

No. 119, Blue Springs, Nebr., and 14 others, favoring the passage of a Civil War pension bill increasing the pension of Civil War survivors and of Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1727. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of Percy C. Curtis & Son, of Mapleton, Me., and others, urging passage of Senate bill 108, known as the Borah bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1728. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of B. B. Bacon and 22 others, of Gove County, Kans., favoring increase of pension for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1729. By Mr. STONE: Evidence in support of House bill 6250, granting a pension to Jessie P. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

1730. By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of the citizens of Belleville, Kans., urging passage of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1731. Also, petition of the citizens of Manhattan, Kans., urging passage of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1732. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Armstrong County, Pa., in favor of legislation to increase the rate of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1733. By Mr. SULLIVAN of Pennsylvania: Petition of 54 veterans and widows of the Civil War, asking an increase of pension for all pensioners under this law; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1734. By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of residents of Jay and Delaware Counties, Ind., relative to the enactment of pension legislation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1735. By Mr. WALKER: Petition for reduction of war tax on Burley tobacco products, from W. H. Baker and other citizens of Kentucky, in favor of House bill 3573; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1736. By Mr. WASON: Petition of Silas C. Newell and 27 other residents of Newport, N. H., requesting legislation for the relief of veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1737. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of citizens of Norristown and vicinity, of Montgomery County, Pa., favoring increased rates of pension for soldiers who served during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

1738. By Mr. WILSON: Petition of Mary M. Morley, of Downsville, Union Parish, La., urging action of Congress on Civil War emergency pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1739. By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey: Petition of members of William B. Hatch Circle, No. 2, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Camden, N. J., favoring increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1740. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of E. S. Cutlip, M. D., and others of Webster County, W. Va., urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased pension rates to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

1741. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Albert W. Schroder, of Avonmore, Pa., requesting passage of the Rogers bill, providing additional hospital facilities for disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, December 10, 1929

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 4, 1929)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

ELLISON D. SMITH, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, appeared in his seat to-day.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal for the calendar days of Wednesday, December 4, Thursday, December 5, and Friday, December 6, 1929.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### FORMULATION OF SCHEDULES OF RADIO FEES (S. DOC. NO. 47)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 351—agreed to March 2, 1929—a paper entitled "A Fee System for Radio Licenses," which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

### CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES GRAIN CORPORATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certain information on the States of Minnesota and South Dakota, in further response to Senate Resolution 98—agreed to June 18, 1929—which directed the Department of Commerce to furnish to the Senate the following data:

(a) The names and addresses of each person, firm, or corporation as they appear on such books and records of the United States Grain Corporation and who have, or appear to have, therefrom, a claim against the United States Grain Corporation or the United States, unpaid, in whole or in part, for such interest and insurance under and by virtue of said contract; and

(b) The respective amounts entered on said books and records as apparently earned by each said person, firm, and corporation, under and by virtue of said contract—

which, with the accompanying papers, were ordered to lie on the table.

### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REPORTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, also the annual report of the register of copyrights, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on the Library.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	Johnson	Sheppard
Ashurst	Frazier	Jones	Shortridge
Bingham	George	Keyes	Simmons
Black	Gillett	La Follette	Smith
Blaine	Glass	McCulloch	Smoot
Bleese	Glenn	McKellar	Steiwer
Borah	Goldsborough	McMaster	Sullivan
Bratton	Greene	McNary	Swanson
Breck	Hale	Metcalf	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Harris	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Townsend
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Trammell
Connally	Hatfield	Nye	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Oddie	Walcott
Cutting	Hebert	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Fess	Howell	Schall	Watson

Mr. CARAWAY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] are engaged on official business in a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FESS. The following-named Senators are absent from the Chamber in attendance upon a hearing on the communications bill before the Interstate Commerce Committee:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

### PETITIONS

Mr. ALLEN presented sundry petitions, signed by approximately 3,400 citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of legislation providing increased pensions to Spanish War veterans and widows of veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented a petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Frederick, Md., praying for the passage of the so-called Smoot bill, being the bill

(S. 1468) to amend the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, by extending its provisions to tobacco and tobacco products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WAGNER presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Genesee County, N. Y., favoring the purchase of land in the northwest part of Genesee County, N. Y., known as the Oak Orchard Swamp, to be used as a migratory bird sanctuary, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana presented a petition of sundry citizens of Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Texas, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WALCOTT presented petitions and papers in the nature of petitions from the common councils of the cities of Danbury and Hartford, W. L. Bevin's Auxiliary to the United Spanish War Veterans, of Meriden, and Ernest Weichert Camp, No. 26, United Spanish War Veterans, of Danbury, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bartlesville, Okla., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Education Association, favoring the passage of legislation to establish a Federal department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR WARREN

Mr. FESS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 176) submitted by Mr. WATSON on the 4th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. Francis E. Warren, late a Senator from the State of Wyoming, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### ASSISTANT IN OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. FESS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 179) submitted by Mr. WATSON on the 9th instant, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to employ an assistant in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, to be paid at the rate of \$2,040 per annum out of the contingent fund of the Senate, until the end of the present Congress.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 2541) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Nelson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 2542) for the relief of Charles S. Harleston; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2543) authorizing the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2544) granting a pension to William George Madden; and

A bill (S. 2545) granting a pension to Lynn G. Pierce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 2546) granting an increase of pension to Sophia J. Skelley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 2547) granting a pension to Royal L. Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2548) for the relief of the Lake Chelan reclamation district; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2549) for the relief of John W. Knox; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 2550) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Marlow, Okla.;

A bill (S. 2551) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Anadarko, Okla.; and

A bill (S. 2552) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Duncan, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2553) granting a pension to Sarah Beers; and

A bill (S. 2554) granting a pension to Miriam C. Buck; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2555) to amend a part of section 1 of the act of May 27, 1908, chapter 200, as amended (sec. 592, title 28, U. S. Code); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRIS (by request):

A bill (S. 2556) to establish a hospital for defective delinquents;

A bill (S. 2557) establishing two institutions for the confinement of United States prisoners;

A bill (S. 2558) to amend an act providing for the parole of United States prisoners approved June 25, 1910, as amended;

A bill (S. 2559) to provide for the diversification of employment of Federal prisoners, for their training and schooling in trades and occupations, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2560) to reorganize the administration of Federal prisons; to authorize the Attorney General to contract for the care of United States prisoners; to establish Federal jails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 2561) to authorize the creation of Indian trust estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLEASE:

A bill (S. 2562) for the relief of Celena McHugh and of Joyce McHugh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 2563) for the relief of Porter Bros. & Biffle and certain other citizens; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2564) granting the consent and authority of Congress to the States of Texas and Oklahoma, and the counties of Cooke and Love, respectively, in said States, to construct, maintain, and operate free highway bridges between said States across Red River, ratifying the agreement of said States to construct the same;

A bill (S. 2565) granting the consent and authority of Congress to the States of Texas and Oklahoma, and the counties of Grayson and Bryan, respectively, in said States, to construct, maintain, and operate free highway bridges between said States across Red River, ratifying the agreement of said States to construct the same; and

A bill (S. 2566) granting the consent and authority of the Congress to the States of Texas and Oklahoma and the counties of Montague and Jefferson, respectively, in said States, to construct, maintain, and operate free highway bridges between said States across Red River, ratifying the agreement of said States to construct the same; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 2567) granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection who were discharged in the Philippines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2568) to authorize the erection of a Veterans' Bureau hospital in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2569) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Shipman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2570) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Grider (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2571) granting a pension to Susan Dill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2572) granting an increase of pension to Katherine E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2573) to provide for the appointment of Maurice D. Loewenthal as a warrant officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2574) to provide for the acquisition of certain sites and the construction thereon of a Federal courthouse and



United States post-office building, respectively, in the city of New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 2575) for the relief of Justin W. Lane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2576) granting a pension to Eva Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2577) for the relief of A. C. Elmore;

A bill (S. 2578) for the relief of John T. Lennon and George T. Flora;

A bill (S. 2579) for the relief of Johnson & Higgins;

A bill (S. 2580) for the relief of Ralph Rhees;

A bill (S. 2581) for the relief of Madrigal & Co., Manila, P. I.;

A bill (S. 2582) for the relief of Juan Francisco Rivas (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2583) for the relief of the Baltimore branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) to correct section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1926; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### RELIEF OF FARMERS IN AREA OVERFLOWED BY RIO GRANDE

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico last summer was the scene of the most extensive flood that had taken place there in a century. About 8,000 people lost their homes, farm machinery was carried down in the flood, and they have nothing with which to carry on their farming activities. They have no means of making a living, and at the present time are dependent largely upon the charity of the Red Cross and other similar organizations. On yesterday the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry authorized a unanimous report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 73) for the relief of farmers in the area overflowed by the Rio Grande River in the State of New Mexico, and it was reported to the Senate by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have no objection if it does not lead to any debate. If it can be passed without debate, I shall have no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is a meritorious measure and ought to pass.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] if this matter is on all fours with the appeal I made to the Senate last year for the relief of certain onion growers in the State of New York whose properties were destroyed by flood?

Mr. McNARY. I do not know whether it is on all fours or not. It occupies a little different position. It is quite as meritorious. Here is a case where the homes of the inhabitants of the little valley were wiped out, their property, their livestock, and machinery destroyed. Attempts are being made to rehabilitate them by the lending of money, as has been the practice of the Congress in years past in the relief of many citizens of various States who have suffered a like calamity.

Mr. COPELAND. What happened to the appeal I made for the relief of the citizens of my State?

Mr. McNARY. I supposed it was so deeply impressed upon the distinguished Senator from New York that he would know.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, yes; I know that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate made a favorable report and the measure passed the Senate, but was defeated in the House.

Mr. McNARY. It brought to me a great deal of discomfort; but we are not at all responsible for the action of the House, as the Senator knows.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah interpose an objection?

Mr. SMOOT. No, if we can have action upon the joint resolution without further debate.

Mr. COPELAND. So far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to vote for the measure. I was anxious to relieve the citizens of my State, but was defeated in my purpose. If the Senators from New Mexico can be fortunate enough to relieve those of their State I shall be glad.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, lines 7 and 8, to strike out the

words "seeds of cotton, tobacco, corn, nursery stock, and vegetable crops" and insert the words "suitable seeds for planting"; in line 9, to strike out the words "of fertilizer"; on page 2, line 1, to strike out the word "fertilizer"; and in line 6, to strike out the words "or fertilizer," so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to make advances or loans to farmers and fruit growers in the area overflowed in August, 1929, and again in September, 1929, by the Rio Grande River in the State of New Mexico, for the purchase of suitable seeds for planting, of feed for work stock, and of farm machinery and tools, and for the purchase of materials and the employment of labor for the replacement of damaged or destroyed irrigation ditches, and, when necessary, to procure such seed, feed, machinery, tools, and materials and sell the same to the farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this act shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. No advance or loan under this resolution shall exceed \$1,000 to any one person. All such advances or loans shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate. For carrying out the purposes of this resolution, including all expenses and charges in so doing, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$400,000, to be immediately available. Any person who shall knowingly make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance or loan under this resolution shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution for the emergency relief of flood sufferers in the area overflowed by the Rio Grande River in the State of New Mexico."

#### FREE TEXTBOOKS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I notice in the Washington Post of this morning the following headline:

Citizen units urge gratis textbooks. School board budget hearing marked by Ballou talk on situation. Expansion plans told.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] a few months ago had a bill pending in the Senate to provide free textbooks to the poor children of the District of Columbia. I offered an amendment to that bill providing that no textbook should be used in the District of Columbia that contained anything contrary to the American principle of the separation of church and state. The measure went over on that calendar day. I afterwards went to the Senator from Kansas and told him that I would not insist upon my amendment to his bill, that, so far as I was concerned, he might get his bill up and have it passed, and that I would seek to have my amendment passed as a separate measure. On two or three different occasions various people in the District of Columbia have published articles to the effect that I defeated the bill of the Senator from Kansas. It is not true. I am in favor of that measure. I should like to see the children of the District of Columbia have free school books.

#### SENATOR CAPPER'S ADDRESS BEFORE OLDEST INHABITANTS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have here an account of the meeting of the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia on last Saturday evening in which is incorporated a speech made by our colleague the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and also a brief address by the president of the association, Theodore W. Noyes. I ask that these addresses may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., December 8, 1929]

#### VOTE FOR DISTRICT URGED BY CAPPER BEFORE CITIZENS—KANSAN TELLS ASSOCIATION OF OLDEST INHABITANTS OF CAPITAL PROBLEMS

With national representation for the District of Columbia ringing as a keynote to a gathering of distinguished civic leaders last night at the annual banquet of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants at the Raleigh Hotel, Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, chairman of the Senate District Committee, laid down a comprehensive development program for Washington which he predicted would make "Washington in every sense the model and inspiration for the other cities of the United States."

Senator CAPPER hoped for passage this session of the Jones resolution providing national representation for this city. He was backed in this by an array of civic leaders from outstanding trade and citizens' organizations, most of whom saw votes for the District in the near future. The District Commissioners envisioned a new and greater Washington in the building.

Theodore W. Noyes, president of the association, as toastmaster, called upon local organizations for unity of effort in promoting the city, in obtaining national representation, and predicted that with such unity, "the greater Washington of which we dream will be made a reality, not only the city beautiful (in the development of which fine national leadership with local cooperation is bringing about glorious results) but the Americanized city, the city healthful, the city intellectual, and the city good, the city of its people as well as the material, wonder city of the Nation."

#### CAPPER ASKS ENFORCEMENT

Senator CAPPER struck forceful blows for law enforcement and strongly supported higher pay for both the police and fire departments. He went intensively into a great number of problems facing the District.

In short, he favored regulation of dangerous weapons; early consummation of the school-building program; elimination of "death traps" at grade crossings; elimination of commercial fraud; better control of the real estate and insurance business of the city; a new solution of the transportation question with "some unified merged way out"; co-ordinated control of traffic; building program; a new center market; municipal airport; expansion of library facilities, and abatement of the smoke nuisance.

Proctor L. Dougherty, chairman of the Board of District Commissioners, pointed to the greatest budget in the history of this city, now before Congress for 1931, as evidence that "we can report progress in the District of Columbia."

The increase of \$4,183,000 of the budget over the appropriations for the present fiscal year, Commissioner Dougherty explained, "was largely made possible by the interest shown by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House in obtaining money for the Municipal Center and some additional items."

#### WILL ACCOMPLISH MUCH

"If the present Congress allows appropriations substantially as presented for the fiscal year 1931," said the commissioner, "Washington will obtain in the near future the accomplishment of several things of great importance."

Commissioner Sidney F. Talliaferro predicted Washington would "endure as long as civilized nations inherit this earth."

Commissioner William B. Ladue declared the municipal authorities were working hard to give a "good, clean, honest business government" for this city to protect the public health, safety and public welfare in line with the great traditions of America.

The text of Senator CAPPER's speech follows:

"It is with genuine pleasure that I greet you to-night on your sixty-fourth birthday anniversary. May you gather at this board for birthday dinners for many years to come! And may those years be happy and prosperous for you all!"

"Your president, Mr. Noyes, tells me that the average age of your membership is over seventy, and that one of you has passed the century mark. I can only say that I can scarcely believe it. You are not at all the patriarchs of common tradition.

"So many city patriarchs are accustomed to spend their time only in living over the days of the past. But I happen to know that you are interested in the present. There is about you an aura of alertness that betokens your lively sympathy with your city's progress. And it is better so. We need seasoned minds to study the problems of a great community such as Washington. Besides, by your active participation in civic affairs, you set a good example for younger generations.

"By your fine exemplification of true civic spirit you have rendered a signal service to the District. Under the oppressive burden of votelessness, you have not faltered in your duty to the Nation and to your city. I wonder if others would have found taxation without representation too heavy a handicap? Would they have felt they should not work for a community inasmuch as they had no voice in the government? I do not know. I know only that you have done your share by impressing upon the national consciousness your slogan of 'Financial equity and political equity for the Washingtonian.'

"It is my fervent hope that this current session of Congress will see full justice done to the voteless District of Columbia. I hope for the adoption of the resolution introduced by my colleague, Senator WESLEY JONES, providing national representation for the District. I believe that great benefits will accrue to this city and to the Nation as a whole by granting the people of the District a voice in their National Government.

"You hear it said that Washington has gone far without the vote. You hear that 'well enough should be let alone.' The latter is sheer sophistry. With the first argument I am willing to agree to a certain extent. I will agree that Washington, although voteless, has made remarkable progress in its 129 years as the seat of National Government.

"Tiber Creek is now but a figment of local history. There is no more shooting of ducks in the ugly and unhealthy swamp which now is part of the Mall. The infamous mud and dust of Pennsylvania Avenue no longer vexes paraders. And I am sure that some of you will have difficulty in remembering Washington's Birthday in 1871, when President Grant opened the famous \$1,000,000 wood-block pavement from the Capitol to the Treasury.

"Where are the tumbledown shacks and tottering taverns of ancient Washington? And where the farm lands of Mount Pleasant, Columbia Heights, and Woodridge?

"It is true, indeed, that the city has grown great. But in spite of disfranchisement, not because of it. The fact that Washington has prospered is no excuse for withholding from 600,000 people the most sacred right of an American citizen.

"You have frequently heard visitors say, 'Washington is perfect! What more could you want?'

"The answer is that we want a great deal more. For it is not sufficient that we study the city's requirements through the wonder-filled eyes of the tourist. When we look backward Washington's present glory seems dazzlingly bright. But we must look ahead. We should plan for the future Washington.

"So let us consider some of the city's immediate pressing needs. Congress will be asked to legislate upon a number of these during the present session.

"First and foremost I place the paramount problem of law enforcement. A few days ago, in his message to Congress, President Hoover made this assertion: 'The District of Columbia should be the model of city law enforcement in the Nation.'

"I am with the President, heart and soul, in that sentiment. You may build the finest city in the world, but if its laws are not properly administered, that city is doomed. Its beautiful buildings are besmirched by evil associations, its commerce is undermined, and its citizens are diverted from good endeavors.

"Good laws, well observed and enforced, are the lifeblood of a city. If they are not enforced by those who are sworn to carry out their provisions, we may look for a general disrespect for law. Since President Hoover delivered his message, the eyes of the Nation are upon the District of Columbia. The good name of Washington is at stake. And at this time of crisis, every good citizen of the Nation's Capital should pledge anew his loyalty to the Constitution and to the laws of our country.

"But what has brought about a condition in the District which calls for comment by the President of the United States? The answer lies in this additional excerpt from the President's message to Congress: 'While conditions here are much better than in many other cities, they are far from perfect, and this is due in part to the congestion of criminal cases in the Supreme Court of the District, resulting in long delays.'

"That is tragically true. Procrastination is the worst enemy of justice. At the present time the District Supreme Court is years behind in its work. Justice is thwarted by long delays between indictment and trial. Habitual criminals, at liberty under bond, walk the streets and continue their nefarious pursuits, while other persons lie in the District jail for months before they are given an opportunity to stand before a jury in open court and prove their innocence.

"The congested dockets must be cleared. Our only means to this end is an increase in the facilities of the District Supreme Court. Two additional justices are needed. I have introduced a bill to meet that need. With this assistance, which I am confident Congress will vote at this session, the courts soon will catch up with their work.

"But there is another phase of law enforcement in the District. This is the necessity for cooperation between the police and the prohibition unit in the enforcement of the national prohibition act. Legislation is needed to develop the desired harmony of action between the District and Federal officers.

"It is imperative to the interests of the city and to the self-respect of our Nation that the District be provided with a clear, definite law governing the enforcement of prohibition. President Hoover saw the need for this when he wrote in his message:

"There is need for legislation in the District supplementing the national prohibition act, more sharply defining and enlarging the duties and powers of the District Commissioners and the police of the District, and opening the way for better cooperation in the enforcement of prohibition between the District officials and the prohibition officers of the Federal Government."

"That is a clean-cut statement of the present situation. Under present conditions, there exists considerable doubt as to the extent of participation of the District government in the enforcement program. This has engendered an undesirable feeling of lack of authority over prohibition matters in the police department, from the highest official down. A law such as President Hoover recommends will give our enforcement agencies, local and national, confidence in their respective positions. This law should be on the books before the close of the present session.

"I have given you, in these remarks, the merest outline of the most serious problem facing the District to-day. But if I dwell upon the



subject for hours, I could make no more important appeal than this: That the greatest task before American citizens to-day is to educate themselves to respect the mandates of their Constitution and their Nation's laws. They must endeavor diligently to see that the Constitution is implicitly observed and the laws enforced impartially and honestly.

"Every citizen must arouse himself to the crying need of this time to honor and abide by the laws of this Republic. There is no man in high position, and there is none so humble, who can afford to be recreant to his duty as an American citizen.

"The President looks to the District to defend its fair name, and to justify its unblemished reputation, in the face of bitter attacks upon the administration of laws in the Nation's Capital. Congress must help the District by giving to enforcement agencies the legal aid they now lack.

"Now, let us consider our police department. This is our first line of defense against the enemies of decent society. It must present a united front to the forces of crime. There must be no break in the line. It must not be weakened by inefficiency or disloyalty.

"We need men of high order of intelligence and integrity to hold this line against crime. We must get them.

"Severe criticism has been made of the local police. Some of it probably is justified. However, when the various complaints are examined, it is generally discovered that they are directed not against the police department as a unit but against certain individuals. If these men have been lacking in efficiency, honesty, or proper respect for the public's rights, they do not belong in the police department.

"We must attract more high-grade men to the police service. We must weed out the morally unfit. But how can we obtain the men we want?

"One can not persuade them to leave more lucrative positions for low police pay and the hazards of police work. At the present scale of pay the department must take such men as it may obtain or go without.

"I think we have the remedy to this condition in a bill to increase the pay of members and officers in the police and fire departments. Nor am I alone in this belief. Prominent Washingtonians, representing a great number of good citizens, suggested this bill to me.

"The proposed legislation would allow privates in both departments a maximum annual salary of \$2,400. The present maximum is \$2,100. I do not think \$2,400 is too much to pay a man whose five years of conscientious service have proved his ability to defend the lives and property of the people.

"The city of New York last month voted to give its policemen a minimum of \$3,000 a year. That is for privates. It is more than our own police and fire captains get.

"Washington has no cause to be proud of the fact that she stands sixty-fifth in a list of American cities in the matter of police and fire pay. Ten years ago this city stood fourth on the list. We have not kept pace with the times. It is time we did so.

"I believe the great majority of our policemen and firemen are gallant, courageous, and honorable men. I believe that under proper direction our police department can be made a model for the country. But we must pay the men fairly.

"One other legislative measure which seems to me really vital to the enforcement of law in the District is a bill to regulate rigidly the sale of deadly weapons. I should like to see such a bill enacted at this session. The authorities should make it exceedingly difficult for criminals to obtain instruments for the commission of crimes of violence.

"Next to adequate law enforcement, I think the most important subject of local legislation pertains to our public schools. We have made splendid progress with our educational system. But in this field, also, much remains to be done.

"No true Washingtonian can be proud of the 72 portable school buildings which are still in operation. These dangerous, unhealthy structures would not be tolerated in another city. Nor do we take pride in the numerous obsolete buildings, crowded and unsafe, which should have been abandoned years ago.

"At this session Congress should make provision for completion of the 5-year school-building program. This will give every Washington child a seat and full-time instruction in new, modern, sanitary school-houses.

"I believe Congress soon will enact into law the bill providing free textbooks and educational supplies for pupils of the senior and junior high schools. This legislation is needed to lift an unjust burden of expense from parents.

"The passage of the bill for an elective Board of Education would advance school progress in Washington considerably, I believe. Certainly the people of Washington are capable of selecting the men and women best fitted to administer the affairs of the schools.

"Just a word about a very commendable project in the schools. I refer to the special classes for crippled children in the Weightman and Magruder Schools. Considerable praise is due the Kiwanis Club of Washington for promoting this splendid work. School authorities should see to it that the classes are maintained at a high standard, with all necessary equipment for this special purpose.

"Regarding the schools and the District generally, one of the most encouraging signs is the change of policy on the part of the Bureau of the Budget in sending to Congress a total amount more nearly commensurate to local needs than was the practice in the past.

"The 1931 Budget, amounting to almost \$48,000,000, is the largest in the history of the District. I am sure that every Washingtonian will rejoice in the recommendation that \$2,710,000 be expended for the construction of new schools, to do away with portables, and \$300,700 for sites.

"The Budget also provides a generous appropriation for additional medical and dental assistance in the schools. It is good to note that the school authorities have at heart the physical well-being of the children and are advancing their health program so successfully.

"We see also that the Budget makes provision for the elimination of two great menaces to public safety. These are the grade crossings at Chestnut Street and at Michigan Avenue. Congress should not fail to carry out the wishes of the District in this matter. Furthermore, I would like to see Congress provide at this session for the removal of the two other grade crossings in the District, located at Bates Road and at Charles Street. These death traps imperil lives. They should be done away with, either by viaducts or underpasses, without delay.

"Now, let us look into another vital phase of the legislative situation. This concerns public protection of a different nature. It is the combat against commercial fraud and business trickery, present and potential.

"Our subcommittee on insurance and banks, headed by Senator BLAINE, has before it a number of bills designed to safeguard the public against impositions upon its faith.

"Among these is a measure to regulate the sale of securities in the District. This is the so-called 'blue sky' bill.

"When we read the statement by the Better Business Bureau of Washington that stock swindlers secure \$1,000,000 from this city every year, the need for such a law is readily seen. All good citizens must fight this appalling diversion of the people's money from legitimate business into illicit channels, from which investors can not hope to reap a cent of return.

"There is also before the subcommittee a bill to govern the real-estate business here. Experience has shown that we need a law of this nature.

"Another bill would provide an insurance code for the District. This is expected to place the insurance business on a high ethical plane, and to keep out of the city undesirable companies and individuals. Still another bill promotes the protection of persons holding industrial insurance policies.

"These bills are deeply in the public interest, and I hope favorable action will be had on them at this session. No city is truly clean unless its business is clean. It is our duty to stamp out swindlers and outlaw unethical commercial practices in Washington.

"Transportation: This is one of our most difficult problems. With a constantly increasing population in a more slowly expanding area, the situation has become acute. The District should have better street-car and bus service. This should be accomplished without increase of fare, under the economies possible by unified, merged management of the traction companies.

"The Public Utilities Commission may suggest an answer to the merger question, in order that Congress may take definite action soon.

"The steady increase in automotive traffic has resulted in a condition that requires consideration. The subcommittee on traffic, of which Senator HASTINGS is chairman, has been making a study of the situation.

"One of the many interesting facts developed at the subcommittee hearings is that there exists in Washington no real centralized control of District traffic. The regulatory power is diffused among several Federal and local agencies. The members of the subcommittee agree with the traffic authorities of the District government that the remedy for this condition is coordinated control of traffic.

"If this coordination of authority were in effect to-day, there would be less concern about the lack of provision for parking and storage of automobiles in the Federal building group in the Mall. The Hastings subcommittee probably will make recommendations looking toward a marked alleviation of this and other traffic matters.

"As regards the Mall development, I know that you have read with pleasure that plans are in progress to spend \$15,000,000 a year on additional public-building projects in this city until a total of \$115,000,000 shall have been expended. The congressional committees on public buildings and grounds are in charge of this.

"Every one interested in the beautification of Washington will watch the progress of this legislation with keen interest.

"It is scarcely necessary to assure you that I welcome every proposal to maintain and augment the beauties of the Nation's Capital. I want to see Washington the most beautiful capital city in the world. Nothing less will satisfy me.

"There remain a few streets and sections where Washington's magnificence ends and eyesores begin. Fortunately, existing legislation

eventually will wipe out some of these miserable, squalid spots. Others must be abolished by future action of Congress.

"In this connection it may be noted that the District Committee has before it a bill which should be passed. It provides for the discontinuance of alley dwellings in Washington. This legislation is desirable from many standpoints and is generally supported.

"In the path of Washington's progress there lie several old landmarks. We regret to see them fall before the wrecker's hammer. But they must give way to greater plans. I know that many of you deplore the passing of Center Market.

"Washington has a real affection for this building. It is to be razed to provide a site for the new Department of Justice Building.

"But its demolition will be more orderly than the removal of the old North Liberties Market, which, as many of you may recall, was located where the Public Library now stands.

"In a most interesting book, *Washington, Past and Present*, by Charles Moore, chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, there is a good-natured account of the way in which Governor Shepherd tore down the North Liberties Market:

"He invited the judges of the court to a clambake down the river, beyond the power of injunction," Mr. Moore writes. "Then his men tore down the offending structures. It was not until a quarter of a century later that Congress settled the last bills for the demolition."

"These were irregular methods, but Governor Shepherd in his zeal for beautifying Washington was not one to shrink from taking the bull by the horns, if I read local history aright.

"But we are proceeding in a more orderly manner to-day. Full notice has been given that Center Market is to go. I must confess that I was rather surprised at the apparent indifference of the public when this fact first became known. A modern municipal retail market, it seems to me, is a valuable institution in any community.

"I am glad that a number of citizens' associations, the Federation of Women's Clubs, and other organizations are taking up the fight for a new market. I have received a great many letters on the subject.

"It is necessary that Center Market be replaced by a modern market building, conveniently located. Congress should provide the required legislation at this session.

"Another District improvement which I strongly favor is an airport. It is vital to the future of Washington. The Joint Congressional Commission on Airports held hearings on the subject last spring. This commission expects to make final recommendations next April. Congress should take some specific action on this matter before the close of the session.

"I am wholeheartedly committed to the movement for expansion of public library facilities and for the acquisition and development of public parks and playgrounds. Furthermore, in certain sections of Washington sanitary facilities are lacking. These should be attended to without delay. The street construction and maintenance program should be kept up to date by generous appropriations, as some of our streets are in deplorable condition.

"The regulations against excessive smoke should be rigidly enforced, and if additional legislation on this subject is needed it should be provided.

"I have outlined here, somewhat sketchily, some of the District's outstanding needs. Many of these are provided for in bills now pending before various committees of Congress, notably the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. Others will be cared for in bills yet to be introduced.

"On the whole, I feel that the District may look forward to a highly beneficial session of Congress. It is my desire that when the work of this session is completed we shall find enacted into law many provisions which will contribute to the greatness, the cleanliness, and the beauty of our Nation's Capital.

"Whether or not Congress does its full duty by the National Capital, I know that you, the oldest inhabitants of the most national city in America, will continue your good work for Washington and for the Nation. And in closing I wish to assure you again that I am with you, heart and soul, in your aspirations to make Washington in every sense the model and inspiration for the other cities of the United States. And may Washington always have with it and for it the oldest inhabitants, old in years but young in spirit and viewpoint, looking always to a better future built upon the foundation of a glorious past."

#### MR. NOYES'S ADDRESS—PRESIDENT OUTLINES AIMS OF THE SOCIETY

The annual address of Theodore W. Noyes, president of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, delivered at the meeting of the association last night, follows:

"Nothing pertaining to Washington is foreign to the oldest inhabitant. But he is primarily interested in the animate as distinguished from the inanimate city, in the men and women of the Capital rather than its buildings and avenues, its parks and monuments. For himself, he delights in reminiscence, to live again in the past; for his children and grandchildren his deep concern is for the future.

"The inanimate Washington is now in process of wonderful development. The animate city claims for itself and its welfare a like measure of enthusiastic devotion.

"The Oldest Inhabitants fight to secure for the men, women, and children of Washington—

"1. Political equity, national representation, voting representation in Congress and the Electoral College. When the power involved in this vital right is won the campaign for financial equity and for the satisfaction of every other wholesome need of the District will be wonderfully strengthened.

"2. Financial equity. When a taxing body has, in violation of American principle, no representation in it of the taxed, fair play demands from the alien tax gatherers special sympathetic consideration of the wishes and welfare of the unrepresented taxed. When Congress in fiscal relations with the District obeys the injunction 'put yourself in his place,' and when there is reciprocity in forbearance, in regard, and in good will between Congress and the people of the District, financial equity prevails.

"3. The Washingtonian needs access on equal terms with other Americans to the Federal courts; the same right to sue in a Federal court as that enjoyed by the citizen of a State. In this respect he is now, the United States Supreme Court has said, on a lower plane than aliens.

"4. The Washingtonian needs access for his sons and daughters to local means of self-support that they may not be exiled in order to live. The establishment of light and clean manufactures, like those of Paris and Vienna, and the development of local trade, wholesale and retail, must be encouraged. Then repeal or amend, in the interest of the District, the apportionment of offices law so that the youth of Washington, if the most meritorious of all applicants, may have ready access to the Government departments and workshops which for Washington take the place of iron mills in Pittsburgh and the cotton, woolen, and shoe factories of many New England cities. Congress, by its policy of discouraging commerce and manufactures at the Capital, excludes all other great factories and workshops than its own, and then by the apportionment of offices law (a relic of the old spoils system, distributing offices like bandits' plunder among the States in proportion to their strength) shuts out the growing youth of the city from the classified service and from access to the only local means of self-support of this kind which it permits to exist. In the Nation's city national workshops are local. Washington is the only community in the world where employment of the local youth in the local workshop instead of being encouraged is prohibited; where the young man must go abroad in order to become eligible for employment at home.

"During the World War the apportionment of offices law was exposed in all its unbusinesslike, hurtful inefficiency. In order that the National Government might function quickly and effectively to meet the requirements of the business of war making, the hampering apportionment of offices law was evaded, ignored, or suspended. Under a true merit system the Government should be able to use to do the Nation's work, whether in war or peace, the best fitted of American applicants, irrespective of the State or Territory or section from which they hail. As an integral part of the system of business efficiency to which the new administration is sincerely committed, the apportionment of offices law should be repealed as unsound in principle and hurtful in practice.

"5. The Washingtonian needs relief from defamation against which he is helpless if it comes from the immune zone on Capitol Hill. He needs continued and ungrudging recognition by the Nation and by Congress of his public-spirited services as a Capital builder, as a contributor in land and money, as a taxpayer and otherwise to the city's development, and at times he needs relief from undeserved slander upon his public spirit and integrity and from baseless slurs upon him as a mendicant. He is entitled to his good name.

"6. Unity of effort in respect to essentials is an obvious outstanding need in the development of the National Capital. Assembled here tonight as guests or hosts are representatives from the great civic organizations which have cooperated in citizens' joint committees to fight harmoniously and effectively for both financial and political equity. Unity of effort as exemplified by these cooperating organizations must be extended to apply to other essential needs of Washington.

"With this unity of effort on the part of Washingtonians the Greater Washington of which we dream will be made a reality, not only the city beautiful (in the development of which fine national leadership with local cooperation is bringing about glorious results), but the Americanized city, the city healthful, the city intellectual, and the city good; the city of its people as well as the material wonder city of the Nation."

#### COLONEL ALSTON'S ADDRESS ON CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1787

MR. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record an address appearing in the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., of December 6, on the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The address was delivered December 5 before the Jacksonville Bar Association by Col. R. C. Alston, a distinguished attorney of Atlanta, Ga. It is very instructive.



There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., Friday, December 6, 1929]

COL. R. C. ALSTON, NOTED GEORGIA ATTORNEY, TELLS BAR GATHERING OF FORMING OF CONSTITUTION

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Jacksonville Bar Association: It is a very great pleasure to address the members of the bar of this important city. My admiration for the far-sighted courage of those who have built and who are building this metropolis of the South is very sincere.

Recently I had the pleasure of traveling over a substantial part of the great expanse of some of our western country; and wondered at its almost endless immensity. I stood on the summit of one of its loftiest mountains and was thrilled with the awesome grandeur of the works of nature mingled with those of man. I was lost in the contemplation of the grandeur of our country. Then the thought came that the people who make this Nation and who live amidst her grandeurs were called upon to turn the tide of the world's greatest war, and that it was her immense store of resources, her power to marshal her might, the greatest numbers of men she could put under arms and their fearless determination to keep our flag the emblem of all that courage and bravery demand, which did turn the tide of the fearful conflict in favor of civilization.

I then asked myself, as you have many times asked yourselves:

"What is it that holds this great country together?"

What is it that enables our Nation to preserve the liberty of its people and at the same time marshal its own great might to the end that all the peoples of the world may go free?

The answer is, the Constitution formed in the convention of 1787 and molded throughout the years.

The Constitution of the United States is the greatest document in the history of the American people. It may very well be that it is the greatest in the annals of mankind.

Mr. Gladstone said of it:

"As the British Constitution is the most subtle organism which has proceeded from progressive history, so the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

It is not the purpose of this address to tell you things anew, but to bring to your recollection some account of the times and of the circumstances in which this great work was accomplished, to the end that we may not forget those days nor the men who labored that our country might live; and further to the end that we may resolve anew to preserve it to our people and to all the peoples of the world.

The convention was brought together by the lack of power in the Government of the Confederation to legislate and to enforce such authority as it possessed; also because of State legislation unjust alike to their citizens and to those of neighboring States, such as laws staying the processes of the courts, making property a tender in payment of debts, issuing paper money, interfering with foreclosure of mortgages, imposing commercial restrictions on goods and citizens of other States.

The Articles of Confederation provided a government consisting of a single house; equal representation of the States therein; having no executive and no adequate courts, no power to tax, nor to raise troops, nor to regulate commerce, nor to enforce its own laws or treaties.

Each State had the power to tax and make its own money, to impose its own import and export duties, and to conform or not, as it chose, to the acts or treaties of Congress, or to its requisitions for money or troops. "Congress could only supplicate; it could not enforce." (Warren.)

The conditions were very desperate, and General Washington wrote in 1787:

"I do not conceive we can exist long as a nation without having lodged somewhere a power which will pervade the whole union in as energetic a manner as the authority of the State government extends over the several States. \* \* \* If you tell the legislatures they have violated the treaty of peace and invaded the prerogatives of the confederacy, they will laugh in your face."

There was much discussion of a division of the country into three confederacies—eastern, middle, and southern.

The eastern confederacy would have included the New England States and New York; the middle confederacy, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland; the southern, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Shay's rebellion—between September, 1786, and February, 1787—was the cause of further and very deep alarm in Massachusetts and the New England States. A great proportion of the people were in debt and were "interested in promoting measures directly opposed to good government." (Carrington to Jefferson, April 24, 1787.)

Washington had written to Knox that "It is among the evils, and perhaps is not the smallest, of democratic governments, that the people must always feel before they will see."

Truly the situation in which the convention was assembled in May, 1787, was desperate. The people were "feeling" the effect of their impotent government, but they were not yet "seeing" the remedy.

The authors of The Rise of American Civilization have undertaken to minimize the desperation in which the country found itself during the period between the definite treaty of peace with Great Britain in 1783 and the meeting of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. They put themselves out of line in this respect with all other authorities which have come to my attention.

The first suggestion of a "continental convention" was made by Peletiah Webster in May, 1781. Mr. Webster was a retired merchant who on February 16, 1783, issued a pamphlet proposing a government very much of the kind we now have. (Taylor, p. 26.) At a meeting at Mount Vernon, General Washington proposed extending the navigation of the Potomac River by canal and otherwise, and it became necessary for the States of Virginia and Maryland to act in concert. Early in 1785 a committee of the two States met at Mount Vernon. A compact was prepared, but the plan contemplated the connection of the head waters of the Potomac with those of the Ohio, and it was found necessary to invite Pennsylvania to become a party to it. It then became desirable that there should be an agreement upon a uniform system of duties and commercial regulation and upon currency. The Legislature of Maryland adopted the agreement. Virginia, after hesitation, adopted it. Then it developed that it was necessary to have other States in conference, and the result was that the Virginia Legislature invited commissioners from all the States to meet at Annapolis on the first Monday in September, 1786. (Fiske.) And commissioners from Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey met. This representation was not sufficient.

On the motion of Alexander Hamilton a resolution was adopted calling for another convention to be held in Philadelphia the following year. This resolution recommended a "revision" of the Articles of Confederation, but the revision was to be sufficient to make those articles "adequate to the exigencies of the Union." The Continental Congress, clinging to the shadow of its authority, refused to issue a call for that convention or to recognize the call which was made. Finally, on the 21st of January, 1787, the Congress did adopt a resolution declaring that:

"It is expedient that on the second Monday in May next a convention of delegates who shall have been appointed by the several States be held at Philadelphia for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures such alterations and provisions therein as shall, when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the States, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of government and the preservation of the Union."

The States, except Rhode Island, which was never represented in the convention, rather greedily accepted the invitation to send delegates to this second convention. Most of the States expressly limited their delegation to a revision of the Articles of Confederation.

On the second Monday in May, 1787, some of the delegates assembled, but not enough to make a quorum. State delegates from nine States having arrived, the convention was organized on the 25th day of May, 1787, in the hall in which the Declaration of Independence had been adopted. By common consent George Washington was elected President. Thus the great hand and mind which had been the stay of the people during the long War of the Revolution was again to be the bulwark of the country and save it from an anarchy with results more disastrous than we can now imagine. There seems to be no event in the life of Washington which does not more and more entitle him to the renown which time has given to him and which by common consent makes him our first citizen, and in all probability the first citizen of the world.

The authorities universally describe the membership of this convention as being of extraordinary quality. Jefferson was then the minister of this country to France. Upon being informed of the membership of the convention he said that it was truly composed of "demigods."

Chief Justice Fuller in the Pollock case in the One hundred and fifty-seventh United States Reports said of the membership:

"We must remember that the 55 Members of the Constitutional Convention were men of great sagacity, fully conversant with the Government's problems, deeply conscious of the nature of their task, and profoundly convinced that they were laying the foundation of a vast Empire."

The delegates were conversant with the American experience in the formation of government. This experience had lasted for a period of 200 years. It began with the charter granted in 1584 to Sir Walter Raleigh, which authorized him to discover and settle heathen lands; it gave to him and his heirs and assigns the title to any lands they might settle; and for a period of six years he was given "full power and authority to correct, punish, pardon, govern, and rule" the people who should come to him or who should live within 200 leagues of him. His powers were absolute, but his laws were to conform "as near as conveniently may be" to the laws of England.

The English Crown had granted 29 charters to the American Colonies, down to and including the Georgia charter of 1732.

There had been many efforts to unify the Colonies. The earliest was the confederation of the New England Colonies in 1643. This included Massachusetts, New Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven. Rhode

Island was even then too much disliked to be invited into the plan. That government was intended to be perpetual; it lasted 25 years.

In 1696-97 William Penn had drawn up and submitted to the lords of trade and plantations a plan for another union of all the Colonies.

In 1701 Robert Livingston, of New York, had proposed "three governments—one composed of Virginia, Maryland, and North and South Carolina; a second, of a part of Connecticut, New York, the Jerseys, Pennsylvania, and Delaware; and a third, of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and the rest of Connecticut."

In 1721 the Earl of Stair proposed a plan for including not only the English Colonies on the American Continent but the West Indies as well.

In 1754 there was a convention at Albany for the purpose of forming a union, and this in the beginning had the assent of the lords of trade. Benjamin Franklin proposed a plan of union which was adopted. It was unacceptable to the States because of the powers granted to the general government. It was objected to by the lords of trade because it was too democratic.

The Continental Congress assembled in 1774 was a government created out of necessity and by tacit consent. Almost immediately after its creation it began to consider plans for a union of the Colonies, and this resulted in the Articles of Confederation. Although the consideration of the plans for this union began in 1774, it was not finally ratified until March 1, 1781.

In 1775 the Continental Congress recommended to the States that they adopt constitutions suitable to their new condition, and constitutions were adopted in all of the States except Rhode Island and Connecticut.

Thus in 1787 Americans had already had an extensive and varied experience in the formation of government.

The convention adopted and rigidly adhered to a rule of secrecy. It was understood by substantially all of the members that this rule applied, not only throughout the convention, but throughout the lives of its several members.

It was 53 years after the close of the convention that Madison's papers were published. He was no longer in life. By singular coincidence this man, who was in truth and in fact the father of the Constitution, was the last survivor of its membership. The people were long without adequate information as to the convention and as to the making of the Constitution. Much has been written on this subject in recent years, but almost nothing was written of that which happened inside of the convention hall for nearly 50 years after the convention adjourned.

