the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable waters," approved March 1, 1911, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 13053) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations to or in behalf of institutions conducted for the benefit of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 13054) to provide equal apportionment among the several States, Territories, and District of Columbia by the United States Civil Service Commission, extending the apportionment to all departments in the District of Columbia and to all States or Territories; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 261) to appoint a select committee to investigate short selling of stocks on stock exchanges; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Resolution (H. Res. 262) to investigate the tariff bill of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Resolution (H. Res. 263) to amend Rule XII of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: Memorializing the Congress to effect passage of legislation placing the financial cooperation of the United States Public Health Service that all States may receive more adequate protection of the urban and rural population throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASWELL: Memorializing the Congress to effect passage of legislation placing the financial cooperation of the United States Public Health Service that all States may receive more adequate protection of the urban and rural population throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 13055) granting a pension to Oscar Cochran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 13056) granting a pension to Patrick Kilmartin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 13057) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Erisman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRADDOCK: A bill (H. R. 13058) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Mercer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 13059) granting an increase of pension to Emery M. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 13060) granting an increase of pension to Lyddy J. Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 13061) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bickford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 13062) granting a pension to Ella I. Dewire; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 13063) granting an increase of pension to Julia Purnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13064) for the relief of Wade Dean; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13065) granting a pension to James S. Casteel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 13066) granting an increase of pension to Willimina Rabuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHAELSON: A bill (H. R. 13067) for the relief of George W. McDonald; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 13068) granting an increase of pension to Ellen P. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 13069) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13070) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13071) granting a pension to Maryland Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 13072) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Viola Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 13073) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Nix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 13074) granting an increase of pension to Truman T. Burr; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7604. Petition against the official judicial conduct of Judge Bascom S. Deaver, United States judge for the middle district of Georgia, fifth judicial district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7605. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of Montgomery County Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Montgomery City, Mo., indorsing establishment of a national park on the site of Fort Boonesborough, Ky.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7606. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution by the Comte de Grasse Chapter, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, at Yorktown, Va., urging the passage of House Joint Resolution 347, to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the memory of Comte de Grasse; to the Committee on the Library.

7607. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of the Research Club, of Elliott, Iowa, favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures in interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7608. By Mr. YATES: Petition of H. E. Edwards, commander Bell Post, American Legion, Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to pass legislation for the benefit of World War soldiers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7609. Also, petition of Elizabeth Hodge, secretary Federal Employees' Union, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 471; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7610. Also, petition of M. J. Ballester, recording secretary Unity Lodge 4807, Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage of the Couzens resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7611. Also, petition of Carl Anderlin, secretary Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, 246 Summer Street, Boston, Mass., and six of its locals in Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage of House bill 471; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7612. Also, petition of Robert Odenbach, recording secretary Federal Labor Union No. 15441, 2800 South California Avenue, requesting the consideration and passage of the Saturday half-holiday bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7613. Also, petition of R. A. Omohundro, commander Clay Post, No. 14, American Legion, Flora, Ill., urging the passage of the Johnson bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

7614. Also, petition of James Rons, 5407 West Twenty-second Place, Cicero, Ill., secretary Public Schools Janitors' Local No. 11, urging the passage of House bill 471; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7615. Also, petition of R. H. McDaniel, president Western Broker Division Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 209 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of the half-holiday bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7616. Also, petition of Edward Batz, secretary International Wood Carvers' Association, 5637 School Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage of House bill 471; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, *June 20, 1930*

(*Legislative day of Wednesday, June 18, 1930*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for just a few moments?

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. FESS. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Washington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a joint resolution, but I want to take two or three or four minutes before I do so.

At present we have the annual controversy over the District of Columbia appropriation bill. This has occurred during several years past. It is very desirable that we should get the matter in shape so as to avoid such a controversy. It is injurious to the city and it is very vexatious to Congress. It has been proposed in some quarters that a commission should be appointed to study the situation and recommend to Congress the proportionate part of the expenses of the District that should be borne by the District and by the National Government. As I look at it, judging from the past, that is a useless procedure. A few years ago we had such a commission. That commission studied the situation very carefully, went into it very thoroughly, and recommended to Congress a plan, which was adopted by Congress. I think about the next year, or at least the second year afterwards, it was absolutely abandoned. We could expect the same result from another commission.

It does seem to me, however, that there is something substantial that can be done to help avoid these controversies in the future. The prime factor, it seems to me, in determining what is just to be contributed by the National Government and what is just to be contributed by the District government should be upon the basis of the values of the property of the National Government and that owned by private parties in the District. If we could get the facts showing substantially the value of the Government property in the District and at what it should be valued, and then get the value of the private ownership in the District, it would form a pretty good basis, I believe, upon which we could determine what would be just and fair as between the National Government and the District.

Of course, there are some other questions aside from that, but they are questions which can be settled upon principle rather than upon the facts. What I propose is a commission to gather the facts.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I wish to suggest to the Senator what I am sure he realizes anyhow, and that is that this is the Nation's Capital and we can not determine the matter exclusively upon a business basis.

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. GLASS. All improvements made in Washington are made on a permanent and monumental basis such as would not obtain in any other city in the United States.

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. GLASS. Pride in the Nation's Capital and the fact that what I have just said must be so should enter largely into the determination of the question.

Mr. JONES. I agree absolutely with the Senator. I tried to make it clear that I am not proposing something that is the sole solution of the matter; but I do think that one of the prime factors in determining how the matter should be treated is the value of the respective properties. That is one thing about which I desire to seek and obtain information for the Congress, and not a commission which would determine the rate of contribution. My desire is to get the facts so that Congress in determining the question will have the facts in order to give to them the weight that they ought to be given.

Mr. GLASS. If the Senator will permit me, while we are discussing the question, I would like to say this much more: The question involved now is something more than a mere agreement between the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. JONES. I want to make my position clear. I am not proposing the joint resolution as affecting the present situation at all.

Mr. GLASS. I understand that, but I want to take advantage of the fact that the Senator is discussing the problem to say a word further to the Senate.

Matters have reached such a point that unless the Senate of the United States wants absolutely to abase itself and to supinely confess that it is not a part of the legislative branch of the Government of the United States, it must assert its dignity and its right to legislate. I want to cite this incident to the Senate.

On day before yesterday there came into my office, as I was about to leave, a committee representing the policemen's and firemen's organizations of the District of Columbia. They said to me that if they would be permitted to carry from me to a Member of another branch of the Congress an assurance that the conferees on the part of the Senate on a pending bill would agree to the demands of this Member of the House, he would permit the House to send the bill to conference. In all my legislative experience I have never known of such a piece of effrontery. The message that I did send to that Member of the other branch would not be printed in the RECORD if I were to tell the Senate what it was. That is the situation exactly with respect to the disagreement between the two Houses.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the senior Senator from Virginia?

Mr. JONES. I want to say to the junior Senator from Virginia first that I did not intend to bring up the present controversy at this time. All I have in mind looks to the future. I regret, of course, the situation that confronts us now. I am very hopeful that we shall get it satisfactorily adjusted. With that statement I yield to the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator, who has the floor, is the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I understand that under the new Budget system which appertains to our financial affairs as related to both the House and the Senate, it is the duty of his committee and of the House Committee on Appropriations to make appropriations in pursuance to the law. We have no right to change the law. We can not make an appropriation for the Navy Department unless it is authorized by the Budget and is given the approval of the Appropriations Committee. The Congress has enacted a law fixing the basis of apportionment of the contribution between the District and the Federal Government, as I understand it. Is not that true?

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. It is a basis fixed by law, fixed by the will of Congress, fixed as the basis upon which the House and Senate Appropriations Committee shall operate under the rules of the Senate and the House. Is not that true?

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, it would seem that the House Committee on Appropriations seeks to abrogate the law of Congress in making an appropriation for the District of Columbia. It seemingly claims to be a legislative committee and not an appropriations committee. The law provides that after we fix the amount to be appropriated for the District, the amount shall be apportioned 40 and 60. That is the law; that is the basis fixed by statute. Under that law we ascertain the amount needed to run the District government for the next fiscal year.

When the time comes to fix the pro rata part of the District and the pro rata part of the Federal Government, the House committee refuse to obey the law, as I understand it, but say, in effect, "We will nullify that law." It seems to me if the Budget system is to be a success and is to carry out the purposes and principles for which it was inaugurated, it is their duty, after the Budget has fixed the amount it will cost to run the District government, to apportion it according to law.

Is the Senator insisting that the law should be obeyed and that the apportionment should be made according to law enacted by Congress?

Mr. JONES. Is the Senator through?

Mr. SWANSON. Has the Senator insisted that this law shall be obeyed? Are the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate to be permitted to nullify the law? Is it contrary to the Budget system that was devised? It seems to me the right way for the Appropriations Committee to do is to ascertain what the District government ought to expend and then apportion it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I shall be compelled to call for the regular order if this matter can not be disposed of without further debate.

Mr. JONES. The Senator must not overlook the fact that I can talk as long as I wish.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have no doubt about the capacity of the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I could take as long as I desire. I am talking really longer than I desired to talk. I did not expect to take more than three or four minutes. I am not going into the controversy that is raised by the two Senators from Virginia.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator will understand that I mean no discourtesy to him, but I am most anxious to dispose of the bill, which is the unfinished business, and which can be disposed of in my opinion within two hours, and we can then take up the veterans' bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the demand made for a quorum by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], who yielded to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I did not understand that the Senator from Ohio made the point of no quorum, and I do not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator had made that point.

Mr. JONES. Then why is the Chair letting me proceed if the Senator from Ohio made the point of no quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Because the Senator from Ohio withheld the point of no quorum momentarily to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I do not see how he could yield in that way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If he pressed the point of no quorum, the Chair would sustain him.

Mr. JONES. I want to get through in just a minute. I did not want to take any time in discussing the matter in such a lengthy way.

Mr. FESS. I understand that I have the floor.

Mr. JONES. I do not so understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio was recognized.

Mr. JONES. Very well. I will take the floor again after we get a quorum.

Mr. FESS. If it does not take too long for the Senator to conclude, I will yield, but if it is going to take too long——

Mr. JONES. I am going to take all the time that is necessary to do what I wanted to do.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion just a moment?

Mr. FESS. For what purpose?

Mr. HARRISON. Here we have the largest attendance of Senators we have had at this hour of the day for some time. What is the need for calling a quorum under the circumstances?

Mr. JONES. There is no need for it.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no need in the world for calling a quorum.

Mr. FESS. The need is that certain absent Senators want a quorum called in order that they may be notified. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fess	La Follette	Shortridge
Ashurst	George	McCulloch	Simmons
Barkley	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Bingham	Glass	McMaster	Steck
Black	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Blaine	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stephens
Borah	Hale	Moses	Sullivan
Bratton	Harris	Norris	Swanson
Brock	Harrison	Oddie	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hastings	Overman	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hatfield	Phipps	Townsend
Capper	Hayden	Pine	Trammell
Caraway	Hebert	Pittman	Tydings
Connally	Heflin	Ransdell	Vandenberg
Copeland	Howell	Reed	Wagner
Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Walcott
Cutting	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Kean	Robsion, Ky.	Watson
Deneen	Kendrick	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Keyes	Shipstead	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate by illness.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251) to promote peace and to equalize the burdens and to minimize the profits of war.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 4017. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928, pertaining to certain War Department contracts by repealing the expiration date of that act;

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of Seth J. Harris; and

H. R. 7997. An act authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of additional land for the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce.

DIAL TELEPHONES

Mr. JONES obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. JONES. I will yield to the Senator if what he has in mind to do will take but a moment or two.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am confident it will take only a few moments.

Mr. President, several days ago I introduced a resolution in regard to the use of dial telephones around the Senate, the resolution really being in the nature of an amendment to a resolution offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and adopted. I now have an amendment to the resolution previously introduced by me, to which I understand all those who are in opposition have agreed, and I think that the resolution can be disposed of without any debate. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 288, and that the amendment which I desire to propose to that resolution may be read and adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 288) submitted by Mr. TYDINGS on June 10, 1930, as follows:

Whereas Senate Resolution 274, considered and agreed to May 22, 1930, directed the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate to order the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to replace with manual all dial telephones in the Senate wing of the United States Capitol and in the Senate Office Building within 30 days; and

Whereas some Senators may desire to continue the use of dial telephones: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is authorized and directed to order the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. not to remove such telephones from the offices of any Senator in the Senate Office Building or in the Senate wing of the United States Capitol unless requested by the Senator to replace such dial telephones with manual telephones, which request shall be complied with within 10 days.

Mr. TYDINGS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Maryland proposes to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and in lieu thereof insert:

That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is authorized and directed to order the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to remove such telephones from the offices of the Senate Office Building or in the Senate wing of the United States Capitol and to substitute therefor manual telephones unless said company is requested by any Senator to continue the use of the dial telephones in such places as the requesting Senator is in charge.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say that all the resolution seeks to do is to give to Senators who want the old-style telephones the opportunity of having them in their offices and to give to those who want the dial telephones in their offices the opportunity of having them.

I may say further that to-day is the last day on which action may be taken. If the resolution as proposed to be amended is going to be adopted later, it is a pity to require the telephone company to go to all the trouble of removing the dial telephones to-morrow, and then have the dial system installed afterwards; it will be a sheer waste of money.

May I also say that the employees of the Senate wish the dial telephone? A number of them came to my office, through their representatives, and said they would like to have the dial system. As under the resolution it will be optional, and as every Senator will be able to have the kind of telephone he wants, I trust the Senator from Washington will not object.

Mr. DILL. The Senator from Washington will object, and he will tell the Senator why he is going to object. Ever since this resolution was proposed the Telephone Co. has had men around the Senate lobbying with Senators and their secretaries to get this very thing done. In other words, they have taken the position that they are not going to take the dial telephones out. If this resolution is going to be considered, it will be discussed; it is not the regular order, and I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask to be permitted to finish what I have to say, and I will take, I think, only two or three minutes.

I do not intend to open up the controversy that is now pending between the House and the Senate regarding the District of Columbia appropriation bill. What I hope to do, however, is to present a proposition that I think should be considered with a view to avoiding all such controversies in the future. I am quite hopeful that the present controversy will be satisfactorily adjusted before Congress shall adjourn.

As I said a while ago, what I propose is simply that an appraisement of Government property and an appraisement of private property shall be made in the District, so that Congress may know approximately—of course, the information will not be altogether accurate, but approximately so—the values of Government property and the values of the property held in private ownership within the District. The suggestion which the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] made, of course, will have to be taken into consideration, but the purpose of the measure which I desire to introduce is simply to ascertain the facts and to have them reported to Congress annually. Upon those facts Congress will be better able to determine what proportion of the expenses of the District should be borne by the people of the District and what proportion should be borne by the Government itself.

Therefore I propose to introduce a joint resolution, which will simply provide, in substance, for the appointment of a commission, composed of the assessor of the District and two others, to be named by the President, one of whom, at least shall be a nonresident of the District and shall not own property here. The commission thus created is to make an annual appraisement of the property within the District, and to report to Congress on the first Monday of December of each year. Then Congress will have the facts upon which it may decide what adjustment should be made in the annual appropriation bill in view of the respective holdings of the Government and private individuals.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. JONES. I will yield in just a moment.

The first appraisement report, of course, can not be made between now and the first Monday in December of this year. So I provide that the first report shall be made on the first Monday in December of next year. Congress will have to try to work out for another year, for the fiscal year 1932, the proportion which should be borne, respectively, by the Federal Government and by the District, as it is doing now. After that time, however, Congress would have the facts, anyway, upon which it could act; and I think the facts thus ascertained would form a much better basis for determining what contribution the Federal Government should make for the expenses of the District than is now available. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a while ago the Senator indicated in his remarks that he thought a just basis of taxation here would be the relative value of private property and Government property.

Mr. JONES. The Senator misunderstood me. I said that was one of the prime factors; that is all. The Senator from Virginia suggested several other factors that should be taken into account, such as the necessity for buildings of a monumental character, the fact that Washington is the National Capital, and other considerations. The purpose of the joint resolution I propose to introduce is to ascertain one thing, namely, the approximate value of private holdings in the District and the approximate value of the holdings of the Federal Government here.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator knows that if it were not for the property and buildings of the Federal Government in the District the private property would be worth very little.

Mr. JONES. The suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky is one that can be taken into consideration by Congress, of course, in determining what amount should be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury and what amount should be paid by the people of the District.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. JONES. I will yield in just a moment. I hope that Senators will understand that all I propose to do is to provide for ascertaining, as nearly as practicable, the relative value of Government property and of private property in the District, and simply have the facts reported to Congress for such consideration as Congress may feel justified in giving them.

Congress, of course, would also take into account all the other considerations involving matters of principle rather than depending upon the ascertainment of certain facts. That is all the joint resolution I propose to introduce seeks to do; and it seems to me that, if adopted, it would greatly help in determining what should be the attitude of the National Government toward the District in connection with appropriations for the expenses of the District. I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the joint resolution the Senator intends to introduce, provided that it is distinctly understood that the plan suggested shall not necessarily be the limit fixed upon the proportionate share of the expenses to be borne, respectively, by the Federal Government and the District.

Mr. JONES. I am not going to ask for the consideration of the joint resolution this morning.

Mr. SWANSON. I thought the Senator was going to do so.

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. SWANSON. My idea is this: The Federal Government compels the District to have better pavements than are provided in the ordinary city, better and wider and more beautiful streets, lined with trees. Furthermore, the expenses are greater on account of Washington being the seat of the Federal Government, and all the improvements have to be on a more monumental scale, even in the back alleys, I might almost say, as compared with other cities. Such considerations as I have indicated ought to be taken into consideration if the Senator is going to ask for the passage of a joint resolution of that kind.

Mr. JONES. I am going to leave that——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon demands the regular order.

Mr. JONES. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A question of order, however, can be raised at any time.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; the Senator can state the question of order, and I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the question on which the Senator is now speaking, to wit, on agreeing to the amendment of the committee to the river and harbor bill as amended last night.

Mr. JONES. Certainly; and I can take all the time I desire on that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized on that subject.

Mr. JONES. Very well.

Mr. President, I am trying to explain as clearly as possible the sole purpose of the joint resolution which I desire to introduce. I am not going to ask for its consideration this morning, but it does seem to me that we ought to do something to take care of the controversies which arise annually. None of the suggestions the Senator from Virginia has just made are dealt with in the joint resolution, but they can all be taken into consideration and should be taken into consideration by Congress when it is determining the proportionate share of the expenses of the District the Federal Government should bear and the proportionate share the District government should bear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as a part of my remarks, the proposed joint resolution to which I have referred may be read; it is very brief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington continues to hold the floor on the pending question.

Mr. JONES. I should like to read the joint resolution. It is as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Joint resolution to aid in determining the share of the United States toward the annual expenses of the District of Columbia

Resolved, etc., That as an aid in determining the fair, just, and equitable amount to be paid annually by the Government of the United States as its share of the annual expenses of the government of the District of Columbia there is hereby created a commission to be known as the United States and District of Columbia Commission, to be composed of the assessor of the District of Columbia, who shall act as chairman, and two persons thoroughly familiar with real-estate values to be appointed by the President of the United States, at least one of whom shall not reside in or own property in the District of Columbia. It shall be the duty of the commission, under such rules and regulations as to it may seem fair and just, to make an annual valuation as of the 1st day of July of the land and improvements thereon in the District of Columbia owned by the United States, exclusive of streets and alleys, and all privately owned land and improvements thereon in

the District of Columbia, exclusive of land and improvements thereon expressly exempt from taxation. The commission shall report the result of its valuation to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1931, and annually thereafter. The assessor of the District of Columbia shall serve without additional compensation. The other two members shall serve for a term of four years and until their successors are appointed and qualified, and shall receive an annual compensation of $9,000 each, the payment of which is hereby authorized. Such sum as may be submitted annually by the Bureau of the Budget for personal services and other necessary expenses in connection with the work of the commission is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Now, Mr. President, I hope I may have permission to introduce this joint resolution and have it referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

LIMITATION OF JURISDICTION OF COURTS OF EQUITY

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for the filing of reports from the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. In pursuance of the unanimous consent that was given some time ago, the majority, represented by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], and the minority, represented by myself, desire to file our respective reports upon the so-called anti-injunction bill, S. 2497.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report (No. 1060) to accompany the bill (S. 2497) to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, heretofore reported adversely from that committee.

Mr. NORRIS. From the same committee, I submit the views of the minority (pt. 2, Rept. No. 1060) on Senate bill 2497.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consent having already been given, the reports will be received and printed and go to the calendar.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. JONES. I merely wish to inquire if some one objected to the introduction of my joint resolution?

Mr. BLACK. I objected. I am willing to state my reasons.

Mr. JONES. It seems rather peculiar to me that the introduction of a joint resolution should be objected to, when other matters have been allowed to come in.

Mr. BLACK. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a statement as to why I objected?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I objected on account of the fact that, as I understand, the President of the United States is seeking to bring about a settlement of the deadlock on that controversy between the two Houses, but he does not seem to be doing anything with reference to the deadlock on Muscle Shoals.

Mr. GEORGE. Nor the veterans' bill.

Mr. BLACK. Nor the veterans' bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. JONES. My joint resolution does not deal with the present situation at all.

THE TARIFF AND THE POLITICAL SITUATION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a dispatch from Paris in a morning paper states in the heading that "France officially scores United States tariff," and that the French have started a movement to inaugurate reprisals or to impose countervailing duties against us. I desire, without having it read, to have that article inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Friday, June 20, 1930]

FRANCE OFFICIALLY SCORES UNITED STATES TARIFF—CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES BODY THREATENS REPRISAL IF DUTIES ARE NOT CUT—TARDIEU TO GET ORDER

PARIS, June 19.—Official France made its first move of protest against the new American tariff and its first official threat of reprisal to-day through the committee on customs of the Chamber of Deputies. The committee adopted the following "order of the day," to be submitted to Premier Tardieu.

"The committee on customs of the chamber, after examining attentively the consequences of the increase in custom duties decided upon by the United States, notes with regret:

"First. That the new American tariff, affecting especially the most active branches of production, will sensibly decrease French exports to that great friendly country.

"Second. That it will seriously increase the difficulties which generalized economic nationalism brings about in international exchanges.

"Third. That owing to the injury done to the equilibrium of their commercial balances, countries which have debts to settle with the United States risk severe tension in the monetary systems.

"The committee deems it necessary to adopt French customs duties, as applied to American products, to the régime to which will be submitted French exports to America, and requests the Government to intervene immediately with the President of the United States to obtain such decrease in American customs duties necessary to the maintenance of French exports.

"The committee on customs, in event that such intervention remains without result, would insist upon suppression of the clause now granting most-favored nation treatment to the United States, deeming it illogical that the United States should benefit by such treatment without the slightest reciprocity such as consented by other nations."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, some days ago—I think on the memorable occasion when certain members of the majority party met at the White House to participate before the movies in the signing by the President of the Grundy tariff bill—it was stated that the leader of the Republicans in the Senate was delayed and could not get there. We are not informed whether he got a gold pen or not. Those who were present did get gold pens, according to the press.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and to whom?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator made the statement that this was the Grundy bill. I desire to ask the Senator if he has not made a mistake. Is it not either the Hoover-Grundy bill or the Grundy-Hoover bill? Which is it?

Mr. HARRISON. I should say the Grundy-Hoover bill, then.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that while six prominent citizens of the United States each received gold pens all the rest of the people received gold bricks. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. HARRISON. I will accept the Senator's amendment.

It is stated that they waited there until one minute before 12 o'clock, I believe, for the distinguished leader on the other side, but he did not show up. I do not know why he did not. Perhaps the onerous burden of trying to keep his forces in line detained him.

Mr. President, some things have happened in the past week that ought to be called to the attention of the country. There were several elections in the country; and, with rare exceptions—and those exceptions are accounted for—the gentlemen were defeated who sponsored and helped to frame this tariff bill that the Senator from Indiana invites as an issue before the country this year, and as to which we have gladly accepted the challenge, may I say to the Senator from Indiana. He could not get away from it under any circumstances, because it will be the issue. The people will make it the issue, much to the regret of many distinguished Senators on the other side and Representatives in the other House.

Up in New Jersey, however, they had a primary election. Mr. Morrow was nominated by a tremendous majority. He was running against two very distinguished Republicans, one of whom has been one of the colaborers in the House in framing this tariff legislation, who had spoken very often, and was always reputed to carry out the wishes of the President of the United States.

When Mr. FORT entered the Republican primary in New Jersey it was very freely stated that he was the candidate of President Hoover in that contest. I think some of the White House correspondents denied it, but it was generally accepted in the country, because he had been the spokesman of the President in the Kansas City convention; he had been his coworker and spokesman in the House of Representatives; and he was rather projected into the New Jersey primary as the representative of Mr. Hoover and this administration. Some of the papers went so far as to say that Mr. Hoover was a little envious of Mr. Morrow, and did not care about his getting a big majority up there, because he might loom up as an opponent in the next election for the presidential nomination on the Republican ticket. But the campaign was waged, Mr. FORT, of course, de-

fending his position with reference to the tariff legislation that he had championed in the House; and the other distinguished gentleman who was running up there, Mr. Frelinghuysen—who had occupied a conspicuous place in this Chamber, and had been a member of the Finance Committee and one of the main advocates of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law, and had defended it, I presume, more than anyone else upon the floor of the Senate except the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and the author of that bill in the Senate—spoke on the tariff at length, frequently calling attention to the great work that he had done in raising rates when he was a member of the Finance Committee in the consideration of the Fordney-McCumber law. But the primary was won by Mr. Morrow, the anti-Hoover candidate in New Jersey, who, by the way, is the only Republican nominee, so far as I have been able to see from the papers, who, following his nomination, received a telegram from the President, saying that the President and the administration would cooperate with him to the limit in the coming election in that State.

I do not know why the President slighted some of the other Republican nominees; but it is of record that he did not slight Mr. Morrow. He was quick in trying to remove the impression in the country that his chief opponent in the coming Republican convention was not to receive his support in this election. He wanted to remove the idea in the country that he was not going to work with Mr. Morrow, and that from now on there would be a fight within the Republican ranks for the Republican presidential nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and to whom?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean to intimate that the President did not congratulate the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL], who received the Republican nomination a few days ago, and assure him of his cooperation?

Mr. HARRISON. I never heard of such a telegram of congratulation.

Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator is speaking about the coming election in New Jersey and is in the habit of making predictions as to results——

Mr. HARRISON. I have made no prediction.

Mr. GLENN. Will the Senator be kind enough to predict for us now whether or not, in his judgment, Mr. Morrow will be elected in New Jersey?

Mr. HARRISON. I predict that the Senator from Illinois, if he were coming up this year for reelection, would not be reelected in Illinois. I doubt very seriously whether the people of his State will forget within the next two years, when he does come up, and reelect him to the Senate.

Mr. GLENN. But I should like the Senator's prediction as a political prophet—the rôle which he essays here so frequently—as to whether or not Mr. Morrow, the Republican nominee, will be elected in New Jersey. I hope the Senator will not worry so far ahead about me.

Mr. HARRISON. I can say to the Senator that I hope Mr. Morrow will not be elected.

Mr. GLENN. What does the Senator think his prospects are?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know. I know that he ran pretty strongly against the Republican mouthpiece in the recent primary and received 10 votes to 1 over Mr. Frelinghuysen, who made the tariff question one of the issues. Of course, he got entangled a little bit in the wet-and-dry question, too; and Mr. Morrow beat Mr. FORT, the Hoover candidate, about 4 to 1, I believe.

Mr. CARAWAY and Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and to whom?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, the thing I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not overlook is that in 1928 Mr. Hoover was the hope of the drys. Mr. Morrow ran under the New Jersey tradition, "As wet as the Atlantic Ocean." He was immediately assured of the administration's support. Mrs. MCCORMICK was nominated in Illinois on the dry ticket and has a wet opponent; and, so far as I know, the President has not said a word about his support of Mrs. MCCORMICK as against the wet candidate in Illinois. A member of the President's own Cabinet, Mr. Davis, was nominated in Pennsylvania as a dry and has received no assurance of support. So far as the record goes, the only Republican running wet who got a nomination was at once assured by this dry administration that he had its blessing and its support.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; that is the way they play both ends against the middle in order to get in.

Mr. President, while Mr. Morrow in that campaign was very silent with reference to the tariff bill and his views respecting the tariff, forging to the front on another issue, it will be interesting to the country, and ought to be interesting to the Senate, to know what the views of Mr. Morrow are, so far as they are recorded.

I recall that when the French debt-settlement agreement was before the Finance Committee, Mr. Morrow gave some expression to his views with reference to international trade and commerce. I am going to venture to read some of the expressions given at that time to the Finance Committee, over which the distinguished Sentaor from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] presided; and during much of that testimony the Senator from Utah squirmed in his seat and went through some very uncomfortable moments.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the first time I knew of it.

Mr. HARRISON. It is not the first time the Senator ever squirmed and it is not the first time he ever had uncomfortable moments. I read from the testimony:

Senator Jones, of New Mexico, speaking about American surpluses and French surpluses of manufacture, asked this question—

What will they do with the surplus?

Mr. MORROW. It may be in the shape of cotton goods that go to the Tropics. It may be in the shape of the finely finished products of the French workman that go to England or to this country. It may be in the shape of foodstuff that goes across the channel to England. Nobody can say what it is going to be. The countless transactions of trade make it. But the fundamental thing is that the people of a country shall be consuming less than they produce. The rest is saving.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Well, will she sell in these foreign countries goods which compete with American products?

Mr. MORROW. Presumably. There is nothing that any right-minded person with experience should regret in that. We should not want to sell to all the rest of the world without competition.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Well, but would that not interfere with some of our people who are engaged in the exporting of these goods?

Mr. MORROW. It will both help and hurt them. It will be just like competition at home. The more trade that there is in the world the more there is for everybody. Trade is not a limited thing that you cut up like a piece of pie and of which each person gets a certain amount. Trade is not a thing where what you get you take away from me. It is the interchange of goods and services between people that have something to give for what they get.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Well, then, what about the United States engaging in that exchange of goods?

Mr. MORROW. It will. It is. It is doing it now, and it will in constantly increasing amounts.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Well, to come to the point directly, Mr. Morrow: Does France produce or will she when rehabilitated produce any large quantity of goods which would not come in direct competition with American production?

Mr. MORROW. Oh, I think a great many that would not come into direct competition with us.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Well, why would it not be a good thing then for us, in order to help out France and prevent the transfer of this load from the Treasury of the United States to the people of the United States, to try to find a market in the United States for French goods which would not materially interfere with American industry?

Mr. MORROW. Well, I think, whether you try to find it or not, Senator——

Senator WATSON. Senator Jones has been at it a good while, and he has finally come down to the free-trade side of it. He has been at it a long while.

Senator REED of Pennsylvania. He has been kind of creeping up on it.

Senator WATSON. Yes; I saw him coming up to it. We all understood the Senator.

Senator HARRISON. You ought to let Mr. Morrow answer the question.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. I would like to have Mr. Morrow answer that question.

Mr. MORROW. My answer to that question, Senator, would be that whatever you do you can not prevent it. The things that they can do better than we can do we will take from them and give them in exchange therefor the things that we can produce and manufacture better than they can.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. And is that not a good thing for both countries?

Mr. MORROW. And I do not think you can put the tariff high enough to prevent it.

* * * * * * *

I mean when you get several thousand items on a tariff list the protection that you give with one hand you are very apt to take away with the other. But are we not getting pretty far afield, Senator?

Senator JONES of New Mexico. I am asking you to apply your knowledge of economics.

Mr. MORROW. It is generally true that the lower the cost of a thing the more is consumed.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Or in other words, the law of supply and demand means the demand at a given price, does it not; and presumably if you lower the price you increase the demand. Is that not the recognized rule of economics?

Mr. MORROW. That is true of almost all products.

Then further on Mr. Morrow said:

Mr. MORROW. Well, as I say, Senator, you are getting into a field which I do not at all qualify as an expert in. My own feeling is that if individuals are allowed to buy what they want and sell what they want, we reach a result that is a little more healthful than if governments determine what individuals shall buy and what they shall sell.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. The Government of ours now have a Department of Commerce. It is maintained at great expense by the Government. The principal work of that department now is to find a market abroad for American goods, is it not? Would it not be economically as profitable for us to try to make some arrangements whereby those goods could be paid for, and that through the process of finding a market in the United States for noncompetitive goods?

Mr. MORROW. Well, I do not think anybody would object to that.

Senator SHORTRIDGE. I would object to it.

Mr. MORROW. Noncompetitive goods?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I want this country to be industrially independent and not dependent upon France or any other country, and we can become industrially independent.

Well, Mr. Morrow does not come here to discuss political economy or free trade.

Mr. MORROW. I do not claim to be an expert, Senator.

Senator HARRISON. We claim it for you, Mr. Morrow.

So throughout he gave the impression which caused the squirming of the distinguished Senator from Utah, that he believed in an exchange of trade, and that when the tariff was put too high it destroyed our trade and our commerce.

He has been nominated, however; nominated not on account of the tariff but in spite of the tariff. He piled up these tremendous votes over Mr. FORT, who had championed the tariff bill, and over Mr. Frelinghuysen, who is known to be a tremendously high protectionist.

I look into the benign countenance of my friend the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]. He may claim that Mr. Morrow was nominated because he supported him, and no doubt he did add many thousands of votes to his total. But others may think he was nominated in spite of the cooperation of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, down the line these gentlemen who stood for this Hoover-Grundy bill are being weeded out, are being put upon the shelf, are being retired by the American people.

The former Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Sackett, saw the handwriting upon the wall. Smart and shrewd business man that he was, during the first discussion upon the floor of the Senate of the tariff bill, after he had helped in the framing of it, he sought an exit, and he went over to Germany as ambassador in order to get out from under what was about to happen.

The distinguished present ambassador to France, the predecessor of the present junior Senator from New Jersey, read the handwriting upon the wall, and after he had helped frame the Grundy bill, and upon the first discussion of it here upon the floor of the Senate, seeing the scores of protests coming from the country, the avalanche of opposition that was gradually but assuredly approaching the Congress of the United States, he knew that it was best for himself to find a storm cellar. So he accepted the appointment as ambassador to France at the hands of President Hoover and went over there.

Every time the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRUNDY], who did so much to frame these high rates, popped his whip over on the other side certain gentlemen did what he wanted them to do. He came before the people in his State, and they overwhelmingly condemned his action with reference to the tariff bill.

Then take the distinguished Senators who have stood four square fighting against the increases in the rates, these additional burdens being piled upon the American people, such as the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. While the reactionary elements in his State were fighting him as they have not fought before, because he stood here in the long-drawn-out tariff fight and turned down the request of the reactionary interests of the country and voted against the enormous increases and against the bill, he was nominated in Minnesota by more than 80,000 majority.

Take the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCMASTER]. None has been more energetic and more faithful in the whole tariff fight, in standing by the people and against the high rates, than he. He went out and waged a campaign upon his record here, and with all the money that was spent, perhaps, to defeat him, and all the organization of the reactionary elements in his State to encompass his defeat, he came out victorious.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator, of course, recalls that the opponent of Senator MCMASTER in the primary ran as an administration supporter of the tariff bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Of course, I dislike to mention the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], a man of whom we are all so fond, but he was another one who helped to frame this patchwork of tariff legislation. He went before the people of his State and was crushed.

Mr. President, the distinguished Republican leader [Mr. WATSON] in addressing the Senate the other day—and he never did answer some of the questions which were put to him in that remarkable, and, of course, eloquent speech, because he always makes an eloquent speech—did not answer a question about Senator MCMASTER. He dwelt very little upon Mr. GRUNDY. But he heralded "DICKINSON comes to the Senate from Iowa," and that he indorsed the tariff bill, and that he voted for the tariff bill. That is the loophole they try to get out of.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand three speeches which were printed at the direction of Mr. DICKINSON, the gentleman referred to by the Senator from Indiana, at his own expense, I presume. They were distributed as such speeches are distributed; I do not know whether there were hundreds or thousands or millions of them distributed, I am not advised, but they were put in pamphlet form and distributed throughout Iowa. What are they?

One is a speech on the McNary-Haugen bill second veto message, in which Mr. DICKINSON criticized President Coolidge and lauded the agricultural interests of this country. He exploited his own efforts in behalf of the agriculture of this Nation. Indeed, he told the farmers how he was the leader of the farm bloc over in the House of Representatives, how at times he had been forced to threaten to defeat legislation over there unless they took care of the needs of agriculture.

He told them how he overrode the President's veto of the McNary-Haugen bill, how he had championed the debenture plan, and many of the things he had said in his speeches in the House. He impressed the farmer that he was his friend, and it was on that issue, and in spite of the vote he cast in the House on the tariff bill, that he happened to squeeze through out in the State of Iowa.

If the papers can be believed, the opponent of Mr. DICKINSON in Iowa contended, in publications paid for, that he was being supported by the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], trying to make capital of the fact, and take votes from Mr. DICKINSON because Mr. BROOKHART was giving him his loyal and his earnest support in that campaign.

Mr. President, here is one of the assertions of Mr. DICKINSON. This is the kind of speeches he had put out in Iowa:

Many of the assertions in the veto message can only be answered by a blunt statement that they are not true, either as economic fact or as interpretation of the bill. On the other hand, many assertions in the message seem to merit detailed replies.

The message is in parts as intemperate as a fishwife's tirade.

Here is what he said in another speech:

Mr. Speaker, the presidential veto has put an end to all prospects for farm relief legislation at this session of Congress. The momentum behind this legislation has been gradually growing for the past four years and with each new economic depression more sentiment is created for the passage of this legislation.

* * * * * * *

TARIFF REVISION

The farm population is also becoming converted to the fact that the protected interests of the country can not carry along on the present high plane with the existing buying power of the farm population of the country. They read with interest the veto of the farm relief bill and at the same time and in the same week note the advance in tariff on pig iron to the maximum amount allowed under the law under the adjustable tariff provision now in existence. They recall that the greatest producer of pig iron in the United States is the United States Steel Corporation; that in the closing of the last year they declared an additional dividend of approximately $200,000,000; they see that business stabilized by an additional protective duty under the above conditions. It will therefore be the problem of the farmer to study the tariff schedules, and everywhere he sees that exorbitant prices are being charged or that excessive profits are being made, he will join hands with those who are asking for tariff revision downward on such commodities in order to secure the equality to which he believes he is entitled.

* * * * * * *

All of which goes to show that the veto was inspired not by a statesman's conception of principles of economics and government but by a

politician's calculations of political advantage. And be it remembered that the misuse of political power is responsible for many of the unjust burdens of farmers, and that it is through the misuse of political power that selfish industrial interests are now seeking to further industrialize the Nation at the expense of agriculture.

I read from remarks of Mr. DICKINSON in the House of Representatives in 1928:

I want to say one thing more to you. If you take out the equalization fee you are going to turn the farmers of the country against the Members of the House who have voted to strike it out. I believe this thing has been before this country long enough to show that the great majority of the farmers of this country understand it, and with that understanding they are demanding just plain justice; that they be put within the protective tariff system of this country and if they are not, then they are going to take things into their own hands and see whether or not they are not in shape to force something through the legislative halls of this Congress and put men and women in the seats of Congress who will give them what they think they are entitled to. The only way you can give them that equality, the only way you can maintain the American standard, and the only way you can carry it out to the farm is under the principle of the equalization fee. Nobody has offered anything anywhere, at any time, that is a substitute for the equalization fee.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the authority given each Member of the House, I hereby extend my remarks by inserting the following statement on farm relief.

When the farmer goes to vote in November he will be able to identify his friends. The platform of the Republican Party of 1924 is unfulfilled. To commend the record of the past four years, so far as agriculture is concerned, is to indorse and applaud the nullification of the promises in the 1924 platform. Such promises made and unfulfilled should eliminate those who held places of responsibility for the past four years.

Yet the Senator from Indiana says that this gentleman, who happened to vote for the tariff bill, has been nominated because of that. He was nominated in spite of it, because he tried to give the other impression to the electorate of the State of Iowa. He was nominated because he made the people believe that he had been friendly to the farming interests of that State in voting for the debenture and in making speeches against the exorbitant rates on industrial items carried in the tariff bill.

We welcome the issue in the coming campaign. I know that after the coming election there will be missed the faces of those who voted for the Grundy-Hoover legislative monstrosity.

Mr. COUZENS obtained the floor.

Mr. STECK. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi yielded the floor and the Senator from Michigan was recognized. To whom does the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. COUZENS. I want to proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. STECK. I merely wish to put an editorial in the RECORD at this point along the line of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COUZENS. I have no objection.

