATION,
New York, N. Y., March 12, 1928.

VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER FLEET CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C.

Attention vice president operations.

DEAR SIR: Referring further to our conversation of Saturday morning about the article in the morning Tribune, quoting Mr. C. R. Page in connection with insurance rates, and my letter to you of Saturday advising of the methods of handling cargo under the supervision of insurance or cargo surveyors:

On June 14 last you wrote me instructing that a meeting be arranged with the board of underwriters for the purpose of determining what their requirements would be incident to obtaining and maintaining the highest insurance classification for vessels in the burlap and jute trades. Upon receipt of your letter we addressed Mr. Benjamin Merklen, jr., of the board of underwriters, at once requesting a meeting for the following day. Mr. Merklen promptly replied, saying that it was impossible to arrange for a meeting on that day, which was Friday, June 17, but that he hoped to place the matter before the underwriters and have some definite word some time the following week.

Also, upon receipt of your instructions, we held a preliminary meeting in my office with a representative of the Roosevelt Steamship Co., one from our maintenance and repair division, and our traffic manager.

Not hearing from Mr. Merklen, I called him up and was informed that the members of the committee were out of town. A week or so later I called him again and was informed they were still out of town, and Mr. Merklen reiterated his former statement there was nothing he could do and we would have to wait until the members returned.

I wrote you on June 23 telling you the unsuccessful and unsatisfactory outcome of my attempts to get the representatives of the board of underwriters to attend a meeting.

The beginning of July we again wrote Mr. Merklen, telling him that we had heard nothing from him, and asked him if he was not in a position to tell us when we could expect to have a meeting. Mr. Merklen did not reply. Since that the traffic manager of the Roosevelt Steamship Co., on my instructions, has also endeavored to obtain some definite information from the board of underwriters as to their decision in regard to the insurance classification of our vessels, but all our efforts to date have been unsuccessful, and I believe we are quite justified in feeling there is no intention on the part of the board of underwriters to meet with us in an endeavor to agree on equipment and methods of handling cargoes so as to give our vessels the benefit of the highest insurance classification.

Our vessels are in every way equal to competing ones, and they are deserving of insurance rates no higher than the ships of competitors. Care in carrying and the supervision given to the handling of cargo is all that the cargo in competing ships receive, and there can be no reasons advanced as regards the ships operated by the Roosevelt Steamship Co. for adversely discriminatory rates.

Very truly yours,

W. E. GRIFFITH,
District Director.

And this man Griffith is a real ship captain, who has also been a marine superintendent, and knows from personal experience and observation what constitutes a ship and proper ship operation.

Possibly because the *William Penn* is operated by the Roosevelt Co. it was thought necessary to include her among ships that had had accidents, and you will recall how she was mentioned. They could not very well have picked a ship less adapted to what I judge was their purpose.

The *William Penn* is a motor ship of 13,258 dead-weight tons. She went into service on August 8, 1921, and has been in service continuously ever since. During that entire period—and I now quote from the report of the insurance department:

"The claims which we have paid on her account amount to slightly more than $7,000, which is less than one annual premium on this vessel. In fact, the insurance fund has received premiums on this vessel in excess of $60,000."

Do you wonder that these insurance companies have such corpulent surpluses?

And it happens that during her seven years of service, among her other achievements, she collected $17,500 in salvage, and it will be noticed that that one item of service on a single voyage amounted to about $11,000 more than all the claims that had accrued against the *William Penn* during her seven years of service.

You will notice that fact was not tacked on to the statement made to you of how she once struck something, and it happens that the striking referred to was only her propeller hitting a rock in those treacherous waters of the Philippine Archipelago; and when she struck she was being handled, not by the inexperienced Roosevelt Steamship Co. but by one of the most experienced steamship-operating companies in the world.

You didn't hear them mention the *West Prospect*, which for five years has been running to the Orient, and yet that Shipping Board vessel, which has never had the advantage of flying the British flag, has never had so much as a claim for insurance damage filed against her since she was built.

During the past four years the Shipping Board, operating something like 350 ships in all kinds of services, in some of the most perilous waters in the world, has only had six losses—only two more losses than the old experienced Clyde Line suffered in a single winter.

Now, I know that it isn't fair to cite these exceptional cases, so as to give this committee an impression that this is a sample of our operations, and I'm not attempting it. I am simply citing these cases, and I could add a lot to them, to let this committee understand that when it comes to picking out individual cases for self-serving purposes, more than one man can play at that game.

Every practical shipping man knows that marine casualties run in streaks. A concern will go along for years and years without serious difficulty, and then all of a sudden it seems as if the whole sky broke and everything went wrong. Take the case of the Clyde Line that I referred to. There's a veteran company that for a half century had been paying in its premiums and helping to build up the great surpluses which these marine companies have accumulated; and then, two years ago, in a single season, four vessels went, and I have no doubt, judging from what I have observed during these hearings, that this New York trio will probably forget the fact that this company in its insurance was only getting back a part of the premiums that it had paid during all these years, and that they will proceed to raise the rates on the ships of that company.

One will get an impression from what's been said here, that the operators go out on the ships and take care of them. So far as the operator is concerned, his contribution to the safety of a vessel is a minor factor. His principal duty is to provide a seaworthy vessel, and the first index of a seaworthy vessel is her classification. I understand it's been stated that these insurance men don't count the classification of vessels for much. I can't believe that that statement was intended to be made, because every practical man knows that the fundamental principle of safety of a vessel is her classification. The great classifying companies—Lloyds, the American Bureau of Shipping, and the French Bureau Veritas; they go over these ships—they classify them when they are built, and they go over them every four years, and at each period they put these vessels as nearly as possible in perfect condition, and the first thing that the insurance companies used to ask, when I was acquainted with their procedure before the war, was for the vessel's classification. Classifying is something in which the operator has no part. But the operator sees to it that competent men are put in charge of the ship.

Now, none of these American officers can take charge of a vessel until they are duly licensed by the department of the United States Government having that matter in charge; and the operator, just as the insurance agents used to do before the war, looks into the record of these officers—captains and engineers—to see if they are good, reliable men. When the operator has done that, and has sent his ship out in a seaworthy condition, he's done all that he can do. The ship is then in the hands of her officers and the perils of the sea.

I listened to the statements regarding the Roosevelt Line. Let me show you where that rule of this New York trio leads to. It happened at the time I became attorney to the Atlantic Carriers Association that William F. Palmer, a Massachusetts school teacher, whose knowledge of shipping was purely artificial, decided to go into the ship-operating business. He built a fleet of vessels. I don't recall that during his 12 years of operating he lost a single vessel. He was the man who, in the *Marie Palmer*, took the first cargo of gasoline across to France when all other shipping men were afraid to touch it, and he made a success. At the same time the old firm of J. S. Winslow & Co., of Portland, Me., who had been in the business for three-quarters of a century, whose experience and success no one could question, sent out the beautiful new ship *Carnegie*, which was built in my home city, in charge of one of the most experienced captains of the fleet, and she was lost on the southern shore of Long Island on her first voyage; and while the wreck was still there, this same firm sent out another new ship, the *Miles M. Murray*, also built in my home city, and also in charge of a veteran captain, and she was lost almost within sight of the *Carnegie*. Now, if this trio in New York had been operating under what I understand to be their present rules, because of lack of experience William F. Palmer's vessels would have been charged an overwhelming insurance premium and these ships of the veteran firm of J. S. Winslow & Co. would have been entitled to an exceptionally low rate of insurance. Practical men understand this, and that's why you find veteran shipping men, those who have learned the problem of ship operation by plowing those treacherous waters of the Orient or sailing the snow-blinded courses of the North Atlantic, are most charitable when it comes to discussing losses at sea. You will all recall how the *Kearsarge* went on

Roncador Reef, 40 miles off her course, in charge of naval officers. Nobody will claim that the navigators of the United States Navy are not as competent as any in the world—but there's what happened. How did she get there? No one can tell, no more than anyone can tell how the *Titanic*, in charge of the most experienced master of that old line, was lost on her first voyage.

Something is to be allowed for experience, because men learn from experience to judge men and their capacities, but in my opinion it does not justify any such spread—any such spread—as is made between the Roosevelt Line and the British Harrison Line, or the Isthmian Line and the British Harrison Line.

You noticed how those accidents charged against the 92 ships which the Shipping Board pulled out of lay-up to take care of the grain and cotton shipments of this country during that period when foreign tonnage had practically deserted our shores, which ships saved the farmers and planters of this country millions and millions of dollars, were recited to this committee.

Every practical man knows the truth that Kipling voiced in "The Ship that Found Herself," how it takes time for a new ship, or a ship after years of lay-up, to get shaken down to her business—for her crew to learn their vessel. The Shipping Board put those 92 ships into as good condition as maritime skill could put them. The classification societies did their work, and they did it well; and I, for one, not only feel that the record made by those ships is one with which we well may be satisfied, but if the people of this country ever face such an emergency again, I, for one, shall advocate the putting into operation of another just such fleet; and any accidents that may occur then will not make any more impression on me than have the accidents to which reference has been made here. We had a duty to the public to perform, and we did it. It was an emergency service and liable to emergency contingencies.

Of course, I expected criticism from the foreign interests when we put those 92 American ships into service and prevented our American producers from being mulcted through excessive rates charged by foreigners; but I did not expect an echo to come from people here at home.

But, after all, it seems to me these insurance men have by their own admissions simplified the problem and shown how absolutely necessary is some such insurance legislation as that proposed in the bills now before this committee.

They have had eight years of unrestricted opportunity, free from all control and all supervision, to go ahead and put American vessels on a parity with foreign vessels, so far as the costs of marine insurance are concerned. They certainly have not done it. If I get the drift of what they have been saying, they admit they can not do it. Then here's the insurance problem in a nutshell.

It is admitted that we must have an American merchant marine. It is admitted that to have one we must have some Government assistance. We want that assistance rendered in the most effective way and at the least cost to the Government.

That's the reason we propose having the Government loan money for shipbuilding at 2½ per cent. That's the most economical contribution the Government could make. For if the ship has to pay bankers 6 per cent for its money, the contribution by the Government would be increased just that much. If we leave this extra charge for marine insurance on our ships, it's got to be paid for ultimately by the Government.