The nine States which were represented on the 25th of May were Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. Georgia had only one delegate at the opening of the convention, William Few. Notes on the convention were made by several persons. These for the most part only dealt with special features of the convention. The journal kept by the secretary was singularly incomplete. Notes were kept by Robert Yates, chief justice of New York, who attended for only a short time, and by Rufus King—these are referred to as being next in importance to those of Mr. Madison—and by James McHenry, of Maryland, who was absent during June and July, and William Pierce, of Georgia. These were printed in 1928 and are specially valuable for their character sketches of his fellow members. Alexander Hamilton, Charles Coatsworth Pinckney, and George Mason also preserved memoranda; but the chief notes of the convention were made by Mr. Madison. He was present every day of the convention. He states that he was absent only the smallest fraction of an hour at any time.

The convention directed the secretary to "deposit the journal and other papers of the convention in the hands of the president." Thereupon General Washington desired to be instructed what to do with them, and was directed to "retain the journal and other papers subject to the order of Congress, if ever formed under the Constitution." General Washington delivered these papers to the Department of State in 1796. They were ordered printed in 1818. President Monroe requested Secretary of State John Quincy Adams to take charge of the publication of the journal. Jackson, secretary of the convention, called on Adams and looked over the papers, but he had no recollection of them which could remove the difficulties arising from their disorderly state, nor any papers to supply the deficiency of the missing papers.

The Virginia plan was presented to the convention on the 20th day of May by Mr. Edmund Randolph, who was Governor of Virginia. It is very likely that this plan was largely prepared by Mr. Madison. The members of the Virginia delegation were amongst the first to arrive in Philadelphia, and between the time of their arrival and the meeting of the convention these delegates met for the purpose of perfecting their plan. Mr. Pierce describes Mr. Randolph as follows:

"Mr. Randolph is Governor of Virginia, a young gentleman in whom unite all the accomplishments of the scholar and the statesman. He came forward with the postulates, or first principles, on which the convention acted, and he supported them with a force of eloquence and reasoning that did him great honor. He has a most harmonious voice, a fine person and striking manner. Mr. Randolph is about 32 years of age."

Notwithstanding the fact that Governor Randolph presented the Virginia plan, his name is not signed to the Constitution. He had been attorney general of Virginia and served in the Congress under the Articles of Confederation. This so-called Virginia plan was a series of 15 resolutions. The first dealt with the extent to which the Articles of Confederation should be amended.

The second sought to fix the right of suffrage in the National Legislature according to the quotas of contributions, or to the number of free inhabitants, as the one or the other rule may seem best in different cases.

The third sought to make the National Legislature consist of two branches.

The fourth, to fix the method of electing the members of the first branch. It is worth while here noting that this plan proposed that the members of the first branch should be subject to recall. The Members of Congress, under the Articles of Confederation, were subject to recall by their respective States.

The fifth proposed the election of the members of the second branch of the National Legislature by the members of the first out of their number.

The sixth empowered the National Legislature to enjoy the legislative rights vested in Congress by the confederation and moreover to legislate in all cases in which the separate States are incompetent, or in which the harmony of the United States might be interrupted by the exercise of individual legislation; to negative all laws passed by the several States contravening, in the opinion of the National Legislature, the Articles of the Union; and to call forth the force of the Union against any member of the Union failing to fulfill its duty under the articles thereof.

The seventh proposed a national executive, but not specifying whether it should consist of one or more persons, but to be elected by the National Legislature.

The eighth proposed that the National Executive and a convenient number of the national judiciary should compose a council of revision with authority to examine every act of the National Legislature before it should operate and every act of a particular legislature before a negative thereon shall be final; and that the dissent of said council shall amount to a rejection, unless the act of the National Legislature should be again passed or that of a particular legislature be again negatived by an unnamed number of the Members of each branch.

The ninth provided for a national judiciary.

The tenth, for new States; the eleventh, for guaranteeing a republican form of government to the States; the twelfth, for continuance of Congress until the Constitution is adopted; the thirteenth and fifteenth, for amendments; and the fourteenth required oaths to support the Articles of the Union.

On the same day Charles Pinckney presented a plan known as the South Carolina plan. It was referred to the committee of the whole, as was the Virginia plan. This plan had been framed by Mr. Pinckney before he left Charleston. It was not merely a set of independent resolutions. Its form was much more nearly that of a completed constitution. After the plan was referred to the committee "nothing more is recorded of it, except that on July 24 the Committee of the Whole was formally discharged from further consideration of it and it was referred to the committee on detail, which was appointed to draft a constitution upon the basis of the proceedings of the convention at that date." Mr. Pinckney's plan was confessedly before the committee on that date. There was no copy of this plan among the papers turned over to Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams appealed to Mr. Pinckney for a copy of the missing document. Mr. Pinckney replied and furnished the document, writing:

"I have already informed you I have several rough drafts of the Constitution I proposed and that they are substantially the same, differing only in words and the arrangement of the articles. At the distance of nearly 32 years it is impossible for me now to say which of the four or five drafts I have was the one, but inclosed I send you the one I believe was it. I repeat, however, that they are substantially the same, differing only in form and unessentials."

This draft is in a great many respects like the Constitution as it now exists, and the fact that it was not in the records seems to have put Mr. Pinckney under a suspicion of unfairness. This result was to some extent promoted by a guarded criticism appearing in Appendix No. 2 to Mr. Madison's papers as follows: "The length of the document laid before the convention, and other circumstances, having prevented the taking of a copy," etc. We thus, however, know from this veiled criticism that Pinckney presented a plan that was a lengthy one; that Mr. Madison did not take a copy of it.

It is not the purpose of this address to go into the details of the part which Mr. Pinckney took in the making of the constitution. Mr. Charles Warren, in his recent book, *The Making of the Constitution*, says (p. 803):

"In 1903 and 1904 the large part which Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, played in connection with the form and contents of the constitution was established on a firm historical foundation by Prof. J. Franklin Jameson, who reconstructed Pinckney's plan for a constitu-



tion in an illuminating article in the *American Historical Review*, which was further strengthened by an article in 1904 by Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin in the same magazine."

Mr. Hannis Taylor said:

"The only plan or 'system' actually presented to the convention was that of Charles Pinckney, which, as the documentary evidence now available shows, was largely used by the committee on detail in preparing their draft to the constitution submitted to the convention of August 6."

It is supposed that the reason why so little of the Pinckney plan in its original form was found in the records was that the committee on detail used it as a printer's copy.

The cloud which came over Mr. Pinckney was largely due to Professor Bancroft's unhappy statement to the effect that "no part of it was used."

Studies of comparatively recent years have fairly established for Mr. Pinckney a much higher place in the making of this immortal document than that which has been conceded to him.

On June 15 Mr. Patterson, of New Jersey, presented what was known as the New Jersey plan. It was not in fact a plan for a constitution. It was a plan for revision of the Articles of Confederation. It was born out of the struggle of the small States for better representation. It presented none of those powers which distinguished our present Government from other confederacies of ancient times. It did not intend to give to Congress the power to act directly upon individuals.

The convention had been in session a little more than two weeks when that plan was offered. The discussions which had taken place during that period had already begun to mold a sentiment in favor of a strong government with power to act upon individuals. The Virginia plan was recommitted to the committee of the whole to be considered along with the New Jersey plan on the 6th day of June. This recommitting of the Virginia plan with the New Jersey plan brought in distinct juxtaposition the idea of a strong government acting upon individuals and of a continuance of a weak government established under the Articles of Confederation with some of its powers increased but without the power to operate upon the individual.

Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, offered a series of propositions which were considered by some of the historians as next in importance to the Virginia plan, but more recent studies appear to suggest that this is an overestimate upon the importance of those resolutions.

Alexander Hamilton "read a sketch of a plan of government which was meant only to give a more correct view of his ideas, and to suggest the amendment which he should probably propose to the plan of Mr. Randolph in the proper stages of its future discussions."

This was done in a speech made on the 18th of June. Mr. Hamilton was absent from the convention for a large part of its session. The other delegates from New York were hostile to the idea of the Constitution. Mr. Hamilton's ideas were for a government far more concentrated than was then desired. He desired that the "supreme executive authority" be invested in a governor, to be elected to serve during good behavior. He would have made the governor or president of each State, to be appointed by the General Government. Senators would have been elected to serve during good behavior. He thought the British Constitution the best in the world. He desired to model this Government on the idea of British colonial government. He had procured New York to send delegates to the convention against great opposition, but he could not control the naming of the delegates. Lansing and Yates, Hamilton's colleagues, left the convention on the 10th of July. Neither of them signed the completed document. Hamilton did sign it. Mr. Hamilton's influence in the making of the Constitution was small, except in that he impressed the convention as being a man of great ability, and that he earnestly desired that a strong government should be created. His influence in causing the Constitution to be adopted by the States after the convention was immense.

Whether the executive should be composed of one person or of a number of persons was one of the very earnest subjects of debate. Washington, Madison, Wilson, and Randolph favored a single executive, and this was agreed to on June 4, the vote being 7 States to 3. The method of selecting the Executive was a subject of prolonged debate. Perhaps this consumed as much of the time of the convention as any other subject.

The Virginia draft, as reported back to the house by the committee on detail, provided for the election of the Executive by the Legislature. The method of election finally fixed in the Constitution as submitted for ratification, of course, proved unsatisfactory in the contest between Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr, and the present method brought the Nation to the very brink of internal war in 1876. If we had been a people of less stability, and if we had been less devoted to the Constitution, we undoubtedly would have gone to war at that time.

The election of Members of the first branch of the Legislature was a subject of considerable debate. New England desired to hold to its system of annual elections. There was a sentiment for 3-year terms. There was a debate as to whether the Members of the National Legislature should be paid by the States or by the Government. There was

argument for election by the legislatures of the States rather than by the people.

The Virginia plan as reported from the committee of the whole on June 13 provided for a 3-year term for Members of the Lower House, the Members to be chosen by the people of the several States. They were to receive fixed stipends to be paid out of the National Treasury.

Hamilton, Wilson, and Madison were a unit in favoring elections by the people, Wilson declaring it "not only the corner stone but the foundation of the fabric."

The composition of the Senate and the method of its election brought about more acrimony and came nearer destroying the convention than any other subject presented.

On the 11th of June the committee of the whole adopted a motion to the effect that the right of suffrage in the Second Branch should be the same as in the First. This was carried by a vote of 6 States to 5, but this did not end the subject. The debates continued for a long time and came perilously near causing the convention to end without result.

On June 30, Doctor Franklin made a statement to the convention in which he used this illustration:

"When a broad table is to be made and the edges of planks do not fit, the artisan takes a little from both and makes a good joint. In like manner here, both sides must part with some of their demands in order that they may join in some accommodating proposition."

He then made a proposition as follows:

"That the legislatures of the several States shall choose and send an equal number of delegates, namely, ———, who are to compose the second branch of the General Legislature."

"That in all cases or questions wherein the sovereignty of individual States may be affected or whereby their authority over their own citizens may be diminished, or the authority of the General Government within the several States augmented, each State shall have equal suffrage."

"That in fixing the salaries of such officers, and in all allowances for public services, and generally in all appropriations and dispositions of money to be drawn out of the General Treasury, and in all laws for supplying that Treasury, the delegates of the several States shall have suffrage in proportion to the sums which their respective States do actually contribute to the Treasury. Where a ship had many owners this was the rule of deciding on her expedition."

At the time of this suggestion, Luther Martin states that the convention was on the verge of dissolution, scarcely held together by the strength of a hair. Messrs. Ellsworth and Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, had already suggested what is known as the Connecticut compromise which led the way to the arrangement ultimately adopted, according to which the national principle was to prevail in the House of Representatives and the Federal principle in the Senate. (Fiske.) The terms at first met with strenuous opposition. Martin stated:

"No compromise for us. You must give each State an equal suffrage or our business is at an end."

Sherman stated: "Then we are come to a full stop."

The fate of the new Government was, in fact, scarcely held together by the strength of a hair. A vote was taken on the 2d of July and resulted in a tie. Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland voted in favor of the compromise. Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina voted against it. The vote stood five States for and five States against the compromise. New Hampshire was not then represented. Georgia divided and in that division she rendered her greatest contribution to the convention. It was Abraham Baldwin, a native of Connecticut, formerly a tutor in Yale University, and lately moved to Georgia, who divided the vote and "prevented the decision which would in all probability have broken up the convention." Fiske says of this incident:

"His State was the last to vote and the House was hushed in anxious expectation, when this brave and wise young man yielded his private conviction to what he saw to be a paramount necessity for keeping the convention together. All honor to his memory."

On June 28, when the subject of representation was under debate, and the convention seemed to be moving rapidly toward disintegration Doctor Franklin addressed the convention, directing attention toward the small progress made during the last four or five weeks and reminding his auditors that in the contest with Great Britain—

"When we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for Divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. \* \* \* I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see of this fact—that God governs in the affairs of men, and if a sparrow can not fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an Empire can rise without His aid?"

The subject of the compromise was then referred to a special committee, and on the 5th of July the committee reported in favor of it. It was not finally adopted until the 16th of July, and then by a vote startlingly close and, in fact, almost accidental. The States then voting for the compromise were Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and North Carolina—five. The States voting against it were Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia—four. Massachusetts was divided. New Hampshire had still not come into the

convention, and Rhode Island never came into it. Thus, by this small margin was the convention again the second time saved.

William R. Davie, of North Carolina, made possible the result of this final vote. He said he "thought that, in general, there were extremes on both sides. We were partly Federal, partly national, in our Union," and he did not see why the Government might not in some respects operate on the States; in others, on the people.

This compromise had a peculiar effect. The small States had from the beginning been jealous of the Government, and were disposed to give to it as little powers as practicable. Now their views changed and they seemed to be willing to give to it substantial powers. After this action the proposed Government began to be spoken of as a Federal Government.

The second great compromise concerned slaves as an element in determining the basis of representation. It had been determined that representation in the lower House should be based upon population. If slaves were to be counted as population, the Southern States would have their power in the Federal Government enhanced. This would proportionately decrease the power of the Northern States. In 1783 the same question had arisen in the Congress, and the Northern States (nonslaveholding) had been inclined to treat slaves as population and the Southern States had been inclined to treat them as chattels. Their interest had now changed, and with the change in their interest had come a change in conviction. Mr. Madison had then proposed that the slaves be counted as three-fifths population and it had been accepted.

Of course, this was not a logical settlement and, like all other illogical acts, it turned out not to be final. Its only merit lay in that it was the best that could be done. In the course of the debate on the representation of the States in the Congress, Mr. Madison had stated that, if the proposed union should be formed, the real danger would come not from the rivalry between the large and small States, but from the antagonistic interests of slaveholding and nonslaveholding States. How tremendously true that was is, of course, a matter of dreadful history.

The third compromise concerned slavery and commerce. One of the most potent reasons for the call of the Constitutional Convention was, as we have seen, the necessity of regulating commerce and the jealousy of the States over commerce. There was no argument over the questions that commerce should be regulated by the General Government. There was consideration as to what commerce should be regulated. Madison thought that commerce was indivisible and should be regulated by one body. The southern delegates insisted that the power of Congress to pass navigation acts should not be exercised, except upon a two-thirds vote of each House. This was unfortunate and was not desired by New England. All of the States, except South Carolina and Georgia, desired that the importation of slaves should stop. Those two States felt that the cultivation of indigo and rice required the continued importation of slaves.

There was also great fear of a treaty which had been prepared by Jay and which would have surrendered to Spain the right of navigation on the Mississippi River for 25 years. This proposed treaty greatly incensed that part of the country lying south of the Ohio River and left those States fearful of the exercise of this power by a majority of Congress. The contention was compromised by prohibiting Congress from interfering with the importation of slaves prior to 1808, and giving Congress full power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce and commerce with the Indians, by a majority vote. This compromise was agreed upon on the 29th day of August.

Mr. Pinckney stated:

"It was the true interest of the Southern States to have no regulation of commerce, but considering the loss brought on the commerce of the Eastern States by the Revolution, their liberal conduct toward the views of South Carolina and the interest the weak States had in being united with the strong Eastern States, I think it proper that no fetters should be imposed upon the power of making commercial regulation."

This statement is supposed to have originated out of the compromise which had been agreed to.

It was Luther Martin who proposed that provision of the Constitution which now reads:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The effect of this provision is probably more far-reaching than Martin intended it to be. It gave force and majesty to the instrument which makes it at once one of the most important provisions of the document. It raises the document to the majesty of law and supreme law. Martin was an earnest opponent of the ratification of the Constitution. That this provision should have come from him is in keeping with the erratic course which marked the life of that marvelously strong and wonderfully lovable person.

The convention was very much concerned that the States would pass laws which would be contrary to the Constitution. There was a great deal of consideration as to how such laws should be dealt with, whether by Congress or by the legislatures of the States or in what manner. It has not been generally noticed by historians that Thomas Jefferson in a letter to Mr. Madison of June 20, 1787, objected to giving Congress the power to negative the acts of the legislatures of the several States.

He thought that the power was going too far. To use his expression, he thought "that the hole and the patch should be commensurate, but this proposes to mend a small hole by covering the whole garment." As an alternative he suggested "an appeal from the State judicatures to a Federal court, in all cases where the act of confederation controlled the question." This is the first suggestion for the determination by Federal courts of the question as to whether or not an act of the legislature of a given State was violative of the Constitution of the General Government.

The courts of Virginia had probably in two cases, and certainly in one case, several years before, declared an act to be void because unconstitutional. In 1778 the case of Josiah Phillips appears to have taken this action, but the case is badly reported. In 1782, in the case of the Commonwealth v. Caton, 4 Call (Va.), 522, it was held that they had the "power to declare any resolution or act of the legislature, or either branch of it, to be unconstitutional and void." A court of North Carolina took similar action during the meeting of the convention.

The original Constitution contains no bill of rights. Its omission was not accidental. Bills of right were not unknown to the States. Maryland and Virginia each had an elaborate bill of rights. Virginia's first declaration of the rights was not in a constitution, but in a series of resolutions of its legislature. It was feared that the undertaking to make a bill of rights would prolong the convention and probably destroy it. The first 10 amendments to the Constitution are accepted as supplying that deficiency.

On September 8 a committee was appointed to "revise the style and arrangement of the articles that had been agreed to by the house." This committee came to be known as a committee on style. It was composed of Dr. William Samuel Johnson, a graduate of Oxford; Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, James Madison, and Rufus King. A better committee for this purpose could not have been selected. Probably no more learned men could have been found in the country. To Gouverneur Morris is justly attributed the performance of the labors of that committee. Certainly they were well performed. The document is expressed in terse, clear language, probably without a single redundant sentence, and in this respect and others it continues to challenge the admiration of mankind.

It is quite clear that no member of the convention went into it with a plan which was satisfactory to a majority of the States, and had the plan entertained by any delegate or set of delegates been adopted, the result would have been disastrous. There was a purpose either to completely subordinate the States to the General Government or the General Government to the States. The relation between the States and the Government in the Constitution as agreed upon is a result of the debates and the compromises. In fact, the relation is still one of development. It is well that this is so; and neither should be unnecessarily subordinated to the other. The Government as made has been well declared to be an "indestructible Union composed of indestructible States."

The Constitution as adopted by this convention was not modeled on any previously existing government created anywhere in the world. The members of the convention appear to have been informed of the federations of ancient and medieval times; but none of those governments undertook to create a government which was itself intended to be indestructible while still composed of indestructible units or States, and which acted directly upon the individuals. Dr. Hannis Taylor says of the Constitution:

"Thus for the first time in history the great architect proposed: (a) Federal Government with the independent power of taxation; (2) the division of the Federal head into three departments, legislative, executive, and judicial; (3) the division of the Federal Legislature into two chambers; (4) a Federal Government with delegated powers, the residuum of power remaining in the States." (Origin and Growth of the American Constitution, p. 29.)

It was not founded upon the English Government; for that is a consolidated government. The determination to be free was born in that purpose which wrested the Magna Charta from King John, and which with indomitable pertinacity preserved it. Much more was gotten out of the experience of the Colonies, which has been referred to, than out of the experience of any other government; and still it remained for American genius to bring into existence a Government having the four distinctive qualities to which I have just referred.

The document was laid before the members for signature. Of the 55 members who had attended, only 39 signed. There was some unwillingness to sign even by those who remained. Mr. James Beck in his learned book on the Constitution says:



"Few there were, if any, of the convention who were enthusiastic about this result. Indeed, as the document was ready for signature it became a grave question whether the remnant had sufficient faith in their own work to subscribe their names, and if they failed to do so, its adoption by the people would have been impossible."

Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry, who had been outstanding factors in the convention, not only indicated their purpose not to sign, but from that purpose they did not depart. The form of attestation of the Constitution was framed in order to induce the signature of some of those who were in doubt. Doctor Franklin moved that this form of attestation be "done in convention by unanimous consent of the States present."

On Monday, the 17th day of September, the convention met for the last time. Mr. Wilson read a conciliatory and eloquent address prepared by Doctor Franklin, in which he stated that he had been opposed to some parts of the Constitution, but he was not certain that he would continue to be opposed, and he thought that the Constitution was the best that could be gotten. He further said:

"Thus I consent, sir, to this Constitution because I expect no better and because I am not sure that it is not the best. The opinions I have had of its errors I sacrifice to the public good. I have never whispered a syllable of them abroad. Within these walls they were born, and here they shall die."

It was thought that the form of attestation suggested would enable those who doubted to sign on behalf of their States without accepting personal responsibility.

Mr. Gorham, of Massachusetts, made the last motion to amend the draft. He moved that the provision requiring that "The number of Representatives shall not exceed 1 for every 40,000," be changed to provide that the number "shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000."

General Washington made a speech in favor of the change. The burden of his statements was that it would bring the Government closer to the people. The motion was adopted without dissent.

As the last members of the convention were signing the Constitution, Doctor Franklin, no doubt mentally recalling that he had made a draft of the constitution for the famous Albany convention of 1754, drew the attention of those near him to the emblem on the back of the President's chair, and observed that "Painters have found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising from a setting sun."

"I have often and often in the course of the session and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

Especially does it fall to you and to me and to those who are in like position in the administration of the law to see that the sun which appeared to Doctor Franklin on the 17th day of September, 1787, to be a rising sun shall continue its majestic ascent, preserving the balance between the two kinds of government then created, and that in its dealings with States, individuals, and the world it shall continue to represent that splendor of character which is possible to only those who think and act in justice as well to the weak as to the strong.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. CARAWAY and Mr. ALLEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield the floor, as I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] desires to address the Senate on the pending amendment to the tariff bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I understand the Senator from Utah has yielded the floor to me. If I have the floor, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN], who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope that whatever Senator shall be finally awarded the floor will yield to me for the purpose of presenting a report.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

#### REPORT OF JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON LOBBYING

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, by the special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee investigating lobbying, I am directed to submit a report. I ask that it may be read, though I shall not ask for action upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and, without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the report (No. 43, pt. 3), as follows:

Your committee, named by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, begs leave to report as follows:

Among others into whose activities in endeavoring to influence congressional or other governmental action your committee inquired, as required by Senate Resolution 20, was one Joseph R. Grundy, who, by reason of the extraordinary and commanding place he holds among the lobbyists in the National Capital, is the subject of this interim report.

Mr. Grundy has been almost continuously in Washington since the House of Representatives began its inquiries looking to the framing of the tariff bill now before the Senate, about January 1 of the present year, interesting himself in increases in the tariff rates. This self-assumed task was by no means novel. He had, like William Burgess, heretofore mentioned in a report of your committee, come to Washington on the occasion of the pendency of every tariff bill considered by Congress since 1896, engaging in similar activity. Lobbying seems to be hereditary in his family, for he told the committee that when the McKinley bill of 1890 was in process of building his father attended a meeting in a room in the old Ebbitt Hotel when a few of the leaders of the dominant party of that day, in conjunction with other gentlemen interested in the measure, agreed upon it—a method of framing tariff legislation he approved and commended. Despite the highly picturesque language in which James G. Blaine denounced that bill, as history tells the story, and what followed, Mr. Grundy maintains it "was one of the greatest bills the country ever had from a protective standpoint." He expressed some regret that that method had not been emulated in connection with the bill now before the Senate and exhibited not a little resentment against those members who were disposed to question the virtue of the bill, either as a whole or with respect to specific provisions as it came from the House or from the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. Grundy resides at Bristol, Pa., where he is engaged in the production of wool yarns and tops under the firm name or corporate style of William H. Grundy & Co., but his principal business is politics—that is, he devotes practically all of his time to politics. He is a Republican, was a delegate to the Republican National Convention at Kansas City in June, 1928, and arrogates to himself credit for having prepared the plank in the platform adopted by that convention dealing with the subject of the tariff. His lobbying activities are not confined to the national field. He is a regular habitué of Harrisburg when the Pennsylvania Legislature is in session, having in mind, among other matters, a possible effort to amend or repeal the law of that State which exempts from taxation manufacturing establishments. He is, and for more than 20 years last past has been, the president of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, and is vice president of the American Tariff League. His chief contribution to political life has consisted of the raising of funds for campaign use. As a member of the ways and means committee of the Republican National Committee for the State of Pennsylvania he raised for that committee in the campaign of 1928 nearly \$700,000, a large part of it contributed by manufacturers interested in tariff rates. In the primary campaign in his State in the year 1926 he raised money to promote the nomination of George Wharton Pepper for United States Senator and John S. Fisher for governor, donating himself \$18,000 and loaning to the committee conducting the fight \$300,000 more. He preferred Vare, Pepper's antagonist, but concluded to tie to the Pepper-Fisher ticket because he knew Fisher was sound on the repeal of the law exempting manufacturing establishments from taxation, while the position of Beidleman, Vare's running mate, on that issue was not so well known.

In addition to the huge sum raised by him in the 1928 campaign he traveled throughout 40 counties of Pennsylvania assisting in raising money for local use in the election with particular reference to the election of Republican Congressmen. It need not be said that the services so rendered gave him a standing among his political associates in both Houses of Congress not to be ignored in a study of the influences affecting its legislation, not to speak of the consideration likely to be accorded him in other branches of the Government.

There can be no doubt of his ardent attachment to the principle of protection. His zeal for it is religious in its intensity. He attributes to it practically all the blessings our country enjoys. The innumerable elements that enter into the general prosperity which, on the whole, our country has experienced throughout its history are ignored by him. He descanted on the subject at every opportunity before the committee, though there has been a noticeable dearth of assault on the principle, and submitted a prepared statement in which that policy was extolled. At the same time it can not be overlooked that he has grown rich in the pursuit of a highly protected industry. His product, wool yarn, is protected by a liberal compensatory duty and on top of that an ad valorem to the amount of from 30 to 40 per cent, the maximum to be increased as the Senate Finance Committee proposes to 55 per cent. The purity of his faith is subjected to further suspicion from the fact that, while he says he did not oppose, he gave no comfort to those who were asking a duty on manganese, entering into the production of steel, a leading product of his State of Pennsylvania, and more particularly is it impugned by the fact that he interested himself not at all in obtaining raises in the agricultural schedule, though he did not overlook wool, in which he is directly concerned.

Having, as he claims, been instrumental in the adoption of the tariff plank in the Kansas City platform, and having raised the huge sum

mentioned to elect the Republican candidate for President and Republican Congressmen, he felt an obligation to come to Washington to see that the promises of the platform in respect to tariff were kept and that the individuals who, through his solicitation, contributed to the company fund, were made whole. That there may be no misunderstanding as to his purpose in Washington, the following is quoted from his testimony:

"Mr. GRUNDY. I feel that the Republican Party should put into law the platform adopted at Kansas City, on which they went before the people and received what you might call the mandate of 23,000,000 voters.

"Senator CARAWAY. They put up the money to bring that mandate about, and they ought to get the legislation they bought and paid for?

"Mr. GRUNDY. If that platform was put into law, they would get their money back.

"Senator CARAWAY. They would get their money back?

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes, sir.

"Senator CARAWAY. And you were down here to see that they got their money back?

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes, sir; I was helping every way I could.

"Senator CARAWAY. Yes; I don't think anybody could accuse you of laying down on the job.

"Mr. GRUNDY. I hope not. I don't want them to.

"Senator CARAWAY. That has been your activity every time a tariff bill has been up?

"Mr. GRUNDY. That has been the principle on which I have been present here." (Rec., Vol. II, p. 434.)

Mr. Grundy's views as to what he achieved in connection with the various tariff bills, the pendency of which brought him to Washington, are disclosed by his testimony, as follows:

"Senator CARAWAY. What services were you rendering? Were you seeing Members of Congress of both Houses?

"Mr. GRUNDY. To which revision do you refer?

"Senator CARAWAY. Commencing with the first one.

"Mr. GRUNDY. I saw those whom we felt would help carry out the purposes for which I was here.

"Senator CARAWAY. You saw them personally?

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

"Senator CARAWAY. Do you think you saw them personally?

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

"Senator CARAWAY. And talked with them?

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

"Senator CARAWAY. Do you think you got results from those talks?

"Mr. GRUNDY. The results that were finally achieved were satisfactory. I wouldn't want to flatter myself that I got them.

"Senator CARAWAY. You and the others interested with you, that were down here, got them; is that the idea?

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

"Senator CARAWAY. And your modesty keeps you from claiming all the credit?

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

"Senator CARAWAY. You think there are tariff rates now enacted into law that are higher than they would have been if it had not been for your activity?

"Mr. GRUNDY. I wouldn't want to go that far. I did my best to see that the results we thought were satisfactory were enacted.

"Senator CARAWAY. And you think that was the result of your efforts?

"Mr. GRUNDY. And if you will allow me to overcome my natural modesty, I do.

"Senator CARAWAY. That is what I am coming to. You think that there are tariff rates now reflected in the tariff law that your activities put there? You can answer that yes or no.

"Mr. GRUNDY. Well, I am pleased to say yes; yes." (Rec., Vol. II, p. 571.)

The American Tariff League, of which he is vice president, maintains an office in one of the large office buildings of the city of Washington. On the floor below is his office, but the door to it bears not his name but the legend "American Tariff League, News Bureau." At this office persons seeking tariff benefits were aided in the preparation of their cases to present to the committee or otherwise to impress Members of Congress; press releases were prepared and issued. The expenses of Mr. Grundy in Washington, including those of the office he maintains, amount to about \$2,000 a month, all of which he bears out of his own private resources, the total for the present occasion of his being here amounting to something in excess of \$20,000. He has been during his stay in the Capital in frequent consultation with members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate and other Members sharing his general views with respect to the tariff, always, however, with Republican Members, including the Senator from Connecticut, at whose office he met Eyanson, referred to in a former report of this committee. He even mentioned Eyanson in replying to a question asked him as to the Senators with whom he had talked. Eyanson he regards as a model young man, and expressed the hope that a hundred like him could be induced to come to Washington

to aid in tariff legislation. He endeavored to induce Eyanson to surrender his employment with the Connecticut Manufacturers Association to become his, Grundy's, assistant in Washington. He, as well as Burgess, labored to have incorporated in the bill the principle of the domestic as against the foreign value as a basis for the computation of duties, an extreme to which even the highest of high-tariff men in Congress would not go, as it was urged they should in 1922 and again in connection with the pending bill.

Though the result is not to be attributed wholly to him, those who so liberally contributed, at his instance, to the party war chest may gain some idea of the value of the services of Mr. Grundy in connection with the tariff legislation from the fact that in 65 of the leading industries of the State, the bill, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, recommended raises in the duty in the case of 42, signifying added profits to the manufacturers of that State, if the rates became effective, of \$1,186,000,000, as computed by an expert statistician of the Department of Commerce and shown in a table inserted in the record. By the pyramiding process it is estimated that the additional cost to the consumer will be very much more than that stupendous sum, well-informed experts insisting it will reach double that amount. Mr. Grundy, of course, does not admit—indeed, he scoffs at the idea and denies—that the consumer will pay any additional amount on account of the tariff, but he was not prepared to extend that view so far as to include the duty on manganese, nor did he offer any reason why, if the price of that commodity would not be increased, the steel manufacturers of his State offered such stubborn resistance to the imposition; nor, apparently, could he find it applicable to agricultural products. With the reservations indicated, Mr. Grundy adheres to the view that the foreigner pays the cost of the tariff, not the consumer.

According to newspaper reports, Mr. Grundy waited on the President on May 8, 1929, to interpose with him in behalf of a raise in the Senate of the rates in the House bill. At least, on leaving the White House he complained that the House rates were too low, saying:

"The few raises that are in the bill fall short of meeting the requirements, which the past seven years of Pennsylvania's industries show, along the lines indicated in the Republican platform adopted at Kansas City."

Though he reserved to himself the right to criticize the bill because the rates were, in his opinion, too low, he was unreservedly caustic in his comments on Republican Members of the Senate who thought them too high and exercised their right to attempt to revise them accordingly.

Reference has been made to a written statement which Mr. Grundy was permitted to insert in the record. Having in the statement incorporated tables exhibiting the wealth and industrial output of the State of Pennsylvania, as compared with that of other States, the income tax paid by it with a like comparison, the number of wage earners, its population, and other like statistics, he commented as follows:

"Perusal of the figures here submitted justify the statement that if the volume of voice in the United States Senate were proportioned to population, productive power, or the total sum contributed toward the national upkeep, some of those States which are now most vocal would need amplifiers to make their whispers heard. The truth of the matter is that such States as Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, Mississippi, etc., do not pay enough toward the upkeep of the Government to cover the costs of collection, and States like Pennsylvania, hamstrung as they are by adverse legislation, support these backward Commonwealths and provide them with their good roads, their post offices, their river improvements, and other Federal aid, figuratively, on a golden platter."

Referring to the States mentioned in the foregoing amazing paragraph and the attitude of Representatives or some of the Representatives from them toward the tariff bill, he said: "Frankly, when you come to analyze what they mean to the national life of the country they haven't got any chips in the game at all," and he continued, "if it was not for the unfortunate provision in the Constitution that gives each State two Senators—I say 'unfortunate' because it was a great compromise that got our Constitution through—they probably would not be heard at all." Warming to his subject, he added:

"If this was a problem that had to do with junior Red Cross work for backward States or something like that, they would have a right to get into that game, but when it comes to this great fundamental policy that has made this country what it is and has produced this great revenue, those seven States that have about 2.66 per cent of the taxes of this great country and put all of this holler against the States which pay about 64 per cent of the revenues of the country there is something wrong down here somewhere." (Rec., Vol. II, p. 500.)

He would not entirely silence the Senators from his "backward States," but in his opinion "they should talk darned small." He thought "the Senators from Georgia ought not to be putting up the roar that they do," nor especially the Senators from Mississippi and "many others from these Western States as well."

Mr. Grundy was unable to submit any figures to support his assertion in the paragraph quoted from his statement that the States named "do not pay enough toward the upkeep of the Government to cover the cost of collection," and the declaration is obviously absurd. It was refuted by figures from the Treasury. He was further obliged to admit



that there was no truth in the statement that States like Pennsylvania support what he denominated backward Commonwealths, "and provide them with good roads, their post offices, their river improvements, etc." He had, however, a solution for the troubles of the wheat farmer, namely, that he reduce his production of wheat.

The consumer does not figure at all in Mr. Grundy's views in respect to tariff legislation. They constitute, he says, a part of the 23,000,000 who voted the Republican ticket in 1928, giving a mandate to revise the tariff, a mandate he construes to signify such a revision as the leaders of the party shall propose, to antagonize which is treason on the part of any other of its members. In view of his complaint that the rates in the pending bill are not high enough, one is prompted to speculate on whether his loyalty would withstand a downward revision should such a course be advocated or pursued by those same party leaders.

It was nowhere revealed in the testimony of Mr. Grundy that either he or anyone on his force was in a situation to offer any enlightenment to Members of either House on any matters pertinent to the discussion of the tariff bill not available to them on application to the Tariff Commission and other branches of the Government. The inference is irresistible that it was believed by him and by those associated with him that by reason of the very substantial aid he had rendered as revenue raiser for political campaigns he would be able to influence the action of his party associates in the Congress.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me for just one moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas further yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ALLEN. For what purpose, may I ask the Senator from Arkansas? I have been yielding a long time.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, well, if the Senator objects, never mind.

Mr. ALLEN. I will take only three minutes, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas. Then I will yield the floor to him.

I desire to call attention to a remarkable statement that is made significant by the fact that it is the voluntary contribution of 300 editors and publishers of rural newspapers in the State of Minnesota. It is headed:

A STATEMENT TO CONGRESS BY EDITORS OF RURAL NEWSPAPERS IN MINNESOTA

From personal acquaintance and contact with our farmer readers, it is our opinion that they want the tariff bill passed with as little delay as possible.

They regard the early passage of the tariff bill, with its increased and comprehensive farm rates, as more important, from the standpoint of farm prosperity, than anything else Congress could do at this time.

This belief of many Minnesota farmers is based on two things:

First. The prospect for a larger American market for farm products, which will come through the operation of these new farm tariff rates.

Second. An understanding of how this large and more stable market will fit into the prosperity program accompanying the new marketing systems to be developed under the terms and with the assistance of the agricultural marketing act.

These marketing systems, with their farmer control and their more direct consumer contacts, are calculated to give the farmers a larger share of what the consumers pay for farm products. Tariff protection will enlarge and stabilize the markets. This is the combination upon which Minnesota farmers believe their opportunity for permanent and dependable prosperity now really rests.

Hence the widespread desire that the tariff bill be passed without unnecessary delay.

We do not believe the tariff bill should now be held up indefinitely to slash the industrial rates of the 1922 law, as it will be delayed if there is an attempt to make indiscriminate changes. There would be delays not only in the Senate, but in the House, and especially in the conference committee.

These delays would seriously affect the constructive program of building farm prosperity on the foundation of larger markets and better handling systems to reach those markets. They would interfere, too, with President Hoover's wise emergency program for stimulating business and industrial activity.

Aside from these considerations, however, we want industrial labor to be prosperous. The workers of the industrial centers are our best customers. We want them to be employed, busy, and able to buy. Any considerable unemployment would affect us almost as quickly as it would affect them.

We know that the business structure of the country is based largely on tariff protection; that the structure has been in process of building for many years; and that business is adjusted to it.

We have noted how industrial tariff slashing in times past has invariably brought depression and unemployment. We do not want that condition to recur, because many of our products are already dangerously near saturation point as regards consumption.

We must increase the market demand for our products, and there is no better or more certain way to increase that demand than to safeguard the prosperity of the country, especially those parts of the country where demand is normally the greatest.

In short, we are better off with good customers paying us higher prices for the products we sell every day and every week, even if we must forego slight reductions in the prices of what we much less often buy from them.

We sincerely believe that the best interests of agriculture, not only in Minnesota but throughout the country, will be better served by the quick passage of the tariff bill with adequate farm rates.

Mr. President, this is signed by more than 300 of the rural editors and publishers of the State of Minnesota; it is signed by half a dozen publishers in South Dakota and North Dakota, and publishers in Iowa. It is their voluntary contribution, apparently.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I read this morning with a great deal of interest the advertisement that the Senator has just read. I hope the Senator will not stop with reading the address to Congress but that he will include, or at least have printed, the names of the publishers and the newspapers that it is said are signing this appeal, and have paid for the advertisement that the Senator has just read.

Mr. ALLEN. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that it is my intention to do that very thing. Here is a map showing the districts from which these editors come; here is a summary of their combined circulation, which amounts to nearly 500,000; and here is a list of the signers. I will ask to have it all included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the list of signers and summary of circulation will be printed in the RECORD. The map will be printed in the RECORD if permitted by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know about the map, Mr. President. That is not important.

Mr. SMOOT. We shall have to see about that.

Mr. FLETCHER. The map can not be printed without special authority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The map can not be printed without action of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MINNESOTA CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Minnesota newspapers which signed the accompanying statement are represented by dots on the above map [not printed]. Several newspapers from the adjoining Dakota also signed. Due to lack of time it was impossible to reach all the editors in this territory, and many more would have signed if given the opportunity. The circulation of these newspapers totals 495,350, with approximately a million and a half readers.

MINNESOTA

Ada Index, R. D. Pfund, publisher.  
Aitkin Republican, A. L. Hamilton, publisher.  
Albert Lea Tribune, Burt May, publisher.  
Alexandria Citizen-News, Kinney & Son, publishers.  
Amboy Herald, H. L. Burdick, publisher.  
Anoka Herald, Roe Chase, publisher.  
Argyle Banner, P. W. Kemp, publisher.  
Atwater Republican-Press, G. E. Johnson, publisher.  
Austin Herald, H. E. Rasmussen, publisher.  
Battle Lake Review, Edith W. Tiller, publisher.  
Becker Herald, L. S. E. Wright, publisher.  
Belgrade Tribune, Ed Vig, publisher.  
Bemidji Pioneer, H. Z. Mitchell, publisher.  
Bertha Herald, D. E. Cuppernull, publisher.  
Blackduck American, E. L. and W. L. Oberg, publishers.  
Blooming Prairie Times, Geraldine Rasmussen, publisher.  
Brainerd Tribune, George E. Erickson, publisher.  
Browerville Blade, C. M. Sutton, publisher.  
Cambridge North Star, Carlson Bros., publishers.  
Canby News, M. W. Trussell, publisher.  
Cannon Falls Beacon, Erickson & Lewis, publishers.  
Carlton Vidette, W. H. Hassing, publisher.  
Clara City Herald, C. Burges, publisher.  
Clarissa Independent, George A. Etzell, publisher.  
Clearbrook Leader, S. C. Sheets, publisher.  
Cloquet Pine Knot, Orlo B. Elfes, publisher.  
Coleraine Iron News, L. D. Lammon, publisher.  
Dassel Dispatch, S. R. Perl, publisher.  
Deer Creek Mirror, S. M. Rector, publisher.

Deerwood Enterprise, A. J. Crone, publisher.  
 Delano Eagle, C. J. Buckley, publisher.  
 Detroit Lakes Record, Lou Benshoof, publisher.  
 Duluth Advertiser, George Jensen, publisher.  
 Duluth Stockman and Dairy Farmer, W. H. McGenty, publisher.  
 Eagle Bend News, W. E. Hutchinson, publisher.  
 Elk River Star-News, L. A. Dare, publisher.  
 Ellendale Eagle, C. R. Campbell, publisher.  
 Elysian Enterprise, W. K. Wilcox, publisher.  
 Emmons Leader, M. Aasgaard, jr., publisher.  
 Evansville Enterprise, Basil Gordon, publisher.  
 Eveleth Clarion, Grove Wills, publisher.  
 Fairfax Standard, E. R. Sheer, publisher.  
 Faribault News, Mrs. Howard Bratton, publisher.  
 Frazee Press, S. J. Huntley, publisher.  
 Gary Graphic, Lewis Garden, publisher.  
 Gaylord Hub, Charles Wallin, publisher.  
 Glenwood Herald, B. K. Savre, publisher.  
 Gonvick Banner, W. W. Jones, publisher.  
 Goodhue Tribune, L. E. Cook, publisher.  
 Good Thunder Herald, Carl E. Young, publisher.  
 Grand Rapids Herald-Review, L. A. Rossman, publisher.  
 Grey Eagle Gazette, M. J. Walburn, publisher.  
 Hancock Record, E. J. Bahe, publisher.  
 Hastings Gazette, S. W. Isham, publisher.  
 Heron Lake News, V. E. Joslin, publisher.  
 Hewitt Banner, H. L. McChesney, publisher.  
 Hibbing Tribune, R. W. Hitchcock, publisher.  
 Hutchinson Press, Iver J. Iverson, publisher.  
 International Falls Journal, C. J. Chilgren, publisher.  
 Itasca Farmer, L. D. Lammon, publisher.  
 Ivanhoe Times, W. N. Johnson, publisher.  
 Kasson Republican, Nottage Bros., publishers.  
 Keewatin Chronicle, L. A. Rossman, publisher.  
 Lake Crystal Tribune, Palmer Gilbertson, publisher.  
 Lakfield Standard, H. J. Hayden, publisher.  
 Lake Park Journal, Walter A. Willis, publisher.  
 Lake Wilson Pilot, Forrest & Smith, publishers.  
 Le Sueur News-Herald, Carl Eastwood, publisher.  
 Little Falls Transcript, Ed. M. LaFond, publisher.  
 Little Forks Times, J. L. Albertson, publisher.  
 Long Prairie Leader, Rudolph Lee, publisher.  
 Mahanomen Pioneer, H. P. Phillips, publisher.  
 Mapleton Enterprise, H. C. Hotelling, publisher.  
 Melrose Beacon, C. W. Carlson, publisher.  
 Menahga Messenger, E. O. Qualey, publisher.  
 Montgomery Messenger, Jerry and Peter J. Koehe, publishers.  
 Monticello Times, C. A. French, publisher.  
 Moose Lake Star Gazette, G. W. Rydeen, publisher.  
 Morris Tribune, J. C. Morrison, publisher.  
 Motley Mercury, Rolley R. Hull, publisher.  
 Newfolden Review, John P. Mattson, publisher.  
 Northfield News, Herman Roe, publisher.  
 Osakis Review, C. H. Bronson, publisher.  
 Owatonna Journal-Chronicle, E. K. Whiting, publisher.  
 Parkers Prairie Independent, R. S. Meyers, publisher.  
 Park Rapids Enterprise, Haradon & Rogers, publishers.  
 Pelican Rapids Press, E. L. Peterson, publisher.  
 Pollock's Newspaper Notes, Robert L. Pollock, publisher.  
 Raymond News, H. Giescke, publisher.  
 Red Wing Republican, Jens K. Grondahl, publisher.  
 Redwood Falls Gazette, B. E. Marsh, publisher.  
 Rochester Post-Bulletin, Glenn S. Witherstine, publisher.  
 St. James Plaindealer, J. H. Curtis, publisher.  
 Sandstone Courier, C. W. Colby, publisher.  
 Sauk Center Herald, Asa M. Wallace, publisher.  
 Sauk Rapids Sentinel, Ed Vandersluis, publisher.  
 Sebeka Review, M. E. Isherwood, publisher.  
 Shakopee Argus-Tribune, W. F. Duffy, publisher.  
 Slayton Herald, J. V. Weber, publisher.  
 Sleepy Eye Progressive, A. O. Wensberg, publisher.  
 Spring Grove Herald, M. O. Onsgard, publisher.  
 Spring Valley Tribune, George Van Rhee, publisher.  
 Stillwater Gazette, W. E. Easton, publisher.  
 Thief River Falls Times, W. E. Dahlquist, publisher.  
 Truman Tribune, Theo. C. Radde, publisher.  
 Twin Valley Times, R. A. Lee, publisher.  
 Two Harbors Chronicle, C. M. Hillman, publisher.  
 Underwood Independent, Cecil E. Nelson, publisher.  
 Upsala News-Tribune, H. R. Dicks, publisher.  
 Verndale Sun, Lewis A. Bradford, publisher.  
 Vernon Center News, H. L. Burdick, publisher.  
 Villard Grit, H. E. West, publisher.  
 Virginia Enterprise, Elbridge Smith, publisher.  
 Wadena Pioneer-Journal, A. R. Lemke, publisher.  
 Warren Sheaf, J. P. Mattson, publisher.  
 Warroad Pioneer, A. E. McDonald, publisher.