Mr. STECK. I have an editorial in my hand from Wallace's Farmer, which gives the summary of that publication of the situation in Iowa with reference to the recent primary election, in which a candidate for the United States Senate was nominated. It should be read to the Senate, but in view of the pressure of business, I merely ask that it be placed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

A WRONG IMPRESSION

It is evident from reading the comment of eastern papers on the Iowa primaries that there has been a very wrong impression with reference to Congressman DICKINSON's victory in his campaign for the Senate. The eastern press and their Washington correspondents have analyzed the results as a victory for the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill now before Congress and interpreted the State of Iowa's attitude as being for the tariff bill. As a matter of fact, the exact contrary is true. Congressman DICKINSON in his campaign did not defend the tariff bill, but only the agricultural schedules of that bill, and his talks were confined almost entirely to the agricultural schedules. Had he made a fight for the tariff bill as a whole, there would have been an entirely different result, and if those eminent correspondents, Mark Sullivan and David Lawrence, were to visit Iowa and get a clear picture of how folks, and particularly farm folks, stand on the tariff, their comment on the senatorial primaries would be very greatly different from what it has been, as by no stretch of the imagination can Mr. DICKINSON's victory in the primaries be construed as Iowa's putting an O. K. on the tariff legislation as proposed.

As to the Iowa farmers' stand, their position is brought out very clearly in the ballots they have cast as to whether the President should sign or veto the tariff bill. To date 804 ballots have been received. Of this number, 766 have voted in favor of the President vetoing the tariff bill, while only 38 have voted for the President signing the bill. If the vote of every farmer in Iowa were registered, we think the proportion in favor of the veto would be just about the same as in the ballots already cast. There is much opposition to the tariff bill in Iowa among business men as well as among farm folks.

It is reasonable to suppose that most of the folks who voted for the President vetoing the tariff bill also voted for Congressman DICKINSON in the primaries, as there were other issues at stake. We believe it can be fairly stated that the big majority of people in Iowa would feel that the President would be rendering a real service by vetoing the present tariff measure in case it should pass. It is generally considered out here in Iowa that the country would be better off without any new tariff legislation at all than with the present bill before Congress. More advocates of the tariff bill were backing Governor Hammill than Congressman DICKINSON. Again we want to say most emphatically that in our opinion it was not the issue in the primary campaign to which Mr. DICKINSON could attribute his victory. We believe it can be fairly said that he received more support from the folks who opposed the tariff bill than he did from those who were in favor of it. Mr. DICKINSON and the eastern leaders could hardly make a more serious mistake than to construe his victory as an indorsement of the tariff bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE].

Mr. FESS and Mr. WATSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. He desires to have the Senate proceed with the unfinished business, and the Chair is undertaking to state the pending question.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. FESS. After the address of the Senator from Mississippi I think it would be proper to insert in the RECORD the vote of 39 Members on the Democratic side on the various items of the measure denominated by the Senator from Mississippi "the Grundy tariff bill." I have had a table prepared which gives it accurately from the RECORD, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to insert the material immediately following the Senator's address.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, which I am not going to do, because it is all right, I will merely state for the benefit of the RECORD that already leave has been granted for the publication in document form of every vote upon the part of every Senator on all the items of the tariff bill, which will tell the story.

Mr. FESS. That, however, does not appear in connection with the Senator's speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter submitted by Mr. FESS is as follows:

Table showing precisely the votes of the 39 Democratic Senators on the tariff bill during the months of its consideration by the Senate

Senators	For increases	Against decreases
Ashurst	19	13
Barkley	5	7
Black	5	7
Blease	2	3
Bratton	24	13
Brock	5	10
Broussard	39	64
Caraway	7	2
Connally	21	12
Copeland	19	35
Dill	17	22
Fletcher	27	8
George	9	6
Glass	1	2
Harris	11	4
Harrison	4	3
Hawes	9	23
Hayden	19	15
Heflin	13	9
Kendrick	63	10
King	1	1
McKellar	12	14
Overman	1	3
Pittman	25	19
Robinson of Arkansas	1	0
Ransdell	34	44
Sheppard	32	12
Simmons	2	4
Smith	0	1
Steck	14	10

Table showing precisely the votes of the 39 Democratic Senators on the tariff bill during the months of its consideration by the Senate—Con.

Senators	For increases	Against decreases
Stephens	9	3
Swanson	4	4
Thomas of Oklahoma	17	15
Trammell	21	23
Tydings	3	9
Wagner	10	23
Walsh of Montana	6	8
Walsh of Massachusetts	9	10
Wheeler	6	12

TARIFF

SENATOR HENRY F. ASHURST

Voted for increases

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 10, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

February 1, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to place a duty on crude gypsum.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on timber.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on sodium sulphate, anhydrous.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on grapes.

Voted against decreases

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment reducing the duty on wools from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

January 31, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to strike out the duty on cement.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

SENATOR ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

February 1, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to place a duty on crude gypsum.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to increase the duty on casein.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

SENATOR HUGO L. BLACK

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's rate 8 cents per pound.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction in rate on calcium carbide from 1 to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR COLE. L. BLEASE

Voted for increases

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 to one-half of 1 per cent per pound.

November 14, 1929, voted against the motion of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to strike out paragraph 402, which removed the duty on maple and certain other flooring.

March 7, 1930, voted against Mr. KEAN's amendment to reduce the duty on cement, in House text, from 8 to 6 cents.

SENATOR SAM G. BRATTON

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for the 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate 3½, Mr. SHORTRIDGE's 8 cents per pound.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 10, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment increasing the duty on cattle.

February 24, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on wool yarns.

February 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma for a duty on oil, gasoline, etc.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's amendment for a duty on hides, leathers, and shoes.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE's amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment reducing ing the duty on wools from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

December 12, 1929, voted against Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to reduce the specific duty on wool and hair advanced beyond washing, etc.

February 21, 1930, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on sisal cordage.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to put goat and kid leather on the free list.

SENATOR WILLIAM E. BROCK

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

January 20, 1930, voted for the committee amendment for higher rates on basic paper.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

February 17, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Montana, to reduce the duty on aluminum.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 12, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendments to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

SENATOR EDWIN S. BROUSSARD

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents. The committee rate, 3½ cents. Mr. SHORTRIDGE's, 8 cents per pound.

October 25, 1929, voted for committee amendment increasing the duty on transparent cellulose sheets from 45 to 50 cents per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH's amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

October 31, 1929, voted to place a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on lithium and other new elements.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

January 6, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the ad valorem part of the duty on yarn, etc.

January 7, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on woven fabrics of silk, etc.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the rate on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 24, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on wool yarns.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on timber.

February 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma for a duty on oil, gasoline, etc.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on sodium sulphate, anhydrous.

March 12, 1930, voted for an increase on iron in pigs.

March 13, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on spring clothespins.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 17, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's amendment for a duty on hides, leathers, and shoes.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE's amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on chinaware, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to restore the duties on wire fencing.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on pincers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on wood veneers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on grapes.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized paper.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against a reduction of the rate on calcium carbide from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment reducing the rate on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 6, 1929, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to the committee amendment to reduce the duty on iron in pigs, etc.

November 13, 1929, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's substitute for paragraph 367, which reduced certain rates as to watch movements.

November 14, 1929, voted against the motion of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, to strike out paragraph 402, which removed the duty on maple and other flooring.

November 14, 1929, voted against the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, to reduce the duty on spring clothespins.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on wools from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute, which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment, which would lower the duty on wool rags.

December 12, 1929, voted against Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to reduce the specific duty on wool and hair advanced beyond washing, etc.

January 16, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on sugars.

January 21, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, to reduce the duty on cork insulation.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. SIMMONS's amendment to reduce the minimum duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 30, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on straw hats.

January 31, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to strike out the duty on cement.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on acetic anhydride.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on formic acid.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment reducing the duty on chalk, whiting, etc.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. COPELAND's amendment reducing the duty on gelatin, glue, etc.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment reducing the duty on cellulose compounds.

February 6, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to strike out the duty on baking soda.

February 6, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on formaldehyde.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on white lead.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on lead pigments.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on carbon black.

January 10, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on spirit varnishes.

January 10, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to strike out the duty on common brick.

January 11, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on sheet and cylinder glass.

January 11, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

January 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to eliminate the duty (additional) on hollow bars.

January 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on wire rods.

January 17, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Montana to reduce the duty on aluminum.

January 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on aluminum utensils.

January 21, 1930, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on sisal cordage.

January 24, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duties on men's, boys', etc., clothing.

January 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

February 26, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to reduce the duty on fur hats, etc.

February 26, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to reduce the duty on photographic dry plates.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on sodium and potassium.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the specific part of the duty on earthenware and crockeryware, undecorated.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on sheet glass.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on plate glass.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in striking out the duty on maple flooring, etc.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent rate on sugar.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on maple sugar.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on cartridge shells.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to place goat and kid leather on the free list.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on goat and kid leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on upholstery leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 19, 1930, voted against the amendment for free cement for public use.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

SENATOR T. H. CARAWAY

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma for a duty on oil, gasoline, etc.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

SENATOR ROYAL S. COPELAND

Voted for increases

October 31, 1929, voted to place a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on lithium and other new elements.

February 1, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to place a duty on crude gypsum.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to increase the duty on casein.

March 12, 1930, voted for an increase of duty on iron in pigs.

March 13, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on spring clothespins.

March 15, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on shoes, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on laces.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on acetic acid.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on chinaware, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to restore the duties on wire fencing.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on pincers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on wood veneers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

Voted against decreases

October 22, 1929, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on tannic acid, etc. (medicinal), from 20 to 18 cents per pound.

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. SIMMONS's amendment to reduce the minimum duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 28, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendments to reduce the duty on straw hats.

January 31, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to strike out the duty on cement.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment reducing the duty on hydrocarbon derivatives.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on lead pigments.

February 10, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on spirit varnishes.

February 10, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to strike out the duty on common brick.

February 11, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

February 17, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Montana to reduce the duty on aluminum.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duties on men's, boys', etc., clothing.

February 26, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to reduce the duty on fur hats, etc.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on litharge.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on sodium and potassium.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the specific part of the duty on earthenware and crockery ware, undecorated.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on plate glass.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in striking out the duty on maple flooring, etc.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on maple sugar.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on cartridge shells.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to place goat and kid leather on the free list.

March 19, 1930, voted against the amendment for free cement for public use.

March 20, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on tiles.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to strike out the duty on brick.

SENATOR TOM CONNALLY

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

December 10, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma for a duty on oil, gasoline, etc.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE's amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on grapes.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on China clay or kaolin.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment reducing the duty on wools from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would lower the duty on wool rags.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on coarser wools.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

SENATOR C. C. DILL

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee rate was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on timber.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to increase the duty on casein.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 14, 1929, voted against the motion of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to strike out paragraph 402 which removed the duty on maple and certain other flooring.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on wools from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

January 31, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. MCMASTER to strike out the duty on cement.

February 10, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to strike out the duty on common brick.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on litharge.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in striking out the duty on maple flooring, etc.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on maple sugar.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to strike out the duty on brick.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on buttons of agate, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on matches.

SENATOR DUNCAN U. FLETCHER

Voted for increases

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH's amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 1, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to place a duty on crude gypsum.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment increasing the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment increasing the duty on dates in packages.

February 20, 1930, voted for Mr. BROOKHART's amendment increasing the duty on lard.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on timber.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to increase the duty on casein.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on all starch.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on acetic acid.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on chinaware, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on wood veneers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on grapes.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the specific part of the duty on earthenware and crockery ware, undecorated.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on buttons of agate, etc.

SENATOR WALTER F. GEORGE

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN'S amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for reconsideration of the vote adopting the amendment reducing the rates on wrapper tobacco.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the specific part of the duty on earthenware and crockery ware, undecorated.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

SENATOR CARTER GLASS

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE'S amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment was 8 cents per pound.

Voted against decreases

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER'S amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

SENATOR WILLIAM J. HARRIS

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE'S amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment was 8 cents per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH'S amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for reconsideration of the vote adopting the amendment reducing the rates on wrapper tobacco.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER'S amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR PAT HARRISON

Voted for increases

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN'S amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER'S amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

SENATOR HARRY B. HAWES

Voted for increases

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN'S amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES'S amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on broomcorn.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE'S amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment reducing the duty on hydrocarbon derivatives.

February 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment to eliminate the additional duty on hollow bars.

February 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment to reduce the duty on wire rods.

February 21, 1930, voted against Mr. BLAINE'S amendment to reduce the duty on sisal cordage.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on litharge.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on sheet glass.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on plate glass.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on cartridge shells.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to place goat and kid leather on the free list.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on upholstery leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE'S amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment was 8 cents per pound.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 10, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT'S amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment as amended to increase the duty on wool rags.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment increasing the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN'S amendment increasing the duty on dates in packages.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT'S amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN'S amendment to increase the duty on sodium sulphate, anhydrous.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the reconsideration of the vote adopting the amendment reducing the rates on wrapper tobacco.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE'S amendment for a duty on hides, leathers, and shoes.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on grapes.

Voted against decreases

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on wool from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE'S amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE'S amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF'S substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM'S amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE'S amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to place goat and kid leather on the free list.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on buttons of agate, etc.

SENATOR J. THOMAS HEFLIN

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE'S amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment was 8 cents per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH'S amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

January 20, 1930, voted for the committee amendment for higher rates on basic paper.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN'S amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment reducing the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER'S amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR JOHN B. KENDRICK

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE'S amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S was 8 cents per pound.

October 25, 1929, voted for the committee amendment increasing the duty on transparent cellulose from 45 to 50 cents per pound.

October 25, 1929, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on agar-agar.

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH'S amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

October 31, 1929, voted to place a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on lithium and other new elements.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

January 6, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the ad valorem part of the duty on yarn, etc.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE'S first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE'S second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN'S amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN'S amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 20, 1930, voted for Mr. BROOKHART'S amendment to increase the duty on lard.

February 24, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on wool yarns.

March 17, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE'S amendment for a duty on hides, leathers, and shoes.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE'S amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on laces.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES'S amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on acetic acid.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on chinaware, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on broomcorn.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against the reduction of the rate on calcium carbide from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment reducing the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 6, 1929, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment to the committee amendment to reduce the duty on iron in pigs, etc.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

November 14, 1929, voted against the motion of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to strike out paragraph 402, which removed the duty on maple and certain other flooring.

November 14, 1929, voted against the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to reduce the duty on spring clothespins.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on wools from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

January 16, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON'S amendment to reduce the duty on sugars.

January 21, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to reduce the duty on cork insulation.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. SIMMON'S amendment to reduce the minimum duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 29, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendments to reduce the duty on straw hats.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment reducing the duty on hydrocarbon derivatives.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. COPELAND'S amendment reducing the duty on gelatin, glue, etc.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment reducing the duty on compounds of cellulose.

February 6, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment to reduce the duty on formaldehyde.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON'S amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment to reduce the duty on carbon black.

February 10, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment to strike out the duty on common brick.

February 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment to eliminate the additional duty on hollow bars.

February 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment to reduce the duty on wire rods.

February 21, 1930, voted against Mr. BLAINE'S amendment to reduce the duty on sisal cordage.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY'S amendment to reduce the duties on men's, boys', etc., clothing.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE'S amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on goat and kid leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on side upper leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on upholstery leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 20, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on tiles.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to strike out the duty on brick.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on buttons of agate, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on matches.

SENATOR WILLIAM H. KING

Voted for increases

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT'S amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

Voted against decreases

January 16, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON'S motion to reduce the duty on sugars.

SENATOR KENNETH D. M'KELLAR

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE'S amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment was 8 cents per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH'S amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

January 20, 1930, voted for the committee amendment for higher rates on basic paper.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE'S first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE'S second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1929, voted for Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment increasing the duty on cattle.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on hides.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER'S amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. SIMMONS'S amendment to reduce the minimum duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 31, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER'S amendment to strike out the duty on cement.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 19, 1930, voted against the amendment for free cement for public use.

SENATOR LEE S. OVERMAN

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE'S amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE'S amendment was 8 cents per pound.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER'S amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER'S amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

SENATOR KEY PITTMAN

Voted for increases

October 31, 1929, voted to place a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on lithium and other new elements.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 10, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT'S amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN'S amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN'S amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 20, 1930, voted for Mr. BROOKHART'S amendment to increase the duty on lard.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES'S amendment for a duty on timber.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to increase the duty on casein.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on sodium sulphate, anhydrous.

March 13, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on spring clothespins.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's amendment for a duty on hides, leathers, and shoes.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE's amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 to one-half of 1 cent pound.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duties of men's, boys', etc., clothing.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on sodium and potassium.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on sheet glass.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on plate glass.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to place goat and kid leather on the free list.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 20, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on tiles.

SENATOR JOSEPH E. RANSDELL

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee rate was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

October 25, 1929, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on transparent cellulose from 45 to 50 cents per pound.

October 31, 1929, voted to place a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on lithium and other new elements.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

January 6, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on the ad valorem part of the duty on yarn, etc.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on timber.

February 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma for a duty on oil, gasoline, etc.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 13, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on spring clothespins.

March 13, 1930, voted for the concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the reconsideration of the vote adopting the amendment reducing the rates on wrapper tobacco.

March 17, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's amendment for a duty on hides, leathers, and shoes.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE's amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on acetic acid.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on wood veneers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on broomcorn.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against the reduction of the rate on calcium carbide from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 6, 1929, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to the committee amendment to reduce the duty on iron in pigs, etc.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

November 14, 1929, voted against the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to reduce the duty on spring clothespins.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment, which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

December 12, 1929, voted against Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to reduce the specific duty on wool and hair advanced beyond washing, etc.

January 16, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on sugars.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. SIMMONS's amendment to reduce the minimum duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 29, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendments to reduce the duty on straw hats.

January 31, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to strike out the duty on cement.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on acetic anhydride.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment reducing the duty on hydrocarbon derivatives.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. COPELAND's amendment reducing the duty on gelatin, glue, etc.

February 6, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment striking out the duty on baking soda.

February 6, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on formaldehyde.

February 10, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on spirit varnishes.

February 11, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on sheet and cylinder glass.

February 11, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

February 21, 1930, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on sisal cordage.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duties on men's, boys', etc., clothing.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on coarser wools.

February 25, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on spun silk.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on litharge.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on sodium and potassium.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on sheet glass.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of duty on plate glass.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on goat and kid leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on upholstery leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 19, 1930, voted against the amendment for free cement for public use.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to strike out the duty on brick.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on buttons of agate, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on matches.

SENATOR JOSEPH T. ROBINSON OF ARKANSAS

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

SENATOR MORRIS SHEPPARD

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee rate was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH's amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

December 10, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

January 20, 1930, voted for the committee amendment for higher rates on basic paper.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's first amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 10, 1930, voted for Mr. CAPPER's amendment increasing the rate on certain starches.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 20, 1930, voted for Mr. BROOKHART's amendment to increase the duty on lard.

February 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma for a duty on oil, gasoline, etc.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to increase the duty on casein.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's amendment for a duty on hides, leathers, and shoes.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE's amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on all starch.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on China clay or kaolin.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on wools from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR F. M. SIMMONS

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR ELLISON D. SMITH

Voted against decreases

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

SENATOR DANIEL F. STECK

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

January 20, 1930, voted for the committee amendment for higher rates on basic paper.

February 1, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to place a duty on crude gypsum.

February 10, 1930, voted for Mr. CAPPER's amendment to increase the rate on certain starches.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 6, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to increase the duty on casein.

March 17, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on crude beeswax.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on all starch.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on chinaware, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment placing a duty on crude gypsum, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on wood veneers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on broomcorn.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

February 10, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on spirit varnishes.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 22, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on buttons of agate, etc.

SENATOR HUBERT D. STEPHENS

Voted for increases

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on timber.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

Voted against decreases

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR CLAUDE A. SWANSON

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½, the committee rate was 3½, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

January 20, 1930, voted for the committee amendment for higher rates on basic paper.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR ELMER THOMAS, OF OKLAHOMA

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee rate was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted for Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH's amendment to increase the duty on olive oil in containers.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's amendment to increase the duty on hides.

January 24, 1930, voted for Mr. ODDIE's second amendment to increase the duty on hides.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for reconsideration of the vote adopting the amendment reducing rates on wrapper tobacco.

March 19, 1930, voted for the amendment for a duty on petroleum, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted for Mr. PINE's amendment for a duty of 50 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty of 40 cents per barrel on petroleum.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on pincers.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take denatured vegetable oils from the free list.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place petroleum, crude and refined, on the dutiable list at 10 and 20 per cent.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on white lead.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on lead pigments.

February 11, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on sheet and cylinder glass.

February 11, 1930, voted against Mr. MCMASTER's amendment to reduce the duty on plate glass.

February 25, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on spun silk.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of the duty on sheet glass.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to strike out the duty on brick.

SENATOR PARK TRAMMELL

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½ cents per pound on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee rate was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

November 5, 1929, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment to restore the duty on silica, crude and suitable for pigments.

December 10, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

January 28, 1930, voted for the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to increase the duty on vegetable oils.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. PITTMAN's amendment placing a duty on silver ores.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 20, 1930, voted for Mr. BROOKHART's amendment to increase the duty on lard.

February 27, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on timber.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 5, 1930, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on sugar.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

March 20, 1930, voted for Mr. JONES's amendment for a duty on lumber, etc.

March 20, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on acetic acid.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on chinaware, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on grapes.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on jute, etc.

Voted against decreases

October 23, 1929, voted against reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment striking out the specific duty on undecorated earthenware, etc.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

November 14, 1929, voted against the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to reduce the duty on spring clothespins.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's substitute which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment reducing the duty on hydrocarbon derivatives.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment reducing the duty on ethylene glycol.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. COPELAND's amendment reducing the duty on gelatin, glue, etc.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on white lead.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on lead pigments.

February 10, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on spirit varnishes.

February 11, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on sheet and cylinder glass.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the specific part of the duty on earthenware and crockery ware, undecorated.

March 12, 1930, voted against concurring in the reduction of the duty on sheet glass.

March 13, 1930, voted against reconsidering the vote for a 2-cent sugar rate.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on cartridge shells.

March 17, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to eliminate the countervailing duty on coal.

SENATOR MILLARD E. TYDINGS

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½ cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee's amendment was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

February 19, 1930, voted for Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to increase the duty on dates in packages.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

Voted against decreases

October 28, 1929, voted against Mr. WAGNER's amendment to reduce the duty on olive oil in containers.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 30, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duty on straw hats.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment reducing the duty on ethylene glycol.

February 17, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Montana reducing the duty on aluminum.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the minimum rate on rayon filaments and yarns.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on cartridge shells.

SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

Voted for increases

October 31, 1929, voted to place a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem upon lithium and other new elements.

January 20, 1930, voted for the committee amendment for higher rates on basic paper.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

March 12, 1930, voted for an increase of duty on iron in pigs.

March 15, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on shoes, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duties on chinaware, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on wood veneers.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to place duties on basic and sensitized papers.

March 22, 1930, voted for the amendment to take creosote and anthracene oils from the free list.

Voted against decreases

October 22, 1929, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's motion to reduce the duty on tannic acid, etc. (medicinal) from 20 to 18 cents per pound.

October 22, 1929, voted against the reduction of rate on calcium carbide from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. SIMMONS's amendment to reduce the minimum duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 29, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendments to reduce the duty on straw hats.

February 5, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment reducing the duty on hydrocarbon derivatives.

February 7, 1930, voted against Mr. HARRISON's amendment to reduce the duty on lead pigments.

February 17, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to eliminate the additional duty on hollow bars.

February 17, 1930, voted against the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Montana to reduce the duty on aluminum.

March 5, 1930, voted against Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to reduce the duty on calcium carbide.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on red lead.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on sodium and potassium.

March 7, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment striking out the duty on cement.

March 13, 1930, voted against the motion to reconsider the vote fixing a 6-cent duty on cement.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on maple sugar.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on cartridge shells.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to place goat and kid leather on the free list.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on side upper leather.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 19, 1930, voted against the amendment for free cement for public use.

March 21, 1930, voted against the amendment to strike out the duty on brick.

SENATOR DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Voted for increases

October 25, 1929, voted for the committee amendment increasing the duty on transparent cellulose sheets from 45 to 50 cents per pound.

October 26, 1929, voted for Mr. GILLETT's amendment increasing the duty on paints used by school children.

November 8, 1929, voted for the committee amendment to strike out the 25 per cent ad valorem on wood screws of iron or steel, which would increase the duty to 45 per cent under the blanket clause.

January 6, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the ad valorem part of the duty on yarn, etc.

February 6, 1930, voted for Mr. KEAN's amendment increasing the duty on synthetic camphor.

February 24, 1930, voted for the committee amendment to increase the duty on wool yarns.

March 14, 1930, voted for the amendment increasing the rates on mica.

March 15, 1930, voted for the amendment to increase the duty on shoes, etc.

March 21, 1930, voted for the amendment to place a duty on cotton blankets.

Voted against decreases

November 13, 1929, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's substitute for paragraph 367, which reduced certain rates as to watch movements.

December 12, 1929, voted against Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to reduce the specific duty on wool and hair advanced beyond washing, etc.

January 27, 1930, voted against Mr. WHEELER's amendment to reduce the duty on filaments and yarns of rayon.

January 29, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendments to reduce the duty on straw hats.

February 21, 1930, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amednment to reduce the duty on sisal cordage.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to reduce the duties on men's, boys', etc., clothing.

March 14, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on sole leather, etc.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to place goat and kid leather on the free list.

March 17, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on side upper leather.

SENATOR THOMAS J. WALSH, OF MONTANA

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee rate was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

December 20, 1929, voted for Mr. SMOOT's amendment to increase the duty on thread or yarn waste.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

February 1, 1930, voted for Mr. COPELAND's amendment to place a duty on crude gypsum.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

Voted against decreases

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's amendment which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on the coarser wools.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

SENATOR BURTON K. WHEELER

Voted for increases

October 24, 1929, voted for Mr. BLAINE's amendment for 5½-cent rate on casein. The House rate was 2½ cents, the committee rate was 3½ cents, and Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment was 8 cents per pound.

December 11, 1929, voted for the committee amendment, as amended, to increase the duty on wool rags.

February 18, 1930, voted for Mr. CONNALLY's amendment to increase the duty on cattle.

March 3, 1930, voted for Mr. SHORTRIDGE's amendment for a duty on long-staple cotton.

March 13, 1930, voted for concurrence in the amendment increasing the duty on mustard seed.

March 19, 1930, voted for a duty on silver ores.

Voted against decreases

November 5, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on china clay or kaolin.

November 11, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on tungsten ore.

November 21, 1929, voted against the committee amendment to reduce the duty on wool from 34 to 31 cents per pound.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on card and burr waste.

December 10, 1929, voted against Mr. BLAINE's amendment to reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. METCALF's amendment which would reduce the duty on wool rags.

December 11, 1929, voted against Mr. BINGHAM's amendment which would operate to lower the duty on wool rags.

February 24, 1930, voted against Mr. GEORGE's amendment to reduce the duty on coarser wools.

March 6, 1930, voted against concurring in the amendment to reduce the duty on litharge.

March 13, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on mustard seed.

March 15, 1930, voted against the amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

March 15, 1930, voted against the second amendment to reduce the duty on hides.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I had expected to make a few remarks, wholly unnecessary, of course, in answer to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], but the Senator from Michigan rose to his feet more quickly than I did and was recognized, and hence I can not obtain the floor in my own right.

However, as a part of my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to do so, an Associated Press story of a speech made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] on the 31st of May, 1922, predicting the overwhelming defeat of the Republican Party everywhere as a result of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill; also a speech made on the 26th day of October, 1924, in the Coolidge-Davis presidential campaign, in which he made the same prediction for the same reason; also a speech made by my friend from Mississippi on the 16th of August, 1926—in fact, this was not a speech, but an editorial upon an interview after he had returned from Europe, in which he told about what a terrible abomination the tariff was and how the European debtors of the United States could not pay unless the United States removed the tariff on goods, and all that sort of thing.

I can not take time to discuss these matters at some little length because the Senator from Michigan has the floor. All I want to do is to ask unanimous consent, with the permission of my good friend from Mississippi, to insert these in the RECORD. If opportunity is afforded I shall discuss at some length later on the accuracy of the prophecies of my friend from Mississippi.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRISON. Reserving the right to object, I merely want to express my thanks to the Senator from Indiana for embellishing the RECORD by inserting in it these very illuminating speeches, and also to express the hope that the Senator from Indiana will send them out as a campaign document for the Republican Party in the coming campaign. They will not do his party any good.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Indiana is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1922]

SENATOR HARRISON SEES G. O. P. DEFEAT—DECLARES REPUBLICANS HAVE NO LEADER AND CALLS TARIFF BILL "INIQUITOUS"—GIVES TWO ADDRESSES IN DAY—TRIBUTE PAID TO WOODROW WILSON AS "GREATEST PILOT WHO EVER LED SHIP OF STATE"

WILMINGTON, N. C., May 30, (by Associated Press).—With the assertions that the Republican Party is without a leader; that it has failed to keep its promises made in the last presidential election, Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, speaking at a luncheon tendered him here to-day by the chamber of commerce, predicted that the next Congress will have a Democratic majority and that President Harding will be succeeded by a Democrat at the end of his present term.

MONUMENT IS UNVEILED

Senator HARRISON was the principal speaker at memorial exercises here to-day in memory of New Hanover County men killed in the World War. In connection with the memorial exercises a monument to the World War dead of the county was unveiled and dedicated.

In Senator HARRISON'S memorial address he steered clear of politics. But in his address before business men at a luncheon in his honor he left the solemn vein which characterized his memorial address and discussed political issues.

The Republicans have failed badly, the Senator stated. That which the Republican Congress has done has been all wrong, he said, while it has left undone those things which are most needed and should have been the first to be disposed of.

CALLS TARIFF "INIQUITOUS"

The passage of certain tax bills, the seating of Senator Newberry, and the pending "iniquitous" tariff measure are some of the things which Senator HARRISON declared have had much to do with causing the Republicans to lose the confidence of the people and causing dissatisfaction throughout the country. He said that the Republicans will be held to strict accountability in the November election and predicted a Democratic victory.

"A few Democrats supported Harding, but they know better now," he said. "They have seen the error of their way, and never again will they be held away from the party that stands for all the people."

In his memorial address Senator HARRISON paid tribute to former President Woodrow Wilson. The speaker was loudly applauded many times during his address, but nothing brought such an outburst as his reference to Mr. Wilson, whose childhood home was in Wilmington.

"Woodrow Wilson was the greatest pilot who ever guided the ship of state," the speaker stated, adding that Mr. Wilson "is as much a wounded soldier as any veteran now in the Government hospitals."

[From Washington Star, October 26, 1924]

DECLARES ELECTION OF DAVIS ASSURED—HARRISON SAYS LA FOLLETTE WILL CARRY MORE STATES THAN COOLIDGE

President's Coolidge's election November 4 is an impossibility, according to the opinion expressed by Senator PAT HARRISON, Democrat, of Mississippi, in a speech delivered last night from WRC radio station.

Senator HARRISON declared not only that Coolidge has not the slightest chance to obtain the necessary majority of the electoral college, but that John W. Davis, the Democratic nominee, will be the next President. He said that Davis will be either elected by a sufficient number of electoral votes, or he will be the choice in the event the selection is thrown into the House of Representatives.

In explanation he contended that Senator La Follette will draw his support almost entirely from the Republican Party and that he will carry more States than will President Coolidge.

[From the Washington Post, August 16, 1926]

PAT HARRISON ABROAD

After an exploration of Europe for several days Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, turns in his report to the American people. He visited Germany, Belgium, and France. In the course of his perilous journey he was held up by French customs officers and made to pay duty on 39 cigars. Then, in Paris, he entered into extended pourparlers with taxi drivers, hotel couriers, and waiters at boulevard cafés. The data thus accumulated, after careful coordination and analysis, have yielded this distilled wisdom:

1. A high tariff is an abomination.
2. The European debtors of the United States can not pay unless the United States removes its tariff on their goods.
3. As the demand for payment of these debts is unabated, it follows that the tariff will be the leading issue in the campaign of 1928.

Senator HARRISON, it must be admitted, is supported in his reasoning by more complete data than are usually gathered by those who insist that the United States shall pay Europe's debt by admitting Europe's goods into this country free. Few statesmen holding that view have been the victims of French rapacity at the customs border, and fewer still are qualified to confer in Parisian French with taxi drivers, couriers, and waiters on matters of pith and moment affecting the equilibrium of States. Usually the argument for abolition of the tariff is advanced by gentlemen who have no data except such as are generated by spontaneous combustion of brain cells suddenly called upon to perform extra duty. The short-circuiting of intellect often causes a supernatural incandescence that is easily mistaken for the light of reason, when in fact it is the warning of annihilation.

But Senator HARRISON is not of that ilk. He believes in personal research as a means of vindicating opinions already formed. His experience on the French border and the information he has gathered in Paris fully bear out the conclusions he had reached long before he began his epoch-making voyage, and which he had expressed in extenso with a wealth of eloquence and wit upon the floor of the Senate. French customs officers, waiters, taxi drivers, et al. would be rendering poor service to their country if they failed to supply its champion with data whereby he can force the United States to close its factories for the benefit of Europe. They did not fail. They gave to Senator HARRISON the information he was seeking. He will do the rest.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I want to proceed now. I am getting tired of this political "bosh."

Mr. WATSON. I hope when the Senator refers to "political bosh" he refers to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COUZENS. I do! [Laughter.]

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

Mr. COUZENS. I decline to yield. I desire to proceed with the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

PAYMENT OF JUDGMENTS—TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 185)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations (indefinite) for "Payment of judgments, United States district courts, Treasury Department," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FEDERATION INTERALLIEE DES ANCIENS COMBATTANTS (S. DOC. NO. 186)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State, fiscal year 1930, to remain available until June 30, 1931, amounting to $25,000, for the contribution by the United States for the expenses and entertainment, while in the United States, of delegates from foreign countries participating in the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Federation Interalliee des Anciens Combattants, to be held in Washington in September, 1930, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 184)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1931, amounting to $93,900, and a draft of proposed legislation pertaining to an existing appropriation, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the One hundred and forty-second Annual General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at Cincinnati, Ohio, declaring its belief "that the right and duty of citizenship should not be conditioned upon the test of ability or willingness, contrary to conscience, to bear arms or to take part as a combatant of war," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATOR TRAMMELL'S VIEWS ON THE TARIFF

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief telegram received from the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times and my reply thereto relative to the tariff bill recently passed by Congress.

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

TAMPA, FLA., *June 16, 1930.*

HON. PARK TRAMMELL,
United States Senate:

Please wire night press collect 500-word statement on how Florida will be benefited, if any, by new tariff schedules.

Thank you.

TAMPA DAILY TIMES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 16, 1930.*

TAMPA DAILY TIMES,
Tampa, Fla.:

You ask me "how Florida will be benefited, if any, by the new tariff schedules." Answering, will say because Florida will no longer have to sell practically all that it produces in an unprotected market and buy all that it buys in a protected market, as under all previous tariff laws. With reasonable protective duties on fruits and vegetables and other farm products competing with our Florida products the great agricultural industries now languishing and struggling in Florida for their existence will be rescued and saved from destruction by foreign competition. Certainly no one can believe that our farmers could have long survived with Mexico, Cuba, and other foreign countries with 40-cents-a-day farm labor and about the same transportation charges to our markets, increasing their shipments by leaps and bounds in competition with our Florida products. If the disaster was impending and we have checked it, Florida has been benefited. With our farmers prosperous, this prosperity is reflected in our villages, our towns and cities and its reflex reaches the manufacturer, the banker, the professions, the merchants, and the laborer. The opposite is true if agriculture is depressed. The Democratic Party in its convention in 1928 declared for a tariff that would be sufficient to meet the lower cost of foreign labor, to guarantee to the American laborer a fair wage, and to give a reasonable return on capital invested in American industries. Heretofore farm products and some other products in Florida have not had that degree of protection pledged by the National Democratic Party. Now, while our Florida producers on at least an equal footing with the foreigner, I have great hope for agriculture in our State. Some other industries in Florida, given a little protection, should also be benefited. I voted for the tariff bill primarily because of the protection it affords Florida products and also because I felt that all in all the legislation would be of more benefit to our State than a continuation of the present tariff law which protects most everything that Floridians buy and practically nothing that we sell. I had to choose between the two. There is much in the new bill of which I do not approve, but this is equally true of the tariff law now being superseded by the new legislation. No tariff law has ever been a panacea for all ills, and it is too much to forecast that this new one will be. I believe, however, from Florida's standpoint, that it will be better for the State than to have retained the old law. The sponsors of the new legislation have praised it too much, its enemies have condemned it recklessly and, in my opinion, to an unjustifiable extent. When the ill effects of the criticism blow over and the country once again gets down to business, I believe that Florida will be better off than it would have been without the protective duties given us in the main on our farm and grove products.

PARK TRAMMELL.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. KEYES, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12343) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept donations of sites for public buildings, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1057) thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and a report as indicated:

H. R. 12099. An act to apply the pension laws to the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 1058); and

H. R. 12586. An act granting an increase of pension to Josefa T. Philips.

Mr. DALE, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12663) granting the consent of Congress to the Texas & Pacific Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across Sulphur River in the State of Arkansas near Fort Lynn, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1059) thereon.

Mr. HOWELL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 650) for the payment of damages to certain citizens of California and other owners of property damaged by the flood, caused by reason of artificial obstructions to the natural flow of water being placed in the Picacho and Noname Washes by an agency of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1061) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 917. An act for the relief of John Panza and Rose Panza (Rept. No. 1062); and

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Elizabeth B. Dayton (Rept. No. 1063).

Mr. McMASTER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 47. An act for the relief of the State of New York (Rept. No. 1064); and

H. R. 2222. An act for the relief of Laurin Gosney (Rept. No. 1065).

Mr. McMASTER, also from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of J. A. Miller (Rept. No. 1066); and

H. R. 6663. An act for the relief of J. N. Lewis (Rept. No. 1067).

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Jacob S. Steloff (Rept. No. 1068);

H. R. 2464. An act for the relief of Paul A. Hodapp (Rept. No. 1069);

H. R. 7026. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fanor Flores and Pedro Flores (Rept. No. 1070);

H. R. 8723. An act for the relief of Rachel Levy (Rept. No. 1071); and

H. R. 11493. An act to reimburse Lieut. Col. Charles F. Sargent (Rept. No. 1072).

Mr. GLENN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 191) for the relief of George B. Marx, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1076) thereon.

Mr. HOWELL, from the Committee on Claims, submitted the views of the minority to accompany the foregoing bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2156) authorizing the sale of all of the interest and rights of the United States of America in the Columbia Arsenal property, situated in the ninth civil district of Maury County, Tenn., and providing that the net fund be deposited in the military post construction fund, and for the repeal of Public Law No. 542 (H. R. 12479), Seventieth Congress, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1073) thereon.

Mr. BRATTON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 4435) for the relief of James Williamson and those claiming under or through him, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1074) thereon.

Mr. CUTTING, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11477) for the relief of Clifford J. Turner, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1075) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that to-day, June 20, 1930, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2414. An act authorizing the Government of the United States to participate in the international hygiene exhibition at Dresden, Germany, from May 6, 1930, to October 1, 1930, inclusive;

S. 2834. An act to establish a hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii;

S. 3258. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

S. 3341. An act providing for the acquirement of additional lands for the naval air station at Seattle, Wash.;

S. 3619. An act to reorganize the Federal Power Commission;

S. 4017. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928, pertaining to certain War Department contracts by repealing the expiration date of that act;

S. 4518. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across Little River in the State of Arkansas at or near Morris Ferry; and

S. 4606. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Georgia and the counties of Wilkinson, Washington, and Johnson to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Oconee River at or near Balls Ferry, Ga.

REPORT OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

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. FESS:

A bill (S. 4736) to provide for an investigation as to the location and probable cost of a southern approach road to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 4737) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Walker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

A bill (S. 4738) to provide that the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the general health of the rural population of the United States and the welfare and hygiene of mothers and children; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN:

A bill (S. 4739) for the relief of Lyle O. Armel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4740) to change the name of Meridian Park in the city of Washington to Henderson Park; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 4741) granting a pension to Belle K. Hockensmith; and

A bill (S. 4742) granting a pension to Espy G. Goodpaster (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 4743) for the relief of Jose Ramon Cordova; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) authorizing investigation of certain operations on cotton exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ANNUAL EXPENSES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I proposed to introduce a joint resolution a short time ago and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] objected to its introduction. The Senator from Alabama, I understand, has withdrawn his objection, and I want to assure him that there has been no consultation with the President or anybody else in regard to the joint resolution. It was prepared and offered on my own responsibility entirely.