Let us assume for the purposes of this discussion that these insurance men are right in saying that the business can't be done for less than it's being done now. Then the Government might as well contribute through reinsurance in some other way, and there would result from the Government taking hold these two tremendous advantages: The millions which we now send abroad in premiums would be kept in this country, and the foreigners who now do the greater part of our reinsuring, as well as so much direct insuring, would be deprived of that intimate knowledge of what our merchants are doing abroad, which is their privilege to-day. And there's always the chance that these men will discover ways to cut down costs when they find there are other insurance companies, when they find they can get reinsurance without our competitors coming into the field. Of course, by birth, teaching, and lifelong experience I am radically opposed to having the Government do any business that a private citizen can do. But when a thing needs to be done and private parties have not done it and admit that they can't do it, then the Government should step in. Canada is teaching us something practical in the way of government activities every day. She found that the short hauls to New York were taking from her a vast amount of grain shipments during Montreal's closed season. Last September her railway commission authorized the Government railways to make the same rate on grain over the 1,187-mile haul to Halifax and St. John that is made on the 397-mile haul to New York. She knows that with plenty of base cargo, like grain, available in Halifax and St. John, vessels will bring to and take from those ports general cargo and thus develop those ports and support the transportation systems of that country. But because of the dreaded fogs which haunt those waters, as well as outlying reefs and rocks, insurance rates have been necessarily higher on cargoes to and from those Canadian ports than to and from United States ports—a handicap which the British preferential tariffs have not overcome. So now the Canadian Government is considering the formation of a Canadian Lloyd to insure vessels going to and from Canadian ports at the same rates as companies insure cargoes to and from American ports. They know, of course, how much more dangerous are voyages to those Canadian ports, how just is at least a portion of the extra charges made against those ports. But they also know how tremendous is the cumulative effect of even a small increase in marine insurance rates; and if private companies can't or won't find a way to solve it, the Canadian Government will.

If the extra charges on what cargoes are handled through Canada's three eastern ports are sufficient to move the Canadian Government to come to the rescue, can this country, where the volume of traffic affected is so tremendous and the extra charges run into millions, hesitate to show the same good business sense that Canada has shown in handling her rail rates and is preparing to show in handling her marine insurance rates?

In these hearings I repeatedly demanded to be informed by the representatives of insurance companies, or their general counsel, who was present, how it was that the United States Government, operating a department devoted to the self-insurance of Shipping Board ships, was able to maintain an average rate of 3 per cent in premiums and accumulate a substantial surplus from such premiums charged against its ships, while at an average rate of 5 per cent on the hulls of American ships American marine insurance companies showed only constant losses from such operations. That question was never answered, and there was much doubt as to whether the insurance representatives would furnish from their books the schedules of rates, gains, and losses on the hulls and cargoes of American and foreign vessels alike, insured by such American companies.

Most sinister rumors were constantly floating through the corridors and among the groups of men assembled at the hearings, of the power possessed by these American insurance companies and how it might be used to defeat the passage of any bill intended to give a living chance upon the seas for American ships. Some of these insurance companies were able to pay dividends upon millions of capital as high as 25 per cent per annum, as well as be able to accumulate surpluses several times greater than their capital stock.

The American steamship owners, on the other hand, were shown to be meeting annual losses from the operation of their ships, running into hundreds of thousands of dollars, with but a hope that the tide might turn before they became bankrupt. To their credit, these American steamship owners are undismayed, and are even planning to build new ships, so as to better meet foreign competition, and thus secure a fair share of the carrying of American cargoes to and from foreign countries.

For many, many years it has been known to all that powerful foreign lobbies exist in the United States, whose sole purpose it is to diffuse propaganda favorable to foreign and unfavorable to American ships, especially in the magnifying of every trivial accident or casualty happening to an American ship, in order to show the general unworthiness of them, while foreign ships, some of them crack trans-Atlantic liners, could almost break in two in mid-ocean, and limp to their docks, from which the insurance companies would not allow them to stir until they were thoroughly reconditioned, so fearful were they if taken to a shipyard and a drydock for such repairs that the vessels might collapse en route over a distance of only a few hundred miles.

A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee are trying faithfully to work out a bill that will conform to the views of the full committee, and I have every reason to believe that a bill will be reported to the House which we can all get behind and that we can then in conference with the Senate reach an agreement and can place the American flag on the seas over a merchant marine the equal of any in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I ask permission, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks, and in that extension I would like to insert a statement of Mr. Plummer, of the Shipping Board, in reference to this insurance matter.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise again to make a few observations on what might be called "the submarine question." The *S-4* has at last been raised after her long sleep in the mud and silt of the ocean for three long months. The remaining members of her crew, numbering eight, whose bodies had not been heretofore removed, are at last on the way to their families and their friends.

There were 40 men who perished in the *S-4*. I have expressed time and time again the hope that we might find some latent spark of humanity in our breasts which might be aroused to a flame of indignation and have the effect of spurring the bureaucrats in the Navy to some definite remedial action. Appeals to the heart have failed. I am going to make an appeal now to the pockets of the American people.

I have taken the pains to prepare a list of the accidents to American submarines since March 25, 1915, and will, without reading it now, put it in my remarks:

Accidents to American submarines from March 25, 1915, to date

Date	Name	Place	Cause	Lives lost	Monetary loss
Mar. 25, 1915	F-4	1½ miles off Honolulu.	Unknown	21	$1,500,000.00
Dec. 17, 1917	F-1 [1]	Off San Diego, Calif.	Collision	19	1,200,000.00
July 30, 1919	G-2		Open hatch	3	Not stated.
Mar. 12, 1920	H-1	Point Rodondo, Calif.	Ran ashore	4	Not stated.
Sept. 1, 1920	S-5 [2]	Delaware Capes	Making crash dive	0	1,500,000.00
Sept. 26, 1921	R-6	San Pedro Harbor, Calif.	Torpedo lock defect.	2	Not stated.
Dec. 7, 1921	S-48	Bridgeport, Conn.	Open manhole	0	Not stated.
July 17, 1928	S-38	Anchorage Bay, Alaska.	Neglect to close valve.	0	Not stated.
Oct. 29, 1923	O-5	Limon Bay, Canal Zone.[3]	Collision with steamship Abangares.	3	1,000,000.00
Aug. 20, 1924	S-34	San Francisco Harbor.	Grounded in fog	0	40,677.00
Oct. 28, 1924	R-1	Barbers Point, Oahu.	do	0	55,000.00
Jan. 13, 1925	S-19	Cape Cod, Mass.	do	0	94,473.00
Jan. 29, 1925	S-48	Portsmouth Harbor.	do	0	268,932.00
Sept. 25, 1925	S-51	Block Island	Collision with steamship City of Rome.	37	3,013,974.65
Oct. 5, 1925	R-8	Pearl Harbor	Collision	0	Not stated.
Oct. 15, 1925	S-25	San Pedro, Calif.	Collision with steamship Ortolan.	0	30,000.00
Dec. 17, 1927	S-4	Provincetown, Mass.	Collision with Coast Guard Paulding.	40	1,999,321.97
Totals				129	10,702,378.62

[1] Sank in water too deep to be salvaged.
[2] Abandoned.
[3] Salvaged and sold for junk.

From this exhibit you will note that there were 17 accidents to American submarines from March 25, 1915, to date, and yet these gentlemen in the Navy congratulate themselves that they have not had more. In those accidents 129 American sailors perished. But what about human life? Evidently the death of six score or more of human beings does not count. Perhaps the financial loss involved might have a greater effect in spurring us on to some definite action. Well, I figured that out, too, aided by the experts from the Navy Department who appeared before the committee, and this is what I find: Those 17 accidents cost the American people $10,702,378.62, and that does not include six accidents about which they are unable to give us any report.

You ask: What is the significance of financial statements in connection with the loss of submarines? Just this, that with that $10,000,000 spent wisely and intelligently the Navy could have adopted devices which would have rescued the crews and salvaged the vessels, and it is my hope that if this side of the problem is sufficiently emphasized we may eventually compel the bureaucrats to adopt definite plans and devices for the saving of lives and the salvaging of submarines.

These experts from the Navy appeared before the committee and gave vent to the usual story of "how things can not be done." I hope the subcommittee were not hoodwinked by their arguments, which, to my mind, were quibbling, casuistical, and unreliable.

There is something about the bureaucrat that makes him essentially a conservative. I think the defect lies in his training and environment and the glamor, the honor, and dignity that go with military rank. Real men are not unbalanced by such things, but the little fellows are flattered and cajoled into the belief that because they are supposed to know they do know.

This criticism does not apply alone to the Navy. It is equally applicable to the bureaucrats in the Army. Why, gentlemen, if the world were dependent upon the originality and the initiative of Army and Navy bureaucrats we would still be fighting with flintlocks. There is not a single invention of any moment connected with the implements of war that has originated from the head of a bureaucrat. Of course, there are a few exceptions, but generally the experience of men of invention throughout our history confirms that statement.

INVENTORS' STRUGGLES WITH BUREAUCRACY

Take poor Doctor Bushnell, the man who made the first practical submarine. He was humiliated and ignored, so that he was compelled to take refuge in Europe. When after some years he returned to the United States he took up his home in Georgia under an assumed name and practiced his profession as a doctor.

Robert Fulton got no encouragement here. He had to go to France for recognition.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. Knowing all of this, why does the gentleman insist upon deluding the country by holding out the false hope that any invention or device that is serviceable will be brought forth out of the department?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am not expecting any such happy result. But I am trying, if I can, with your aid, gentlemen, to goad them into the acceptance of devices that are recognized and adopted in most of the modern navies of the world.

Continuing, take the case of Ericsson, the inventor of the *Monitor*. As a matter of fact, when Ericsson brought his "cheese box on a raft" into Hampton Roads that vessel had not been accepted by the United States Navy. It was built by private capital in defiance of the opinions of the experts of the Navy, who told him that any fool knows that iron will sink. They did not believe it was possible to build an iron vessel with a turret on it which would be of any service, and his epoch-making invention had to earn its title to recognition in actual warfare at one of the most critical times in the Nation's history.

Sir Hiram Maxim who, notwithstanding the fact that he has the prefix "Sir" to his name, was an American, born in Maine, presented his device for a machine gun to our Government, but he was flouted and humiliated. He had to go to England to be recognized, and not only was his invention accepted but he was signally honored.

Take Hotchkiss, another machine-gun inventor. He was obliged to go to France to have his invention recognized.

Coming down to the present period, take the case of the Wright brothers. It is a fact that the first recognition the Wright brothers received and the first dollar they earned by reason of their invention was received by them in France. Our Smithsonian Institution takes the pains to deny the credit which was theirs, so that Orville Wright, although a good American, is forced to the recourse of sending the first plane that flew with a human being, at Kitty Hawk, to find an honorable place in a British museum.

This is not derogatory to Americans. It is no reflection upon our system of government nor upon our people, who are the most inventive in all the world, but it is a reflection upon the conservative, reactionary bureaucrats who never learn and who never will learn.