Waseca Journal, Don Brown, publisher.  
 Waterville Advance, S. H. Farrington, publisher.  
 West Concord Enterprise, L. W. Smith, publisher.  
 Windom Citizen, D. L. Keith, publisher.  
 Windom Reporter, George F. Warren, publisher.  
 Winona Republican-Herald, H. G. White, publisher.  
 Winsted Journal, Paul F. Wolf, publisher.  
 Winthrop News, C. C. Eaton, publisher.

## IOWA

Lake Mills (Iowa) Graphic, M. A. Aasgaard, sr., publisher.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo Forum, Norman B. Black, publisher.  
 Minot News, H. S. Davies, publisher.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Brookings (S. Dak.) Register, Paul Dutcher.  
 Huron (S. Dak.) Huronite, Charles H. J. Mitchell, publisher.  
 Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Edward I. F. Lusk, publisher.  
 Yankton (S. Dak.) Press and Dakotan, W. C. Lusk, publisher.

## METROPOLITAN NEWSPAPERS

Duluth Herald, M. F. Hanson, publisher.  
 Duluth News-Tribune, M. F. Hanson, publisher.  
 Minneapolis Journal, Carl W. Jones, publisher.  
 This statement paid for entirely by the above northwest newspapers.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Kansas has kindly agreed to put in the names of the publishers and the names of the newspapers that back this statement and have paid for it. I want the farmers of Minnesota to know what their so-called country newspapers, which are pretending to be friends of the farmers, are really signing, what they are paying for in the way of propaganda. I hope that the lobby committee will send for some of these men and ascertain how much they are paying, who solicited the payments, and how all this has been brought about.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from Nebraska has just stated, I am told that these editors and publishers, in common agreement, after a conference upon the subject to which they have called our attention so ably, themselves paid for this advertisement. I am very glad indeed to second the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska that these country editors, who have had the temerity to give us advice about the need of hurrying up, be made the subject of a congressional investigation.

Mr. NORRIS, Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, and Mr. CARAWAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. It will be very opportune, coming in the RECORD following the testimony of Mr. Grundy, who has just said that the fellows who are backing this tariff and who are opposed to a decrease in any existing tariff, as these so-called country editors are—

Mr. ALLEN. May I ask the Senator what he means by "so called"?

Mr. NORRIS. Grundy says, "We bought the election and paid for it, and we are entitled to get what we paid for."

Mr. ALLEN. In order that the Senator may make himself clear, I ask him what he means by "these so-called country editors"?

Mr. NORRIS. I mean just what I say.

Mr. ALLEN. Does he mean that they are mis-called?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know any of them; I have not looked the list over to-day. I said "so called." Perhaps they are rightly called, possibly wrongly called. At least they are with Grundy and the people who are advocating relief for farmers. They are in the same boat, asking the same things.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, may I say that they are with a very large section of this country that would like to see us proceed to pass a tariff bill, that would like to see the United States Senate join with the other influences in this country that are cooperating with the President of the United States to secure stabilization in a time of need.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I am prompted to ask the Senator from Nebraska why he should get agitated over this matter, because this declaration comes from one of those backward States which are not entitled to representation in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. Unless some one else wishes to ask me a question, I yield the floor.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I desire to say, in connection with the report of the committee on the activities of Mr. Grundy, that Mr. Grundy himself is quoted in to-day's paper as stating modestly that he is undecided whether he will accept a seat in this body or not, which it is forecast will be offered



him by the Governor of Pennsylvania. I want to correct that last statement; not by the Governor of Pennsylvania but by Grundy and the others who bought and paid for the office the Governor of Pennsylvania now occupies. Whenever they make up their minds, whether it is wise or otherwise for Mr. Grundy to be named, he will speak, but in the meantime he seizes upon the occasion, when for a little time he is in the public eye to the extent that he can procure himself to be quoted, to assail some of us who were opposed to the seating of Mr. Vare.

Following the example and lead of the patriotic and wise mayor of Philadelphia, who scornfully said that women were not paid for their political activities in Pennsylvania because they were not worth it, he referred to the Senator from Nebraska and myself as being feminine. He seems to think that carries with it an unanswerable charge of inferiority, and that all right-thinking people like himself and the mayor of Philadelphia will join in the approval which it is presumed will be given for placing us in such an ignominious position.

Mr. President, the governor occupies the same position among men and many politicians and other governors that is the title of the second book a young lady wrote, the first book being entitled "The Bad Girl." Everybody remembers the title of the second book, and that aptly describes the position of the man who for a little time, by the money of Grundy and others, is Governor of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHALL. For over a year now some mysterious financial interest has been purchasing the controlling interest in rural newspapers throughout the State of Minnesota and we have had ample evidence through the recent Federal Trade Commission's investigations that they have been doing the same in other States. In every county in my State these agents have been at work. Their plan is to secure the control of the paper and leave the editor in charge as a camouflage to its readers. Ordinarily the paper is to go along as usual but when the time comes that they want something especially, the mysterious influence takes charge of the policy of the paper. I understand that such interests have secured a couple of hundred of such papers in my State. It may have even reached 300.

I do not know that the great majority of the papers herein mentioned have been diligent in serving the Backus machine, which in Minnesota would compare with the Grundy machine in Pennsylvania, but I do know that a majority of these papers are constantly misrepresenting Senator SHIPSTEAD and me and our votes in this Senate and are in harmony with the Grundy theory that any change would be preferable to the western Senator who fights for agriculture.

I know of this movement to secure the rural press of my State for eastern financial interests to use as a club of public opinion upon the representatives of that State.

Perhaps it would be well to bear in mind the Grundy theory of fighting and belittling western Republican Senators who insist on a place in the sun for agriculture and are desirous of equality of protection for agriculture with industry. That is nothing for anyone to get frightened about. Just the same kind of a square deal for agriculture as industry has had for many years. Just keeping the Republican platform promises. Western Senators, even if they must, as Grundy puts it, talk "darned small" surely know eastern propaganda whether they see it in papers printed in the West or in the East, in the North or in the South, and the mere fact that such propaganda is printed in a western paper may not relieve it from the imputation that it was written in the East.

The article is self-explanatory and needs no comment on my part as to its classification but I thought if the Senate knew of the eastern newspaper-buying movement in my State it might find food for serious thought and it might be well for the lobby investigation committee, headed by Senator CARAWAY, to take note of this advertisement and probe a little to find the source of its payment.

I do know that it is from quotations of the majority of this list of newspapers that the Minneapolis Journal keeps constantly before its larger circle of readers any false disparaging comment concerning me in the furtherance of the Backus candidate for the Republican nomination to the Senate next June and if you will look at the bottom of this list, to be inserted in the RECORD by Senator ALLEN, you will see the name of the paper that is also at the bottom of this eastern advertising propaganda.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, notwithstanding what has been said about Minnesota and Minnesota newspapers, I venture to offer for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune, entitled "The Farmer as a Consumer." I ask to have that inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Saturday, November 30, 1929]

#### THE FARMER AS A CONSUMER

In a statement just issued at Chicago, Sam H. Thompson, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, for the moment turns the spotlight upon the importance of the farmer as a consumer.

This is a matter too frequently overlooked by all those seeking solution of economic problems now receiving widespread attention. The viewpoint adopted too often considers the farmer as one interested wholly in selling and only secondarily in buying.

Home from the conference of farm leaders with President Hoover, where agriculture pledged its aid to the proposed program for speeding up industry and public improvements, Mr. Thompson points out:

That there is a return of confidence and of buying power in rural America as a result of the manifest intent of the Government to extend the protective system to agriculture and to fulfill the home-market pledge.

That the farmers of rural America are ready to buy 150,000,000,000 feet of lumber, when they can afford it, to catch up with the repairs needed in buildings alone, and that this is more than four times the annual production of lumber in the United States.

That 5,000,000 farmers barred from access to markets, and the merchants who serve them when unimproved roads are impassable, are ready to authorize expenditures, when they can afford them, to expand and improve secondary roads reaching from farms to markets.

That this project will have an immediate reaction in the automobile industry reflected in sales of motor cars, and a subsequent reaction meaning the employment of more men in the automotive manufacturing industry.

That prosperity for the farmer will mean also a decided reaction in the farm-implement manufacturing industry, with results identical with those in the automobile industry.

Mr. Thompson might have gone much further with full warrant of facts. For it is true the farmer will buy more radios, more pianos, more electric-lighting plants, more plumbing, washing machines, more rugs, clocks, furniture, clothing, more of the comforts that go to create the American standard of living when he is able, and that the producing manufacturing industries for all these commodities will be correspondingly benefited.

There is no more hopeful feature of the program being worked out for agricultural rehabilitation than that indicated in increasing the buying power of the farmer and its inevitable effect upon the interest of industry.

And outstanding in this situation is the fact that a billion-dollar home market now denied the farmer by the tariff when given him will permit him to spend money at home which now goes abroad, and to improve his capacity as a consumer.

Agriculture in its current undertakings does not seek to penalize industry. It is not so shortsighted. It is too fully cognizant of the mutual interest involved.

The economic facts as they are being developed clearly point the way to increase home consumption of home-manufactured goods, and irrevocably fix the mutual interest of industry and agriculture under the American standard of living.

#### PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, while these interesting articles are being placed in the RECORD and the discussion is revolving around certain gentlemen who are being considered for the Senate, I am just wondering why some one on the other side of the aisle does not have read some of the articles that are appearing in the press touching the conspiracy to have a former President of the United States and a former Presiding Officer of this body run for the Senate in the State of Massachusetts.

Of course, we read and hear much about the anxiety of the President of the United States touching opposition within his own party to a renomination three years hence. We hear it said that Mr. Dwight Morrow was sent down to Mexico in order to destroy his chances for the Republican nomination. Then we read that certain leaders of the Republican Party put their heads together, and it is planned to send Mr. Morrow to the Senate and bury his hopes and aspirations in this august body.

The other gentleman who looms up as a probable candidate against the present President of the United States for renomination is the distinguished ex-President, Calvin Coolidge. It was an interesting article that appeared in the morning papers—I shall not detain the Senate by having it read—telling how, when the ex-President came to Washington on his last visit, and was seen by the correspondents of the press and gave a very interesting interview, Mr. Hoover was a little bit perturbed and afraid that his predecessor might grab the front page headlines, and one of the numerous secretaries to the President devised the scheme to have President Hoover give out a more sensational statement touching the cruiser construction program

and thereby stole the front page position from President Coolidge.

Now, we see the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], a man of long and distinguished service not only in this body but in the House of Representatives as a Member and as Speaker of the House, stepping aside in order to open the way for the ex-President to be nominated for the Senate.

Those who are close to Mr. Hoover, it is said, are behind this movement to get an ex-Governor of Massachusetts, Mr. Fuller, out of the way, so that President Coolidge can come and bury his hopes and aspirations in this august body.

I venture to give a little suggestion to ex-President Coolidge, because I like him personally, and I admire many things he did while President of the United States. He should not take that nomination for the Senate. I look into the faces of distinguished gentlemen over on the other side whose presidential aspirations have been nipped in the bud, not once but several times, because they happened to be Members of the United States Senate. This is a fine burial ground for presidential aspirations.

Even though the ex-President of the United States may have shone with great brilliancy in the White House, because of his quiet demeanor and his ability to remain silent when all public questions arose, and because, too, of the very exigencies of the times when we had to have tax reduction in this country, because of the sale of surplus war materials and postwar prosperity, and he received the credit for the tax-reduction program and stamped himself in the country as a great economist and a very able President, I advise him not to come to the Senate and bury himself in this body. He will not shine here as he did in the White House.

We remember him here as Vice President of the United States. When his history shall have been written little will be said about his qualifications as a Presiding Officer. In this body he will just have to take a back seat and his star will soon set. By running for the Senate he will merely play into the hands of the President and the President's friends.

I have too much respect for former President Coolidge to believe that he is going to fall for this subtle plan inaugurated by the very adroit politicians within the Republican Party who are very close to President Hoover. I have too much confidence in his good political judgment to think that he is going to accept a place in the Senate of the United States and by so doing bury himself and his presidential aspirations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, perhaps a word before I proceed to speak on the pending tariff bill would not be amiss in view of what has been said by the Senator from Mississippi. I want my friend from Mississippi to cease any further solicitude or alarm as to what may happen to former President Coolidge if he should become a candidate for the Senate and should undertake to be elected a Member of this distinguished body. I assure him that the Democracy of Massachusetts will take care of any candidate nominated by the Republican Party, and that I shall have the privilege and satisfaction of having a Democratic colleague in the Senate after the next election.

#### REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. BLAINE to the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

The amendment of the committee was, on page 172, line 23, to strike out "noils, 21 cents" and insert "noils, carbonized, 30 cents per pound."

The amendment to the amendment was, before the word "cents," to strike out "30" and insert "22."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] to the amendment of the committee, on page 172, line 23, to strike out "30" and insert "22." On that question the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the consideration of some facts in connection with the duty on wool rags. When we get into tariff discussions we are very likely to lose sight of facts. Local influences and prejudices from one group of producers sway our judgment and we forget the facts. I hope in the few moments I am privileged to address the Senate to present some undisputed facts in regard to the proposal to increase the duty upon wool rags.

The first question I want to put to my fellow Senators is, Who is asking for this increased duty?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can answer the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Not now. Is it the wool-rag picker? There are wool-rag pickers in America, a good many of them. No; it is not he. Is it the wool manufacturer? No. Is it the consumer of wool? No. Is it the woolgrower? Yes. The first fact therefore is that the petitioners for this unusually high and excessive duty on wool rags are the domestic wool-growers.

To make out a claim for an increased protective tariff duty some evidence ought to be presented here, first, as to whether or not the domestic industry is being injured, its production lessened, the value of its product decreased in price by reason of an increasing volume of imports; and, secondly, there ought to be some evidence presented that by reason of the entrance into this country of imported products that are taking the place of the domestic products, the domestic industry is becoming financially injured and threatened with destruction by being unable to produce here at a price less than, or at least equal to, the cost of the comparable imported product plus the tariff duty levied.

Where is the evidence here that since 1922, when we last adjusted these duties, there has been any increase in the imports of woolen rags into this country? Where is the evidence here that the imports of woolen rags have had a tendency to injure financially the woolgrowers of the country?

Before answering these questions I digress to call attention to the different grades or classes of wool with which we are dealing in this schedule. First, I want to remind Senators that there is imported into this country virgin wool used for clothing purposes. Secondly, there is imported into this country carpet wool, another type of virgin wool. Thirdly, there are imported into this country wool rags. Fourthly, there is produced in this country virgin wool. Fifthly, there are produced in this country wool rags.

Let us consider the prices of these grades of wool. Virgin wool imported into this country is valued, when the wool is of a character to be used in the making of woolen clothing, at 53.1 cents a pound. That is the average value of that class of imported wool. Combing wool used in making worsteds, which are a higher class of wool fabrics, is valued at 67.4 cents a pound. Carpet wool, which comes in free, averages 30.2 cents a pound in value. Wool rags which are imported bear an average valuation of 29 cents per pound. Exported domestic wool rags are valued at an average of 8 cents per pound. No one can successfully dispute these prices or classes of wool used in the manufacturing of wool fabrics.

Now if these figures mean anything, they mean that these grades or classes of wool serve different purposes and make different priced fabrics, different grades of clothing, different grades of blankets, different grades of socks, and different grades of sweaters, and are on the market at different prices.

What is behind this proposal to increase this duty? It is sought by the woolgrowers to take away from the American consumers the wool fabrics made from wool rags which average at a price of 28 or 29 cents per pound and substitute virgin wool which competes with imported wool where the average value is 60 to 80 cents per pound. Mark you, the woolgrower is looking in the direction of substituting virgin wool for imported wool rags. Otherwise he has no case here and he can get no benefit by this increased duty. He is not trying to help the domestic wool-rag dealers. He boldly seeks to shut out imported wool rags and force those manufacturers who make low-priced wool fabrics from wool rags to use high-priced virgin wool.

Mr. President, I invite the woolgrowers to look in another direction—namely, in the direction of wool rags domestically produced at 8 cents a pound. Fortunately I have here in the Senate to-day two blankets, one made from inexpensive domestic rags and another blanket made from imported rags which, as I said, average to cost about 29 cents a pound. I ask every Senator here before they vote upon this duty to feel both of these blankets. The one which I now hold in my hand is made from the imported rags, fine in texture, good appearing, and in every way suitable for the purpose of giving warmth. Here I display another blanket, coarse, heavy, lacking in the fineness of the previous one, and this one is made from domestic rags. A third blanket which I now display is made of all wool, selling at about \$10.

The domestic rag-made blanket sells at \$3, the imported rag-made blanket at \$4.50, and the virgin-wool blanket at \$10. These are about the lowest priced blankets of their type that could be obtained. What is the proposition?



Mr. SMOOT. But the Senator has not given—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Wait a moment, please. Placing this embargo duty upon the imported wool rags, the result would be that the American public would be obliged either to turn to the \$10 virgin-wool blanket or take as a substitute the \$3 blanket made from domestic wool rags, which are inferior and not nearly as valuable or as useful or as good as the imported wool rags.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No; if the Senator please. The other day I was interrupted so much that my speech was disconnected. I am trying to develop the facts in this issue and I prefer to proceed uninterrupted.

Mr. SMOOT. But the weights of the blankets are not the same by any manner of means.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think it is true, as the Senator calls my attention to the fact, that the first two blankets referred to are of the same weight and of the same type, one being made from domestically produced wool rags and the other from imported wool rags. But here is another blanket of the same weight as the blanket made from the virgin wool. This blanket is made from the imported rags and sells for \$5, while the blanket made from virgin wool sells at about \$10.

The same story runs through the exhibit which I have here of suits of clothes and overcoats. The weight is the same in a suit or overcoat where the virgin wool is used, of course; but the price of the virgin wool is in excess of that of the wool rags.

Why are the imported rags better than the domestic rags? That is a fair question.

The reason for the importation of rags into this country is because they are of such a nature as are not produced in quantity in this country.

The rags that we import consist mostly of old and new knit rags such as sweaters, jackets, stockings, and underwear. The production of this type of rag in this country is very limited as we consume principally cotton, rayon and silk underwear, stockings, and socks.

The rags which we export are mostly discarded and worn-out clothing of which we produce an abundance in this country. The rags we exported last year averaged in price approximately 8 cents per pound, while the rags that we imported averaged in price approximately 29 cents per pound.

The difference between the price of rags imported and exported is accounted for in that the rags exported will not compare either as to quality or staple with the rags imported, they being of a far superior type.

So we are able to get from Europe, from England particularly, these fine, high-class woolen rags from discarded woolen clothing of one kind or another.

In this country the only rags we have are obtained from discarded clothing, the wool in which is mixed with cotton and other fabrics, and because of the close weave it is more difficult and more costly to extract the pure wool from the American clothing. We import woolen rags for the purpose of supplying our people with better clothing and blankets than can be made from domestic rags, but not so good as can be made from virgin wool. We export domestic rags in great volume; indeed, our exports of woolen rags average about 15,000,000 pounds a year, while our imports of woolen rags are about 20,000,000 pounds a year.

The woolgrower contends and expects that the result of increasing the duty upon wool rags will be to stop wool rags coming into the country and the public will be driven into buying virgin wool for their clothing and their blankets, losing sight of the fact that the poor must have cheap clothing, and that they are not obliged or compelled to buy clothing made of virgin wool. So the effect of the increased duty will be to stop the exporting of domestic cheap rags and to substitute for the shoddy clothing of to-day the miserable coarse clothing that will be made from domestic rags, such as is exemplified in this blanket [exhibiting] which is made of domestic rags.

This proposition is very closely akin to the suggestion made in the early days of the consideration of the pending tariff bill, that we should put a tariff duty upon bananas in order to compel people to eat apples instead of bananas. It is proposed in this instance to impose a tariff duty upon wool rags which are not produced here, but which are used to help expand and develop the woolgrowers' business, because in fabricating these rags wool is interwoven, and so long as the rag business is prosperous there is a demand for more and more of the raw wool produced in this country.

I repeat, the result is not going to be what the proponents of the duty on wool rags claim. The result of this duty, if levied, will be to take away from the great middle classes of the country a kind of clothing that is cheaper than that made from

all wool, and compel them to purchase inferior clothing. I frankly say that I do not think the result of the imposition of this duty will be always to increase prices of clothing. If the manufacturer should continue to make the same grade of suit and the same grade of blanket there would be an increase in prices; but he is not going to do that. The public demands a \$22.50 suit; the public demands a \$5 blanket; and what is going to happen will be that domestic rags will take the place of imported rags; cheap 8-cent rags will take the place of 28-cent rags; and the poor, who always get the worst end of every deal, are to be forced by the action of the Congress of the United States into using cheaper and inferior clothing, which lacks the warmth and the appearance of the clothing they have been able to get from imported wool rags. Inferior substitutes will take the place of these superior wool rags.

There is a tremendous span in the prices of wool rags. I said the average price of imported wool rags is 28 or 29 cents. The price of some grades of wool rags is as high as is the price of raw wool—75 or even 80 cents a pound. Not many of them are so high, but they go almost up to that price and correspondingly down to a few cents a pound. So the result of the levying of this duty will be that the inferior and the cheaper foreign wool rags will be brought over here, and the higher class, the better wool rags, will be kept in Europe and will not come here if this duty shall be imposed upon them.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The motive in this instance is to substitute virgin wool for wool rags; the motive is to take from the public of America a class of wool material used in making cheap and serviceable clothing which they now enjoy. It would only be a short step to provide an embargo tariff duty upon silk or rayon or cotton that would attempt to compel the American public, instead of using other textiles in their clothing, to use woolen clothing.

With these facts before us let me present a few questions. Have the imports of wool since 1922 increased? The answer is they have not substantially increased. In 1922 there was a very substantial increase in wool importations, because the duty was increased at that time; the proposed increase had been pending here for months and a good deal of wool came in, anticipating a change of duty, for storage purposes; but there has been an appreciable decline during the years since then in the importation of virgin wool. Not only that, but there has been an appreciable tendency toward a decline in the importation of wool rags.

So we have not the situation of an industry in this country knocking at our doors asking for a readjustment of tariff duties, because, lo and behold, a constant stream of imports since the last tariff readjustment has been flowing into the country. That fact can not be disputed. There is no case here of increased importations; on the contrary, there has been a decrease. There is no case of increased rag importations, for in fact there has been a substantial decrease, and wool rags for clothing are becoming scarcer in Europe. The figures are all in the record.

How about the financial condition of the woolgrowers' industry? The woolgrower can not produce evidence that the situation has changed so as to threaten his being deprived of the domestic market. Until the past year it has been generally conceded that the woolgrower has been fairly prosperous; that he has been benefited by the increased duty that was levied in 1922; that he is among the most prosperous of the various farm groups. That is the case. As to him there is no serious depression, no serious loss, no such picture of conditions as other groups in the farming or manufacturing industry have been able to present. There has been no flood of imports robbing him of the domestic market.

I inquire what is the condition of the manufacturing industries dependent upon wool, and what is the condition of the consumers of the country who must bear the increased price which will result if this increased duty shall be levied?

In the last seven years the woolen industry has declined—and in making that statement I refer to all the branches of the industry, including both the woolen and worsted—substantially 20 per cent in earnings, in wages paid, and in production, the figures varying from 18 per cent to 21 per cent. Is this industry in a position to have the cost of its raw products increased in view of its present depressed condition? Is it the time to increase the rent upon a storekeeper when he is on the verge of bankruptcy? Is this the time to increase the price of the raw product of an industry which is struggling for its very life? Is this the time to increase unemployment?

Mark you, Mr. President, there are two industries affected—the worsted industry and the woolen industry. If the effort made here to increase the duty upon wool rags should succeed, it would injure seriously the woolen industry and tend to help the worsted industry, which uses not rags but new wool only.

The woolen industry is one of the most picturesque industries in the United States; it is an industry that can not help but appeal to our sympathies. There are 500 plants engaged in the woolen industry, using in part imported wool rags and employing 65,000 people. These organizations are small units and employ but few hands apiece. Along the Blackstone River, which rises in central Massachusetts and flows down into Narragansett Bay, near Providence, right by the home of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], there are more factories and mills in that stretch of 40 miles than on any other stream in the world. There is scarcely a foot of that stream that has not been converted by the construction of dams into a place for the storage of water for power purposes.

On that stream are dozens of these little factories, making the cloth that goes into the clothing and the blankets of the poor by the use of wool rags, and in that valley several thousands of hands are threatened with destruction if the effort here succeeds. To do what? Not merely to increase the burden on this industry, not to increase its raw product, so much as to force it out of business and make it abandon one type of business for another; to make these factories close and turn over their business to the worsted manufacturers, who are in larger units and who by reason of their consolidations have somewhat reduced competition. If this is not the purpose of the advocates of this duty on wool rags, then it is to force the woolen manufacturers to make a very much inferior shoddy clothing from the almost worthless domestic rags used now for making paper and felt roofing.

Is there any voice here to be raised to say, "What about the 65,000 working men and women in these factories? What about the small manufacturer who has invested his all in these little woolen mills, who by his genius and industry has built up a little business for himself in the making of clothing from wool rags?" Are we to think only of a group of woolgrowers and the possibility, the remote probability, of those woolgrowers being able by an embargo tariff law to force the poor to buy new wool only?

Mr. President, in clothing made of wool quality is of the essence of the whole tariff problem. This is because the cutting-up trade buys at a fixed price. The cutting-up clothing manufacturer says to the cloth manufacturer, "I will pay you so much per yard and no more, and I expect the best quality possible for that price or my contracts in the future will go to somebody else."

Thereupon the cloth manufacturer, with an eye both on his necessary profit and on keeping the business, puts 50 per cent of virgin wool into the fabric because the long staple of virgin wool gives wearing quality and appearance to the clothes made out of his cloth.

But virgin wool is dear and he can afford to put as much as 50 per cent of it into the cloth, at a fixed sales price for the cloth, only because wool rags are cheap—worth, say, about one-third as much per pound as the virgin wool.

Now, then, if the cost of wool rags should be materially increased, but still cost the cloth manufacturer less than virgin wool costs him, he will decrease the proportion of virgin wool and increase the proportion of yarn made from wool rags.

So, in the end, what will happen will be that, with respect to this branch of trade, there will be less virgin wool used than before (and the wool raiser will not be benefited at all) and there will be less wearing quality in the clothes made from the cloth thus artificially forced into a lower-quality channel.

This increased duty on wool rags should be entitled "An act to cause the middle classes of the American public, including farmers, to be shabbily dressed."

Senators, this is unfair dealing. It can not be justified. The poor can not become rich overnight. There is no immediate prospect in America that the earning power of the American working man and woman is going to increase so rapidly that he can turn from a shoddy suit of clothes to a virgin-wool suit of clothes. Indeed, it is certain that he will have to turn to the domestic shoddy or rags and get a poorer and inferior quality and pay the same price he now pays for higher-grade shoddy clothing.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply desire to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the principal raw material of these woolen mills is rags imported into this country.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Undoubtedly; it is their all. Of course with the rags they do use some fleece wool in making clothing.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The statement is rather general. Can the Senator give us any facts? What is the total amount of wool rags used by the woolen mills of the State of Massachusetts, and what is the total amount of virgin wool used by them? Let us see.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will develop the facts. I have purposely been general, because the facts have all been placed in the RECORD during these days we have been debating this duty on wool rags.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I asked because the Senator was going to give us facts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will give you the facts.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, when we were discussing the rates on virgin wool I put into the RECORD the percentage of raw materials used by the woolen manufacturers. While I do not recall the exact figures, I think the rags constitute about 21 per cent of the raw material of the woolen manufacturers in the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That sounds more reasonable.

Mr. SMOOT. That is about right.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Georgia is correct; and not only that, but the percentage of rags that has been used has decreased steadily and the percentage of wool has increased.

I have in my hand a table which shows the fiber used in the manufacture of woven-woolen fabrics. This table shows that the percentage of scoured wool that was used in the woven-wool fabrics in 1914 was 27 per cent of the total fabrics. In 1919 it was 37 per cent. In 1925 it was 40 per cent. In 1927 it was 41 per cent.

The amount of rags used in 1914 was 27 per cent—exactly the same as the scoured wool. In 1919 it had dropped to 20 per cent. In 1925 it was 23 per cent. In 1927 it was 22 per cent.

The amount of cotton used in 1914 was 11 per cent. In 1919 it was 6 per cent. In 1925 it was 7 per cent. In 1927 it was 7 per cent.

The amount of recovered wool fiber in 1914 was 12 per cent. In 1919 it was 14 per cent. In 1925 it was 11 per cent. In 1927 it was 9 per cent.

The amount of wastes and noils in 1914 was 17 per cent. In 1919 it was 17 per cent. In 1925 it was 17 per cent. In 1927 it was 18 per cent.

The amount of animal hairs in 1914 was 7 per cent. In 1919 it was 5 per cent. In 1925 it was 2 per cent. In 1927 it was 2 per cent.

Adding those percentages together you will find the total is 100 per cent in each case; and the table shows the division in percentages of the fibers that are used. This table shows that in 1924 the percentage of wool rags and clippings was 27 per cent of the woven-wool fabric, and in 1927 it had dropped to 22 per cent.

I ask that this table be incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

*Fiber used in manufacture of woven-woolen fabrics*  
[Data from U. S. Census]

	1914	1919	1925	1927
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
Scoured wool	27	37	40	41
Rags and clippings	27	20	23	22
Cotton	11	6	7	7
Recovered wool fiber	12	14	11	9
Wastes and noils	17	17	17	18
Animal hairs	7	5	2	2

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in connection with this matter, will the Senator, in view of his familiarity with this subject, indicate to us which paragraphs of the bill deal with woolen goods as distinguished from worsted goods?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not think either of them does. The divisions of woven-wool fabrics are based upon their weight per square yard and the price per pound of the woven-wool fabric rather than the material that is used in it; but it is assumed—and I will ask the Senator from Utah if I am correct—it is assumed that because wool rags are cheaper than virgin wool, the shoddy cloth, so-called, or the woolen cloth falls in the lower brackets, being cheaper per yard than the worsted,



which falls in the higher brackets. I will ask the Senator from Utah whether that is a fair statement.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a fair statement.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me ask the Senator, then, this question, in view of his deep concern—in which, of course, we all share—about increasing the cost of clothing to the poor: As a matter of fact, is there not a substantial raise in this bill in the duty on woolen goods?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There has to be.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, there is a compensatory duty.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. You can not raise the duty upon raw wool from 31 to 34 cents, and raise the duty upon wool rags, without an increase in the duties on woolen goods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Does the Senator assert that there is no raise except the compensatory raise?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think there is a raise of 5 per cent per pound of cloth in certain of these grades.

Mr. SMOOT. The ad valorem is raised.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So that apparently we are both involved in this crime of raising the cost of clothing to the poor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Oh, I do not wonder that the Senator is disturbed about voting for this duty upon wool rags. He is trying to get away from the issue that I am insisting upon—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Not at all.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That wool rags make the clothing of the poor; that an increase from 8 to 24 cents means an effort here to force the industry that uses wool rags into using virgin wool, which is a very much more expensive product, and will result in increasing the prices of clothing or giving the poor inferior and cheaper, shoddy clothing.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; we seek to increase the price in one way, and you seek to increase the price in another way.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have not sought to increase the duties in the wool schedule. I was not a member of the Finance Committee that voted the raises in these duties; and I will say to the Senator that I sat in this Chamber in 1922, and you saw me here fighting the duties that were levied on raw wool, wool rags, and wool fabrics in the wool schedule, though it was one of the principal industries of my State. Why? The woolen industry was prosperous at that time. The industry had made large sums of money during the war. In my judgment they did not have a case for increased protective tariff duties. Now, I am frank to say, the situation is changed. The industry is in dire distress.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Seeing that we have gotten into personalities about this matter, the Senator will remember that I voted with him against all these increases upon raw wool as well as upon the manufactured product. He will remember that the other day I voted against the increase in the duty upon raw wool; so this is rather aside from the matter, it seems to me.

The situation is that the people of the West who are engaged in growing wool are desirous of raising the duty on wool rags, which will increase to some extent no doubt the cost of clothing to the poor. The people of Massachusetts are insisting upon an increase in the duty on woolen goods, which will increase the cost of clothing to the poor; so that in that respect we are in exactly the same situation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I remember the interest the Senator from Massachusetts took in this schedule in 1922. Of course we had free wool up to that time, and the Senator desired free wool at that time.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was willing to levy a small duty on raw wool, but not 31 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. And, of course, if we had had free wool at that time we would not have been producing any wool in the United States to-day. That is conceded by everybody now. It is true that the raise of 3 cents a pound on the scoured content of wool will slightly increase the cost of all goods into which that wool goes. It is 3 cents a pound. There are only about three pounds in a suit of clothes. That would be 9 cents on a suit of clothes. That is as far as the wool duty goes in the way of an increase over and above what the rate is to-day.

I know that the Senator desires not to be interrupted—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. But as soon as the Senator is through I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the very examples that have been given.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BLAINE. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah just how much the woolgrower is going to get out of that 3-cent increase on clean content.

Mr. SMOOT. He is going to get it all.

Mr. BLAINE. Three cents a pound?

Mr. SMOOT. He will get the increase of 3 cents a pound.

Mr. BLAINE. On what wool?

Mr. SMOOT. On the scoured wool; on any kind of wool that is imported into the United States or used in the United States.

Mr. BLAINE. How does the Senator figure that?

Mr. SMOOT. I figure it in that way because that is exactly what it is going to be.

Mr. BLAINE. Does the Senator contend that the farmer now gets the full benefit of the 31 cents?

Mr. SMOOT. No. I contend, however, that any increase here will be an absolute increase over and above the amount that he gets to-day.

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; an increase relative to the extent to which he now benefits from the tariff protection.

Mr. SMOOT. No; not relative. It will be the total amount of what he is getting to-day.

Mr. BLAINE. Then why does he not get the 31 cents to-day?

Mr. SMOOT. That has been explained here, Mr. President, and can be explained again; but I know that the Senator from Massachusetts does not want to have it done in his time.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No; I shall have to ask for the floor.

Mr. BLAINE. But the Senator from Utah has not said how much the farmer receives per pound for his wool off the sheep's back.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah would have to take more time than the Senator from Massachusetts desires to give at this time to go into the details of it.

Mr. BLAINE. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit just one other suggestion, last Friday I offered the Senator from Utah all the time he wanted in my time to answer that question. He did not answer it then; he has not answered it in this debate; and I doubt very much if he is going to answer the question.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may have my conscience in his keeping, but I doubt it.

Mr. BLAINE. I should like to have the question answered while it is material.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has intimated that my position is one of supporting the duties asked for in this bill by the woolen manufacturers. I want to state my position.

I am for the present law on virgin wool, on wool rags, and on manufactured woolen fabrics. I will let others choose and defend their position, especially those who are going to vote for the duty on wool rags. I have already voted against the increased duty on virgin wool; I am going to vote against the duty on woolen rags; and I am going to do my part to preserve the present law in all respects so far as the wool schedule is concerned. I remind the Senator from Montana that he is advocating an increased duty of 200 per cent on wool rags, whereas the duties on the manufactures of wool rags is increased less than 10 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator will modify his statement at least in this particular: The House bill provides for wool rags and flocks, a duty of 8 cents a pound. That is perfectly absurd; flocks and rags are not the same.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course, my statement is subject to modification, just as the Senator points out; the House included rags and flocks together, and they are of different values, and for the sake of clarity and fairness there ought to be a different duty levied on those two articles.

Mr. SMOOT. There must be.

Mr. FLETCHER. How about the present law? The Senator says he is for the present law. Does the present law make any distinction?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think not; and there are no importations of flocks to speak of. The distinction is immaterial.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Before the Senator proceeds, I would like to have the facts elicited by the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Montana with reference to these rags somewhat clarified.

I want to ask a question of the Senator, who has probably made a more thorough investigation of this matter than I have. Do not the woolen mills consume practically all of the woolen rags that are imported into this country?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is my information.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says they will constitute 27 per cent of their raw material.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. About 21 per cent this year. Fifteen years ago it was 27 per cent. Now it has gotten down to 21 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. They use also what the Senator has called domestic rags.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Most of our domestic rags are imported.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is the Senator correct in that? Are not most of our domestic rags exported?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I stated that in the early part of my remarks.

Mr. SIMMONS. What they use in addition to these woolen rags imported into this country is woolen waste, which is produced in this country; not woolen rags, but woolen waste. That is somewhat on a parity with woolen rags. Then they use about 10 per cent of cotton.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Seven per cent at the present time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator to say 10 per cent a little while ago. So that a little bit more than one-half of the raw material used by them is imported from abroad, or is waste of our woolen factories, or is cotton. The balance of it is virgin wool, and virgin wool of an inferior quality as a rule.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator has stated the situation accurately.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, did the Senator from Massachusetts give the percentages of the raw materials?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will repeat what I said to the Senate a few minutes ago.

The fiber used in the manufacture of woven-woolen fabrics consists of the following: Scoured wool, rags and clippings, cotton, recovered wool fiber, wastes and noils, and animal hair. The United States Census Bureau has reported the use of these various fibers, which I give in proportions to the nearest per cent.

In 1914 the amount of scoured wool was 27 per cent; in 1927 it was 41 per cent.

In 1914 the rags and clippings were 27 per cent; in 1927 they were 22 per cent.

Cotton in 1914 was 11 per cent; in 1927 it was 7 per cent.

The recovered wool fiber was, in 1914, 12 per cent; in 1927 it was 9 per cent.

Wastes and noils were 17 per cent in 1914 and 18 per cent in 1927. That seems to have remained about the same during these four periods when the census was taken.

Animal hair was 7 per cent in 1914, and in 1927 it was 2 per cent.

Adding up all those percentages shows how the hundred per cent of the fibers in woven woolen fabrics are divided.

Mr. GEORGE. So that in 1927 approximately 50 per cent of the raw materials of the woolen manufacturers consisted of wool in scoured condition plus animal hair, plus cotton, and approximately 50 per cent consisted of rags, clippings, recovered wool fiber, wool wastes, and noils. That is correct?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is my understanding.

Mr. GEORGE. Did the Senator put in the figures with reference to the worsted manufacturers?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I did not.

Mr. SMOOT. It is in the RECORD.

Mr. GEORGE. It is in the RECORD, but it is interesting to note that the raw material of worsted manufacturers, on the other hand, in 1927 was as follows: Wool in the scoured condition, 81.46 per cent. Animal hair, 12.66 per cent. Cotton, 2.66 per cent. While rag clippings amounted to only 0.16 per cent; recovered wool fiber amounted to 0.41 per cent; wastes and noils amounted to 0.265 per cent.

In other words, the rags, clippings, recovered wool fiber, wastes, and noils, in worsted manufacture constitute less than 3 per cent of the raw material.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator for putting that information in the RECORD.

During these interruptions my attention has been called by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] to a letter which he received from the Jefferson Woolen Mills of Knoxville, Tenn.; and I want to repeat what I said a few minutes ago about these woolen mills. I spoke particularly of the large number in New England, but they are in every part of this country. They are in California, they are in the South, they are in the West, little units of industry which have grown up for the purpose of supplying a cheap grade of clothing to the people who can not afford the all-wool.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, are we to understand that all these so-called woolen mills to which the

Senator has called our attention produce these articles from wool rags and other woolen wastes?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Those which are engaged in the woolen business do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The making of blankets, of course, is classed as the production of woolen goods.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The larger units, like the American Woolen Co., make worsted and woolen goods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Blankets are not worsted; they are woolen goods.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Does not the Senator know that quite a large number of the woolen mills out on the coast and in the Western States specialize in making virgin-wool blankets?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have no doubt about it. There must be some virgin-wool blankets. There are many shoddy blankets made of wool rags as well.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So that the fact that there are woolen mills scattered all over the country does not by any means indicate that those woolen mills are using either rags or woolen wastes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I venture to say that there is not a State in the Union in which there are not woolen mills using some wool rags.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I dare say that is true. There are a large number in the State of Oregon, for instance, that make exclusively virgin-wool blankets.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have a letter I want to read at this juncture, and then I will yield.

The letter I have in my hand, Mr. President, is from the Jefferson Woolen Mills, Knoxville, Tenn., and reads:

DEAR SENATOR BROCK: We earnestly ask your consideration of paragraph No. 1105 of the proposed tariff legislation that increases the duty on wool waste.

The present duty of 8 cents per pound is acceptable to all mills that produce the medium and lower priced fabrics, but the proposed advance to 24 cents per pound will compel the discontinuance of waste and largely increase the cost of workmen's clothing.

The worsted mills of New England, by working hand in glove with the woolgrowers, will alone be benefited by putting wool waste out of commission, and the carded woolen manufacturers will suffer.

The worsted mills that use the virgin wool are practically all in New England, but scattered throughout the country we find woolen mills in which the cheaper goods are made.

Mark this sentence in the letter received by the Senator from Tennessee:

The laboring men, who are in the great majority, can not afford to wear clothing made entirely of virgin wool. The clothing they and their children are accustomed to wear, and which is composed of wool carded with a certain amount of cotton and wool waste, is also more serviceable than much of the clothing now made entirely of low-grade wools.

Respectfully,

JEFFERSON WOOLEN MILLS.

Mr. President, I could produce, and probably every Senator here could produce, innumerable letters of the same type and character, and I do not wonder that those who are going to vote for this duty are uncomfortable and disturbed at the suggestion that it is a duty which will bear especially heavy upon the poorer classes of our population; that it is a duty which will result in increasing the prices of their clothing; that will result in substituting inferior and cheaper blankets and cheaper clothing. That issue can not be dodged. The very spirit underlying this movement is to substitute something else for wool rags. What is it—cotton? No. Is it domestic rags? No. Is it silk? No. What are you trying to do? You are trying to substitute virgin wool produced here in the United States for imported wool rags. That is your purpose. Who can dispute the fact that virgin wool costs more than wool rags; twice as much, indeed?