Mr. BLACK. I understand the joint resolution is not introduced as a result of a conference in which the President called the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] to the White House yesterday in an effort to settle the deadlock.

Mr. JONES. It has absolutely nothing to do with that whatever.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 196) to aid in determining the share of the United States toward the annual expenses of the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McMASTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $300,000 for the payment of claims in accordance with the act entitled "An act authorizing an appropriation for payment of claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of the Sioux Indians," approved June —, 1930, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12902, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $506,067.50 for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the relief of the State of Georgia for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929," approved May 27, 1930, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12902, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 for a survey by the Surgeon General in connection with the control of cancer, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12902, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12902, the second deficiency apropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed as follows:

On page 19, after line 21, to insert:

"BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

"Phony peach eradication: For supplementing the work of investigation, eradication, and control of the phony peach disease for the fiscal year 1931, $80,000, to be expended for the same purposes and subject to the same terms and conditions as the appropriation under this heading made by the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes,' approved May 27, 1930."

USE OF SILVER FOR MONETARY AND OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BRATTON (for Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 296), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Whereas the United States is a large producer of silver and in its production many thousands of American citizens find employment; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has in its Treasury silver bullion valued at more than $6,500,000; 494,000,000 coined silver dollars, against which silver certificates have been issued, and silver coins, consisting of half and quarter dollars and dimes, of the face value of more than $5,000,000, and has in circulation more than $38,500,000 and silver half dollars, quarter dollars, and dimes of the face value of more than $281,000,000, all of which were purchased at prices much higher than those now prevailing for silver bullion, and any further decline, measured by gold, in the price of silver, will result in additional losses to the Government; and

Whereas the use of silver in trade and commerce and for monetary purposes is essential, not only in the United States but throughout the world; and

Whereas a considerable part of the foreign trade of the United States is with countries in which silver is extensively used as a medium of exchange, and if the price of silver is further depressed the purchasing power of many countries will be materially reduced to their injury as well as to the injury of the United States; and

Whereas China and India, which represent more than one-half of the world's population, have been the principal consumers of silver, and any policy that will further depress the price of silver or prevent its advancement to normal levels will injuriously affect the economic and industrial condition of the United States, as well as of other countries; and

Whereas it will be advantageous for the United States to expand its foreign trade and commerce, and particularly to find markets for its surplus products in the Orient and in all silver-producing countries, such as Canada, Mexico, Bolivia, and Peru; and

Whereas efforts are being made to induce China to demonitize silver and adopt a fiscal policy calling for a new currency based upon a gold-standard fund, and to further debase silver and curtail its use in India, which said efforts, if successful, will result in a further destructive decline in the price of silver and in economic and industrial injury not alone to silver-producing countries but to all countries of the world; and

Whereas it is important not only to countries producing silver but to all countries engaged in trade and commerce that measures be adopted to avert the disastrous consequences that will inevitably follow a further decline in the price of silver, and to secure an international agreement, or the adoption of an international policy that will stabilize the price of silver and obtain for it a suitable status in the monetary systems of the world; and

Whereas it is believed by many persons that an international conference should be called for the purpose of considering and taking action upon the questions herein referred to: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to confer with such governments as he may deem proper and through such agencies as he may see fit for the purpose of ascertaining whether economic and other conditions are propitious for the convening of an international conference to consider and devise plans to increase the use of silver for monetary and other purposes, and to bring about the stabilization of the price of silver; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform Congress of his proceedings hereunder and the results thereof.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing were communicated to the Senate from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EDUCATION BY RADIO

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Advisory Committee on Education by Radio to the Secretary of the Interior.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BY RADIO TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

SIR: The advisory committee which you appointed following a conference in your office, May 24, 1929, of parties interested in educational broadcasting, respectfully reports:

I. ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE

The committee met in the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, June 13, 1929, with the United States Commissioner of Education in the chair, and organized. After a thorough discussion of work needing attention, four subcommittees were created and each member of the advisory committee was assigned by the chairman to one of these committees. They are: A committee on ways and means, which was charged with responsibilities of securing funds and administering them; a committee on fact finding, which was charged with the responsibility of canvassing the field very carefully with a view of discovering every experiment in broadcasting of an educational nature; a committee on research, which was asked to develop techniques for evaluating the effectiveness of educational programs on the radio; and an executive committee, which undertook the responsibility of coordinating the work of the other committees and of acting for the advisory committee itself in the intervals between meetings.

II. ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

This report has been made possible by grants from the Payne fund, the Carnegie Corporation, the J. C. Penney fund, and individual donors. All receipts and expenditures are set forth in the final and audited report of the committee on ways and means attached hereto as Appendix No. 1.

A more detailed statement of the activities of the committee may be had by consulting the summary of minutes which we submit herewith as Appendix No. 2.

In brief, the advisory committee accomplished its work in two more meetings (three in all). At the meeting on November 6 progress reports were received from all subcommittees, and a decision was reached to end the work of the committee, if possible, on December 31, 1929. At the second meeting, December 30, Doctor Shipherd presented for the fact-finding committee a report of 47 pages containing a summary of the work accomplished, including suggested recommendations for the advisory committee itself. This report, supported by some 146 pages of appendices Nos. A to H, inclusive, is submitted herewith as our Appendix No. 3. After thorough discussion these documents were accepted as the report of the fact-finding committee, and two letters representing views of Messrs. Aylesworth and Paley were accepted as minority reports and added thereto as appendices I and J. This committee was duly discharged, effective with the close of business December 31. The recommendations as found on pages 42 to 47 of the committee's report did not receive the approval of the advisory committee, which directed a special committee to prepare the final report and submit it by mail to every member. When a unanimity of opinion on the conclusions should be reached the report should come to you. This instruction is fulfilled by this report. Your attention is respectfully called to the following points:

III. INTEREST FOUND

There is a widespread interest in educational broadcasting evidenced by:

(a) A collection of magazine articles, press clippings, reports of experiments, and opinions of interested persons gathered by the fact-finding committee which totals approximately 1,200 items.

(b) One hundred and fifty surveys or reports on experiments in which 120 organizations interested themselves.

(c) Copies of or extracts from speeches made over the radio, totaling 1,441 items, furnished by 60 organizations.

(d) An unusually high return of answers to questionnaires sent out by the committee. Sixty-six per cent of the colleges and universities owning broadcasting stations replied; 81 per cent of the colleges and universities not owning their own stations replied; 81 per cent of the State superintendents circularized replied; 60 per cent of 3,250 questionnaires sent to superintendents of school districts having 2,500 or more population replied; over 53 per cent of the 507 questionnaires sent to commercial broadcasting stations were filled in. (See Appendix No. 3, p. 5, et seq.)

IV. EXTENT TO WHICH EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL IS BROADCAST

The fact-finding committee found that:

(a) Seventy-seven (12.3 per cent) of the 627 licensed broadcasting stations are owned and operated by educational institutions. Fifty-one of them report a weekly average of 8 hours of broadcasting, 2½ hours of which is called strictly educational.

(b) Two hundred and seventy-one commercial stations report a weekly average of 57 hours' broadcasting, of which 7½ hours (13 per cent) are called educational. The National Broadcasting Co. reports that the Damrosch music appreciation hour course in music, now in its second year, is reaching 150,000 schools. The Columbia Broadcasting System, in cooperation with the Grigsby-Grunow Co., began on February 4, 1930, an educational program in history, literature, music, and art, prepared under a corps of experts headed by Dr. William Chandler Bagley, of Columbia University. Until the middle of May two half-hour programs will be broadcast weekly.

(c) Eight State departments of public instruction report the use of the radio for educational purposes. The State of Ohio maintains an organized program of school work for one hour every school day, supported by the State legislature, which has appropriated $20,000 per year for a 2-year period. The superintendent of public instruction for the State of South Dakota reports that the educational forces of the State are organized and ready to institute a State program in South Dakota.

(d) Six hundred and thirty-five (32.6 per cent) of the 1,946 school superintendents who answered our inquiries reported radio receiving equipment installed in 1,606 school buildings. We illustrate by the following cases: 57 of the 253 Massachusetts high schools had receiving sets (1927 survey); North Carolina reaches most of its 142 high-school vocational departments by radio; South Dakota reports 22 rural schools and Iowa 46 rural schools equipped. The city of Nashville reports all schools equipped with receivers, and Cincinnati has a school-board order requiring all new schools to be "completely wired for radio."

V. NATURE OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL AND SOME PROBLEMS INVOLVED

Your committee finds that there are two distinct fields: First, broadcasting the materials of formal school work; and, second, broadcasting for adults.

Since school materials must be broadcasted during the hours schools are in session, the various time belts constitute a serious obstacle to successful work over a national chain. Probably the best units are large school districts, a radio union of school districts or State departments of education. Successful experiments have been reported from Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, New York City, Oakland, Calif., Richmond, Va., and other cities; from Fort Bend County, in Texas, where the county board of education owns and operates a station, KGHX; from a union of three counties in Illinois; and from several States, the best organized of which is Ohio.

Almost every subject has been broadcasted (see Appendix No. 3, pp. E 1–5, inclusive), but little has been done in grading the work and almost nothing in scientific evaluation of the results.

Among the many problems to be solved in this field are: (1) Ascertaining what subjects, if any, may be better taught over the radio than in formal school procedure. Many believe that courses in Government may be better taught in this way. (2) Discovering which subjects may be supplemented by radio. If much of the school work in music and in art, especially the appreciation aspects of these subjects, can be done over the radio by experts the work of the classroom teacher should become more effective. For music, the Standard music hour on the Pacific coast and the Damrosch concerts have demonstrated almost unbelievable possibilities. (3) Learning in what subjects radio may be used to stimulate interest or motivate the work. It is likely that high-school teaching in foreign language, history, literature, and science can be improved in this way. (4) Discovering the requirements in voice, composition, etc., for good teaching over the radio. (5) Finding out by actual experiment those courses which may be broadcast most satisfactorily on a local basis, on state-wide basis, and on a time-region basis. (6) Developing a plan for financing and administering broadcasting if it extends beyond the boundaries of a well-established political division. (7) Perfection tests to be used in checking the results. If the broadcasting is regional we must determine who will prepare the programs and coordinate the testing. (8) Developing a plan to keep school programs free from propaganda on one hand and the deadening effect of censorship on the other.

Broadcasting educational material intended for adults presents quite different problems. In this field experience in Europe, particularly Great Britain, deserves a special study since the English issue a magazine outlining and illustrating lectures given over the radio which is sold on the newsstands in increasing numbers. In the United States where no monopoly exists commercial stations, political parties, advertisers, organizations of many interests, several Federal departments, notably agriculture and commerce, State departments of education, colleges and universities have all tried their hand. Subjects broadcasted are as numerous as human interests are wide. (See Appendix No. 3, p. E 6–16.)

Some of the major problems are: (1) Those involved also in formal school work, such as voice, quality and tone, composition, style, etc.; (2) ascertaining the most favorable hours—for many adults evening hours only can be used; (3) determination of the proper proportions of materials of formational character and materials designed to raise standards of taste; (4) obtaining accurately listeners' reaction; (5) determining the effectiveness of radio instruction where it is formal in character; (6) ascertaining its value as compared with correspondence lessons, extramural lectures, and other devices used by university extension authorities, and as a supplement to them; (7) consideration of

the advisability of giving courses for college credit in this way. Eight institutions are now experimenting in courses for credit.

VI. RECONCILING EDUCATORS AND COMMERCIAL BROADCASTERS

In a chapter on educational extension in the Survey of Education for the biennium ending 1922, attention was called to radio particularly as a factor in university extension work. "In radio," it is written, "education has found a new and powerful ally. Sixty educational institutions are broadcasting educational and musical programs, 47 of them being colleges and universities." Thus enthusiastic in the beginning was the schoolman's interest in this subject. In 1929 educators throughout the country heartily indorsed education by radio. Many stress the fact that radio is more a means of intellectual inspiration than of direct communication of facts or culture. The objectives of a series of educational lectures, as stated by officials of the University of Cincinnati recently, were "to impart high lights of information," to "stimulate persons to pursue further study," and to "widen the interests of those who have passed their period of formal training." A small minority expressed the opinion that education over the air had a very limited field because the American people are always on a quest for "culture" without any intention of working for it.

Your committee finds the commercial interests declaring themselves interested in educational work, offering "time on the air" without charge, and cooperating in the fullest measure with this survey.

General lack of cooperation between the two groups, however, exists. Doctor Shipherd summarizes these conditions as follows:

"General lack of cooperation between the two groups appears; as in (a) widespread distrust among educators of commercial motives and 'propaganda'; (b) the belief among the educational stations that they are given the inferior positions on the broadcasting spectrum and in the allocation of hours; (c) the tendency among commercial stations to reduce educational programs to shorter and poorer periods as their time becomes more salable; (d) the practice among the commercial stations of offering educational programs to cultivate general good will and create publicity, rather than to build up a sound educational method and research with the help and guidance of educational experts."

Mr. Armstrong Perry of the Payne fund, who, on behalf of your committee, visited broadcasting stations in every State in the Union and interviewed the persons chiefly concerned, reports that radio is attracting a "large and increasing volume of advertising," and that "time that once was given to educators without charge was being restricted or withdrawn in some instances." In further explanation Perry writes:

"The only considerable group of broadcasting stations devoted primarily to educational purposes was composed of those owned and operated by colleges and universities, many of which were State institutions. As the well-organized and powerful commercial broadcasters struggled to acquire radio channels, the educational stations were more and more restricted. The tendency was to drive them off the air in the evening and confine their operation to the daylight hours, when their effective range was only one-tenth of the radius covered at night and when listeners were more likely to be at work than sitting at their receivers. There developed also a tendency to restrict the amount of power used, and to assign to the educational stations wave lengths at the ends of the tuning scale, where it might be difficult or impossible for listeners to tune in their programs." (Appendix No. 4.)

M. H. Aylesworth, president of the National Broadcasting Co., pointed out to the committee two of the principal reasons for the apparent tardiness of commercial broadcasting companies or stations in systematic presentation of educational material. They are:

1. The National Broadcasting Co. has felt that, both in the interest of education and of industry, it was important that educational programs should be developed, not by broadcasters but by representative educators themselves, in order that any taint of commercial propaganda might be avoided. Educators so far have failed to act in furnishing us with such programs in spite of offers to make nation-wide facilities available.

2. Educators have so far failed to adapt their material to the technique required by the new art.

In brief we find that:

(a) The largest listening audience is available between 7 and 10 o'clock in the evening. This audience consists of groups who desire (1) educational programs for vocational or cultural improvements; or (2) mere entertainment of one kind or another.

(b) The commercial advertiser is searching for the largest number of potential buyers and endeavoring to get them in a frame of mind to receive a clever sales talk. His interest in education apart from this narrow propaganda interpretation of it is slight.

(c) The educator is best acquainted with methods of teaching adapted to young people working under conditions which practically compel them to listen. He must develop voice qualities, new composition styles, and new teaching techniques if he is to get and hold any who do not feel much the same compulsion to hear as do those in regular classes.

(d) Radio broadcasting is expensive in equipment, in maintenance, in operation, and in program making. So far the listeners have paid for benefits received only indirectly in the price of their receiving equipment or in the goods advertised. Assuming that the expenses of formal school programs will be met as other school expenses are met, the financing of programs for adults is as yet uncared for in any satisfactory manner.

At the present time the so-called commercial broadcaster is in a better position as regards the engineering and business aspects and in knowledge of radio technique, while the school people are potentially better equipped in the way of program talent for educational purposes.

VII. SOME RESEARCH PROBLEMS

The subcommittee on research gave special attention to (a) collecting techniques of investigation now in use in attacking problems of education by radio; (b) attempting to formulate policies for a program of further research study.

In the former field those who visited stations and educational institutions collected such material as could be found, which, in toto, the committee reports as "meager" and "almost entirely in the listeners' field." Broadcasters anxious to ascertain the popularity of programs have conducted house-to-house canvasses, employed questionnaires, analyzed newspaper clippings, made telephone surveys, offered prizes to correspondents for reports, and have placed personal representatives in some local communities to gather data. Of all these methods, used in almost feverish haste, none has been refined to a degree which merits the term "scientific." In the second field the committee finds the broadcasters very anxious to measure the results of their work accurately and believes that properly staffed research agencies will receive hearty cooperation. Such research agencies are sadly needed.

Organizing the various problems in the order in which they must be solved by those contemplating a broadcasting program, the committee suggests that techniques be developed to enable any institution (1) to discover whether or not it should attempt broadcasting by ascertaining the possible field for its activities, by estimating the cost of broadcasting as compared with other methods of instruction, by study of the possibility of reaching the desired audience and securing results through radio as compared with other methods, and by estimating the effects of such a program upon other policies of the institution; (2) to develop methods of overcoming inertia, mistrust, and fear of commercialism, should its investigation indicate that it should broadcast; to secure easily official recognition if it uses its own station or to determine what commercial station is best suited to its needs; (3) to handle, after the station facilities are arranged, scores of problems connected with the program itself, such as kind of talent, its availability, and cost; the development of proper voice and manner before the microphone; the maintenance of scholarly accuracy of material in a form which will reach the listeners effectively. This is likely to involve a whole department for preparing manuscripts and conducting rehearsals and its setup must be studied; (4) to establish curricula best adapted to adults and children. These must be studied carefully, the former in regard to interests, needs, and previous schooling; the latter in regard to subject matter, grades, other interests, and distractions; (5) to secure accurately listeners' reactions and evaluate them.

The problems concerned with equipment appear to be going forward rapidly in the engineering laboratories of the manufacturers themselves and call for no special attention from the committee.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the facts found and necessarily summarized in brief space above, the committee respectfully recommends:

1. That there be established in the Office of Education, Department of the Interior, a section devoted to education by radio, and charged with such responsibilities as the following: (a) To receive from the advisory committee on education by radio its files and collected documents, to keep this material up-to-date and available for reference by the many students of the subject; (b) to organize some of the material into bulletins, to be issued as demand warrants; (c) to outline techniques for research and carry on investigations into the best methods of broadcasting, and compare the results of lessons sent to schools by radio with the results obtained by other means; (d) to keep the educational interests of the country fully posted on and alive to the importance of this new instrument as an educational tool; (e) to attempt to prevent conflicts and duplication of effort between various broadcasting interests; (f) to furnish advice on the educational soundness of programs suggested and to supply typical programs upon the request of any station, whether educational or commercial.

2. That the funds necessary for financing such a section in the Office of Education be provided in the regular budget for the Department of the Interior.

3. That there be set up in connection with this unit an advisory committee representing educational institutions, commercial broadcasters, and the general public. This committee should consist of 9 to 15 persons whose residence is such that they can meet from time to time for actual consideration of problems arising in the Office of Education. This committee may well administer any funds remaining in our budget to promote research into the techniques of radio education.

4. That an effort be made to secure from interested persons or foundations an amount of money sufficient to bring to the microphone for a period of two to three years a high-grade program in certain formal school subjects and to check carefully the results obtained. The com-

mittee believes that as much as $200,000 per year for a period of three years may be wisely expended in this manner, under direction of a nonpartisan committee of educators and laymen.

5. That the Secretary bring to the attention of the Federal Radio Commission the importance of the educational interests in broadcasting, and that he keep the President of the United States informed of the desirability of having on this commission spokesmen for programs which will tend to improve the general well-being of the American people.

Respectfully submitted.

WM. JOHN COOPER, *Chairman.*

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Science News-Letter of June 7, 1930, entitled "Drifting Mexicans."

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

By checking up on the money orders sent back home by Mexicans in the United States, a Mexican scientist has cleverly gathered some new facts about border immigration. Figures on Mexicans who enter this country, particularly those who come temporarily for picking fruit, thinning beets, or other seasonal employment, are confusing and contradictory. Thousands of these workers ford the Rio Grande in order to avoid paying the United States an $18 visa and head tax, which they do not happen to have. When they return, they register boldly and officially at the Mexican office, for there is no reason to do otherwise.

Records of the national Mexican post office, made available to Dr. Manuel Gamio, one of Mexico's leading scientists, have shown that about $5,000,000 is sent into Mexico each year by postal orders from Mexicans in the United States. The records indicate that the northern plateau of Mexico, and to a lesser extent the central plateau, are supplying the greatest number of Mexican workers to the States. Seasonal fluctuations in the postal orders sent from different States bear out the belief that a large proportion of the Mexicans who cross the border do so to engage in seasonal work and return home when idle.

The Mexican who comes to work and live in the United States does not assimilate into American civilization, Doctor Gamio declares, in explaining his view that it would be for the good of both countries to restrict permanent immigration from Mexico.

LONDON NAVAL TREATY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] was kind enough to have inserted in the RECORD a radio speech I had delivered the night before. Last evening the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] delivered a radio speech in this city. As a believer in good sportsmanship, however vigorously I may endeavor to fight, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD the speech delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania last night.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation and thanks for the courtesy and good sportsmanship of the Senator from California.

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

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR DAVID A. REED, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA, MADE OVER A NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO. NETWORK AT 6.30 O'CLOCK, EASTERN STANDARD TIME, THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1930

Many of you doubtless listened with interest last night, as I did, to the eloquent radio address by Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, in which he denounced the London naval treaty and demanded that it should not be ratified by the United States Senate. Senator JOHNSON denounced the treaty, but he did not describe it. Neither did he describe the situation that existed in the navies of the world when the London conference met. His denunciation of the treaty is all-embracing. He does not admit that it contains a single good point or that it gives America any advantage in any respect. As he sees it, the treaty is unqualifiedly bad. If he is correct, the American delegation surrendered everything at London. He would have you believe that a delegation, consisting of the American Secretary of State, the American Secretary of the Navy, three American ambassadors, Charles G. Dawes, Dwight Morrow, and Hugh Gibson, the Democratic leader of the United States Senate, and a Republican Senator as well—that such a delegation agreed unanimously to a treaty that, according to Senator JOHNSON, is in every respect a surrender of American interests And not only would he have you think this, but he would have you think that the commander of the American Fleet stood by at London and approved this humiliating surrender. I believe that as you listened to Senator JOHNSON you must have suspected that there was another side to the story. There is another side and that is what I am going to try to tell to-night. I believe it can be told in a comparatively short time.

You will remember that the disarmament treaty of Washington, made in 1922, limited the building of battleships and airplane carriers, but it failed to limit the building of cruisers and destroyers and submarines. It established a ratio in battleships which ultimately was to be 5 for us, 5 for Great Britain, and 3 for Japan, but by the terms of that treaty that ratio was not to be reached until 1942. In the interval Great Britain was to have a stronger battleship fleet than we were to have. At the present time she has 20 battleships to our 18 and Japan's 10. For another thing, that treaty provided for a great replacement program of battleship building. Commencing in 1930, Great Britain and ourselves were each to build 10 new battleships, and Japan was to build 6 in the course of six years. The effect of that treaty was good in so far as it prevented the building of battleships by anybody between 1922 and 1930, and it had a good effect on international relations, as far as it went. But since it limited only some kinds of warships and not others, it had the effect of transferring naval competition from battleships to cruisers and destroyers and submarines, as to which the Washington conference was unable to agree. That conference was unable to agree on a ratio for cruisers or destroyers or submarines.

Now, let us see what has happened since the Washington conference. Great Britain and Japan have built up very considerable fleets of cruisers, while we have stood still. They have built modern destroyers and modern submarines to a far greater extent than we have. Practically speaking, our fleet of ships of this nature stands just about where it did at the time of the Washington conference, except that it is eight years older.

When the American delegation went to London in January of this year the American fleet of cruisers consisted of 11 ships in commission, totaling 80,000 tons. The British fleet consisted of 54 cruisers, totaling 327,000 tons. In other words, the British had more than four times the tonnage of cruisers that we had. The Japanese fleet consisted of 29 ships, totaling 166,000 tons; that is to say, the Japanese had more than twice the tonnage that we had. I can not expect you to carry these figures in mind, but it is enough if you will remember that as we met in London, the British had more than four times our tonnage of cruisers and the Japanese had more than twice our tonnage. It is worth while remembering these facts when you hear talk of maintaining the ratio with Great Britain and Japan. There never was a ratio agreed on with these countries in the Washington treaty with respect to cruisers. Such an agreement was attempted in Washington, but was never arrived at. You can not "maintain" something that does not exist, either in theory or in fact.

In destroyers and submarines the condition was almost as bad. It is true that we have a large tonnage of destroyers left over from the World War, but many of them are obsolete and are on the disposal list. Everyone knows that they would be almost worthless in war. The British and Japanese fleets of destroyers and submarines are more modern, and unless we built far more rapidly than these countries, their submarine and destroyer fleets would be far greater than ours by 1936. That was the situation that confronted your delegation when they went to London last January.

Now let us see what the treaty of London actually does. In the first place, it provides for immediate parity in battleships with Great Britain and a 5-to-3 ratio with Japan. This relationship would not otherwise have been attained until 1942. The treaty accelerates parity with Great Britain by 11 years, and does it by requiring Great Britain to scrap 5 of her battleships against 3 to be scrapped by us and 1 to be scrapped by Japan. The British ships that are to be scrapped have larger guns than ours and are in all respects better vessels than the three old ships which we are to scrap. You will notice that Senator JOHNSON made no reference to that. In the next place the treaty provides that none of us shall build battleships between now and 1936. Inasmuch as a battleship costs to build about $40,000,000, the taxpayers of the United States ought to be well satisfied that this expenditure of $400,000,000 on 10 unnecessary battleships is being avoided, and I have no doubt that the taxpayers of Great Britain and Japan feel the same way about the savings that result to them.

Now about cruisers: The treaty provides that cruisers shall be divided into two classes; first, those armed with guns larger than 6 inches in caliber, and, second, those with guns of 6 inches or less. When we went to London the United States had just one 8-inch-gun cruiser in commission, Great Britain had 15, and Japan had 8. We had an elaborate building program and so had they. If we prefer to consider cruisers, both built and building, then the United States had 1 built and 12 building, 5 of which had not even had their keels laid down. Great Britain had 15 built and 4 building, Japan had 8 built and 4 building. These figures are pretty hard to carry in mind, I know. Perhaps it will help to state it this way: In the large cruisers the United States had 13 built and building, Great Britain had 19, and Japan had 12. Now then, what does the treaty do? It provides that we shall go on through the next six and one-half years building up our large cruisers until at the end of the treaty period we will have 18, of which 16 will have been completed and 2 practically completed. On the other hand, Great Britain, which now has 19 such cruisers, built and building, reduces that number by scrapping 4 during the treaty period, so that

she comes down to 15 against our 18. Japan stands absolutely still with her present 12. In these cruisers, which our Naval General Board says are so important, you will see then that we get better than parity with Great Britain and we get exactly 5 to 3 in tonnage with Japan.

Now, let us look at the 6-inch cruisers. At the present time we have 10 such ships in commission and none building. Japan has 21, and Great Britain has 39. Let me repeat these figures again—the United States has 10, Great Britain has 39, and Japan has 21. I am speaking of 6-inch cruisers. By the terms of the London treaty the British are reduced from 39 to 35. The Japanese stand still, and the American tonnage of such cruisers is permitted to be more than doubled. Does that sound to you as if we had surrendered American interests at London?

Some of the nations tried at London to limit the tonnage of the 6-inch cruiser class to 7,000 tons per vessel. The American delegation opposed that, and in these cruisers that we are to build we have the right to make them the same tonnage, the same speed, and the same cruising radius as the 8-inch cruisers.

Senator JOHNSON has spoken of the treaty as if it were a complete surrender by the United States. He does not mention the advantages which come from the treaty. Let me tell you some. At the Geneva conference in 1927 an effort was made to limit the cruisers of the world's great navies. That effort failed miserably, largely because Great Britain insisted upon the right to have 70 cruisers. Much to the displeasure of her big-navy advocates, she has now agreed to reduce that number from 70 to 50, and that is the limitation imposed upon her by the London conference. And, by the way, if admirals change their minds, as admirals have been known to do, the treaty gives us the option of building 50 ships of the same types and of the same total tonnage as the British cruiser fleet if we see fit to do so. If that is not parity, it would be hard to tell what is. We may, on the other hand, insist upon our right to build more of the large cruisers than Great Britain, so that we will have 18 to her 15, with a corresponding reduction in our tonnage of small cruisers. It is here that the whole controversy arises. Our naval board wanted the right to build 21 big cruisers, against the British 15, whereas the treaty allows only 18 for us against the British 15. For the three 8-inch ships which we surrender we have the right to build four large 6-inch ships, and this whole controversy, in the last analysis, comes down to the question of the advantages or disadvantages of that alternative. If there was ever a tempest in a teapot, it would seem to be here. The idea is preposterous that a great step forward in the cause of world peace should be rejected because of a disagreement as to the caliber of the guns to be placed on three ships out of our great fleet.

To some of you, however, the controversy may seem of sufficient importance to call for a little explanation, and at the risk of being technical I want to speak for a moment about this 6-inch and 8-inch gun dispute. Remember that there is nothing to prevent us in the 6-inch cruisers from having the same speed and cruising radius as the 8-inch ships and that it will be possible to give them somewhat heavier armor than is carried on the 8-inch vessels, because the weight that is not put into guns can be put into armor. The type of 6-inch and 8-inch guns now used in the American Navy is excellent. They are both fine weapons from a technical point of view. Each has a muzzle velocity of 3,000 feet per second and each has a range so long that the falling shells can not be spotted or observed from the ship that fires them. The range of the 8 inch is of course longer than that of the 6 inch, but it is useless unless the fire is observed from the air. In a battle between two such cruisers that one which has the control of the air will have the advantages at the long ranges.

It is worth remembering, however, that so far as we can discover no shot has ever been fired in a naval battle in all the world's history at a range of more than 20,000 yards—the Battle of Jutland, for example, began at about 19,000 yards—and the American experts on ordnance and gunnery have advised us without hesitation that under 20,000 yards the 6-inch guns have a great advantage because of their greater rapidity of fire. The 6-inch guns have been fired in battle practice by our fleet as rapidly as 11 shots per minute per gun. The 8-inch, which is machine loaded, can not be fired faster than two shots per minute. You can readily see how the 6-inch gun has the advantage at such ranges, particularly when you remember that the 6-inch gun can penetrate the armor of any 8-inch cruiser now in existence at any range up to 20,000 yards.

After listening for weeks in this country to naval experts on both sides of the controversy and after continuing these hearings in London with the advisors that accompanied us there the delegation came unanimously to the conclusion that the provisions of the treaty were preferable to those suggested by the Naval General Board. If we were wrong, the difference in the result is trifling, but we still think we were right.

This is not the first time that it has been necessary to disagree with the Naval General Board. At the Washington conference in 1922 they demanded a minimum of a million tons of battleships for the American Navy, but were finally compelled to be content with 525,000.

There is not sufficient time for me to discuss the provisions with regard to destroyers and submarines in the same detail. It must suffice to say that the provisions as to these categories have not evoked the same criticism from the opponents of the treaty that have been levied against the cruiser agreement.

With regard to submarines, however, perhaps I ought to say this: That it was the position of both Great Britain and the United States that the submarine had better be abolished entirely, because the temptation to misuse it is so strong in war time that we have been fearful that the next war would see a repetition of the same barbarity on the sea that was witnessed in the last war. We were unable to do that, because some of the nations at the conference were unwilling to agree with us in abolishing the submarine entirely. They did join with us, however, in a section of the treaty—and this included France and Italy, by the way—providing that in war time submarines should be bound by the same rules of visit and search that bind surface vessels in attacks upon merchantmen, and it provided also that no merchant vessel should be sunk until provision had been made for the safety of the passengers and the crew. And lest there be some doubt about what that meant, it was provided that merely putting them in boats—ships' lifeboats, out of sight of land—did not amount to putting them in a place of safey. To that extent we made some progress that we think will be valuable in the next war.

We agreed, Great Britain and ourselves, to give Japan parity in submarines at a low figure of 52,700 tons. That calls for the scrapping of about one-third of the present Japanese submarine fleet. Now, when we remember that submarines do not fight submarines, that you never meet a submarine attack by sending out other submarines but by sending out destroyers, you can see that the question of ratio is not so important in that category as is the aggregate size of the different navies; and our experts advise us, and it seemed true to us, that a submarine tonnage of 52,000 tons was sufficient for each of the three of us.

You have doubtless heard it said many times that this treaty forces us to build the kind of ships that Great Britain wants and not the kind that we want, and leaves her free to build the kind of ships that she wants. This is easy to say, but it can not be proven. If, as a matter of fact, Great Britain does not want 8-inch cruisers, then you will readily see that the treaty forces her to have 15 of the kind of ships that she does not want, aggregating 146,000 tons, while we are only forced to have 73,000 tons of the kind of ships that we are supposed not to want. Of course, the truth is, and every admiral on both sides of the controversy admits, that a certain number of each type are absolutely essential for a balanced fleet. That is obviously so, because the admirals on both sides of this controversy admit that for fleet action, for repelling attacks of destroyers and submarines, the 6-inch cruiser, whcih can be maneuvered quickly and which fires so rapidly, is infinitely better for that kind of service than the 8-inch cruiser can possibly be. The whole quarrel, then, rages over the relative value of the two types of cruisers—not in work with the fleet, not in naval battle at all, but in distant raiding and commerce-protecting operations.

And it is worth remembering, also, that when the American General Board was unhampered by any treaty and could have built 8-inch cruisers if it chose, it built our 10 ships of the *Omaha* class; and at the beginning of this year, at the time we went to London, 10 our our 11 cruisers were 6-inch cruisers of the *Omaha* class and only 1 of them was an 8-inch vessel.

One other thing I think perhaps I should mention. There have been many references to the bravery of the admirals who have dared to testify against the naval treaty and have dared to say what they want in the number of cruisers. As a matter of fact, every one of them, every officer, has been given the utmost freedom to say what he pleased, or to write and publish what he pleased, for or against the treaty, and it is ridiculous to talk of their being bludgeoned into silence. One officer that I have in mind has published 20 articles for a newspaper syndicate denouncing the treaty. Another officer has published 11. Several of them on both the active and the retired list have made speeches at various meetings in different cities. The utmost freedom of expression has been given to those on both sides. And I am sorry indeed to find in Senator JOHNSON'S eloquent speech of last night the statement that a few of them took the position that led to favors and preferment, as if anyone who testified on his side deserved great credit but anyone who testified against him was only looking for favors from the administration. I think that they demand respect, those on both sides. They are a fine body of officers, and we have heard them with respect, and I have no doubt that the country, too, will hear them with respect.

Another statement to which I must take exception is the statement that all that we have done means no saving to the taxpayers of the country. Obviously, I think you will see that it costs less to build up to parity with a navy that is standing still than it will cost to build up to a navy which is constantly increasing. Great Britain and Japan, in substance, have agreed to stand still during these seven years, while we build up past Japan and up to Great Britain. Obviously, the treaty course costs less than the unlimited naval competition that we would have without the treaty. And, also, as I have explained a little while ago, we are saving $400,000,000 on battleship construction alone in the next six years. So I think that it is not

in accordance with the facts to say that there is no saving to the taxpayers by this London treaty.

Now, if I have not wearied you too much with the statistics and technicalities that I have been talking about, let me sum up in a word what this treaty does: It removes competition in naval construction among the three leading naval powers in the world, and it does so in every category of ship. It gives all three countries a holiday from battleship building during the next seven years, and saves the taxpayers of the United States an outlay of $400,000,000 on replacement of battleships alone. It allows the peoples of these three great Nations to rest secure in knowledge that no one of the three can be attacked in its home waters by any navy on earth. It makes it plain to all the world that none of the three countries is designing a war upon either of the others. It promotes to an important degree the international friendship that we all desire.

It is opposed in each of the three countries by the big-navy party of that country. The same things that were said to you by Senator JOHNSON last night are being said in London by Admiral Jellicoe, Lord Bridgeman, and Mr. Winston Churchill. The same things are being said in Tokyo by Admiral Kato and his colleagues. In each of the three countries the same clamor is arising; but in each of the three I am confident that common sense will prevail and that the treaty will be ratified.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11781) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to lines 11 and 12, on page 32, to the words "*Provided further*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this project a sum not to exceed $7,500,000." Those words should be stricken out inasmuch as the same language is in the amendment which was just agreed to. I move the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, after the Senate had agreed to the committee amendment relating to the Lake Charles Deep Water Channel, La., lines 24 and 25, page 58, and lines 1, 2, and 3, page 159, and the amendment at the bottom of page 59 relating to the Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, in lines 23 and 24, and lines 1, 2, and 3, page 60, I filed notice of a motion to reconsider the votes by which the Senate agreed to those two amendments of the committee. I now rise for the purpose of calling up the motion to reconsider those votes so that the committee amendments may again be placed before the Senate, and, I hope, not agreed to.

I spoke to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill anl learned that it was his opinion that the committee amendments should not be agreed to. I ask the Senator from California if he agrees now to a disagreement to the two committee amendments to which I have referred?

Mr. JOHNSON. The motion is to reconsider the votes by which the amendments were adopted, I take it.

Mr. COUZENS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Personally, as I have examined them now, I think the motion ought to be carried. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], however, is here and can present the matter from his standpoint.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan having entered his motion to reconsider, the motion is now before the Senate and the question is upon agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan to reconsider the votes by which the two amendments were agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I take it that there ought to be a unanimous-consent understanding to do so.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana will say that he does not think either he or the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] has any objection to the motion to reconsider. Of course, we will have serious objection to a rejection of the two amendments, but we do not object to reconsidering the votes by which they were adopted. We think every Senator ought to have a fair chance. I have no objection and I do not believe the Senator from Texas has any objection to the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan to reconsider the votes by which the two amendments were agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Michigan not to press the matter further at this time. There are other matters pending, and I want to see if we can not perhaps arrange the matter satisfactorily to all concerned.

Mr. COUZENS. I think it ought to be disposed of. It must be disposed of before we take up individual amendments. I understand that all committee amendments have now been disposed of.

Mr. RANSDELL. Have all committee amendments been disposed of?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is one more committee amendment to be disposed of.

Mr. COUZENS. May I inquire what that amendment is?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Michigan that it relates to the insertion of the Nicaragua Canal item. That is left to be determined. I have a letter this morning from the engineers respecting the matter, and I am inclined to think that the view I expressed the other day would not be an inappropriate mode of action.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] was very strongly opposed to disagreeing to the amendment. The House inserted in the bill an item relating to the Nicaraguan Canal. The Senate Committee on Commerce struck it out. Thereafter the engineers asked that it be reinserted because the amount that would be required in the work that they were doing would be a very small sum, and they could, they insisted, by utilizing some funds under this bill, be able more cheaply to do the work than in any other fashion. That is the position they take.

It is a matter of indifference to me so far as I am concerned. It is a matter of indifference in reality to the House. The question is in reality one that was raised the other day by the Senator from Washington as to the propriety, under this bill, of utilizing any funds for the survey that was by the Congress decreed to be made in Nicaragua.

Mr. COUZENS. Does the Senator desire to take up that amendment now?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am ready to submit it to a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless some agreement is made by unanimous consent or otherwise, the question is now upon the two committee amendments.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Michigan to consent that he and I may get together and see if we can not arrive at an agreement upon this matter and fix it in some satisfactory form and save quite a long speech on the part of myself and another one on the part of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator from Michigan has no desire to disagree with that suggestion, but he wants to go along in an orderly way, and the orderly procedure now is consideration of the two committee amendments, which will have to follow the disposal of the pending committee amendment. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has agreed to a vote on the one remaining committee amendment which is still pending, which relates to the Nicaraguan canal appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, that is a debatable question, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to be recognized on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is very appropriate, it seems to me, in considering a river and harbor bill to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the intimate way in which rivers and harbors, so far as a river and harbor bill is concerned, are interlocked and connected with flood control. In fact, flood control as applied to our rivers, navigation as applied to our rivers, irrigation as applied to our rivers, and power as applied to our rivers, all dovetail and harmonize with each other and help each other.

Flood control is recognized as a national problem. Everybody concedes that it is proper to use public funds to control the floods which so often cause our rivers to overflow their banks and do immense damage. Congress has appropriated many millions of dollars in the building of levees, for instance, along the lower Mississippi to protect the lands adjacent to that great stream from overflow by flood waters which come from the Rocky Mountains and which come from all parts of the great Mississippi Valley.

The object of this bill is the improvement of navigation. By the control of the flood waters of all the tributary streams which flow into the Mississippi River, the navigability of the Mississippi and of its tributaries may be very materially assisted. The control of flood waters by the building of dikes and levees, while very often to a great extent successful, I think everyone must concede has also been to a considerable degree disappointing. The higher we build the levees the higher rises the bed of the stream by the deposit of sediment and soil

washed from various sections of the great valley by the flood waters. There would be no building up of the bottom of the Mississippi River by the deposit of soil that comes from the Dakotas, from Minnesota, from Nebraska, and from Kansas if it were not for the fact that the waters which carry that soil in times of flood are rushing at a tremendous rate toward the Gulf of Mexico. Thus the bed of the stream is built higher by nature, and man continues to build levees higher. In that contest, however, everybody knows that, sooner or later, nature is going to prevail.