Take the submarines. They are an American invention, yet they received no encouragement here in the beginning. Simon Lake, in his book entitled "The Submarine in War and Peace," says:

> What is the reason for this lamentable state of affairs in respect to American military inventions? I believe that I can partially explain it. I believe it is because our Army and Navy officers are too busy with the routine of their profession to give the necessary time to a thorough investigation of devices other than those with which they are forced to become familiar by their training. I believe that there is not a single fundamental invention which has emanated from an Army or Navy officer during his service.

That is from page 138 of The Submarine in War and Peace, by Simon Lake. Likewise the following significant observation:

> The few inventions which have gained sufficient early recognition and have received governmental aid in their development have usually been forced on the Army or Navy by either political or financial interests (p. 139).

What is true of other devices in war is particularly true in the case of submarines.

John P. Holland, the inventor of the first practicable submarine, met with most humiliating and discouraging opposition in his dealings with the Navy from the very beginning. His first plans for a submarine were presented to the Navy in 1875. He went to Secretary Robeson with a letter from the governor of his State—Leon Abbott, of New Jersey. Secretary Robeson referred him to Commander Sampson, at that time in charge of the torpedo station at Newport, R. I., and later the admiral

who destroyed Cervera's fleet. Sampson reported that the project was practically impossible, owing mainly—listen gentlemen—

to the difficulty of finding in what direction to steer the boat under water and the attempt to do so would be an aggravated case of trying to find one's way in a fog.

Admiral Sampson was a good fighter, but very impatient when it came to bothering about new ideas. The good admiral did not seem to think it might be possible to steer the submarine by the compass.

Then when Simon Lake submitted his plans for the peculiar type of boat which he invented, and which has been largely adopted in foreign countries, he also ran up against this perverse and foolish hostility of so-called experts. His plans were referred to a naval board, but they were not adopted at the time, because the naval constructor of the board interposed the foolish objection that when the Lake boat was running on the bottom on wheels—you know the Lake boat was provided with wheels originally—"she might run off a precipice at the bottom and go down head first to so great a depth as to be crushed by the tremendous pressure of the water."

This was the offhand decision of a distinguished and experienced naval officer who did not even think of the elementary principle of physics involved in the submarine, namely, that the stability of the vessel itself, assisted by its hydroplanes, would prevent any such happening. In other words, the buoyancy of a submarine is such that there is hardly any weight to cause her to drop.

Now, in connection with hydroplanes it is interesting to note also that another great naval constructor, L. Y. Spear, enlightened the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, long before the chairmanship of our good friend, Mr. FRENCH, of Idaho. In 1902 he said:

As an expert I do not think he [Lake] would make his hydroplanes work. (Lake's book, p. 173.)

Notwithstanding this official opinion, the hydroplane has been generally adopted all over the world.

John P. Holland, the pioneer of submarine invention, died August 12, 1914, two weeks after the outbreak of the World War. He did not have the good fortune to live to see his invention applied and given the highest test; that is, the test of warfare. Six weeks after he died, however, one of his model of submarines sank three British battleships, the *Aboukir*, the *Cressy*, and the *Hogue*.

Holland's experience with the United States Navy experts humiliated him and soured the declining years of his life. Even after having obtained the award for building the first Navy submarine, known as the *Plunger*, he was hampered at every step in its construction by the interference of the "know-it-alls" in the Navy, who insisted upon modifications of the plans to such an extent that it turned out to be an absolute failure. For instance, they insisted upon the installation of steam engines developing 1,500 horsepower and failed to provide for the insulation of the fire boxes, with the result that no human being could stay inside the boat while the furnace was going. Recognizing the folly of these interferences, Holland induced the company backing him to build a second boat to be held in reserve when the trial of the *Plunger* proved to be a failure, as he suspected it would, and which it did. This boat, the *Holland*, was an unqualified success, for the reason, as Holland said:

It was built away from red tape and gold lace.

SOME NAVY MEN WHO HAD VISION

It is only fair to state that there were a few in the Navy who were not afflicted with bureaucratic inertia. Among them was Admiral A. T. Mahan, who was one of Holland's earliest supporters. Rear Admiral Jouett also had the vision to foresee the possibilities of the future. Admiral W. W. Kimball, now living here in Washington, and Admiral George H. Converse were also among the staunchest supporters of Holland.

Admiral Kimball particularly deserves mentioning, because he not only believed in the submarine, but he was willing to risk his life in one. In 1898, when we were at war with Spain and while he was in command of our torpedo flotilla off Cuba, he asked the Navy Department to purchase the *Holland*, even as she was, just off the stocks, before she had been accepted by the Navy Department. "Put me in command," he said and he would go into Santiago Harbor and torpedo the Spanish fleet. The bureaucrats shook their heads wisely and said: "Impossible."

Admiral Dewey was also a staunch advocate of the submarine, and his secretary, Lieut. H. J. Caldwell, was the first submarine captain in the United States Navy. Admiral Hitchborn was also another friend of the inventor and a man of vision.

Lieutenant Nixon, although himself the designer of the battleships *Indiana* and *Massachusetts*, was an earnest advocate of the submarine.

The support of these men was, of course, encouraging, but it was overwhelmed by the crushing antagonism of the reactionaries. Admiral Charles O'Neill, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, could see no virtue or promise in the new device. Admiral George Q. Melville was another expert of the reactionary class and wrote:

From the time that the Senate and House Naval Committees look with favor on these boats, there will be a decreased construction of battleships.

In other words, he feared the submarine as the rival of the battleship.

I do not know whether I ought to blame him for these views or not. Perhaps he saw what all thinking men do see in the future, and that is, that in the next war battleships are going to be tied up in a safe harbor and the contest will be between airplanes in the air and submarines under the sea.

THE SUBMARINE HAS COME TO STAY

I have no sympathy with the attitude of men who would abandon the submarine as an implement of war because of these unfortunate disasters. All that I am contending for is that they be given the same chance as surface vessels and that they be provided with obvious safety appliances for the rescue of the crew in case of danger and proper salvage facilities in case they sink. The submarine has come to stay, and while it is going to make war terrible it may have the effect of lessening the chances of war due to that very fact. But while wars exist, fomented by hate and greed, it is our duty to be prepared.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman as to the importance of the submarine, but it is interesting to know that, notwithstanding the criticism of naval officers, to-day we have the largest tonnage of submarines of any nation in the world.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is, of course, the best proof that we believe in it, but we should apply to it this fundamental principle—that if it is to be a useful instrumentality of war it must be fitted with all the safety appliances which are necessary to protect the lives of the crew.

SUBMARINES SHOULD BE FOOLPROOF AND NOT DEATH TRAPS

In other words, it should be foolproof and not a death trap. Industrial society takes great pains to protect the workingman at his bench and at his lathe, providing that saws and gears shall be protected so as to minimize their danger. Even admirals themselves, I dare say, use safety razors. They have comfortable quarters on battleships. Why should they not be disposed to adopt safety appliances for the benefit of men who risk their lives under the sea in submarines?

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say to the gentleman that the bill provides $200,000 in addition for investigating and working out methods of that kind and the naval board has devoted much time and energy toward that end.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I congratulate the committee. I know it is in the bill and I appreciate it, but I want to prepare the minds of the Members of the House and the minds of the people of the country, so far as my words can reach them, for adverse reports by naval experts.

Mr. HARDY. They have had more than 3,000 propositions to make submarines safe, many of which have been investigated and found not of much use, and some have been tried out and found foolish. The officials of the Navy have gone forward very diligently in this direction, and, moreover, the Navy in itself is not expected to adopt every new thing suggested.

Mr. GRIFFIN. No; but they carry their skepticism to weakness. They have 3,000 suggestions, and I have received 300 from humane men and women from all over the country. A large number of the correspondents have written to me because they could not obtain recognition from the Navy Department.

Mr. HARDY. The committee has heard a great deal on the subject and has had a great many people before it on the question of safety devices. Your committee has not heard from the bureaucrats on this, but the committee brought before it men lower in rank. It was very interesting to hear their viewpoint when not surrounded by superior officers and when they could talk as they pleased.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All of that is in the hearings, which I hope Members will read.

Mr. HARDY. Here is what one boy said. He said—

we think the safety of the submarine lies in devices in the submarine which the men can use. We do not think so much of the plan of inaugurating buoys and pontoons around where the submarines go. That is like a football captain telling the boys before the game we have 11 ambulances here to take care of you, go in and do your best.

[Laughter.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. Nevertheless the ambulances are there at the football game within reach and the boys know that if they are hurt they will not be buried alive. The boy my distinguished colleague from Colorado speaks of will not have very much solicitude about iron staples and pontoons accessible to salvage the vessel until the ominous moment when he happens to be trapped as poor Commander Jones was caught in his submarine. It is all very well for those brave boys to repeat parrotlike what their superiors have said, but it carries no conviction.

We have had 17 submarine accidents in a little over 12 years, an unfortunate record of incompetence and neglect not surpassed by any other country in the world.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, there is no excuse for the American Navy to have any loss of life or any disaster if by proper care and foresight it may be avoided, but I think the gentleman is in error when he contrasts so unfavorably the United States with foreign countries. We called upon the department to indicate to us the disasters over a period of some 8 or 10 years where loss of life had occurred, and on page 108 of the hearings the gentleman will find that since 1919 Great Britain has had six disasters with a loss of life of 200 in her submarine work, and Japan three, with a loss of life of 135, and the United States seven disasters, with a loss of life of 89, less than one-half the ratio of Great Britain upon a Navy that in submarines is not so large, and only about two-thirds of the loss of life in Japan, with comparison with a Navy that ranks as three to five with ours.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It would be well in that connection to also give the difference in the number of submarines in commission in the American Navy and in the two navies to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is right. That is the point.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to take up the time of the gentleman, but if he will just permit me to do so, I would direct his attention to pages 146 and 147 of the hearings, where he will find that the United States has 6 fleet submarines built, 50 submarines of the first line, and 65 submarines of the second line, as against for Great Britain 4 fleet submarines of the first line, 3 submarines of the second line, 1 cruiser submarine, 3 mine-laying submarines, 29 submarines of the first line, and 22 submarines of the second line. In other words, in numbers of submarines Great Britain is considerably below the United States, and so, with greater use of submarines and more men in the service, the loss of life through disasters has been one-half less in the fleet of the United States.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the gentleman for having taken the pains to make that comparison, because it brings me to a discussion of the very point I was about to discuss.