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to present this issue to the country. Outside of the Senators from the wool-growing States, I do not believe any Senator can successfully defend this outrageous, indefensible proposition, in one fell swoop to increase the duty upon the products that enter into the cheaper clothing from 8 cents a pound to 24 cents a pound.

I can not conceive of any spirit behind this bold move except extreme selfishness and greed, disregard for another great industry, disregard for the working people in that industry, and disregard for the great masses of our people who have to buy the cheaper fabrics.

I venture to say that of all the roll calls during the consideration of this tariff bill, the one on this amendment will be the outstanding one.



I venture to say that Senators who vote for this increased duty will be on the defensive in the next campaign from the beginning to the end. Of course, I exclude those who come from the woolgrowing States, because I can appreciate that their situation may be different and that their zeal and their desire to increase their local industry may prevent them from seeing the viewpoint of the consumer. The roll call will say and declare who is forcing the American people into the use of clothing, overcoats, underwear, and blankets, all of poorer quality.

As I said in the speech I made in the closing days of the last session, there are other ways of injuring human beings than through starvation. They can be injured by raising the price of food so that the sustaining things of life will be taken from them.

Human beings, especially children, can also be seriously injured from exposure, from lack of shelter, and that is just what we are discussing here now. Let us pause before we use our power to levy tariff duties, for such unworthy purposes, namely, by pretending to enrich a few, rob the many of the comforts and protection that wool clothing affords.

Mr. President, the exhibit of suits, overcoats, blankets, and woven fabrics that I have placed in the Senate Chamber demonstrates that articles made of virgin wool cost greatly in excess of those made of wool rags, and that the increased duty on wool rags will substantially advance the prices on medium-grade clothing and blankets, which are the only woolen goods that the working and middle classes can afford to purchase. Particular attention is directed to the blankets on display.

Blanket, sample AA, is made of domestic rags, and is greatly inferior in quality to blanket, sample B, made from English rags, which demonstrates beyond contradiction that goods made from the high-grade imported wool rags are much better than goods made from the low-grade rags produced solely in the United States. Facts and figures explaining the exhibit follow:

#### OVERCOATS

Exhibit B is an all-wool coat that retails at from \$32.50 to \$40. Another overcoat of the same grade on display is made from fabric which is 90 per cent wool rag and retails for \$20. If 16½ cents a pound is added to the duty on rags, this popular overcoat will retail at not less than \$25 and in some instances \$27.50—an increase of \$5 to \$7.50 on overcoats worn by the majority of men.

#### SUITS

A virgin-wool suit in the exhibit retails at \$50. Exhibit C is a suit of similar quality made from 100 per cent wool rags that retails at \$25, with two pairs of pants. If the proposed duty on wool rags is retained, the retail price of the wool-rag suit, which is the one in greatest demand, will be \$27.50 to \$30, depending on the type of concern marketing the suit—an increase of from \$2.50 to \$5.

#### WOVEN FABRICS

Among the exhibits is an exhibit of overcoating fabric made from wool rags. The claim here is made that the additional duty on wool rags will increase the cost of this woven fabric 60 cents per yard. It has already been shown how this will affect the price of overcoats of medium price, namely, an increase from \$5 to \$7.50.

#### BLANKETS

The first blanket—sample AA—is made of domestic rags, and according to our best information, this stock would advance approximately 10 cents per pound, at least. The mill sale price on this blanket is \$2, and on that basis the retailer sells it at \$3. On an increase of 10 cents per pound the mill price would be \$2.40 and retail price \$3.60; increase to the consumer of 20 per cent, or 60 cents.

Sample blanket B—made of better-grade rags, comparable to English rags, the mill sale price would be \$3 and retail sale price \$4.50; on the increased tariff the mill sale price \$4 and the retail price \$6, increase to the consumer of approximately 33½ per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want to consume much of the time of the Senate, but I think there ought to be a brief explanation made of the exhibits and also some of the statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in relation to rags and other wastes used in the manufacture of woolen goods in the United States. The Senator started out by exhibiting to the Senate some blankets. He said that one blanket made of virgin wool sells at \$10. He said the other blanket is made of all waste. Then he called attention to a third article which he called a blanket, which, of course, is simply a laprobe, single; and then he compared the prices of all three articles, when they do not weigh the same and are not the same class of goods at all.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The purpose of exhibiting the two blankets which the Senator calls laprobes was simply to show the texture and character of the one robe made from imported rags and the other robe made from domestic rags. There is one blanket there made from domestic rags. I exhibited the other two blankets, one of which is made from all virgin wool and one from imported rags.

Mr. SMOOT. It does not make any difference whether they are imported rags or American rags.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Oh, yes; there is a great difference.

Mr. SMOOT. I know there is a difference in the importations, because the importations are of rags coming into this country worth 28 cents a pound.

Let me show the Senate of the United States what the rags are about which we are talking. Here [exhibiting] are the rags that we import. These are the rags that are worth 28 cents a pound. The rags that are being compared with these are rags that are cut off of old clothing gathered up from all parts of the United States, the clippings of the manufacturers in making up suits.

The rags which I display are sweater rags; they are soft rags. These rags can be made into wool just as good as any to make a thread up to 46, just as good as a thread made from virgin wool. One can not draw the thread out finer, but for a 46 it can be used, and it is just as good for that purpose as scoured wool. There is no question about it at all. Not only rags but the whole paragraph ought to be considered in the light of making the rates on an equal basis at least and not having it like the act of 1922, which has developed in the United States almost a new industry in the woolen business in the shipping and using of wool rags.

Here [exhibiting] is a noil on which we are asked to grant an increased rate. Who would not want to use this noil at a rate of 30 cents instead of 34 cents on the scoured contents? The scoured content of the wool after it is scoured is used, and the very first time it is put in the machine, beginning with the first card, there is a waste. I do not care how clean it may be washed or how clean it may be scoured, if we put the wool upon a card in the first breaker, when we go into the card room we see the little fibers flying all over the room. We find them under the cylinder of the carding machine, the first breaker, the second breaker, and even the condenser itself. There is an absolute waste in that respect. The noil which I have displayed contains none of that waste. This noil has had all of that waste material taken out of it. The noil which it is said comes in competition with wool here is just as good as any wool that was ever used for the making of any blanket, I do not care how fine it may be. What is the use of saying to the wool raiser, "We will give you with this hand 34 cents on scoured wool and with the other hand we will take it away from you in the rate on noils and with the rate on the class of rags that I have shown here"? They ought to be taken care of alike, one way or the other.

The Senator from Massachusetts referred to \$25 suits of clothes. There are suits upon the table which I have had placed there, purchased within the last two days, not only a worsted suit for \$22.50 but a fine woolen suit as well. There is an overcoat there of all wool, every ounce of it wool, selling for \$22.50. Here we have on the Democratic side of the Chamber suits containing rags, displayed by the Senator from Massachusetts, which sell for \$25.

As to the amount of wool used in woolen goods referred to just a moment ago—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do the worsted manufacturers use noils or rags at all?

Mr. SMOOT. The worsted manufacturers can not use them. A result in the process of the combing of the wool is to make noils, and after the noil is made as it comes from the various processes, then the carded people buy the noils.

Mr. SIMMONS. But they make goods that sell on the market at a much higher price than the average woolen goods.

Mr. SMOOT. They are generally a little higher. There is on exhibit here a suit of clothes to which I have called attention, a worsted suit, which sells for \$22.50.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then the woolen people of the country use all the waste, all the noils, and all the rags? Do the woolen mills that make these cheaper goods use all the noils, all the waste, and all the rags?

Mr. SMOOT. They use what they can. Wherever a rag waste is used or any kind of waste, it is a coarser thread. Even in the carding we can not draw out a really fine thread if we put any waste in it at all. It has to be virgin wool in order to do that.

The waste and noils represent 18.46 per cent of all the clothing in the United States made by the carded-woolen people. The noils that I have shown here are waste. They can put it in their clothing. That is carded; it is not combed. It is treated entirely in a different way, but it is just as good as wool of that kind. I would not care a snap of my finger whether noils went into a carded thread or whether pure wool went into the carded thread. It would not make a particle of difference.

Now let me refer to the rags again. All we have to do is put those rags on a machine and run them through, and we have wool that can be used by the carded-woolen people and is used by them. It ought to be used. It never ought to be wasted at all. It would be a wicked waste if it were undertaken to waste this kind of material. It is just as warm, it is just as good, and it answers every purpose in the world, so why should not they use it if they can get it? These rags are what are imported into this country. Our cheaper rags that I have described are exported. We are exporting rags because of the fact that better rags are gathered from all over the world and shipped in here—rags of the character which I have shown. Why? They have free wool, and it does not pay them to use these rags when they have free wool. England does not have to use that kind of stuff. She has free wool. If we had free wool we would not want to be using rags either. Therefore the best rags in the world come here, and our poorest rags are exported. That condition can not be changed. I do not think we want to change it. I know I would not want to change it.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator does not dispute the fact that the cheap so-called woolen goods used by the poorer classes of people of the country are made by woolen mills and made very largely out of the rags imported into this country and the waste which is used in this country by the mills and by tailors and other people who make clothing.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no. They use either wool or a substitute which is just as good as wool.

Mr. SIMMONS. Who uses all of the rags or practically all of the rags that we import?

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean in the manufacture of cloth?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The carded-woolen people use them, entirely so.

Mr. SIMMONS. And the goods turned out are known generally as shoddy?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no. "Shoddy" is an old term used for the purpose of designating articles like flocks. We have here a rate of 8 cents a pound on flocks. What are flocks? After this piece of goods comes from the loom and goes into the finishing room and is scoured in the finishing room, then it is gigned, and that gig brings out all the little loose fibers about one-sixteenth of an inch in length. Then it goes through a shearing machine and those fibers are taken off to show the pattern and to make a surface on it. What is taken off is the flocks. Whoever uses flocks except for weighting? That is all it is used for. Flocks are not over one-sixteenth of an inch long and there is proposed a rate of 8 cents on flocks and according to the House provision wool rags bear the same rate. It is unthinkable that they should have made such a provision if the true situation was brought to their attention. I can not understand why it was ever done, because there is no sense in it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Admitting that the woolen mills use all of the rags that we import, admitting that they use a great deal of waste wool that is produced in this country and use only a part of the virgin wool, and that of an inferior quality, I can not understand why the Senator insists that the consumers of these cheap products should have the price of their clothing advanced by the high rate which he advocates.

If the Senator will pardon me for just a moment—

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to answer the Senator's question now.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say just this about it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me answer that statement first and then the Senator can proceed. An overcoat has been exhibited here by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] made of all waste. Every ounce of wool material in that overcoat would not cost more than \$1.75. The whole wool product that is in there would not cost more than \$1.75.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is not a question of whether the price is high or whether the price is low, but the question is whether the poor people of the country will get their clothing cheaper if the duty on rags is low than they will if the duty on rags is high.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that I doubt whether there will be a single penny of difference.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator from Utah mean to contend that the duty on rags, whether high or low, will have no effect upon the price of the products made out of them?

Mr. SMOOT. Let me state the fact as to one of the sample suits of clothes which is exhibited in the left corner of the Chamber. They are as follows:

A carded woolen suit made entirely from pure wool (retail price, \$22.50):

Made of cloth weighing 14 ounces per yard.

Three and one-half yards of cloth in the suit makes 49 ounces of cloth in the suit.

One and one-half ounces of wool required to make an ounce of cloth.

Forty-nine times  $1\frac{1}{2}$  equals  $73\frac{1}{2}$  ounces of wool to make the suit.

Proposed increase in wool duty of 4 cents per pound equals  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent per ounce.

Seventy-three and one-half ounces of wool at a duty increase of  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent per ounce equals a duty increase of  $18\frac{1}{2}$  cents for the entire suit.

The entire wool duty cost in the suit would be \$1.56 under the proposed rate, as against \$1.38 under the existing rate.

Does the Senator from North Carolina think a difference is going to be made in the price because of a duty increase of  $18\frac{1}{2}$  cents on the entire suit?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator might just as well argue that the wool in a garment is of very little value because the quantity is very small.

Mr. SMOOT. That is quite a different thing.

Mr. SIMMONS. But whether the quantity is large or the quantity is small, the prices which will have to be paid upon the wool content, whether it be clean wool or rags, is advanced to the extent of the duty which is imposed upon such quantities of the material as enter into the making of the cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think it will make any difference at all in the retail price. I do not think there is a sufficient increase to justify any retailer to ask more for a suit of clothes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator think that the cost of the wool that enters into a suit of clothes has something to do with the price of the suit of clothes?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say that it has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what the statement of the Senator logically means.

Mr. SMOOT. The proposed increase in the present rate on the amount of waste that goes into a suit of clothes would be so small that I do not think it would ever appear in the retail price of the suit of clothes; in other words, the suit now selling for \$22.50 will still sell for \$22.50 and the \$25 suit of clothes will sell for \$25.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator think that the American manufacturer can make a suit of clothes out of pure wool and sell it at the price for which the suit of clothes on the rack in the corner of the room is selling?

Mr. SMOOT. The manufacturer is doing that right now.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know where the Senator got his information. How does the Senator imagine that—

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. How does the Senator imagine that that suit would ever be sold if the pure-wool suit could be sold as cheaply in the American market?

Mr. SMOOT. It is sold, Senator—

Mr. GEORGE. Where is the customer who would buy that suit at the same price that he would have to pay for a pure-wool suit?

Mr. SMOOT. That all depends upon the retailer and upon what he asks for his goods.

Mr. GEORGE. When the Senator speaks of the retailer he refers to a retailer who handles every class of goods. The Senator knows that the American manufacturer can not make a suit out of pure wool and sell it as cheaply as that suit there [indicating] is sold for.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a sample before us of a worsted suit. Waste can not be put in a worsted suit; and it is an all-worsted suit. It was purchased from the Richman Bros. Co. Now this is the analysis of it—

Mr. GEORGE. Just a minute. If the pure-wool suit made of pure American wool can be sold as cheaply as the suit made of shoddy and waste, why is there need for a duty?



Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of what the suit is sold for.

Mr. GEORGE. Why is any duty needed at all? If that is true, the Senator knows that his premise can not be correct.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may say that, but a duty is needed in order to insure that at least a sufficient number of sheep will be maintained in this country to furnish a part of the wool which we use. Where would we have been in the war time if we had not had any sheep here?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to go back to the war.

Mr. SMOOT. I imagine the Senator does not, but we may have another war at some time.

Mr. GEORGE. But the Senator is making an astounding statement for him that a suit of clothes made of imported woolen rags is sold in this market at the same price for which the American merchant can sell American clothes manufactured out of pure wool of the same weight and the same grade.

Mr. SMOOT. Exactly. There are  $3\frac{1}{2}$  yards of cloth in a suit.

Mr. GEORGE. I know that.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will not let me finish, I am not going to yield to him further.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to make a statement and then I will yield.

There [indicating] is a suit of clothes which was bought from the Richman Bros. Co. for \$22.50. I ask any Senator to take the cheap suit in the opposite corner of the Senate Chamber and compare it with the Richman Bros. suit. The Richman Bros. suit is a worsted suit, and in a worsted suit no waste can be put. This is an all-worsted suit. The facts as to that suit are as follows:

An all-worsted suit, made entirely of pure wool (retail price \$22.50):  
Made of cloth weighing 12 ounces per yard.

Three and one-half yards of cloth in the suit makes 42 ounces of cloth in the suit.

One and one-half ounces of wool required to make an ounce of cloth.

Forty-two times  $1\frac{1}{2}$  equals 63 ounces of wool in the suit.

Proposed increase of wool duty, of 3 cents per pound, equals one-quarter cent per ounce.

Sixty-two times one-quarter cent equals a duty increase of  $15\frac{1}{2}$  cents in the entire suit.

Whole wool duty in suit under proposed rate would be \$1.31, as against \$1.17 under the existing rate.

That suit, which it is said the poor man does not buy, but which the rich man buys, is sold for \$2.50 less than the suit exhibited at the other end of the Chamber.

In this connection I will also give the facts as to the overcoat, which is on exhibition in the Chamber:

A carded woolen overcoat, made entirely of pure wool (retail price \$22.50):

Made of cloth weighing 32 ounces per yard.

Three and one-half yards of cloth in the overcoat.

Three and one-half times 32 ounces equals 112 ounces of cloth in the overcoat.

One and one-half ounces of wool required to make an ounce of cloth.

One hundred and twelve times  $1\frac{1}{2}$  equals 168 ounces of wool in the overcoat.

Raw wool duty in the overcoat under present rate is \$3.26.

Under proposed rate it would be \$3.57.

The duty increase in the overcoat, therefore, would be 31 cents.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator answers one more question, I will not interrupt him again. Why should there be any rags imported into this country, to be made into suits, if the manufacturer can take the pure wool and make a suit and sell it cheaper than he can sell a suit made from rags?

Mr. SMOOT. The suit to which I have just referred is a worsted suit, and no rags can be put in it.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not talking about that. Most of us, however, would rather have a worsted suit than a cheap woolen suit.

Mr. SMOOT. And it can be bought just as cheaply.

Mr. GEORGE. Will not the Senator please answer my question? Why has there been an increase in the importation of woolen rags if the manufacturer can make and sell a suit made of pure wool as cheaply as or cheaper than he can a suit made of rags? Will the Senator explain that?

Mr. SMOOT. A carded mill can not make a worsted cloth and a worsted mill can not make a carded cloth.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator to wait for a moment. I want, at least, to have time to explain the question of price.

There is no question that there is a difference in the retail price of exactly the same goods in different sections of the country, and, perhaps, in the same city. A question is asked, Why are rags imported into the United States? The rags which are imported are the very best rags that can be found in the world; they are gathered all over the world for the American trade, and they are shipped here. I have shown the samples both of the white and the colored rags. They are of this character [exhibiting]. The carded-woolen manufacturers use that class of rags. If there is desired a fine face upon, say a 28 or 32 ounce overcoating, with a backing as to which it was not necessary to draw more than a 24 thread waste can be used, particularly when made of such rags as these [indicating]. It is just as warm; it wears just as long. That is the reason that they use this class of material, and it is economically right, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Do they not use it because it is cheaper?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly it is cheaper. That is why, I say, they do use it.

Mr. GEORGE. It is possible to use pure wool for every ounce of waste that is used.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about that at all; and, of course, we can destroy the sheep industry of the United States if we want to.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I asked the Senator in the beginning, namely, if the reason why they imported these rags was to make a garment which they could sell cheaper than they could the raw wool cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, and I said to the Senator that there is a margin of profit that comes in.

Mr. GEORGE. I was not talking about the retailer's profit; I am speaking of—

Mr. SMOOT. I am speaking of the manufacturer's profit. It is his business to make goods just as cheaply as he can; and to make them so that there will be a demand for them in the market. That is what he is doing; there is no question about that at all. There is a wider margin of profit all down the line.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Are we not to find the report of the Tariff Commission of any consequence? There was put in the Record yesterday a statement from the Tariff Commission indicating that the cost to the consumer of a suit of clothes made out of rags, under this increased tariff rate, would be lifted \$2.16.

Mr. SMOOT. I know how that was figured out. They included all the profits, beginning with the woolgrower, then the profits of the ragpicker, then those of the spinner, from the spinner to the weaver, from the weaver to the wholesaler, from the wholesaler to the retailer, and from the retailer to the customer.

Mr. COPELAND. Is not that the way it happens?

Mr. SMOOT. Not always.

Mr. COPELAND. Where does one buy a suit of clothes? Does he go to a fire sale, where the Senator bought this cheap suit?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator were really serious about it, and would cease casting reflections, of course, I would answer him.

Mr. COPELAND. I withdraw any implication the Senator might make from anything I said. I am interested to know about this question. I represent in part a community of 12,000,000 people, most of whom have to buy cheap clothing, and if the Senator can convince me that they can buy pure-wool clothing at the same price that they now pay for clothing made out of rags, I want to be convinced. However, the Tariff Commission tells me that the increase in the cost under the proposed tariff rate of a suit of clothes would be \$2.16 and that on an overcoat it would be \$4.55. I have not been convinced by what the Senator has said so far that one can buy a pure-wool garment for the same price that he will have to pay for it after this tax shall have been imposed.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, as I have said, Mr. President, the figures cited assume that the rags will cost 16 cents a pound more than they do now. Then reference is made to an overcoat. I say to the Senator that all the material in the overcoat to which I have referred did not cost \$1.75. So the cost of it can not be due to the tariff; there is no question about that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt him for a moment, he has referred to my clothing store, over in the corner so frequently that I want to call attention to the fact that we are not in competition, because I am offering for the price named two pairs of trousers with a suit of clothes, and the Senator is only offering one pair of trousers.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but the Senator is charging \$2.50 more for the suit.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am prompted to rise in view of the high figures again referred to by the Senator from New York as to the increased cost of a suit of clothes in consequence of this proposed duty on wool rags. I think we may concede at least that in the ordinary woolen goods—and clothing ranks high in that line of goods—there is not more than 50 per cent rags, the remainder being virgin wool; but the Tariff Commission has taken into consideration the pyramiding of prices to which the Senator from Utah has referred, and it has given us the additional cost of a suit of clothes in consequence of a duty of 31 cents a pound on pure wool. How much does it amount to? Let me give the figures. Bear in mind in the suit of clothes made of pure wool the additional cost by reason of the extraordinary duty of 31 cents a pound, as against whatever rate may be imposed upon rags in the case of fabrics weighing 10 ounces, is \$1.97; in the case of fabrics weighing 12 ounces the increased cost is \$2.36 to \$2.76; and in the case of the ordinary style of clothes the total cost is \$3.09 to \$3.38—that is with a duty of 31 cents a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment. I want to say to the Senate another thing:

How many mills are there that make goods that first pay the scourer, and then pay the spinner, and then pay the weaver, and then pay the finisher, and then pay for selling the goods? Why, Mr. President, the woolen mills make the goods complete in nearly all cases. It is true that there are some little people who sometimes make yarns for knitting hose and sometimes for knitting sweaters; but you go into the woolen mills of this country and you will find that they take the material from the sorting of the wool to the finished product. There are not any intermediate steps. There is not any other profit such as is spoken of in that report. Therefore I say it was based upon 16 cents a pound, and that very process of handling the wool was done by the corporation, and it passed its profits on to another corporation to take the next step in manufacturing wool into cloth.

That is not the way it is done. The manufacturer buys the wool, he scours the wool, he sorts the wool, he cards the wool, he spins the wool, he beams the yarn, he weaves it, and he sells it. He has his agents throughout the United States. There is not any 50 per cent and 25 per cent and 15 per cent and 20 per cent profit as outlined there. That was in answer to a question, and the Tariff Commission could not have said anything else if such a thing as that happened; but it does not happen.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Almost the Senator persuaded me to believe that you can buy a worsted suit for less than you can buy this combination.

Mr. SMOOT. There are different kinds of worsted suits and there are different kinds of woolen suits. For instance, up here in New Jersey there is located a mill that makes the finest cassimeres, I was going to say, in the world, and I think I am perfectly safe in saying it; but there is only the one mill that makes that class of goods in the United States. The price of that cloth makes no difference to the man who buys it. He does not care whether he goes down here to Snyder's and pays \$150 for a suit, when he can go right across the street and have the same material made up for I do not know how much less. I refer to Snyder's only because I have my clothes made there myself, and I know they are good tailors; but the cloth does not cost any more. It is the work in the suit; and so, Mr. President, it seems to me that these things can be answered.

What we are legislating for here is the great industry, from one end of the country to the other, whether the establishments be small or whether they be large. It is one of the great industries of this country; and, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to another fact—that clothing to-day is cheaper than it was when we had free wool between 1913 and 1922. There is not any doubt at all about that.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, the conclusion the Senator reaches is that increasing the tariff on rags from 8 cents to 24 cents—

Mr. SMOOT. It may not be 24 cents.

Mr. COPELAND. Well, no matter how it is increased, the conclusion is that there will be no added cost to the consumer for that article.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, Mr. President, without a question of a doubt, that in the case of the goods those wastes go into, the ultimate consumer will not pay any more for a suit of clothes than he is paying now.

Mr. President, you do not find that suit of clothes priced here at \$24.75; do you? You do not find that suit of clothes priced at \$22.75 or \$22.10 or \$22.90. No, sir; that is not done in the clothing trade. You find the suit priced at \$22.50—\$25 over here, and over here at \$22.50. So far as the material that is in that suit of clothes or overcoat goes, as I have already said, I figured it out here several times on the floor of the Senate; it is \$1.75, making it just as high with all the waste that we could give in the manufacturing processes; and that is what it was. Now, we do not want to lose our heads. We do not want to turn over this business to a foreign country. We want as much wool raised in the United States as it is possible for us to raise under existing conditions, and that is all we are asking for.

I admit that shortly after the passage of the law of 1922, not for the first year but for the second year, we had a wet season all through the West. For the few years following that, the ranges there were almost perfect. We had more rains than at any other time. Every sheepman pays to the Government of the United States so much a head for grazing his sheep in the forest reserves for the period of three months in the year. Do we object to it? No; but I want to say to the Senator this: Take my own State and take the other Western States. What do we have to do? We have only about 23 per cent of the whole area of the State in private ownership. Those States have to impose taxes on the 23 per cent, or whatever the percentage is, and not only maintain their own institutions but guard the Government against all kinds of frauds and murders of people passing through or coming there.

I want to tell the Senator from New York and the Senators from other States and the people of the District of Columbia that they do not know what taxation is. Take my own State. We pay nearly 5 per cent on the actual value of the property itself. What would New York think if she had to do that? All we can do is to impose a tax upon the 23 per cent. The production of wool is not only one of our industries, but it is the only industry that we can carry on upon those mountain ranges; and yet complaint is being made here against a tax upon wool in order to maintain that industry, that will be so vital to the United States in case of war, and it is vital in any case.

What I want is this, Mr. President: I do not want the Senate of the United States to vote a duty of 34 cents on scoured wool and then turn around and vote rates of duty that will nullify all that increase of duty. What we want to do is to be consistent, and, if we are going to give protection on wool, let us protect it all along the line. If not, let us change the rate on the scoured basis of wool; but do not make the discrepancy such that one commodity can take the place of the other. That is what we are doing.

Mr. President, I know that if the Senators knew the industry, if they knew just what it meant, there would not be any objections to this. Take these noils as a waste: I say to you that the length of fiber in that noil is longer than in any wool raised on mountain tops, with the exception of one character of wool; and everything is taken out of it. It is nothing but clear, pure wool, scoured, and not only that but carded, and put into the shape that the ordinary washed wool would have to be put into before arriving at this stage.

That is what I am complaining about in this whole matter, and that is what I am fearful is going to happen in this schedule. We are going to let the 34 cents remain, and then we are going to take it away by allowing products of this kind to come into the United States at a much lower rate.

Mr. President, as to the 24 cents on rags, that is a great increase. Is it justified? If we took into consideration only the rags that were brought into this country, yes; it is justified; but if we are going to take into consideration all the classes of rags, from the cheapest to the best, the local rags and the rags of the world, I think it could be reduced somewhat. They will gather these rags from all over the world, and they will come in here, and the inferior rags we are going to export as we are doing now; and if we are going to have rags in the clothing of the people of the United States I want the very best ones that there are, and so does the manufacturer want them. I know that if I were running a woolen mill to-day, and I wanted to use a shoddy for a backing of an overcoat, I would a thousand times prefer these rags than to try to use a coarser wool and make a thread that I could not draw up.

That is the exact situation. Do you want to take care of the man who raises the sheep, who spends his time in winters and summers away from home, guarding and protecting them against wild animals of every kind, and all the inclement weather that comes in the mountains and the floods? Why,



Mr. President, when I owned sheep myself—and I sold them just as soon as Grover Cleveland was elected—I want to say to you that I have had as high as 1,100 head drowned in one day. They were off in the desert; they were thirsty; they came in for water; and if they happen to come in at a place where there is a steep bank the first one goes in, and all of them follow, and they are smothered. Why, I could recite by the dozens to the Senate of the United States the difficulties that the man who raises wool has to pass through.

Mr. President, I do not know that there is any need of saying anything further upon this subject. I am ready to vote; but while I am on my feet I want to call attention to the carbonized noils. That is the pending question.

Here is a carbonized noil. We changed that. Here is an uncarbonized noil. In other words, those are the same wools. The Senators will note that all through this wool there are little specks, little burrs. When that is carbonized those little specks are eaten out. All vegetable fiber is eaten out. That is the result of the carbonization. Then that is put through just one machine, and there are, both exactly the same.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, does it cost 7 cents to do that?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it does not cost 7 cents to do that. The loss and the cost would be perhaps about that amount, 6 or 7 cents. Whenever it is carbonized it takes every bit. This, of course, I have handled so long that much of it has gone out. That is the situation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on that point I thought the Tariff Commission had ascertained that the difference in the cost of carbonizing at home and abroad was only about 3 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the actual cost without the losses.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it 3 or 4?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is 3 cents. I think the actual work of doing it, passing it through the bath of sulphuric acid, taking it out, washing it, drying it, and preparing it for the first process of straightening out the fiber, would be about 3 cents.

Mr. GEORGE. That is, the difference between the cost of carbonizing at home and abroad is about 3 cents?

Mr. SMOOT. Just the cost; but, of course, the losses come in, making it 6 or 7 cents.

Mr. GEORGE. There is some element of loss?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes. For instance, we have burrs in our wool. The sheep run over the hills and out on the desert, and many times they run into a burr patch. We can not pick those burrs out; I mean it would not do to try to pick them out. All of that wool has to be carbonized, and when that class of wool is carbonized, in the process the burr is made just like dust, and when it goes through the duster, that is all blown out. That is what we call carbonizing; and, of course, we lose the cost of the work, we lose the cost of the acids, we lose the time, and I was going to say that it was not quite as good after it has been carbonized as it was before.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have been so overwhelmed by the eloquence of the Senator from Utah that I hardly know how to begin what I have in mind. He talks about the taxes in his State. The people in my State have to pay taxes. My State pays 30 per cent of all the taxes for running this Government.

But it is not a question of direct taxation that I have in mind now. I am thinking of the welfare of the woolen industry in contradistinction to the demands of the worsted industry, and next the welfare of the consumers who must buy the cheaper products made from wool.

Mr. President, it is all very well for the Senator from Utah to say that with an embargo placed upon rags—and that would be the effect of this tax—the consumer will not pay more for his woolen garments. I can find no justification for that statement.

Disregarding the pyramiding of costs, taking the report of the Tariff Commission, and I think taking the figures as presented by the Senator from Utah himself, we find a material increase in the cost of a suit of clothes.

Now, will the Senator tell me whether these figures are right or not? The number of ounces of rags required for 1 yard of cloth is 32, according to the table before me.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the weight of the cloth?

Mr. COPELAND. Forty-pound cloth.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I have the floor while the Senators are carrying on this private conversation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not ask anybody to yield. I thought the Senator from New York and the Senator from Utah had started a little Senate of their own, and I was going to keep the other one going.

Mr. COPELAND. We have been keeping it going all morning while the Senator was away.

It takes 32 ounces of rags to make a yard of cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. That can not be.

Mr. COPELAND. Then we must discard everything the Tariff Commission says.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Tariff Commission ever made that statement.

Mr. COPELAND. Let the Senator take the report and study it. I will go on with my speech, for fear the Senator from Nebraska may take the floor this time.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think they ever made that statement.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me ask this question of the Senator from Utah. Are the woolgrowers of the United States prepared to supply all the wool needed for the manufacture of woolen garments in this country?

Mr. SMOOT. They are not.

Mr. COPELAND. Then of necessity, since they can not supply all the wool needed, there must be brought into the country foreign wool, or some substitute must be found. Is that right?

Mr. SMOOT. Just the same as with many other items produced in the United States; in fact, I may say a majority of them.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well; then the woolgrowers could not produce the raw wool; they could not furnish enough wool to make these garments, and we are driven to find some substitute.

Mr. SMOOT. Not to find a substitute; we can get wool.

Mr. COPELAND. We are driven to bring in foreign wool or to find a substitute.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true; and that is the case with over half of the articles produced in the United States, I might say. Does the Senator take this position, that because the United States can not produce an article in sufficient amounts to supply the demand of the United States there should be no duty upon it?

Mr. COPELAND. No, I would not say that; and I am not in favor of putting wool upon the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the Senator must mean that in that case there should not be a high duty.

Mr. COPELAND. I voted against the 34-cent duty on wool, of course, but I would vote for a duty of 31 cents. I believe in the protection. But now we have a situation where there must be supplied to our people garments made either from foreign wool imported at great cost, or the garment must be made from some substitute for wool. We have developed an industry in this country by which woolen rags can be converted into a product which makes a very satisfactory so-called woolen garment, and a garment which can be sold to the people at a reasonable price. Now it is proposed to increase the tax upon the wool rags so much as to necessitate an increase in the price paid by the consumer for the garment made from those rags.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. In examining the record from which the Senator was quoting as coming from the Tariff Commission I find that the figures are from the American Woolen Co., Mr. R. S. Bartlett, general manager. The Tariff Commission had nothing whatever to do with the figures. The Senator will see himself from an examination that the figures come from the source I have mentioned.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 9, 1929, when the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] placed in the RECORD this material, and in doing so he said this:

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I desire to ask that there may be printed in the RECORD a statement from the Tariff Commission, with a table confirming the figures I have just read.

Mr. SMOOT. Those figures were prepared by the American Woolen Co., Mr. Bartlett, general manager, I think. I can not help what mistake was made in presenting them. I did not hear the statement when the figures were presented, but those are not the Tariff Commission figures. They are the American Woolen Co.'s figures.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have the record before me. The Senator from Massachusetts at the moment is not on the floor. When he comes in he will explain to us what the situation is. But it does not require any figures made by the Tariff Commission or by the American Woolen Co. or anybody else to enable us to know that if the cost of the raw material that goes into a garment is increased materially it must of necessity increase the cost of the garment to the consumer. We never find these additional costs absorbed by those who sell the garments. They are added to the cost of the garments. The consumer pays the extra amount.

Who are the persons who use the garments made out of these rags brought in from Europe? Two classes of people are the chief consumers of these garments. They are those who live in the great centers of population, like my city, and the farmers of the country. They are the ones who buy these garments, and if this tax upon woolen rags is increased as the Senator from Utah desires to have it increased it will mean that every purchaser of clothing in the United States of America of the class represented by all groups except the very rich will have his garments increased in price by reason of this tax.

Mr. President, I am sorry the articles under discussion are called "rags," because it must give the impression to those who are not familiar with the facts that the yarn made from this material is an inferior thing. It is not. A fine product is made from it. In many ways it is a warmer product than that made from pure wool.

There are thousands, there are millions, of sweaters and sweater coats and sweater garments, ready made, sold in this country, the backs of which are made of the yarn produced from rags, the fronts being made from pure wool. It is my contention that when an argument is made against the importation of these rags a disservice is rendered to the sheep growers of the United States. If we can not have a garment made from this product, the imported rags, which can be sold cheaply to people who want cheap clothing, some substitute must be found. We are living in an age when rayon and wood fiber and a hundred other things are being suggested as a material from which to make clothing for our people. Once turn the thought of our consumers away from the idea of a woolen garment, once permit them to use some substitute for wool, and how long will it be before this substitute will permanently take the place of the wool?

I think every man who votes for this high tariff upon rags on the theory that he is helping the wool industry of the United States is doing exactly the opposite of that. As I see it, he is doing something which will destroy the wool industry of this country by the encouragement of the use of substitutes.

The material made from these imported articles has been referred to as "the poor man's wool." I am interested in the poor man's wool, because I live where there are more poor than are gathered together in one community anywhere else on the face of the earth. I wish Senators could see how the poor of this country live.

It may be said that there is poverty upon the farm. I know it. I was born on a farm. My relatives are farmers. I know the sacrifices made by the farmers. But there is one thing about a farm that is true, and that is that one can always get something to eat there. He may not be able to sell the different products from the farm to get cash to buy the privileges that we want the farm children to have. So far as I am concerned, even though coming from the great city of New York, I have had in mind always the necessity of the farmer and have voted for all of the farm relief measures; but I want Senators to think now of the poor of my community.

I want to refer to one particular square mile of territory in New York City. We think about a square mile out in the great open spaces of our country, and it is not a very large territory. In New York City we have one square mile where live 500,000 persons—half a million people—in one square mile. They live as many as 12 in three rooms, 4 often sleeping in the kitchen over night. I could take Senators to hundreds of those so-called homes, where people live in inside rooms without any light or ventilation.

If we increase the cost of woolen garments so that those already overburdened poor people can not buy overcoats and outside garments, what must they do? They huddle about a tiny stove in one of the rooms in those dark homes, shivering over a little fire made from broken dry-goods boxes. The fire eats up the oxygen of the air and the bodies of these people huddled about the stoves exude poisons and germs. That is where tuberculosis is born and that is where tuberculosis thrives. That is why there is a lowering of the powers of resistance of the people in those crowded places, brought into those little so-called homes and crowded together, and that is why they become tubercular. Nothing is more important to the poor, to those who live under bad home surroundings, than the out-of-door life and they can not enjoy that out-of-door life unless they have warm garments to wear.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] almost wept in his lamentations over the poor suffering woolgrower. The woolgrower is not going to suffer any when he has a tariff of 34 cents on wool; but, if you please, a tax of 25 cents or 24 cents on woolen rags, the wool of the poor, is going to cause suffering and disease among the poor of the cities of our country.

I think nothing is so sad or so destructive of our nationality, if I may put it that way, as to have any dissension between the

city and the country, or to raise up the thought of class in America. But, Mr. President, I see in this move an effort upon the part of the West to do something for itself by making an attack upon the people who live in the great cities of the East. Why do it? The West has a tax of 34 cents upon wool.

It can not produce enough wool to supply all the garments needed by the 120,000,000 people living in this country. Take that tax of 34 cents, prosper with it as I hope the West may, and no one will be more pleased than I. But, my friends, do not disregard the great consuming public of America.

We had hearings before the Finance Committee representing every industry in America except the consumer. The consumer seems to be forgotten.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I have been listening to the Senator with a great deal of interest. I sympathize with what he is evidently trying to accomplish, but I would like to ask him a question. The present tariff on raw wool is 31 cents. By an amendment which we have already adopted to the bill we have increased it to 34 cents. I had no sympathy with those who were trying to increase it. If the Senator will examine the RECORD he will find I voted against it. I do not think it can be defended. I agree with the Senator that the tariff is already high enough. But that increased rate having been voted upon the raw wool, it is contended that the rate now before us is a sort of compensatory duty, and that, right or wrong, having increased the rate on raw wool we are under obligation therefore to increase the tariff in other places.

Mr. COPELAND. I know how the Senator from Nebraska feels about it. There has been no more loyal friend of the farmer or of the poor than the Senator from Nebraska. He feels that the farmer who has been given, we hope, some benefit by schedule 7, by increased rates upon agricultural products, will have all of that benefit defeated if compensatory rates are granted making him pay more for everything he buys. I know what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. STEIWER. Does the Senator regard a low tariff on woolen rags as a compensatory tariff?

Mr. COPELAND. No; not if it be a prohibitive tariff.

Mr. STEIWER. I want to make my question just a little clearer. If a tariff is placed upon a raw material of any given amount, then under the tariff policy there is allowed the manufacturer a certain compensatory duty to protect him for the increased price which he pays for his raw material. The illustration which I have just given affords a true example of the compensatory tariff. But the woolen rag is not the manufactured product for the purpose of which we are speaking now, and when it is imported to this country it merely becomes raw material or at least it is on its road to becoming raw material. It therefore is merely another form of raw material or another form in which wool might be introduced. I was wondering under the circumstances, therefore, if the Senator would refer to this duty upon woolen rags as a compensatory duty?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not think it comes at all in the same category as an ordinary compensatory duty. As the Senator said, it is a raw material. But I hope I make myself clear to the Senator from Oregon. I was impressed yesterday by what he said. I know how sincere he is, and I know how sincere is the Senator from Nebraska. But we have here a product which, next to food, is perhaps the most essential thing with which we can deal—the clothing that the people wear. Next to the food they eat, their clothing is the most important thing in their lives.

There is no sort of compensatory duty that will give full protection to the woolgrower, but when we come to the matter of wool rags I think they should be dealt with entirely apart from all the other theories of tariff reform or tariff economics. That is an article which is used in the clothing of the poor and next to meat and potatoes it is of most importance to the poor. I can not conceive of the Senate taking a position which will practically insure the elevation of the cost of the very garments used to clothe the poor. I do not care whether it is violative of the compensatory theory of tariff making or whether we are dealing with something that demands independent consideration. I do not believe that the warm-hearted Senator from Oregon, and certainly not the Senator from Nebraska, who has committed himself on this matter time and time again, would think of imposing upon the poor of America a prohibitive price upon their necessary garments.



I do not know that there is any need of continuing the argument. There are very few Senators present in the Chamber. No doubt those who are here will take the same view that I do and those who are not here perhaps have already formulated an opinion. But when I think about the tariff and particularly about the paragraph now before us, and especially the item in that paragraph which we are now discussing, I think of thinly-clad shivering children and undernourished women as well as hard-working men who will be taxed beyond their power to pay it this increase is granted. I beg of Senators to vote down this proposed increase.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we have had several—

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, from time to time we have had very interesting exhibits on the floor of the Senate; for some time we had over here on this side of Main Street Mr. Grundy's Piggly Wiggly store. Trade was so good that he sold out his entire stock. His lease of the premises not having expired, he put in a different stock of goods, as Senators will see.

For some reason this has excited the enmity, perhaps the animosity, of some of our friends on the other side of Main Street, for we now have on that side another stock of goods competing with the display over here.

Mr. BINGHAM. Whose store is that?

Mr. NORRIS. That is the store for which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] seems to be the manager.

For fear that Senators may misunderstand the purpose of these two stocks of rival merchandise, as a representative of the pioneer merchant, Mr. Grundy, I take the floor now to help advertise some of the samples now on exhibition.

We have here [exhibiting] an overcoat made out of virgin wool, lined with silk, protected by a high tariff.

Mr. CARAWAY. Before the Senator starts an auction he ought to take out a license.

Mr. NORRIS. I have a license from Mr. Grundy. Mr. Grundy elected this Congress, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas, as he said in his testimony; he bought the election; this Congress is his, and he has a right to do what he pleases with it, and, carrying out his ideas, I am here in his behalf.

Mr. President, here [exhibiting] is a sample of wool out of which the overcoat was made. This overcoat is superior to the garments which are displayed on the other side of Main Street under the control and charge of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator not to take the things away. I like to have those who are anxious to buy look at them; but I hope Senators will not carry the samples away.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me just for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BLAINE. The wool which the Senator has in his hand are noils, and noils are the waste products of Mr. Grundy's worsted mill at Bristol, Pa.

Mr. NORRIS. I said I was representing Mr. Grundy. Why should he not have an opportunity to sell the stuff that he makes, and why should not we protect him by a tariff so that he will not be driven out of business by cheap clothes?

Mr. President, here [exhibiting] is another example of wool. It has the quality of absorbing a large amount of liquid material. It is used principally as a lining for suitcases and traveling bags. An ordinary traveling bag lined with this material is guaranteed to soak up the contents of two quart bottles that might be broken inside the bag and thus save the traveler from any annoyance that might come about by virtue of some prohibition enforcement officer seeing the leakage which ordinarily takes place in such a condition of things on the depot platform. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, here [exhibiting] is a sample of goods manufactured in Pennsylvania. It is used as a sort of a buffer. It is used very often and to a great extent by football players. Clothing lined with this material will save the body from bruises and the bones from being broken and disjointed. It is guaranteed by Mr. Grundy that a person clothed in a union suit made out of this material will have his body fully protected from kicks of horses, cattle, and even from the kick of a son of a wild jackass. [Laughter.] I understand that

the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] is now having a suit made out of this material for everyday wear. [Laughter.]

We now come to a lighter material that fills the heart with more happiness and joy. Here [exhibiting] is another sample of Mr. Grundy's manufacture. Mr. President, when clothing is made out of this material it brings to the wearer a feeling of happiness and contentment. It is emblematic of the smile of happiness and satisfaction that spread over the countenance of Eyanson when he received the \$1,000 check from the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM].