It seems to me the proper way to control the flood waters of the Mississippi Valley and the Mississippi River is to build dams near the source of the rivers, wherever nature has provided a proper site for a storage reservoir. The waters thus stored will be released when the river is low, thus increasing the flow when an increased flow is desired, and they will be held back when the river is in flood, thus decreasing the height of the stream when desired.

Moreover, Mr. President, that kind of a system would improve the navigability of the main stream and the tributary streams as well, because more water would be put into the stream than during low water, and we should keep out of the stream by that means a great part of the water which flows into it when the river is in flood.

Where, particularly on the western side of the Mississippi River, there is not sufficient rainfall for the growing of crops, such impounded water could be used for irrigation. The best way in the world to store the flood waters is in the soil, where they may be used for the growing of crops, thus making of farming a certainty in localities where it is now a hazardous undertaking.

Mr. President, the building of flood-control dams and paying for them simply on the theory of protecting the lower Mississippi and its tributaries would cost an enormous amount of money, but if we can increase navigation by that means, if we can, as we could in many instances, double the navigability of the stream, it would be proper to charge a part of that expense to navigation, the improvement of which is another governmental function.

If we can make it easier for agriculture to obtain water for irrigation, we may properly charge a part of the expense to agriculture. Under existing conditions the farmer pays all of the cost of impounding flood waters where they are used for irrigation; yet every gallon of water the farmer impounds under our reclamation projects from streams whose waters would ultimately, if not impounded, go into the Mississippi River, adds just that much to the protection of the lower lands along the Mississippi River from damage by overflow. Thus we would make it easier and less expensive to the farmer to impound the waters; we would make it easier and less expensive for the Government to control the flood waters; we would make it easier and less expensive to put the rivers and streams in that great valley into such a navigable condition that they could carry a larger amount of traffic.

In addition to all this, Mr. President, if such dams were built there could be developed an immense amount of power by the installation of proper machinery, and that power could be distributed over a great portion of the great Mississippi Valley by means of the flood waters impounded and held back by such dams. Thus another useful service would be rendered, and a part of the expense could then properly be charged up to power.

So, if all four of these items—flood control, navigation, irrigation, power—should be united and each one be charged a proportionate share, the expense would be lessened for everybody, the farmer would be able to get water at less expense than he now does, navigation would be made possible where it is now impossible, navigation would be possible for a longer period during seasons of low water, and the lands heretofore overflowed would be protected from damage and destruction.

Mr. President, flood control, as I previously said, is a national problem. Wherever in the great Mississippi Valley nature has provided natural reservoirs in which large quantities of flood waters may be stored, there we ought to commence to construct dams that will interlock and work into the broad system I have outlined for the control of flood waters.

As I said awhile ago, the carrying of silt and soil down into the Mississippi River goes on only during seasons of flood. When the river is not in flood soil is not carried away and the bottom of the Mississippi River is not built up. It is only when the waters are raging and uncontrolled that damage is done, not only in the Mississippi River itself, but for a great distance on the tributaries, where the soil of many fertile farms in the Dakotas and in Nebraska is eroded and washed down into the Mississippi River, destroying homes and in some instances villages and towns. Damage of that kind does not occur when the river is not high; it would not occur if the flood waters were controlled. So the waters which do damage both at the source of the streams and along their courses and at their mouths, if properly controlled, would bring benefit to all who live in the watersheds.

Some of these great natural reservoir sites are now known. For instance, in North Dakota, north of Bismarck there is a natural reservoir site, sufficient surveys of which have been made, I am told, to show that in that one place by building a dam across the Missouri River there could be held back 15,000,000 acre-feet of water. That is a volume of water it is almost beyond the imagination to comprehend. I understand by proper works in that one basin the continuous flow of the Missouri River at that point could be held back for two years.

The construction of such a dam and reservoir would develop a tremendous amount of power. Much of it perhaps would not be the best kind of power, as is the case practically with respect to all dams of this kind, for most of the power would be secondary, because flood control contemplates letting out the water when the rivers are low and holding it back when the rivers are high. But the water would not be let out all at once; and so, by interlocking these great dams, a system could be created that would give to the inhabitants of the great Mississippi Valley an immense development of horsepower, running, I think, into the millions; and by interlocking them a great amount of the power thus developed could be made into primary power, although in many cases it would be necessary to build steam plants as stand-bys, to be operated when the reservoir was being emptied. So far as I know, that reservoir site in North Dakota is the largest such site in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains.

Then, on the eastern side of the great Mississippi Valley, we have Cove Creek, for the development of which we have provided in a bill which has passed both Houses of Congress, but it is held up in conference. The dam at Cove Creek should now be built. It would retain out of the Tennessee River 3,500,000 acre-feet of water—an enormous volume of water—which, if properly handled, would do more than any other one improvement to make the Tennessee River navigable from its mouth up to Cove Creek. Also it would prevent floods not only on the Tennessee River but to an appreciable extent on the Mississippi River, just as the building of the dam to which I have referred in North Dakota would prevent floods on the Missouri River in South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas, while at the same time putting into the Mississippi River at the Missouri's mouth a large volume of water when the Mississippi River is low, and holding back a large volume of water when the Mississippi River is high.

In my State, on another tributary of the Missouri, there is another natural reservoir site which has been completely surveyed by Government engineers under a resolution adopted by the Senate, a resolution of which I had the honor to be the author. In accordance therewith the Senate once passed a bill providing for the building of dams for that reservoir, although the bill died in the House. That would hold back 450,000 acre-feet of water. It is much smaller, you will see, than the others. There are many other places where flood waters similar in amount to those I have described in the case of these dams would be impounded. Taking them all in all and all together, they would, in my humble judgment, go further than any other method that has ever been devised toward controlling the flood waters of the Mississippi Valley, toward preventing damage down the lower Mississippi, toward building up navigation upon the Mississippi River, upon the Tennessee River, upon the Missouri River, and other tributaries. On those tributaries coming in from the West it would mean the irrigation of a great amount of soil that is now not cultivated because there is not sufficient moisture. It would bring down the price of irrigation so that the man who owned the land to be irrigated could afford to pay his share, and by paying his share and irrigating his tract of land he would also be contributing his share toward the great national problem of controlling the angry flood waters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries; and when we got through we would have a great system, of which the Mississippi River would be the center, properly controlled and handled, that would give us the maximum amount of flood control, the maximum amount of navigation, the maximum amount of irrigation, and the maximum amount of power, all at the minimum amount of expenditure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The question is on the committee amendment to the Nicaraguan item.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has been kind enough to hand me a memorandum that exactly confirms my position the other day.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I said this morning, if the Senator will permit me, that I thought his objection was an objection that made the issue plain as to this matter.

Mr. DILL. I want to say to the Senator, after reading the memorandum, that I have no desire to see the engineers down there hampered; but, as the provision now stands, there is no limit to the amount of this river and harbor fund that can be used for the Nicaraguan canal. If we are to make provision for it, there ought to be some limitation upon the amount to be used outside the United States proper. If we are going to use a part of these funds in a foreign country, and no limitation is to be placed upon it, it is very bad legislation. I think the Senator will agree with me on that.

My suggestion to the Senator is that he strike out this item and go to conference with it, and then, in conference, work out a limitation as to the amount of money that ought to be permitted to be taken out of the fund to be used for this service.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, let me say to him confidentially—because nobody else here will be familiar with the subject, of course—that I have a hope that if we can pass the pending bill this afternoon it is not going to conference; and I would rather, if the Senator insists upon it, withdraw the suggestion of rejecting the amendment and agree to the amendment that has been inserted in the bill by the Commerce Committee.

Mr. DILL. I wish the Senator would do that, with a view to fixing the amount that shall be taken. It only took $150,000 in the original bill. This item fixes no amount and leaves the Army engineers free. I think it would be better to go to conference and consider that proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, originally I had asked that the amendment be rejected. The amendment struck out "Nicaragua canal." I now withdraw the request for rejection of the amendment and ask that the amendment as fixed in the bill by the Commerce Committee be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, has the Senator had this memorandum put into the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; will the Senator insert it?

Mr. DILL. I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

JUNE 20, 1930.

Memorandum for Senator H. W. JOHNSON (through the Secretary of War).

Memorandum: Item in river and harbor bill.

Public Resolution No. 99, Seventieth Congress (S. J. Res. 117), authorized a survey of the proposed Nicaraguan Canal route and authorized $150,000 to bear the expense of same. The $150,000 was appropriated and is being used for the purpose intended. However, it is not sufficient to pay for collecting all the data necessary.

In order to get the maximum amount of information with the least expense the survey has been conducted with a battalion of Army engineers. Salaries, food, clothing, etc., are borne by Army appropriations, and the survey money pays for extra expenses, such as travel, transportation, equipment, instruments, tools, etc. Transportation for supply is expensive, requiring boats, pack animals, and native labor.

In order to have proper information as to foundations it is necessary to make borings. The funds available have not been sufficient to buy the necessary diamond drills and pay for the special labor to handle these. The survey will be completed next year. With moderate additional funds all necessary information can be obtained while the battalion of engineers is on the job. Without some additional funds the surveyors will have to return to the United States without complete information and the report on the survey will be only the best that can be made with the money available. To get the additional information necessary at some later date will cost many times what it will cost to get it now. If the river and harbor bill contains an item authorizing the Chief of Engineers to allot from river and harbor funds for this survey, relatively small amounts will be sufficient to perfect this survey and can be allotted in amounts absolutely necessary for the purpose.

It is exceedingly desirable that the river and harbor bill include the item authorizing expenditures for the survey in Nicaragua.

LYTLE BROWN,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, where are we now in the bill? Are all the committee amendments disposed of?

Mr. JOHNSON. All of the committee amendment now have been disposed of save the committee amendments that affect the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL]. They are being considered, as I understand, by those two Senators in conjunction with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is opposing them.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that we may pass over those two remaining committeee amendments and that we may proceed with the individual amendments relating to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the suggestion of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none. Individual amendments are now in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have three amendments. One is a project known as the Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, which has now been approved. There is a document on the subject that has been printed, and the item would have been included in the bill had the report of the engineers come in earlier. I ask that it be added to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, at the bottom of the page, it is proposed to insert:

Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, New York Harbor, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 44, Seventy-first Congress, second session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us the amount involved?

Mr. COPELAND. This amendment proposes a deepening of the channel between Governors Island and Long Island—that is, along the edge of Brooklyn—and its purpose is to make possible the handling of the giant vessels which are being built, such as the *Bremen*, the *Europa*, the *Leviathan*, and other boats. We are having great difficulty, as the Senator no doubt has read, about handling those boats in our harbor. The engineers report that the cost of the project when it is entirely completed will be in the neighborhood of $1,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now, may I suggest that the amendments be taken up in the order in which they will appear consecutively in the bill? The first of those is one offered by the Senator from New York, on page 5, after line 15, relating to Newtown Creek.

Mr. COPELAND. I send forward that amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

Newtown Creek, N. Y.: The existing project is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as contained in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 42, Seventy-first Congress, first session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, a very unusual and unpleasant duty was left with me, because the Senator who is opposing this amendment, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], was required to attend an engagement this noontime, and he wished me to present the objections that he has to the particular matter. I do that merely out of consideration for him, because I did not wish the bill to be delayed, and because of his inability to be present. He states—and I am reading his views solely—

The proposed amendment reverses the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, who has disapproved the report of the board of engineers for rivers and harbors. The Chief of Engineers says:

"From the above-mentioned reports I am not convinced that the proposed work above the mouth of the creek will not severely damage much property along the banks and have reason to suspect that there will be much damage."

The Chief of Engineers recommends that the mouth of the creek be widened at this time, but recommends that before the channel above the mouth be deepened or widened a survey be authorized to determine the feasibility, saying:

"After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I recommend—

"(a) That the existing project on Newtown Creek be modified by the widening of the present channel at the mouth of the creek to the line 'proposed channel line' as indicated on the map submitted with the report of the district engineer, at an added authorized cost of $10,000, with an added maintenance cost of $500.

"(b) That a survey be authorized to determine the feasibility of deepening and widening the channel at Newtown Creek from its mouth at East River to a point about 150 feet north of Maspeth Avenue, and for the provision of a turning basin near Mussel Island, with an accurate determination of possible damages to abutting property by the work proposed."

This recommendation is reasonable in the present instance for the reason that the foundations of the Meeker Avenue Bridge are now insecure and no dredging whatever can be made in the vicinity until the bridge is rebuilt, a matter of at least four or five years. On this point the commissioner of the department of plant and structures of the city of New York, through his chief engineer, states, in referring to this bridge:

"The department has made studies for the construction of a new higher level bridge, to be located easterly of the present bridge. The new bridge would be a 2-leaf bascule structure with a channel width of about 150 feet. No definite date has been settled as to when the construction of this new bridge will begin, but it is probable that work will be started within three years, as the department has received $50,000 for the preparation of plans and making surveys and borings.

"The foundations of the existing Meeker Avenue Bridge do not extend to a sufficient depth to allow of any increase in the depth of the channel at this bridge. There is a noticeable movement in the center pier when the present swing span is operated and any increase in channel depth would endanger the foundations of the piers of the bridge. * * * This is the statement of Commissioner Goldman."

The Meeker Avenue Bridge is at a vital point in the proposed deepening, and no benefit can result from the deepening until it is completed through this bridge.

Making the survey recommended by the Chief of Engineers will also avoid jeopardy to the channel from a caving in of the banks, which may be so great as to jeopardize even the present 20-foot channel.

There is ample time for the survey recommended by the Chief of Engineers and for the consideration of the conclusions to be drawn therefrom, and for action by Congress, without any resulting detriment.

There is no need at this time for including in the pending rivers and harbors bill an item disapproved by the Chief of Engineers, which has not had the benefit of consideration by the proper committee of either House of Congress, and as to which there has consequently been no opportunity for the proponents and opponents of the item to be heard.

Now, Mr. President, permit me for myself to say that I was very sympathetic with the amendment that was presented by the Senator from New York. I felt that it was an amendment that he and his colleague were entitled to have presented here; and I felt that for one of us from another State to interpose himself in the desire of his colleagues who were of a single opinion in their State was not exactly what I would have desired in my own instance. Therefore I felt wholly favorably inclined to the situation presented by the Senator from New York, and I felt entirely favorable to his amendment.

This morning, however, in looking at the document, I find that this particular work is not recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and that the amendment is drawn in such fashion that it relates to the report of an inferior body rather than to the report of the superior body. Therefore it presents a question that the Senate ought to determine, and that I think it ought not to determine favorably to the amendment. It is an unfortunate thing that the situation thus presents itself; but the report of the Chief of Engineers is here before us, and that report is not favorable.

The amendment reads, if Senators will follow me for a moment:

The existing project is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as contained in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 42, Seventy-first Congress, first session.

The Board of Engineers is the subordinate body of the Engineers. The report of this board is forwarded to the Chief of Engineers, who then acts upon it, and either approves or disapproves it. The Chief of Engineers in the particular Document No. 42, which I have in my hand, has disapproved of the project. Therefore the anomaly is presented here, if we adopt the amendment, of adopting what has been done by the inferior tribunal, and overruling the Chief of Engineers.

That is the position. I leave it with the Senate to determine.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut can have no just cause for complaint. I am sure his cause was as well presented as it would have been by the Senator himself if he had been here.

Let me say a word or two about this, and then we will have a vote. The Newtown Creek is a river running through the eastern end of Long Island. It is a geographic boundary of two of our boroughs, Queens and Brooklyn. I wish to say that it is a matter of great concern to both those boroughs.

The Chamber of Commerce of Brooklyn, the Chamber of Commerce of Queens, the Green Point Chamber of Commerce, which represents that immediate neighborhood; the New York Board of Health, because in its present state the Newtown Creek is a menace to health; the New York Dock Department; and everybody else who could have any possible interest are in favor of this project.

Listen to this. Up the river a little way the Standard Oil Co. has a plant. It has been there a long time. The bulkheads are more or less rotten, ready, they fear, to fall in if there should be any improvement of this creek, and if I am correctly advised, the Standard Oil Co. within three or four years will remove from Newtown Creek to Staten Island, and they do not wish to do what that great, rich corporation should do cheerfully because it would be so trifling in amount; they do not wish to repair these bulkheads.

I want to read for the sake of the RECORD one paragraph from the Brooklyn Eagle of June 12 relating to this subject, as follows:

The Standard Oil Co. of New York, which has extensive property holdings abutting on Newtown Creek, in hearings held on the project led the opposition to the widening and deepening of the creek as proposed on the grounds that such dredging as would be required will cause general failure of bulkheads and sinking of ground level back of the bulkheads with resultant damage to buildings.

Stafford Smith, attorney for the Standard Oil Co. of New York, and John F. O'Rourke, consulting engineer, retained by the company, have been in Washington during the past week attempting to have Senator COPELAND withdraw his amendment.

Of course, the Standard Oil Co. did not have that effect upon me, and would not have it upon the Senator from California. I do not know why the Senator from Connecticut has opposed this, except for the fact that he wishes economy to prevail. But I would suggest if he were here that there are several projects in Connecticut representing five or six times the cost of this project, and if economy is his purpose, he might begin with his own State.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator state the amount involved in this project?

Mr. COPELAND. About $200,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have one more amendment to offer.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will not the Senator yield to me to offer an amendment, which I am sure will be accepted?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I am sure this amendment is so inclusive that the Senator in charge of the bill will accept it. I move that on page 43, line 16, after the words "Rye Harbor," to insert "Hampton, Hampton Falls, and Seabrook," so as to read:

Rye Harbor, Hampton, Hampton Falls, and Seabrook, N. H.

This amendment is merely to bring the contiguous portions of the New Hampshire shore within the survey which is contemplated, and I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, for a preliminary survey, which I hope the chairman of the committee will accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, after line 12, insert the following:

Mount Desert Narrows, between Western Bay and Eastern Bay, Me.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is merely for a survey, and I have no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me to suggest a correction in the bill?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 61, line 24, appears the following:

Wolf River and Noncannah River, Tenn.

That second name should be spelled N-o-n-c-o-n-n-a-h. I ask unanimous consent that the correction be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have a third amendment to offer, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, line 22, insert the following:

New York Bay-Delaware River section of the intracoastal waterway, for the sole purpose of finding and recommending the most desirable route for such waterway, with a minimum depth of 25 feet and adequate width, with plans, and estimate of cost of same, and with a provision that the State of New Jersey or other local interests shall furnish all necessary rights of way, without cost to the United States.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I offer this amendment at the request of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association. There is just one link left to complete the intracoastal canals. It is the link across New Jersey.

There is a marked difference of opinion among the engineers as to where the canal should be, and what sort of a canal it should be. The purpose of this amendment, and the sole purpose, as the amendment states, is that the engineers may make a further study to determine where that canal should go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask to have placed in the RECORD at this point the memorandum furnished me by the Atlantic Waterways Association.

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

NEW YORK BAY-DELAWARE RIVER SECTION OF THE INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

(Memorandum)

1. For nearly 100 years there has been in existence a canal across the State of New Jersey. It sufficed for the practical demands of commerce when first constructed, but has now become totally inadequate, both as to depth and width, and, in addition, it contains quite a number of locks which impede navigation.

2. For at least 40 years efforts have been made and particularly by the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York for the construction of a canal of adequate depth and width and by a more favorable route across the State of New Jersey, connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River. Congress has not yet authorized the construction of this modern waterway.

3. Investigation by the engineers of the War Department may be said to have begun under authorization by Congress in 1910. On January 5, 1912, the Chief of Engineers submitted a report on the several links of the intracoastal waterway from Boston to Beaufort, N. C. (H. Doc. 391, 62d Cong., 2d sess..) The initial investigation was made by a board of special engineers. As to the waterway across New Jersey, this special board of engineers recommended a sea-level canal 25 feet deep and 125 feet bottom width. In 1920 the Board of Engineers and Chief of Engineers recommended that construction be postponed until the prices of material and labor declined. (See H. Com. Doc. No. 6, 66th Cong., 3d sess.) On January 5, 1923, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors adopted a resolution requesting the engineers to review their previous reports with a view of ascertaining the desirability of the immediate construction of this waterway across New Jersey. After a lapse of more than seven years, the district engineer submitted his report on April 23, 1930. The district engineer recommended the immediate construction of this waterway across New Jersey as a sea-level canal, 12 feet deep and 125 feet bottom width. He estimated that the total cost of same would be $93,047,000. He also recommended local cooperation by the State of New Jersey or other local interests by furnishing rights of way, areas of land for depositing material, and the securing of releases for damages to any existing water-power interests, at an estimated cost of a little over $4,000,000. This would reduce the cost to the Government to $89,011,000. The district engineer estimated that this new waterway would carry a traffic amounting to 12,500,000 tons and that the annual savings would be 40 cents per ton, making a total saving of $5,000,000. He recommended a route from near Bordentown on the Delaware River via the south river route to Raritan Bay and to New York Bay. Estimates were also submitted of the cost of a waterway 25 feet deep and of adequate width at a total cost of $109,000,000, or about $16,000,000 greater than the 12-foot canal. The Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers, in considering the report of the district engineer, estimated that the district engineer was too optimistic in his estimate of the commerce which would use the waterway and also of the savings to be effected, and for these reasons a final unfavorable report was submitted. These last reports are embodied in House Committee Document No. 38, Seventy-first Congress, second session.

4. Local shipping interests in New York and on the Delaware River and in New Jersey generally advocated a waterway with a depth of 25 feet. Owing to the fact that this waterway will connect the great port of New York with the great commerce on the Delaware River, with the consequent large commerce which would use this waterway and the larger type of boats, local interests strenuously contended that the waterway should have a minimum depth of 25 feet with appropriate width so that moving vessels could easily pass each other.

5. Importance of this waterway across New Jersey: Since the original favorable report was submitted on January 5, 1912, for the construction of the several links between Boston and Beaufort, N. C., all of the several links have been constructed except the waterway across New Jersey. The Government has purchased the Cape Cod Canal, with a depth of 25 feet, and is maintaining the same. This furnishes an inside route from Boston to New York Harbor. The Government has purchased the former Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, connecting the Delaware River with Chesapeake Bay, and has enlarged this waterway and is maintaining same. Congress has also authorized the construction of a waterway from the lower end of Chesapeake Bay at Norfolk to Beaufort, N. C., and the same has been completed. In addition Congress has authorized the construction of an inside waterway from Beaufort, N. C., to Cape Fear River, N. C., and the same is now under construction. There is contained in the pending river and harbor bill an authorization for the construction of an inside waterway from the Cape Fear River by way of Georgetown to Charleston, S. C. There is an inside natural waterway route from Charleston to the St. Johns River, Fla., which is also being improved under authorization of Congress. Congress has also authorized and consummated the purchase of what is known as the Florida East Coast Canal, which furnishes an inside route from St. Johns River, Fla., to Miami, Fla. Therefore the general statement may be made that Congress has authorized every link in the intracoastal waterway from Boston to Miami, Fla., except the link across the State of New Jersey connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River. There is presented the interesting anomaly of a continuous inside route, which might be called a trunk line for transportation from Boston to Miami except the link across New Jersey.

6. While it is not intended to make invidious comparisons, the waterway across New Jersey from a commercial point, however, transcends in importance any one of the other links. Obviously the commerce moving through this waterway would be greater, both as to tonnage and the size of vessels which would use the same. Its commercial value can not be disputed. On the other hand, owing to physical conditions and the density of population in the area in New Jersey intersected by this waterway, the cost of same would be comparatively large. The proper test, however, is whether the proposed waterway is worth the cost. Undoubtedly its contribution to the facilities of transportation would justify its cost.

7. The consideration of public policy and the economic justification for the construction of this waterway across New Jersey are factors primarily for the consideration of Congress. It is the function of the engineers to select a more feasible route, to make the plans and the estimates of cost and to express their views regarding local cooperation, but it is for Congress to determine all matters of policy and the wisdom or unwisdom of the expenditure of the public revenues.

8. It is the purpose of this amendment to secure the necessary engineering information from the Corps of Engineers and then to determine whether, under all the conditions, the project shall be adopted by Congress.

9. Let us suppose the case of a trunk-line railroad five hundred to fifteen hundred miles in length confronted with an uncompleted link of 30 miles. Suppose even the completion of this unconstructed link would be more expensive than any other similar distance of the trunk-line railroad? Would the managers of such railroad and private capital hesitate for a moment in supplying this missing link of railroad construction? Railroads have been frequently confronted with conditions of this kind and have never hesitated in the public interest to make the necessary construction, whether such construction required the tunneling under mountains or under rivers or the construction of expensive tunnels. The pending amendment simply seeks the necessary information for wise action.

10. The Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, which has been in active existence for many years and has promoted the construction of the other links in the intracoastal waterway, earnestly advocates the immediate construction of this missing link in the intracoastal waterway.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, after line 8, insert:

Schuylkill River, Pa.: The existing project is hereby modified in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 40, Seventy-first Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], I present the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 22, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the north jetty at the entrance to Christiana River may be modified or removed in the discretion of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, after line 8, insert:

Inland waterways from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: The existing project is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations in the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 41, Seventy-first Congress, second session, and Senate Document No. 151, Seventy-first Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said documents.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to say that this has been approved by the Board of Engineers, and I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the regular report has been made, and, therefore, I have no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 44, after line 23, insert:

New Rochelle Harbor, N. Y.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, that is for a mere survey, and there is no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 67, after line 23, insert:

Tarrytown Harbor, N. Y.

Mr. JOHNSON. That likewise is for a mere survey, to which there is no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 60, line 21, strike out the period after the word "Texas," and insert a comma and add thereafter the words, "with a view to further enlargement and improvement."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, this merely specifies and makes plain the purpose of the survey.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is no objection so far as I am concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 60, after line 17, insert:

Guadalupe River, Tex., and channel in San Antonio Bay connecting the Guadalupe River with the intracoastal waterway.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, this is merely for a survey.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is no objection to it, so far as I am concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I desire to propose an amendment on behalf of my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] and myself. I have submitted the matter to the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 57, after line 9, insert:

St. Andrews Bay, Fla.: Shoal area opposite Davis Point with a view to securing a depth of 24 feet at mean low water.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, that is for a mere survey, as I understand it, and therefore there is no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 17, at the end of the item for Baltimore Harbor, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That in addition to the improvements recommended in said documents the main channel shall also be enlarged to a depth of 37 feet with the present general width of 600 feet from the Sparrows Point Channel to Fort McHenry at an estimated additional cost of $504,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will not the Senator please state the reasons for the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will try to do so briefly. This amendment was offered by my colleague and by me jointly.

As all Senators know, Baltimore city ranks first and second in the United States in imports and exports, New York alone surpassing it in one particular. It is the outlet for a considerable amount of territory from Chicago eastward, and it is the southern terminus of many of our airplane lines northward. But the shipping from Baltimore city is almost unbelievable.

It so happens that there is a very excellent harbor there, with one exception, and that is that ships have to anchor 12 miles from the city because the channel is not of sufficient depth to permit the bringing of the larger ships up to the shore.

In addition to that fact, when boats are brought up there, the channel does not afford space enough to anchor them and let them swing without blocking traffic.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wanted to inquire whether the engineers had reported upon this.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding is at this time that the engineers did not report favorably upon it. However, they did state that there was a need for it, and I may venture the somewhat speculative opinion that the engineers did not recommend it because there was work going on there but that subsequently, perhaps, they will do so.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that I think this project came before us when we were considering the bill, and the engineers at that time were opposed to it, for which reason it was not inserted in the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to the Senator the physical facts which exist there.

Here we have a port which ranks second among all the ports in America in imports and exports. When large vessels come up to deliver their cargo they have to anchor about 12 miles from the point of destination because the draft of water is not sufficient to enable the vessel to reach the docks. When in smaller vessels come up into the harbor and anchor, waiting their turn to come into the docks, the harbor is so small that when the vessels swing with the wind they block egress and ingress to and from points above them.

If Baltimore was a small harbor and ranked fifteenth or twentieth, this would seem to be a huge expenditure, but when it is known that it ranks second among all the ports of America, I think it is a project which deserves and should receive the support of the Senate in the present river and harbor bill. This is in no sense what may be termed "pork-barrel" legislation on a river and harbor bill. Here is a port which ranks second in all the country. Think of it! When ships come to that great port to discharge cargoes they have to anchor away down the bay until such time as they can come up to the docks. In some cases some vessels can not get up at all because the channel is not of a sufficient depth to enable them to get to the point of destination.

Although the chairman is not inclined to do so—and I appreciate his situation is such that he can not very well accept the amendment personally, I very much hope that the Senate will accept it and let it stay in the bill and see if we can not work out something in conference respecting it.

As I said, Baltimore city is a tremendous port. I note, without wishing to cast any reflection upon Florida, that millions of dollars are devoted to building harbors on all the coast around Florida, and yet Florida has not one-twentieth the volume of business that Baltimore city has. Why should not we make this port one in keeping with the amount of business that comes there? I hope the Senate will incorporate the amendment so as to give Baltimore the kind of harbor it should have considering the huge volume of commerce which it handles.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator if a preliminary survey, both engineering and economic, has ever been made of the proposed project?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; a preliminary survey has been made and we have been told that eventually it will come. May I say to the Senator that this very moment we are building huge bulkheads around Baltimore. Back of those bulkheads there is nothing but water inclosed, but the dirt taken from the channel bottom would be dumped over the bulkheads and made into new land. There we are erecting one of the largest airplane-construction plants in the world.

There is a tremendous development through all this section. In fact, down at Point Breeze the Western Electric Co. is now building a plant which will employ 26,000 people in Baltimore city, which will bring about 100,000 people there. There is

every physical merit to the proposition. If it were some small port the amount of money would seem perhaps out of reason, but when it is considered that Baltimore is the second port in the country in imports and exports, it is entitled to the finest harbor we can give it within reason.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I appreciate the importance of the port of Baltimore. I know its commerce, present and promising, but there is a procedure that is always followed, and the Senate must be fair to the various sections of the country. I assume there is full merit in what the Senator has said. I should like to be in a position to support and vote for his amendment, but under the practice, the rule, and, as suggested——

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

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment ago we gave to the State of New York $200,000 to improve a harbor which does not rank anywhere near in importance with the project which I have outlined. I do not propose to sit by and see a really big project like Baltimore city denied improvements that are necessary when aid is being given to other places that can not and do not rank in importance with Baltimore.

Mr. McNARY. But that is not a parallel case. It did not meet with my approval, but it did have back of it a survey by the local and divisional engineers and a report by the Board of Army Engineers, though adverse.

Mr. TYDINGS. So has this.

Mr. McNARY. I am not opposing the project. I would like to see Baltimore become the largest port in America, if it so desires to be and if the future trade and commerce so justify; but we must be fair to the various ports and sections of the country. It is a practice which is unbroken in the history of the country that we must have first a preliminary survey, then it must go before the Board of Army Engineers for their consideration, after which it goes to the Chief of Engineers, and from him to the Secretary of War. Then it must be transmitted to Congress and become a House document. Then hearings are to be held before the Senate and House committees. None of these steps has been taken whatsoever in this case.

Certainly we should not sit idly by and permit a situation to develop that would embarrass us in the future. Many projects came before the committee and were turned down, which were meritorious, which had run the gantlet of procedure.

I am only asking the Senator as a matter of good faith and judgment to follow the procedure that is always followed by every legislator. For one I will support him in his position and carry it along as fast as anyone, and that can be said of the chairman and other members of the committee. But let us not commit ourselves to a project and procedure which is unwise and unfortunate. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Oregon has said and also appreciate the attitude of the chairman of the committee, that it is not a question of individual opposition, but that they want to live up to the precedents and follow the routine. But may I point out to the Senator from Oregon that in this case there has been a preliminary survey and that the amount of money provided in the amendment is the amount of money which the Army Engineers say will be necessary to do the work; that they have already embarked upon a partial improvement and that this amendment is simply to provide ways and means to complete it?

As I said and will repeat, if this were a small town, some long-undeveloped harbor, it would be one thing; but when it is considered that the port of Baltimore ranks second in the United States I feel that we are justified in giving it the kind of harbor that its commerce shows it is entitled to have. Therefore I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, just a word as to policy. This is a matter of policy with us, and policy alone. Here is a harbor that is entitled, of course, to every bit of governmental aid that can be extended to it. It is entitled to all the service that we can render in respect to the harbor. But we are not the ones to determine engineering problems, and when before us comes a project for the expenditure of half a million dollars, and the engineers say it should not be done, and it is turned down in the committee because the survey is adverse to it, we ought not to attach it upon the bill. That is the whole proceeding presented here and that is exactly this case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [putting the question]. The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 44, after line 11, insert the following:

Entrance to the channel of Salt Pond, sometimes called Point Judith Pond.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is a survey merely?

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I will have to ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment on page 40 was agreed to, beginning in line 21. I will state the reason for it. I want to insert, after the word "House," the word "committee," so it will read "House committee report."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. JONES. I now move to amend the amendment in line 21 by inserting, after the word "House," the word "committee," so it will read:

House committee document.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, after line 24, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Oakland Harbor, Calif., in accordance with the report submitted in House document numbered 43, Seventy-first Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. At the instance of the War Department, I offer the following amendment relating to Porto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, after line 14, insert:

The existing project for the improvement of San Juan Harbor, Porto Rico, is hereby modified in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers submitted April 9, 1930, so as to fix the total amount of cash cooperation required from the people of Porto Rico at $150,000, which amount shall become payable five years from the date of the approval of this act: *Provided*, That the foregoing modification of the project stated shall be conditional upon the communication by the Government of Porto Rico to the Secretary of War, within one year immediately following the date of approval of this act, of the acceptance by the Government of Porto Rico of the arrangement hereinbefore outlined.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I offer certain formal amendments, one of them being for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who is absent. On page 17, in line 18, strike out all after the word "session" down to and including the word "adopted" in line 23. I have no objection to the amendment personally. It simply alters the phraseology without altering in any degree the substance of the provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 18, after the word "session," strike out the remainder of the paragraph in the following words:

So as to provide for a channel 30 feet deep and 500 feet wide over the bar, and a channel 27 feet deep and 400 feet wide at Brunswick Point. The sum of $1,210,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the prosecution of the work herein adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. On page 26, line 10, after the word "between," insert the words "the mouth of," and after the word "Illinois" insert the word "River," so as to read:

Mississippi River between the mouth of Illinois River and Minneapolis.

This is asked by those who are interested in that particular matter as clarifying and rendering certain the description.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk informs the Chair that that has already been done.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was not aware that it had been done.

On page 28, line 17, after the word "plans," I move to insert the words "and estimates," so as to read:

That the Chief of Engineers is hereby authorized to revise the plans and estimates to meet any changes in condition.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. On page 28, line 18, beginning with the word "*Provided*," I move to strike out the remainder of the paragraph, being lines 18, 19, and 20, in the following words:

Provided further, That the expenditures on this project shall not exceed the amount estimated in the aforesaid report as the cost of the work therein recommended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 37, after line 22, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Noyo River, Calif., in accordance with the report submitted in Senate Document No. 156, Seventy-first Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the acquiring of any lands required for the purpose of this improvement.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is in accordance with the report of the engineers, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire as to the amendment inserted at the request of his colleague the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] relating to Hampton, Hampton Falls, and Seabrook, N. H.?

Mr. KEYES. That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on page 69, line 17, after the words "Yaquina Bay," I move to insert the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 69, line 17, after the name "Yaquina Bay," it is proposed to insert the words "and river," so as to read:

Yaquina Bay and River and entrance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment at that point having already been acted upon, without objection, the vote whereby it was agreed to will be reconsidered; the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] will be agreed to; and the amendment, as amended, will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. At the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in after line 5 on page 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 72, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

Craig Harbor, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have some verbal amendments which the clerk of the committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. McGann, whom I have known for many years, has handed me. He came over to see the chairman of the committee, but the chairman was busy, and so he handed the amendments to me. They are verbal amendments, and, with the consent of the chairman of the committee, I will offer them.

On page 4, line 20, I move to strike out the words "Rivers and Harbors Committee" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "House."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the words "Rivers and Harbors Committee" and to insert the word "House."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JONES. On page 5, line 1, I move to strike out the word "Bay" and insert the word "Creek," and in line 2, on the same page, to strike out the word "Senate" and in lieu thereof to insert the words "Rivers and Harbors Committee."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington is to a committee amendment heretofore agreed to, without objection, the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered, the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be agreed to, and the amendment, as amended, will be agreed to.

Mr. JONES. In the committee amendment, on page 10, line 17, I move to strike out the word "Channel" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Harbor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 10, line 17, after the name "Claiborne," it is proposed to strike out the word "Channel" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Harbor," so as to read:

Claiborne Harbor, Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. On page 34, line 25, I move to strike out the words "Rivers and Harbors Committee" and in lieu thereof to insert the word "'House."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JONES. The clerk of the House committee also asked me to request that the paragraph on page 41, relating to the Connecticut River above Hartford, Conn., be transferred to the bottom of page 3. That will not change the effect, but will put the paragraph at another place in the bill. So I move, on page 41, to strike out the paragraph from line 15 down to and including line 2, on page 42, and to transfer the paragraph to the bottom of page 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Alabama, I present an amendment providing for a survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

Three Mile Creek, Ala.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to insert, on page 66, after line 5, the words "Point Lookout, Mich."

Mr. JOHNSON. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on page 55, after line 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

Steinhatchee River into Deadmans Bay, Fla.
Wacissa River, Fla.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think, Mr. President, we are now ready for the presentation of the only remaining amendment in connection with the bill.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANSDELL. I move to amend the committee amendment, on page 58, by striking out lines 24 and 25 on that page and lines 1 to 3, inclusive, on page 59, and inserting in lieu thereof the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 58 it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out lines 24 and 25 and, on page 59, lines 1 to 3, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Lake Charles deep water channel, Louisiana, with a view to maintaining said channel to its enlarged dimensions and to reporting the amount of contributions in land and money heretofore furnished by local interests for such waterway.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Louisiana why is not the provision adopted by the House

ample for his purposes? The item is merely for a survey, and the language of the House bill reads:

Lake Charles deep water channel, Louisiana, with a view to maintaining said channel to its enlarged dimensions.

Does not that answer the Senator's purpose?

Mr. RANSDELL. I may say to the Senator that I am not at all sure that the provision in the House bill would be satisfactory.

Let me say, Mr. President, that this channel was first a small canal, 5 feet deep and 40 feet wide, running from Lake Charles, on the Calcasieu River, to the Sabine River, a distance of 40 miles. It was a Government canal, but the enterprising citizens of the Lake Charles, in my State, thought that they were entitled to have an ocean port. So the, said to Congress, "Give us this deep waterway." Congress was unwilling to do so; it did not have confidence in the project. Then the people of the community said, "Very well, give us a chance to build a waterway here ourselves, and we will do it." The permit was granted by the War Department, and the people of the community voted $2,750,00 of bonds and constructed therewith a magnificent waterway 30 feet deep and 125 feet in width.

Let me read what Mr. W. P. Weber, president of the Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District, says in a telegram to me, dated June 17:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *June 17, 1930.*

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Your advice that rivers and harbors bill passed committee carried inspection item relative to Calcasieu Ship Channel. Hope that there will be no objection by anyone. Certainly the taxpayers this parish and city entitled to Federal aid on waterway project. Our ship channel completed and port officially opened November 19, 1926. There has not been one dollar spent on maintenance. The ship channel and river have sufficient current to keep channel clear of silt. Channel is now really deeper than when completed more than three years ago, due to current. Channel now in excellent shape. Our Federal Government, through the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, is using this waterway and port facilities in large way. Railroad engineers, port authorities, marine officials, also Hon. Roland K. Smith, Shipping Board Commissioner, have inspected ship channel and marine terminals, and stated that the waterway and terminals are as good as any on the Gulf, being complete and modern. There were 14 deep sea steamers that made this port during month of May, as compared with 8 ships for same month last year. Our tonnage is developing so rapidly that we are forced to arrange to double our port facilities as soon as possible. This port has been beneficial to rice industry this section. The steamer services and dispatch available is making this port very desirable and attractive to exporters and importers of various commodities located in States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska. If additional statements or figures required, please wire.

W. P. WEBER,

President Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District.