My colleague [Mr. OLIVER] hit the nail on the head when he interjected the suggestion that in this connection we ought to consider the submarines actually in commission. The figures my colleague [Mr. FRENCH] quotes from the tables on pages 146 and 147 of the hearings give the entire fleet, but if you will look at page 128 of the hearings you will find that out of a fleet of 122 we only have had in commission 79. The others, to the number of 43, are laid up and out of commission.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I think before we leave this point I should state for the RECORD at this particular place that the members of our subcommittee are much indebted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] for many suggestions he has brought to our attention, and I am sure he has contributed to affirmative constructive programs by suggesting ways and means by which disasters may be avoided. However favorable the record of the United States Navy may be, we must not rest content until we shall have made submarine service as safe as possible to those who may be asked to engage in it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman. Now, as to his comparison with the losses in the British Navy. In the first place, the British vessels concerned were mostly of great size with large crews. The *K–5*, on January 20, 1921, had a crew of 57 men; the British submarine *M–1*, sunk in the British Channel in 1925, had a crew of 69 men. There were only 6 accidents in the British service, while there were 17 in ours in the period I mentioned. We do not build our submarines as big as they do theirs in England or else they are more heavily manned.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman wants to contradict me?

Mr. FRENCH. No. I am directing attention to another point. Since 1919, in contrast with the disasters that have occurred in the British Navy, two of our disasters have resulted in heavy toll of life. The other disasters have taken a less toll, or as follows: In one, a loss of life of 4; in another, a loss of life of 3; in another, a loss of life of 3; in another, 2; and in still another, of 4.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is where the gentleman was sleeping at the switch. That is where the Navy has pulled the wool over your eyes. They give seven as the number of accidents. There were more than seven.

Mr. FRENCH. I was speaking of disasters involving loss of life.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; and the others are worthy of consideration, too, because they might have involved loss of life.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman stated, as I understood him, that the British submarines were larger than ours. We have 50; all of them are of large tonnage except one. Some of ours exceed by 993 tons.

Mr. GRIFFIN. But they are not using them. We have six fleet submarines, first line, of approximately 1,500 tons; and only four of them are in commission, which you can confirm in the hearings at page 128. Of the "S" class of approximately 1,000 tons there are two of them under the sea. One was used to help salvage the *S–4*.

Mr. TABER. All of those are under commission.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That all appears in the hearings. I want to be as judicial and as fair-minded as I can in this statement that I have made to the House. I do not want to appear as a mere enthusiast. I want to tell you gentlemen the truth, and I hope you will all read the hearings of the committee. The subcommittee was very fair.

Mr. FRENCH. My colleague has called attention to the difference in tonnage of the smaller ships. On page 146 of the hearings the gentleman will find there are six fleet submarines of the United States of 9,618 tons, as against four of great Britain's with a tonnage of 6,670. In other words, they fall approximately into the same class as to tonnage, so the gentleman can not compare adversely in tonnage the two navies with the adverse feature against the United States.

Mr. GRIFFIN. As I have already said, only four of our first-line fleet submarines are in commission, so that the comparison with Great Britain's forces does hold good.

Mr. FRENCH. Then there is one other feature in that same connection. The steaming in miles for the submarines of the United States I would estimate to be not less than 25 per cent and maybe 35 per cent more than the steaming in miles for the submarines of Great Britain, of the same tonnage.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is information which the gentleman might very well give in a speech of his own if he wanted to take the responsibility of defending the Navy against the charges I make as to their tardiness in adopting modern safety devices. I have not fairly gotten into my subject as yet. I hope gentlemen will make their own arguments in their own time, because, after all, the comparisons which I made seem to be the only matters of contention.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, how many minutes have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I must hurry on, because I have barely gotten into my statement.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes. I shall use only a part of it and leave the rest with him. Permit me to say that members of this subcommittee have no defense whatever for any disaster that could have been avoided. We are not seeking to whitewash or cover over anything. All we want is to be helpful in obtaining truth.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I realize that.

Mr. FRENCH. As to the *S–4*, I do not know and you do not know. Now, may I say further, that when the gentleman was proposing a foundation for what he wanted the House to assume as a basis I felt the gentleman would welcome a statement as to tonnage, the mileage of steaming, the number of submarines, and other factors in connection with loss of life.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I read those tables very carefully, but I did not derive the same conclusions from them that the gentleman does.

THE CAUSES OF SUBMARINE ACCIDENTS

Let me point out to you the causes of the various accidents in the United States submarine service. First of all, the *F-4* was sunk 1½ miles off Honolulu. The cause was unknown. The *F-1*, December 17, 1917, by collision. That implies negligence and want of care. Take the accident which happened to the *G-2* on July 30, 1919, due to an open hatch; to the *H-1* March 12, 1920, off Point Rodondo, Calif., ran ashore. September 1, 1920, the *S-5* sank off the Delaware capes in making a crash dive. September 26, 1921, the *R-6* off San Pedro Harbor, Calif., a torpedo lock defect. December 7, 1921, the *S-48*, off Bridgeport, Conn., an open manhole. July 17, 1923, the *S-38*, off Anchorage Bay, Alaska, neglect to close valve. October 29, 1923, the *O-5*, collision with steamship *Abangares* off Limon Bay. Then the *S-34*, grounded in fog; the *R-1*, grounded; the *S-19*, grounded; the *S-48*, grounded; the *S-51*, collision with steamship *City of Rome;* the *R-8*, collision; the *S-25*, collision with the steamship *Ortolan;* and the *S-4*, collision with Coast Guard vessel *Paulding*. I submit that is not a pretty spectacle, and I do not think there is any defense for it.

CONTRADICTIONS IN THE HEARINGS

Now I want to go into the hearings to show some of the inconsistencies. I want to call your attention, gentlemen, in the first place, to the fact that the testimony of one of the naval officers shows that the probable lift necessary to raise the *S-4* from the bottom of the ocean would be about 700 tons. It turns out that she was eventually lifted with six pontoons of 80 tons each; in other words, with a lift of 480 tons.

LIFTING EYES

I make the charge here without hesitation that if the Navy had fitted lifting eyes to these vessels in the Navy, such as Lieutenant Commander Ellsberg recommended after the salvaging of the *F-51*, and if they had had pontoons at New London instead of being scattered all over the country, at New York and at Norfolk, and that if they had had a salvage vessel within reach and were able to put divers down to the *S-4* to attach the chains the vessel could have been lifted immediately.

Mr. HARDY. But if they had had 100 pontoons there they could not have worked for several days because of the weather.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is what you say, and that is what they say, but it is absolutely not so.

THE DOCTRINE OF INHERENT BUOYANCY

Mr. AYRES, of the subcommittee, asked a very pertinent question, and I want to lay emphasis on Admiral Hughes's answer:

Mr. AYRES. Can you count on anything, Admiral, in the way of salvaging boats or any other contrivance that you can have, or can think of, to save life?

Admiral HUGHES. No, sir; not that I know of.

Mr. AYRES. Any more than you could on pontoons?

Admiral HUGHES. The best thing I can think of is for the rescuing vessel to get men down to see if they can connect air lines and raise the ship from its own buoyancy; and that is about the only hope of saving life.

Now, mark the significance of this: He says that the only hope lies in the use of internal means to raise the vessel by its own buoyancy. What is the inference from that? Simply that the submarine has a certain degree of buoyancy, which is, of course, true. In case, however, of damage to the hull, whereby one compartment is flooded, the inherent buoyancy is diminished to the extent of the weight of the water admitted. In the case of the battery compartment of the *S-4*, which was the compartment damaged by the prow of the S. S. *Paulding*, the water admitted diminished the buoyancy of the vessel by approximately 300 tons. Obviously, if that decreased buoyancy can be neutralized either by blowing out the water or applying a direct lift from the outside, the vessel could be raised. In other words, if the facilities were at hand to apply a lift of 300 tons, then the *S-4* could have been raised. This is confirmed by the reports of the divers which show that there was such a degree of buoyancy in the vessel in the unflooded compartments that she showed signs of having shifted her position.

One of the experts who has been quoted in the press states that when the vessel was struck the controls had been set to fill the ballast tanks and the vessel was on its descent. He is also quoted as saying that she did not sink because of the water admitted into the compartment through the fracture in her hull but sank only because her ballast tanks were full; and he goes on to state that if the crew in the control room could have remained at their posts they could have started the machinery to blow out the ballast tanks and that she would have floated to the surface, notwithstanding the loss of buoyancy due to the amount of water in the battery room.

Mr. HARDY. The storm would have prevented any diver from going down.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Never mind that. You are going ahead of the story. Consider now what was her condition when she sank. There was only one compartment filled with water. And what was the capacity of that compartment? She had 300 tons of water in her. Now, remember a submarine when she is submerged has what is called negative buoyancy; she may be raised or lowered with the mere touch of the hand. If you project into one compartment of a submarine 300 tons of water, you lessen the vessel's buoyancy by so much and have 300 tons more to lift. If they had had lifting eyes on that vessel and had had a suitable salvage vessel there to put into operation, she could have been lifted a part of the way, towed into shore, and the crew could have been rescued. I say this with due deliberation and with all the certainty of conviction that God has given me.

Now, on page 96 of the hearings Admiral Hughes when testifying before the committee said:

The *S-4* lying on the bottom, as she is now, or as she was when we were working with her, has a weight of something like 760 tons.

But it turned out she had only 480 tons. That is all they had to lift.

SALVAGE SHIPS

Now, as to his views on foreign salvage ships, he states:

You have got to have them lift 700 or 800 tons.

This was in his argument against the use of salvage ships such as they have in the French and in the Italian Navy. He states you must have 700 or 800 tons lifting capacity and yet in every case where we have had to salvage submarines we have never had occasion to put into play the exertion of such a lift. The *S-51* was raised with 8 pontoons of 80 tons capacity, or 640 tons. That was all the lift there. If we had had one of the German *Vulcan* type of catamaran salvage ships, she would have been perfectly capable of raising the *S-51*.

Yet Admiral Hughes persists in saying that as to salvage ships:

They would not do. I think the Germans built one or two; Brazil has one; Italy has one; and Spain has one. So far as I know, they have raised only a little submarine that weighed about 400 tons. You have got to have them lift 700 or 800 tons.

And yet if we had them, as the other navies have them, their capacity of 700 or 800 tons would have been ample, as it turned out, to have raised both the *S-51* and the *S-4*.

AS TO PONTOONS

Mr. AYRES, a member of the committee, addressed this question:

Mr. AYRES. Admiral, do you not think it would be advisable to have a set of those at each of our naval bases, on both coasts?

Admiral HUGHES. I think we should have some on the Pacific Coast, but I do not say at every naval base; no, sir.

Mr. HARDY. You do not count much on these pontoons for the saving of life, do you?