But, Mr. President, the samples we have in stock are not all wool and woolens. We have also samples of iron and steel, aluminum, glass, and rubber, all worked into one harmonious whole, constituting this small model which I hold in my hand [exhibiting], and which I have taken from the Grundy counter in his store here. This is an exact model, Mr. President—a sort of mascot—of a very large band wagon that has been operated and used by the Loyal Order of Young Turks. You will observe it has had rather rough usage. One of its wheels is broken off, its windshield is destroyed, its steering gear is smashed, and somebody has filled its carburetor with sand. It is rather dilapidated and will be sold very cheaply.

Here [exhibiting] is a still brighter sample, Mr. President. I will say, Senators, "If you have tears, prepare to shed them now." [Laughter.]

This is Grundy's mantle; I remember

The first time ever Grundy put it on;

'Twas on a pleasant evening in the fall;

That day great Hoover won his fight and sent

The defeated hordes of Democracy back upon the sidewalks of New York.

Look, in this place ran CARAWAY's dagger through;

See what a rent the envious BORAH made;

Through this the son of a wild jackass stabbed;

And as he pluck'd his cursed steel away,

Mark how the blood of Grundy follow'd it,

As rushing out of doors, to be resolved

If he so unkindly knock'd, or no.

This was the most unkindest cut of all;

For when the noble Grundy saw the jackass stab,

Ingratitude, more strong than traitor's arms,

Quite vanquished him; then burst his mighty heart;

And, in his mantle muffling up his face,

The great Grundy fell.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Finance Committee that conducted the hearings on the woolen schedule. From the testimony presented before them the subcommittee recommended to the full committee no change in the House rates on woolen rags. The full committee, after giving the matter careful consideration, by a very narrow margin voted to make the duty on woolen rags 24 cents a pound, which is an increase of 200 per cent over the House rate of 8 cents a pound, and a little more than that over the present rate of 7½ cents a pound.

The testimony brought out before the subcommittee, Mr. President, showed that the average price of woolen rags bought by the manufacturers who are engaged in producing the character of cloth used in making overcoats and suits, which are sold over a large part of the United States for \$22.50, is something less than 30 cents a pound.

Testimony has been brought to my attention to show that these rags average about 24 cents a pound and sometimes a little less than that. We import a good many millions of pounds of such rags, something like 25,000,000 pounds; we export between fifteen and twenty million pounds of rags, which are valued at something less than 8 cents a pound, the average, according to my recollection, being about 7½ cents a pound. If we were to attempt to import the type of rags which we export, the duty as presented in the report of the Finance Committee and now before the Senate would amount to something over 200 per cent ad valorem.

The committee's attention was drawn to the fact that sometimes the very high grade of rags which are really not rags at all but clippings from new sweaters and new woolen underwear of a very high grade made in Europe may bring about three-fourths as much as a pound of virgin wool that has been cleansed, the difference amounting to the cost of what is known as the pickering of the material, reducing it to wool, which is sometimes known as shoddy, although the term "shoddy" has a connotation which does not justify its use in this particular.

Shoddy actually is material that is all wool, but on account of the way in which it has been handled, by being pickered from the rags, the length of the staple is very short. Consequently, it is impossible to use it in the manufacture of this grade of cloth without mixing a large percentage of virgin

wool with it. The reason for that is that the virgin wool has a long staple, and it is the length of the staple that holds the cloth together and makes it more durable.

A cloth that was made entirely of shoddy would be of such very short staple that it would have no wearing quality. A cloth made entirely of virgin wool is of such long staple that it has a very high wearing quality, but the virgin wool is expensive, its price varying from somewhere around 75 cents to a dollar a pound, and consequently it can not be used in clothing that is intended to be sold at a very low price.

Our attention was brought to the fact that the manufacturer of garments who intends to sell his suits of clothes at \$22.50 per suit retail, or his overcoats at \$22.50 or perhaps \$25 per overcoat goes to the manufacturer of woolen goods and tells him how many yards he needs and what he can afford to pay per yard, in order that when the labor cost is added and the retailer's profit is added the goods may sell at the standard price. The manufacturer meets that price. It is a rather extraordinary situation.

The manufacturer apparently does not make the goods and put them on the market at a price at which he can make a fair profit and hope to sell them. The manufacturer makes the goods for the price that the clothing manufacturer is willing to pay. The price which the clothing manufacturer is willing to pay is fixed by the standard price at which he can sell these goods, namely, a price which has become fixed in recent years at \$22.50. Therefore he can only afford to pay a certain price per yard for the goods.

The way in which those goods are made up and the proportion of virgin wool that goes into them depends on the cost of the waste material that goes into them in the shape of shoddy. If the imported waste material costs about 24 or 25 cents a pound, and there is added to it, at the present time a duty of 7½ cents, the manufacturers testified that they were able to use in the production of this cloth about 50 per cent of virgin wool. If the cost of the waste should be increased as proposed in this bill it will mean that they will use less virgin wool, and the woolgrowers who are interested in selling more wool, and who believe that by greatly increasing the duty on wastes, and particularly on woolen rags, they will sell more wool, will, in the opinion of the manufacturers testifying before us, be disappointed.

It was testified that in view of the fact that the manufacturer is unable to increase the price of his product, for the reason I have already given—the reason being that the manufacturer can not afford to pay more than so much a yard if the suit of clothes is to be sold at \$22.50 per suit—it will mean that he must use more substitutes and less virgin wool.

One manufacturer testifying before us stated that he could make up a cloth of only 25 per cent virgin wool and 75 per cent substitutes which would defy detection so far as any chemical analysis was concerned, or so far as the appearance of the cloth was concerned; but the fact is that a suit of clothes or an overcoat made of material consisting of 75 per cent waste products and 25 per cent virgin wool is not nearly so durable as a suit made of 50 per cent waste products and 50 per cent virgin wool. Therefore, although this increase in duty may not result actually in the person buying a \$22.50 suit or a \$25 overcoat having to pay more for that suit or more for that overcoat, it will result in his getting poorer material; it will result in his suit wearing out quicker, looking shabby quicker, and not lasting as long as the suit that he is buying at the present time under the present tariff duty.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that when the manufacturer testifies to us that the price of these rags is running at about 25 cents a pound we find that if we put on them a duty of 24 cents a pound, as is proposed by the majority report of the committee, it means virtually a 100 per cent ad valorem tax on the material that goes into making a large part of the cheaper suits of woolen clothes and the cheaper grade of woolen overcoats. We are only putting on raw wool of the highest grade, even by the increase granted by the Senate and the House, a duty of 34 cents a pound, which would amount to about 50 per cent ad valorem, to perhaps 35 per cent at times. In other words, we are only putting a tariff of from 35 to 50 per cent ad valorem on the material going into the very highest grade of the most expensive woolen clothing, whereas it is proposed by this duty on woolen rags to put an ad valorem duty of from 75 to 100 per cent on the material going into the poor man's suit of clothes and the poor man's overcoat.

There is no getting away from that fact, Mr. President. The only argument that is used to offset it is the belief of those who propose it that by putting a fairly prohibitive duty on woolen rags they will force the manufacturer to buy more virgin wool, and therefore the woolgrower will profit thereby. It is the testi-

mony of the manufacturers that if they are forced to buy rags at such a high price that the price becomes practically prohibitive, they will not be buying as much virgin wool as they do at present. Therefore the woolgrower will not really benefit thereby. The person that will be hurt the most by it is the person who has to buy the suit of clothes and finds that it will not last as long.

This paragraph—paragraph 1105—has been the storm center of a great deal of the discussion in regard to the entire woolen schedule because of the theoretical considerations advanced by proponents of high duties on wool, waste, noils, etc. It has been claimed that the duties placed on these materials have admitted heavy importations, which have displaced domestic wools of clothing length and lowered the price of such wools. It has been argued that the duties on waste have deprived the Government of millions of dollars of revenue which otherwise would have been paid on allegedly necessary importations of equal quantities of new wool had the 1909 duties on waste been in effect.

Such statements are at variance with the facts. The existing duties on waste, noils, rags, and so forth, were based on the relative value of these materials as compared with new wool in 1922 and prior thereto. These materials are valuable in proportion to their usability when blended with new wool in the manufacture of woolen goods. Their usability depends in part on the presence or absence of color and the depth of these colors, which largely determines their usefulness in different shades of new weaves. Their usability also depends upon the length of the wool fiber when these materials have been prepared for blending and subsequent manufacture.

The imports of these materials dutiable under paragraph 1105, chiefly noils and high-grade rags, have not displaced domestic wool. All of the United States production of wools of clothing length have been needed to blend with the imported materials to supplement the domestic production. The imports of noils and rags have not changed the total supply of raw materials in the foreign markets. Prices, whether for wool or for waste, noils, rags, or shoddy, have not been affected since the total volume of raw materials has not been changed.

The proponents of high waste duties would have a plausible reason for prohibitive duties on the items in paragraph 1105 if a part of the American production of clothing wool had to be exported as the result of a domestic surplus. In 1928 there were domestic exports of 17,400,000 pounds of old rags, as compared with imports of 21,700,000 pounds. The latter were valued at 28.7 cents per pound, while the exports were worth only 7.9 cents per pound, or about one-fourth as much. Domestic exports are hard, twisted rags, which are picked into a fair quality of shoddy in the slower-moving machinery used in Europe. The imports are soft knitted rags, which are picked into superior shoddy for use in American woolen mills.

Before the war the American rags now exported were used in the United States, together with a considerable proportion of cotton, and woven into woolen goods much inferior in average quality to those now made by using the imported materials. At the present time much less cotton and much more new wool are used in the blends with the imported materials in making the high-grade woollens now on the American market. Raise the duty on rags and other wastes to a point where they will be embargoed, and you have raised the cost of the popular-priced suit and overcoat, and you have deprived the largest proportion of the American public of good woolen clothing at a reasonable price. Embargo these wastes, particularly rags, and you have in effect told thousands and thousands of men and women that although such an embargo will aid no one in this country, they must pay from \$2 to \$8 more for each suit of clothes and each overcoat.

It has been claimed by the proponents of prohibitive duties under paragraph 1105 that the United States got along perfectly well under the rates in force prior to 1913, when, except for short periods, it was not practicable to import appreciable quantities of these materials. The statement also is made that the United States would get along very well or better at the present time if prohibitive duties were enacted. It must be remembered, however, that during the four decades prior to 1913 the worsted phase of the wool-manufacturing industry in the United States was expanding rapidly, whereas the woolen phase was declining. The style and production trend was almost continuously toward the worsteds. The increasing quantities of wastes and noils made in the United States, together with domestic rags picked into inferior shoddy, met the needs of the declining woolen industry.

Then came the war, with its unprecedented demand for woollens, and the trend was reversed. The civilian population, through necessity, was clothed largely in woollens. After the



war, prices were very high and for a time continued to rise. Then came the "buyer's strike" of 1920 and 1921, a revolt of the consumers against the then current price levels. It seems to me that if any unreasonable duties are imposed upon the items which are not competitive with American wool there will be a repetition of the buyer's strike of 1920 and 1921, and the wool-grower, the wool manufacturer, and the worsted manufacturer will suffer. The wholesale clothing manufacturers are continually protesting against high cloth prices, and they are encouraging the style for woollens in order to keep down cloth prices.

As already noted, the use of imported materials dutiable under paragraph 1105, particularly nolls and rags, has permitted the production of woollens of much higher average quality than were made prior to the war, when the inferior shoddy, made from hard twisted rags, and a high proportion of cotton, were used in the blends for woollens. In 1914, according to the census of manufactures, the woolen mills of the United States used slightly more than 221,000,000 pounds of raw materials. Nearly 59,000,000 pounds, or 26.5 per cent, consisted of new wool. There were 16,000,000 pounds of animal hair, almost entirely mohair. Cotton was used to the extent of 24,000,000 pounds, and wastes, nolls, and so forth, to the amount of nearly 123,000,000 pounds, or more than 66 per cent of cotton and other low-priced materials. Now, compare that mixture with the condition which existed in 1927, when the woolen mills of America used 258,000,000 pounds of raw materials. New wool amounted to 106,000,000 pounds, or nearly twice the amount used in 1914, and constituted 41 per cent of the materials used in 1927, as compared with only 26 per cent in 1914. The consumption of hair amounted to 6,000,000 pounds; cotton, 18,000,000 pounds; wastes, and so forth, 128,000,000 pounds. Cotton and wastes, and so forth, formed 56 per cent of the total consumption in 1927, as compared with 66 per cent in 1914. Slightly less hair and cotton, slightly more wastes and nolls, and vastly more new wool, were used in a consumption of raw materials which was 17 per cent larger in 1927 than in 1914.

The present duties under paragraph 1105, therefore, have not operated to displace new wool in woolen goods. That fact can not be controverted in the face of the figures I have just quoted. On the contrary, they have coincided with a large increase in the use of new wool in the woolen mills.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the fair way to tax the rags is not by a specific duty but by an ad valorem duty, or else by a bracket that will place a low specific on a rag of low price and a high specific on a rag of high price.

If wool is worth a dollar a pound, and there are rags which, as the Senator from Utah has said, are practically just as good as new wool—clippings from sweaters and high-grade underwear—and those rags are of such quality that they sell for 75 or 80 cents a pound, then there can be no objection to a duty of 24 cents per pound being levied on them. If, on the other hand, with wool at \$1 a pound, there are rags that are coming in at 24 cents a pound and going into the manufacture of cloth for the cheaper grades of wool clothing, then it seems to me it is indefensible to place a tariff of 100 per cent ad valorem on that quality of rag, as is done under the present bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we can not fix an ad valorem tariff on wool rags, we ought to have a series of brackets which should place a low tariff on the cheaper rags and a high tariff on the more expensive rags. The rags that we export in large quantities are worth only about 8 cents a pound. Most of the rags that we import are worth only about 25 cents a pound. Therefore I hope that some one who is more versed in these matters than I may offer an amendment to the wool-rag rate which will recognize the difference in price between rags of very high grade and rags of lower grade, in order that the cheaper rags going into the poor man's clothing may not pay so nearly 100 per cent ad valorem duty, and those going into the higher grade and the all-wool, virgin-wool garments may pay a very much lower percentage ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in addressing myself to the question before the Senate I feel it to be my duty to my colleagues to disclose my personal interest in it, as well as the interest of my State.

I am myself engaged in the sheep business. That is to say, I have some money—a considerable sum for me, though, perhaps, a very insignificant sum to some of my colleagues—invested in it. The State of Montana ranks second among the States of the Union in the production of wool, being surpassed in the number of sheep by the State of Texas only, that State at the present time running something over 5,000,000 sheep, and the State of Montana something less than 4,000,000.

At the same time, that the value of what I may say may be duly appraised, I desire to call attention to the fact that I voted against the raise proposed by the Committee on Finance of the duty on virgin wool from 31 cents to 34 cents. I did so feeling

that the increase of 3 cents per pound of clean content of the wool—that is, for the scoured wool—would signify to the sheep raiser something less than a cent a pound, and probably not more than half a cent a pound—an inconsequential amount which he would never appreciate he had received at all.

Mr. President, I must confess that my attitude with respect to the matter of wool rags, which has been the subject of so much discussion here, is, to a very large extent, purely sentimental. I revolt at the idea of our people clothing themselves in the cast-off rags of Europe.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In just a moment. I have no hesitancy at all in the imposition of an embargo rate upon wool rags, notwithstanding everything that has been said here concerning the imposition that this means upon the poor. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does not the Senator agree with the position taken by the Senator from Utah in his argument in favor of the high tariff on wool rags, that most of the rags have nothing to do with cast-off clothing at all but are really clippings from brand new garments?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have no doubt that there are among the rags imported from Europe the clippings that come from tailor shops and from clothing manufacturing establishments, but the fact about the matter is that the chief reason why the wool rags of Europe carry a higher price than those of the United States is that they come mostly from knitted garments rather than from the machine-woven garments. So that I do not agree at all that the wool rags that come from Europe are not, as the American rags are, from clothing that has been discarded by the wearers of it.

Mr. President, I am the more reconciled to that idea because, in my judgment, the increased cost to the consumer by reason of any duty upon wool rags, even a prohibitive duty, will be of very little consequence. I do not agree at all with the contention that there will be no increase in the cost of the clothing into which rags enter. There will be, in my judgment.

I have time and again heard the argument that a duty will not be paid by the consumer because the price will remain the same for one reason or another. I am perfectly satisfied that when the manufacturer is obliged to pay a higher price for his raw material it will be reflected in the price of the goods he produces or in the quality of the goods he produces.

Admitting, then, that this means an increased price of goods into which the wool rags enter as raw material, and likewise admitting that the goods into which the wool rags do enter are the cheaper grades of goods that are bought by the poor, I want to advert to the fact that practically every duty we impose adds to the burdens of the poor.

The same thing may be said with respect to the duty on virgin wool. We impose a duty upon virgin wool of 31 cents a pound. That, of course, increases the cost of the clothing worn by the rich as well as by the poor, and that is the very purpose of it. It is regarded, however, as a wise public policy to do this, and the consequences must be accepted.

The conclusion can not be escaped that the duty put upon steel rails adds to the burdens of the poor, adds to the cost of living which they pay for in increased freight rates upon everything that comes to them over the lines of railroads of this country. Exactly the same thing is true of the duty upon crockery and tinware and everything else. They add to the burdens of the poor.

This is the same controversy, the same conflict of interest, that has characterized this debate throughout. It is a contest between the manufacturer upon the one side and the producer of wool on the other. It is a question of taking care of the manufacturer upon the one side or of taking care of the farmer on the other.

I can not forget that at least this morning the debate against a substantial duty upon wool rags has been carried on chiefly by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, my namesake, and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. CORLAND]. The Senator from New York has repeatedly upon this floor objected to certain duties, and has advocated others. He, as well as the Senator from Massachusetts, has pleaded earnestly and eagerly against the increases in the duties on agricultural products, saying that the food of the poor would be made to cost more. Nobody can dispute that. That is the very purpose of putting the duty on, so that the cost of the food not only to the poor but to the rich will thereby be increased. They are hardly in a situation to complain, however, because they are asking for high duties upon multitudes of articles, all of which add to the burdens of the poor.

This particular matter comes, as it seems to me, with especially poor grace from the Senator from Massachusetts. He complains that the duty proposed upon wool rags will increase

the cost of producing wool goods into which wool rags enter as a constituent part, and thus the poor, the advocate of whom always has the public sympathy, will be burdened. But we overlook the fact that woollens are protected under the present law by a duty of 51 per cent, which it is proposed in the Senate committee bill shall be increased to 69.4 per cent. So that if we from the West are engaged in adding to the burdens and the impositions upon the poor, I find that the people of Massachusetts, on exactly the same product, woolen goods, are equally adding to the burdens of the poor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that the cheaper woolen cloth bears no increased duty in this bill?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have been endeavoring to analyze that, and I asked the Senator from Massachusetts for some information about the matter. I am going to ask now that the paragraphs dealing with this subject be put into the RECORD at this point. Paragraph 1108, paragraph 1109, and paragraph 1111, I think, will cover the case. I ask also to have inserted the corresponding paragraphs of the act of 1922, paragraph 1108, paragraph 1109, and paragraph 1111.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## ACT OF 1922

BILL AS REPORTED BY FINANCE  
COMMITTEE

(The part stricken out in black brackets and amendments in italic)

PAR. 1108. Woven fabrics, weighing not more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at not more than 80 cents per pound, 37 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 80 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound upon the wool content thereof and 50 per centum ad valorem: *Provided*, That if the warp of any of the foregoing is wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber, the duty shall be 36 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem.

PAR. 1109. Woven fabrics, weighing more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at not more than 60 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound and 40 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 60 cents but not more than 80 cents per pound, 37 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 80 cents but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 45 cents per pound upon the wool content thereof and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 45 cents per pound upon the wool content thereof and 50 per centum ad valorem.

PAR. 1108. Woven fabrics, weighing not more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at not more [than 80 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 80 cents but not more] than \$1.25 per pound, [50 cents] 46 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.25 but not more than \$2 per pound, [50 cents] 46 cents per pound and 55 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$2 per pound, [50 cents] 46 cents per pound and 60 per centum ad valorem: *Provided*, That if the warp of any of the foregoing is wholly of cotton, or other vegetable fiber, the duty on the fabric, valued at not more than \$1 per pound, shall be [40 cents] 37 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1 [per pound, 40 cents per pound and 55 per centum ad valorem] but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 37 cents per pound and 55 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 37 cents per pound and 60 per centum ad valorem.

PAR. 1109. (a) Woven fabrics, weighing more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at not more than [60 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound and 40 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 60 cents but not more than 80 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 80 cents but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 50] \$1.25 per pound, 46 cents per pound and 50 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than [31.50] \$1.25 but not more than \$2 per pound, [50 cents] 46 cents per pound and 55 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$2 per pound, [50 cents] 46 cents per pound and 60 per centum ad valorem.

## ACT OF 1922—continued

BILL AS REPORTED BY FINANCE  
COMMITTEE—continued

[(b) Woven felts and articles made thereof (including belts and belting, endless or otherwise), finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of wool, shall be dutiable at the rates provided in subparagraph (a).]

(b) Felts, belts, blankets, jackets, or other articles of machine clothing, for paper-making, printing, or other machines, when woven, wholly or in chief value of wool, as units or in the piece, finished or unfinished, shall be dutiable at the rates provided in subparagraph (a).

PAR. 1111. Blankets and similar articles, including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs, made of blanketing, wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding three yards in length, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound and 30 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents but not more than \$1 per pound, 27 cents per pound and 32½ per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1 but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 30 cents per pound and 35 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 37 cents per pound and 40 per centum ad valorem.

PAR. 1111. Blankets, and similar articles (including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs), made of blanketing, as units or in the piece, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding three yards in length, valued at not [more than 50 cents per pound, 20 cents per pound and 30 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents but not] more than \$1 per pound, [30 cents] 28 cents per pound and 36 per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1 but not more than \$1.50 per pound, [33 cents] 31 cents per pound and 37½ per centum ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, [40 cents] 38 cents per pound and 40 per centum ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing, exceeding three yards in length, the same duty shall be paid as on woven fabrics of wool weighing more than four ounces per square yard.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have been studying those paragraphs with considerable care, and I have not been able to satisfy myself about where the difference comes in between worsted goods and woolen goods. It is true that in each of these cases there is no substantial change in the very lowest class of goods, but the information I give comes from a classification made by the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau classifies certain goods as woolen goods, and the customs officers so classify them, and the goods so classified get an increase in the pending bill, as reported by the Senate committee, of from 51.9 to 69.4 per cent.

Mr. President, it will be borne in mind that the Senate committee recommended the retention of the present duty upon virgin wool as against the 34 cents presented by the House, so that the computation of 69.4 per cent is based upon a 31-cent duty upon wool.

Of course, the Senate committee does recommend an increase in the duty on wool rags, and a portion of the increase from 51.9 per cent to 69.4 per cent may be regarded, and very justly regarded, as a compensation for the increase in the duty on rags. Nevertheless, the whole can not be assigned to that reason. In other words, so far as imposing upon the poor in this matter is concerned, we people from the West and the people from Massachusetts are equally guilty of the crime.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator say that there was no increase on the lower-priced fabrics?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That was my understanding. I shall be glad to be corrected if I am in error about it.

Mr. SMOOT. In paragraph 1109 (a), "Woven fabrics, weighing more than 4 ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool valued at not more than," the committee proposes to strike out the words "60 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 60 cents but not more than 80 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 80 cents but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 50," and to insert "\$1.25 per pound." In other words, that is an increase in all of those classes. They are stricken out entirely and all of those goods fall under the \$1.25 rate.



Mr. WALSH of Montana. They get an ad valorem of 50 per cent on everything less than \$1.25 a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. They get 46 cents per pound.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The 46 cents is supposed to be compensatory, and that should not be charged up against them; but they get a 50 per cent ad valorem rate.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is correct. The lowest rate under the present law is 40 per cent, so that they get a raise in that.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. Did the Senator from Montana understand that the duty on rags and wool wastes was carried over into subsequent sections with compensatory duties?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This is what is done. On woven fabrics weighing more than 4 ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, a compensatory duty of 46 cents per pound is given upon the supposition that it takes  $1\frac{1}{2}$  pounds of wool to make a pound of fabric. The wool carrying a duty of 31 cents, the duty on the pound and a half would amount to 46½ cents. But if made of wool rags, which carry a duty of only 24 cents, then the compensatory duty is much too high. It is calculated upon the basis of pure wool. In other words, if wool rags are used we must add that amount to the additional load that the manufacturers are imposing upon the poor.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. Let me suggest that the duty on wool rags at no time is carried over as a compensatory duty, but wool rags are made out of cloth and fabric that has already paid the basic duty of 31 cents and as well the compensatory duty, whatever it is.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I can not follow the Senator there.

Mr. BLAINE. The cloth carries a compensatory duty under the present law and the fabric carries a compensatory duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think that reasoning is altogether erroneous, if the Senator will pardon me for saying so.

Mr. BLAINE. I mean that in carrying over the compensatory duty no consideration is given to the duty on rags and wool waste.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think the Senator is wrong. I think the compensatory duty of 46 cents is given upon all those fabrics whether they are made of virgin wool or whether they are made of wool rags.

Mr. BLAINE. Take worsted goods, for instance; there are no wool rags used in worsted goods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; so that perhaps so far as worsted goods are concerned the compensatory rate is proper and correct; but if the goods are made of wool rags in any considerable quantity, then the compensatory rate of 46 cents is altogether too high.

Mr. BLAINE. Oh, I entirely agree with the Senator upon that proposition.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So there is a compensatory duty upon wool rags, but that compensatory duty is 46 cents.

Mr. BLAINE. I entirely agree with the Senator that the compensatory rate under those circumstances is too high, but tariff legislation has never taken into consideration wool rags as affording a compensatory duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Separate and apart from pure wool or virgin wool.

Mr. BLAINE. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I explain to the Senator why that is true?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The compensatory duty is not based on the price. The compensatory duty provided for is on account of the shrinkage of the product in the process of manufacture from the rags to the cloth. Of course, there is that shrinkage, and that has to be taken care of, which brings the rate up to about 51 cents. If we carry out the increase of 34 cents on wool, if we carry the same ratio clear through, then the compensatory rate ought to be 51 cents. In other words, there is shrinkage in the grease in virgin wool, but the shrinkage in rags is a shrinkage because of the fact that they can not produce the net weight without the loss of about 50 per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it is really too bad that we should increase the cost of clothing to anybody, rich or poor. That is just too bad. But we increase the cost whenever we impose a protective duty upon any commodity.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption before he proceeds to discuss that point?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to clear up the matter of whether there is any increase in the duty on cheaper woolen fabrics. My information is that woolen fabric valued at not over 80 cents a pound, and valued at between 80 cents and \$1.05 a pound, is given a protective duty of 50 per cent, that that is the House rate, and that is the rate in the present law. Am I correct?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but the Senator will notice that the \$1.25 a pound is the value. Anything below that is given a rate of 46 cents a pound and 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But I am not talking about that. I am trying to find out where the increases are. Is it a fact or is it not a fact that in the cheaper goods valued at less than \$1.25 there is no increased protective duty, and in the quality above that there is an increase of 5 per cent, and in the very high bracket an increase of 10 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and the ad valorem in paragraph 1109—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am not talking about that. The cheapest cloth has no increased tariff protection in this bill over the rate in the present law.

Mr. SMOOT. They will get it if we carry out the rate of 34 cents. They will get 51 cents instead of 46 cents.

I want also to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that where valued at more than 60 cents a pound the rate is 26 cents a pound and 40 per cent ad valorem. That 40 per cent becomes 50 per cent, so that, so far as the question asked is concerned, there is that difference of 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But there is also the difference that one class of these fabrics is not over 4 ounces per square yard and the other class is a fabric over 4 ounces per square yard.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But in the cheaper light-weight fabric or cloth there is no increased duty over the present law in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. In the light weight and the higher value there is none within the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, conceding that we who are asking for this increased duty on wool rags are adding to the burdens of the poor, which is exactly the same as the manufacturers who want an increased duty on the manufactured product are adding to the burdens of the poor, I come to the next step in my argument, namely, that the amount of this increase has been exaggerated out of all reason by those who are opposing the increase.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption at that point?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is my information that there are practically no importations of cheap wool fabric cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The importations are of the higher-class, higher-valued woolen cloths that are used in expensive suits and expensive overcoats, and they are especially made in English mills. The manufacturers are seeking to have such a duty levied upon those higher valued fabrics that they can diminish the imports. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is correct as to the importations. There are scarcely any importations of the lower-valued goods found in paragraph 1109. The importations come in under paragraph 1108, where there are finer wools, and it applies to higher-priced goods. That is where the importations come.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in the first place there is no getting away from the statement made by the Senator from Utah that the figures which have been furnished us to indicate the additional cost to the consumer of the clothes he wears by reason of this duty on wool rags can not possibly be what they are asserted to be, that price being greater than the entire cost of the material that goes into a suit of clothes made up of wool rags even if it were made altogether of wool rags. It is now conceded, I think, that there is scarcely anything that anybody attempts to make out of wool rags altogether, but they use virgin wool to the extent of anywhere from 25 to 50 per cent of the entire garments in making it up. It is easy enough to figure the thing out.

The schedules offered in evidence show what the imported wool rags cost. They cost anywhere from 25 to 30 cents a pound, and if we count 3 or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  pounds of wool made into a suit of clothes, it is an easy thing to compute that the amount does not exceed more than \$1. and then if we speak about pyramiding prices it can not possibly cost, as the Senator from Utah has said, more than \$1.75.

I placed in the Record a while ago when I interrupted the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] the cost of a suit of clothes made from virgin wool and the additional cost in consequence of the 31-cent rate upon wool. I gathered from the book before me that the computation was made by the Tariff Commission. I want to correct that impression. It was not, but was made by the Bureau of Research, Institute of Economics, considering the question of the pyramiding of the various costs. I find, however, so far as the Tariff Commission discussed the subject in connection with the duty of 1922, that they considered these figures as quite too high. It will be recalled that that table disclosed that the duty of 31 cents a pound on wool increased the cost of a suit of clothes \$1.97 in the case of the lighter weight goods and \$3.38 in the case of the heaviest goods entering into a suit of clothes. But a note says:

It has been claimed by certain clothing manufacturers that, compared with free wool, the present tariff will increase the consumers' clothing bill by from \$4 on a summer suit to \$7.50 on a heavy winter overcoat. The Tariff Commission checked up on their figures and found that, using the same methods, the estimated possible cost would be from \$2.03 on a summer suit to \$5.70 on a heavy winter overcoat, but indicated that because of various factors the real cost might amount to no more than from \$1.62 on a summer suit to \$4.56 on a heavy overcoat. The Manufacturers' Club, of Philadelphia, whose members are as much interested in cheap raw materials and high selling prices as the clothing manufacturers, takes exception to both the foregoing estimates and states that, compared with free wool, the true cost to the consumer properly attributable to the present tariff should range from \$1.14 on a summer suit to \$2.78 on a heavy winter overcoat. (The Tariff on Wool and Its Cost to the Consumer, The Manufacturer, Philadelphia, November, 1922, vol. 4, No. 11, p. 3.)

That is the story of the increased cost of a whole suit of clothes by reason of the duty of 31 cents a pound on wool. If that is correct, then I think we must agree that it is absurd to talk about an increase of \$2.50 in the cost of material that enters into a suit of clothes made in part from wool rags, even though they should carry a duty of 24 cents a pound.

But what is the fact about the matter, Mr. President? As has heretofore been stated, according to the last figures available we imported something over 21,000,000 pounds of wool rags in 1928 and we exported something more than 17,000,000 pounds of wool rags. So that if we put an embargo upon the importation of foreign wool rags we still have 17,000,000 pounds of our own rags to use. It is true they are not of such high quality, but by mixing them with virgin wool there can be produced a garment that is substantially as good as may be produced from the foreign rags. I was not quite clear in my understanding as to whether the blanket which has been exhibited here as being made of wool rags is made of wool rags or in part of virgin wool.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is made of wool rags.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. In the event the things to which the Senator refers should happen, that an embargo should be placed upon European rags and then dependence should be placed upon the rags which we now export, the wool producer would not be benefited, would he?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly, because the manufacturers would be obliged to use an additional amount of the domestic virgin wool to mix with the inferior grades of domestic rags.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, the point the Senator has in mind is that more virgin wool would be required to be mixed with the rags which we now export than is now required to be mixed with the rags which we import?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; that is the only difference. For all practical purposes it will be observed that we export as much as we import. The difference is a small percentage. So we would not be without the rags at all; we would use our own rags; we would not export them except we would be obliged to mix more virgin wool with them which would make an additional demand for our domestic product.

Mr. COPELAND. And would also increase the cost?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly.

Mr. COPELAND. So that the consumer would be taxed that much more for what he purchases?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly. The Senator happened to be out of the Chamber when I began. My premise is that the price will be increased.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I agree with the Senator that if an embargo should be placed upon imported wool rags, domestic rags, which are of an inferior grade, would have to be used; but it seems to me—and I will ask the Senator to give me his opinion about it—that the reason why wool rags are valuable and important is that at a nominal price, averaging in the neighborhood of 27 or 28 cents a pound, we can have wool which in the virgin stage is worth from 75 cents to a dollar a pound.

In other words, the cloth made from wool rags has in it wool comparable in appearance, in value, and in warmth to virgin wool, and the price paid is only around 30 cents, while wool in the raw state is worth from 75 cents to a dollar a pound.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, I can not agree with the Senator at all about that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I had hoped the Senator could agree with me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; I can not.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What we are doing, it seems to me, by increasing the duty upon wool rags is to take away from the consuming public a cheap but desirable wool in the shape of rags and to make them, instead, use clothing made from high-priced virgin wool at from 75 cents to a dollar.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, I can not agree that there can be made as good an article of clothing from wool rags as can be made from virgin wool. The Senator, I suppose, could not have really intended to say that. Wool rags are cheaper than virgin wool because there can not be made as good a fabric out of wool rags, whether they are used exclusively or whether they are used in combination with virgin wool.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is my opinion that clothing made from wool rags, if the rags are of the finer grade, is superior to all-wool clothing made from inferior and cheap wool.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is true, when the clothing is made of inferior wool, of course, for inferior wool may be hair.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that it has been the contention of the Senator from Utah, as I understood him, that the rags which we import from abroad are of such high quality that there can be recovered from them a wool which is equal to our best wool.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I never said that. I said that such rags could be mixed with wool to make a certain class of goods which would be just as warm and just as good as if they were made from all wool. That is what I said; but there can not be drawn from a rag as fine a thread to make as fine a class of goods as can be made from the virgin wool; that is impossible.

Mr. COPELAND. But, in any event, the product made from the virgin wool would cost more than the product made by the mixture of the two.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about that, because of the fact that the price of the virgin wool of the class which would be used would be from 70 to 72 or 73 cents a pound, whereas the product of the rag would be about 35 cents a pound.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I should like to clear up a little confusion. Reference has been made repeatedly to the superiority of foreign rags over domestic rags. Of course there exists no such superiority at all. What is meant by that is that only the high class of wool rags are imported into this country. We have the same kind of rags here, and we use them to the extent of something like 80,000,000 pounds in the production of fabrics. We have the same high character of rags. We do not import the low character of rags; it is only the highest grade of rags that we import; the clippings from the tailor shops and the manufacturing establishments, which are, of course, of high class, and of knitted fabrics where the fiber is preserved practically in its original length, at least until the garnetting process is pursued.

Mr. President, not only would we have the 17,000,000 pounds of domestic rags which we export with which to supply the vacuum which would be created by the exclusion of the foreign rags under an embargo tariff, but we would have the 60,000,000 pounds of rags, in addition to the 17,000,000 pounds which are annually consumed in making felt roofing and in paper making and articles of that kind. That would be a great source of rags in this country that could be seized upon in order to supply the deficiency occasioned by the shutting out of the foreign product. The price of wool rags used for the purpose of making paper or of making felt roofing can not be raised very much more, or such rags will cease to be used for that purpose, and the manufacturers will get some substitute in the production of felt roofing and paper, and that kind of thing. So the



price of the rags used for that purpose can not possibly be raised to the limit of 24 cents a pound, as suggested in the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, or even 20 cents or 18 cents, as is now proposed. There could not be any such thing, and all the computations made in support of the contention that it is going to cost something like \$2.50 more for a suit of clothes is based upon the assumption that the price of wool rags would be raised to the entire limit of the proposed duty of 24 cents. I presume probably the Senator from New York himself will appreciate that that is impossible; that is to say, that the embargo point would be reached long before the 24-cent duty was reached.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that a 1½-cent increase in the price of the rags of the character the Senator is now describing, which are used in paper making and in the manufacture of felt roofing, would prohibit their use in that class of manufacture.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. That reminds me of another line of argument pursued with his usual force and vigor and persuasion by my esteemed friend from Massachusetts, namely, that to impose the proposed duty on wool rags would force the consumer, the poor man, whose plight awakens his sympathy always, to resort to some kind of a substitute that would not be as warm. The Senator from New York very justly appreciates the position of the penurious people of his State and city who would be driven to use clothing not as valuable so far as excluding the cold is concerned as wool clothing, but, of course, the same thing can be said about the original duty upon wool. The duty of 31 cents a pound on the clean content of wool forces the employment of substitute fabrics, of fabrics that are half cotton or that contain a considerable quantity of cotton, or other fabrics of that character. That is the tendency of putting a duty upon any commodity. It promotes the utilization of substitutes; and so if the price of wool rags be raised to any considerable extent, they could not be used for the manufacture of felt roofing; they could not be used for the making of paper; but they would be available for the manufacture of fabrics at a very slight increase in their cost.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator think it is possible for wool rags such as are used in the making of roofing and paper to be used for clothing purposes?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I know of no reason on earth why they should not be.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am informed that such rags sell for from 2 to 4 cents a pound, and if it were possible to use such rags for clothing purposes profitably, I do not understand why we have been importing rags and paying an average of 28 cents a pound or so for them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Where do the rags used in the manufacture of roofing come from?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They are inferior rags; it costs more to get the wool out of them than they are worth; they are rags of the cheapest and most inferior kind.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They are either the waste from manufacture or else they are rags.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why do not the manufacturers use them instead of paying 28 cents a pound for foreign rags? Why do they not buy wool rags at 2 cents a pound? I can not see why the manufacturers do not use them if they are suitable for clothing instead of paying a duty of 7½ cents in addition to the price of the foreign rags.

Mr. SMOOT. If such a situation should arise as has been described, the manufacturers, perhaps, would take 10,000,000 of such rags, the top rags as they are called, and they could use them for the purpose of manufacturing cloth. There is not any doubt as to that. Of course, I am referring only to the top rags. Below that grade the manufacturers could not use them.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. About what percentage is that?

Mr. SMOOT. Ten million pounds could be used, or about 25 per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There are about 60,000,000 pounds used in these industries.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is, about one-sixth of the woolen rags which are now used for manufacturing felt roofing and for paper making could be sorted out and used for clothing purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but the manufacturers will not do that unless they are compelled to do it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why will they not do it? If they want to make good clothing and cheap clothing, why

do they import wool rags and pay a high price for them, and the duty in addition, when they could get the other rags for from 2 to 4 or 6 cents a pound?

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator why. In the case of the cheaper rags with the short fiber the loss is greater than in the case of the better rags. Of course, there is hardly any loss in the case of the best grades. But there is a point where the loss in making those rags into yarns to go into cloth is so great that it does not pay to use them.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is what I supposed, and that is why they are used for roofing.

Mr. SMOOT. To-day about 10,000,000 pounds which are used for paper making and the manufacture of roofing could be used by the manufacturers of clothing if they were forced to do it; that is, in the manufacture of coarser grades of yarn and woolen manufactures.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the higher the price is raised the more can be put into the selection of desirable parts of the waste that now go into felt roofing and into the manufacture of paper.

Of course, we have exactly the same experience out West in the mining business. The higher you raise the price of copper the greater amount you can expend in selecting out and in concentrating ores that otherwise it would be impossible to utilize at all.

Mr. President, in view of all these considerations I am convinced that while even an embargo rate upon wool rags would undoubtedly increase the cost of clothing into which wool rags enter, the cost would be relatively inconsequential in my judgment; and that leads me to the conclusion which I desire to submit.

We have deemed it a wise public policy to impose a duty of 34 cents a pound upon virgin wool. All we are asking of Congress now is that they do not admit substitutes for wool at such a low figure that the duty which they concede to us upon the virgin wool will not be realized to any considerable extent. In other words, we ask you not to hold the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope.

Much has been said here about how this will do the wool-grower no good. It is my judgment, generally speaking, that those who are engaged in a particular industry are the best judges of what is for their own interest; and all of those engaged in the sheep and wool industry are here asking that this duty be imposed at a very substantial rate. They are here convinced, after a study—and they are students of this problem—that this inconsequential duty of 7½ or 8 cents a pound on wool rags has been operating so as to deprive them of a considerable portion of the duty upon the virgin wool; and they ask for relief from that situation.

Again, Mr. President, we must remember that this Congress was called in extra session, and the work of the extra session is continued, to relieve the farmer from the depressed condition in which he finds himself; and that depressed condition was to be relieved by increasing the duty upon his products. You did increase the duty on wool; and now we appeal to you not to take away the advantage that is accorded us by that increase but to give us a substantial rate upon these wool wastes, including wool rags.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1816) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Wabasha, Minn., and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### NOMINATION OF FRANK W. DONALDSON

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, several days ago the President sent to the Senate the nomination of Frank W. Donaldson to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Tennessee. The present holder of the office has resigned and goes out of office to-day, and it is very necessary that Mr. Donaldson should be confirmed. I ask unanimous consent that, as in open executive session, the nomination of Mr. Donaldson may be confirmed at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will report the nomination.

The CHIEF CLERK. Frank W. Donaldson, to be collector of internal revenue, district of Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

## REPORT OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Eightieth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1929.

## HOLIDAY RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on a concurrent resolution before doing that?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I will yield for the quorum if the Senator would like to call it; but I have here a concurrent resolution which I should like to introduce, to which I think there will be no objection. I ask unanimous consent to introduce it out of order, and after the clerk has read it I shall ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I have been advised as to what the concurrent resolution is. I think it is the better part of wisdom to have the quorum called for first.

Mr. WATSON. I have no objection to the quorum, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CUTTING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Ashurst	George	McCulloch	Smith
Barkley	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Bingham	Glass	McMaster	Steak
Black	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Blaine	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Sullivan
Blaise	Greene	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Hale	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Harris	Norris	Townsend
Brock	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Brookhart	Hastings	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Hathfield	Patterson	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Pine	Walcott
Connally	Hebert	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Cutting	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Kean	Sheppard	
Fletcher	Keyes	Shortridge	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I now renew my request for unanimous consent for the introduction, out of order, of the concurrent resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Saturday, December 21, 1929, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, January 6, 1930.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered by the Senate and agreed to.

## REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industry of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may the pending amendment be stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] proposes to amend the committee amendment, on page 172, line 23, by striking out "30" and inserting in lieu thereof "22."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that he take the rate in the existing law, 24 cents, rather than 22 cents on carbonized noils. That, I believe, is the rate in the present law.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, 24 cents is the rate of the present law. The rate I suggested is according to the relative-value basis of wool. If the Senator asks that the amendment be modified I have no particular desire to prolong any discussion on the matter, for the reason that the amount of imports is very inconsequential. I think in 1928 there were only 850,000 pounds of imports.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is true; but in view of the fact that the Senate has agreed to a rate of 34 cents on wool, which is the rate adopted by the House, and, therefore, that matter is not in conference, I think the carbonized noils ought to be placed at least at the rate in the existing law, which is, of course, 6 cents under the rate recommended by the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. BLAINE. I accept the modification.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin modify his amendment?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin modifies his amendment. The question now is on the amendment as modified.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, more time has been occupied in the discussion of the rag rate than on the present amendment. I simply want to say, if the Senate desires now to destroy the duty that it has given the woolgrower upon his wool, let it vote for this amendment.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the product that is involved here. As far as that is concerned, carbonized noils are just about as good as wool. You are voting on putting a rate of 24 cents on carbonized noils. The committee reported 30 cents, and the 30 cents was based upon a duty of 31 cents a pound on wool.