I have a similar telegram from Hon. Leon Locke, the mayor of Lake Charles, also telegrams from several prominent citizens of the city; and also a very interesting statement of Mayor Locke published in the Lake Charles American-Press, April 30, 1930. I do not ask to read them, but that they be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *June 17, 1930.*

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Citizens deeded land for intracoastal canal direct to United States and voted bond totaling three millions to enlarge to 30 by 125 dimension, after securing permission from War Department. In addition, city Lake Charles voted one million for modern terminals declared by experts to be among best considering capacity in South, and we shall soon expend one-half to one million more. Channel perfect, and if anything deeper than when completed nearly four years ago, and not a dollar expended for maintenance. Population of Lake Charles 15,600; of parish, including city, 40,000. Total valuation of city and parish thirty-two millions. Have fully proved value of channel to United States in use of Government boats. If engineers examination does not show economic value of channel to United States, we will no longer urge or seek relief. We therefore feel that Congress should give us opportunity to establish propriety of our claim by providing survey.

LEON LOCKE, *Mayor.*

LAKE CHARLES, LA.

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL,

United States Senate:

Lake Charles and Calcasieu Parish have accomplished a great work in providing another governmental port serving the rice industry most effectively and affording great relief to farmers in connection with intracoastal waterway now being improved through the rice, sugar, and salt sections. We are now saving for planters 7 cents a hundred on rice. Our community bearing heavy burden, and we are asking Congress to examine this channel through its engineers to ascertain and report its value to Nation. We have no doubt that the Senate will grant us this privilege. Thanks for your splendid help.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,

By N. E. NORTH, *Vice President and Cashier.*

LAKE CHARLES, LA.

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL,

United States Senate:

Value of ship channel to agriculture easily demonstrable if opportunity is given to us to make presentation. This can be done only by an examination, which is asked for in your amendment to bill. Sincerely trust that no objection will be made to item, for we shall make no claim unless engineers clearly show the value of our ship channel as an asset to the United States.

LAKE CHARLES TRUST & SAVINGS BANK,

By RUDOLPH KRAUSE, *President.*

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *June 17, 1930.*

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL,

United States Senate:

Referring to river and harbor bill, we wish to confirm wires of Mayor Locke and Port Director Nelson, and urgently request that Lake Charles item be retained.

CALCASIEU NATIONAL BANK.
PURE OIL CO.,
SWEET LAKE LAND & OIL CO.
POWELL LUMBER CO.
KELLY-WEBER CO.

[From the Lake Charles American-Press, Lake Charles, La., Wednesday, April 30, 1930]

LOCKE GIVES HIS VIEWS ON STATUS OF SHIP CHANNEL—SAYS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OWNS WATERWAY—ALSO RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTENANCE—UNITED ACTION IS NECESSARY TO SECURE RELIEF FROM CONGRESS

To make it clear to local citizens that the Federal Government owns the Calcasieu Ship Channel; that it is responsible for the maintenance of the channel without any action on the part of Congress for that purpose, and to impress upon the minds of Calcasieu and Lake Charles taxpayers that united action is necessary to secure from Congress an assumption of the remaining indebtedness incurred locally for improvement work, Mayor Leon Locke, special representative of the Calcasieu police jury for securing Government relief, made the following statement to-day:

A misapprehension of the status of the ship channel and its relationship to the Government seems to exist in Lake Charles, and is held in the minds of the Members of Congress.

GOVERNMENT OWNS WATERWAY

It should be understood that the Government now owns this canal and no formal action is necessary by Congress relative to its ownership or its maintenance beyond a mere recital of the fact and a resolution declaring governmental ownership, thus removing all doubt or danger of controversy. Official records contained in House Document No. 238, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, is conclusive evidence of Government ownership. It reads as follows:

"SEC. 5. Calcasieu River to Sabine River, La. and Tex.: The report on which the original authorization was based provided that the rights of way for the waterway should be furnished free of cost to the United States. A strip of land 300 feet wide has been deeded to the United States by local owners. Local interests desired that the location of the canal on this section be changed from that of the adopted route, and consented to bear the difference in cost. In view of this the route was changed, and they contributed $27,450, of which only $13,266.97 was used, the remainder reverting to the contributors.

"The acts of August 8, 1917, and July 18, 1918, require that local interests contribute $260,000; that they obtain consent from the landowners for the necessary depositing on their land of the excavated material in both the construction and maintenance of the canal; that they protect the United States from any damages which may be claimed on the part of the riparian owners due to such dumping; and that they assume the cost of removing the present bridges in advance of the dredging and that of providing any new bridges required.

"Local interests have deposited with banks in Lake Charles, La., $260,000, the amount required by the acts of August 8, 1917, and July 18, 1918, guaranteed by satisfactory bonds to be available as needed in the progress of the work. These deposits were approved by the department January 30, 1918, and September 24, 1918. Privileges for depositing of excavated material were secured and a bond in the sum of $2,000 for the removal of present bridges was furnished, all of which papers were approved by the department on July 12, 1918.

"Under date of January 5, 1922, a permit was granted by the Assistant Secretary of War to the police jury of Calcasieu Parish to enlarge this waterway to a depth of 30 feet with a bottom width of 125 feet."

THE ORIGINAL CANAL

The language, as will be observed, shows that the original Intracoastal Canal, of which this section is a part, was constructed by the Government; right of way consisting of a strip 300 feet wide was deeded by local owners to the United States. It can not therefore be argued that any construction or improvement contained in this original 300-foot strip could possibly belong to any other agency or authority than the owner of the land, which is the United States.

The amount of $13,266.97 was used by the Government, and the language contained in the above quotation from the records confirms that, and specifically refers to it as a contribution. Likewise, the $260,000, composed of the bond issue of December 30, 1916, of $250,000 plus an extra $10,000 raised outside the bond issue, are referred to as contributions, and are so designated in the acts of August 8, 1917, and July 18, 1918.

TO ENLARGE WATERWAY

The enlargement of the ship channel dimension enlisted governmental interest through an appeal to the Secretary of War by the police jury of Calcasieu Parish to enlarge this waterway to a depth of 30 feet with a bottom width of 125 feet.

If the United States had not had title to this section, no appeal to the Government would have been necessary. In other words, by reason of the United States owning this land and canal it was necessary for the police jury to obtain the consent of the Government to improve it. By no stretch of law or imagination can it be held that the expenditure of even so vast a sum of $2,750,000, the amount of the bonds voted by the parish for its improvement, could we claim ownership of the canal. Acting upon these facts my argument before the River and Harbors Committee in February, 1928, was based upon the belief entertained by me that by reason of the ownership and title being vested in the United States our efforts must be directed toward petitioning Congress to reimburse us for the money we locally expended on the Government's waterway.

A JUST CLAIM

The Government owns the ship channel, but with the exception of approximately $700,000 our community, that is Calcasieu Navigation District No. 1, consisting of wards 3 and 4 of the parish, and the parish itself in its later bond issue, paid for the canal. Our claim therefore to the restoration by the Government of the amount we locally expended in the interests of the Government, totaling approximately $3,000,000, is a just one.

I have been, I think, unfairly criticised by various people for championing in the manner I have this return of money through appropriation by Congress. The bill of 1928, that was not acted upon by Congress in that year, by reason of the early adjournment of Congress due to the political conventions of that year, and the subsequent stand of President Coolidge against any river and harbor legislation when the Congress reconvened in December, 1928, contained the following language which was incorporated in the bill through my presentation in February of that year:

PROVISIONS, 1928 BILL

"Lake Charles deep-water channel, Louisiana: With a view to maintaining said channel to its enlarged dimensions; also, with view to reporting the character and quantity of work done by local interests in making the enlarged channel, and the cost of same; and as to the advisability of the United States reimbursing said local interests for all or any of the funds so expended."

The pending bill, which has passed the House, contains merely this reference, authorization for examination of the "Lake Charles deep-water channel of Louisiana, with a view to maintaining said channel to its enlarged dimensions," omitting all references to reimbursement. This bill will soon reach the Senate, and we are now engaged in an effort to have the language of the 1928 bill restored to the pending bill by Senator RANSDELL, who is in a position to greatly aid us, by reason of his being a very prominent member of the Commerce Committee of the Senate to which the river and harbor bill will be referred. The United States must maintain the channel by reason of its ownership of the channel, and of its constant use by boat's belonging to the Government.

APPEALS FOR SUPPORT

I appeal, therefore, to the citizenship of Lake Charles to give this matter careful study. In the continuation of this work I am entitled to the support of our entire community. If the people of Lake Charles feel that my course is wrong they should either apprise me of my errors or authorize in another manner and through other agencies, the carrying on of the work that I undertook by the request of the Calcasieu Parish police jury.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I, myself, had occasion to visit the port of Lake Charles some months ago, and I was amazed to find the rapidity with which business there is growing, and was astonished to learn the number of large ships availing themselves of the use of this canal. It is a very successful enterprise.

Mr. RANSDELL. And the community which has undertaken and completed this work is a very small one, I will say to the Senator.

It is possible that all of these facts may be brought out under the House provision, but all I am asking for is that the engineers may report the actual facts. I venture to say there is not a similar case in the entire United States. If ever the exception proves a rule, Mr. President, this is one such case; it is a most remarkable one and we ought to have the facts presented by the engineers.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I should like to ask the Senator a question to ascertain whether I have the correct idea or not. As I understand, all the Senator asks is for a survey.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is all.

Mr. JONES. And, furthermore, he asks that in the report on the survey there shall be a statement as to the contributions made heretofore by citizens of the locality.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is all.

Mr. JONES. I have no doubt that the engineers in making their report will incorporate the facts as to the contribution in their report. So I see no particular reason why the amendment should not be agreed to.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope there will not be any objection. As I have said, it is a very unusual and meritorious case.

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment if it is understood that the purpose of the amendment is not to claim a refund for the local contributions.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I can not say what my people will wish to do hereafter. I am not going to prophesy about that. I am going to lay the facts before this great American Congress, and then it can do with those facts whatever it deems best.

Mr. COUZENS. Of course, this is an entering wedge toward securing refunds by all local communities that have contributed to these water projects. There is no use in trying to hide the fact that this is just for the purpose of getting facts and figures which could ordinarily be gotten from the engineers' reports in any event and then of presenting them to Congress for the purpose of getting a refund.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Michigan that when the first appropriations or authorizations were made, it was distinctly understood that there would be no request for the return of those contributions.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am not asking any return at this time. I am simply asking to have the facts presented. What my people will do in the future, I do not know.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator has an idea.

Mr. RANSDELL. Certainly, I have an idea; and if they want to present the facts and ask for a refund, they have a right to ask it. I will say to the honorable Senator that the right of petition is open to all American citizens; and, when those facts come in, if they warrant a petition to Congress for reimbursement, they ought to have that right.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. This is merely to secure information.

Mr. RANSDELL. Certainly, it is just to let the light shine on this very interesting situation.

Mr. SMOOT. It was distinctly understood that there would not be any request for reimbursement.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I want to say that I should be very strongly opposed to refunding any contributions heretofore made in connection with any project; but I do think that the engineers have a perfect right, in making a survey and a report, to take into consideration, in making up their recommendations, the contributions that have been made by the locality. That, I take it, would really be the effect of this provision. It rather emphasizes to the engineers that they must look into the matter and see what contributions these people have made. They would probably incorporate those facts in their report without this provision.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope they would.

Mr. JONES. But, in view of the intimation of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], I do not want this taken as conveying any idea that I would approve refunding. If I thought this was really an entering wedge toward bringing about refunding what has been contributed toward these different projects, I should oppose it; but I do not think that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair now lays before the Senate the amendment on page 59.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the last vote of the Senate apply to both amendments which were reconsidered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; both were reconsidered under the same motion, but are to be voted upon separately.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that similar action be taken as to the amendment I offered. I have modified it in the same way in which the Senator from Louisiana modified his amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 59, line 24, strike out the word "funds" and insert in lieu thereof the words "contributions in land and money"; strike out all in line 1, page 60, after the word "waterway" and lines 2 and 3, page 60, and insert a period after the word "waterway" in line 1, page 60.

Mr. JONES. May I ask how that will read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the amendment be stated as it will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. So that it will read:

Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, with a view to reporting the amount of contributions in land and money heretofore furnished by local interests for such waterway.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, it looks as though that is the sole purpose of the survey.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the sole purpose of this particular amendment.

Mr. JONES. I think that is an entirely different proposition from the other. That certainly contemplates a refund; and I am opposed to that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is not the proposition. It asks for information.

Mr. JONES. Well, why? If that is the only purpose of the survey, what is it for?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The other part of the survey is in another paragraph of the bill. Instead of connecting this part with the other in a single paragraph, as the Senator from Louisiana did in the matter of his amendment, I put it in another paragraph.

Mr. JONES. I should like to have it read as it is.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I was under the impression that the two propositions rested on exactly the same basis, and that both are exactly the same. I am glad to know the fact that they are not.

Mr. JONES. All that the clerk read was calling for a report as to the amount of contributions. That is all that the clerk read.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is because, I presume, that language followed the statement of the survey.

Mr. JONES. I should like to have read the whole provision relating to the survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read, as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 59, after line 22, the committee proposed to insert:

Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, with a view to reporting the amount of funds heretofore furnished by local interests for such waterway and as to the advisability of the United States Government reimbursing the local interests for all or any part of the funds so contributed.

As modified by the Senator from Texas, the amendment reads as follows:

Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, with a view to reporting the amount of contributions in land and money heretofore furnished by local interests for such waterway.

Mr. JONES. If that is all there is, it seems to me that must be entirely different from the other amendment, because that does not provide for any survey at all, except merely to ascertain the amount of contributions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To clear up the situation, I ask to amend it further by adding, after the word "to," where it first occurs, "enlargement and improvement, and reporting," and so forth. Then it will be in practically the same language as is the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. COUZENS. Will the Senator point out where it appears in the other portion of the bill? He says it is the same proposition that the Senator from Louisiana asks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Page 60, line 21, "Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas," to which should be added, "with a view to enlargement and improvement." It will be seen that I have placed the whole proposition in two paragraphs instead of one. However, I can clear up the matter by striking out the language on line 21, page 60, and transferring the proposal for a survey and for enlargement and improvement to the last amendment I offered, so that the last amendment will read:

Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, with a view to enlargement and improvement and reporting the amount of funds heretofore contributed by local interests.

Mr. COUZENS. I think I can say to the Senator from Washington that he is correct, that it does not change the intent of the amendment at all. The simple intent is to try to make this body go on record as favoring eventually the refund of these local contributions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no such motive in making this proposal.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, what are the words used for, Mr. President?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to ascertain the facts, to show the wonderful things these people have done. The Senate is entitled to this information. All I wish is the information. We frequently have had information as to other matters furnished us by the departments through Senate resolutions and Senate enactments.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator agree now that he will not ask for a refund?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I do not think that is a fair inquiry in the situation that has been presented by this matter. Of course I know, just as the Senator does, exactly what is going to happen; but the vote has been taken on the one amendment, and we have adopted it, so I think it is only fair that we should adopt the other. I voted against the other one; but I think, inasmuch as we adopted the one, we have adopted the policy, and we ought to adopt this one.

Mr. SMOOT. I know just exactly what will be done.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I just want to say that I must have misunderstood the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana. I thought the Senator from Louisiana was providing for a survey of a proposition and then asked to have incorporated in the report of the survey the facts with reference to the contributions.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator thought right, I will say to him.

Mr. JONES. That is not this proposition.

Mr. RANSDELL. The provision says, the way the House adopted it:

Lake Charles deep-water channel, Louisiana, with a view to maintaining said channel to its enlarged dimensions.

Mr. President, there never has been a survey since that was a 4-foot channel. Now it is a great ship canal, built entirely by local people; and, of course, the Government must make a survey to say whether or not it is going to maintain a ship canal when it was formerly a small local canal. It takes a survey, and a survey is absolutely required under the language which we have adopted.

Mr. JONES. Now, I want to ask the Senator from Texas about this matter again. I understood from him that there were two provisions relating to it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There were.

Mr. JONES. I find one at the bottom of page 59. Where is the other one?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Page 60, line 21.

Mr. JONES. That reads:

Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas.

That is the regular survey.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The regular survey. I asked for information as to local contributions in another paragraph, instead of coupling it with the survey paragraph.

Mr. JONES. I think it ought to be coupled there, so that it will be included in the report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I consent to that.

Mr. JONES. "Including in the report data as to contributions."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Exactly.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I withdraw my amendment and ask that it be inserted in line 21, page 60, so that the language in that line will read:

Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, with a view to enlargement and improvement.

Mr. JONES. I suggest adding, "including in the report thereon the amount of contributions."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well. We amended the language in line 21, page 60, a while ago, by saying, "with a view to enlargement and improvement." Now I want to add, after "improvement," the words "and to including in the report the amount of lands and moneys heretofore contributed by local interests."

Mr. JONES. I have no material objection to that, with the understanding, of course, that if the Senator comes in asking for a refund I shall vote against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If no further amendment is proposed, the Senator from Texas proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On line 21, after the words "with a view to enlargement and improvement," I move to insert the following:

And to including in the report the amount of lands and moneys heretofore contributed by local interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Texas, and agreed to, is reconsidered; and the Senator from Texas now offers the amendment which the clerk will report.

The CHIEF CLERK. Add after the word "improvement," in the amendment heretofore agreed to, the words "and to including in the report the amount of lands and moneys heretofore contributed by local interests," so that the language in line 21, page 60, as amended, will read as follows:

Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, with a view of enlargement and improvement and to including in the report the amount of lands and moneys heretofore contributed by local interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I have no further amendments before me. I ask if there are any other Members of the Senate who have any amendments to present at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No further amendment being offered, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me a moment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here an amendment by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE], who is absent, which I promised to offer; and I ask unanimous consent to offer it now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all proceedings as to the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill will be vacated; and the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it in relation to bridges?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON. The law takes care of that, and it is unnecessary. That is the reason why I did not offer the amendment myself. I understand that the law takes care of bridges where it is essential that they should be constructed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well, Mr. President. With that understanding I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proceedings as to engrossment and third reading stand. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The Senator from Michigan is entitled to the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make a brief statement to the Senate.

I voted against this bill on the final vote in the Commerce Committee. Perhaps the fact that mine was the only vote proves to what gross extent I erred. But I must persist in that mistake, if mistake it be. I do not believe it is wise legislation, not only for reasons which I have already given but for other general reasons which I now briefly summarize. Brevity suffices because I realize that no power can stop this stupendous and adroitly distributed authorization of ultimate drafts upon the Public Treasury.

I am not criticizing the committee, Mr. President. It gave long and faithful hours to its task. Its distinguished chairman gave patient heed to every petitioner, including myself. Certainly I am not impugning the motives of any Senator among the overwhelming majority which obviously favors this bill. Their judgments, of course, are as honest as mine.

Nor do I quarrel, Mr. President, with the intrinsic merits of most of these projects—even many of those which lack specific engineering approval from the War Department.

I believe in the liberal development of inland water transportation. We must persist in constantly expanding activities upon this score. The appropriations of yesterday can be no criterion for to-morrow—except as they be an admonition. I agree also that it is exceedingly difficult for us, as legislators, to pick and choose as between the earnestly and conscientiously supported projects which various sections of the country urge upon us for proprieties. All this is a perplexing reality. But, Mr. President, the greater this perplexity, the greater the need for caution and continence in the preparation of a rivers and harbors bill.

The total authorizations in this bill are beyond all rational limits. It came to us bearing $110,000,000 in authorizations. By one method of figuring—namely, that of counting only the immediate expenditure in view—we have carried it to something like $130,000,000. But by the official method of figuring, as defined to the committee by General Brown, we have carried its ultimate commitments to nearly $335,000,000. That is the total promise which we are making to the widely scattered constituencies which soon will be applauding their particular prospective dividend. Either that, or these authorizations are a mere political gesture intended to excite but not to satisfy the expectations of these communities. Surely we may dismiss any such intent. Therefore, in our long-range planning we must take these authorizations at their face. That mounts to $335,000,000. But though the intent to defraud these expectations be lacking. I feel that a mere balancing of authorizations against likely appropriations is calculated to threaten that we shall keep the word of promise to the ear, yet break it to the hope. In other words, we are to embark upon a tremendous increase in actual rivers and harbors expenditures—far greater than anything yet prophesied in terms of tax cash—either that or somebody is to be fooled.

The total new work done in rivers and harbors expenditures from 1922 to 1929, inclusive—eight years—has been less than $225,000,000. At that rate, Mr. President, the total commitments in this bill represent a closed mortgage for 12 years to come on all the available funds for new rivers and harbors work. Without another rivers and harbors bill for 12 years—which would be an unthinkable season of congressional restraint—all available rivers and harbors funds until 1942 are exhausted by this authorization, based on the experience of the last eight years.

Perhaps we shall increase the annual lump-sum appropriations which are allocated to these projects. I think we should. But can we, in the face of pressing expenditures that multiply in every other governmental direction, expect to increase them enough to reduce appreciably the span of this bill's authorized promises? I fear not. Not the least reason to the contrary is the fact that our annual maintenance bill for rivers and harbors progressively and irresistibly increases as we expand these public works. It was only $10,000,000 in 1922. It was nearly $20,000,000 in 1928. I think we are adding $5,000,000 in this bill. Upkeep as well as original cost must be borne in mind in any candid computation. We are a rich nation. But even a rich nation must cut its garment to fit its cloth, though the cloth be cloth of gold.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Many of the surveys authorized in this bill would probably after being made be rejected, so far as the War Department is concerned. In other words, they will be reported adversely. In arriving at the three hundred and thirty or three hundred and forty million which the Senator estimates as the ultimate cost, does he assume favorable reports upon all the surveys to the maximum amount required?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, no; I include only the projects which actually are authorized in this bill. I do not invade the section of the bill including new surveys whatever. It is $340,000,000 in commitments. In addition the bill orders new surveys on over 200 other projects which I do not undertake to assess.

Now, Mr. President, I voice my second fundamental objection. Many of these gigantic authorizations in the pending bill do not bear the final recommendation of the Board of Rivers and Harbors Engineers at the present time. I confess that it is hard ofttimes to wait upon the deliberative verdict of what may seem to be a recalcitrant and stubborn Board of Engineers. But unless these decisions primarily are technical instead of political we are at sea without a rudder or a compass. I know of no more essential rule, rigidly to be recognized, than the rule that nothing should enter one of these rivers and harbors bills except through the door of a conclusive recommendation from the engineers. The higher the quality and caliber of this board the more useful is its reliance. It should be jealous of its right to command for its recommendations and decisions the highest possible congressional respect. It should yield to no pressure save the pressure of engineering finality. Neither should it be asked to yield. And then, Mr. President, we ourselves should not yield to the temptation of overriding it. Yet we override it to the tune of millions of dollars in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I think this bill reverts to a very dangerous precedent. I have offered an amendment to the Senate rules under which hereafter it will be possible to make a point of order against a project which has not had the benefit of final recommendation when a bill of this character comes before the Senate.

For the reasons indicated I am opposed fundamentally to the legislation, and I wanted to spread this statement on the RECORD. I hope always to be dependably friendly to the development of all inland waterways, but I believe the greatest friendliness is to insist that the process shall be orderly and shall be scientific and shall not transgress the reasonable limits of prospective budgets.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, the big pork-barrel idea in rivers and harbors bills has been a restriction rather than an extension. In 1923 I was on the special committee which investigated the Lakes to the Gulf waterway, and I found in looking matters up that Congress had authorized four big projects, the improvement of the Ohio River, the lower Mississippi, the upper Mississippi, and the Missouri to Kansas City. The Government had expended at that time about $252,000,000 on those projects. Congress had fixed a time limit within which each one should be completed, and in 1923 each of those time limits had already expired by one or two years, and, of course, the time has been extended every year since. Only one of the projects has been completed, that being the improvement of the Ohio River, which was completed recently.

Ninety million dollars was the estimate made to us at that time for the completion of all the four projects. The rivers were not usable in their condition in any profitable way. The expenditure of the $90,000,000 would have made them fit for use, and that would also have extended the operations of the Government barge line over all of them. We were getting no adequate return out of the uncompleted projects, but we would get an adequate return at once if they were all completed.

In looking up the situation at that time I reached the conclusion that the railroad lobbies had been the ones which had prevented adequate appropriations to finish the projects. They did not want the inland waterway transportation facilities completed. So instead of criticizing the Senate for what has been done here—I assume it has been intelligently done—the enlargement of this activity will have the effect of preventing "pork" and preventing waste, and this should not be called a "pork barrel" bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

RELIEF OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I move that the bill (H. R. 10381) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, be now taken up to be made the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to propose the following unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That at the conclusion of its business to-day the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian Monday next; that at that hour the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10381) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, and continue its consideration, to the exclusion of all other business; that after the hour of 3 o'clock p. m., on said day, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment or the bill, and that on said day at not later than 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed, and upon the bill through its several parliamentary stages to and including final passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed agreement requires the ascertainment of a quorum.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I shall object to the provision cutting off debate after 5 o'clock. It would cut out all debate after that hour, as I understood the reading of the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent agreement will have to be restated after the ascertainment of the presence of a quorum. The Senate could hardly agree to it prior to the ascertainment of a quorum.

Mr. JONES. But we can disagree to it.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator from Washington is misinformed as to the hour. Let that part of the agreement be restated.

The Chief Clerk again read the latter part of the proposed agreement.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, if the part of the agreement fixing the hour of 5 o'clock as the time for a vote be left out, I shall have no objection, but the debate may not be exhausted at 5 o'clock, and yet, according to this unanimous-consent request, whether it is or not, or no matter how many amendments may be pending, whether they are new, or have been discussed, we would have to vote. I am not opposed to the request with that part left out, but I will not agree to it with it in.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, to conform with the pleasure of the Senator—and I do not think his suggestion is unreasonable—I am willing to remove the provision about the hour of 5 o'clock, but retain in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement the provision that a final vote shall be had before adjournment on that day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is all right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the fact that there is no specific time set for a vote, is a roll call necessary?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point is well taken. Is there objection to the agreement?

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the proposal does contemplate a final vote on the bill. It does contemplate and provides that before adjournment the bill shall be finally voted upon. That was the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, and in all fairness the roll would have to be called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In any event, the junior Senator from Washington has suggested the absence of a quorum, and therefore the roll must be called.

Mr. McNARY. I withdraw my suggestion.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fess	La Follette	Shortridge
Ashurst	George	McCulloch	Simmons
Barkley	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Bingham	Glass	McMaster	Steck
Black	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Blaine	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stephens
Borah	Hale	Moses	Sullivan
Bratton	Harris	Norris	Swanson
Brock	Harrison	Oddie	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hastings	Overman	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hatfield	Phipps	Townsend
Capper	Hayden	Pine	Trammell
Caraway	Hebert	Pittman	Tydings
Connally	Heflin	Ransdell	Vandenberg
Copeland	Howell	Reed	Wagner
Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Walcott
Cutting	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Kean	Robsion, Ky.	Watson
Deneen	Kendrick	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Keyes	Shipstead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to ask the proposer of the unanimous-consent agreement a question. We may have the second deficiency appropriation bill ready to report sometime Monday, and I would like to have the opportunity of reporting that bill—not taking it up, but merely reporting it. I would like to have that exception made.

Mr. McNARY. There will be no objection to that.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sure there would be no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent proposal submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JONES. I understand that if the Appropriation Committee is ready to submit the report on the deficiency bill it may be submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report may be submitted without calling up the bill. Let the unanimous-consent agreement, as modified, be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That at the conclusion of its business to-day the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian Monday next, that at that hour the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10381) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, and continue its consideration, to the exclusion of all other business; that after the hour of 3 o'clock p. m. on said day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment or the bill, and that prior to adjournment on said day the Senate proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed, and upon the bill through its several parliamentary stages to and including final passage.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, why can we not have a session to-morrow and pass the bill? There are several Senators who will not be here on Monday. I do not think we ought to recess over Saturday when we can accomplish something by remaining in session. We ought to pass the bill to-morrow and get the river and harbor bill out of the way to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The river and harbor bill has already been passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; the river and harbor bill is already out of the way. It was passed some little time ago.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then it passed while I was downstairs at lunch. Reserving the right to object, I again ask why not pass the veterans' bill to-morrow? Why not meet to-morrew and pass the veterans' bill to-morrow?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Alabama that I would like to do that myself, but upon investigating the matter I find that Senators are absent who insist on being present when the bill is considered, and that there would be objection made to a request to vote to-morrow.

Mr. HEFLIN. Are the absent Senators favorable to the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S APPROVAL OF FOREIGN LOAN FLOTATIONS (S. DOC. 183)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State in response to Senate Resolution 293 of June 16, 1930, requesting him to inform the Senate "upon what authorization of law, constitutional or statutory, expressed or implied, does the State Department base its right either to approve or disapprove investment securities offered for sale in the money markets of the United States by foreign governments, corporations, or individuals," and "by what sanction of law, constitutional or statutory, does the State Department assume the right to direct the action of the Federal Reserve Board or banks with respect to their lawful powers concerning the business of banking in foreign countries or the investments of these banks in foreign securities offered in the money markets of the United States."

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1930.*

RELIEF OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 19, addressed to me by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
Washington, June 19, 1930.

Hon. DAVID A. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR REED: In accordance with your personal request made yesterday there is set forth below an estimate of the cost of H. R. 10381, as reported by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Section 1, page 3, lines 3 to 12:	
5-year statute of limitations against breaking service connection	$702,000
Section 6, page 11, line 12 to line 2, page 12:	
Relief of disbursing officers in connection with waiver of recovery	218,000
Section 9, page 13, lines 9 to 18, inclusive:	
Authority for Secretary of War to accumulate records	3,000,000
Section 10, from page 14, line 18, to and including line 2 on page 15:	
Provision for venereal disease cases (misconduct)	$5,421,000
Section 10, from page 16, line 10 to line 23 on page 17:	
Presumption of service origin for diseases—	
Disability cases, 1931	55,900,000
Death cases, 1931	22,700,000
Cost of hospitalizing veterans whose disabilities will be service connected under this amendment and the cost of whose hospitalization will be assumed by the Government pending building of additional Government facilities	6,440,000
The previous figure of $44,000,000 submitted to the Finance Committee, which is reduced to $42,041,000 by the LaGuardia amendment, represented the cost of such presumption provisions based upon the experience expected during the fiscal year 1930, and did not include any amount to cover death cases. For your information there is set forth a table showing the estimated annual minimum cost of this amendment from 1930 to include 1934:	
1930	$42,041,000
1931	55,900,000
1932	71,791,734
1933	84,773,955
1934	89,107,406
The provisions of H. R. 10381 provide that payment shall continue only for a period of 3 years. Therefore, if the bill were adopted and no further amendments made, payments would cease sometime in 1933, dependent upon when the bill became a law.	
Section 11, page 18, lines 7 to 9, inclusive:	
Minimum amount for dependent fathers and mothers	6,000
Section 11, from page 20, line 20, down to line 2 on page 21:	
Flags to drape the caskets for all deceased veterans	40,250
Section 12, page 23, lines 11 to 19, inclusive:	
Extra $25 allowance for specific-injury cases	1,000,000
The estimate on this section covers only the amputated cases, as it is impossible to estimate the number of men who have suffered the loss of use of the various members specified.	
Section 13, page 25, lines 19 to 22, inclusive:	
Minimum rating of 25 per cent for arrested tuberculosis	8,000
Section 14, from page 26, line 22, to line 14, page 27:	
Allowance for dependents of veterans hospitalized for nonservice-connected disabilities	1,900,000
Section 14, page 28, lines 4 to 12, inclusive:	
Spending allowance for veterans hospitalized for nonservice-connected disabilities	218,000
Administrative cost incident to carrying out the provisions of the amendatory act	5,000,000
Total	102,553,250

There are other sections of the bill the enactment of which will undoubtedly result in additional cost to the Government. It is impossible, however, to in any way accurately estimate the approximate cost of such amendments, and for that reason they have not been included in the above total. I believe, however, that you should be advised with respect to the possibilities for cost that such amendments entail.

The first of these is contained in section 4, which amends section 19 of the act by extending the time for filing suits on war-risk insurance contracts. At the present time the Government's liability over and above its premium income on war-risk term insurance (98 per cent of the suits filed are on such insurance) amounts to approximately $1,300,000,000. Therefore every insurance contract which is matured adds an additional liability of $13,800. If 5,000 additional suits were brought as a result of the extension of the time for filing suits—and the bureau has every reason to believe that such a number of additional suits will be filed—there will be a possible additional liability of $69,000,000. It is, of course, not expected that the bureau would lose all of such suits. According to the experience of the bureau on past suits, it would be reasonable to assume that the Government would lose 50 per cent of these suits, which would result in an additional liability to the Government of $34,500,000. This amount will be payable over a period of from 10 to 20 years, dependent upon the number of installments which have accrued at date of entry of judgment. In addition to this, there will be the cost of the defense of these suits. It is estimated that the average cost of preparing for the trial of one of these cases is $2,000. Thus the cost to the Government of trying these cases would be approximately $10,000,000.

The second is contained in section 16 which repeals section 206 of the act. This section of the act limits the time for filing proof in the majority of cases to April 6, 1930. By the repeal of this section, unquestionably thousands of cases will hereafter be allowed on the basis of new evidence submitted which, under the existing law, could not be considered. There is, however, no way to estimate the actual number of cases which will be affected.

The third amendment is that contained in section 17 which repeals section 209 of the act. This section of the act prohibits the filing of claim in the majority of cases after April 6, 1930. As that date is passed, few, if any, claims can now be filed. By repealing the section, undoubtedly thousands of new claims will be presented, many of which will be adjudicated and allowed. To this extent, there will be an additional cost to the Government, but the number of cases which will become payable as a result of the amendment is impossible to forecast.

The fourth amendment is that contained in section 23 which amends section 307 of the act by making all contracts or policies of insurance incontestable from date of issuance, reinstatement, or conversion, and prohibits the Government from raising a plea of estoppel against a claimant because of his reinstatement and conversion. As a result of the adoption of this amendment, undoubtedly many contracts or policies of insurance will become payable which would otherwise not be paid. Further, many recoveries on original contracts will be possible notwithstanding subsequent to the lapse of such contract, there has been a reinstatement or reinstatement and conversion which under the present law would act as a bar to the insured's claim on his original contract. It is impossible, however, to estimate the number of cases which will be affected. In view of the retroactive nature of the amendment, there will be thousands of insurance contracts, payment of which have been denied, which will automatically become payable, and the cost, undoubtedly, will run into many millions of dollars.

There is also for consideration in connection with the cost of this amendatory legislation the possible effect upon future hospital construction. The cost of construction per hospital bed is approximately $3,500. The cost of annual maintenance per bed is approximately $1,500. If the Government is to provide sufficient hospital facilities so that all men suffering with disabilities irrespective of service origin, can be hospitalized, it would necessitate providing within the next three years 13,000 new beds, in addition to those existing or authorized. The cost of construction of such facilities would be approximately $45,500,000, and the annual maintenance cost, after completion, would be approximately $19,500,000. It is to be assumed that if the Government is to provide an allowance for claimants and the wives and children of claimants hospitalized for nonservice connected disabilities, it will provide sufficient hospitalization for all men who need the same. Otherwise there would be a marked discrimination for the reason that the man fortunate enough to be hospitalized by the Government would receive an allowance for himself and family, whereas the man who could not, due to lack of facilities, secure hospitalization by the Government, would receive nothing.

I also feel it is my duty to call your attention to the fact that the figures as given above as the cost of the various provisions contained in the bill represent a minimum cost and do not take into consideration the new claims which will be filed as a result of amendatory legislation. The figure given is based upon known disallowed claims in the bureau and, of course, in no sense represents the maximum cost which might be possible from the enactment of the amendments.

Taking into consideration the new claims which we might expect to be filed and allowed under section 200 of the act, as amended by section 10 of the bill, it is entirely possible that the estimate of this amendment alone will reach approximately $180,000,000 per year.

In closing, I think it only fair to point out the effect of section 18 of the bill. This section amends section 210 of the World War veterans' act by providing that nothing contained in that section shall be construed to permit the payment of compensation under the World War veterans' act as amended, for any period prior to June 7, 1924. The purpose of this amendment is to place the legislative stamp of approval upon the interpretation of the World War veterans' act as adopted by the bureau shortly after its original enactment to the effect that compensation payable solely because of the provisions of that act should not retroactively be paid prior to June 7, 1924. Recently the Comptroller General and the Attorney General expressed the opinion that under the language as used in the World War veterans' act, compensation in some cases could be paid one year prior to the date of claim and in others two years prior to date of claim even though such period is prior to June 7, 1924. If these opinions were to be placed into effect, it would result in an additional payment by the bureau of approximately $25,000,000. By the adoption of this amendment, the Government will be relieved of the necessity of paying this retroactive compensation. While this can be considered a saving, it should be borne in mind that the amount can not be deducted from the amount which it will be necessary to appropriate by reason of the adoption of this bill.

Summarizing for your convenience, the minimum cost of the bill is estimated for the fiscal year 1931 as $102,553,250, with a potential maximum annual cost in five years of approximately $225,000,000, if all eligible veterans and their dependents apply for and are granted relief.

There is inclosed for your information an estimate of the cost of paying a pension to World War veterans, which was prepared for Senator DAVID I. WALSH. A copy of this letter is also inclosed for your use.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Director.*

TARIFF ON LEATHER AND HIDES

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, concerning the hide and leather schedule in the tariff act of 1930, and expressing the gratitude of the leather workers, I have received a letted dated June 17, 1930, from Hon. W. E. Bryan, general president of the United Leather Workers International Union. This letter, together with my reply thereto, I submit for publication in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letters are as follows:

UNITED LEATHER WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 17, 1930.

Hon. TASKER L. ODDIE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Now that the battle to place hides and leather under the protection of H. R. 2667 has been won in both the Senate and the House, notwithstanding the rates, in my judgment are inadequate, yet it has been a great victory to get these commodities off the free list.

It has been one of the pleasures of my life to have been permitted to come in contact with you in this undertaking and to render whatever assistance I and my associates may have contributed to the successful consummation; your able and zealous efforts in this notable conflict must be admired and respected, even by all who were in opposition to us; therefore, upon the part of myself and associates, I express our deepest gratitude and appreciation for your masterful devotion to the undertaking.

With best wishes and highest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. E. BRYAN,
General President United Leather Workers International Union,
Windsor Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.

JUNE 18, 1930.

W. E. BRYAN, Esq.,
General President United Leather Workers International Union,
Windsor Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. BRYAN: I have received your kind letter of June 17.

It was a service of inspiration and pleasure to assist the leather industry in obtaining a tariff so as to establish more normal economic conditions and enable that industry to enlarge its employment of American leather workers.

One of the things that impressed me deeply as I became more familiar with the serious economic status of the leather industry was the fact that leather workers are specialists, and that perfection in the trade has come down from one generation to another, so that if a leather worker can not find employment in his own trade he is unable to obtain at some other occupation an income sufficiently large satisfactorily to maintain his family without lowering the standard of living.

To create healthy economic conditions in the leather industry is the first important requisite to full-time employment, and the tariff as now enacted should aid greatly in this regard. Furthermore, a strong domestic leather industry with increased purchasing power will improve greatly the market for domestic hides.

Your organization performed a most constructive service, through the personal contacts of yourself and Mr. Quinn, in making available to Members of the Senate first-hand practical information in support of the tariff on leather. Without this voluntary cooperation on the part of your organization the Senate would not have realized the importance of this tariff to the employment of leather workers. The initiative of the United States Leather Workers International Union in voluntarily joining the manufacturers of leather in this campaign marks a new era in the improvement of relations between capital and labor and one which will bring the highest rewards not only to industry but also to the labor employed therein.

With kindest personal regards, I remain, very sincerely yours,

TASKER L. ODDIE.

VOLLBEHR COLLECTION OF INCUNABULA

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, there is a House bill on the calendar about which there has been great interest throughout the entire United States and for the passage of which there is need of haste. I refer to the bill authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of the celebrated Vollbehr collection. It is Order of Business No. 998 on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time and passed. I do not believe it will lead to debate. It was passed unanimously by the House and there is a unanimous report from the committee. There is great need for haste.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the bill be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12696) authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of the Vollbehr collection of incunabula.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BRATTON. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that just a moment?

Mr. McNARY. For what purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask for the immediate consideration of a resolution that is in the nature of an emergency.

Mr. McNARY. That may be considered later. I desire at this time to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that just a moment? Will the Senate resume legislative session after the executive business is disposed of?

Mr. McNARY. That is possible.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let us do that, because we want the resolution passed to which the Senator from Tennessee has just referred. I understand that we shall resume legislative business after the executive session.

Mr. McNARY. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there are no reports of committees, the calendar is in order, and the clerk will report the first business on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

HANFORD MACNIDER

The Chief Clerk announced the nomination of Hanford MacNider, of Iowa, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Canada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the confirmation of Hanford MacNider?