Thus encouraged, Admiral Hughes said, "No, sir." Further on he continues:

Mr. OLIVER. Right there, Admiral, it seems to me that your answer to Mr. Hardy's question should be qualified; because, of course, if later you should put on a safety device and find that it is practical, and that your divers could make the connection, then if you had your pontoons near by, you might raise her pretty quickly. So, of course, they could be considered in connection with the saving of life.

Admiral HUGHES. I said before that they are a possibility, but not a probability.

Mr. OLIVER. I thought there should be a qualification.

Admiral HUGHES. Incidentally I might say that those pontoons have not been used yet. I think they will probably put them down, if weather conditions permit, in the next few days. They got there within 24 or 36 hours after the thing happened. They were all on the spot; but they have not been used yet.

Here, again, the admiral goes off from the true state of facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed one hour. The gentleman from Idaho has yielded the gentleman an additional five minutes, which can not be yielded to him without the consent of the committee.

Mr. AYRES. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas also yields the gentleman five minutes. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding 10 minutes beyond the hour?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Now, as to getting the pontoons there, four pontoons were sent to Provincetown, a storm came up, one of them broke away and was lost, and in the testimony of one of the Navy men there appears an item of $16,000 for building another pontoon to take its place. This was 48 hours after the accident. The remaining pontoons sent up from Norfolk did not get there until Wednesday night; in other words, the 21st. This was 96 hours afterwards.

Mr. HARDY. If they had got there the day after the disaster, they could not have been used.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is true, but it shows the way these men quibble and do not know the facts when they are testifying before committees of this House.

Mr. HARDY. But the impression the gentleman gives is that with due diligence we could have saved the lives of the men in the *S-4*, when the facts are that the storm was such that with all the devices the gentleman has mentioned the divers could not have gotten down there to use them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am trying to present a complete case, and I hope the gentleman will not take up my time.

THE SALVAGE AIR LINE

Now, note what the admiral says about the only device that is practicable, in his mind, which is to get an air connection to the sunken vessel, to pump air into her and drive out the water and have her rise of her own buoyancy. He sticks persistently to the thought that this is the only way of accomplishing a remedy of conditions, and yet he has never been able to do that very thing.

On the *S-4* they were able to get a connection with the salvage air line and the moment they started to pump the air in the water came into the torpedo room, and the men there begged them to stop pumping because the water was coming in from the battery room.

Now, it seems that they do learn, but it takes years to get a new idea into their heads. The salvage air line as installed in all the S-type of vessels is a conduit stretching from the compartments with an inlet near the conning tower, and you are thus obliged to make a connection there and pump the air into the conduit and through that by branches into the different compartments. They persisted in that for years, although the experts have warned them that it was dangerous. The proper way to install air inlets is to make a separate air inlet for each compartment. Now, they are going to do that very thing in the new type of vessels. But they are only doing it after two submarines have gone to the bottom, with a casualty list of 73.

TELEPHONE SIGNAL MARKERS

Now, for the telephone signal marker, look at the hearings on page 990. Admiral Beuret says—

we installed them and removed them and we could put them back again should the operating personnel desire it, but they apparently do not consider them necessary.

Mr. OLIVER asked him if it could not be so attached as not to interfere with the operation in peace times, and Admiral Bueret said that would be entirely practical. That was something apparently they had never thought of. They took them out entirely.

Lieutenant Jones was asked how long was it after the sinking of the *S-4* before it was discovered, and he said it was discovered within a few hours; they knew exactly from the navigational data of the Coast Guard destroyer where it was located.

Those were valuable hours! Mr. AYRES asked the admiral:

Would this telephone buoy that you spoke of have enabled you to locate her earlier than she was located had it been attached to the submarine—

And Admiral Beuret said—

As a matter of fact the approximate location of the *S-4* was known practically at once from the navigational data of the service ship.

Mr. AYRES said he appreciated that fact, and that is the reason for it, but under other conditions would this telephone buoy have enabled them to locate the submarine a few hours earlier than would otherwise have been the case, and Admiral Beuret said—

that would depend on the damage she received. It might have destroyed the buoy.

You see how ready they are to jump at some excuse for not doing the thing they ought to have done. They are not bound to having one marker—they can have three. They do not count much in weight and they do not take up much space.

Now, on page 1009 of the hearings, Lieutenant Jones further testified:

My own experience with that marker buoy in making a 200-foot dive to test it proved the uselessness of it, as it was released some time prior to our resting on the bottom at 200 feet and was never found.

Now, mark the reasoning he gives for not having found it. He says:

When we made our test dive of 200 feet, the releasing of that buoy from a 200-foot depth was required as a test. We attempted to release it from inside the boat. We operated a mechanism to release it from inside the boat. When we came to the surface the tug that was observing and standing by had not seen any buoy, and asked us why we had not released the marker buoy.

Then Mr. OLIVER asked him—

Might not that have been due to some defect in that particular buoy or its attachment to the ship?

And Lieutenant Commander Jones said:

Nobody knows. The cable was gone. There was a defect somewhere in the system, and knowing the danger of a buoy being released when it was not warranted, we all asked to have it taken off, and they were taken off.

Apparently, no one in the Navy thought it incumbent upon him to make inquiry why the marker was so improperly attached that it disappeared—and even the cable with it! This is a fine example of contentment being a virtue, but a mighty poor example of Navy efficiency.

BREATHING DEVICES

Now, there is another device in use in foreign navies—in the German, Swedish, Dutch, and Spanish. It is a breathing device which enables the crew, in case the vessel is damaged at the bottom, to go into a chamber or an airlock, put this breathing device on, which consists of an oxygen supply and a clamp over the nose, and float to the surface. Lieutenant Momsen says they are not practical, and yet they have been tried and adopted in other navies.

ELECTRIC ARC TORCH

This is a device that enables a diver to cut through all kinds of metals under water. It was tested away back in 1923 at the submarine base at New London, found satisfactory, and Lieutenant Commander Jeans, United States Navy, the laboratory officer, wrote the following letter to the International Submarine Co. (Inc.) advising them that—

Recommendation was made that an outfit be installed on the U. S. S. *Falcon* for a service test.

NAVY YARD, NEW YORK,
LABORATORY SECTION,
December 13, 1923.

INTERNATIONAL SUBMARINE CO. (INC.),
17 Battery Place, New York City, N. Y.

Subject: Electric cutting—under water.

GENTLEMEN: With reference to the test conducted at the submarine base, New London, on electric cutting under water, you are advised that the report has this day been forwarded to the Bureau of Construction and Repair via Bureau of Engineering.

Recommendation was made that an outfit be installed on the U. S. S. *Falcon* for a service test.

It is suggested that you write to the Bureau of Construction and Repair relative to the test at New London and the prospective test on the *Falcon*.

Very truly yours,

H. S. JEANS,
Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy, Laboratory Officer.

Well, was it installed? Not much! The Navy bureaucrats do not move as fast as that. It took them just five years to make up their minds to install a device that every private wrecking company in the world had in the meantime adopted. I now submit the telegram from the commander of the salvage operations on the *S-4*, dated January 15, 1928, which brought about its final adoption:

UNITED STATES NAVAL COMMUNICATION SERVICE,
Boston, Mass., January 15, 1928.

COMMANDANT NAVY YARD,
New York.

Action commandant navy yard, Boston, information navy yard, New York, Bu. C. and R. 0015.

There are available in this force only gas torches for underwater cutting. This equipment requires careful regulations, expert handling, and can be used only for ferrous metals, besides using large quantities of gas. Delay in regulating and operating gas torches required valuable

hours of good diving weather, and salvage force may possibly be confronted with necessity of cutting nonferrous metals underwater. Recommend all preliminary steps be taken preparatory to rental or procurement of electric arc underwater cutting equipments, including motor generators. Government not to be obligated to any expense until equipment actually called for by this force. Prospective bidder International Submarine Co., 95 Liberty Street, New York. All work with this equipment to be performed by naval personnel of this force 1727.

COMMANDER SALVAGE OPERATIONS "S-4."

SALVAGE FACILITIES

As far back as 1913, Congress did think that there was something in salvage facilities, for in the naval appropriation act of that year there was an appropriation of $300,000 to provide for a study of the subject.

The appropriation was never used, and in the naval appropriation act of 1915 it was made available for building more submarines.

Now there is an appropriation of $200,000 in the present bill for the same purpose. I hope it does not meet the same fate as the last.

SUBMARINE SALVAGE VESSELS

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman made the statement at the beginning of his very humanitarian discussion, to the effect that all other nations have these safety devices that would rescue the lives and save us from the disasters that we have had—practically that statement. Does the gentleman know of any ship or any device now known to mankind which in the storm that followed the sinking of the *S-4* could possibly have been there and worked in that storm and saved any lives?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. This Simon Lake from whose book I have been quoting, a distinguished inventor, built years ago a salvaging submarine called the *Protector*.

Mr. HARDY. Where is it in use now?

Mr. GRIFFIN. This protector submarine had a compartment in the forward part of the vessel, a diving chamber, from which divers could work. It is perfectly feasible to lower that submarine and have the divers emerge and go to the submarine that is in danger and work upon her. Mr. Lake's company offered this salvage submarine to our department on January 14. He offered to put up a bond that he would have that salvage submarine in shape so that it would be possible to work four divers from it inside of 30 days from the date the contract was signed.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman's question bears on this, I yield; otherwise I would prefer to continue.

CASUALTIES IN INDUSTRY

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. It bears on this. Of course, we all regret very much the disaster in the operation of submarines, but I ask the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] how does the loss of life in the operation of submarines compare with the loss of life in the operation of surface ships, trains, and the industries of our country, if he has any information on that subject.

These catastrophies are followed always by the regret of the whole Nation, and the sympathy of the people goes out to the families of the deceased, but in the operation of any great civilization and its ramifications, there are many tragic happenings, and no one is censurable or blamable, because it is inconceivable that anyone would consciously or otherwise contribute to such a holocaust as the mournful affair to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] is so feelingly referring. Are not these terrible accidents, profoundly shocking as they are and heartbreakingly regrettable, almost inevitable in a rapidly growing civilization with its many accompanying inventions, which, in accordance with the law of compensation, bear good as well as bitter fruits? Are not these disasters, in other words, the fearful price we pay, and which has always been paid for the dizzy heights to which we have ascended?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I compliment the gentleman upon his alacrity in coming to the rescue of the bureaucrats and justifying their negligence by digging out of his mind the plausible but ancient doctrine that progress must take its toll of human life.