I am ready for a vote. I wanted the Senate to understand the question.

Mr. GEORGE. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to address an inquiry to the Senator from Georgia. The present rate of 24 cents is based, of course, upon the duty of 31 cents existing in the present law. If the Senator wanted to preserve that, he should increase the 24 cents by the same amount by which the 31 cents was increased, that is to say, that should be made 27 cents instead of 24, not in order to preserve the rate in the present law but to preserve the relation of the duty on noils to the duty upon wool.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator is right so far as the preservation of the relationship is concerned, but from my study of it I believe that 24 cents is a fair compensatory rate on the carbonized noils. When the amendment was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin I suggested that he might accept the 24-cent rate.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator that the relative value between 24 and 30 is out of all proportion. There is very little difference between the scoured wool basis and the carbonized noils basis.

Mr. GEORGE. I realize that.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the use giving a rate on carbonized noils that will allow them to come in, when every pound imported displaces a pound of scoured wool? That is all there is to it.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the answer to that fear on the part of the Senator from Utah is that the imports have been very small. Even with the rate at 24 cents, as it is in existing law, the importations have been small. They have not shown a tendency to increase. The notable increase has been in the importation of rags and the other products.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason is that we have not imported very much scoured wool. The wools have been coming in in the grease but if that change is made, we will quickly see what will happen. I am telling the Senate what is going to happen. Senators can do as they please about voting the rate, but just as sure as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning, if we leave this at 24 cents, and leave 34 cents on scoured wool, wool will be made into noils and imported in that form.

Mr. GEORGE. At least the Senator from Utah will agree with me that 24 cents is better than 22 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not offer the amendment.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I want to say in answer to the statement of the Senator from Utah that I think it has been clearly demonstrated that under the existing law the cost of the duty to the manufacturer is not over 23.6 cents per pound. That is what it costs the manufacturer. He wants to pyramid these profits on all of these waste products, as well as on noils. On the basis of the amount the wool duty costs the manufacturer, the rate on garments ought to be 21 cents; that is,



based on the relative value of wool according to the experience of nearly seven years under the 1922 tariff rate of 31 cents, the rate actually ought to be only 21 cents. That represents exactly the cost of the duty to the manufacturer.

I am willing to give a leeway there of 3 cents a pound, but I have not found a single word of discussion to justify the proposition that these high compensatory rates should be carried over all through this wool schedule. The relative value of noils on the wool basis is 25 per cent. The amount the manufacturer actually pays on account of the duty, that is, the cost of the duty, is only 23.6 cents per pound. Therefore, by a simple calculation it can be seen that the duty on this item ought not to be more than 21 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the question of importations has been raised. As long as those soft, clean rags carried the rate fixed, no carbonized noils would be shipped in, but raise the rate on rags and leave noils at the rate the Senator is asking, and we will very soon learn what is going to happen. Instead of the importations consisting of wool, they will be noils, carbonized noils, or noils uncarbonized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], as modified, to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRATTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote, and I, therefore, vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and vote "yea."

Mr. HATFIELD (when Mr. GOFF's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is confined to his home on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay." He is paired on this question with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote nay.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] is necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is detained from the Senate by illness. I am not informed as to how he would vote on this question.

I desire also to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 53, as follows:

#### YEAS—22

Barkley	Fletcher	Heflin	Smith
Black	George	La Follette	Trammell
Blaine	Glass	McKellar	Wagner
Blease	Harris	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Brock	Harrison	Robinson, Ark.	
Copeland	Hawes	Simmons	

#### NAYS—53

Allen	Glenn	McMaster	Steck
Ashurst	Goldsbrough	McNary	Steiwer
Bingham	Greene	Moses	Sullivan
Borah	Hale	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Hastings	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hatfield	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Patterson	Walcott
Connally	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Cutting	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Kean	Sheppard	
Frazier	Keyes	Shortridge	
Gillett	McCulloch	Smoot	

#### NOT VOTING—20

Baird	Goff	Overman	Shipstead
Broussard	Gould	Phipps	Stephens
Caraway	Kendrick	Randsell	Swanson
Dale	King	Reed	Thomas, Okla.
Deneen	Metcalf	Robinson, Ind.	Tydings

So Mr. BLAINE's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 172, line 23, strike out the words "noils, 21 cents" and insert "noils, carbonized, 30 cents per pound; noils, not carbonized, 23 cents per pound."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely want to call the attention of the Senate to one thing, not that I expect it to do any good because we are fixing to write a wool schedule that will put a blush of shame upon the old Payne-Aldrich Schedule K. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Tariff Commission itself has found, after exhaustive study and research, that the difference in the cost of carbonizing wool at home and abroad is only 4 cents a pound. The Senate is asked to make a difference of 7 cents. That is the finding of the Tariff Commission, and I think it will not be disputed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, 4 cents is the cost of carbonizing, but in the carbonizing there is involved the removal of all the waste matter that comes from the wool after its bath in sulphuric acid. All of the burrs and all of the foreign matter are eaten away by the acid, and that forms a part of the waste of the material before it is carbonized. Therefore, while the 4 cents would cover the actual expense of the carbonizing, it would not take care of the waste that is in the noil before it is carbonized.

Mr. GEORGE. The carbonizing of the wool simply means taking out all of the vegetable matter in it, and it is admitted on all sides that 4 cents is the measure of the difference in the cost of carbonizing at home and carbonizing abroad. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to it, and I am ready for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, in order to carry out the purpose of the bill and make it conform to the action just taken, on page 172, in line 25, "thread or yarn waste, 23 cents a pound," the 23 cents should be made 25 cents. I move that amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays. I think the change of 2 cents does not make any difference, because we are favoring the manufacturers now and not so much the producers of the raw wool.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah propose the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I propose to strike out "23" and insert "25." It is simply carrying out the plan of providing a differential between 31 cents and 34 cents on the scoured content.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 172, line 25, the original amendment is to strike out the word "and" and insert "23 cents per pound." The Senator from Utah proposes to strike out "23" and insert "25," so it will read:

Thread or yarn waste, 25 cents per pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee. The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRATTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence and not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. SACKETT (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], who has not voted. Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] is necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL].

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 24, as follows:

## YEAS—47

Allen	Greene	McNary	Smoot
Ashurst	Hale	Metcalf	Steiwer
Bingham	Hastings	Moses	Sullivan
Bratton	Hayden	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hebert	Nye	Townsend
Capper	Howell	Oddie	Trammell
Connally	Johnson	Patterson	Vandenberg
Cutting	Jones	Pine	Walcott
Fess	Kean	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Frazier	Keyes	Schall	Waterman
Gillett	McCulloch	Sheppard	Watson
Goldsbrough	McMaster	Shortridge	

## NAYS—24

Barkley	Copeland	Heflin	Smith
Black	Fletcher	La Follette	Steck
Blaine	George	McKellar	Swanson
Blease	Glass	Norris	Wagner
Borah	Harris	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Brock	Harrison	Simmons	Wheeler

## NOT VOTING—24

Baird	Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.
Broussard	Glenn	King	Sackett
Caraway	Goff	Overman	Shipstead
Couzens	Gould	Phipps	Stephens
Dale	Hatfield	Ransdell	Thomas, Okla.
Deneen	Hawes	Reed	Tydings

So Mr. Smoot's amendment to the amendment was agreed to. The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] if he has any objection to changing "34" to "37," in line 22, in view of the action just taken?

Mr. BLAINE. Let us proceed and finish with the committee amendments first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there has been a misprint in paragraph 1105 which I wish to have corrected. The printer got it mixed up. This is the way it should read. After the semicolon following the word "pounds," in line 25, it should read as follows:

Card or burr waste, carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah what he proposes to do with the provision in lines 1 and 2 on page 173?

Mr. SMOOT. That will be taken care of by a further amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Utah state the question again?

Mr. SMOOT. On page 172, after the semicolon following the word "pound," in line 25, it should read as follows:

Card or burr waste, carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound; all other wool wastes not specially provided for, 24 cents per pound.

Then we will strike out, on page 173, line 1, after the word "for," the words "18 cents; carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound." We must strike that all out because it is in the wrong place.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely want the Senator to read the proposed amendment, so that we may all hear it.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 172, line 25, after the semicolon following the word "pound," insert the following:

Card or burr waste, carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound.

Then follows, on line 25 of the same page, "all other wool wastes not specially provided for, 24 cents per pound." That is one amendment. Then I shall offer the other amendment striking out the words that were inserted in the wrong place.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Utah finished his statement? I do not want to interrupt the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not ask the Senator from Utah to yield; I do not want the floor unless the Senator from Utah is through with it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have concluded.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the explanation of the Senator from Utah is perfectly plain with one exception. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he is sure that in the rates in the amendment as modified he has taken into consideration the fact that we have raised the duty on raw wool from 31 cents to 34 cents?

Mr. SMOOT. I have so stated.

Mr. NORRIS. It may be I did not hear the Senator. Of course, if he is sure of that, we are ready to vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to move to amend the amendment of the committee. I presume the committee amendment is subject to amendment. I move to strike out the numerals "23" and to insert "16"; to strike out the numerals "16" and to insert "10"; and to strike out the numerals "24" and to insert "20." The rates which I have proposed correspond to the relative value, taking into account that the manufacturer because of the tariff does not pay more than 23.6 cents per pound. I submit that, since the duty does not cost the manufacturer more than 23.6 cents per pound on the basis of a 31-cent wool rate, and not over 25½ cents a pound on the basis of a 34-cent wool rate, the rates on wool wastes should correspond to the cost of the duty to the manufacturer.

I can see no justification for jacking up the duty on wool wastes far above the relative value of virgin wool. I am not a prophet, but I think it ought to be plainly seen by those who are interested from the standpoint of the woolgrower that we are not aiding the producers of wool, the farmers. These wool wastes have no replacement utility basis whatever, because there is no wool in America to be replaced; we have a shortage of wool of over 200,000,000 pounds a year, so there can not be any justification for legislating upon the basis of the displacement utility value.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered these amendments, realizing, of course, that they are going to be defeated, in order to be consistent and to carry out what I believe, in the interest of the woolgrower, the woolen manufacturer, and the consuming public, should be done, namely, that the rates should be based upon the relative value. I do not care to extend the debate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Wisconsin has said that he could not understand why it was the desire of certain elements in this body to "jack up" the rates upon the wools and wastes above the basic rate on wool. I think there is no difficulty in understanding that. We do not produce enough wool in this country to supply the demand. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that the manufacturers should have some imports of wool. So the Committee on Finance did not wish to make the duty on wool absolutely prohibitive, but they did wish to make the duties on waste wools and rags absolutely prohibitive. That is the reason for the action.

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; and that is the proposal of the Finance Committee, to make these duties absolutely prohibitive. If adopted, they will place a complete embargo against these articles in paragraph 1105.

I am not going to extend the debate, because I have at some length analyzed the paragraph and indicated that which in all probability will be the consequence to flow from these exorbitant and prohibitive rates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin to the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, let me see if I understand the amendment of the Committee on Finance. As I understand the proposition is to insert the words "card or burr waste, carbonized, 23 cents a pound." Is that the amendment proposed by the committee?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. So the carbonized waste carries a differential of 7 cents, as compared to the uncarbonized, although there is only an actual difference in carbonizing of 4 cents a pound, as I said before?

Mr. SMOOT. Most of the card and burr waste is carbonized, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. And as to that not carbonized the duty is 16 cents?

Mr. SMOOT. It is 16 cents.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not understand the remainder of the amendment.



Mr. SMOOT. The remainder of the amendment reads "all other wool wastes not specially provided for, 24 cents per pound."

Mr. GEORGE. Including carbonized and not carbonized.

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to move to strike out "18 cents, carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound." Those words are to be stricken out because they are in the wrong place in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Why does the Senator from Utah propose to raise the rate beyond the recommendation of the committee on all other wastes from 23 to 24 cents?

Mr. SMOOT. The committee rates were based upon a duty of 31 cents on the clean content of the wool. The Senate has increased that rate to 34 cents, and, therefore, it is necessary to have the compensatory duties conform to the basic duty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. BLAINE. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRATTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with reference to my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] as on the former vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. HATFIELD (when Mr. GOFF's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] has a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. If the senior Senator from West Virginia were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GEORGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] is necessarily detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 49, as follows:

#### YEAS—25

Black	George	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Blaine	Glass	Norris	Trammell
Blease	Harris	Robinson, Ark.	Wagner
Brock	Harrison	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Heflin	Smith	
Dill	La Follette	Steck	
Fletcher	McKellar	Swanson	

#### NAYS—49

Allen	Greene	McMaster	Steinwer
Ashurst	Hale	McNary	Sullivan
Bingham	Hastings	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Hatfield	Nye	Townsend
Bratton	Hawes	Oddie	Vandenberg
Brookhart	Hayden	Patterson	Walcott
Capper	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Cutting	Johnson	Sackett	Watson
Fess	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Frazier	Kean	Sheppard	
Gillett	Keyes	Shortridge	
Goldsborough	McCulloch	Smoot	

#### NOT VOTING—21

Baird	Deneen	Norbeck	Shipstead
Barkley	Glenn	Overman	Stephens
Broussard	Goff	Phipps	Tydings
Caraway	Gould	Ransdell	
Couzens	Kendrick	Reed	
Dale	King	Robinson, Ind.	

So Mr. BLAINE's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Utah, is, on line 25, page 172, after the word "pound" and the semicolon, to insert "card or burr waste, carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. The next amendment is on page 173, line 1, where the Senator from Utah proposes to strike out "18 cents" and insert "24 cents." The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] proposes, in lieu of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, "24 cents," to insert "20 cents," so that it will read:

Wastes not specially provided for, 20 cents per pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Utah proposes to strike out "18" and insert "24" cents.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I want to strike out the words "18 cents; carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound," found on lines 1 and 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will advise the Senator that that was not what the Senator wanted. The Senator wants this amendment rejected, as the Chair understands.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but I ask unanimous consent that the 18 cents be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That has been agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the present situation with reference to the pending amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the clerk state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 173, line 1, it was originally proposed to strike out "18 cents," now "24 cents," and insert "carbonized, 23 cents per pound; not carbonized, 16 cents per pound."

Mr. SMOOT. That will be all right.

Mr. WATSON. Then what becomes of the 18 cents?

Mr. SMOOT. It is 24 cents now. My original motion was to provide, for wastes not specially provided for, a rate of 24 cents per pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that if this amendment is rejected it will leave the rate 24 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I want.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHIEF CLERK. The next amendment is on page 173—

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that we vote upon the rate on rags before we vote upon the rate on wool extract and mungo and shoddy. I do that because I think we ought to determine the rate upon rags before we vote upon the other rate.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is in order now. It is the next amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the next amendment is "shoddy, 18 cents."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Senate be in order, so that it may understand the request of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that we vote now upon "wool rags, 24 cents per pound," on line 4, page 173; and after that is disposed of I will return to line 3, "and wool extract."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator the reason for that request?

Mr. SMOOT. The reason of it is that I should like to have the rate upon rags determined before we pass upon the other rate.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there any reason why that should be done?

Mr. SMOOT. Whatever the rate is upon rags, there should be a difference of about 6 or 7 cents per pound. I should like, therefore, to have the rag rate disposed of at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, there is no amendment to the proposed rate on mungo.

Mr. SMOOT. There is an amendment here on wool extract. I ask that that be passed over until we vote upon rags.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether it is his idea to raise the duty on line 3 on shoddy and wool extract in case the duty on rags is agreed to as offered by the Senate committee?

Mr. SMOOT. If the rag rate of 24 cents per pound should be maintained, of course the wool extract and shoddy rate would have to be greatly increased. Therefore, I want the Senate to vote on the rags first.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the committee did not see it that way. The committee reported 21 cents on the extract, and 24 cents on rags.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator say that the difference ought to be 6 cents instead of 3?

Mr. SMOOT. It ought to be just the other way, Mr. President.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the 24 cents on rags is retained, what does the Senator propose to ask on shoddy?

Mr. SMOOT. The relative value of the two—I mean, wool extract and shoddy—is about 6 cents more for the shoddy than for the wool rags.

Mr. GEORGE. So there will be a rate of about 30 cents for shoddy?

Mr. SMOOT. It all depends on what rate they are going to have upon wool rags.

Mr. GEORGE. I say, if the rate of 24 cents on wool rags is retained?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that would be about a compensatory duty between the two, based on the relative value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 173, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "wool rags and" and to insert "wool rags, 24 cents per pound."

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. What amendment is proposed and pending now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. "Wool rags, 24 cents per pound."

Mr. WATSON. I know; but is some amendment to the amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], after the vigorous protest and exhaustive debate that we have heard, if the majority members of the Finance Committee are not moved to recommend a lower rate than 24 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as I am personally concerned, I think it ought to be done.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor, having been recognized by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WATSON. No; I am not yielding. I have not said anything yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to inquire whether or not there is pending at this time an amendment to the Senate committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not.

Mr. WATSON. Then I move to strike out "24 cents per pound" and insert "18 cents per pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 173, line 4, in the committee amendment, the Senator from Indiana proposes to strike out "24" and insert "18," so that it will read:

Wool rags, 18 cents per pound.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I have listened to this debate on both sides as far as possible, and I have talked with many Senators on both sides, those opposed to the 24 cents and those favoring it. I have come to the conclusion that the compromise rate of 18 cents is about a just rate; that it is compensatory to the producer and is not burdensome to the consumer. I believe that 18 cents is about the rate that ought to be fixed. For that reason I have made this motion, and I trust it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is the present rate on these rags?

Mr. WATSON. Seven and a half cents.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. In view of the fact that the present rate is 7½ cents, does the Senator from Indiana consider that he is offering a compromise that is worth while when he proposes to make this rate 18 cents, 10½ cents higher than the present rate?

Mr. WATSON. I will say to my friend from New York that if I had not thought so I would not have offered the amendment. I think it is a fair compromise. The Senate committee provides for a rate of 24 cents. I violate no confidence, I trust, when I say that I made that motion myself in the committee, because I thought at that time it would take 24 cents to protect the farmer and the woolgrower on the wool-rag matter. I have since come to the conclusion that 18 cents would be fully protective, and at the same time that it would be as little burdensome as any rate that could be imposed if the producer of wool rags is to be protected at all.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am interested to know what the people will say when they buy the clothing at the increased cost which will be forced upon them. Whether this rate is fixed at 24 cents or 18 cents or 15 cents, it is outrageous, as I see it.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, to strike out the numeral "18" and to insert "9."

That rate is in conformity with other rates I have suggested upon wool waste, upon the same theory and upon the same basis. I do not care to go into a debate upon the proposition.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WATSON. The proposal to make the rate 24 cents a pound, proposed by the committee, is in and of itself an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not under the practice of the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. Then the Chair holds that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin is in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. WATSON. As an amendment to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order under Rule XVIII.

Mr. SMITH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRATTON (when his name was called). Repeating my announcement as on the previous vote with reference to my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], I vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and vote "yea."

Mr. HATFIELD (when Mr. Goff's name was called). The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] has a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Announcing as before my general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. The Senator has a general pair for the day with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], but I do not know how either Senator would vote on this amendment if present.

I desire also to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. MOSES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD] and allow my vote to stand.



Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am authorized to state that if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] were present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

## YEAS—31

Bingham	George	Heflin	Simmons
Black	Gillett	Keyes	Smith
Blaine	Glass	La Follette	Steck
Blease	Greene	McKellar	Swanson
Brock	Hale	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Copeland	Harris	Moses	Wagner
Dill	Harrison	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Hawes	Robinson, Ark.	

## NAYS—43

Allen	Glenn	McNary	Sullivan
Ashurst	Goldsborough	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Hatfield	Oddie	Townsend
Bratton	Hayden	Pine	Trammell
Brookhart	Hebert	Pittman	Vandenberg
Capper	Howell	Sackett	Walcott
Connally	Johnson	Schall	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Jones	Sheppard	Waterman
Cutting	Kean	Shorridge	Watson
Fess	McCulloch	Smoot	Wheeler
Frazier	McMaster	Steiner	

## NOT VOTING—21

Baird	Goff	Overman	Shipstead
Barkley	Gould	Patterson	Stephens
Broussard	Hastings	Phipps	Tydings
Caraway	Kendrick	Ransdell	
Dale	King	Reed	
Deneen	Norbeck	Robinson, Ind.	

So Mr. BLAINE's amendment to Mr. WATSON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment. The present rate is 7½ cents. The increase on raw wool is 3 cents. I move that the rate fixed upon rags shall be 10½ cents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I offer a substitute amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 173, line 4, after the first semicolon, strike out the remainder of line 4 and insert in lieu thereof:

Wool rags, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, 8 cents per pound; valued at more than 30 cents per pound but not more than 50 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound; valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 16 cents per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will regard this as an amendment in the form of a substitute and as being in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this amendment, in my judgment, is a fair proposal. The maximum rate, I think, is higher than what ought to be levied, but it has the merit of distinguishing between different grades of woolen rags. The importance and necessity of a graduated duty can best be realized when I call attention to the equivalent ad valorem rates upon wool rags that have been imported into this country, based upon the present rate of 7½ cents per pound.

Wool rags have come into this country varying in price from 15 cents to 75 cents per pound under the present law. The ad valorem equivalent has varied from 10 per cent to 50 per cent under the present law.

The proposal made by the Finance Committee, fixing a specific duty of 24 cents per pound, works out to levy an equivalent ad valorem duty varying from 33 per cent to 160 per cent. Mind you, the 160 per cent is upon the cheap wool rags that go into the cheaper clothing.

The proposal made by the Senator from Indiana of a specific duty of 18 cents per pound works out to make the spread in equivalent ad valorem terms vary from 24 per cent to 115 per cent. We can not defend successfully the levying of a duty which varies from 24 per cent to 115 per cent in ad valorem terms.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SACKETT. Will the Senator tell me what amount of imported rags would come in under the different rates proposed in this schedule?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am sorry I have not that information, but from my recollection of the testimony I think that most of the rags that have come in have been the higher and middle priced rags.

Mr. SACKETT. That is not the information we get from the experts who served with the committee. I think the Senator from Utah can give us some idea what those amounts are.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We know the average price of the imported wool rags and by-products of wool. It is 28 or 29 cents per pound. That means that there must be many wool rags valued at less than 28 cents and many valued in excess of that.

Mr. SACKETT. That, then, would mean that the bulk of them come in under the lowest bracket.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, 90 per cent of all the rags imported into the United States are under 35 cents a pound. It is true that there are a few of the dainty, colored rags used for special purposes, as rags coming from France mostly, I think, that come in valued at about 75 cents a pound. That is the situation. We would not care whether those rags came in or not. They do not interfere with wool at all. They are some special, wonderfully soft colored rags, made, perhaps, for some special dress or some special occasion, and they do not amount to anything.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as I understand the reply of the Senator from Utah, it is that most of these imported wool rags would fall within the second bracket, namely, 12 cents a pound, under this pending amendment.

Mr. President, before the vote is taken, before this increase is adopted, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate, and particularly the Members of the Senate upon the other side, to what the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House said about this proposition. They made a report as to why they reached the conclusion that 8 cents a pound was a satisfactory and a just duty to levy upon wool rags.

It is very brief:

The committee has not been able to agree with the woolgrowers who ask that the duties on all these wastes, etc., be made practically as high as the duties on the medium and fine wools on the ground that they displace wool in the manufacture of clothing.

This is the report of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

These wastes do not displace wool. They supplement wool. They really furnish a market for wool which must be mixed with these other materials in order that the wastes may be used in clothing. By using the wastes, cheaper clothing is made available for that part of our people who desire it. The wastes therefore do not displace wool and, contrary to the claims of the woolgrowers, do not lower the price of wool.

There is the statement of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives voting for and fixing a rate of 8 cents per pound. The proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island meets the objection that the specific duty is not fair because it operates to make the equivalent rate higher upon the cheaper wool wastes than upon the more expensive wool wastes, and furthermore it actually increases the House duty of 8 cents per pound. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the inconsistency of the House in voting 8 cents a pound on flocks and 8 cents a pound on woolen rags. Flocks are nothing but the shearings of a piece of cashmere. As it comes from the loom it is gaged and the little short hairs are raised and then it is taken to the shearing machine and those little short hairs are sheared off. The flocks are about one-twelfth of an inch long, not more than that. The House put a rate of 8 cents a pound on flocks and put the same rate upon rags that cost 40 cents a pound. Flocks sometimes are used in weighting overcoats. Sometimes where there is a backing flocks are used for the weighting of the cloth. Flocks can not be pinned. Nothing can be done with them unless they can be used simply in order to get weight. So far as my mill is concerned, flocks are thrown out on the dump and burned, because they are not worth anything.

But now it is proposed to give flocks 8 cents per pound and then to give 8 cents a pound on rags. It is perfectly absurd, and I say that without a question of doubt. I know that anybody who knows anything about it will agree with me.

This is what the amendment means. There will be 72 to 75 per cent of all the rags that will come in under the 8-cent rate under the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, and most of the balance will come in at the rate of 12 cents per pound. Another 8 per cent is composed of special rags that come in. We are not worrying about them at all. There is only about 8 per cent of the whole amount of rags coming in that are of that character. Rags that come in at 75 cents a pound never go into a cheap suit of clothes, so no one can appeal on the theory that that item is going to increase the cost of the poor man's clothing. Those rags do not go into that kind of clothing.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have not said that they did. I said the 75-cent rags have an ad valorem duty of 10 per cent and the 20-cent rags have an ad valorem duty of 166 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say that the Senator so stated. I was calling attention to the inconsistency of the whole thing. Do we want a rate on rags here that will make effective the duty which is imposed upon wool? If we do, we will have to vote for the 18-cent rate. If we do not, then we will vote for the amendment as offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I think it will bear repetition that this is a contest between the manufacturer on one side and the farmer on the other side.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. METCALF. I want to say that I have been a woolen manufacturer. We do not use any rags whatever and the question does not affect me in any way, shape, or fashion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I had no thought of any personal reference in the matter at all. I have stated heretofore, when the Senator from Rhode Island did not figure in it at all, that this is a contest between the manufacturer on the one side and the farmer on the other side. I repeat it now. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], however, quotes in support of his contention the views of the House Committee on Ways and Means. I say that the entire tariff question, as has been demonstrated over and over again, is a contest between the industrialists on the one side and the farmers on the other.

What is the composition of the Republican membership of the House Ways and Means Committee? There are 15 Republican members in the House Ways and Means Committee. Five of them come from agricultural States and 10 of them come from industrial States. Of the five that come from agricultural States, one comes from the State of Wisconsin and another one from the State of Iowa, of practically no consequence whatever in the production of wool. There are just two representatives from woolgrowing States, one from Oregon and one from Colorado. It is quite reasonable and natural to expect those gentlemen to take the manufacturers' side of the contest. I appeal to those in this body who are really desirous of doing something for the farmer to realize the nature of the controversy that is here.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is a member of that committee from the State of Washington.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is quite right. I had Mr. HADLEY's name noted, but overlooked it. That makes three from the woolgrowing States.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in spite of what the Senator from Montana has just said and in spite of the repeated statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that the duty upon rags in an unimportant thing as regards the price of clothes worn by the poor of our country, I still contend and believe that the imposition of this high tax will materially increase the cost of the garments worn by our people. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] may say that this is a contest between the manufacturers and the farmers. So far as I am concerned, it is a contest between those who would place a higher price upon the garments worn by the poor and those who must suffer if the tax is imposed.

Senators, here is one place in the schedule where there is an opportunity to do something for the common man. In my judgment, the farmer will not suffer and the manufacturer will not suffer if we make this concession. I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island may be adopted.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate in reference to these matters except to make the observation that in my opinion the specific proposal offered by the Senator from Rhode Island is the most hurtful suggestion which has yet been made from the standpoint of the producers of wool in this country. It would be better for the woolgrower to have accepted the 9-cent proposal made in the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] than to accept this substitute amendment which carries a rate of 8 cents upon rags of a lower value and a higher rate upon rags in the upper brackets.

The Senator from Utah has explained to the Senate that the very great proportion of the rags now imported are brought in at a value of less than 30 cents per pound. But we must remem-

ber there is no graduation in the present law. The rate is 7½ cents on all rags, and just as certainly as we impose a graduated tariff with a differential in favor of the cheaper rags, the importations will all or substantially all consist of the cheaper rags, and we would have an 8-cent rate instead of a 9-cent rate. I can accept, if I have to, the proposal of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], although I thoroughly believe the rate should be 24 cents, but I want to say to the Senate from the standpoint of the producers of wool that there is a real sinister injury, although not so intended by the Senator from Rhode Island, a real harmful effect that will come to the wool producer if we adopt this substitute. I hope it will not be seriously considered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the amendment, but I rise to say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] that this is not a contest between the farmers on the one hand and the industrialists on the other hand. By far the greatest number of citizens come within the class of general consumers and are entitled to fair consideration at the hands of the Congress. Prior tariff legislation was condemned chiefly because of the wool schedule. There has been written in no prior tariff act anything approaching the iniquities of this measure. It is not to the manufacturers that we must answer and it is not to the farmers as such that we must answer, but it is to the general consumers of the country, including the farmers.

What are we doing? The woolgrower is the most fortunate man engaged in general agricultural production to-day. Moreover he has the highest effective tariff of any producer of any major agricultural product. He is in a better financial position and he enjoys the highest effective protection that any group of agriculturalists enjoy in the country. Democrats, some from the South, sit here and vote for an indefensible rate upon wool for the woolgrower seemingly unmindful of the fact that the real fight here is Grundy's interests on the one hand, worsted, against the woolen manufacturer.

The woolen manufacturers of the country draw 7 to 12 per cent of their raw materials out of the cotton fields of the South, and yet southern Senators with half a dozen sheep running around over the hillsides of Southern States join forces with Grundy.

A survey of the farmers in the United States discloses that the woolgrowers occupy a better financial position than the producers of any other major agricultural crop. Look again at the picture. They now have a duty of 31 cents a pound on wool and it is more effective than any rate provided for the growers of any major farm product. The cotton farmer must use some wool. Let him pay more for it. The corn farmer who does not get a penny out of the tariff must have some wool. That does not matter. Let him pay more for his woollens. The wheat farmer has a high fictitious rate, not as effective as the 31-cent rate on wool. The wheat farmer must use wool and woolen products. Let him pay more. A few straggling sheep, gamboling over the hills of Southern States, of wheat States, of corn States so frighten and disturb us that we must go over and join Mr. Grundy.

As I have said before, when I sat in the subcommittee and saw Mr. Grundy come in, arm in arm with the sheep growers, I knew that it was a "cold day" for the American consumer. They made common cause against all other farmers in the country, and all the consumers of the country. The profound regret I have is that this vote was not delayed long enough for the Governor of Pennsylvania to appoint Mr. Grundy Senator from that great State, so that he could come here and vote for a 24-cent or an 18-cent duty on woolen rags. Then, like Abou Ben Adhem, at least brother Grundy's name would lead "all the rest" of those who love their fellow men, who love the poor and want to help the poor, especially the poor downtrodden farmer, the poor downtrodden wool producer of the United States.

Mr. President, I think if a vote were delayed that Mr. Grundy might arrive, and there would not be any doubt about how he would vote. I want to say to my friend from Montana that Mr. Grundy is classed as a manufacturer, but he came into the committee room with the sheep growers of the West, and he beamed with satisfaction, if, indeed, he did not display deeper emotion, when anything was said by any member of the subcommittee that sounded like an effort to raise the duty on raw wool and wool rags and on the products that Mr. Grundy makes.

If the vote does not come before Mr. Grundy arrives, he will take his place on the side of the farmer against the manufacturer, though he is the president of the Manufacturers' Association of Pennsylvania and has been raising money to elect those who believe in high tariffs, and has said pretty brutally that he came down here to see that "the goods were delivered." He would vote with the farmer; he would vote against the woolen



manufacturer. The woolen manufacturer is Mr. Grundy's competitor. If he can get the Senate to raise the cost of making woollens so close to the cost of worsted as to wipe out the present substantial difference between the two, he will do the balance, and wipe out the woolen manufacturers because he manufactures worsteds. But in this fight for the poor sheep raiser, for the hard-pressed sheep raiser, Mr. Grundy is for the farmer against the manufacturer. This, however, is the rate that Grundy wants. If he were here, he would vote for it, except I doubt if he would vote for the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] to reduce the duty on rags to 18 cents; he would not appreciate that; and I do not believe it is fair to reduce this rate in brother Grundy's absence, when at least we are led to believe that he is probably on his way here to take his place in the Senate.

Mr. President, the extraordinary session of Congress was called to enact legislation to relieve the farmer. We are about to relieve the cotton farmer; we are about to relieve the corn farmer; we are about to relieve the wheat farmer; we are about to relieve the farmer who produces general crops. We are about to administer their effects. I would have no complaint if the wool producer stood relatively in the position of the cotton farmer. The Senator from Utah says that there would not be a sheep in the United States if there was not a duty on wool. He forgets that more than 2,000,000 American farm families have for all these years grown cotton, have borne the robberies of which they have been the victims because of iniquitous tariff rates, without a single penny's protection. Corn, wheat, cotton, have had no effective protection; but under existing law the woolgrowers enjoy a tariff of 31 cents a pound, which is at least 17½ cents a pound or perhaps 18 cents a pound effective on the average; and yet Senators want to close their eyes to the condition of every man, woman, and child in the cotton fields of America, in the wheat fields of America, in the corn fields of America, and to add to their burdens when already the sheep raisers enjoy a prosperity which others engaged in agricultural pursuits have never been able to enjoy during any long period of time.

The singular thing about it all is that the sheep have been increasing under the tariff of 1922; wool production has been increasing under the tariff of 1922; imports of competitive products have been falling off under the tariff of 1922, and the woolen industry and the worsted industry have been barely struggling along under a competition which those industries were hardly able to meet, a competition from other textiles as well as among themselves. It is now proposed to increase the burden of those manufacturers; that is true and I concede it. It is proposed to do that because they can not advance their prices greatly, or else there will ensue a further decline of consumption of woolen products in the United States. It is now proposed to cut the throat, so to speak, of the woolen manufacturer and then the woolgrower will have a poor market in which to sell his wool in this country.

No doubt Senators have thought very seriously about this matter. If we do not actually harm the woolgrowers, if some benefit to the woolgrowers should result, we are going to do a great deal of harm to the general consumers, and to the farmers who do not produce wool in commercial quantities. That is the situation as I see it.

Of course, the Senate would be willing to give to the woolgrower a reasonable tariff; and I thought surely the woolgrower would be satisfied when we increased the tariff on wool from 31 to 34 cents a pound. I thought he would appreciate the fact that there had been a general decline of wool prices throughout the world and that his trouble was not a lack of tariff nor his remedy in the height of the tariff wall; but here, under the leadership of men who desire to serve their constituents, and under the leadership of farm agents and farm representatives, who must make good with farm organizations, Senators find what they believe to be a loophole in the tariff wall; and they say the importation of wool rags must be stopped; that they must not be permitted to come into the country at all.

Here is an amendment which, if adopted, would let the rags come in. It would make all the rags of the value of less than 30 cents a pound, which is a little above the average value of all rags imported, dutiable at 8 cents a pound; and then the duty would go up as high as 16 cents a pound; but the woolgrowers are not willing to accept that. The woolgrowers will find themselves ultimately in the position of siding with the industrialists as against their fellow farmers and the general consumers alike; and it may well be doubted whether in the long run the course is a wise one.

Now, Mr. President, I am content to have a vote taken on the pending amendment and also to have a vote taken upon the

amendments affecting the two remaining products in the Senate committee amendment to this particular paragraph. If there is to be no further argument, I ask for a roll call upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Metcalf].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator from Utah desire to run awhile longer to-night? There are two or three Senators who want to be heard upon this matter, and it is now half past 5.

Mr. SMOOT. The time has arrived when I intended to move a recess, if the Senator does not object.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield for that purpose.

#### CLINCH RIVER BRIDGE, KNOX COUNTY, TENN.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, before that is done I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to report back favorably from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment, Senate bill 679, granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., and Anderson County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Clinch River at or near Solway, in Knox County, Tenn., and I submit a report (No. 54) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. I have not been asked yet to yield. I want to know what this is all about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a bridge bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A couple of bridge bills.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield for their consideration.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Knox, Tenn., and the county of Anderson, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Clinch River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Solway, in Knox County, Tenn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HOLSTON RIVER BRIDGE, KNOX COUNTY, TENN.

Mr. BROCK. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment Senate bill 680, granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Holston River at or near McBees Ferry in Knox County, Tenn., and I submit a report (No. 55) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Knox, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Holston River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near McBees Ferry in Knox County, Tenn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### COMPLETION OF THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, a printed copy of the report on the completion of the Senate Office Building, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Rules.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in open executive session, laid before the Senate sundry executive messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to submit to the Chair a parliamentary inquiry which has been suggested to me. Was there a unanimous-consent agreement earlier in the day by which we should recess at 5.30?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. NORRIS. I have been told that there was such an agreement.

Mr. BLAINE. It was understood yesterday that that would be done.

Mr. SMOOT. There was no such agreement.

## REPORT OF YORKTOWN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. The commission that was appointed to make a report to Congress on the sesquicentennial celebration at Yorktown was directed to report on the 15th of December. It has been impossible for the commission to make the report. All we ask is—and action must be taken very quickly—that the time for making the report shall be extended until the 1st day of February, 1930.

I present a concurrent resolution for that purpose, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It is very important that it should be passed before the 15th of December.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, has the measure been reported from the committee?

Mr. SWANSON. It has not been reported from the committee.

Mr. JONES. Is it a concurrent resolution?

Mr. SWANSON. A concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let it be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21), as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 6 of the House concurrent resolution establishing the United States Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission as amended be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:*

*"Sec. 6. That the commission shall, on or before the 1st day of February, 1930, make a report to the Congress in order that enabling legislation may be enacted."*

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think that measure ought to go to the committee.

Mr. SWANSON. Let it go to the Committee on the Library, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Library.

DISTRICT OFFICE OF BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, several years ago a district office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was established at Memphis, Tenn. I have in my hand a letter from Dr. Julius Klein, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, dated December 3, 1929, giving a history of the workings of that office. It is so favorable that I desire to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,  
Washington, December 3, 1929.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Remembering the interest you took in the establishment of a district office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at Memphis, you will, I am sure, be glad to have some details as to the actual dollars-and-cents results achieved by that office.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, 46 firms reported voluntarily that they had secured new business or had benefited by preventive services to the extent of \$1,043,725 through the efforts of the Memphis office. The preventive services were in the form of savings through negative information leading to the curtailment of certain unwise export plans, the discouragement of expenditures in exploiting dubious markets, etc. This office is serving some 207 Tennessee and Arkansas firms, so that the total results of the trade-promotive efforts of the office are probably many times the figure mentioned, many firms reporting that it was impossible to estimate the "dollars-and-cents" results, but paying high tribute to the service by the Memphis branch.

I am sure you will agree that in view of the modest budget of that office, which is only \$15,000, the above figure represents a decidedly substantial "dividend" for the taxpayer.

For all of the 29 offices throughout the country there were voluntary reports during the fiscal year 1928-29 from 1,021 firms (out of about 22,000 currently using the bureau's services) showing results achieved for them which totaled \$42,651,854. Since this represents about one-twentieth of the bureau's regular clientele, it would seem that the total value of the efforts of the organization in behalf of American business is many times this amount.

In addition to being a "service station" on export trade, the Memphis office has endeavored to serve as a clearing house for firms seeking information on all problems connected with domestic marketing. While this phase of the work has been limited due to the small available personnel, the office has been able to serve some firms by giving exact information concerning our domestic markets and the various practices in marketing.

I am sure you will understand my mentioning these details to you as being not in any sense a "glorification" of the bureau, but simply as part of a businesslike accounting to Congress of the stewardship of our staff and its obligations under the appropriations voted by Congress for the last year.

Cordially yours,

JULIUS KLEIN.

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR COPELAND ON A FREE PORT IN THE JAMAICA BAY AREA

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. COPELAND] before the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce on Monday, November 25, 1929, on the subject of "A Free Port in the Jamaica Bay Area."

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is no doubt in my mind that the nation controlling the export trade of the world is sure to be the greatest of the world powers. The city that offers the facilities for handling and promoting this commerce is sure to be the imperial city of its own country, and, indeed, the imperial city of the world.

There was a time when the United States was a maritime nation. Ninety per cent of its exports and imports were carried in its own bottoms. For one reason and another our shipping interests declined, so badly, indeed, that at the outbreak of the World War we had but a baker's dozen of vessels in transoceanic trade. Even now only about 30 per cent of our commerce is carried under the American flag.

Speaking nationally, these are uncomfortable facts. From the standpoint of New Yorkers, they are matters of great concern.

Under no circumstances must we stand idly by and permit our supremacy as a city to be challenged by any other city, domestic or foreign. Are we alive to our dangers, our possibilities, and our immediate opportunities?

This is not the occasion for discussing the subject of the merchant marine in general. It is a fascinating study and one that should not be neglected by this chamber of commerce. I am sure it is in your thoughts.

To-night I desire to present briefly the arguments for a free port or trade zone in New York harbor. To my mind, no better place can be found than Jamaica Bay. I do not overlook the advantages of Staten Island, and admit that a location might be found in Newark Bay.

But, so far as Jamaica Bay is concerned, it seems to me the god of waters prepared it for such a use as this. If it could be utilized as a free port there is no question that Brooklyn would be greatly benefitted. The bay gives itself to proper policing, has ample space, offers safe anchorage, and is every way suited for this specific use.

What is a free port or foreign trade zone?

It is an area set apart from the rest of the given harbor, an area in which goods brought from abroad may be unloaded and handled. Under restrictions determined by the Government, such goods may be stored, sorted, graded, assembled, repacked, manipulated, and even processed or manufactured. Afterwards they may be reloaded and shipped to foreign ports. All these steps are taken without the imposition of customs formalities and duties which are applied to similar goods entering the country for domestic use.

Let no one get the idea that a free port such as we are considering has anything to do with free trade. I think I may describe myself as a Democrat with moderate protective-tariff leanings. On this account I could not indorse any scheme that seeks to impose free trade upon the Nation.

An American foreign-trade zone, as I view its function, is intended primarily to care for goods which, from the beginning of their shipment, are designed to reach some other country than the United States. It is merely a matter of convenience to land them on our shores for reshipment to their ultimate destination.

Let us assume, for instance, that a full cargo of coffee is shipped to Brazil. Part of it is assigned to the United States, while the rest is to go to London or Antwerp. Perhaps it is on a ship carrying the American flag, belonging to an established line terminating in New



York. What is to become of that portion of the cargo destined for Europe?

Under the law as it is at present, the surplus cargo can be placed in a "bonded warehouse." Here it may be repacked, sorted, or cleaned. This may appear to be exactly what we hope to accomplish in a foreign trade zone or free port.

As a matter of fact, however, the bonded warehouse and "draw-back system" do not begin to serve the same purpose. There is a good deal of reexportation of merchandise out of these establishments, but the system is complicated and unsatisfactory. The United States Chamber of Commerce investigated this matter. Let me quote from its report:

"In bonded warehouses merchandise has to be entered, examined, assessed, and entry liquidated; credit is given against the warehouse entry as the merchandise is withdrawn and duty actually paid, in the case of imports coming out of the warehouse for consumption in the domestic market. Similarly, credits are given against the warehouse entry on goods reexported from bonded warehouses. If merchandise is transferred from one bonded warehouse to another there are further customs formalities. The expenses in connection with customs storekeepers and especially the red tape in connection with the inspection, supervision, and recording of bonded merchandise, its movements to and from bonded warehouses, all have a deadening effect. In addition, there is the expense of the bond for payment of double the amount of the duties."

How different are the conditions where a free zone is established. The ship ties up at a dock in an area which to all intents and purposes is as free from formality as a country where customhouses do not exist. It unloads its cargo and leaves for its home port or its foreign destination. The goods thus landed are taken to that part of the zone where they can be dealt with as desired.

Of course, they are impounded, so to speak. They can not enter American trade unless they pass through our customs and pay the regular tariff charge. But no matter to what methods of handling or manufacturing they are submitted within the zone itself, they may be taken aboard another ship and sent anywhere over the seven seas, without let or hindrance from our authorities. All the red tape of the present system of bonded warehousing and drawbacks is done away with, and the owners of the property are encouraged to perform on our shores and in our port the many productive measures which make for local prosperity.