Mr. BROOKHART obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Iowa proceeds, will he yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to make this suggestion: I think the nomination just stated is probably the only controverted nomination on the calendar. Would the Senator from Iowa have any objection to allowing it to be passed over temporarily so that the remainder of the calendar may be disposed of, the Senate then to recur to the MacNider nomination?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa consent to the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BROOKHART. That is agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over, and the Secretary will state the next nomination on the calendar.

RALPH J. TOTTEN

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ralph J. Totten, of Tennessee, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

EDWARD A. DOW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward A. Dow to be consul general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis H. Breuer to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

CUSTOMS SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jennie P. Muser to be collector of customs, district No. 48, headquarters at Salt Lake City, Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, post-office nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry officers in the Army.

Mr. REED. I ask that the Army nominations may be confirmed en bloc and that the President may be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar except for the nomination first stated which will be again read.

HANFORD MACNIDER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hanford MacNider, of Iowa, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Canada.

Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Senate. After having spoken for 10 minutes—

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes.

RECEPTION OF REAR ADMIRAL RICHARD EVELYN BYRD, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, Admiral Byrd, the only man who has flown over both the North and the South Poles, is in the Vice President's office. In order that the Members of this body may have an opportunity of meeting this distinguished citizen of America and expressing to him personally their gratification at his heroic achievements and at the success of his wonderful expedition, I move that the Senate take a recess for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, with that proposition I am in the heartiest accord. When Admiral Byrd's expedition was being organized, former Sergeant Czegka, of the Marine Corps, who was one of my old riflemen, came to me and asked me to recommend him as Admiral Byrd's mechanic. I did so. He was accepted, and the next I heard of him was a radiogram from Little America, in Antarctica. I am delighted to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. I also move that the Vice President appoint a committee to escort Admiral Byrd to the Senate Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WATSON, Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. GLASS as members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will call the attention of Senators to the fact that the members of Admiral Byrd's party are in the Members' gallery. The Chair will ask the members of the party to stand up, so that the Members of the Senate may see them.

(The members of Admiral Byrd's party rose, amid applause from the floor and the galleries.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will stand in recess.

The Chair is requested to announce that Admiral Byrd will represent his party on the floor. Since there are so many members of the party, and there is room for only one to come, Admiral Byrd will represent the whole company.

The Senate being in recess, Rear Admiral Byrd, preceded by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, was escorted into the Chamber by the committee appointed by the Vice President, amid applause.

The Vice President and Rear Admiral Byrd stood in the area near the Secretary's desk, and Mr. SWANSON personally presented the Members of the Senate to the distinguished visitor, after which he was escorted from the Chamber, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

HANFORD MACNIDER

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business, the question being on the confirmation of Hanford MacNider to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Canada.

Mr. BROOKHART resumed and concluded his speech, which follows entire:

Mr. President, in reference to this nomination I filed an objection to it that it was personally offensive to me in the highest degree. That objection still holds good. I would not have filed such an objection were it not that I am convinced of the absolute unfitness of this man for such a service, or for any public service, for that matter.

Now, Mr. President, I shall present some matters in reference to this man for the consideration of the Senate. So far as the political phases of the controversy between him and myself are concerned, I care nothing about them, but it may be necessary to refer to them in order to present a proper background. I do not object to nominees because of political opposition to me. After I was ousted from the Senate and in the primary against former Senator Cummins, the manager of Senator Cummins's campaign was Col. C. B. Robbins, who was subsequently appointed to a Federal office. Colonel Robbins had managed the campaign against me, but I made no objection whatever to his appointment.

Later the Democratic candidate against me, Mr. Claude R. Porter, was a candidate for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I made no objection to his appointment. Neither of those men would have been appointed if I had made an objection, because I was consulted beforehand. In this case, however, I was not consulted beforehand, but a representative of the President has informed me that that was not intended as any personal discourtesy or fight upon me in any way.

The MacNider controversy, however, started in an acute form about the time of the contest for the Senate seat. This same man, MacNider, was the chief lobbyist against me among the Senators, and even insulted some of the Senators, and was even ordered from their offices.

At that time, Mr. President, as I am informed and fully believe, the father of this man called President Coolidge on the telephone from Iowa and asked him to see that I was kicked out of the Senate, and said that he wanted it done in time so that I would get in the June primary, and then they would beat me and be done with me. After that transaction the then Senator Butler, of Massachusetts, who prior to that time had favored my being seated, changed his position.

I am not referring to the contest or to the vote of any Senator in the contest because I have any resentment whatever against anyone on account of any vote cast in that contest, whether for political reasons or otherwise. I think I have served long enough in the Senate since that time to let every Senator be advised that I have not resented those votes, and I am only referring to the matter now to give a proper background for the situation.

As soon as I was unseated, Hanford MacNider went to Boston to make a speech against me. He usually goes to some other State when he makes his speeches against me. I wish to read an excerpt from that Boston speech:

He went to Russia, his first trip abroad. One of the greatest Governments on earth, he declared, after a few days among the soviets. He recommended that we clasp them to our bosom. They had much to offer us. They didn't believe our form of government should be allowed to exist, but nevertheless he was for them. The reaction was not so good. He found that we weren't communists out in Iowa; so he proceeded temporarily at least to forget them. Saying good things about anyone was hard work for him, after all; so the good old bugaboos were dragged out again and shot full of holes—the same old bugaboos and the same old holes. The plain inference was that every person in America who had an account in a savings bank was a thief.

In a few short months, with his tales of disaster in Iowa, BROOKHART did more damage to the price of Iowa land and Iowa's products than any 10 normal years had ever developed for us. He promised everything; he has delivered nothing.

Out in Iowa we scratched our heads and said, "Is this man ours or are we his." He was a Lincoln, a Roosevelt, Republican he said, and hollered his way through the primary while we watched him—still stunned by his thunder. Iowa was his. He was bigger than the party, bigger than the President. He grew wilder. He threw everyone else off the Republican ticket but himself.

He got so interested in watching the clouds part before his destructive oratory that to his great surprise he walked off a cliff. Republican Iowa, neglected, with no show of anything constructive and his roar of destruction ringing in her ears, fell out from under him, and 300,000 Iowa Republicans, as far as the Senate was concerned, went Democratic Firmly convinced that no name in a column which carried Calvin Coolidge at the top could be stopped, nevertheless we protested.

It was a hard job for Iowa Republicans to scratch the ticket. We didn't know how. BROOKHART seemed to have won. The contest went to the Senate. Ten to one the Senate committee reported his defeat, but the timid counseled—"Caution! Careful! Safety first!" "What would happen if this terrible man was ejected?" "True he was no Republican, but he traded on the name. What if he has flaunted the red flag in our face? What if he had betrayed the party which gave him high office? What if he had not made any sense? He was a bad man, and he might do anything. Let the President and the party swallow his taunts—let Iowa and everyone else suffer—but let's avoid trouble."

Out in Iowa the Republicans who had ousted him looked amazed on the spectacle. "What kind of justice was this," came their queries—and this Senator and I can both testify they came by the thousands.

The Senator referred to there was Senator Butler, of Massachusetts, in his home town—

And then, in the midst of indecision, came leadership—strong, virile, unafraid. And with that leadership came back the faith in the party which had led the Nation through all its most perilous days. Iowa Republicans owe to William M. Butler a great debt. We can hold up our heads again as members of our party.

Of course, Mr. President, it will be remembered that that speech defeated Butler, and it also renominated me in the Republican primary. So I have no personal complaint on account of that speech, except as to some of the terms used.

In answer to that speech the Des Moines Register, which is the largest newspaper in Iowa, published the following editorial:

A DEAD BOGEY

Of course, on the theory that all is fair in a fight, which our political tradition certainly seems to justify, any kind of statement that is likely to embarrass the other side is smart politics. Of course, also, in the heat of a political fight the other fellow comes to be regarded as such a rascal that, if the particular charge against him isn't warranted, it may be assumed that other worse things might be said, and therefore that he is being done no injustice.

On this ground, which Colonel BROOKHART'S opponents may occasionally be tempted to occupy, the dragging in of the old bogey of Russia by Colonel MacNider in his speech at Boston Thursday, might be excused. It is rather difficult to see how it is to be excused on other grounds.

MacNider was speaking for Senator Butler in Senator Butler's own campaign. He was simply citing Butler's activity against BROOKHART in the Senate-seat contest as an argument in favor of Butler's election to succeed himself as Senator from Massachusetts. All of which was fair enough, since, as Assistant Secretary of War and as former national head of the American Legion Colonel MacNider naturally cuts a figure.

But the reliable Associated Press quotes MacNider as saying that BROOKHART, after his trip to Europe a few years back, referred to the Russian government as "one of the greatest governments on earth." That is the old charge, used to send shivers up the backs of conservatives in Iowa. But the record of public statements made by BROOKHART does not support it. The record is plenty clear that what BROOKHART said was different. What BROOKHART said was that the Russian government was one of the most stable in the world at the particular time of his visit. Colonel Haskell returned from Russia about the same time and said the same thing. And time has amply proven that the judgment was a sound one. The Russian government of that time has proven stable. Much as it displeases some people yet, it still seems more stable than not a few other governments to-day.

And there is another part that, perhaps, does not refer to this.

Mr. President, one comment I should make on that Russian stuff is that Herbert Hoover showed me Russia. During my trip around Europe he had me accompanied by his personal representative, Dr. Alfred P. Dennis, whom nearly all of you know, and who is now vice chairman of the Tariff Commission, one of the ablest and finest men I know. When we got ready to go into Russia, Doctor Dennis wanted very much to go with me. I cabled Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, and asked permission for Dennis to go. He immediately replied that permission could not be given, as he was a Government employee, and we had not recognized Russia; but he said, "I have cabled Colonel Haskell, in charge of the American relief administration in Moscow, and he will look after you in Russia."

Colonel Haskell still had his automobiles and his interpreters. His interpreters were czarists. They were not of the Soviet Government, and it was in Colonel Haskell's automobiles and through his interpreters that I saw and heard Russia. Nevertheless, MacNider makes this speech.

In addition to this, as soon as the Register published this article, he replied in a signed statement—I have a photostatic copy of it here—of April 29, 1926. It is in this statement that he made the personal charges against me upon which I based my objection; and I will read the portion of the statement covering those charges. Since then he has informed members of the committee, and me, too, that he made no such charges against me; but here is what he said:

Does BROOKHART'S criticism of our national banking system rate space in the Register because he has been accused of transferring his property to avoid assessment in a failed bank of which he was a stockholder? At the Iowa Corn Belt conference in Des Moines he proclaimed as if it were a misdemeanor that my father had pledged his personal fortune to back the deposits in the First National of Mason City. As it happened that was not necessary, but which action do you approve—BROOKHART'S reported attempt as a stockholder to evade his responsibilities to depositors or the opposite action which he derides on my father's part?

Mr. President, nobody ever accused me of transferring my property to avoid a bank assessment or any other debt. In that particular transaction I had $2,000 of stock in this bank, and I promptly paid my 100 per cent assessment. My wife and her sister, who is a missionary in India, had $800 more that they had bought with a little legacy from their father's estate. They had no money to pay this assessment. I held it as trustee, and was not personally liable for it, but I went into my own pocket

and paid it all myself. Mr. MacNider or anybody else could have ascertained these facts before making this kind of a charge if they had simply dropped a letter to the bank examiner. There would have been no trouble at all in finding out about it.

(At this point Mr. BROOKHART yielded that the Senate might receive Rear Admiral Richard Evelyn Byrd; and after the reception, the Senate resumed executive business.)

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, in the statement I read from MacNider's signed letter to the Register reference was made to his father. That is not a true statement of the situation. His father, who was fighting me more bitterly than any other man in the State, and had more money with which to do it, came to Washington and went to the White House, and he gave out a statement of what wonderfully prosperous and rosy conditions existed in Iowa. Then, he went back home, and within a week he was standing before his bank to prevent a run. The newspapers said he pledged his private fortune to stop the run. I was twitting him in Iowa about his prosperity talk. It will be noted that the other MacNider tells about the damage done to land values by my telling the facts of the situation.

Now, I want to read another speech, where this man not only paid his respects to me but to some other Senators, and to the "Young Guard" in particular. This speech was made January 30, 1930, down in Kansas. It will be noticed that he usually goes out of the State of Iowa, as I have said, to make his speeches. The speech in full is as follows, as reported in the Topeka Capital:

The Hon. Dave Mulvane has given me my instructions. I am to make a Republican speech. It doesn't matter much what I say, as long as I sit down when I get through.

Now, it's a great honor for an Iowan to be given such an opportunity. The only thing Republican that my State can be accused of lately is that we voted for Herbert Hoover and Charley Curtis. Our senior Senator is a Democrat, but at that he's a lot better Republican than his junior colleague. Occasionally at least, he lets a day go by without publicly panning the President and the whole Republican administration.

Nevertheless, you of Kansas and we of Iowa ought to be allowed to stick out our chests a little. We furnished the party and the Nation with the two men who won the last election. Our States are both full of good people who call both of them by their first name. What is more, our two States are Republican, although I will admit that Kansas's immediate record is in better shape than ours.

It is that very record I want to discuss and what I may say applies to Iowa and some others in similar trouble rather than to yours. The situation, however, is one that vitally concerns everyone of us who call ourselves Republicans. Sooner or later we must make a decision on what the aim of our party is to be. Are we simply trying to win successive elections or are we endeavoring to furnish the men and women who will fight for the principles which we as a party have decided are the best for our country?

SUBORDINATING PRINCIPLE

It is of course important that we have a continuing program and that our party and our chosen leaders have time and opportunity to carry out their constructive ideas, but it does seem to a private in the ranks of the party like myself that we are subordinating our principles to the exigencies of the moment when we allow our party flag to fly over men whose interest in the party dies and who brazenly set out to wreck its program the moment the election is over.

Personally, I am only one Iowa farmer living outside an Iowa town.

I wish to stop there just a moment on that Iowa farmer statement. I want to remind the Senate of President Hoover's speech of acceptance. The President said:

The whole tendency of our civilization during the last 50 years, has been toward an increase in the size of the units of production in order to secure lower costs and a more orderly adjustment of the flow of commodities to the demand. But the organization of agriculture into larger units must not be by enlarged farms. The farmer has shown he can increase the skill of his industry without large operations. He is to-day producing 20 per cent more than eight years ago with about the same acreage and personnel. Farming is and must continue to be an individualistic business of small units and independent ownership. The farm is more than a business; it is a state of living. We do not wish it converted into a mass-production machine. Therefore, if the farmer's position is to be improved by larger operations, it must be done not on the farm, but in the field of distribution. Agriculture has partially advanced in this direction through cooperative and pools. But the traditional cooperative is often not a complete solution.

I know of no more emphatic statement against the chain farm, or the corporation farm, than the statement of the President in his speech of acceptance. I was, therefore, somewhat astonished that he should come to Iowa and select the one chain farmer of the State to represent the United States in Canada. MacNider is the only kulak farmer in the whole State of Iowa, and perhaps that is the reason why he gets after me so strongly about Russia, because in Russia they are cleaning the kulaks out and dividing their holdings into small farms, such as those Hoover advocated in his speech of acceptance.

I have here a photostatic copy of a speech published in the Des Moines Register for December 22, 1929, in which the following appeared:

4,000-ACRE PROJECT

Some 20 farms, including something over 4,000 acres, will be operated this coming year by the Indian Head Farms Co., which will employ hired labor entirely. Mr. MacNider—

That is the same young MacNider—

is head of this company, while the active management is being carried on by Howard O'Leary and the supervision by O. W. Ong.

So Iowa is to be misrepresented in this situation by the head of the chain farm organization which the President himself condemned so emphatically.

The speech from which I was quoting proceeds:

This business of licking the boots of every whelp who runs as a Republican, campaigns on the party platform, and then goes to Washington with the sole idea of making himself conspicuous by blocking every move by the head of the party, by joining with the enemy to discredit the administration and to prevent in every way possible the reelection of the party's nominees, is not my idea of what our party should represent.

The party—and when I say the party I mean those who sit in its high counsels and chart its course—needs courage, intestinal fortitude, guts in plain American. The next election is not so all-important that we must knuckle down before every demagogue.

After all, why can these so-called Republicans berate all things Republican—the President and all the party platform and get away with it?

* * * * * * *

Whose fault is it that this goes on? The President's? Somewhat perhaps, because he is the head of the party, but, after all, where must he go for advice when one of these wild artists blows up on him and joins the Democrats? Naturally he consults the leaders of the party in that State, and what do they advise? Half the time awed by the noisy radical (plus the Democratic) applause which has followed this traitor in his fearless fight on everything he supposedly vouched for during the last campaign, these leaders cautiously decide perhaps it would be better not to jeopardize the next convention delegation by antagonizing this fellow's crowd, rapidly being strengthened by the patronage being allowed him. The first thing they know he has them where he wants them, at least long enough to seriously cripple the administration's efforts to justify itself before the people.

* * * * * * *

We are now being entertained at Washington by an antiadministration group of self-styled Republican Senators led by one who campaigned for Al Smith and by another who campaigned even harder for Herbert Hoover and who incidentally demanded and received for that effort the pitiful special session to pass a farm tariff, and which passed nothing except abuse of the President and all things Republican. One of the noisiest Members comes from my own State. He campaigned violently for the ticket and repudiated it the moment it was elected. He is now being rewarded with all the State's patronage for his labors.

That last remark refers to two American Legion soldiers whom I had appointed as United States marshals out in Iowa, either one of whom would make a better minister to Canada than Hanford MacNider.

Now we have something more interesting still:

Take the two younger stalwarts who proudly take upon themselves the title of the "Young Guard." These two embryo statesmen were too busy or too exhausted to do anything but claim exemption when the Nation last faced an armed enemy, but they are overflowing with vigor and vitality when it comes to waging a campaign against their own party. I hand it to them. They are doing a good job of demolition at the present time.

Of course, the statement never would have been made but for the absolute ignorance of the man making the statement. The "Young Guard" that was organized here everybody knew was to sustain the President and help him in his ideas against the "Old Guard," which had gone into this general tariff revision when the President wanted only a limited tariff revision. But this smart aleck, who knows more than Congress knows, who knows more than anybody else knows, who knows more than the President knows, attempts to represent them as standing for exactly the opposite of their intentions and purposes.

Mr. President, the nominee represents the Cement Trust; he represents the Power Trust; he represents the chain-farm situation. On soldiers legislation he has been the worst enemy of

the soldiers that United States ever had. He thinks that the hard-boiled laws we have in the Veterans' Bureau are all that the soldiers need. I have had personal contact with him upon these subjects, and I know that he is opposed to giving the soldiers of the World War or any other war any just economic reward.

For instance, I went not long ago to the soldiers' hospital at Tupper Lake, N. Y. There were 350 tubercular patients in that hospital. It is one of the newest of the hospitals. Of that number 212 were not drawing compensation because they were unable to connect their disability with the service by technical medical proof. In one of the beds was a soldier who was perhaps dying with tuberculosis. He was a single man, it so happened. He was drawing his compensation of $100 a month. In the next bed was another soldier. Hanging there was a picture of his wife and four children. He was in a worse condition than the single man, and he was not drawing a single cent of compensation, although that family of his was dependent upon charity for their living. He could not, by technical medical proof, trace his disability to the service connection. General Hines reported to me there are 7,000 soldiers in like condition in all the hospitals.

I have insisted that because these men have answered the call of the Government when the Government needed them the Government should answer their call when they need the Government; but this man, Hanford MacNider, is opposed to anything of that kind. He is opposed to pensions for World War veterans. He is against everything of the sort, and manipulates in the most arbitrary way the political committees of the State convention to accomplish that purpose.

I do not know why he was appointed unless it was to reward him for some of his activities during the campaign. He has insisted upon making the American Legion into a partisan political organization. In the recent campaign he was given headquarters of some kind in Chicago, but the manager there, who was really a wise man, kept him out of Iowa because he was unable to do any good working for anybody in Iowa. I have always found him very valuable, however, when he was active against me. Some Senators may think that is the reason why I do not want to send him to Canada.

Here is another thing, Mr. President, another charge I want to make against the fitness of Hanford MacNider especially at this time. Too many American Legion conventions have been just drunken revels. I have seen this man Hanford MacNider leading those revels. I know he is to blame for that more than any man in the whole American Legion. I am not in favor of sending as a representative of the American Government anywhere a man that leads in that kind of a situation.

Mr. President, I have stated at least some of the reasons why I have a right to make a personal objection against this man. If any Senator ever had that right I have it in this case. I have voted to sustain that objection myself every time it has come up. Many Senators have told me they would vote to sustain the objection if I requested it. But, Mr. President, I am not going to ask the Senate to vote against this man on account of my personal objections. I have stated other reasons. If Senators want to have him confirmed, the responsibility is upon President Hoover. If he wants a man who will violate his own speech of acceptance, a man who has violated his own theory of law enforcement, and similar matters, to represent him in a foreign country, he shall take the responsibility. I have said my say.

Mr. STECK. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything in this matter at all, and I would not do so if it were not for the last statement of my colleague. I can not let that go by unchallenged. I care nothing about the political differences between my colleague and Hanford MacNider, of Iowa. They are both Republicans; at least, both claim to be Republicans, and their standing amongst the Republicans in the State of Iowa will have to be fought out by the Republicans in that State. As to nothing else which the Senator has stated do I care to speak, except two statements which I can not let go by unchallenged.

In the first place, when he speaks about the ex-service men and what MacNider has or has not done for them, I may say that has nothing to do with this matter at issue, but I can not let it go by without comment. I know Hanford MacNider and his activities in the American Legion. I have knowledge of the fight he put up as national commander on the bonus and other soldiers' legislation.

The Senator is right in one respect. Mr. MacNider is at this time opposed to a general service pension for men of the World War. Mr. Hanford MacNider and my colleague fought that out on the floor at the last American Legion convention, and, as I remember the vote, the resolution which was proposed by my colleague or by some one in his behalf received about 3 votes in the convention where there were some thousand or more delegates. That is enough for that matter.

But when my colleague infers that Hanford MacNider is a drunkard, or anything of that sort, I will say to the Senator that he does not know what he is talking about. He is either ill-advised or he has no knowledge of the situation. I will admit very frankly that up to a few years ago Mr. MacNider did take a drink occasionally, and there is no question about it, as thousands and thousands of other men, both inside and outside of the Senate, at American Legion conventions and nearly all other conventions, have done. When Mr. MacNider came into public life he ceased to drink and has been an absolute teetotaler for the last four years. I defy anyone to deny that statement.

Mr. MacNider is fit for the position, in spite of the statement of my colleague. He has been chosen by the President. He did not want the position, but he was chosen and finally agreed to accept it. I know that his nomination meets the enthusiastic approval of practically the entire press of Iowa and of nearly every citizen in that State, as well as over the entire country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.]

The ayes have it. The nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States making sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

The Senate resumed legislative business.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial appearing in to-day's Washington News which I ask that the clerk may read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. STECK. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLACK. I have the floor, and I shall read the editorial myself. The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 20, 1930]

PRESIDENT SHOULD SPEAK

Those who declare that President Hoover and his administration will be responsible if Muscle Shoals legislation fails this session apparently are right.

There is reason to believe that Hoover, with a word, could end the present controversy and allow both Houses of Congress to decide whether or not they will accept the new shoals compromise proposal. That compromise is deadlocked in conference because a Republican Congressman from Tennessee has refused to agree to it.

Senator NORRIS offered the compromise. It allows the Government to retain the power facilities at Muscle Shoals, orders the United States to build Cove Creek Dam, and permits lease of the nitrate and fertilizer properties. This should please the House, which has demanded that Muscle Shoals be put to work making cheap fertilizer for American farmers.

But the Tennessee Representative, believing—or so he indicates—that the compromise would not get presidential approval, has turned it down altogether.

Unless the Congressman accepts the compromise, he will have placed responsibility for failure of Muscle Shoals legislation upon the President and the Republican Party.

The President has spoken before to end such deadlocks. He should speak now to the Republican Congressman from Tennessee and the leaders in the House, so that Congress may dispose of this old problem and put Muscle Shoals to work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from Alabama has just stated, there is a precedent already made by the President. Apparently he made it yesterday when he called into conference with himself the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], one of the conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I understand that the President is now undertaking to settle or aid in the settlement of the dispute over that bill, which is in conference. So far as I am concerned, I hope that the President will be of aid in the settlement of that conference on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, because I believe that we ought to adopt a very liberal policy toward the city of Washington. I believe either that the Senate figure should be adopted or a compromise between the figures passed by the two Houses agreed upon. I think a compromise should be made in that case.

But, Mr. President, there is one thing certain. The President of the United States knows more about the Muscle Shoals proposal than he does about the District of Columbia proposal, for the reason that he evidently made a study of the Muscle

Shoals question in 1928 and came to the same conclusion that has been reached by most of the conferees on Muscle Shoals legislation, namely, that a compromise ought to be adopted. The proposal then suggested by the President, then a candidate, is substantially exactly the same as that now offered by the Senate conferees, and so the President, it seems to me, could with great propriety ask the House conferees to accept the proposal of the Senate conferees. I very sincerely hope that the President will be successful in his efforts to bring about a compromise on the District of Columbia appropriation bill now in conference, and I just as earnestly hope that he will then take up the Muscle Shoals question in the same way and bring about an adjustment and compromise upon that measure instead of standing in its way, as I believe he is now doing. One word from him to the House conferees would bring about an agreement on Muscle Shoals and bring about an agreement on a proposal exactly the same as that which the President advocated in 1928 when he was a candidate for President.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, there is no difference between my colleague [Mr. BLACK] and myself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] as to where the responsibility will ultimately rest with reference to Muscle Shoals. It is just a question of the best policy of reaching the President and having him act. Of course, it is his duty to act; and if he does not act the responsibility will be upon him. I still hope we will get out of the deadlock and settle the matter.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington News.

Mr. COUZENS. It has already been read.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. WAGNER. I still have the floor. I shall read the editorial myself.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] just read the editorial.

Mr. FESS. Has it not already been read by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WAGNER. No; I am referring to another editorial. I shall read the editorial:

IS IT TRUE, MR. PRESIDENT?

Is the President responsible for blocking the passage of the Wagner unemployment bills? That charge is freely made in Congress.

It seems inconceivable that these conservative and generally accepted measures, which embody recommendations of four Hoover commissions during the last eight years, should be killed now by the man who really inspired them.

It seems even more inconceivable that any President under any circumstances would prevent enactment of unemployment legislation when from three to five million men are begging for the right to work, which is denied them.

But some powerful influence somewhere has delayed House action on these bills passed by the Senate. We can not believe that the fact that the bills carry the name of a Democrat is the reason, as charged, that the House committee has just sidetracked one of these bills and emasculated another.

It is clear, nevertheless, that the House has the idea that the President wants the bills killed and that nothing short of a frank White House statement can save this tremendously important legislation before Congress adjourns.

PRINTING OF RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, in the absence of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the river and harbor bill may be printed with the amendments numbered.

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

HISTORY AND PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet prepared by Miss Katherine Halterman, of St. Louis, Mo., entitled "History and Principles of Democracy."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The pamphlet is as follows:

HISTORY AND PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY—THE PRINCIPLES OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY DEFINED AND APPLIED

CHAPTER I

History of Democracy

The history of democracy is the history of the age-old struggle for human rights, of resistance to oppression.

Democracy's light began to gleam along with the light of Christianity and grew brighter with the spreading of that faith. Before the coming of Christ the treatment accorded as a matter of course to human beings was unspeakable, revolting to contemplate. Used as beasts, whipped, starved, done to death as galley slaves, human life was worse than disregarded. Lingering torture, inhuman cruelty, and intolerable suffering were not only looked upon with indifference but even enjoyed, because it demonstrated the power of oppression, power of some over others. The only right was the right of the strong, the powerful.

After that period of the world's history marked by the coming of Christ, a change becomes discernible. First pity, then mercy, then justice began to enter into social relationships. Along with these grew hope and courage. Through the centuries there gradually developed a drawing together of men in defense of the common interest of mankind. So tremendous is the significance of this movement it has been accorded the all inclusive descriptive term—the brotherhood of man. It constitutes the first vision of democracy.

These dark centuries are marked with the imprint of resistance and struggle against injustice and oppression; conquest, oppression, rebellion, experiments in government; faint new conceptions—of the dignity of man, the worth of human life; courageous leaders daring to assert the rights of human beings; tyrants rising afresh and resisted anew by fresh defenders of the people.

Every separate right enjoyed to-day as a matter of course was wrested at the cost of blood, suffering, and death from the tyranny of the strong and powerful, cruel oppressors of their own humankind—the right to print the truth; the right to assemble and freely discuss public questions, to seek protection in the courts, to follow the individual conscience in the worship of God, to petition redress of grievance, to have a part in the government of themselves.

Liberty of human beings would never have emerged through all this welter of suffering and oppression from the dark ages to the present era of freedom had it not been for the undying germ of democracy implanted in the human breast. Democracy, therefore, is a fundamental element of the make-up of the human being, the growth of democracy an inevitable development, because deeply rooted in the souls of men.

The founding of our own country, the establishment of our Government was a phase in the progress of this struggle for democracy. This very occasion came hand in hand with oppression in the form of love of conquest, the driving motive which led to the discovery of America and which marked the earlier stages of colonization until the yoke was thrown off in the Revolution.

The American who would understand present-day problems of his country must never forget that the founding of our free country was one of those struggles for liberty which have been going on for centuries, that our Government is one of those experiments in democracy, that it is still in the testing and will be so long as it lasts. Nor should we ever forget that those men who consecrated their lives to making ours a successful experiment in democracy were very close to the tyranny and oppression they had to resist and that it was to avoid the oppression of government they tried to frame our own.

Why must we remember these things?

Because unless we are alert and intelligent and keep the lamp of democracy trimmed and tended and burning brightly in our day, tyranny and oppression will arise again in a perhaps unexpected form and overthrow and reduce the succeeding generations and their inheritance. For oppression is just as natural a force in the breast of mankind as is democracy, both struggling for ascendancy. Because they knew this fact the founders strove to formulate a government which would withstand this naturally opposing force and create an enduring free government and people.

Because they had just escaped from under the shadow of oppression the founders of our country realized clearly what it was that kept all men from enjoying all their rights from the beginning and that constantly menaces the continued enjoyment of those rights. Just one thing—the desire of some to possess power and riches, to glorify themselves at the expense of others less strong or less grasping. And it was against this well-recognized tendency and desire that their safeguarding efforts were directed and were expressed in the instrument used as the formula of our Government. In their own words, the Constitution was ordained and established "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The principles they followed in erecting these safeguards are the

Principles of democracy

applied as a practical working basis—a theory of government put into practice.

This practical application can be seen in the very structure of the Government set-up—the three departments, legislative, executive, and judicial, balancing each other so that no one department has complete right of exercise of power over the affairs of the people.

But it is in the bill of rights of the people that the protective safeguard is most manifest. These were the rights for which man had been struggling for centuries. They were added to the Constitution at the insistance of the patriot Jefferson in order to insure them to the

people of his country. Each one of them was specifically mentioned because it was a right which had been flagrantly violated by tyrants and governments of the past. They are the expression of the very essence of democracy. Read them and consider how you would like to live under a government where you were deprived of them.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

"No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

To be denied these rights would mean terrorism—entering of homes without legal warrant, dragging off and imprisoning father, mother, or child without information of what or of by whom accused, false trials among strangers, extortion of testimony by torture, cruel, and unusual punishments, persecution for religious beliefs, for printings or speaking the truth. For men have always done these things to others when they had the power.

These first principles of democracy have to do with rights or liberty of the people. There are others which express the duties of government toward the people and regulate the attitude and conduct of officials.

Controversy arose over these phases of the structure of government while our Constitution was being framed—controversy between two schools of political thought—between Madison, Jefferson, Monroe, and their followers on the one hand and Alexander Hamilton on the other, Madison contending for a national government whose officials were to be selected by the people of the several States for short enough terms that they would always be under the power of the people to remove, a national government with power limited to those things which the people of the separate States could not well manage separately, as national defense, foreign affairs, the nation-wide monetary system, foreign commerce, transportation and commerce between the States, thus reserving to the self-governed States and to the counties, cities, and townships the management of their own affairs and of all the things which pertained to the daily lives of the people.

Hamilton contended for a strong central (national) government. He came to the constitutional convention with a draft proposing that the President be selected for life and with power to appoint the governors of the States. For that reason his followers were called Federalists.

Madison's idea was adopted, but after the adoption of the Constitution and throughout the administration of Washington and Adams these two opposing schools of political thought continued to contend. Upon the election of Jefferson as President, however, he immediately declared the Democratic interpretation of the principles upon which the Government was formed and upon which it should be administered.

These then are the principles of democracy, the practical expression of that idea deeply rooted in the breast of man—

That government should exist solely for the benefit of the people, a banding together of them for mutual protection and preservation of their rights, and to insure that none of them trespass against others.

That the processes and power of the people's Government should not be turned to use against them.

That officials of the Government are employees of the people and subject to their will; that they have no right to use office nor influence for themselves, nor for the benefit of any who might seek special privileges, but solely for benefit of all the people.

That the laws or rules adopted by the people for administration of the Government should be so framed and applied as to be of benefit to all the people and to apply to all of them alike—in short, that there should be no "class legislation"; that is, laws for the benefit of special classes, nor to fall more heavily on some (the same old tendency to gain power and wealth at the expense of others).

That Government should not interfere in business, but give to the business interests of the country the same protection and safeguards in the right to operate freely and without hindrance as is given to people in their right to own and enjoy property.

That religion is not the concern of the Government—that its duty in that respect is to protect the citizen in his right to follow his own conscience.

It is interesting to trace the political history of our country through succeeding administrations to ascertain whether or not the principles on which the Government was founded have been put into effect, to note when and by whom they have been faithfully applied. This will be done in the following chapters. When you have read them you will understand why your father and grandfathers back through preceding generations stood loyally and staunchly by the banner of democracy, why their children and grandchildren must continue to uphold the standard if democracy is to survive, why, in success or defeat, it is an honor and a privilege to be aligned with those forces which, however imperfectly, strive to preserve the principles of democracy and apply them to our Government.

CHAPTER II

Democracy applied by

1. Jefferson—

After the adoption of our very democratic form of government an amusing controversy arose—a controversy as to whether there should be titles and ceremonies in this most democratic land. The first days of the first session of Congress were largely taken up with discussion of such titles as, "Majesty, excellency, highness, most honorable," until it might have been supposed a monarchy was being set up instead of a democracy.

This question being determined in favor of equality and simplicity, the same spirit became manifest in a more serious form—an issue which, in various forms, has been ever present in the administration of our Government, the question of a privileged class. It does not seem reasonable such a question could arise under a government founded on the principle all men are equal, that government should be administered equally for the benefit of all and that there should be no favors nor penalties not applicable to all alike.

Nevertheless, human nature being what it is, there has never been a time in the country's history when this effort to get special privileges, or to use the Government for private benefit, was not going on, either openly or coverty. In those first days of our Government it was manifested rather openly, the wealthy and influential, the merchants and financiers grouping themselves about Hamilton who, born under the shadow of illegitimacy and reared in a counting house, entertained a passion for aristocracy and wealth and gave his great ability and capacity to their service. The agricultural classes and the poorer people rallied around Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe and the very able group of early patriots, in Congress and out, who aided and supported them.

One incident of the first Congress furnishes an interesting illustration of this fundamental difference in attitude.

After the close of the war the heroic soldiers of the Revolution had dispersed to their homes, to the woods and farms, and the frontier—to begin the task of making a nation out of the country they had saved. The governments of the several colonies which they had served in the war had no funds from which to pay for their military service and had issued to them certificates to be later redeemed in money.

Hamilton's first message to Congress proposed that the Federal Government should assume these debts of the States to the soldiers and redeem the certificates.

But before his message was delivered the plan was allowed to leak out to the favored who supported Hamilton's policies. There were no fast mail trains to carry the news to the woods and the frontiers—no telegraph nor telephone—no wireless nor radio.

Secretly, express riders carrying large sums of money were dispatched into the back country, fast-sailing vessels were started down the Carolina coast—with agents bearing funds to buy from the poor soldiers at 15 or 20 cents on the dollar these certificates which the Government would later redeem at par.

The matter became a public scandal. James Madison, who might be termed the first Democrat, arose in Congress to offer an amendment to Hamilton's proposal by providing that certificates in the hands of the original holders should be redeemed in full, but where they had been assigned the assignee should receive the market price and the original holder the remainder.

The followers of Hamilton rallied to defeat Madison's proposal. Hamilton's plan was adopted after a bitter fight. And later it became known that 29 of the 64 Members of which Congress was then composed had been engaged in buying up certificates! Several of the early New England and eastern fortunes were founded in this way.

Thus the very first application of the Hamilton policies resulted in enriching the privileged classes by defrauding the poor and the country's heroes. And the latter were taxed to pay the certificates besides.

The party which supported Hamilton in his advocacy of a powerful national government by a ruling class came to be called Federalists. They dominated the Government until Jefferson was elected President. His convictions were deeply rooted in the principles on which the Government was founded—they were largely his own conception. He set about to apply them, inaugurating a period of simplicity and equality, elimination of class privilege which lasted, with the impetus added by Jackson, until the Civil War.

Jefferson then did the one thing to which we will owe the survival of democracy in our Government so long as it does survive. He knew that his conception of a free and equal people could be soundly based only on the foundation of a leveling of intellectual capacity through education—an upward process bringing the intellectual capacity of the people up to the highest level—not merely for education itself alone, but in order that America should have a citizenship with the capacity to understand, appreciate, and preserve the blessings of free government. With this in view he planned our system of National and State colleges, secondary and primary schools, and proposed the then unheard-of idea that the Government should provide free education for all.

Another foundation of democracy in Jefferson's eyes was dignity of agriculture. He wanted for America no peasant class of farmers, such as Europe had, no agricultural class subservient to and at the mercy of the industrial and financial interests. He planned and builded for an agricultural nation, utilizing its vast virgin tracts to fill the larders of the earth and keep American commerce and an American merchant marine busy transporting our agricultural products all over the world. He visioned a farming class of landowners, educated by the State, an intelligent citizenship, taking place in the social and economic scale along with the banker, the merchant, the manufacturer, and the professions.

Thus Jefferson not only applied the principles of democracy in his own administrations but insured the continuation of those principles by providing for the future the only foundation upon which they could endure.

His principles were followed and his policies carried out by his successors, Madison and Monroe.

2. Democracy applied by Jackson—

By the time Andrew Jackson became President an institution founded under the policies of Hamilton had become so powerful as to have a strangle hold on the people. This was the United States Bank. It controlled the money of the country.

Its charter was about to expire and Jackson opposed renewal. He proposed that the people of the country should control their own money and wealth.

He and his followers, people of Missouri and other new and struggling Western States, were denounced as "this miserable rabble" by the wealthy class, who wanted the United States Bank to continue to control the money of the country and keep it in the East. The bank even went so far as to cause a money shortage and hard times in order to frighten Jackson and his followers.

But Jackson won. The charter was not renewed and a money system was adopted which served the people until the Democratic Party put the present Federal reserve system into effect nearly a hundred years later.

During the administrations of such leaders as Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson there was never an accusation of favoritism to sinister interests, never a charge of special privilege, never a voice of protest that the administration, the Government was being used for the benefit of the few. This for the very good reason that everyone plainly understood that the Government was being administered for all alike. There was no question about it. No scandals, no necessity for defenses, no attempts to cover up—nothing to conceal.

The period from Jefferson to the Civil War was a golden age of democracy triumphant. Under the guidance of a strong and pure Democratic Party the country progressed from a Union of a few struggling States to one of the earth's largest and most powerful of countries, a dream of democracy come true—justification for all the struggling and striving after a government under which human rights would be safe, the "blessings of liberty" insured and the equality of all men respected by the courts and the Government

The most optimistic observer of conditions in our country to-day would hardly contend that the happy situation described in the two preceding paragraphs still prevails.

What was it that happened to the American experiment in democracy to bring about the change?

The next chapter traces the fortunes of democracy through one of its darkest hours, emerging with the reaffirmation and reapplication of its principles by Cleveland.

CHAPTER III

Through Democracy's dark hour to Cleveland

We have traced the origin and development of the Democratic Party to the time of the Civil War.

What of the origin of the Republican Party, which to-day opposes it so successfully?

To the Civil War the Democratic Party was overwhelmingly predominant throughout the entire country—no stronger in the South than in the North. The thinkers and leaders of the country, North and South, were Democrats. The opposing party, the Whig Party, was largely composed of the wealthy and aristocratic of the South.

At the close of the war, contrary to the idea generally prevalent, the Democratic Party was still the predominant party—still strong in the North. It was, in fact, the only national party in existence at that time. The Republican Party was in the making. The war with its prejudices, passions, and hatreds, its complications of the issues of slavery, State rights, and preservation of the Union, brought a confused political situation. Then came the assassination of Lincoln. Andrew Johnson became President. He was the last Democratic President until Cleveland. He was a southerner, a Tennessean, but a strong Union man and an opponent of slavery, believing it injurious to the poor white people—the laboring classes. He was placed on the ticket with Lincoln in 1864 because he was a Democrat and because Lincoln wanted him.