Of course, every intelligent being knows that in the development of new implements, both in war as in industry, certain mishaps happen, but it is wrong to say that they are inevitable. Vision and foresight might very well prevent the greater number of them; but the fact is that humanitarian devices for the protection of life and limb rarely owe their installation to foresight. Usually they come from hindsight; that is, after a long train of obviously avoidable disasters. And that is just the point I am driving at. I am willing to forgive the Navy its want of foresight; that is, in failing in advance to see the dangerous points in submarine navigation. What I complain of is that they do not care to take advantage of hindsight; they will not even profit by past experience, and they persistently and dogmatically insist on ignoring the advances made elsewhere in the world in life-saving and salvage devices.

Mr. HARDY. It is stated that 20,000 people were killed last year at grade crossings.

Mr. GRIFFIN. We have gotten far astray in discussion. There is no doubt that if men are callous enough to refuse to be influenced by tragedies of this kind they will justify themselves for all sorts of accidents due to human frailty. But there is this thing to be accentuated, and that is that men are becoming more civilized; they are trying to do better. The laws provide for the improvement of industrial conditions and the introduction of safeguards to protect the lives of human beings; and that is all I am making my plea for here.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I just want to compliment the gentleman for the lucidity of his statement.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In that case I am bound to yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. He has mentioned the disasters that follow the introduction of mechanics into those activities. If the gentleman had not mentioned it, perhaps nobody would have noticed it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Strange, is it not?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not want to intrude upon the time of the gentleman from New York, but I will say, if I may do so, in response to the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR] that of course our committee could not undertake such a voluminous inquiry as the suggestion of the gentleman would indicate he would like to have us undertake. It is true, however, that whenever we develop machinery and mechanism with which to assist human labor, we have disasters vastly greater in number than we would like to have. For example, last night's Washington Star related that 92 children in Washington had been killed during the last five years as the result of automobile accidents. I do not know that it is inevitable. It ought not to be inevitable. I do not believe it is. But certainly it is true that disasters fall among people who exercise great care and ingenuity and thought in connection with the operation of machines of all kinds.

SIGNAL BOMBS

Mr. GRIFFIN. The signal bombs which were ordered by the Secretary of the Navy in 1914 are being installed on our submarines now. Admiral Beuret says:

Considerable difficulty was encountered in developing a satisfactory pyrotechnic for the signal cartridges, but about January 1, 1928, a supply of such cartridges was shipped to the home yards of all submarines.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not ask for any further time. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and place therein certain tables and letters and matters to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore given some attention on the floor to attacks that have been for some time made upon the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and to certain organizations, avowedly formed and maintained in the interest of the Indians, but which are destructive rather than constructive in their policies and efforts. There has just come to my attention a statement issued by the secretary of the Indian Rights Association, which has its headquarters in Philadelphia. I do not know how old an organization that is. I do know that the first contact I had with any organization in behalf of the interests of the Indians was with this organization when I was a member of the Committee on the Public Lands, a number of years ago. It has an honorable record of useful service.

The regrettable thing is that so much misinformation concerning the Indians appears in church and other magazines and papers and a good many people are led to believe that the Government treats the Indians unjustly, whereas they have in the main been treated with great generosity. The statement I have, and that has just come to my attention, is the reply by this Indian Rights Association to certain specific charges published in the Christian Century in December, and under the leave granted I shall insert that statement, and to those who desire some exact information about certain controversial points

on our Indian affairs, I think it might be of interest. As Franklin has said, "To sift truth from rubbish, I do what I can."

INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION, 995 DREXEL BUILDING,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 28, 1928.

The attached editorial from the Christian Century of December 15, 1927, was submitted to me for comment on the accuracy of the 11 specific allegations contained therein. This I have done in the memorandum that follows the article, without attempting to include other information bearing on the general question.

M. K. SNIFFEN,
Secretary Indian Rights Association.

[From the Christian Century, December 15, 1927]

SPECIFIC CHARGES VERSUS GENERAL DENIALS

When one considers how difficult it is for the ordinary citizen to get a clear idea of what the United States Government is doing with and to the quarter of a million Indians who are its wards, one may be grateful that we have no mandates in remote regions of the earth where control would be, if possible, still more arbitrary and the facts still more difficult to ascertain. Some months ago the Churchman published an article by Rev. Irwin St. John Tucker containing a severe indictment of the Indian Bureau based upon the report of the Indian Commissioner himself and the sworn testimony presented to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs last February. Commissioner Burke is said to have been present when this evidence was given to the committee, but he did not reply at the time. Subsequently, the commissioner published a reply to the charges in the Churchman, and still later the Episcopal missionary bishops in the Indian areas issued a manifesto denying the charges and defending the bureau and the commissioner. To a reader of this considerable body of material, the most significant fact is that, omitting rhetoric, many of the charges are specific while the denials are general. We find nowhere any denial of such statements as these: (1) "The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has under his absolute control $90,000,000 in money and securities and $1,650,000,000 of Indian property, according to his own report, which he administers, and as guardian he reports to no court, can be questioned or disciplined by no court." (2) "The Indian makes a will—Commissioner Burke can amend or nullify it." (3) "On reaching the age of 6 every Indian boy and girl is subject to be taken from his or her family—if necessary by force—and sent 200 or 1,000 miles away to an Indian boarding school." (4) "These schools are overcrowded exactly 38.5 per cent above their utmost possible capacity, as stated by the bureau." (5) "There is every possible condition to facilitate the rapid spread of disease, particularly tuberculosis." (6) "The death rate among Indians has increased 48 per cent in four years." (7) "The Indian tuberculosis death rate is six times the white death rate." (8) "The Indian Bureau in 1926 actually requested Congress to reduce the appropriation for health and medical work among the Indians." (9) "The Indian property is being dissipated at the rate of 4 per cent each year through actions exclusively by the official guardian and not by the Indians." (10) "The Navajo Nation was informed that the bureau recommended and Congress had voted to appropriate $100,000 from their tribal fund to build a tourist bridge, which is 40 miles away from the nearest habitation." (11) "Simultaneously the Christian Pimas, who are dying at five times the white death rate, are taxed $100,000 for a tourist bridge, with decorative electric lights, to connect Phoenix with Tucson." These specific statements are not to be answered by sweeping assertions that they are "malicious, libelous, and defamatory."

(NOTE.—Figures in parenthesis indicate that specific comment is made thereon in the following memoranda.)

"1. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has under his absolute control $90,000,000 in money and securities and $1,650,000,000 of Indian property, according to his own report, which he administers and as guardian he reports to no court, can be questioned or disciplined by no court."

Comment: The commissioner does not have absolute control of Indian money and property. His acts are all subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior, and any acts not authorized by law or in abuse of discretion are reviewable by the United States courts.

"(2) The Indian makes a will. Commissioner Burke can amend or nullify it."

Comment: Commissioner Burke can neither amend, nullify, or approve an Indian will. The Secretary of the Interior, however, in his discretion may approve or disapprove a will made by an Indian, but he can not amend it.

Further, the Secretary's decision is not final. If any heir is not satisfied with the settlement of the estate in question, he can appeal to the Secretary for a rehearing through counsel; or if it can be shown the Secretary's decision was arbitrary or capricious appeal can be taken to the United States courts. (Lane *v.* Mickadiet, 241 U. S. 201; Butterworth *v.* Hoe, 112 U. S. 50; Garfield *v.* Coldsby, 221 U. S. 249; Harnage *v.* Martin, 242 U. S. 386; Houston *v.* St. Louis, 249 U. S. 479.)

The department has a staff of "examiners of inheritance," trained in the law, who act as a probate court in the settlement of Indian estates affected by wills or intestate law. Open hearings are held and full opportunity given to any claiming a right to a share of the estate. Every case is set forth by the examiner in a report with his recommendations. This is examined in the law division of the Indian Bureau, and if errors are discovered the report is returned to the examiner for reconsideration. If not, the case is submitted to the Secretary of the Interior where other legally trained examiners check up the statement of facts before final action is taken.

Since the present law went into effect (1910) the heirs have been determined in about 60,000 cases, and probably not more than 3 per cent of that number have been disputed.

The average probate cost to the Indians was $25, which is about one-fourth of the fees charged in the courts of the respective States.

We know what happened in Oklahoma, for instance, when Indian estates are probated in the county courts.

"(3) On reaching the age of 6 every Indian boy and girl is subject to be taken from his or her family—if necessary by force—and sent 200 to 1,000 miles away to an Indian boarding school."

Comment: The act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 876), forbids taking of Indian children into another State for school purposes without the written permission of the parents. Incidentally, the Secretary of the Interior is directed by the act of February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 408–410), to compel every Indian child between the ages of 6 and 16 to attend school.

In a few sections there was formerly some objection on the part of parents to sending their children to school; but now, in most localities, they are eager to have their children attend school. In the Navajo country the parents usually prefer to have their children remain on the reservation, in the boarding schools, rather than be sent to the distant nonreservation schools. As to the latter, however, it is interesting to note that the requests of the Indians to be admitted to them far exceed the capacity of the schools.

Moreover, many of the parents wish their children to attend the boarding schools, because they are comfortably clothed, well fed, and are better protected at night from inclement weather that is encountered in most of the camps or villages, which make it difficult to keep warm. In fact, they have more of a chance to survive at school than if they remain at the camps.

"(4) These schools are overcrowded exactly 38.5 per cent above their utmost capacity, as stated by the bureau."

Comment: Commissioner Burke's report for 1927 gives the total capacity of these schools as 33,195 and the average attendance 27,618.

"(5) There is every possible condition to facilitate the rapid spread of disease" in these schools.

Comment: This statement might be applied to many of the most unfavorable Indian homes, but certainly not to the Federal schools, which are under constant medical supervision.

"(6) The death rate among Indians has increased 48 per cent in four years."

Comment: Instead of an increase of 48 per cent in four years, ending with 1924, the increase for the five-year period—1921 to 1925—is only 4.9 per cent.

"(7) The Indian tuberculosis death rate is six times the white death rate."

Comment: The death rate from tuberculosis among the Indians is undoubtedly greater than among the whites; but there are no reliable statistics available to make such a positive statement on the subject. One contributing cause to this high death rate from tuberculosis is the fact that in some localities the Indians are slow to adopt modern methods for coping with the disease. The department, however, has been conducting various campaigns to bring the Indian to a realization of doing something to help himself in the fight against tuberculosis.

It is likewise a fact that while the Indian death rate from tuberculosis is higher than among the whites, the Indian is largely immune to certain diseases that are so often fatal to whites.

"(8) The Indian Bureau in 1926 actually requested Congress to reduce the appropriation for health and medical work among the Indians."

Comment: This is wholly misleading. The appropriation for the year 1926 was $700,000, as compared with $500,000 for the fiscal year 1925. The bureau's estimate for 1927 was for $760,000. The Bureau of the Budget cut this to $675,000, but Congress appropriated for that year $756,000, or $4,000 less than the bureau's estimate.