I should not be enthusiastic over the free-zone idea if it were merely a scheme to encourage domestic importations, with marked disadvantage to our own manufacturers. With criticisms of this sort I am familiar. For instance, when this subject was before the Finance Committee of the Senate, one member antagonistic to the plan, said this:

"You have warehouses there where you can give the foreign goods an advantage over buying by sample. You can buy the goods and get delivery next day. Therefore, you are going to increase the use of imported goods and decrease the amount of goods manufactured in America."

If this were the end and aim of the free port, it would not be worth considering. But, as I view it, this criticism is a narrow and illogical one. Let me show you why.

Once more let us take coffee as an example. What a wonderful thing it would be for Brooklyn to have in Jamaica Bay a great coffee-roasting establishment. Here the coffee from Brazil would be cleaned, graded, roasted, and packed in bags or cartons for foreign sale.

In such an establishment many employees would be needed. They would live in your city and give business to every class of merchant. They would buy lots, build houses, and establish permanent homes. They would pay taxes and help to build up a greater Brooklyn.

Java or Cuba would send raw sugar to be refined in the free zone preparatory for export. I can imagine mabogany and other valuable woods sent here for working into lumber, and even for manufacture into furniture for the export trade. Rice may be cleaned, graded, and polished. Wool may be washed and cleaned; vegetable oils may be extracted and refined; and skins may be tanned. The preparation and canning of fruits, vegetables, and other food products for transshipment would surely be an active business.

Unless you have looked into the matter it will be a cause for surprise to learn what enormous quantities of goods are reexported from various ports. It is estimated that the reexport trade of the world amounts to four or five billions of dollars annually.

Some of the most important raw products come from countries of small population, with limited consuming ability. Such countries do not demand imports. In consequence, their exports and imports are handled by the use of triangular routes. This is the only way the poor-load factor can be avoided.

Because of New York's lack of facilities we get comparatively little of this trade. What I have in mind is shown by the fact that Hamburg is the world market for rice, Liverpool for cotton and grain, Glasgow for hides, and London for tea, tin, and wool.

I have seen a list of commodities the United States imports from the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Netherlands, commodities which have not originated in the countries from which we received them. The total amounts to more than 300,000 tons, valued at nearly \$300,000,000.

In this connection I quote from a United States Government document just prepared by the War Department Board of Engineers and the United States Shipping Board. Referring to the table I just mentioned, this official report says:

"The value of these selected imports from only four countries is about three times the total reexports from the United States to all countries. The absence of similar business in this country is one of the most serious obstacles in the way of the development of our merchant marine."

"It is true that the ports of Europe secured virtual monopoly of many of the raw products of the world prior to the construction of the Panama Canal when the United States was geographically at a disadvantage in the struggle for the control of the rich markets of South America and the Orient. The construction of the Panama Canal, however, has brought the short-line route from a number of these important raw markets to Europe directly past our shores, and we are now in a favorable position to gain a fair share of this trade."

Why should all the diamonds be cut in Holland? Why should the crude rubber, jute and jute products, hemp, tea, spices, dates, Arabic gum, palm oil, binding twine, tin, and platinum, to say nothing of a hundred other commodities, be handled or processed in some other country than that of origin, but never in America?

We must awaken from our lethargy. We must have a share in the world's business. We are more progressive than other nations in those matters which relate to domestic production. But in world affairs we have small part.

Any port that is a port of transshipment is sure to be a prosperous community. Here will be done the brokerage, the insurance, the ship repairs, the lighterage, the many profitable activities of a busy harbor. If a part of New York Harbor were set apart as a foreign trade zone, every other part of the port and every industry and business connected with shipping would be benefited.

That smart man Mussolini has not overlooked the value of this idea. Quick to act in everything making for the industrial and economic welfare of Italy, he has seized upon the free port as something of vital interest to his country. He has established in Italian seaports a dozen or more foreign trade zones.

In a recent report Dr. D. J. Owen, manager of the port of London, points out the development of that great port. I quote:

"The trade of the port is in reality a reflection of the trade of the British Nation. A little consideration will enable one to realize that London has not developed into the large port it now is solely on account of the needs of the extensive population at its door, neither has it developed because of the manufactures carried on in its vicinity or of natural wealth, such as coal to be exported from its neighborhood. It is true that within 25 miles of the docks there is a population of 9,000,000 people and that the port is the mouth through which the population is largely fed and supplied with ships. It is true also that there are in and near London engineering factories, breweries, tobacco works, and so on, but the people are not as a whole dependent on such industries as in what is termed 'a manufacturing town.'"

Now, mark the next words. Change the tense of the verbs and they might be regarded as a prophecy of what can happen to Brooklyn and New York if a great foreign tariff zone is created here. Listen!

"What is supremely true of London is that it has developed into a great international market and the financial center of the world. Of its vast population an enormous proportion finds its vocation as distributor and middlemen, financiers and bankers, and bookkeepers and typists. Immense quantities of goods are imported; not for the population at hand to consume or manufacture, but for storage, sale, and distribution to other parts of the kingdom; and, indeed, other parts of the world. This entrepot trade has always been the most striking feature of the port of London."

In a high-tariff country such a port as that of London is possible only by the establishment of a free-tariff zone. Let us have it.

You will be interested to know how President Hoover has expressed himself regarding the free port. During his incumbency of the Secretaryship of Commerce several bills were introduced in Congress, referred to the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, and transmitted to him for recommendation. This is what he said—I quote:

"In my opinion, properly located foreign-trade zones would facilitate and encourage the export trade of the United States and be for material benefit to our merchant marine, for the following reasons:

"1. It will promote and expedite our transshipment trade by eliminating the customs formalities and difficulties under our present system of warehousing for reexport. In the course of the tariff revision of September, 1922, customs administrative regulations have been so liberalized that many of the activities relating to foreign merchandise under section 3 of the bill are now allowed in bonded warehouses without requiring the payment of duties; however, they are so encumbered with requirements, such as filing manifests, of making formal entry to all

foreign merchandise whether intended for ultimate entry into this country or not, having goods weighed or otherwise examined before allowed to be deposited in bonded warehouses, that the privileges available are not sufficiently attractive to be used to any great extent.

"2. The establishment of such zones would probably be of considerable benefit to our merchant marine and place this country in a more advantageous condition to take advantage of our large consumption of many foreign raw materials and distribute such among foreign countries. It will also improve the opportunity for full cargoes for American ships both ways, and result in a more economical use of our merchant marine by eliminating delays due to customs formalities.

"In my opinion the bill is designed to accomplish the foregoing, and I therefore indorse it and recommend its passage."

The bill referred to in this report was known as Senate bill 2570. In similar language he approved a later bill, and so far as I know holds to the same view.

Why should not the city of New York do what European cities began in the fourteenth century? Bruges, then Antwerp, Naples, and Venice; later still, Amsterdam developed leadership in the consignment of the world's goods. Now London has seized that proud privilege. Why should not the metropolis of the western world wrest from her these laurels?

If time permitted, it would be interesting to talk about what Hamburg, Bremen, Genoa, Copenhagen, and Danzig have done for the development of industries within their free zones. Millions of dollars worth of goods are handled and employment given to thousands of men and women. We can not afford to overlook what has been done elsewhere in the world and apply to our own port the same sensible practices.

I have not undertaken to describe the peculiar advantages of Jamaica Bay as an eligible area of our great harbor for the establishment of a foreign trade zone. One of the honored members of your chamber of commerce is, in my opinion, better prepared to do that than anybody else on earth. Of course, I refer to Mr. Henry A. Meyer, deputy commissioner of docks. This is a subject always uppermost in his mind. We will do well to listen to his dreams of development and help him to realize them. Jamaica Bay is at your door and calls to Brooklyn to make use of its facilities. The whole city should be glad to cooperate.

This is a time when the President and all others in authority are thinking of public works that can be entered upon with propriety. I can think of few other more sensible, useful, and productive measures than this. The moment is propitious for pressing the plan.

My friends, I am very jealous, as you are, of the future of our great city. We must leave no stone unturned to advance its welfare. In the borough officers you are blessed in Brooklyn as we are in Manhattan. We have a mayor and city government pledged to every good deed that can make for municipal progress. The congressional delegation is ready to do its share. Let us neglect nothing that can assist the cause of the merchant marine. Everything that promotes shipbuilding, the shipping interests, and the export trade will do much to advance the good of imperial New York.

#### LOANS ON COTTON BY FEDERAL FARM BOARD

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram sent by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT], and myself to Hon. Carl Williams, member of the Farm Board, who is meeting with farm cooperatives at Memphis, Tenn., to-day. We are urging upon him the importance and necessity of raising the loan on cotton to 20 cents per pound.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1929.

Hon. CARL WILLIAMS,

*Cotton Cooperative Meeting, Memphis, Tenn.:*

In accordance with the suggestion made to you, Chairman Legge, Mr. Teague, and Mr. Stone of the Federal Farm Board by Senators Brock, Walcott, Townsend, Smith, and Hefflin of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate we earnestly urge you to bring the matter before your meeting to-day. The suggestion being that the loan be raised gradually 1 cent at a time to 20 cents per pound basis middling seven-eighths inch staple. This would be a fairly good loan and would immediately relieve to a great extent the present distressing condition and would certainly increase the membership in the cooperative associations. We believe that the announcement of a loan of 20 cents per pound would actually result in fewer loans and expenditure of less money by the Government.

TOWNSEND,  
SMITH,  
BROCK,  
WALCOTT,  
HEFLIN,  
*Senators.*

#### RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I now yield to the Senator from Utah for the purpose of making a motion to take a recess.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 11, 1929, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 10 (legislative day of December 4), 1929*

##### AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

William R. Castle, jr., of the District of Columbia, an Assistant Secretary of State, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

##### MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF MEDIATION

Edwin P. Morrow, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Board of Mediation for a term expiring five years after January 1, 1930. (Reappointment.)

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Ethel Liddell to be postmaster at Butler, Ala., in place of Ethel Liddell. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

James Guttery to be postmaster at Double Springs, Ala., in place of Rosa Sims, removed.

Ella L. Rentz to be postmaster at Gilbertown, Ala., in place of E. L. Rentz. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

William F. Barnard to be postmaster at Gordo, Ala., in place of W. F. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Thomas A. Carter to be postmaster at Grove Hill, Ala., in place of T. A. Carter. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Lewis A. Easterly to be postmaster at Hayneville, Ala., in place of L. A. Easterly. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Emma E. Yarbrough to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ala., in place of E. E. Yarbrough. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Ira L. Sharbutt to be postmaster at Vincent, Ala., in place of I. L. Sharbutt. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

##### ARIZONA

Walter J. Kowalski to be postmaster at Springerville, Ariz., in place of W. J. Kowalski. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

##### ARKANSAS

Louella Boswell to be postmaster at Almyra, Ark., in place of Louella Boswell. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Willie C. Allen to be postmaster at Amity, Ark., in place of W. C. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Wendell W. Watkins to be postmaster at Belleville, Ark., in place of W. W. Watkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Horace C. Hiatt to be postmaster at Charleston, Ark., in place of H. C. Hiatt. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Marie O. Pitts to be postmaster at Cherry Valley, Ark., in place of M. O. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Milton T. Knight to be postmaster at Chidester, Ark., in place of M. T. Knight. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Floyd M. Carter to be postmaster at De Queen, Ark., in place of F. M. Carter. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Reese D. Henry to be postmaster at Dierks, Ark., in place of R. D. Henry. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Jonnie Hood to be postmaster at Emmet, Ark., in place of Jonnie Hood. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

George H. Mills to be postmaster at Garfield, Ark., in place of G. H. Mills. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.



James G. Place to be postmaster at Gillett, Ark., in place of J. G. Place. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

John W. Bell to be postmaster at Greenwood, Ark., in place of J. W. Bell. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

William J. Martin to be postmaster at Humphrey, Ark., in place of W. J. Martin. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

John L. Collett to be postmaster at Huttig, Ark., in place of J. L. Collett. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Della E. Penick to be postmaster at Lake City, Ark., in place of D. E. Penick. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Grant B. Sparks to be postmaster at Lamar, Ark., in place of G. B. Sparks. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Frederick W. Youmans to be postmaster at Lewisville, Ark., in place of F. W. Youmans. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Charles A. Roberts to be postmaster at McNeill, Ark., in place of C. A. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Andrew I. Roland to be postmaster at Malvern, Ark., in place of A. I. Roland. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Addison M. Hall to be postmaster at Marmaduke, Ark., in place of A. M. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Dell W. Lee to be postmaster at Mineral Springs, Ark., in place of D. W. Lee. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

John W. Webb to be postmaster at Mountain View, Ark., in place of J. W. Webb. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Clarence M. Fink to be postmaster at Newark, Ark., in place of C. M. Fink. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Belle Armour to be postmaster at Newport, Ark., in place of Belle Armour. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Joseph S. Ottinger to be postmaster at Pea Ridge, Ark., in place of J. S. Ottinger. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Claude M. Williams to be postmaster at Rogers, Ark., in place of C. M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Therese N. Scott to be postmaster at South Fort Smith, Ark., in place of T. N. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

William R. Blakely to be postmaster at Sparkman, Ark., in place of W. R. Blakely. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Ed C. Sample to be postmaster at West Fork, Ark., in place of E. C. Sample. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Florence F. McKinzie to be postmaster at Wilson, Ark., in place of F. F. McKinzie. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Howell A. Burnes to be postmaster at Yellville, Ark., in place of H. A. Burnes. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

#### CALIFORNIA

Albert Norris to be postmaster at Alvarado, Calif., in place of Albert Norris. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Earl Van Gorden to be postmaster at Cambria, Calif., in place of Earl Van Gorden. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Stanton K. Helsley to be postmaster at Ceres, Calif., in place of S. K. Helsley. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John A. Perry, jr., to be postmaster at Chowchilla, Calif., in place of J. A. Perry, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Roscoe J. Johnson to be postmaster at Corona, Calif., in place of R. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ida M. Fink to be postmaster at Crows Landing, Calif., in place of I. M. Fink. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Emma Dodge to be postmaster at Danville, Calif., in place of Emma Dodge. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Brock Dickie to be postmaster at Dixon, Calif., in place of Brock Dickie. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

May Brown to be postmaster at Earlimart, Calif., in place of May Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Laura W. McNeil to be postmaster at El Cerrito, Calif., in place of L. W. McNeil. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Claude D. Tribble to be postmaster at Elk Grove, Calif., in place of C. D. Tribble. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John C. Neblett to be postmaster at Elsinore, Calif., in place of J. C. Neblett. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Tracy H. McPherson to be postmaster at Escalon, Calif., in place of T. H. McPherson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Bessie L. Rogers to be postmaster at Esparto, Calif., in place of B. L. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Helen D. Weir to be postmaster at Fairfield, Calif., in place of H. D. Weir. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Bert Woodbury to be postmaster at Fall Brook, Calif., in place of Bert Woodbury. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Bertha V. Eaton to be postmaster at Florin, Calif., in place of B. V. Eaton. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Van R. Majors to be postmaster at Heber, Calif., in place of V. R. Majors. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Olive I. Caplinger to be postmaster at Hetch Hetchy Junction, Calif., in place of C. E. Ivins, resigned.

Margaret Allen to be postmaster at Indio, Calif., in place of Margaret Allen. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Brayton S. Norton to be postmaster at Laguna Beach, Calif., in place of B. S. Norton. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

David W. Morris to be postmaster at Modesto, Calif., in place of D. W. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George V. Beane to be postmaster at Mojave, Calif., in place of G. V. Beane. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Matie E. Bole to be postmaster at Newark, Calif., in place of M. E. Bole. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Clara C. King to be postmaster at Ojai, Calif., in place of C. C. King. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William O. Hart to be postmaster at Orange, Calif., in place of W. O. Hart. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

David I. Roth to be postmaster at Orosi, Calif., in place of D. I. Roth. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Genevieve Frahm to be postmaster at Palmdale, Calif., in place of Genevieve Frahm. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Edna B. Hudson to be postmaster at Perris, Calif., in place of E. B. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Elizabeth A. Follett to be postmaster at Pixley, Calif., in place of E. A. Follett. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James F. Wheat to be postmaster at Redlands, Calif., in place of J. F. Wheat. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Josephine Purcell to be postmaster at Represa, Calif., in place of Josephine Purcell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Fred Herring to be postmaster at Rio Linda, Calif., in place of Fred Herring. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frederick C. Huntemann to be postmaster at Ripon, Calif., in place of F. C. Huntemann. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ashley L. Smith to be postmaster at Ryde, Calif., in place of A. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank J. Klindera to be postmaster at Tipton, Calif., in place of F. J. Klindera. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Martha A. Smith to be postmaster at Winton, Calif., in place of M. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

## COLORADO

Frank M. Shedd to be postmaster at Aurora, Colo., in place of F. M. Shedd. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Melissa H. Hayden to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Colo., in place of M. H. Hayden. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ralph W. Bidwell to be postmaster at Briggsdale, Colo., in place of R. W. Bidwell. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Hal Parmeter to be postmaster at Byers, Colo., in place of Hal Parmeter. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Edgar A. Buckley to be postmaster at Crook, Colo., in place of E. A. Buckley. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

George W. Heflin to be postmaster at De Beque, Colo., in place of G. W. Heflin. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

John H. McDevitt, jr., to be postmaster at Durango, Colo., in place of J. H. McDevitt, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

May D. Thomas to be postmaster at Eagle, Colo., in place of M. D. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Edward L. Boillot to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, Colo., in place of E. L. Boillot. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Darlie R. Greigg to be postmaster at Greeley, Colo., in place of D. R. Greigg. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Robert E. Taylor to be postmaster at Grover, Colo., in place of R. E. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Chester L. Snyder to be postmaster at New Raymer, Colo., in place of C. L. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Reno H. Auld to be postmaster at Otis, Colo., in place of R. H. Auld. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Siegfried Salomon to be postmaster at Platteville, Colo., in place of Siegfried Salomon. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

M. Gladys Quinn to be postmaster at Stratton, Colo., in place of M. G. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

## CONNECTICUT

Alfred W. Jeynes to be postmaster at Ansonia, Conn., in place of A. W. Jeynes. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

William H. Gould to be postmaster at Fairfield, Conn., in place of W. H. Gould. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Moses G. Marcy to be postmaster at Falls Village, Conn., in place of M. G. Marcy. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Ethel B. Sexton to be postmaster at Hazardville, Conn., in place of E. B. Sexton. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Menley J. Cheney to be postmaster at Milford, Conn., in place of M. J. Cheney. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Claude M. Chester to be postmaster at Noank, Conn., in place of C. M. Chester. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Ellis Sylvernale to be postmaster at Norfolk, Conn., in place of Ellis Sylvernale. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Dexter S. Case to be postmaster at Sound View, Conn., in place of D. S. Case. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Louis M. Phillips to be postmaster at South Coventry, Conn., in place of L. M. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Willis Hodge to be postmaster at South Glastonbury, Conn., in place of Willis Hodge. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Rollin S. Paine to be postmaster at Stony Creek, Conn., in place of R. S. Paine. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Lewis B. Brand to be postmaster at Versailles, Conn., in place of L. B. Brand. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Robert J. Benham to be postmaster at Washington, Conn., in place of R. J. Benham. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

John L. Davis to be postmaster at Wilton, Conn., in place of J. L. Davis. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

William T. McKenzie to be postmaster at Yalesville, Conn., in place of W. T. McKenzie. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

S. Howard Bishop to be postmaster at Yantic, Conn., in place of S. H. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

## IDAHO

Maud W. Taylor to be postmaster at Sandpoint, Idaho, in place of C. J. Shoemaker, deceased.

## ILLINOIS

Charles C. Hamilton to be postmaster at Arthur, Ill., in place of C. C. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Henry E. Petersen to be postmaster at Ashkum, Ill., in place of H. E. Petersen. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John P. Kopp to be postmaster at Baldwin, Ill., in place of J. P. Kopp. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Carl M. Crowder to be postmaster at Bethany, Ill., in place of Carl M. Crowder. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Charles A. Cline to be postmaster at Clinton, Ill., in place of Charles A. Cline. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1929.

Bertha I. Askey to be postmaster at Dakota, Ill., in place of Bertha I. Askey. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Joseph D. Nutt to be postmaster at East Alton, Ill., in place of Joseph D. Nutt. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mercy Thornton to be postmaster at Elkhville, Ill., in place of Mercy Thornton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William J. Hamilton to be postmaster at Evanston, Ill., in place of William J. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles W. Meier to be postmaster at Freeport, Ill., in place of Charles W. Meier. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Elizabeth Titter to be postmaster at Glen Carbon, Ill., in place of Elizabeth Titter. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Lewis M. Crow to be postmaster at Grand Tower, Ill., in place of Lewis M. Crow. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Maurice E. Murrie to be postmaster at Grayslake, Ill., in place of Maurice E. Murrie. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William E. Ford to be postmaster at Karnak, Ill., in place of William E. Ford. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harrison T. Berry to be postmaster at Morrison, Ill., in place of Harrison T. Berry. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ruth J. Hodge to be postmaster at Mundelein, Ill., in place of Ruth J. Hodge. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William J. Thornton to be postmaster at Nebo, Ill., in place of William J. Thornton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edwin L. Griese to be postmaster at Northbrook, Ill., in place of Edwin L. Griese. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Joseph L. Przyborski to be postmaster at North Chicago, Ill., in place of Joseph L. Przyborski. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Robert B. Ritzman to be postmaster at Orangeville, Ill., in place of Robert B. Ritzman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mary E. Lister to be postmaster at Percy, Ill., in place of Mary E. Lister. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Ralph R. Larkin to be postmaster at Prairie du Rocher, Ill., in place of Ralph R. Larkin. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Emma H. Howe to be postmaster at Ravinia, Ill., in place of Emma H. Howe. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Willis J. Huston to be postmaster at Rochelle, Ill., in place of Willis J. Huston. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Charles G. Brainard to be postmaster at Round Lake, Ill., in place of Charles G. Brainard. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.



William Faster to be postmaster at Strasburg, Ill., in place of William Faster. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John E. Miller to be postmaster at Tamms, Ill., in place of John E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Fred E. Schroeder to be postmaster at Warrensburg, Ill., in place of Fred E. Schroeder. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Jay B. Hollibaugh to be postmaster at Waynesville, Ill., in place of Jay B. Hollibaugh. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

## INDIANA

Edith B. Smith to be postmaster at Ambia, Ind., in place of Edith B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Mary J. Haines to be postmaster at Amboy, Ind., in place of Mary J. Haines. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Ivan C. Morgan to be postmaster at Austin, Ind., in place of I. C. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Ralph C. Thomas to be postmaster at Bluffton, Ind., in place of R. C. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Carl McKinley to be postmaster at Borden, Ind., in place of Carl McKinley. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

John P. Switzer to be postmaster at Bryant, Ind., in place of J. P. Switzer. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Fred Y. Wheeler to be postmaster at Crown Point, Ind., in place of F. Y. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Mary W. Lawrence to be postmaster at Earlham, Ind., in place of M. W. Lawrence. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Charles H. Ruple to be postmaster at Earl Park, Ind., in place of C. H. Ruple. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Alfred S. Hess to be postmaster at Gary, Ind., in place of A. S. Hess. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Herbert A. Marsden to be postmaster at Hebron, Ind., in place of H. A. Marsden. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Homer E. Hostettler to be postmaster at Henryville, Ind., in place of H. E. Hostettler. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Edward B. Spohr to be postmaster at Jamestown, Ind., in place of E. B. Spohr. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Albert Honehouse to be postmaster at Kouts, Ind., in place of Albert Honehouse. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Nellie C. Beard to be postmaster at Larwill, Ind., in place of N. C. Beard. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

John G. Sloan to be postmaster at Marengo, Ind., in place of J. G. Sloan. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Jesse A. McCluer to be postmaster at Marshall, Ind., in place of J. A. McCluer. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Charles H. Callaway to be postmaster at Milton, Ind., in place of C. H. Callaway. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Grover H. Oliver to be postmaster at Monroe, Ind., in place of G. H. Oliver. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Fred J. Merline to be postmaster at Notre Dame, Ind., in place of F. J. Merline. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Russell R. Rhodes to be postmaster at Peru, Ind., in place of G. E. Jones, removed.

Loren N. McCloud to be postmaster at Royal Center, Ind., in place of L. N. McCloud. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Jacob F. Ruxer to be postmaster at St. Meinrad, Ind., in place of J. F. Ruxer. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Lowell D. Smith to be postmaster at Sellersburg, Ind., in place of L. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

James B. King to be postmaster at Star City, Ind., in place of J. B. King. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Russell C. Wood to be postmaster at West Lebanon, Ind., in place of R. C. Wood. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Thomas Jensen to be postmaster at Wheatfield, Ind., in place of Thomas Jensen. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

William F. Kahler to be postmaster at Winamac, Ind., in place of W. F. Kahler. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Edgar Spencer to be postmaster at Wolcott, Ind., in place of E. Spencer. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Henry Chapman to be postmaster at Woodburn, Ind., in place of H. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

## IOWA

Frank J. Wuamett to be postmaster at Alvord, Iowa, in place of F. J. Wuamett. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Oltman A. Voogd to be postmaster at Aplington, Iowa, in place of O. A. Voogd. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harriette Olsen to be postmaster at Armstrong Iowa, in place of Harriette Olsen. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Arthur A. Dingman to be postmaster at Aurelia, Iowa, in place of A. A. Dingman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harry R. Grim to be postmaster at Belle Plaine, Iowa, in place of H. R. Grim. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Gayle A. Goodman to be postmaster at Birmingham, Iowa, in place of G. A. Goodman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Henry W. Pitstick to be postmaster at Boyden, Iowa, in place of H. W. Pitstick. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Anton C. Jaeger to be postmaster at Brandon, Iowa, in place of A. C. Jaeger. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Wheaton A. MacArthur to be postmaster at Burt, Iowa, in place of W. A. MacArthur. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Gustav H. Hackmann to be postmaster at Clermont, Iowa, in place of G. H. Hackmann. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Clarence A. Worthington to be postmaster at Cumberland, Iowa, in place of J. A. Edwards, resigned.

Ernest T. Greenfield to be postmaster at Douds, Iowa, in place of E. T. Greenfield. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William C. Rolls to be postmaster at Dow City, Iowa, in place of W. C. Rolls. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Herman Ternes to be postmaster at Dubuque, Iowa, in place of Herman Ternes. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edwin T. Davidson to be postmaster at Duncombe, Iowa, in place of E. T. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

James E. Carr to be postmaster at Farmington, Iowa, in place of J. E. Carr. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Charles S. Parker to be postmaster at Fayette, Iowa, in place of C. S. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John A. Martin to be postmaster at Floyd, Iowa, in place of J. A. Martin. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

E. Ray Morrell to be postmaster at Grand River, Iowa, in place of E. R. Morrell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Arthur M. Burton to be postmaster at Grinnell, Iowa, in place of A. M. Burton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Walter B. Luke to be postmaster at Hampton, Iowa, in place of W. B. Luke. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John H. Nicoll to be postmaster at Harris, Iowa, in place of J. H. Nicoll. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Clyde E. Wheelock to be postmaster at Hartley, Iowa, in place of C. E. Wheelock. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Louis H. Severson to be postmaster at Inwood, Iowa, in place of L. H. Severson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Fred O. Parker to be postmaster at Ireton, Iowa, in place of F. O. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Jesse O. Parker to be postmaster at Keosauqua, Iowa, in place of J. O. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Joseph F. Higgins to be postmaster at Keswick, Iowa, in place of J. F. Higgins. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Jessaline M. Weinberger to be postmaster at Ledyard, Iowa, in place of J. M. Weinberger. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Irene Goodrich to be postmaster at Lehigh, Iowa, in place of Irene Goodrich. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Walter E. Prouty to be postmaster at Lockridge, Iowa, in place of W. E. Prouty. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Thomas E. Halls to be postmaster at Lucas, Iowa, in place of T. E. Halls. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Austin C. McKinsey to be postmaster at Maquoketa, Iowa, in place of A. C. McKinsey. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Purley Jennison to be postmaster at Maynard, Iowa, in place of Purley Jennison. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John P. McNeill to be postmaster at Melcher, Iowa, in place of J. P. McNeill. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Roy L. Day to be postmaster at Melrose, Iowa, in place of R. L. Day. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George Kraft to be postmaster at Melvin, Iowa, in place of George Kraft. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Hugh L. Smith to be postmaster at Montezuma, Iowa, in place of H. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Bruce C. Mason to be postmaster at New Market, Iowa, in place of B. C. Mason. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Everett H. Moon to be postmaster at New Providence, Iowa, in place of E. H. Moon. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Theodore E. Templeton to be postmaster at Paton, Iowa, in place of T. E. Templeton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Fred H. Seabury to be postmaster at Pisgah, Iowa, in place of F. H. Seabury. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Oscar M. Green to be postmaster at Prescott, Iowa, in place of O. M. Green. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George A. Fox to be postmaster at Quimby, Iowa, in place of G. A. Fox. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George A. Bennett to be postmaster at Redfield, Iowa, in place of G. A. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Carroll A. Richardson to be postmaster at Renwick, Iowa, in place of C. A. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Matilda Johnson to be postmaster at Ridgeway, Iowa, in place of Matilda Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William W. Simkin to be postmaster at Salem, Iowa, in place of W. W. Simkin. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William H. Moore to be postmaster at Shelby, Iowa, in place of W. H. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George J. Bloxham to be postmaster at Sheldon, Iowa, in place of G. J. Bloxham. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Allan Mullenburg to be postmaster at Sioux Center, Iowa, in place of Allan Mullenburg. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William H. Jones to be postmaster at Sioux City, Iowa, in place of W. H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Andrew Maland to be postmaster at Slater, Iowa, in place of Andrew Maland. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Elsie N. Morgan to be postmaster at Smithland, Iowa, in place of E. N. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William N. Horn to be postmaster at South English, Iowa, in place of W. N. Horn. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Arthur T. Briggs to be postmaster at Sutherland, Iowa, in place of A. T. Briggs. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mayme L. Petersen to be postmaster at Titonka, Iowa, in place of M. L. Petersen. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Clifford C. Clardy to be postmaster at Valley Junction, Iowa, in place of C. C. Clardy. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Howard D. Peckham to be postmaster at Villisca, Iowa, in place of H. D. Peckham. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

B. Frank Jones to be postmaster at Waukee, Iowa, in place of B. F. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Henry A. Falb to be postmaster at West Bend, Iowa, in place of H. A. Falb. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Roy O. Kelley to be postmaster at Westside, Iowa, in place of R. O. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Seth B. Cairy to be postmaster at Whittemore, Iowa, in place of S. B. Cairy. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Pauline W. Hummel to be postmaster at Yale, Iowa, in place of P. W. Hummel. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

#### KANSAS

Lawrence J. Barrett to be postmaster at Admire, Kans., in place of L. J. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Solomon L. Crown to be postmaster at Agra, Kans., in place of S. L. Crown. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ralph A. Ward to be postmaster at Alden, Kans., in place of R. A. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Lizzie N. Reaburn to be postmaster at Allen, Kans., in place of L. N. Reaburn. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Claude C. Wheat to be postmaster at Augusta, Kans., in place of C. C. Wheat. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Peter H. Adrian to be postmaster at Buhler, Kans., in place of P. H. Adrian. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Minnie B. Fretz to be postmaster at Canton, Kans., in place of M. B. Fretz. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Fred D. Bush to be postmaster at Copeland, Kans., in place of F. D. Bush. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Fred L. McDowell to be postmaster at Garfield, Kans., in place of F. L. McDowell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Hebert W. Chittenden to be postmaster at Hays, Kans., in place of H. W. Chittenden. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Le Roy F. Heston to be postmaster at Kanorado, Kans., in place of L. F. Heston. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ethel I. Starr to be postmaster at Long Island, Kans., in place of E. I. Starr. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Hollis L. Caswell to be postmaster at McDonald, Kans., in place of H. L. Caswell. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Olive Clements to be postmaster at Maplehill, Kans., in place of Olive Clements. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

John C. Braden to be postmaster at Meade, Kans., in place of J. C. Braden. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Robert E. Anderson to be postmaster at Meriden, Kans., in place of R. E. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.



Anna W. Lowe to be postmaster at Moscow, Kans., in place of A. W. Lowe. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Howard L. Stevens to be postmaster at Norton, Kans., in place of H. L. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Byram L. Sams to be postmaster at Offerle, Kans., in place of B. L. Sams. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Milton H. Herrington to be postmaster at Olpe, Kans., in place of M. H. Herrington. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

John F. Nuttmann to be postmaster at Paxico, Kans., in place of J. F. Nuttmann. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Essie M. Hosman to be postmaster at Potwin, Kans., in place of E. M. Hosman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John H. Sunley to be postmaster at Ransom, Kans., in place of J. H. Sunley. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William S. Smith, to be postmaster at Rozel, Kans., in place of W. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ola G. Canfield to be postmaster at Scranton, Kans., in place of O. G. Canfield. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Bruce W. Ruthrauff to be postmaster at South Haven, Kans., in place of B. W. Ruthrauff. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

David H. Pugh to be postmaster at Tampa, Kans., in place of D. H. Pugh. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Leroy C. Sandy to be postmaster at Troy, Kans., in place of L. C. Sandy. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

#### KENTUCKY

Herbert E. Brown to be postmaster at Brandenburg, Ky., in place of H. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1928.

Bennie Robinson to be postmaster at Corinth, Ky., in place of Bennie Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Leonas C. Starks to be postmaster at Hardin, Ky., in place of L. C. Starks. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Nell Hooker to be postmaster at Hickory, Ky., in place of Nell Hooker. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Roy J. Blankenship to be postmaster at Hitchens, Ky., in place of R. J. Blankenship. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

William Blades to be postmaster at Island, Ky., in place of William Blades. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Otis C. Thomas to be postmaster at Liberty, Ky., in place of O. C. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Eli G. Thompson to be postmaster at Providence, Ky., in place of E. G. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Verda Grimes to be postmaster at Salem, Ky., in place of Verda Grimes. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Peter H. Butler to be postmaster at Smiths Grove, Ky., in place of P. H. Butler. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

#### LOUISIANA

Charles C. Subra to be postmaster at Convent, La., in place of C. C. Subra. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mamie S. Kiblinger to be postmaster at Jackson, La., in place of M. S. Kiblinger. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mrs. Edwin L. Lafargue to be postmaster at Marksville, La., in place of Mrs. E. L. Lafargue. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Sallie D. Pitts to be postmaster at Oberlin, La., in place of S. D. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Esther B. Dunn to be postmaster at Slaughter, La., in place of E. B. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Elias C. Leone to be postmaster at Zwolle, La., in place of E. C. Leone. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### MAINE

Lewis H. Lackee to be postmaster at Addison, Me., in place of L. H. Lackee. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Fred A. Manter to be postmaster at Anson, Me., in place of F. A. Manter. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

M. Estelle Goldthwaite to be postmaster at Biddeford Pool, Me., in place of M. E. Goldthwaite. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Burton A. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Buckfield, Me., in place of B. A. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Pearl Danforth to be postmaster at Castine, Me., in place of Pearl Danforth. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Darrell W. Sprague to be postmaster at Corinna, Me., in place of D. A. Gilbert, resigned.

David H. Smith to be postmaster at Darkharbor, Me., in place of D. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Julia E. Lufkin to be postmaster at Deer Isle, Me., in place of J. E. Lufkin. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

George A. Turner to be postmaster at Freedom, Me., in place of G. A. Turner. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Kathryn E. Cantello to be postmaster at Hebron, Me., in place of K. E. Cantello. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ella M. Moore to be postmaster at Jackman Station, Me., in place of E. M. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Henry H. Walsh to be postmaster at Kennebunk Beach, Me., in place of H. H. Walsh. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ralph W. Chandler to be postmaster at Machias, Me., in place of R. W. Chandler. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Bertha D. Redonnett to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Me., in place of B. D. Redonnett. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

James L. Simpson to be postmaster at North Vassalboro, Me., in place of J. L. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

George P. Pulsifer to be postmaster at Poland, Me., in place of G. P. Pulsifer. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ernest E. Pike to be postmaster at Princeton, Me., in place of E. E. Pike. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

William R. Elliott to be postmaster at Skowhegan, Me., in place of W. R. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ernest L. Bartlett to be postmaster at Thorndike, Me., in place of E. L. Bartlett. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Freeman L. Roberts to be postmaster at Vinalhaven, Me., in place of F. L. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Edgar J. Brown to be postmaster at Waterville, Me., in place of E. J. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

#### MARYLAND

Howard F. Owens to be postmaster at Betterton, Md., in place of H. F. Owens. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Edwin S. Worthington to be postmaster at Darlington, Md., in place of E. S. Worthington. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Alfred E. Williamson to be postmaster at Laurel, Md., in place of G. B. Timanus, removed.

Charles Roemer, jr. to be postmaster at Owings Mills, Md., in place of Charles Roemer, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

George G. Henry to be postmaster at Ashfield, Mass., in place of G. G. Henry. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Matthew D. E. Tower to be postmaster at Becket, Mass., in place of M. D. E. Tower. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Hannah E. Pfeiffer to be postmaster at Bedford, Mass., in place of H. E. Pfeiffer. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Augusta M. Meigs to be postmaster at Centerville, Mass., in place of A. M. Meigs. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Frank W. Niles to be postmaster at Charlemont, Mass., in place of F. W. Niles. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Ralph L. Getman to be postmaster at Cheshire, Mass., in place of R. L. Getman. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Lillian M. Allen to be postmaster at Deerfield, Mass., in place of L. M. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Charles L. Goodspeed to be postmaster at Dennis, Mass., in place of C. L. Goodspeed. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Clarence S. Perkins to be postmaster at Essex, Mass., in place of C. S. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Winona C. Craig to be postmaster at Falmouth Heights, Mass., in place of W. G. Craig. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

William J. Williams to be postmaster at Great Barrington, Mass., in place of W. J. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Harry F. Zahn to be postmaster at Hingham Center, Mass., in place of H. F. Zahn. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Mary E. Rathbun to be postmaster at Hinsdale, Mass., in place of M. E. Rathbun. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Richard Lyon to be postmaster at Hubbardston, Mass., in place of Richard Lyon. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Josephine E. Worster to be postmaster at Hull, Mass., in place of J. E. Worster. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Augustus A. Hadley to be postmaster at Marion, Mass., in place of A. A. Hadley. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Alliston S. Barstow to be postmaster at Marshfield, Mass., in place of A. S. Barstow. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Harry T. Johnson to be postmaster at Medway, Mass., in place of H. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Harry D. Whitney to be postmaster at Milford, Mass., in place of H. D. Whitney. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Frank M. Reynolds, jr., to be postmaster at Nantasket Beach, Mass., in place of F. M. Reynolds, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Herman L. Peinze to be postmaster at Northboro, Mass., in place of H. L. Peinze. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Gladys Roberts to be postmaster at North Scituate, Mass., in place of Gladys Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Myra H. Lumbert to be postmaster at Pocasset, Mass., in place of M. H. Lumbert. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Raymond J. Gregory to be postmaster at Princeton, Mass., in place of R. J. Gregory. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Frank B. Hood to be postmaster at Somerset, Mass., in place of F. B. Hood. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Bruce A. Crocker to be postmaster at South Walpole, Mass., in place of B. A. Crocker. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Jesse W. Crowell to be postmaster at South Yarmouth, Mass., in place of J. W. Crowell. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

C. Edgar Searing to be postmaster at Stockbridge, Mass., in place of C. E. Searing. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Everett A. Thurston to be postmaster at Swansea, Mass., in place of E. A. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

Arthur J. Polmatier to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Mass., in place of A. J. Polmatier. Incumbent's commission expires December 14, 1929.

#### MICHIGAN

Fred A. Acker to be postmaster at Adrian, Mich., in place of F. A. Acker. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

John H. Nowell to be postmaster at Amasa, Mich., in place of J. H. Nowell. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Albert Hass to be postmaster at Bad Axe, Mich., in place of Albert Hass. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Lillian J. Chandler to be postmaster at Benzonia, Mich., in place of L. J. Chandler. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Albert L. Eggers to be postmaster at Bravo, Mich., in place of A. L. Eggers. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Morton G. Wells to be postmaster at Byron Center, Mich., in place of M. G. Wells. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Ida W. Wagner to be postmaster at Capac, Mich., in place of I. W. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Edward A. Webb to be postmaster at Casnovia, Mich., in place of E. A. Webb. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Henry P. Hossack to be postmaster at Cedarville, Mich., in place of H. P. Hossack. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Henry M. Boll to be postmaster at Channing, Mich., in place of H. M. Boll. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Patrick H. Schannenck to be postmaster at Chassell, Mich., in place of P. H. Schannenck. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

James Swain to be postmaster at Coldwater, Mich., in place of B. B. Gorman, deceased.

Ellis A. Lake to be postmaster at Colon, Mich., in place of E. A. Lake. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Harry G. Turner to be postmaster at Covert, Mich., in place of H. G. Turner. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Sarah G. Howard to be postmaster at Custer, Mich., in place of S. G. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Elsie R. Stephens to be postmaster at Davison, Mich., in place of E. R. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Clarence E. Norton to be postmaster at Dimondale, Mich., in place of C. E. Norton. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Roy A. McDonald to be postmaster at Douglas, Mich., in place of R. A. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Elery H. Wright to be postmaster at Empire, Mich., in place of E. H. Wright. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Allison I. Miller to be postmaster at Fremont, Mich., in place of A. I. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Cyrenius P. Hunter to be postmaster at Gagetown, Mich., in place of C. P. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Joseph Deloria to be postmaster at Garden, Mich., in place of Joseph Deloria. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Frank Wilkinson to be postmaster at Gaylord, Mich., in place of Frank Wilkinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

R. Deneen Brown to be postmaster at Hale, Mich., in place of R. D. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Charles Hallman to be postmaster at Iron Mountain, Mich., in place of Charles Hallman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edgar Hilliard to be postmaster at Kaleva, Mich., in place of Edgar Hilliard. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Ambrose B. Stinson to be postmaster at Kingsley, Mich., in place of A. B. Stinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Leonard Van Regenmorter to be postmaster at Macatawa, Mich., in place of Leonard Van Regenmorter. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Louis W. Biegler to be postmaster at Marquette, Mich., in place of L. W. Biegler. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Gordon J. Murray to be postmaster at Michigamme, Mich., in place of G. J. Murray. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.



George E. Meredith to be postmaster at Minden City, Mich., in place of G. E. Meredith. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George D. Mason to be postmaster at Montague, Mich., in place of G. D. Mason. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

William C. Hacker to be postmaster at Mount Clemens, Mich., in place of W. C. Hacker. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

John H. Fink to be postmaster at New Baltimore, Mich., in place of J. H. Fink. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Eva A. Wurzburg to be postmaster at Northport, Mich., in place of E. A. Wurzburg. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Harry Davidson to be postmaster at Palmer, Mich., in place of Harry Davidson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Harry A. Dickinson to be postmaster at Port Hope, Mich., in place of H. A. Dickinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Charles J. Schmidlin to be postmaster at Rockland, Mich., in place of C. J. Schmidlin. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Eugene C. Edgerly to be postmaster at Rudyard, Mich., in place of E. C. Edgerly. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Grace E. Gibson to be postmaster at Scotts, Mich., in place of G. E. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Olof Brink to be postmaster at Tustin, Mich., in place of Olof Brink. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

George B. Moat to be postmaster at Twining, Mich., in place of G. B. Moat. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Mack Harring to be postmaster at Osseo, Mich., in place of Mack Harring. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Edwin J. Hodges to be postmaster at Vanderbilt, Mich., in place of E. J. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Elmon J. Loveland to be postmaster at Vermontville, Mich., in place of E. J. Loveland. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Levant A. Strong to be postmaster at Vicksburg, Mich., in place of L. A. Strong. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Volney R. Reynolds to be postmaster at Waldron, Mich., in place of V. R. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Emerson L. Bunting to be postmaster at Walkerville, Mich., in place of E. L. Bunting. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Rollo G. Mosher to be postmaster at Wayland, Mich., in place of R. G. Mosher. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Mae O. Wolfe to be postmaster at Weidman, Mich., in place of M. O. Wolfe. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

John F. Krumbeck to be postmaster at Williamston, Mich., in place of J. F. Krumbeck. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George M. Gaudy to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, Mich., in place of G. M. Gaudy. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

#### MINNESOTA

Thorwald O. Westby to be postmaster at Avoca, Minn., in place of T. O. Westby. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John N. Peterson to be postmaster at Beltrami, Minn., in place of J. N. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edward H. Hebert to be postmaster at Briceyn, Minn., in place of E. H. Hebert. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mabel L. Markham to be postmaster at Clear Lake, Minn., in place of M. L. Markham. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Frank H. Nichols to be postmaster at Comfrey, Minn., in place of F. H. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Benjamin Baker to be postmaster at Campbell, Minn., in place of Benjamin Baker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Louis A. Dietz to be postmaster at Easton, Minn., in place of L. A. Dietz. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John Lohn to be postmaster at Fosston, Minn., in place of John Lohn. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Charles S. Jameson to be postmaster at Littlefork, Minn., in place of C. S. Jameson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Elmer W. Thompson to be postmaster at Lismore, Minn., in place of E. W. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Ernest G. Haymaker to be postmaster at Motley, Minn., in place of E. C. Haymaker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Arvid J. Lindgren to be postmaster at Orr, Minn., in place of A. J. Lindgren. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Lee M. Bennett to be postmaster at Pillager, Minn., in place of L. M. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Minnie W. Hines to be postmaster at Roosevelt, Minn., in place of M. W. Hines. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Ella S. Engelsen to be postmaster at Storden, Minn., in place of E. S. Engelsen. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Gertrude A. Muske to be postmaster at Swanville, Minn., in place of G. A. Muske. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

August W. Petrich to be postmaster at Vernon Center, Minn., in place of A. W. Petrich. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mathias J. Olson to be postmaster at Wolverton, Minn., in place of M. J. Olson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Albert L. Conner to be postmaster at Falkner, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1928.