Johnson made a fight to carry out Lincoln's plans for the reconstruction and recementing of the Union—a magnificent fight against terrific odds and one just now coming to be understood and appreciated. The position which he took in carrying out Lincoln's policies was in support of the terms of surrender made to the South by Grant and Lincoln—simply that the armed forces of the seceding States lay down their arms, return to their homes, and cease asserting the Confederacy as against the Union of all States.

The Democrats, North and South, stood steadfastly by Johnson. They were hopelessly outnumbered and overridden by an embittered, passion-ruled group which dominated Congress, unseated even loyal northern Democrats, and entered upon an orgy of disregard of the Constitution and the courts. This radical party called itself the Union Party.

How was it developed into the powerful Republican Party of to-day?

By means of three processes, each of which did violence to the principles of Democracy.

First, by control of elections through forcible and violent nullification of civil rights and constitutional guaranties.

Second, by forcing negro suffrage upon the South.

Third, by inviting the sinister forces of special privilege into partnership with and participation in government.

As to the first item—control of elections through nullification of civil rights and constitutional guaranties—this sounds incredible of the United States in the middle of the nineteenth century—more like the Middle Ages. Yet it is the public, undisputed, historical truth concerning 10 years of American government.

Under control of the radical party the principle of the government was changed from the consent of the governed to the rule of force. The guaranties of human rights gained through centuries of struggle were set to one side. That foundation stone of personal freedom, the writ of habeas corpus, was unceremoniously disregarded. Private property was confiscated, public property stolen. Laws were passed through Congress by which States were deprived of their constitutional guaranties, their citizens denied the right of trial in local or State courts. Military force was substituted for civil authority in time of peace—direct defiance of the Constitution. Elections were conducted by packed election boards, backed up by military force.

By these means the Southern States were carried for the Republican Party election after election at a time when hardly a white resident of those States but was a Democrat. And during the same period the Democrats were carrying Northern States, electing governors, sending Democratic Senators and Representatives to Congress—Thurman, of Ohio; Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware; Daniel W. Voorhees and Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana; Pendleton, Seymour, Tilden, and many others—a noble array. Although greatly outnumbered, so effective were they that Grant complained that the few Democrats were able "to fix amendments to every important measure." These political and intellectual giants were leading the battle for the Democratic Party in the North, while the Republican Party was controlling elections and sending negroes to the Senate and the House from Southern States.

Negro suffrage was forced upon the South in order to perpetuate the Republican Party—so strong even in that darkest hour was the Democratic Party, both North and South, that these men knew they could not continue in control of the administration of the Government on a vote of the white people only.

The Republican platform of 1868 frankly declared for the forcing of negro suffrage on the Southern States, leaving the question to be determined in the North, each State for itself.

We are here interested in the question from the standpoint of its effect on Democracy.

Negro suffrage, loosing as it did a horde of illiterate voters without capacity for conviction and ripe for abuse by the selfish and unscrupulous, did almost fatal violence to Jefferson's basic idea of an educated citizenship—an intelligent electorate capable of measuring issues and candidates by Democratic principles.

The threat of negro domination of elections drove the Whig Party of the Southern States into the Democratic Party, where they did not by sympathy nor conviction belong, introducing into the Democratic constituency a large element who were by nature opposed to its principle of equality to all and special privilege to none, and, by their

influence, making it difficult for the party to speak with a clear voice on the application of those principles.

Thus by means of the wholesale disenfranchisement of citizens of entire States, by imposition upon the ignorance and credulity of the negroes, and by "waving the bloody shirt"—that is, arousing and keeping alive the prejudices and passions of the war among the well-meaning people of the North—and by military force exerted at election time by the strong arm of the Government under Grant, the Radical or Union Party was kept in power until the partnership between the selfish, special-privilege-seeking interests and the Radical Party was completed and the combination strong enough to dominate elections without the Southern States.

Abraham Lincoln had foreseen the sinister change from a Government administered for all alike to one controlled in favor of a class. Near the close of the war Lincoln wrote a letter in which he said that with the peril of disunion averted he saw another great evil threateing the country—corporations enthroned, wealth concentrated in the hands of the few, and an ensuing era of corruption of Government by privilege.

Accordingly the close of the war saw the Union leaders of idealistic motives displaced by materialists and opportunists. The chaos after the war became the corruptionists' opportunity. Public lands were pillaged to the extent of 200,000,000 acres. Legislation designed to create classes was passed openly through Congress. A partnership was established on the basis of trade between favor-seeking industries who sought to fatten off the people and the Republican Party. The slush fund was introduced—large campaign contributions from corporations which would later expect returns in special legislation and increased tariffs. This levying of campaign tribute on those having dealings with the Government and expecting special favors in return built up the powerful Republican machine which has so successfully sought to dominate the country for generations.

The administration of Grant passed into history under the shadow of official corruption. Scandals in official life were introduced, the power and influence of the administration exerted to conceal and protect corruptionists. Identical embarrassments have dogged the footsteps of the Republican Party ever since.

The foregoing dark description of the development of the Republican Party and of the period when its reign was absolute is not overdrawn. It is a period over which American historians have hurried with a glossing brush.

The birth and development of the Republican Party introduced corruption into the American administration of government because the party's policy is a direct denial of the fundamental principles of democracy that government should exist solely for the benefit of all the people, that the people's Government should not be used against them, that there should be no laws for the benefit of special classes—to benefit some and fall more heavily on others—that Government officials are the people's employees and have no right to use office for themselves nor for any who are seeking special favors.

These principles, therefore, became the fundamental issue between the two parties and remain the issue until this day.

The country sickened of the Republican Party's arrogance, excesses, and corruption, and in 1876 elected the Democratic candidate for President, Samuel J. Tilden. He was never inaugurated. Under instructions from Republican and administration leaders, the election returns were withheld in South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana, where the corrupt governments installed by the combination of negroes and carpetbaggers (nonresidents sent by the Republicans into the Southern States to hold State office) were in control. The election-returning boards in these States falsified the returns sufficiently to give the States to the Republican candidate, Hayes. South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana! Where the citizens were all Democrats.

By 1884, however, conditions were normal enough, public opinion in favor of Democracy strong enough to elect Grover Cleveland, the first Democratic President after the war. So corrupt had been the period preceding his election that Cleveland set himself and his administration to emphasize and bring back into force in public and official life the Democratic principle that public office is a public trust.

By contrast with the preceding years his administraion was noted for its rigid honesty, lack of scandals and corruption, and for fairness in dealing with people and business on the basis of equal rights to all, special privilege to none.

But the days of the easy ascendancy of Democracy in America were over. Since that time the Democratic Party has had an uphill fight for the application of Democratic principles in administration of government, with victory sometimes crowning the party's efforts, as in the second Cleveland administraiton and the two Wilson administrations; but more often with the forces of special privilege, as exemplified by the selfish interests allied with the Republican Party in control.

And after a half century of administration of government according to Republican policy, what had become of the Jeffersonian idea about the dignity of agriculture? What has become of it to-day?

Because western farming interests seek a square deal from their Government they are termed "Sons of wild jackasses" by an arrogant Republican administration leader, representing an eastern manufacturing State. And the head of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association calmly tells a Senate committee that States which are not large industrial centers should not be entitled to have Unied States Senators.

Other chapters will describe what these sinister forces of special privilege are and how they operate to control government and legislation. They will also show the unceasing fight made by the true Jeffersonian democracy to preserve in the administration of our government the principles on which the Government was founded.

CHAPTER IV

Democracy applied in the Wilson administration

In the preceding chapter we saw how the Republican Party was born of the prejudices of the Civil War, nurtured on the excesses of the post-war period, and matured into a powerful political organization by alliance with favor-seeking special interests. Except for the two administrations of Cleveland, the Republican Party controlled the administration of Government of the country until 1912. This was a period of great economic development in the United States, and along with this economic development the Republican Party consolidated its own position, so that the power of the party grew with the growth of industrialism and the development of the economic power of the country.

An insidious new doctrine of materialism pervaded political thought, replacing the spirit of devotion and consecration to public good in which the Government was conceived and founded, and which the Democratic Party leaders had brought to public service over so long a period of the country's history.

Even the smaller business proprietors, those who were receiving no benefits from the alliance between favored interests and the Republican Party, attached themselves to that party on the theory that its policy of fostering and building up manufacturing and industry by the granting of special privilege made for the general prosperity of the country, some of which would trickle down to themselves.

By the close of Cleveland's second term the special interests were hungry. The Republican Party openly consummated its arrangement with them. Mark Hanna, Republican campaign manager, said to the eastern captains of industry:

"Help us back into power and when we get in we will help you."

That is actually true. They went even further. They threatened those who refused. This is what happened:

Mark Hanna sat in his office in Republican national headquarters. He would send for a big manufacturer. "We want a campaign contribution of $50,000 from you," he would say. If the manufacturer objected, "All right, you manufacture a certain product. We will remove the protective tariff from that product."

So the manufacturer paid his tribute. The first great campaign fund in the country's history came to the Republican organization in this way. And after McKinley was elected a Republican Congress enacted the highest tariff ever imposed on the people up to that time. And the manufacturers got back from the people all their contributions and many times more.

This Government policy of favoring the manufacturing and industrial interests at the expense of agricultural sections of the country soon brought about a sectional division, the East, where the manufacturing industries centered, against the West and the Middle West, the farming communities.

The subtle appeal to selfishness made by Republican doctrine and policies drew many people of the Northern and Eastern States away from the Democratic Party into the Republican. The Democratic doctrine of equal rights to all and special privilege to none, of giving special favors to no business but honest protection in the legitimate processes of business to all, no longer held attraction for a materially minded Nation. To-day there are still many Democrats in the Northern and Eastern States and they are of the staunchest type, because they remain Democrats from two motives—unselfish devotion to the cause of humanity or steadfast adherence to the democratic principles on which our Government was founded.

The Republican Party continued in uninterrupted power for 16 years, practicing the policy of special favors, while the East waxed richer and the West poorer.

A political cartoon of the period shows a cow labeled "Tariff" with a long body stretching across the map of the United States, feeding in the Western States and being milked in the East.

The West was settled largely by people from the Northern States and was not easily won from the Republican Party. But the sectional feeling grew bitter. There was not money enough in the West to market crops. Farmers had to sell for whatever was offered. The West and the Middle West grew desperate, went to the extreme of populism—a people's movement demanding a fair share of the country's money. The farmers organized themselves into granges, demanding equality with manufacturing in the Government's favors.

These so-called radical movements served to ally business interests still more closely with the Republican Party.

The revolt grew in volume and in 1912 the western wing of the Republican Party, plus a few eastern Republican of more liberal

tendencies, formed a Progressive Party, with Theodore Roosevelt, formerly a Republican President, as its candidate for President.

With the Republicans thus divided the Democratic Party was returned to power and its great liberal thinker and leader, Woodrow Wilson, became President.

The inauguration of Wilson and a Democratic Congress witnessed a significant occurrence. The lobbyists of the greatest interest which had been controling legislation and, with the aid and comfort of the Republican Party, feeding off the people by continually raising the cost of living, packed up and departed from the Halls of Congress. Those powerful interests had no more influence with a Democratic administration than the poorest laborer.

The two presidential terms of Woodrow Wilson constitute a glorious record for Democracy. In them there was not one breath of scandal nor charge of corruption, no suspicion of favoritism. The contrast between these two Democratic administrations and the Republican periods preceding and following serves to emphasize the eternal correctness and fitness for practical application of the principles the Democratic Party advocates for the conduct of government—

That government should exist solely for the benefit of the people.

That the processes of government should not be used to the expense of the people.

That government officials are employees, not rulers, of the people.

That public office should not be used for private interest.

That there should be no laws for the benefit of some at the expense of others.

What other explanation can be offered of the difference in the tone of our Government under the two parties throughout their entire history?

Under Republican rule—scandals and corruption, enriching of some at the expense of many, favoritism to one section of the country against the interest of another.

Under Democratic rule—never one scandal in National Government—no corruption—no favoritism.

Equal rights to all.

When Woodrow Wilson was President, for the first time in their history the representatives of organized labor were received in the White House.

Samuel Gompers said:

"In my experience with Congress during two score years, I have not seen anything like the fine spirit toward labor, toward the rights and welfare of all the peoeple, pervading all branches of the Wilson administration. Labor has been recognized neither in a spirit of deference on the one hand nor of patronage on the other."

Over strenuous opposition of the Republican forces in Congress the Democrats passed the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, restraining great corporations from freezing out smaller businesses so that they might have a monopoly, with the consuming public at their mercy. In fact, from a legislative standpoint, the whole effort of the administration was directed toward relieving the burdens of the people, equalizing economic opportunity and bringing about a fairer distribution of the country's wealth.

The income-tax amendment was passed and was promptly approved by the necessary number of States. Since this measure went into effect a great portion of Federal taxes have come from the incomes of wealthy people and corporations, from which nothing was collected before.

The farm loan act was passed, the land banks established, so that the Government could lend money to farmers at a low rate of interest—something unheard of before that time, and bitterly opposed by great financial interests of the country.

The Wilson administration leaders turned their attention to the national banking and currency system, seeking to remedy conditions whereby the East had money and wealth piled up while the West could not get enough to move the crops and the livestock to market. The Federal reserve banking act was proposed. A majority of the Republicans in the House and a majority of the Republicans in the Senate voted against it. The act was passed by the Democrats and became law. To-day no Republican would dare propose to repeal it so successful and beneficial to all the business of the whole country has it proved.

Such measures as these reflect the attitude of the Wilson administrations and of the Democratic Party when the conduct of the Government is intrusted to it. If the party had never been in power except during the Wilson administrations its record of legislation and service during those years would abundantly justify its existence and vindicate the principles which it advocates.

The Wilson administrations also demonstrated that Democracy can be efficient. The Great War came during those eight years and the resources of the country—materials, money, men—were marshaled, organized, and successfully led in the most colossal enterprise ever undertaken by the Nation.

At the same time the American Government, under Woodrow Wilson's matchless leadership, set a standard of national unselfishness and adherence to high ideals which gave inspiration and courage to a despairing world and brought our country to the very peak of respect, admiration, and influence among all the nations.

In our domestic affairs, in the midst of enormous expenditures and vast undertakings, a scrupulous standard of honesty in conduct of the public business was maintained. There was no corruption, no scandal.

Immediately after the close of the second Wilson administration, when the Republicans gained control of the Government, numerous committees were created and appointed to investigate the conduct of the war, inspired by partisan hope of finding some graft or corruption which might be fastened on the Democratic Party. After expenditure of some millions of dollars in these fruitless investigations, the investigating commission was forced to announce that no graft nor corruption had been found and that, on the contrary, the conduct of the war had been remarkably free, considering the vast sums and projects involved, from any suspicion of that sort.

Bitter and partisan propaganda has been employed in a determined attempt to discredit these last two Democratic administrations, but the record can not be altered. The facts speak for themselves and the Wilson administrations stand out in the country's history in a glory of integrity, high ideals, practical service, beneficent legislation—a lasting monument to the eternal truth of Democratic principles of government and a source of pride to all who adhere to that party.

There are those who would have us believe that nowadays the cause of the Democratic Party is hopeless—that it is obsolete and impotent to render service in the application of its principles to our Government.

Subsequent chapters tell of the pressing need for a militant and unselfish Democratic Party and of the great service in defending and protecting the people's interest rendered by the Democratic minority in the 10 years which have passed since Woodrow Wilson went out of office.

CHAPTER V

Republicanism applied

The 10 years, from 1920 to 1930, which have passed since the last two Democratic administrations, furnish an excellent examples of the application of the Republican theory of government in partnership with a privileged class, for in this decade just now passing that theory has been most assiduously applied. And these same 10 years have furnished a most excellent example of the inequalities of such a theory, a vivid example of its workings—and numerous examples of the scandals and corruption which follow in the course of its application.

The return of the Republican Party to power witnessed the return of the lobbyists to the halls of Congress. It was well recognized that a sympathetic administration had come into power.

The first concern of the Republican administration was the relief of private and corporate wealth from the burdens of taxation. A Secretary of the Treasury had been appointed who was many times a millionaire, many times a director in rich and powerful corporations, heavily interested in one of the great industries which was, and is to-day, reaping a fat harvest from the pockets of the American people by reason of an exorbitant tariff duty.

The constant reiteration from this Treasury head, the constant request from the Republican President was—Lower the tax rates on the large incomes, on the great corporations. Time after time this was done and not for years was the Democratic minority able to force a lowering in the rates on small incomes.

A new tariff law was written, with rates higher than the manufacturers had ever before dared ask, rates which levy on the American consumer a heavy tax, not for the coffers of his Government, however, for tariff rates so high as to keep out foreign competition cut off the national revenues which would otherwise be received from duties on imports. Competition being shut out, the manufacturer adds the 50 or 100 or 200 per cent tariff rate to the cost of manufacture and the American consumer must pay or do without. So the tax goes to the manufacturer instead of to the Government.

Thus was the new prohibitive tariff law written. And Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, men who had been sent to Congress to represent American citizens, were locked out of the committee while the law was being drafted and lobbyists for the manufacturing interests were being received and invited to tell how much of a raise they would like to have.

Agencies which had been created during the preceding Democratic administration—the Federal Trade Commission, to investigate and curb business combinations and practices which threatened the interests of the public, and the Tariff Commission which had been created for the purpose of dealing with tariff rates on a scientific basis, to investigate and determine just how much protection an industry really needed in order to protect its employees—both these agencies were rendered helpless and of no effect by appointment of commissioners who were entirely in sympathy with, or the tools of, the very interests they were to investigate and curb.

The Federal Farm Loan Board was packed with Wall Street financiers, transferred from the War Finance Corporation.

This activity of the Republican administration on behalf of wealth, corporations, and manufacturers was accompanied by utter disregard of the needs and burdens, the economic situation of any other class of the country's citizens.

The Federal Reserve Board adopted the cruel policy of drastic deflation of farm credits. Orders were issued to all member banks for the instant contraction of credits and loans to farmers and stockmen. Instead of a gradual contraction such as was practiced with other lines of business, country banks were called on to take up immediately all paper of farmers and stock raisers deposited with regional reserve banks as security for loans advanced to the country banks. The result of this stringent withdrawal of credit and financing facilities was the sudden decline of farm values and farm products. For the United States the shrinkage in crop values from 1919 to 1926 was from $14,750,000,000 to $8,400,000,000. In Missouri the shrinkage was over 50 per cent.

Along with their crop and farm values the farmers of the West saw the value of their dollar shrink; that is, it would not buy as much as formerly because the price of everything they had to buy was boosted by the new tariff law.

One illustration of the workings of the tariff is interesting. The iron and steel industries petitioned President Coolidge for a 50 per cent increase in the duty on pig iron. Imports of pig iron amounted to only eight-tenths of 1 per cent of our home consumption. Nevertheless the President granted the increase and the price of pig iron, and of all articles in which it was used, was immediately raised 50 per cent.

The Middle West was further discriminated against in the matter of internal waterways. After operation of the Panama Canal was begun it was found that the lower freight rates by water through the canal gave an advantage to the eastern coast, the industrial section of the country. Goods could be shipped by water from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coast States much cheaper than by rail from the shippers and producers of the Mississippi Valley and Middle West. The Panama Canal had been dug and equipped with billions of dollars of the Government's money received from all the people of all the States. But when the Middle West asked for appropriations to make the Missouri-Mississippi waterways system navigable to the Gulf, the Republican administration objected that would be using the Government funds to benefit a limited section of the country. Time after time these appropriations were delayed while the New England and Eastern States continued to enjoy the advantage given them by the canal.

When the appropriations were finally passed after years of delay, the Congressmen and Senators from the Middle West, who were leading the fight for them, were forced to consent to have an amendment attached providing that the Federal Government should expend over $11,000,000 to buy the Cape Cod Canal in New England, which had been built by eastern financiers and had proved very unprofitable. Only by consenting to having this burden loaded on the Government were they allowed to get the waterways appropriation through.

Another thought for the Mississippi Valley—it seems dreadful to contemplate, but the Springfield (Mass.) Republican openly declared that had the Mississippi Valley floods and attendant suffering occurred in the New England States, President Coolidge would not have waited a day to call Congress in extra session to provide against the frightful loss and suffering attendant on these floods. The homeless and destitute over large parts of a number of States, ruined by the overflowing of streams under control of the Federal Government, were left dependent upon public charity contributed through the Red Cross and on contributions from outside our shores. Little Cuba appropriated $50,000 from her national treasury, but their own Government could do nothing because a New England President refused to act, but went comfortably to his summer home for rest and vacation.

The results of all this application of favoritism by the Government to a privileged class and a favored section was the vast increase of eastern corporate wealth and business, the declaration of huge dividends, while in the West and in all agricultural districts the people were suffering loss and poverty. Banks were closing, businesses failing, farms were abandoned, bankruptcy courts crowded.

A very sinister effect of the concentration of wealth, the centralization of business, and of buying power is now beginning to be felt by the small independent business owner who held that the Republican theory of prosperity by special dispensation to a privileged class would cause some prosperity to trickle down to him. He is finding himself crowded out of business by the chain stores, the chain dry goods store, the chain groceries, and chain druggists. Will the people of America realize too late that there is a very real relation between the Democratic principle of special privileges to none and the right to live their own daily lives and conduct their business affairs in the manner of their own choosing?

The rules which determine their standard of living, the education they are able to give to their children, the amount of money they can lay up for old age, are economic rules. The rule which is applied when the Republican Party is in power is: Enrich the manufacturer at the expense of the rest of the people. Give him the special privilege of protecting him from competition while he charges the consumer as much profit as he wishes. Pile up wealth in the Republican strongholds of the eastern industrial States. Concentrate power and money, consolidate and merge and buy up all lines of business. Freeze out the independent. Gather wealth and influence and power into the hands of the few. Those few will be all the friends the Republican Party will need.

While the East enjoys networks of paved highways, the best of school systems, without even feeling the taxation to pay for them, let the West struggle and skimp to build roads and schools. They are just "Sons of wild jackasses" and probably wouldn't appreciate roads and schools!

And along with the power and arrogance of special privilege came its always faithful attendant—official corruption. No period in the country's history ever witnessed so much. Gone was the high moral tone which characterized the conduct of the Government during the preceding eight years of Democratic administration. The business of the Government became a field for exploitation. No possible avenue of graft was overlooked.

The Veterans' Bureau, set up to care for disabled soldiers, was systematically robbed, sick and insane soldiers became the victims of the very Government official appointed their official guardian.

The Department of Justice was used to protect malefactors, rather than prosecute them. The property of aliens deposited in trust with our Government was despoiled. The Navy's oil reserves bartered away for a bribe by a Cabinet officer whom the Supreme Court of the United States termed a faithless public servant. Juries tampered with, justice obstructed, a vast fund created by heads of great corporations for the purpose of paying the Cabinet officer's bribe, what was left of the fund going into the Republican campaign fund. A logical conclusion!

Thus have we of the present day been given an opportunity to see the workings of the Democratic and Republican theories of government applied side by side—eight years of Democratic control, 10 years of Republican. Democrats can contrast them with pleasure and pride.

Eight years under Cleveland and eight years under Wilson are the total of Democratic opportunity for administration of the Government since the Civil War. Has the party been able to render no more service than that?

The next chapter is an absorbing account of democracy functioning as a minority.

CHAPTER VI

Democracy's service as a minority

"Let the majority rule" is popularly supposed to be an axiom of the democratic system of government.

The phrase is, in fact, a recognition of a fundamental principle of force—that the majority can control. That is, being numerically superior, it has the power to do so. As a matter of fact, the democratic principles of government are based on the idea of necessity for protection of the rights of minorities, so that all may have equal rights. And to that end the third branch of the powers of the Government was constituted—the judicial, for a check on the powers of the executive and legislative branches.

The executive and legislative branches, being elected by the majority, may be presumed to express its will by their acts. But each of their acts, whether of the legislative branch, the Congress, or of the executive, the officials of the Government, is subject to review by the courts, who thus have an opportunity to determine whether laws passed by Congress or action taken by Government officials are in accordance with the democratic principles upon which the Government was founded. To the courts, therefore, is left the final word as to whether a legislative act shall become law or an official action be allowed to stand.

The primary purpose of courts, their very origin, is to see justice done. Frequently, in practice, this becomes a question of protecting and asserting the rights of a weaker party—a minority.

Thus the very structure of our Government provides a powerful limitation on majority rule.

Our system of government by representation, furthermore, provides a definite plan for expression and exercise of minority opinion in the administration of the affairs of the country. Senators and Congressmen, the representatives of the people, who constitute the legislative branch, are not elected by the total vote of the whole country as is the executive branch. Many of them are elected by States and districts where the party which is in a minority in the Nation as a whole has a majority in the State or district, and are, therefore, representative of the minority of the opinion of the country.

This is the exact result which was contemplated by the founders of our Government and was planned by them for a very definite reason. In an earlier chapter was described how the founders had so lately escaped from tyrannical rule that they fully understood the natural tendency in the breast of mankind to exercise the power to oppress others and how they strove to devise a system of government under which the people would be as safeguarded as possible against oppression by the Government itself.

They considered that a government under which no voice could be raised in protest against the policies and acts of the party in power would very speedily develop into a tyranny as absolute as any monarchy. They therefore set up courts to protect the rights of the minority and planned the system of representation so that the voice of the minority could always be heard. The function of the minority thus becomes one of the most important in our system of government.

One of the functions of the minority is to stand watch and sound alarm. The very presence of an alert and watchful minority is an effective restraint on the majority. Frequently in the history of the

country an ably led and forceful minority has been able to modify legislation so as to make it more nearly in accordance with the general needs of the country as a whole, than if it were expressive of the unbridled desire of the majority.

This important part of the minority in the functioning of government is not always understood. Complaints sometimes come from the partisan majority press protesting against the efforts of the minority that since they were not entrusted by the majority of the people with the conduct of government they should keep silent. This attitude betrays ignorance of the true significance of the representative system and of the fundamental structure of our Government.

Whenever, therefore, the Democratic Party has not been in control of the administration of the Government it has not resigned itself and the country to the domination of privilege as represented by the Republican Party. It has accepted the rôle of the minority and has striven to insist on the application of Democratic principles to the conduct of government so far as possible.

Through its representation in Congress, through a loyal Democratic press, through leaders and workers, by bringing the light of publicity to bear upon proposals and acts of the party in power, by keeping the public informed, by pointing out proposed raids on the taxpayers or the property of the Government, by calling attention to abuses of office and of power, a militant Democratic minority has never ceased to fight for the rights of people.

The Democratic Party has always had the advantage of brilliant representation in Congress. The Republican Party has elected brilliant and able men to Congress. But a man who is representing a cold, selfish business interest is always at a disadvantage before an adversary fighting for principle.

Whether or not because of superior attainments, whether or not because the Democratic leaders have been fighting for principles and people, whether or not because of the unselfishness of their cause, the purity of their motives, the Democratic minority in Congress has often been able to drive the majority leaders to cover and reduce them to humiliating silence.

Frequently by the brilliancy and adroitness of their attacks the Democratic minority has been able to maneuver the Republicans into a position where they dared offer no open resistance.

Our own times have furnished the most interesting and striking instances of the service to the country of the Democratic party functioning as a minority. No Democrat who has watched these events would exchange for the mere satisfaction of being with the majority the glory and the righteousness of being one of the militant minority which in the face of heavy obstacles rendered such brilliant and patriotic services to the country.

It may have seemed to a shocked Nation that the exposures of corruption and abuses in the administration of the Government under the Republican Party in the last decade followed one after the other with amazing rapidity, when in truth each disclosure came only after months of patient searching after the facts and persistent assaults on the part of the Democratic minority against the determined efforts of the Republican majority in Congress and of the Republican administration to prevent exposure.

If it had not been for the months of hard and patient labor on the part of the Democratic Senator WALSH of Montana, aided by other Democratic Senators and supported by the liberal press of the country, the raiding of the oil reserves of the Navy would never have been discovered until too late to prevent the theft.

Even after the discovery of the illegal leasing of the reserves and disclosure of the fact that the oil was already being taken out in vast quantities, the frantic efforts on the part of the Republicans to conceal the shameful truth concerning the bribery of a grafting cabinet officer by the heads of great oil corporations would have been successful except for Senator WALSH'S brilliant and masterful conduct of the investigation finally authorized by the Senate under weeks and months of insistence by the Democrats. Due to his efforts, the facts gradually came to light in spite of the stubborn silence, the resistance of Republican officials, their refusal to allow the investigating committee to inspect public records.

Republican leaders, the administration press, prominent Republican citizens rushed to the rescue. The President himself expressed confidence in Fall, Daugherty, and Denby. But one by one they were exposed. An aroused public demanded their resignations. The President was forced to accept them. The Supreme Court cancelled the oil leases, saying the "transaction was consummated by conspiracy, corruption, and fraud," and describing Secretary Fall as a "faithless public servant." Denby was forced to admit either that he was a party to the scheme to rob the Navy or that he signed the leases without knowing what he was doing. He chose the latter course and resigned.

The leases were cancelled by the courts, the reserves restored to the Navy, one oil magnate required to pay the Government for all the oil he had removed.

None of these things would have been accomplished except through the brilliant and exceptional service of the Democratic minority.

And after it was all over, the chairman of the Republican National Committee shamefacedly admitted, under compulsion, that a large part of the Republican campaign deficit was secretly paid out of the same fund that was raised for the purpose of corrupting Fall.

Daugherty headed the Department of Justice. Special Government prosecutors, entirely separate from his department, had to be appointed to represent the Government in the oil frauds. Daugherty used the department in every possible way to obstruct justice. He used it to attempt to persecute the Democratic Senators, WHEELER and WALSH. They were not intimidated. They pursued their investigations until Daugherty stood revealed as the confederate of Alien Property Custodian Miller in a vast scheme to rob the property of aliens entrusted to our Government.

Miller was convicted of accepting bribes to transfer the property unlawfully. Bonds which were part of the bribe money were traced to Daugherty's bank. He admitted having destroyed records which would have shown whether or not they went into his personal account.

Forbes, the head of the Veterans' Bureau, was disclosed as systematically robbing the property of the bureau. He was sent to the penitentiary. A confederate committed suicide.

Fenning, appointed by President Coolidge as Commissioner of the District of Columbia, was discovered to have collected fees totalling over $100,000 for acting as guardian for unfortunate ex-service men who were in a Washington hospital for the insane. President Coolidge ignored demands for his resignation. The Democratic minority forced his resignation.

The country would have known of none of these abuses except for the service of the Democratic minority.

Except for the adroit strategy of Senator Reed in forcing through, in the face of the Republican majority, his resolution authorizing an investigation of the Illinois and Pennsylvania scandals, except for his conspicuous service in relentlessly pursuing and bringing out the truth, the country would never have known of this brazen use of millions to overwhelm the electorate and control—what? Two $10,000 offices!

No Republican assisted in these investigations. Some Republican Senators did everything they could to block them. Secretary Mellon said the money was used as sacredly as if it had been contributed to a church.

It was in reality used on behalf of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association. The secertary of that organization calmly testified to vast contributions and asserted they knew what they were doing—they always got their money back many times over. That was why they were willing to pay so much for a $10,000 office.

Solely due to the efforts of the Democratic minority they didn't get the office. Neither Smith, of Illinois, nor Vare, of Pennsylvania, were admitted to the Senate. Although the Republicans had a majority, they dared not admit them. So much for the power of a militant minority!

To-day we are witnessing another great service on the part of the minority. Congress assembled a year ago, ostensibly to consider what could be done to improve the economic situation in the agricultural sections, the West and Middle West. It was proposed to draft a tariff law for the protection of agricultural products.

The Republicans have an overwhelming majority in the House, a safe majority in the Senate. They organized both Houses, appointed a Ways and Means Committee, which locked out the Democratic members of the committee, and set to work.

The committee reported out a tariff bill. There were a few increases on agricultural products. On the products of eastern manufacturers there were numerous and heavy increases—more cost added to what the farmer must buy, a substantial boost to the cost of living of all the people of the West and Middle West. This, in the face of the fact that tariffs and prices to consumers were already higher than ever before.

The Republican House promptly passed the bill. There was no word of disapproval from the White House.

The bill went over to the Senate. The Democrats could have washed their hands clean of the whole affair simply by having nothing to do with it. They could then have gone to the country in the congressional elections and overturned the administration by showing what had been permitted.

They chose a more patriotic course. They invited the Republican Members from the hard-hit Western States to join them in rewriting the bill. This they are doing, removing the increases on manufactured commodities. So far no word from the White House, except a complaint the Senate is taking too much time on the tariff bill. This came when the Senate got down to the aluminum schedule—Secretary Mellon's monopoly!

When the western Republican Members joined the Democrats for this service it was openly asserted the administration would take a hand in defeating them and electing men who would uphold the President. The Democrats were denounced for doing anything at all. A strong administration paper in Kansas City rebuked them with the reminder that the country hadn't intrusted them with the administration of the Government.

They persisted in their duty. The whole western country, press included, is supporting them. Now the same paper says the bill they are writing is what the President wants.

Perhaps so. No one knows what will happen to the bill when it gets to the President. If it is what he wants, he has a Democratic minority to thank for it.

And the country has the Democratic minority to thank for preventing another steal—the biggest of all—millions from the consumer's pocketbook.

CHAPTER VII

Party regularity a basic principle of government

The principle of party regularity means simply that those citizens who believe in the rules and policies for the conduct of the government as advocated by a party should support those candidates for office who by their open declarations and by their public records maintain and apply those rules and policies, and should continue to support and encourage those officials after election, to the end that the party's principles may be put into effect in administering the affairs of the country; further, that the party's adherents should oppose all candidates and officials who oppose the application of the party's principles.

Following the above rule, therefore, the measure to be applied to a candidate or official is the faithfulness with which he adheres to his party's principles and the ability with which he carries them out—not his personality nor his personal beliefs and opinions on questions not connected with principles of government.

This principle of party regularity is a basic principle of our Government because that Government is founded on the will of the people and in no other way can there be an intelligent application of the will of the people to the conduct of government, no well defined policy nor well ordered administration.

Disregard of the principle by voters has resulted in grave injury to Democracy. The present confusion in our National Government, the inability of Congress to function, the increasing impotence of the administration to cope with the problems of the country are all directly due to violation of the basic principle of party regularity.

Why?

Because the National Government from President and Congress down is filled with officials who are not in accord on questions involving the fundamental principles of Government with the voters who elected them. The fault lies with voters who did not look deeply into the fundamental political convictions of candidates, but voted for them on false issues of social, religious, and moral questions which are not solved by the National Government, but by the far more intangible processes of the manners and customs of communities and their people.

The fault lies partly, of course, with the candidates and campaign leaders who raised the false issues, took advantage of prejudices and passions in order to be elected. The important thing, however, is the result—lack of clean-cut Government policy, lack of definite, solid support for any legislative program, disappointment of the people at failure of the administration to reflect their will, confusion, and chaos.

Particularly has the Democratic Party been hampered by disregard of the principle of party regularity. In the last 10 years when the clearly defined issue between the parties was the continuation of special privilege to eastern manufacturers at the expense of all the rest of the country, an issue sharply aggravated by the scandals and corruption attending on special privilege, thousands of Democrats ignored the issues and voted their opinions on religious and prohibition questions, neither of which could possibly be determined by that particular election.

This was exactly what the Republican campaign leaders wanted them to do. It is a well known fact that in 1924 many delegates to the Democratic National Convention were directed by Klan leaders in a nearby building, who were Republicans. And when the campaign was over millions of patriotic Americans were sore at heart from the stirring of religious prejudices, prohibition enforcement remained in the hands of a former whiskey distiller, and special privilege was still in control of the Government.

The campaign of 1928 and the year and a half following have furnished the most vivid example of the results of violation of the principle of party regularity. The issue in that campaign was continuation under Republican rule of the discrimination practiced by that party in favor of the eastern industrial section of the country as against a return of equal opportunity to all as proposed by the Democratic Party.

Suppose two opposing armies drawn up in battle array. Suppose the soldiers in one army say among themselves, "Our enemies have a general whom we like better than ours. Let us fight under him to-day. After the battle we can return again to our own people."

After the battle, alas, they would find they had helped to put in power not only the general whom they liked but his followers and all they stood for.

In 1928 the Democratic general was a plain, unimpressive little man with remarkably honest eyes and an amazing record of accomplishment in the application of democracy to government, an unheard-of capacity for translating the principles of democracy into the everyday lives of people, an unimpeachable character, a direct manner of speech, and a habit of putting campaign promises into effect. Here was a candidate who not only proclaimed his advocacy of democratic principles but had devoted all of his mature lifetime to applying them to government. Measured by the rule of party regularity there was no reason why he should not have received the vote of every Democrat.

Some Democrats did not like his pronunciation. Some did not agree with him as to the best means of securing a temperate nation. Some did not like the church to which he belonged.

Their reverence for one part of the Constitution—the eighteenth amendment—did not extend to the section which declares there shall be no religious test for qualification to hold office.

And so they went over for a day and supported the general who was leading the army of the enemy, in whose train marched the hosts of special privilege to whom he owed his selection as head of their forces and who were financing his campaign.

This leader of the forces opposing democracy spoke fair words of invitation. Poverty was to be abolished if his cause prevailed. The West and the agricultural sections were to be given equality of opportunity.

The fine record, honest words, and liberal views of the Democratic candidate brought him many more votes than had ever been polled by a Democratic candidate for President, even with thousands of Democrats deserting to the enemy, but the Republican candidate prevailed by the combined vote of Democrats of the agricultural South and West and Republicans of the industrial North and East.

And after he was elected both the agricultural South and West and the industrial North and East claimed their reward. Both could not have it because what each wanted would undo what the other desired. So the general issued a proclamation that each should be given as much as possible of what was asked—and retired to his tent.

This is the real explanation of President Hoover's refusal to take his place in leadership of Congress in putting through a legislative program to meet the necessities of the country. He recommended a tariff for the aid of agriculture and a raise in rates for any industries which might need it. But when the House prepared and passed a tariff bill with the highest duties on manufacturers ever imposed on the American consumer, duties so high on all he must buy that the farmer would be much more injured than helped, Mr. Hoover uttered not a word of objection. Eastern Republican leaders claimed he was for the bill. Western Republican leaders claimed he was against the bill.

When the Democratic minority in the Senate joined with Western Republicans to rewrite the bill in the interest of agriculture and the consumer, Mr. Hoover still kept silent. The same argument arose as to whether he approved or condemned. No one knows.

For Mr. Hoover is in the embarrassing position of owing his election to two elements whose interests are opposite, both of which are necessary to his continuation in office and with one of which he can not be in accord. The net result is that the country has elected a President who can not function, or is afraid to—the logical outcome of violation of the rule of party regularity.

Mr. GRUNDY, of the President's party, has not hesitated to function, however, and since his appointment to the Senate has furnished the necessary leadership developed of long experience in lobbying through Congress whatever the special-privilege interest wants. Due to his efforts the work of the Democratic minority has been undone, high rates have been restored, and the industrial East seems likely to get the larger share of the reward.

Whatever the outcome of the expensive, long-drawn-out tariff session, the country has been given a fair example of the results of violation of the rule of party regularity. Candidates who have the courage to state their convictions and put them into effect after election, an intelligent electorate of voters who decide their preferences on the serious questions of government involved are essential if our Government is to function.

The foregoing articles on Democracy Applied to Government were prepared and distributed for the purpose of arming and informing those patriotic citizens who wish to see the principles on which our Government was founded, preserved, and applied. The truth which they impart is that the Democratic Party has ever been the defender of those principles; that those who follow its banner, under leaders perfect or imperfect, are contributing patriotically to the cause of justice and equality; that no superiority attaches merely to a majority; that it is an honor and a privilege to belong to the Democratic Party in success or defeat.

The Democratic Party is a cause worthy of strong leadership and loyal supporters. The duty of its followers of this day is to be such supporters, develop and follow such leaders, keep alive its glorious achievements and its true teachings against the day when the people turn from materialism of the Republican doctrine and take active interest once more in rights of people, the administration of government for all alike.

SALE OF JACKSON BARRACKS RESERVATION, LA.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar 1072, the bill (H. R. 6871) authorizing the sale of Jackson Barracks Military Reservation to the State of Louisiana for National Guard purposes. It has passed the House and is reported without amendment by the Military Affairs Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that bill was reported with about a dozen other bills from the Committee on Military Affairs. It scarcely seems fair to take up one without the others. I think the bill had better come up in its order.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I want to know whether anybody objects to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been made to its present consideration.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Why should it not be passed at this time?