Incidentally the appropriation bill for the year beginning July 1, 1928, contains an item of $1,547,500 for "conservation of health."

"(9) The Indian property is being dissipated at the rate of 4 per cent each year through actions exclusively by the official guardian and not by the Indians."

Comment: The estimated value of the Indian property for the year ending June 30, 1926, was $1,693,844,806. For the following year—1927—it was $1,716,815,123, or an increase of $22,970,317.

As for dissipating the property, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs can not expend a dollar without authority of law.

Where there are tribal funds it is the Indians—aided and abetted by storekeepers and other interested parties—who clamor for a per capita distribution. These Indians send delegations to Washington for the avowed purpose of securing the passage of a bill directing the commissioner to make such a per capita distribution from tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury.

As an illustration: Two years ago (69th Cong. 1926) a bill was introduced at the request of an Indian delegation to appropriate $5,000,000 for per capita payment to Klamath Indians.

"(10) The Navajo Nation was informed that the bureau recommended and Congress had voted to appropriate $100,000 from their tribal fund to build a tourist bridge which is 40 miles away from the nearest habitation."

Comment: This statement is true as to Congress making an appropriation of $100,000 toward the cost of the bridge at Lees Ferry on western Navajo Reservation, but it is only one-third the cost of the structure. Then, to make it of any value, over $300,000 must be spent to build a road to reach the bridge from Cameron, a distance of 40 or 50 miles. It is true that the bridge will be of practically no immediate benefit to these Indians. Congress, however, has adopted the policy in granting appropriations for any improvement on an Indian reservation to make it a reimbursable charge against the tribe concerned. No immediate collection is contemplated, but the item remains as a charge in case minerals of value are later developed on such reservations, and when funds were being received from such a source the money would be paid back in the United States Treasury.

Because of the political influence behind the measure, the matter would have gone through Congress, regardless of the attitude of the Indian Bureau. In my judgment the bureau made a mistake in not opposing the scheme.

"(11) Simultaneously the Christian Pimas, who are dying at five times the white death rate, are taxed $100,000 for a tourist bridge, with decorative electric lights, to connect Phoenix with Tucson."

Comment: The Pimas are charged $100,000 for the bridge, but they understood the proposition and favored it. The bridge, however, is a superstructure on the wing diversion dam—part of the San Carlos irrigation project—to carry the flood waters to their farming lands. It is likewise of great benefit to them, for the Gila River at times rises very quickly, and when in flood crossing is only possible over a bridge. The Pimas have not made any complaint against this item, but regard it as a great blessing.

Concerning the allegation that they are dying "at five times the white death rate," it should be noted that the tribal rolls on this reservation had not been corrected for about 10 years, and when an allotting agent visited the agency to make a check-up, he found that there were being carried on it the names of approximately 1,000 Indians who had died in that period. Of course, the names were removed from the census record; and if a comparison was made the following year on the basis of the uncorrected roll the percentage of decrease would appear to be abnormally high and wholly misleading if no explanation was made.

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 the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 180

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. WOODBRIDGE N. FERRIS, late a Senator from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL].

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, under general debate on the Navy appropriation bill it occurs to me that it would be in order and very appropriate to discuss flood control, because control of floods on navigable interstate streams in the United States constitutes a very material and important part of national defense. Splendid interstate or national highways are likewise a very important element in national defense. When highways are under water or when they have been washed out and ruined by floods they are of little use in assembling armies or war materials. Everyday navigable interstate streams, such as the Mississippi River, are likewise of great value as a national defense in the transportation of armies, war materials, and so forth. Hence it behooves the Nation to take and manifest a great interest in so controlling the floods of the tributary streams to navigable waters in such a way and to such an extent that the navigable waterways will be always available as a national defense. Then, in addition to the national defense use of interstate navigable streams, there is the everyday interstate commerce use. For these two paramount reasons, to wit, the national defense and general interstate commerce use, the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries by the Federal Government is a tantamount national problem.

But the paramount question is: How shall the problem of controlling the floods on the Mississippi River be successfully and equitably solved? The proposal to do all the work on the lower Mississippi as a means of controlling the damaging floods and maintaining the river in a condition susceptible of everyday use in commerce is one method or plan. This treatment of the subject of flood control reminds us of the plan of healing a disease by treating its effect rather than the method of removing the cause. Another plan is to do such emergency work on the lower Mississippi as will temporarily protect the inhabitants and their property being near the stream and, in addition thereto, ascertain what per cent the various Mississippi tributaries contribute to the floods on the Mississippi. And thereafter, by appropriate legislation in the way of Federal aid, to contribute to the control of floods upon the major streams tributary to the Mississippi. This plan would necessitate, of course, the States and benefit districts contributing the balance of the expense in controlling floods on State or interstate streams by a system of terracing, of reservoir building, of straightening, widening, and cleaning out the channels of the streams. The plan for the State to use for raising its share of the money to be determined by its legislature. This plan would increase the value of the taxable property of the State by reclaiming the flood-damaged land and increasing the value thereof by insuring against the disastrous effects of uncontrolled floods. Such a plan would contemplate, of course, some regulation by the Government of the use of reservoirs, but when finally put in operation would be the most logical, the most effective, and the most equitable plan or system of flood control. The Government would be bearing and contributing its proper share of the cost for national defense purposes and for the civil industry of interstate commerce, and the States and benefited districts would be properly chargeable for the special and local benefits derived from the flood control. Thus the whole problem could be reasonably, successfully, and equitably solved to the benefit of all the people.

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

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the committee will rise in just a moment. May I make this statement? A matter has been brought to the attention of the subcommittee which will be involved in connection with the bill and concerning which the subcommittee may desire to offer an amendment. We plan to have a hearing after we shall have adjourned this afternoon, and in order that Members may be advised upon the hearing, if it may turn out that we would like to offer an amendment, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks any statement that the committee may wish to make.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. 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. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12286) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1928.

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On account of the pressure of business I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy for 1928.

Sincerely yours, GEORGE P. DARROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] to the vacancy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HUDSON, by unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), was granted leave of absence for the day on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred to the appropriate committees, as follows:

S. 710. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the northwestern bands of Shoshone Indians may have against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1131. An act to encourage and promote the production of livestock in connection with irrigated lands in the States of Wyoming, Montana, and New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Frank Dixon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2733. To amend the military record of Joseph Cunningham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Willis B. Cross;

H. R. 7367. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $50,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Seward, Alaska; and

H. R. 10373. An act authorizing the Plattsmouth Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Plattsmouth, Nebr.

DEATH OF SENATOR FERRIS, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. WOODBRIDGE N. FERRIS, a Senator of the United States from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee: Messrs. McLAUGHLIN, CRAMTON, MAPES, JAMES, MICHENER, WOODRUFF, KETCHAM, McLEOD, HUDSON, VINCENT of Michigan, HOOPER, CLANCY, BOHN, RAINEY, HILL of Washington, REED of Arkansas, GREEN of Florida, and WHITEHEAD.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), in pursuance of the resolution, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 24, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, March 24, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To extend the period of restrictions of lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes (H. R. 12000).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to degree-conferring institutions (H. R. 7951).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

416. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of $50,000 (H. Doc. No. 204), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 167. A bill to amend the act of February 12, 1925 (Public, No. 402, 68th Cong.), so as to permit the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians to file suit in the Court of Claims under said act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8280. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the northwestern bands of Shoshone Indians may have against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 2725. An act to extend the provisions of section 2455, United States Revised Statutes, to certain public lands in the State of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038). 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. EVANS of California: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4012. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Sies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Frederick O. Goldsmith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4664. A bill for the relief of Capt. George R. Armstrong, United States Army, retired; without amendment (Rept. No. 1033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7976. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Moore L. Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9148. A bill for the relief of Ensign Jacob E. DeGarmo, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Committee on Claims. S. 1120. An act for the relief of Ella H. Smith; adverse (Rept. No. 1036). Laid on the table.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 1362. An act to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Harry Simpson; adverse (Rept. No. 1037). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 12347) granting all right, title, and interest of the United States to the piece or parcel of land known as the Cuartel Lot to the city of Monterey, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 12348) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of a boathouse at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12349) to amend section 13 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12350) to regulate the separation of juries in felony cases in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 12351) amending section 72 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 145) by changing the boundaries of the divisions of the southern district of California and terms of court for each division; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 12352) to require certain contracts entered into by the Secretary of War, or by officers authorized by him to make them, to be in writing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 12353) to amend and supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 12354) to grant to the city of Leominster, Mass., an easement over certain Government property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEAVITT (by request): A bill (H. R. 12355) authorizing the expenditure of tribal funds of the Assiniboine and Sioux Indians of the Fort Peck Reservation of Montana to employ tribal attorneys; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 12356) authorizing and directing the Inland Waterways Corporation to initiate water carriage upon the St. Croix River and Minnesota River in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: Resolution (H. Res. 145) for the investigation of the Federal penal system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH: Resolution (H. Res. 146) providing for the consideration of H. R. 5773, a bill to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 12357) granting a pension to Gertrude R. Hammill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 12358) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Loomer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 12359) for the relief of the widow of Edwin D. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12360) granting a pension to Myrta M. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 12361) to permit Milton F. Flewelling, jr., to take examination for a commission as ensign in the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 12362) for the relief of Hattie Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 12363) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Gaskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12364) for the relief of L. W. Rowe; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12365) granting an increase of pension to Emma Pilate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 12366) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Hamblett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 12367) for the relief of R. L. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 12368) for the relief of E. B. Rose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12369) granting an increase of pension to Emily Bard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12370) granting a pension to Charley Morrow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 12371) granting a pension to Ella Myres; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 12372) granting a pension to Eva M. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 12373) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lowther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 12374) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Sage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 12375) for the relief of a homestead settler on the drained Mud Lake bottom, Minnesota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12376) for the relief of R. E. Hansen; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 12377) granting an increase of pension to Ellenor Stump; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 12378) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Johnson; 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:

5828. By Mr. ADKINS: Petition of citizens of Champaign, Ill., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill now before Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5829. Also, petition of voters of Mattoon, Ill., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill now before Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5830. By Mr. BACON: Petition of E. Agate Foster and others, residents of Patchogue, Long Island, N. Y., urging passage of Civil War increase pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5831. Also, petition of Arabella Huestis and others, of Amityville, N. Y., for a Civil War pension bill granting an increase, as proposed by the National Tribune, to all Civil War veterans and Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5832. Also, petition of A. L. Haskell and others, residents of Port Jefferson, Long Island, N. Y., for passage of House bill 11410, to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5833. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Nahoun H. Chayes, of 537 Sheffield Avenue East, Brooklyn, N. Y., and petitions attached of hundreds of other citizens, protesting against House bill 78, Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5834. By Mr. BOIES: Petition signed by citizens of Cherokee, Cherokee County, Iowa, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill for the relief of veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5835. By Mr. CORNING: Petition of Minnie E. Jones and many other citizens of Albany County, N. Y., favoring increase of pension for Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5836. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Verdugo Hills Post of the American Legion, for the passage of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5837. Also, petition of the Social Hygiene Society of the District of Columbia, for the passage of the bill (H. R. 6664) for the establishment of the woman's bureau of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5838. Also, petition of Emily Mount, 999 Park Avenue, Trenton, N. J., and 152 other residents of Trenton and vicinity, protesting against proposed compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5839. By Mr. CELLER: Petition of Brooklyn Bar Association, urging an additional United States district judge for the eastern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5840. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Scandinavian descent residing in the States of Montana and Idaho, protesting against the new quota distribution based on national origin in our Federal immigration law and urging that the quota distribution based on the census of 1890 be retained; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5841. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of legislative committee of the Boston branch, Railway Mail Association, Walter E. Rice, secretary, 8 Reddy Avenue, Hyde Park, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of House bills 25, 98, 9585, and 9766; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5842. By Mr. GARBER: Letter of Cactus Chapter, No. 2, D. A. V. of the W. W.; Morgan McDermott Post, No. 7, American Legion; Booker T. Washington Chapter, No. 5, D. A. V. of the W. W.; and Tucson Chapter, No. 4, D. A. V. of the W. W., in support of House bill 97; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5843. Also, letter of Crites Broom Co., of Oklahoma City, Okla., by E. J. Crites, president, in support of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

5844. Also, resolution of the Social Hygiene Society of the District of Columbia, in support of House bill 6664; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5845. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Kingsville, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5846. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 55 residents of Rockingham County, N. H., urging legislation providing for increase of pension for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5847. By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of 90 citizens of Oelwein, Iowa, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill for the relief of veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5848. Also, petition of 131 citizens of Howard County, Iowa, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill for the relief of veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5849. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Robert C. Bell and other citizens of Syracuse, Ind., urging passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5850. By Mr. HOPE: Petition signed by residents of Fort Dodge, Kans., requesting more adequate pension legislation for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5851 By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Petition of Mrs. R. P. Baker and 21 other citizens of Apache, Okla., favoring increased pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5852. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Wortham Chamber of Commerce, of Wortham, Tex., favoring appropriation to prevent the spread of the pink boll worm; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5853. Also, petition of Teague Chamber of Commerce, of Teague, Tex., favoring appropriation to prevent the spread of the pink boll worm; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5854. Also, petition of Calvert Chamber of Commerce, of Calvert, Tex., favoring appropriation to prevent the spread of the pink boll worm; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5855. By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Petition of 69 citizens of Watertown, S. Dak., urging immediate action on legislation increasing Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

5856. By Mr. KIESS: Petition from citizens of Westfield, Pa., favoring legislation to grant increased pensions to soldiers of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5857. By Mr. KING: Petition of the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill, signed by Tella E. Marshall and 250 other inmates of the Soldiers and Sailors Home at Quincy, Ill., and circulated by Mary R. Rash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5858. By Mrs. LANGLEY: Petition of residents of Floyd County, Ky., urging passage of Civil War pension bill for relief of needy veterans and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5859. By Mr. LOZIER: Petition of 23 citizens of Chariton County, Mo., urging increase in pensions of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5860. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition of Catherine Conley, of Minneapolis, and others, urging passage of Welch bill (H. R. 6518); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5861. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Employees Association of Burlingame, Calif., favoring the passage of House bill 6518; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5862. Also, petition of F. H. Brookhop, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5863. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the White bill (H. R. 10765); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5864. Also, petition of the Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash., requesting an impose of 25 per cent ad valorem duty on cedar shingles and lumber imported in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5865. By Mr. QUAYLE: Resolution by the Kings County Dental Society, urging the passage of House bill 5766; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5866. Also, petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of House bill 10765; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5867. Also, petition of the American Legion National Legislative Committee, of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of House Joint Resolution 183; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5868. Also, petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, District Council, of New York City, urging the passage of House bill 11141; to the Committee on Labor.

5869. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition from H. B. Glover & Co., of Dubuque, Iowa, and signed by about 500 employees, urging the passage of the Cooper convict labor bill (H. R. 7729); to the Committee on Labor.

5870. Also, petition from Alice McFarland, of Manchester, Iowa, and signed by about 40 other citizens of Manchester, Iowa, urging immediate steps be taken to pass the Civil War pension bill, carrying the following provisions: $72 per month for every Civil War survivor, $125 per month for every Civil War survivor requiring aid and attendance, and $50 per month for every Civil War widow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5871. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of J. P. Buck, J. H. Church, et al., of Hurdland, Mo., for the passage of Stalker bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5872. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Victor Lamb and 131 others, of Yakima County, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5873. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Homer Cook and 58 other citizens of Castile, N. Y., urging an increase in pension of Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5874. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Minnie S. Leavitt, resident of Thief River Falls, Minn., urging the passage of the Stalker bill (H. R. 9588); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5875. Also, petition of Mrs. E. O. Erickson and other citizens of Thief River Falls, Minn., urging the passage of the Stalker bill (H. R. 9588); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5876. Also, petition of B. M. Thompson and 69 citizens of Henning, Otter Tail County, Minn., opposing the apportionment of immigration quotas on the basis of national origins and favoring the repeal of the national-origins clause in the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5877. Also, petition of N. D. Fidler and 31 residents of Fergus Falls, Minn., in favor of the passage of the Stalker bill (H. R. 9588); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5878. Also, petition of Mrs. M. V. Evenson, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Thief River Falls, Minn., urging the enactment of the Stalker bill (H. R. 9588); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5879. Also, petition of Mrs. S. J. Anderson and residents of Thief River Falls, Minn., in favor of the passage of the Stalker bill (H. R. 9588); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5880. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition signed by Mrs. W. H. Bone and some 20 other citizens of Columbus, Franklin County, Ohio, protesting against the proposed legislation known as the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5881. By Mr. STOBBS: Petition of residents of Worcester, Mass., for consideration of pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5882. By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of Mary E. Linscott and Mary Martin, of Milford, Kans., urging enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5883. Also, petition of 48 citizens of Cloud and Republic Counties, Kans., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5884. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Defiance, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5885. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of nine citizens of Adams County, Iowa, requesting the Congress to pass legislation for the benefit of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5886. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of East Northfield, Mass., for increases in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5887. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition of the veterans of the Civil War, for increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5888. By Mr. WARE: Petition signed by 187 citizens of Covington, Kenton County, Ky., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5889. Also, petition signed by citizens of Newport and Covington, Ky., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5890. By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Petition presented by Dr. M. L. Rice, president Colorado Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, being 131 feet long and containing 3,035 signatures of residents of Denver, against the Lankford Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5891. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Thirty-fifth Continental Congress, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring passage of Capper-Gibson bill (S. 1907, H. R. 6664); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5892. Also, petition of Tarsus Commandery, No. 375, Knights of Malta, Manor, Westmoreland County, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 10078; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

SATURDAY, *March 24, 1928*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"How beautiful it is to be alive!
To wake each morn as if the Maker's grace
Did us afresh from nothingness derive,
That we might sing, 'How happy is our case!
How beautiful it is to be alive!'

"To read in God's great book, until we feel
Love for the love that gave it; then to kneel
Close unto Him whose truth our souls will shrive,
While every moment's joy doth more reveal
'How beautiful it is to be alive.'

"Not to forget when pain and grief draw nigh,
Into the ocean of time past to dive
For memories of God's mercies, or to try
To bear all sweetly, hoping still to cry
'How beautiful it is to be alive!'

"Thus ever toward man's height of nobleness
Strive still some new progression to contrive;
Till, just as any other friend's, we press
Death's hand; and, having died, feel none the less
'How beautiful it is to be alive.'"

Let us pray. O merciful God and Heavenly Father, who hast taught us in Thy holy word that Thou dost not willingly afflict or grieve the children of men, look with pity, we humbly beseech Thee, upon the sorrows of the family and loved ones of Thy faithful servant whom Thou hast called unto Thyself. Gently Thou didst press the tired lids to rest, for so Thou givest Thy beloved sleep. Vouchsafe to him, O Lord, light and rest, peace and refreshment, joy and consolation in the paradise of God; and may the benediction of his noble character rest upon us all, that having served Thee with constancy on earth we may be joined hereafter with Thy blessed saints in glory everlasting. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. WOODBRIDGE N. FERRIS, late a Senator from the State of Michigan.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution:

S. 3343. An act for the relief of the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to provide that the United States extend to the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses an invitation to hold the sixth session of the association in the United States, and for the expenses thereof.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3145) for the relief of Willis B. Cross.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H. R. 340. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of an additional school building, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7367. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $50,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Seward, Alaska; and

H. R. 9860. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government-land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1665. An act to authorize the board of park commissioners of the city and county of San Francisco to construct a recreation pier at the foot of Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 445. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement or agreements with the State of Montana and private owners of land within the State of Montana for grazing and range development, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Willis B. Cross;

H. R. 7367. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $50,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Seward, Alaska;

H. R. 10027. An act to authorize the transfer of a portion of the hospital reservation of the United States Veterans' Hospital No. 78, North Little Rock, Ark., to the Big Rock Stone & Material Co., and the transfer of certain land from the Big Rock Stone & Material Co. to the United States;

H. R. 10083. An act to provide for advances of funds by special disbursing agents in connection with the enforcement of acts relating to narcotic drugs;

H. R. 10373. An act authorizing the Plattsmouth Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Plattsmouth, Nebr.; and

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 65, approved March 3, 1925, authorizing the participation of the United States Government in the International Exposition to be held in Seville, Spain.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	McNary	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	Mayfield	Simmons
Bayard	George	Metcalf	Smith
Black	Gerry	Neely	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	Norbeck	Steck
Blease	Gooding	Norris	Steiwer
Borah	Greene	Nye	Stephens
Bratton	Hale	Oddie	Swanson
Brookhart	Hawes	Overman	Thomas
Broussard	Hayden	Pine	Tydings
Capper	Johnson	Pittman	Tyson
Caraway	Jones	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Keyes	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Cutting	King	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Dale	McKellar	Sackett	Watson
Dill	McLean	Sheppard	Wheeler
Fess	McMaster	Shipstead	

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] is absent on official business.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness in his family.

Mr. KEYES. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] is absent on account of a death in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is necessarily detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to announce that his colleague [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent, and that this announcement will stand for the day.

Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.