Frances G. Wimberly to be postmaster at Jonestown, Miss., in place of F. G. Wimberly. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

Elise Thoms to be postmaster at Richton, Miss., in place of E. Thoms. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1929.

#### MISSOURI

Margaret E. Matson to be postmaster at Barnard, Mo., in place of M. E. Matson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Samuel F. Wegener to be postmaster at Blackburn, Mo., in place of S. F. Wegener. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Henry C. Oehler to be postmaster at Bismarck, Mo., in place of H. C. Oehler. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Constant A. Larson to be postmaster at Bucklin, Mo., in place of C. A. Larson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Claude H. McNay to be postmaster at Butler, Mo., in place of Everett Drysdale, deceased.

Lea K. Glines to be postmaster at Cainsville, Mo., in place of L. K. Glines. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Walter A. Brownfield to be postmaster at Calhoun, Mo., in place of W. A. Brownfield. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Earl M. Mayhew to be postmaster at Callao, Mo., in place of E. M. Mayhew. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edward Burkhardt to be postmaster at Chesterfield, Mo., in place of E. Burkhardt. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edgar H. Intelmann to be postmaster at Cole Camp, Mo., in place of E. H. Intelmann. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Henry E. Martens to be postmaster at Concordia, Mo., in place of H. E. Martens. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Charles E. Leach to be postmaster at Deepwater, Mo., in place of C. E. Leach. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Abraham L. McLlvain to be postmaster at Elmo, Mo., in place of A. L. McLlvain. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edward Beall to be postmaster at Eolia, Mo., in place of E. Beall. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John W. McGee to be postmaster at Ewing, Mo., in place of J. W. McGee. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Robert C. Wommack to be postmaster at Fair Grove, Mo., in place of R. C. Wommack. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Frederick M. Harrison to be postmaster at Gallatin, Mo., in place of F. M. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Henry A. Scott to be postmaster at Gilman City, Mo., in place of H. A. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Thomas E. Sparks to be postmaster at Holliday, Mo., in place of T. E. Sparks. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Chester D. Green to be postmaster at Hume, Mo., in place of C. D. Green. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1929.

Harry F. Gurney to be postmaster at Kidder, Mo., in place of H. F. Gurney. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Jacob B. Marshall to be postmaster at La Monte, Mo., in place of J. B. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Enoch W. Brewer to be postmaster at McFall, Mo., in place of E. W. Brewer. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Charles L. Farrar to be postmaster at Macon, Mo., in place of C. L. Farrar. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Nathan J. Rowan to be postmaster at Meta, Mo., in place of N. J. Rowan. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John Kerr to be postmaster at Newburg, Mo., in place of John Kerr. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Robert L. Jones to be postmaster at New Cambria, Mo., in place of R. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Fred E. Hart to be postmaster at Norwood, Mo., in place of F. E. Hart. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Earl A. Blakely to be postmaster at Revere, Mo., in place of E. A. Blakely. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

William M. Johns to be postmaster at Sedalia, Mo., in place of W. M. Johns. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Washington D. Barker to be postmaster at Shelby, Mo., in place of W. D. Barker. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George W. Hendrickson to be postmaster at Springfield, Mo., in place of G. W. Hendrickson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Joseph O. Bassett to be postmaster at Vienna, Mo., in place of J. O. Bassett. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

#### MONTANA

Hazel F. McKinnon to be postmaster at Bearcreek, Mont., in place of H. F. McKinnon. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Emma E. Waddell to be postmaster at Custer, Mont., in place of E. E. Waddell. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Thomas Hirst to be postmaster at Deer Lodge, Mont., in place of Thomas Hirst. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

William H. Jenkinson to be postmaster at Fort Benton, Mont., in place of W. H. Jenkinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

George W. Edkins to be postmaster at Glacier Park, Mont., in place of G. W. Edkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

George S. Haynes to be postmaster at Judith Gap, Mont., in place of G. S. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Robert M. Fry to be postmaster at Park City, Mont., in place of R. M. Fry. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Archie H. Neal to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, Mont., in place of A. H. Neal. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Clark R. Northrop to be postmaster at Red Lodge, Mont., in place of C. R. Northrop. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Jean W. Albers to be postmaster at Redstone, Mont., in place of J. W. Albers. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Harry H. Goble to be postmaster at St. Ignatius, Mont., in place of H. H. Goble. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William A. Francis to be postmaster at Virginia City, Mont., in place of W. A. Francis. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Ray E. Willey to be postmaster at Wisdom, Mont., in place of R. E. Willey. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Jessie Long to be postmaster at Worden, Mont., in place of Jessie Long. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

#### NEBRASKA

Faith L. Kemper to be postmaster at Alma, Nebr., in place of F. L. Kemper. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Edith F. Francis to be postmaster at Belden, Nebr., in place of E. F. Francis. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Astor B. Enborg to be postmaster at Bristow, Nebr., in place of A. B. Enborg. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Cora E. Saal to be postmaster at Brock, Nebr., in place of C. E. Saal. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

William L. Hallman to be postmaster at Bruning, Nebr., in place of W. L. Hallman. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Charles E. Cram to be postmaster at Craig, Nebr., in place of C. E. Cram. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Ruby H. Gable to be postmaster at Crookston, Nebr., in place of R. H. Gable. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Leo R. Conroy to be postmaster at Eddyville, Nebr., in place of L. R. Conroy. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

John F. Brittain to be postmaster at Elsie, Nebr., in place of J. F. Brittain. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Garry Benson to be postmaster at Ewing, Nebr., in place of Garry Benson. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Laurence B. Clark to be postmaster at Firth, Nebr., in place of L. B. Clark. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Charles A. Shoff to be postmaster at Grafton, Nebr., in place of C. A. Shoff. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Catherine M. Coleman to be postmaster at Greenwood, Nebr., in place of C. M. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Ernest T. Long to be postmaster at Haigler, Nebr., in place of E. T. Long. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Loren W. Enyeart to be postmaster at Hayes Center, Nebr., in place of L. W. Enyeart. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Francis W. Purdy to be postmaster at Hildreth, Nebr., in place of F. W. Purdy. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Daniel W. Roderick to be postmaster at Hubbell, Nebr., in place of D. W. Roderick. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Ernest W. Clift to be postmaster at Humboldt, Nebr., in place of E. W. Clift. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Mary J. Flynn to be postmaster at Jackson, Nebr., in place of M. J. Flynn. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Elias E. Rodysill to be postmaster at Johnson, Nebr., in place of E. E. Rodysill. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Fred C. Armitage to be postmaster at Kenesaw, Nebr., in place of F. C. Armitage. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Henry C. Hooker to be postmaster at Leigh, Nebr., in place of H. C. Hooker. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Dallas R. Coffin to be postmaster at Lyons, Nebr., in place of E. S. Clements, deceased.

Charles M. Houston to be postmaster at Miller, Nebr., in place of C. M. Houston. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Archie B. Jones to be postmaster at Mitchell, Nebr., in place of A. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.



Lester C. Kelley to be postmaster at Monroe, Nebr., in place of L. C. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Donald K. Warner to be postmaster at Oakdale, Nebr., in place of D. K. Warner. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Edwin A. Baugh to be postmaster at Oakland, Nebr., in place of E. A. Baugh. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Frank H. Bottom to be postmaster at Ong, Nebr., in place of F. H. Bottom. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Isaac B. Lamborn to be postmaster at Palmyra, Nebr., in place of I. B. Lamborn. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Katie Heiliger to be postmaster at Plymouth, Nebr., in place of Katie Heiliger. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Luther J. Saylor to be postmaster at Rising City, Nebr., in place of L. J. Saylor. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Peter J. Johnson to be postmaster at Rosalie, Nebr., in place of P. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Walter Plybon to be postmaster at Salem, Nebr., in place of Walter Plybon. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Isaac L. Pindell to be postmaster at Sidney, Nebr., in place of I. L. Pindell. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Calvin E. Lewis to be postmaster at Stamford, Nebr., in place of C. E. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

William A. Pearson to be postmaster at Stella, Nebr., in place of W. A. Pearson. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Mary E. Hossack to be postmaster at Sutherland, Nebr., in place of M. E. Hossack. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Willard Stong to be postmaster at Syracuse, Nebr., in place of Willard Stong. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

August Dickenman to be postmaster at Talmage, Nebr., in place of August Dickenman. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Harry C. Rogers to be postmaster at Upland, Nebr., in place of H. C. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Harry P. Cato to be postmaster at Valley, Nebr., in place of H. P. Cato. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Elroy A. Broughton to be postmaster at Venango, Nebr., in place of E. A. Broughton. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Inez M. Smith to be postmaster at Verdon, Nebr., in place of I. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Edgar A. Wight, jr., to be postmaster at Wolbach, Nebr., in place of E. A. Wight, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

John Q. Kirkman to be postmaster at Wood Lake, Nebr., in place of J. Q. Kirkman. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

#### NEVADA

Harold L. Brown to be postmaster at Elko, Nev., in place of W. L. Merithew, resigned.

Walter S. Norris to be postmaster at Winnemucca, Nev., in place of W. S. Norris. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE

Sarah J. Moore to be postmaster at Alstead, N. H., in place of S. J. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Waldo C. Varney to be postmaster at Alton, N. H., in place of W. C. Varney. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harry B. Burt to be postmaster at Amherst, N. H., in place of H. B. Burt. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Warren W. McGregor to be postmaster at Bethlehem, N. H., in place of W. W. McGregor. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Ambrose P. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Bretton Woods, N. H., in place of A. P. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Fred A. Hall to be postmaster at Brookline, N. H., in place of F. A. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Arthur H. Wilcomb to be postmaster at Chester, N. H., in place of A. H. Wilcomb. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Ernest L. Abbott to be postmaster at Derry, N. H., in place of E. L. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Reginald C. Stevenson to be postmaster at Exeter, N. H., in place of R. C. Stevenson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Arthur W. Sawyer to be postmaster at Franconia, N. H., in place of A. W. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edward E. Cossette to be postmaster at Gonic, N. H., in place of E. E. Cossette. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John W. Buttrick to be postmaster at Greenville, N. H., in place of J. W. Buttrick. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Anna B. Clyde to be postmaster at Hudson, N. H., in place of A. B. Clyde. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Ben O. Aldrich to be postmaster at Keene, N. H., in place of B. O. Aldrich. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

George E. Danforth to be postmaster at Nashua, N. H., in place of G. E. Danforth. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harriette H. Hinman to be postmaster at North Stratford, N. H., in place of H. H. Hinman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edna C. Mason to be postmaster at Tamworth, N. H., in place of E. C. Mason. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Alfred S. Cloues to be postmaster at Warner, N. H., in place of A. S. Cloues. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Chester B. Averill to be postmaster at Warren, N. H., in place of C. B. Averill. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harry E. Messenger to be postmaster at West Lebanon, N. H., in place of H. E. Messenger. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

#### NEW JERSEY

Charles R. Bassett to be postmaster at Bloomsbury, N. J., in place of C. R. Bassett. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

David Hastings to be postmaster at Boundbrook, N. J., in place of David Hastings. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles B. Ogden to be postmaster at Butler, N. J., in place of C. B. Ogden. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Grace E. Cowell to be postmaster at Convent Station, N. J., in place of G. E. Cowell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James E. Vanderhoof to be postmaster at Denville, N. J., in place of J. E. Vanderhoof. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Alice A. Ayers to be postmaster at Island Heights, N. J., in place of A. A. Ayres. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Annie L. Quint to be postmaster at Metuchen, N. J., in place of A. L. Quint. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ira L. Longcor to be postmaster at Morris Plains, N. J., in place of I. L. Longcor. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James A. Morrison to be postmaster at New Brunswick, N. J., in place of J. A. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Richard J. Rogers to be postmaster at Rumson, N. J., in place of R. J. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Lurelda Sooy to be postmaster at Somers Point, N. J., in place of Lurelda Sooy. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Louis A. Thievon to be postmaster at Stirling, N. J., in place of L. A. Thievon. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William C. Swackhamer to be postmaster at White House Station, N. J., in place of W. C. Swackhamer. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

## NEW YORK

Ferdinand S. Hull to be postmaster at Berlin, N. Y., in place of F. S. Hull. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Edna L. Sinclair to be postmaster at Bible School Park, N. Y., in place of E. L. Sinclair. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Robert M. Maxon to be postmaster at Bloomville, N. Y., in place of R. M. Maxon. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Robert W. Gallagher to be postmaster at Buffalo, N. Y., in place of R. W. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Valentine Hessinger to be postmaster at Callicoon Center, N. Y., in place of Valentine Hessinger. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ira B. Cooper to be postmaster at Cato, N. Y., in place of I. B. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Fred C. Dawes to be postmaster at Clinton, N. Y., in place of H. W. Roberts, removed.

Herbert L. Smith to be postmaster at Cortland, N. Y., in place of H. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William F. Bruno to be postmaster at Crown Point, N. Y., in place of W. F. Bruno. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles A. Beeman to be postmaster at Depew, N. Y., in place of C. A. Beeman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harry B. Lyon to be postmaster at Dunkirk, N. Y., in place of H. B. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Edward C. Johnson to be postmaster at East Chatham, N. Y., in place of E. C. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Elmer J. Skinner to be postmaster at East Worcester, N. Y., in place of E. J. Skinner. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George M. Diven to be postmaster at Elmira, N. Y., in place of G. M. Diven. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles E. Van Ornam to be postmaster at Essex, N. Y., in place of C. E. Van Ornam. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ray J. Fuller to be postmaster at Frankfort, N. Y., in place of R. J. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank E. Wolcott to be postmaster at Franklin, N. Y., in place of F. E. Wolcott. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Joseph Alese to be postmaster at Franklin Square, N. Y., in place of Joseph Alese. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Verona M. Simons to be postmaster at Freeville, N. Y., in place of V. M. Simons. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Milford E. Teator to be postmaster at Ghent, N. Y., in place of M. E. Teator. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William B. Phillips to be postmaster at Greenwood Lake, N. Y., in place of W. B. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William R. Churchill to be postmaster at Hancock, N. Y., in place of W. R. Churchill. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Grace M. Harpur to be postmaster at Harpursville, N. Y., in place of G. M. Harpur. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Elmer E. Thompson to be postmaster at Harriman, N. Y., in place of E. E. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Alfred Cox to be postmaster at Hawthorne, N. Y., in place of Alfred Cox. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Mark J. Balmat to be postmaster at Hermon, N. Y., in place of M. J. Balmat. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Hanna H. Pugsley to be postmaster at Highland Mills, N. Y., in place of H. H. Pugsley. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frederick Traudt to be postmaster at Hyde Park, N. Y., in place of Frederick Traudt. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Arnold S. Munn to be postmaster at Islip Terrace, N. Y., in place of Kurt Hoenig, resigned.

Harvey W. Boisseau to be postmaster at Keeseville, N. Y., in place of H. W. Boisseau. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James R. Doyle to be postmaster at Kerhonkson, N. Y., in place of J. R. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank C. Proctor to be postmaster at Kings Park, N. Y., in place of F. C. Proctor. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frederick W. Ashenhurst to be postmaster at Little Falls, N. Y., in place of F. W. Ashenhurst. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Edward J. McSweeney to be postmaster at Long Lake, N. Y., in place of E. J. McSweeney. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William A. Henderson to be postmaster at Manhasset, N. Y., in place of W. A. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George H. Fischer to be postmaster at Mayville, N. Y., in place of G. H. Fischer. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank E. Dickens to be postmaster at Middleville, N. Y., in place of F. E. Dickens. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harley D. Jock to be postmaster at Moira, N. Y., in place of H. D. Jock. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Arthur N. Christy to be postmaster at Newark, N. Y., in place of A. N. Christy. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank Rosenberg to be postmaster at New Hyde Park, N. Y., in place of Frank Rosenberg. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frederick G. Newell to be postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y., in place of F. G. Newell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Fred W. McKenzie to be postmaster at North Bangor, N. Y., in place of William F. Hadley, resigned.

Edward J. Norris to be postmaster at North White Lake, N. Y., in place of E. J. Norris. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John Bentley to be postmaster at Ogdensburg, N. Y., in place of John Bentley. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ray A. Fisher to be postmaster at Ontario, N. Y., in place of R. A. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Matthew McManus, jr., to be postmaster at Orangeburg, N. Y., in place of Matthew McManus, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William H. Mead to be postmaster at Palmer, N. Y., in place of W. H. Mead. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ralph D. Sessions to be postmaster at Palmyra, N. Y., in place of R. D. Sessions. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Peter Critchley to be postmaster at Pocantico Hills, N. Y., in place of Peter Critchley. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William T. Hinman to be postmaster at Potsdam, N. Y., in place of W. T. Hinman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Jessie S. McBride to be postmaster at Rensselaer, N. Y., in place of J. S. McBride. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William P. Lister to be postmaster at Rockville Center, N. Y., in place of W. P. Lister. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John W. Fiero, jr., to be postmaster at Round Top, N. Y., in place of J. W. Fiero. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Walter F. Billington to be postmaster at Rye, N. Y., in place of W. F. Billington. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harrington Mills to be postmaster at Saranac Inn, N. Y., in place of Harrington Mills. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Edwin G. Conde to be postmaster at Schenectady, N. Y., in place of E. G. Conde. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George M. Watson to be postmaster at Scio, N. Y., in place of G. M. Watson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.



Lester N. Hiller to be postmaster at Sharon Springs, N. Y., in place of L. N. Hiller. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William H. Boyce to be postmaster at South New Berlin, N. Y., in place of W. H. Boyce. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank S. Harris to be postmaster at Sacandaga, N. Y., in place of F. S. Harris. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Walter B. Gunning to be postmaster at Ticonderoga, N. Y., in place of W. B. Gunning. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William M. Philleo to be postmaster at Utica, N. Y., in place of W. M. Philleo. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Gilbert A. Williams to be postmaster at Warwick, N. Y., in place of E. F. Still, deceased.

Harry L. Philips to be postmaster at Webster, N. Y., in place of H. L. Philips. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Wilbur C. Eaton to be postmaster at Youngstown, N. Y., in place of W. C. Eaton. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Raymond B. Wheatly to be postmaster at Beaufort, N. C., in place of R. B. Wheatly. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Baxter Biggerstaff to be postmaster at Bostic, N. C., in place of Baxter Biggerstaff. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Norman V. Johnson to be postmaster at Denton, N. C., in place of N. V. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Carl McLean to be postmaster at Laurinburg, N. C., in place of Carl McLean. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

William M. Liles to be postmaster at Lilesville, N. C., in place of W. M. Liles. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

William J. Flowers to be postmaster at Mount Olive, N. C., in place of W. J. Flowers. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Raphael M. Rice to be postmaster at Oteen, N. C., in place of R. M. Rice. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Hester L. Dorsett to be postmaster at Spencer, N. C., in place of H. L. Dorsett. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Ollie C. McGuire to be postmaster at Zebulon, N. C., in place of O. C. McGuire. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

#### NORTH DAKOTA

Clifford E. Kelsven to be postmaster at Almont, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Kelsven. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

John Brusven to be postmaster at Barton, N. Dak., in place of John Brusven. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harold R. McKechnie to be postmaster at Calvin, N. Dak., in place of H. R. McKechnie. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Belle Elton to be postmaster at Deering, N. Dak., in place of Belle Elton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Rose M. Morrison to be postmaster at Granville, N. Dak., in place of R. M. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Chester A. Revell to be postmaster at Harvey, N. Dak., in place of C. A. Revell. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Hattie E. M. Dyson to be postmaster at Haynes, N. Dak., in place of H. E. M. Dyson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Tom S. Farr to be postmaster at Hillsboro, N. Dak., in place of T. S. Farr. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Elizabeth I. Connelly to be postmaster at Hurdsfield, N. Dak., in place of E. I. Connelly. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

James F. Dunn to be postmaster at McClusky, N. Dak., in place of J. F. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Lorena S. McDonald to be postmaster at Medora, N. Dak., in place of L. S. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Josephine J. Luther to be postmaster at Monango, N. Dak., in place of J. J. Luther. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James A. Elliott to be postmaster at New England, N. Dak., in place of J. A. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Harry Solberg to be postmaster at Portland, N. Dak., in place of Harry Solberg. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Bernard E. Rierson to be postmaster at Regan, N. Dak., in place of B. E. Rierson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Edmund C. Sargent to be postmaster at Ruso, N. Dak., in place of E. C. Sargent. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Wanzo M. Shaw to be postmaster at Sheldon, N. Dak., in place of W. M. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mons K. Ohnstad to be postmaster at Sharon, N. Dak., in place of M. K. Ohnstad. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Lydia R. Schultz to be postmaster at Tappen, N. Dak., in place of L. R. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Elizabeth M. Gillmer to be postmaster at Towner, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Gillmer. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Mary E. Freeman to be postmaster at Verona, N. Dak., in place of M. E. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Will M. Wright to be postmaster at Woodworth, N. Dak., in place of W. M. Wright. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Goldia J. Smith to be postmaster at Zuhl, N. Dak., in place of G. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

#### OHIO

William E. Bowers to be postmaster at Amanda, Ohio, in place of W. E. Bowers. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Harry E. Kearns to be postmaster at Amelia, Ohio, in place of H. E. Kearns. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Lessa B. Masters to be postmaster at Antwerp, Ohio, in place of L. B. Masters. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Varnum C. Collins to be postmaster at Barnesville, Ohio, in place of V. C. Collins. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Lowell E. Blakeley to be postmaster at Botkins, Ohio, in place of L. E. Blakeley. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Ora A. Ridiker to be postmaster at Brunswick, Ohio, in place of O. A. Ridiker. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Stuart N. Austin to be postmaster at Chardon, Ohio, in place of S. N. Austin. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Edward E. Truesdale to be postmaster at Delphos, Ohio, in place of E. E. Truesdale. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Marie Thompson to be postmaster at East Fultonham, Ohio, in place of Marie Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Lee Heckman to be postmaster at Edon, Ohio, in place of Lee Heckman. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Charles A. Saunders to be postmaster at Findlay, Ohio, in place of C. A. Saunders. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Ellen M. Cumming to be postmaster at Fort Jennings, Ohio, in place of E. M. Cumming. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

William S. Barhite to be postmaster at Hamler, Ohio, in place of W. S. Barhite. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Orville R. Wiley to be postmaster at Hartville, Ohio, in place of O. R. Wiley. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

George A. Vincent to be postmaster at Hiram, Ohio, in place of G. A. Vincent. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Robert S. Nichols to be postmaster at Jackson Center, Ohio, in place of R. S. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Edwin D. Cox to be postmaster at Leesburg, Ohio, in place of E. D. Cox. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Stella M. Brogan, to be postmaster at Lodi, Ohio, in place of S. M. Brogan. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Carl W. Appel to be postmaster at Lucasville, Ohio, in place of C. W. Appel. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Charles I. Barnes to be postmaster at Millersburg, Ohio, in place of C. R. White, deceased.

Elvey E. Ely to be postmaster at Mount Orab, Ohio, in place of E. E. Ely. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

John S. De Jean to be postmaster at Nevada, Ohio, in place of J. S. De Jean. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Elizabeth L. D. Tritt to be postmaster at North Lewisburg, Ohio, in place of E. L. D. Tritt. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Hattie S. Sell to be postmaster at North Lima, Ohio, in place of H. S. Sell. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

John P. Lauer to be postmaster at Ottoville, Ohio, in place of J. P. Lauer. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Lucina Byers to be postmaster at Poland, Ohio, in place of Lucina Byers. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Owen Livingston to be postmaster at Richwood, Ohio, in place of Owen Livingston. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Lida R. Williamson to be postmaster at Seaman, Ohio, in place of L. H. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Jesse Gamble to be postmaster at Shadyside, Ohio, in place of Jesse Gamble. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Howard H. Collins to be postmaster at South Zanesville, Ohio, in place of H. H. Collins. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Charles E. Kimmel to be postmaster at Struthers, Ohio, in place of C. E. Kimmel. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Howard Arnsbarger to be postmaster at Swanton, Ohio, in place of Howard Arnsbarger. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Wilbur D. Schuder to be postmaster at West Carrollton, Ohio, in place of W. D. Schuder. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### OKLAHOMA

Earl W. Drake to be postmaster at Binger, Okla., in place of E. W. Drake. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Archie V. Roberts to be postmaster at Buffalo, Okla., in place of A. V. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Benjamin G. Baker to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Okla., in place of B. G. Baker. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George W. Sewell to be postmaster at Erick, Okla., in place of G. W. Sewell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Claud H. Hager to be postmaster at Hammon, Okla., in place of C. H. Hager. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Georgia B. Eubanks to be postmaster at Kellyville, Okla., in place of G. B. Eubanks. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James L. Shinaberger to be postmaster at McAlester, Okla., in place of J. L. Shinaberger. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George H. Belcher to be postmaster at Medford, Okla., in place of G. H. Belcher. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John C. Molder to be postmaster at Meeker, Okla., in place of J. C. Molder. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Homer M. Canan to be postmaster at Pocasset, Okla., in place of H. M. Canan. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Fred T. Kirby to be postmaster at Ponca City, Okla., in place of F. T. Kirby. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Arthur W. McCreary to be postmaster at Ringwood, Okla., in place of Frank W. Fuller, resigned.

Gall Lunsford to be postmaster at St. Louis, Okla. Office became presidential April 1, 1929.

Frank S. Roodhouse to be postmaster at Shawnee, Okla., in place of F. S. Roodhouse. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harrison H. McMahan to be postmaster at Tecumseh, Okla., in place of H. H. McMahan. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Perry E. Harp to be postmaster at Wakita, Okla., in place of P. E. Harp. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John W. Gregory to be postmaster at Weleetka, Okla., in place of J. W. Gregory. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### OREGON

John B. Schaefer to be postmaster at Linnton, Oreg., in place of J. B. Schaefer. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William J. Warner to be postmaster at Medford, Oreg., in place of W. J. Warner. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Emma O. Schneider to be postmaster at Myrtle Point, Oreg., in place of E. O. Schneider. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Volney E. Lee to be postmaster at North Powder, Oreg., in place of V. E. Lee. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Nellie P. Satchwell to be postmaster at Shedd, Oreg., in place of N. P. Satchwell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Emma B. Sloper to be postmaster at Stayton, Oreg., in place of E. B. Sloper. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

John H. Baldwin to be postmaster at Atglen, Pa., in place of J. H. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harry E. Harsh to be postmaster at Bareville, Pa., in place of H. E. Harsh. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harry H. Fearon to be postmaster at Beech Creek, Pa., in place of H. H. Fearon. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harry U. Walter to be postmaster at Biglerville, Pa., in place of H. U. Walter. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William L. Hendricks to be postmaster at Bolivar, Pa., in place of W. L. Hendricks. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank E. Sharpless to be postmaster at Boothwyn, Pa., in place of F. E. Sharpless. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Mary W. Ritner to be postmaster at Bruin, Pa., in place of M. W. Ritner. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank O. Hood to be postmaster at Cambridge Springs, Pa., in place of F. O. Hood. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Jeremiah S. Troxell to be postmaster at Cementon, Pa., in place of J. S. Troxell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Elmer L. Russell to be postmaster at Cokeburg, Pa., in place of E. L. Russell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ralph Simons to be postmaster at Cornwells Heights, Pa., in place of Ralph Simons. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Margaret W. Troxell to be postmaster at Egypt, Pa., in place of M. W. Troxell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Henry C. Boyd to be postmaster at Finleyville, Pa., in place of H. C. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Marshall M. Smith to be postmaster at Gaines, Pa., in place of M. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harvey D. Klingensmith to be postmaster at Grapeville, Pa., in place of H. D. Klingensmith. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Robert D. Mitchell to be postmaster at Herminie, Pa., in place of R. D. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.



Marie Patterson to be postmaster at Landisburg, Pa., in place of Marie Patterson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Edward F. Brent to be postmaster at Lewistown, Pa., in place of E. F. Brent. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Walter R. Miller to be postmaster at Liberty, Pa., in place of W. R. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John J. Herbst to be postmaster at McKees Rocks, Pa., in place of J. J. Herbst. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Willis G. Dell to be postmaster at Mapleton Depot, Pa., in place of W. G. Dell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Rebecca Campbell to be postmaster at Midway, Pa., in place of Rebecca Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles A. Swanson to be postmaster at Morris Run, Pa., in place of C. A. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James G. Cook to be postmaster at New Alexandria, Pa., in place of J. G. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Lottie Tueche to be postmaster at New Eagle, Pa., in place of Lottie Tueche. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Esther F. Rivers to be postmaster at Ogontz School, Pa., in place of E. F. Rivers. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Emily M. Shinton to be postmaster at Paoli, Pa., in place of E. M. Shinton. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Floyd R. Paris to be postmaster at Ralston, Pa., in place of F. R. Paris. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Paul V. Leitzel to be postmaster at Richfield, Pa., in place of Ursula Shelley. Incumbent's commission expired January 2, 1929.

Fred W. Allison to be postmaster at Roscoe, Pa., in place of F. W. Allison. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Millard F. McCullough to be postmaster at Seward, Pa., in place of M. F. McCullough. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles F. Abel to be postmaster at Springdale, Pa., in place of C. F. Abel. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John E. Anstine to be postmaster at Stewartstown, Pa., in place of J. E. Anstine. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Amos F. Fry to be postmaster at Thompsontown, Pa., in place of A. F. Fry. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ernest D. Mallinee to be postmaster at Townville, Pa., in place of E. D. Mallinee. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Joseph Straka to be postmaster at Universal, Pa., in place of Joseph Straka. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Della Elder to be postmaster at Vestaburg, Pa., in place of Della Elder. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Thomas J. Langfitt to be postmaster at Washington, Pa., in place of T. J. Langfitt. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles A. McDannell to be postmaster at Wattsburg, Pa., in place of C. A. McDannell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Alvin L. Wenzel to be postmaster at Webster, Pa., in place of A. L. Wenzel. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Mary M. Wells to be postmaster at Wellsville, Pa., in place of M. M. Wells. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### RHODE ISLAND

John C. Sheldon to be postmaster at Hillsgrove, R. I., in place of J. C. Sheldon. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

Lewis J. Goodman to be postmaster at Clemson College, S. C., in place of L. J. Goodman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Joseph G. Brabham to be postmaster at Olar, S. C., in place of J. G. Brabham. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

Benjamin A. Williams to be postmaster at Aberdeen, S. Dak., in place of B. A. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Fayette A. Nutter to be postmaster at Alcester, S. Dak., in place of F. A. Nutter. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Chester T. Chester to be postmaster at Arlington, S. Dak., in place of C. T. Chester. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Sander P. Questad to be postmaster at Baltic, S. Dak., in place of S. P. Questad. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Millard T. Thompson to be postmaster at Buffalo Gap, S. Dak., in place of M. T. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ollie V. Loughlin to be postmaster at Colman, S. Dak., in place of O. V. Loughlin. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Henry C. Grinde to be postmaster at Colton, S. Dak., in place of H. C. Grinde. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Guy R. Neher to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, S. Dak., in place of G. R. Neher. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Aglae Bosse to be postmaster at Jefferson, S. Dak., in place of Aglae Bosse. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Alfred J. Soukup to be postmaster at Lesterville, S. Dak., in place of A. J. Soukup. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Lloyd E. Reckamp to be postmaster at McIntosh, S. Dak., in place of L. E. Reckamp. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Elmer J. O'Connell to be postmaster at Ramona, S. Dak., in place of E. J. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Jefferson C. Seals to be postmaster at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Seals. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John C. Southwick to be postmaster at Watertown, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Southwick. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### TENNESSEE

Frank B. King to be postmaster at Alcoa, Tenn., in place of F. B. King. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Willard J. Springfield to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Tenn., in place of W. J. Springfield. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Carus S. Hicks to be postmaster at Clinton, Tenn., in place of C. S. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Roscoe T. Carroll to be postmaster at Estill Springs, Tenn., in place of R. T. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Peyton B. Anderson to be postmaster at Greenback, Tenn., in place of P. B. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

John D. M. Marshall to be postmaster at Lookout Mountain, Tenn., in place of J. D. M. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

George B. Creson to be postmaster at Mulberry, Tenn., in place of Billie Creson, deceased.

William S. Stanley to be postmaster at Oneida, Tenn., in place of W. S. Stanley. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

Otis E. Jones to be postmaster at Prospect Station, Tenn., in place of O. E. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

James C. Key to be postmaster at Riceville, Tenn., in place of J. C. Key. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

William R. Hurst to be postmaster at Savannah, Tenn., in place of W. R. Hurst. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

James H. Christian to be postmaster at Smithville, Tenn., in place of J. H. Christian. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1929.

#### TEXAS

Marguerite M. Burns to be postmaster at Catarina, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1928.

Mary F. Wakefield to be postmaster at Midway, Tex., in place of M. F. Wakefield. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Wilson P. Hardwick to be postmaster at Pottsboro, Tex., in place of W. P. Hardwick. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Albert W. Henderson to be postmaster at Terrell, Tex., in place of A. W. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

George W. Vaughn to be postmaster at Texline, Tex., in place of G. W. Vaughn. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Landon M. Hatcher to be postmaster at Troy, Tex., in place of L. M. Hatcher. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Jeff Potter to be postmaster at Tulia, Tex., in place of Jeff Potter. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Margaret E. Hodges to be postmaster at Westbrook, Tex., in place of M. E. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Ruby E. Ambler to be postmaster at Yaleta, Tex., in place of R. E. Ambler. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

#### UTAH

Anthony W. Thomson to be postmaster at Ephraim, Utah, in place of A. W. Thomson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Charles E. Walton, jr., to be postmaster at Monticello, Utah, in place of C. E. Walton, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Rufus A. Garner to be postmaster at Ogden, Utah, in place of R. A. Garner. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

#### VERMONT

Marion T. Flynn to be postmaster at Alburg, Vt., in place of M. T. Flynn. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Harold M. Brown to be postmaster at Castleton, Vt., in place of H. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Lucius A. Carpenter to be postmaster at Chester, Vt., in place of L. A. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Glennie C. McIntyre to be postmaster at Danby, Vt., in place of G. C. McIntyre. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles W. Powell to be postmaster at Franklin, Vt., in place of C. W. Powell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George H. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Jericho, Vt., in place of G. H. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Francis A. Gray to be postmaster at Middletown Springs, Vt., in place of F. A. Gray. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Blanche A. Belanger to be postmaster at Orwell, Vt., in place of B. A. Belanger. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Rudolph M. Cutting to be postmaster at Plainfield, Vt., in place of R. M. Cutting. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles H. West to be postmaster at Rutland, Vt., in place of C. H. West. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Frank C. Dyer to be postmaster at Salisbury, Vt., in place of F. C. Dyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Corydon W. Cheney to be postmaster at Sharon, Vt., in place of C. W. Cheney. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Robert H. Allen to be postmaster at South Hero, Vt., in place of R. H. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Ernest F. Illingworth to be postmaster at Springfield, Vt., in place of E. F. Illingworth. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Archie W. Burdick to be postmaster at West Pawlet, Vt., in place of A. W. Burdick. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Carl W. Cameron to be postmaster at White River Junction, Vt., in place of C. W. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles H. Stone to be postmaster at Windsor, Vt., in place of C. H. Stone. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### VIRGINIA

Henry D. Gray to be postmaster at Middleburg, Va., in place of L. L. Keeler. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1929.

#### WASHINGTON

Leonard McCleary to be postmaster at McCleary, Wash., in place of Leonard McCleary. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Etta R. Harkins to be postmaster at Manette, Wash., in place of E. R. Harkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Kathryn Reichert to be postmaster at Orting, Wash., in place of Kathryn Reichert. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Benjamin G. Brown to be postmaster at Ridgefield, Wash., in place of B. G. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Serena D. Vinson to be postmaster at Skamokawa, Wash., in place of S. D. Vinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Dow R. Hughes to be postmaster at Yelm, Wash., in place of D. R. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

James H. McComas to be postmaster at Barboursville, W. Va., in place of J. H. McComas. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Freda W. Mason to be postmaster at Bayard, W. Va., in place of F. W. Mason. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Samuel L. Clark to be postmaster at Cass, W. Va., in place of S. L. Clark. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Eulalie B. Wheeler to be postmaster at Elkhorn, W. Va., in place of E. B. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

George W. Sites to be postmaster at Freeman, W. Va., in place of G. W. Sites. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

John E. Pierson to be postmaster at Gassaway, W. Va., in place of J. E. Pierson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Robert K. Pearrell to be postmaster at Hedgesville, W. Va., in place of R. K. Pearrell. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Chester L. Blevins to be postmaster at Herndon, W. Va., in place of C. L. Blevins. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Rufus B. Scott to be postmaster at Hemphill, W. Va., in place of R. B. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Lida Steinke to be postmaster at Iaeger, W. Va., in place of Lida Steinke. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Juniata Amos to be postmaster at Leon, W. Va., in place of Juniata Amos. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

William M. Chambers to be postmaster at Mabon, W. Va., in place of W. M. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Frederick E. Bletner to be postmaster at Mason, W. Va., in place of F. E. Bletner. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Mary I. Baker to be postmaster at Ranson, W. Va., in place of M. I. Baker. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Ulysses S. Jarrett to be postmaster at St. Albans, W. Va., in place of U. S. Jarrett. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Ralph C. Morton to be postmaster at Sharples, W. Va., in place of R. C. Morton. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

William H. Young to be postmaster at Union, W. Va., in place of W. H. Young. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

#### WISCONSIN

Louis W. Kuhaupt to be postmaster at Allenton, Wis., in place of L. W. Kuhaupt. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Lewis L. Nelson, jr., to be postmaster at Amherst Junction, Wis., in place of L. L. Nelson, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Leonard D. Perry to be postmaster at Cable, Wis., in place of L. D. Perry. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Edward G. Carter to be postmaster at Drummond, Wis., in place of E. G. Carter. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.



Lila O. Burton to be postmaster at Eagle, Wis., in place of L. O. Burton. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Arthur M. Howe to be postmaster at Elk Mound, Wis., in place of A. M. Howe. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Paul L. Fugina to be postmaster at Fountain City, Wis., in place of P. L. Fugina. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George F. Sherburne to be postmaster at Fremont, Wis., in place of G. F. Sherburne. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Marion L. Kutchin to be postmaster at Green Lake, Wis., in place of M. L. Kutchin. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Roy L. Thompson to be postmaster at Hancock, Wis., in place of R. L. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Robert L. Zimmerman to be postmaster at Holcombe, Wis., in place of R. L. Zimmerman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Marie L. Schilleman to be postmaster at Lac du Flambeau, Wis., in place of M. L. Schilleman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles I. Larson to be postmaster at Mason, Wis., in place of C. I. Larson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Freeman E. Boyer to be postmaster at Mattoon, Wis., in place of F. E. Boyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Lewis A. Gehr to be postmaster at Mercer, Wis., in place of L. A. Gehr. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Herman A. Krueger to be postmaster at Merrill, Wis., in place of H. A. Krueger. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

George Henry to be postmaster at Mount Calvary, Wis., in place of George Henry. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Mary G. Helke to be postmaster at Nekoosa, Wis., in place of M. G. Helke. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

James L. Ring to be postmaster at Osseo, Wis., in place of J. L. Ring. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Howard B. Hoyt to be postmaster at Plum City, Wis., in place of H. B. Hoyt. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Orlando M. Eastman to be postmaster at Saukville, Wis., in place of O. M. Eastman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Nicholas Lucius, jr., to be postmaster at Solon Springs, Wis., in place of Nicholas Lucius, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Roy D. Larrien to be postmaster at Spring Valley, Wis., in place of R. D. Larrien. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

William J. Winters to be postmaster at Tripoli, Wis., in place of W. J. Winters. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

John H. Bunker to be postmaster at Turtle Lake, Wis., in place of J. H. Bunker. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

Charles W. Eagan to be postmaster at Wautoma, Wis., in place of C. W. Eagan. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1929.

#### WYOMING

James J. McDermott to be postmaster at Arvada, Wyo., in place of J. J. McDermott. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Minnie C. Corum to be postmaster at Encampment, Wyo., in place of M. C. Corum. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Annetta V. Welsh to be postmaster at Midwest, Wyo., in place of A. V. Welsh. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

Clara Fryer to be postmaster at Saratoga, Wyo., in place of Clara Fryer. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1929.

#### CONFIRMATION

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 10 (legislative day of December 4), 1929*

#### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Frank W. Donaldson, district of Tennessee.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, December 10, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O King of Love, to whom we are indebted for life with all its mercies and hopes and to whom we owe our devoted allegiance, crown our thoughts with clear conception and good motives; thus fortified may we strive earnestly toward the ideals of the Great Teacher. In all this complicated life inspire us by His illustrious example. With prompt efficiency may we fulfill our daily duties. In our moods, in our meditations, and in our communions lift us above temporary pleasure and emotion; yes, Father, lead us above the common currents and make us to dwell above the contagion of earthly conflict. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to amend sections 3 and 4 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. Brock a member of the President's Plaza Commission (Nashville, Tenn.), vice Mr. Tyson, deceased.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. OVERMAN a member of the Commission on the Bicentennial Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington, vice Mr. Bayard, term expired.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. TOWNSEND a member of the Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission, vice Mr. Edge, resigned.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1816. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Wabasha, Minn.

#### LOANS TO FARMERS OF THE SOUTHEASTERN STATES ON ACCOUNT OF FLOOD CONDITIONS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the report of L. E. White, the administrative officer in charge of the loans to the southeastern farmers on account of flood conditions, and also a report attached thereto by a committee headed by David R. Coker, the agricultural director of the Federal reserve bank at Richmond, which discusses the same situation.

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

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

HARTSVILLE, S. C., November 30, 1929.

Hon. A. H. GASQUE,  
Florence, S. C.

DEAR MR. GASQUE: The undersigned are a committee appointed by meeting of a number of representative citizens held in Darlington a few days ago to consider the distressing agricultural situation of the county and ways and means for its relief or amelioration. We believe that the situation in this county and in some of the contiguous territory calls for congressional relief. A very large proportion of the farm population of the county—probably one-third—is without adequate means of subsistence. Many are on the point of starvation and few have or can obtain remunerative work during the next few months.

We wish that before returning to Washington you would come here and interview our county health authorities, some of the leading physicians and pastors, and those in charge of the Red Cross and Associated Charities work.

Last year, when the situation was not so bad as at present, the National Government afforded some relief which, though inadequate, was extremely helpful. This county has been visited by six very wet years since 1920, the cotton yield in five of these years being less than 20,000 bales per annum. The crop yield in two of the three dry years was only about half normal, due to previous losses and inability to finance.