Mr. REED. I tried yesterday to get those bills, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, considered and passed. My request was objected to and it was stated that they ought to lie over and be placed on the calendar. It is not fair to take up one now to the prejudice of the others.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I shall not object to the other bills, but I would like to have mine passed.

Mr. REED. I grant that.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania——

Mr. REED. I believe in the Senator's bill. I reported it favorably and I shall do all I can to get it passed.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Let me state why I would like to have it passed to-day. The legislature is in session and it must make provision for the funds. There are three weeks left in which to provide for this purchase before the legislature adjourns. If we delay the legislature will have adjourned. We have a session of the legislature only once in two years. That is the reason why I am anxious to have it passed. I begged the Senator to report it.

Mr. REED. I was glad to do it. We are going to have a call of the calendar on Tuesday. If we are going to take up all the bills which individual Senators desire to have considered, there will not be any calendar on Tuesday, because a majority of the Senate will not want it. I appeal to the Senator that it is not fair to take up a single bill in this way.

Mr. BROUSSARD. If there is any objection to it, that is quite different.

Mr. REED. Unless the Senate will agree to take up all of them now, I shall have to object.

Mr. McNARY. That can not be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania objects.

CORPORATIONS OPERATING COTTONSEED-OIL MILLS

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred Senate Resolution 292, submitted by Mr. HEFLIN on June 12, 1930, to authorize the printing of the hearings held before the Federal Trade Commission relative to the charge that certain corporations operating cottonseed-oil mills are violating the antitrust laws with respect to prices for cottonseed and acquiring the ownership or control of cotton gins as a document for the use of the Senate, reported it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may consider the resolution and that the proposed substitute be adopted.

There being no objection, the Senate proceed to consider the resolution.

The amendment was to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby directed to transmit from time to time to the Senate, or expeditiously file with the Secretary of the Senate, during the recess of Congress, a transcript of the hearings held before said commission, and exhibits filed in connection therewith, pursuant to Senate Resolution 136 and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-first Congress, directing an investigation of the charges that certain corporations operating cottonseed-oil mills are violating the antitrust laws with respect to prices for cottonseed and acquiring the ownership or control of cotton gins. The transcript of the hearings and exhibits so transmitted shall be printed, with accompanying illustrations, as a Senate document, except that as to copyrighted books, bulky volumes, and other lengthy exhibits only such descriptions thereof and pertinent extracts therefrom shall be printed as the Federal Trade Commission may indicate and transmit with such exhibits for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

POEM BY HORACE G. CARLISLE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle entitled "The Common People Are the Ones."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The poem is as follows:

THE COMMON PEOPLE ARE THE ONES

Back when America was young,
  Who were the sturdy pioneers,
"Unwept, unhonored, and unsung,"
  That westward pushed our wild frontiers,
And planted there their love of home—
  Protected by their trusted guns,
Brought with them from across the foam?
  The common people are the ones.

Who plant and cultivate our crops,
  With which our boasted barns are filled?
Who work our roads and mines and shops,
  That trade and travel be not stilled?
Who pile up profits, year by year,
  For master misers, by the tons—
Compelled to—through a sense of fear?
  The common people are the ones.

Who cut the lumber, make the brick,
  And blast the stone with which we build?
When shells are flying fast and thick,
  Whose patriotic sons are killed?
Who dig our graves and plant above
  Our sleeping dusts the silent stones?
Who carve our epitaphs in love?
  The common people are the ones.

Who guard the safety of our homes
  Against marauders, day and night?
Who, when a conflagration comes,
  Fight back its fires with all their might?
Who love to lend a helping hand
  To those lost souls whom fortune shuns,
And leaves to starve in sinking sand?
  The common people are the ones.

Who do the routine work to-day
  In this, the best of governments?
Who man our fighting crafts, and stay
  Prepared for national defense?
Who "teach the young idea to shoot"—
  With better weapons far than guns—
And lift mankind above the brute?
  The common people are the ones.

Who do the drudgery of life,
  The tasks nobody wants to do?
Who in the struggle and the strife
  'Twixt men and money still ring true?
Who, 'twixt fanatic wets and drys,
  Now far apart as distant suns,
Must find a temperate compromise?
  The common people are the ones.

Who, in the thick of traffic, drive
  Our trucks and taxicabs and cars?
Who steer our busses that arrive
  On schedules faithful as the stars?
Who run our street cars and our trains
  In safety on their daily runs?
Who operate our airplanes?
  The common people are the ones.

Who now in unemployment's ranks
  Are crowded to the last dark ditch,
While—idle—in protected banks
  Lie hoarded millions of the rich?
Who walk our streets and beg for jobs,
  Distressed by debts and dogged by duns?
Who hopelessly hold back their sobs?
  The common people are the ones.

Who cast the ballots that secured
  Those at the Capitol their seats,
By whom the country was assured
  Of "better times when Congress meets"?
Who are denied the chance to earn
  Their daily bread—poor, lost undones—
With none to whom their hopes can turn?
  The common people are the ones.

Who's got to save our millionaires
  From self-destruction through their greed?
Who's got to make them hear the prayers
  And hunger cries of those in need?
Who's got to take a firmer stand
  Against profanity, which stuns
Refinement and pollutes the land?
  The common people are the ones.

If Congress can not do the job—
  Can't tie the hands of graft and greed
That in the name of business rob
  And drive the hands of toil to need,
Who will arrest stagnation's wave
  Which now in madness overruns
The homeland of the free and brave?
  The common people are the ones.

Who in the power of their might
  Will rise and wage a winning war
For freedom, liberty, and right—
  The kind our fathers battled for—
Against the kings of graft and greed,
  Whose money into billions runs,
While hearts of jobless millions bleed?
  The common people are the ones.

Before they'll let their children starve,
  Who will ignore the claims of greed,
And with the sword of justice carve
  Their way to what their children need?

Who—if compelled to—will rebel
  Against oppression's deadly guns,
To save their own from hunger's hell?
  The common people are the ones.

And yet, who hold in high esteem
  Those philanthropic millionaires
That fulfill need's consoling dream
  By answering its earnest prayers?
Who praise the Country's business kings,
  Tho shrewd as Germans—bold as Huns—
Who help mankind to higher things?
  The common people are the ones.

Who were the grandsires, or the sires,
  Of many of our millionaires
That now manipulate the wires
  Of unemployment, unawares?
Who have the right to look for aid
  To these great million-dollar sons,
Whose fortunes Labor's hands have made?
  The common people are the ones.

Who, if it's done, has got to bring
  Religion back into its own,
And prove that money can't be king
  So long as God sits on His throne?
Who's got to burst the prison bars
  Where wealth lies hoarded by the tons?
Who's got to save the Stripes and Stars?
  The common people are the ones.

Who spurn deception's empty show,
  That guarantees a tragic end?
Who know they do not need to know
  The things they can not comprehend?
Who take the Bible as it is,
  Believing they're the Father's sons,
Because it tells them they are His?
  The common people are the ones.

Whose prayers rise heavenward in deed
  For blessings on those money kings?
Who give the toilers in their need
  The joys that just employment brings?
Who want the Nation's millionaires
  To share with them in God's "well dones"
Who prove it by their pleas and prayers?
  The common people are the ones.

Whose acts accord with what they teach
  The nearest in life's fitful school?
Who practice nearest what they preach,
  According to the golden rule?
Who live the closest to the God
  Of countless systems, with their suns?
Who suffer most His chastening rod?
  The common people are the ones.

Who when all humankind shall stand
  Before the Judge of all the earth
Will enter heaven's promised land,
  Where character determines worth?
In answer to their humble prayers,
  Applauded there with God's "well dones,"
Who will be heaven's millionaires?
  The common people are the ones.

—Horace C. Carlisle.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate carry out the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into and take a recess until Monday noon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, took a recess until Monday, June 23, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of June 18), 1930

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

John P. Nields, of Delaware, to be United States district judge, district of Delaware, to succeed Hugh M. Morris, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frederick G. Davies, of Charleston, S. C., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C., in place of S. M. Parker, whose term of office expired.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

AIR CORPS

To be second lieutenant with rank from June 18, 1930

Second Lieut. Elvin Freestone Maughan, Air Corps Reserve.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Edward Goff Elliott, Cavalry, from June 16, 1930.
Maj. Henry Welles Baird, Cavalry, from June 16, 1930.

To be majors

Capt. Alva Franklin Englehart, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 16, 1930.

Capt. Evan Clouser Seaman, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 16, 1930.

To be captains

First Lieut. Benjamin Harrison Graban, Cavalry, from June 16, 1930.

First Lieut. Arthur Ross Nichols, Infantry, from June 16, 1930.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. George Aldridge Whatley, Air Corps, from June 16, 1930.

Second Lieut. Frank Riley Loyd, Infantry, from June 16, 1930.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Harold Wade Kinderman, Medical Corps, from June 14, 1930.

Capt. Robert Malcolm, Medical Corps, from June 14, 1930.

To be captain

First Lieut. Charles Tindal Young, Medical Corps, from June 17, 1930.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

John C. Youngstrom to be postmaster at Girard, Ala., in place of E. H. Siddall, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Lucy B. Hopkins to be postmaster at Calistoga, Calif., in place of L. B. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Mary C. Rathyen to be postmaster at Encinitas, Calif., in place of Warner Rathyen, deceased.

COLORADO

Alice M. Payne to be postmaster at Hudson, Colo., in place of A. M. Payne. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1930.

IDAHO

Lillie R. Culbertson to be postmaster at Burke, Idaho, in place of E. C. Dodson. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1930.

INDIANA

Jacob W. Mintzer to be postmaster at Ashley, Ind., in place of J. W. Mintzer. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1930.

IOWA

Leeta Knapp to be postmaster at Aurora, Iowa, in place of M. W. Knapp, deceased.

Russell I. Polly to be postmaster at Whiting, Iowa., in place of C. P. Worrell. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

LOUISIANA

Otis Waguespack to be postmaster at Vacherie, La., in place of Otis Waguespack. Incumbent's commission expires July 2, 1930.

George M. Tannehill to be postmaster at Urania, La., in place of G. M. Tannehill. Incumbent's commission expires July 2, 1930.

Irma L. Batey to be postmaster at Wisner, La., in place of N. R. Funderburk, removed.

MICHIGAN

Thomas N. Graham to be postmaster at Peck, Mich., in place of Maud Gibson, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Charles S. Hawker to be postmaster at Buffalo, Minn., in place of M. E. Stark, deceased.

MISSOURI

Lewis B. McKean to be postmaster at Blairstown, Mo., in place of N. B. Gallihugh, resigned.

Aaron D. Peterson to be postmaster at Browning, Mo., in place of A. D. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1929.

Fred F. Hall to be postmaster at Hallsville, Mo., in place of L. R. Quick. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1930.

Charles E. Rearick to be postmaster at Garden City, Mo., in place of Florence Gilkeson, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Fannie H. Clayton to be postmaster at Seaside Park, N. J., in place of F. H. Clayton. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

NEW MEXICO

Jessie M. Paschich to be postmaster at Columbus, N. Mex., in place of L. L. Burkhead. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1928.

NORTH CAROLINA

James E. Green to be postmaster at Mount Gilead, N. C., in place of J. E. Green. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1930.

John D. Massey to be postmaster at Selma, N. C., in place of J. D. Massey. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ruth C. Borman to be postmaster at Alamo, N. Dak., in place of R. C. Borman. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1930.

OHIO

Lewis C. Crawford to be postmaster at Shreve, Ohio., in place of R. H. Critchfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1930.

Clarence M. Jennings to be postmaster at Sterling, Ohio, in place of F. V. Boone, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry W. Thatcher to be postmaster at Bethlehem, Pa., in place of H. W. Thatcher. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Robert J. Courtney to be postmaster at Gouldsboro, Pa., in place of E. J. Dowling, resigned.

Charles H. Stormfeltz to be postmaster at Lancaster, Pa., in place of C. H. Stormfeltz. Incumbent's commission expires July 3, 1930.

Henry N. Hoff to be postmaster at Mount Wolf, Pa., in place of H. N. Hoff. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1930.

Wilbur C. Taylor to be postmaster at Port Royal, Pa., in place of W. C. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1930.

William M. Smith to be postmaster at Springboro, Pa., in place of K. C. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1930.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Melvin P. Juel to be postmaster at Canton, S. Dak., in place of A. A. Isakson. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

TENNESSEE

Robert D. Lindsay to be postmaster at Coal Creek, Tenn., in place of R. D. Lindsay. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1930.

Carrie S. Waters to be postmaster at Goodlettsville, Tenn., in place of J. B. McCasland, removed.

VERMONT

Clarence E. Badger to be postmaster at Hyde Park, Vt., in place of E. G. Page, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Clementine M. Wright to be postmaster at Sharps, Va., in place of C. M. Wright. Incumbent's commission expires July 2, 1930.

WISCONSIN

Cornelia F. Whitcomb to be postmaster at Bloomington, Wis., in place of A. C. Bishop, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of June 18), 1930

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Hanford MacNider to Canada.

Ralph J. Totten to the Union of South Africa.

CONSUL GENERAL

Edward A. Dow.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Louis H. Breuer, eastern district of Missouri.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Jennie P. Musser, district No. 48, headquarters at Salt Lake City, Utah.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

George Bigelow Pillsbury to be assistant to the Chief of Engineers.

Charles Hart Danforth to be assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps.

MEDICAL CORPS

Clement Franklin St. John to be first lieutenant.

TRANSFERS IN THE ARMY

Lieut. Col. Charles Conaway Burt to finance department.

Maj. Roger Baldwin Colton to Signal Corps.

Capt. Charles Anderson Wickliffe to Judge Advocate General's Department.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

Bruce Magruder to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.

George Herman Huddleson to be lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Thomas Liggett Lamoreux to be major, Infantry.

Adlai Cyrus Young to be major, Infantry.

Thomas Arthur Dukes to be captain, Infantry.

Arthur Thomas to be captain, Air Corps.

Edward Albert Kimball to be captain, Infantry.

Sheldon Perkins McNickle to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Will Knox Stennis to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Harold George Peterson to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

George Francis Schulgen to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

Otto Paul Weyland to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

Page Purnell Albert Chesser to be major, Dental Corps.

Jay Ross Haskin to be major, Dental Corps.

Clinton Inness McClure to be major, Field Artillery.

Francis Valentine FitzGerald to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.

Thomas James Chrisman to be captain, Infantry.

Reginald Roan Gillespie to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

Kirtley Jameson Gregg to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Beekman L. Youngblood, Minter.

ARIZONA

Annie L. Kent, Parker.

Frank O. Polson, Williams.

COLORADO

Thomas E. Downey, Ordway.

William W. Hofer, Simla.

CONNECTICUT

Willis C. Chidsey, Avon.

F. Ragnar Bergfors, Georgetown.

Michael M. Olie, Pequabuck.

William S. Tifft, Seymour.

Carleton W. Tyler, Southbury.

Walfred C. Carlson, Washington Depot.

DELAWARE

William R. Murphy, Milford.

Samuel S. Dennison, Yorklyn.

FLORIDA

Jennie L. Cooley, Lynn Haven.
Owen W. Pittman, Miami.
Julia Seabloom, Ormond Beach.
John L. Wall, Summerfield.

GEORGIA

Bell Bayless, Kingston.
Buoie L. Bennett, Nashville.
Mary W. Barclay, Rome.

INDIANA

William J. DeVerter, Cayuga.
Shad R. Young, Cicero.
Daniel W. Dupes, East Chicago.
Chester Boone, Connersville.
George A. Dwiggins, Fountain City.
George C. Clemens, Hammond.
Ralph S. Ward, Knightstown.
Harry A. McColly, Rensselaer.
Worth J. LeRoy, Walkerton.

IOWA

Myrtle B. Stark, Boxholm.
John L. Eichacker, Homestead.
Levi L. Reynolds, Little Sioux.
Floyd A. Bryceson, Moorhead.
Phillip T. Serrurier, Sabula.
Ferdinand J. Ruff, South Amana.
Estella M. Hauser, Varina.
Flossie K. Pfeiff, West Burlington.

KANSAS

Melvin L. Holaday, Anthony.
Louise M. Pfortmiller, Gorham.
Douglas M. Dimond, Kensington.
Stephen Young, Louisburg
Harry V. Baxter, Madison.
David E. Hill, Nortonville.
Robert M. Skidmore, Norwich.
Lewis E. Glasco, Piedmont.
John H. O'Connor, Winfield.

KENTUCKY

Hattie O. Duncan, Coxton.
David B. Ramey, Praise.
Lola B. Hollaway, Sedalia.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ephrem J. Dion, Northbridge.
Robert A. Stacey, Williamstown.

MICHIGAN

Walter F. Pratt, St. Clair Shores.

MINNESOTA

Thomas Tomasek, Albany.
Asa R. Woodbeck, Brookpark.
Ward E. Willford, Canton.
William Edmond, Claremont.
Albert Anderson, Clearbrook.
Gustave Backer, Clements.
Jacob P. Soes, Climax.
Frank L. Redfield, jr., Cloquet.
Clara K. Diekmann, Collegeville.
Alwyne A. Dale, Dover.
Frank A. Sandin, Dunnell.
Henry J. Widenhoefer, Fisher.
James B. Hubbell, Forest Lake.
Carleton H. Leighty, Glenville.
Fritz Von Ohlen, Henning.
Henry Hendrickson, Hoffman.
William Perbix, Hopkins.
Orville G. Nichols, Mazeppa.
Winnifred L. Batson, Odessa.
Elmer A. Haugen, Pelican Rapids.
Ema G. Perkins, Pine City.
Lawrence J. Nasett, Robbinsdale.
Anna O. Rokke, Strandquist.
Christ G. Gandrud, Sunburg.
Ole N. Aamot, Watson.
Edward B.. Hicks, Winona.

MISSISSIPPI

Woodard M. Herring, Inverness.
Thomas J. Barnes, Noxapater.
Enfield Wharton, Port Gibson.
Ellen V. Montgomery, Potts Camp.
Corrie F. Taylor, Seminary.
Joseph R. Weathersby, Taylorsville.
Benson L. Myers, West Point.

MISSOURI

Phill H. Hawkins, Buffalo.
Earnest R. Smith, Collins.
John M. Atkinson, jr., Eldorado Springs.
Charles L. Martin, Joplin.
Joe P. Stiles, Keytesville.
George E. Drewel, Labadie.
Berry Crow, Licking.
George E. Richars, Lilbourn.
Benjamin H. Cooksey, Walnut Grove.
George Bently, Westboro.
Ruby O. Foster, Winona.

NEBRASKA

Alfred G. Taylor, Chappell.
Edwin D. Fisher, Falls City.
Bessie R. Adams, Palmer.
Henry Pickett, Sterling.
Leora E. Bowley, Taylor.

NEVADA

Arthur C. Lewis, Ruth.
Emanuel Bollschweiler, Wells.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Wilbur L. Wadleigh, Twin Mountain.

NEW MEXICO

Morgan P. Harvey, Clayton.

NEW YORK

Henry Leonhardt, Alexandria Bay.
Ruth M. Marleau, Big Moose.
Ruth M. Newkirk, Cincinnatus.
William V. Fitzpatrick, Cleveland.
Hermon W. DeLong, jr., Dansville.
Jay E. Davis, Deansboro.
Clifford L. Tuthill, Eastport.
Minnie M. Beers, Freehold.
Sylvester P. Shea, Freeport.
Daniel H. Chichester, Madalin.
Harry M. Barrett, Mahopac.
John A. Campbell, Mumford.
William J. Schonger, North Branch.
Joseph W. Kratoville, Riverhead.
Adolph M. Spiehler, Rochester.
Violet Breen, Roslyn Heights.
Homer H. Thomas, Rushford.
Vernon E. Bowler, Savannah.
George A. Petry, Valhalla.
William H. Middleton, Warwick.
Harold J. Samuels, Waterford.
Jennie Mitchell, White Lake.
Chalmers W. Joyner, White Sulphur Springs.
Edith P. Patterson, Youngsville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Claude S. Rowland, Pinetown.
Walter F. Long, jr., Rockingham.
Dothan A. Norris, Tabor.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fred E. Wollitz, Bowdon.
Florian M. Pezalla, Cayuga.
Seburn J. Cox, Clifford.
Tilda J. Engebretson, Hatton.
Fred Fercho, Lehr.
Ada A. Sorenson, Tuttle.

OHIO

Forest J. Smith, Burton.
Walter H. Bruning, Hamilton.

OKLAHOMA

Ross O. Conrad, Cheyenne.

PENNSYLVANIA

Elmer H. Heydt, Abington.
Harry R. Tomlinson, Andalusia.
Enoch A. Raush, Auburn.
Edward F. Anderson, Austin.
John H. Ammon, Beaver.
John L. Knisely, Bellefonte.
Harry N. Beazell, Belle Vernon.
David P. Stokes, Blain.
Roy L. Wagner, Cressona.
Mary G. Wilson, George School.
Ralph V. Parthemore, High Spire.
Frank J. Over, Hollidaysburg.
Frederick V. Pletcher, Howard.
Rachel M. Thurston, Iselin.

Walter Carrell, Ivyland.
Arthur B. Winter, Jermyn.
Alfred L. Evans, Kane.
Albert D. Karstetter, Loganton.
Robert T. Barton, Meadowbrook.
William L. Swarm, Millheim.
Barbara E. Snyder, New Tripoli.
Samuel G. Garnett, Parkesburg.
Ed. D. House, Pleasantville.
Lester L. Lyons, Pocono.
John A. Baker, Pocopson.
Alex L. Carlier, Point Marion.
Gordon S. Studholme, Port Allegany.
Wilbur J. Woodring, Port Matilda.
Florence H. Gray, Rosemont.
William A. Sickel, Snow Shoe.
William A. Smith, Summerville.
Harry A. Fuellhart, Tidioute.
J. Ellis Tobias, Tremont.
E. Howard Gilpin, Upland.
John C. McCurdy, Verona.
James T. Patterson, Williamsburg.
Max A. Crain, Winburne.

TENNESSEE

John L. Sullivan, Lexington.

TEXAS

Ida S. McWilliams, Anahuac.
George A. Tohill, Big Sandy.
Louis Waldvogel, Columbus.
Birdie Duree, Dimmitt.
Edson E. King, Follett.
Samuel A. West, Joshua.
Edmund W. Tarrence, Llano.
William H. Bruns, Louise.
Wallace C. Wilson, McKinney.
Lotta E. Turney, Smithville.

VERMONT

Edward N. Aldrich, Graniteville.
Berton M. Willey, Greensboro.
John S. Wheeler, North Ferrisburg.
George D. Burnham, Reading.
Sherrie C. Mead, Shoreham.

VIRGINIA

Bascom N. Mustard, Bland.
William R. Connor, Dillwyn.
William R. Moose, Glasgow.
Winter Owens, Haymarket.
Wyatt L. Martin, Hillsville.
Lula E. Northington, Lacrosse.
Paul E. Haden, Palmyra.
Jack F. Fick, Quantico.
William A. Wine, Quicksburg.
Asher Brinson, Stonega.
William R. Kindig, Stuarts Draft.

WASHINGTON

Lillian M. Tyler, Brewster.
Joseph F. Lavigne, Cusick.
Katherine Irving, Dryden.
Jerome E. Depew, Elk.
Guy N. Lafromboise, Enumclaw.
George H. Shanafelt, Kennewick.
Matthew E. Morgan, Lind.
Hilda G. Moe, Malden.
Elva N. Hamilton, Mansfield.
Edwin O. Dressel, Metaline Falls.
Harry E. Stark, Okanogan.
Herman S. Reed, Redmond.
Samuel E. Edwards, Ritzville.
Otto F. Reinig, Snoqualmie.
Myrtle B. Bridgman, Vashon.

WEST VIRGINIA

Clinton V. Boyles, East Beckley.
Wetzel M. Lewis, Lorado.
Neville L. Chancey, Matewan.
Lorene V. Shuttleworth, Nutter Fort.
Boyd McKeever, Wardensville.

WISCONSIN

Harry C. Dowe, Bangor.
John F. Harding, Bay City.
Henry J. Altschwager, Columbus.
Floyd B. Hesler, Glenbeulah.
Carson J. Lawrence, La Farge.
Fred J. Marty, New Glarus.
Giles H. Putnam, New London.
Clyde D. Sullivan, Phillips.
Herman Jacob, Rib Lake.
Wilbur S. Wurm, Shullsburg.

WYOMING

Jason A. Hobbs, Rawlins.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, *June 20, 1930*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

The tender memories of Thy mercies, Blessed Lord, are sweet and heavenly benedictions. With us make this day a fresh beginning as we come to Thee with songs of praise and thanksgiving. Be to our souls a cup of strength, and enkindle in us a zeal for the helpful ministries of life. He who has experienced truth shining in its sphere fails not, for he makes character his aim and the love of country his cause. Bless us with cheerfulness, for wondrous is its strength and its power of endurance. Grant that our lives may blend in full accord with the music of love and the sunshine of gladness. In the name of Christ our Saviour. 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 without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7643. An act to establish a term of the District Court of the United States for the district of Nevada at Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 11050. An act to transfer Willacy County in the State of Texas from the Corpus Christi division of the southern district of Texas to the Brownsville division of such district; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution for the participation of the United States in an exposition to be held at Paris, France, in 1931.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 10919) entitled "An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, and of Elise Steiniger, housekeeper for Consul R. A. Wallace Treat at the Smyrna consulate, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of Government funds and/or personal property by reason of theft, warlike conditions, catastrophes of nature, shipwreck, or other causes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOSES, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. PITTMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. SNELL, chairman of the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, presented the following privileged report (Rept. 1984), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

The Committee on Rules, to which was referred House Resolution 258, authorizing the appointment of a special committee to investigate expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, submits a privileged report on said resolution, with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. When does the gentleman expect to call up the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Not until next week some time.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT UNION

Mr. SNELL, chairman of the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, presented the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 264

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 12549, a bill to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright and to permit the United States to enter the International Copyright Union. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided

and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Patents, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to say just one word about this resolution? This is the same resolution that was brought up under a special rule last week, and was referred back to the Committee on Rules because it did not comply with the Ramseyer rule. There was some doubt whether it would be in order to call it up again, and in order to do away with that doubt the Rules Committee this morning authorized me to report a new rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The provisions of the rule are the same as to the former rule?

Mr. SNELL. Exactly the same. They must comply with the general rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. When does the gentleman expect to call up the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. I can not state. It depends on opportunity.

WAR PROFITS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251) to promote peace and to equalize the burdens and to minimize the profits of war, with Senate amendments, and ask that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "without profit."

Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "war" down to and including "country," in line 10.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, let me say the only thing that is done by the Senate amendments is that the Senate has cut out, in line 6 after the word "provided," the words "without profit." The same words occur in the next line, and this in no way materially affects the purpose. In line 8 the Senate has struck out the words "so as to empower the President to mobilize all the resources of the country," leaving it for Congress to act. As a matter of fact, I do not know as it materially interferes with the resolution one way or the other.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. May I ask the gentleman if this is authorized by his committee?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Was it a unanimous authorization?

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman mean this resolution?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I will say to the gentleman that I shall never bring a matter on the floor of this House and make the statement that it is authorized by the committee unless it is so, with a quorum present.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that; but that was not the question.

Mr. SNELL. I made that statement. I thought the gentleman did not hear me.

Mr. GARNER. No. I do not question the fact that it was authorized by the gentleman's committee. I asked the gentleman if it was by unanimous agreement of his committee?

Mr. SNELL. It was, but no roll call.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. By this amendment you simply denature the resolution and virtually license these profiteers, instead of profiteering in their own names, to unload on the Government, when they take over their enterprises or activities, then to come in after the war and demand enormous profits. So when you put this amendment into the resolution you simply denature it and make it an idle gesture. I am wondering if the gentleman from New York would not agree to call this resolution up at some time when the full membership of the House can be here, especially those who have been interested in it, in order that the amendment and resolution generally could be discussed. I do not think it is fair to call it up now when the very men who have been most interested in it are not present.

Mr. SNELL. I will say that the American Legion, who has been most interested, advised me to call it up and agree to the Senate amendments. I am acting on their representation and with complete approval.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that the men he saw, who arrogate to themselves authority to represent the American Legion, have not consulted the legionnaires in the House or throughout the country in all probability.

Mr. SNELL. Has the gentleman consulted them?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the ex-service men in the House are better informed on this subject and better prepared to pass on it than some one who has not made a study of it.

Mr. SNELL. I understood it came direct from your national commander.

Mr. RANKIN. The national commander can be wrong or misinformed, as was shown to the Congress recently when he sent conflicting telegrams to Congress two different days in succession advising them what to do.

Mr. SNELL. I do not yield to the gentleman any further.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present. I think this matter should be discussed when the men most interested in it are here to get the information. I think the Senate has practically denatured or destroyed the resolution.

I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Abernethy	Dickinson	Kemp	Porter
Aldrich	Dickstein	Kennedy	Prall
Auf der Heide	Dominick	Ketcham	Pratt, Ruth
Bachmann	Doyle	Kiefner	Quayle
Bacon	Estep	Kiess	Ragon
Bankhead	Esterly	Kunz	Rayburn
Beck	Finley	Lampert	Romjue
Black	Foss	Langley	Rutherford
Bohn	Free	Lankford, Va.	Seger
Brunner	Gavagan	Lea	Selvig
Buchanan	Gibson	Leech	Sinclair
Burtness	Golder	Ludlow	Sirovich
Byrns	Goldsborough	McDuffie	Spearing
Carley	Graham	McFadden	Sproul, Kans.
Carter, Wyo.	Griffin	McMillan	Stedman
Celler	Hall, Ind.	McReynolds	Stevenson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hartley	Maas	Stobbs
Collier	Haugen	Michaelson	Sullivan, N. Y.
Connery	Hoffman	Montague	Sullivan, Pa.
Connolly	Hopkins	Montet	Swick
Cooke	Hudson	Mooney	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Wis.	Hudspeth	Murphy	Thurston
Cox	Hull, William E.	Nelson, Wis.	Turpin
Craddock	Hull, Tenn.	Norton	Vincent, Mich.
Crail	Igoe	O'Connor, La.	White
Cramton	James	O'Connor, N. Y.	Whitehead
Curry	Jeffers	Oliver, N. Y.	Williams
Dallinger	Johnson, Ill.	Owen	Wingo
Dempsey	Johnson, Nebr.	Peavey	
De Priest	Jonas, N. C.	Perkins	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from New York will give us some time to discuss these amendments. I understand the gentleman has an hour.

Mr. SNELL. There is other business for to-day and I am not going to yield for a speech; but I will yield for any legitimate question.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, the gentleman from New York proposes to move the previous question on both of these amendments at once?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And vote on them both at once?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The first amendment strikes out of this resolution the words "without profit."

Mr. SNELL. But the next line contains the same thing.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand what the next line contains. It goes on to give the intent. We want a separate vote on that amendment and would like to have some time to discuss it, so the House may know what is before it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for a speech, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 206, noes 101.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fifty-seven Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to know if we have the right to demand a division in order to vote on these two amendments separately?

The SPEAKER. Not after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Sixty-three Members have risen, a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution as amended by the Senate amendments may be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will report the resolution as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is not that equivalent to debate after the previous question has been ordered?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed.

The Clerk read the resolution as amended by the Senate amendments.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate be again reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the two Senate amendments.

The Clerk again read the Senate amendments.

VISIT OF REAR ADMIRAL RICHARD E. BYRD

The SPEAKER. Before submitting the question, the Chair desires to make an announcement. The Chair takes great pleasure in announcing that in response to his invitation Admiral Byrd will visit us this afternoon at about 3 o'clock. [Applause.]

WAR PROFITS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. I would like to inquire if the vote about to be taken is on the Senate amendment or on the adoption of the resolution, because I am in favor of the purpose of the resolution and voted for it when it passed the House some time ago, but I am opposed to the Senate amendment. The resolution, as it passed the House, provided that a commission be—

created to study and consider amending the Constitution of the United States to provide that private property may be taken for public use without profit during war.

But the Senate has amended the resolution by striking out the words "without profit." I think they should remain in there because, as I see it, these words go to the very crux of the situation. I am in favor of the resolution, but opposed to the amendment; and for this reason I want it to be made clear as to which one we are about to vote upon.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 117, not voting 121, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—190

Ackerman	Cochran, Mo.	Hall, Ill.	Kurtz
Adkins	Cochran, Pa.	Hall, Ind.	Kvale
Allen	Cole	Hall, Miss.	Lambertson
Andresen	Colton	Hall, N. Dak.	Lankford, Va.
Andrew	Cooper, Ohio	Halsey	Lea
Ayres	Coyle	Hancock	Leavitt
Baird	Cramton	Hardy	Leech
Barbour	Crosser	Hartley	Lehlbach
Beedy	Crowther	Haugen	Letts
Beers	Culkin	Hawley	Luce
Blackburn	Darrow	Hess	McClintock, Ohio
Bolton	Davenport	Hickey	McCormick, Ill.
Bowman	Dempsey	Hill, Wash.	McLaughlin
Brand, Ohio	Denison	Hoch	McLeod
Brigham	Dickinson	Holaday	McMillan
Britten	Doutrich	Hooper	McSwain
Brumm	Dunbar	Hope	Magrady
Buckbee	Dyer	Hopkins	Manlove
Burdick	Eaton, Colo.	Houston, Del.	Mapes
Butler	Elliott	Howard	Martin
Cable	Ellis	Huddleston	Menges
Campbell, Iowa	Englebright	Hull, Morton D.	Merritt
Campbell, Pa.	Evans, Calif.	Irwin	Michener
Cannon	Fenn	Jenkins	Miller
Carter, Calif.	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Ind.	Moore, Ohio
Chalmers	Fort	Johnson, Nebr.	Morehead
Chase	Garber, Okla.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morgan
Chindblom	Garber, Va.	Kahn	Mouser
Christgau	Gifford	Kelly	Nelson, Me.
Christopherson	Goodwin	Kinzer	Newhall
Clague	Guyer	Knutson	Niedringhaus
Clancy	Hadley	Kopp	Nolan
Clark, Md.	Hale	Korell	O'Connor, Okla.
Palmer	Schafer, Wis.	Stalker	Wason
Parker	Seiberling	Strong, Kans.	Watres
Pittenger	Shaffer, Va.	Strong, Pa.	Whitley
Pratt, Harcourt J.	Short, Mo.	Summers, Wash.	Williamson
Pritchard	Shott, W. Va.	Swanson	Wolfenden
Purnell	Simmons	Swing	Wolverton, N. J.
Ramey, Frank M.	Simms	Temple	Wolverton, W. Va.
Ramseyer	Sloan	Thatcher	Wood
Ransley	Smith, Idaho	Thompson	Woodruff
Reece	Snell	Tilson	Wurzbach
Reed, N. Y.	Snow	Timberlake	Wyant
Reid, Ill.	Sparks	Tinkham	Yates
Rogers	Speaks	Treadway	Zihlman
Rowbottom	Sproul, Ill.	Underwood	
Sanders, N. Y.	Stafford	Vestal	

NAYS—117

Allgood	Doxey	Jones, Tex.	Patterson
Almon	Drane	Kading	Pou
Arentz	Drewry	Kearns	Quin
Arnold	Driver	Kerr	Ragon
Aswell	Edwards	Kincheloe	Rainey, Henry T.
Bell	Eslick	LaGuardia	Ramspeck
Bland	Evans, Mont.	Lampert	Rankin
Blanton	Fisher	Lankford, Ga.	Robinson
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	Larsen	Rutherford
Box	Frear	Lindsay	Sabath
Boylan	Fuller	Linthicum	Sanders, Tex.
Brand, Ga.	Fulmer	Lozier	Sandlin
Briggs	Gambrill	McClintic, Okla.	Smith, W. Va.
Browne	Garner	McCormack, Mass.	Somers, N. Y.
Browning	Gasque	McDuffie	Steagall
Busby	Gavagan	McKeown	Stone
Canfield	Glover	Mansfield	Sumners, Tex.
Cartwright	Green	Mead	Tarver
Clark, N. C.	Greenwood	Milligan	Tucker
Collins	Gregory	Montague	Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Tenn.	Griffin	Moore, Ky.	Warren
Corning	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Welch, Calif.
Crisp	Hare	Nelson, Mo.	Whittington
Cross	Hastings	O'Connell	Wilson
Cullen	Hill, Ala.	O'Connor, La.	Woodrum
Davis	Hull, Wis.	Oldfield	Wright
DeRouen	Jeffers	Oliver, Ala.	Yon
Doughton	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano	
Douglass, Mass.	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	
Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Patman	

NOT VOTING—121

Abernethy	Douglas, Ariz.	Kennedy	Selvig
Aldrich	Doyle	Ketcham	Shreve
Auf der Heide	Eaton, N. J.	Kiefner	Sinclair
Bacharach	Estep	Kiess	Sirovich
Bachmann	Esterly	Kunz	Spearing
Bacon	Finley	Langley	Sproul, Kans.
Bankhead	Fish	Lanham	Stedman
Beck	Foss	Ludlow	Stevenson
Black	Free	McFadden	Stobbs
Bohn	Freeman	McReynolds	Sullivan, N. Y.
Brunner	French	Maas	Sullivan, Pa.
Buchanan	Garrett	Michaelson	Swick
Burtness	Gibson	Montet	Taber
Byrns	Golder	Mooney	Taylor, Colo.
Carley	Goldsborough	Murphy	Taylor, Tenn.
Carter, Wyo.	Graham	Nelson, Wis.	Thurston
Celler	Granfield	Norton	Turpin
Clarke, N. Y.	Hoffman	O'Connor, N. Y.	Underhill
Collier	Hogg	Oliver, N. Y.	Vincent, Mich.
Connery	Hudson	Owen	Wainwright
Connolly	Hudspeth	Peavey	Walker
Cooke	Hull, Tenn.	Perkins	Watson
Cooper, Wis.	Hull, William E.	Porter	Welsh, Pa.
Cox	Igoe	Prall	White
Craddock	James	Pratt, Ruth	Whitehead
Crail	Johnson, Ill.	Quayle	Wigglesworth
Curry	Johnston, Mo.	Rayburn	Williams
Dallinger	Jonas, N. C.	Romjue	Wingo
De Priest	Kemp	Schneider	
Dickstein	Kendall, Ky.	Sears	
Dominick	Kendall, Pa.	Seger	

So the motion to concur in the Senate amendments was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bohn (for) with Mr. Byrns (against).
Mr. Shreve (for) with Mr. McReynolds (against).
Mr. McFadden (for) with Mr. Hull of Tennessee (against).
Mr. Kiefner (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).
Mr. Murphy (for) with Mr. Mooney (against)
Mr. Free (for) with Mr. Whitehead (against).
Mr. Kiess (for) with Mr. Cox (against).
Mr. Bacharach (for) and Mr. Auf der Heide (against).
Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Rayburn (against).
Mr. Connolly (for) with Mrs. Norton (against).
Mr. Dallinger (for) with Mr. Quayle (against).
Mr. Esterly (for) with Mr. Wingo (against).
Mr. Bachmann (for) with Mr. Lanham (against).
Mr. Foss (for) with Mr. O'Connor of New York (against).
Mr. Gibson (for) with Mr. Spearing (against).
Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Brunner (against).
Mr. Johnston of Missouri (for) with Mr. Abernethy (against).
Mr. Golder (for) with Mr. Buchanan (against).
Mr. Sinclair (for) with Mr. Prall (against).
Mr. Graham (for) with Mr. Collier (against).
Mr. Hudson (for) with Mr. Black (against).
Mr. Swick (for) with Mr. Stevenson (against).
Mr. Watson (for) with Mr. Carley (against).
Mr. Taylor of Tennessee (for) with Mr. Igoe (against).
Mr. Seger (for) with Mr. Kemp (against).
Mr. Perkins (for) with Mr. Oliver of New York (against).
Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Celler (against).

Mr. Beck (for) with Mr. Dominick (against).
Mr. Aldrich (for) with Mr. Garrett (against).
Mr. Porter (for) with Mr. Kennedy (against).
Mr. Eaton of New Jersey (for) with Mr. Sullivan of New York (against).
Mr. Crail (for) with Mr. Williams (against).
Mr. Taber (for) with Mr. Kunz (against).
Mr. Freeman (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
Mr. Turpin (for) with Mr. Montet (against).
Mr. French (for) with Mrs. Owen (against).
Mr. Clarke of New York (for) with Mr. Romjue (against).
Mr. Fish (for) with Mr. Sirovich (against).
Mr. James (for) with Mr. Goldsborough (against).
Mr. Vincent of Michigan (for) with Mr. Hudspeth (against).
Mr. Ketcham (for) with Mr. Douglas of Arizona (against).
Mrs. Langley (for) with Mr. Connery (against).
Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Granfield (against).
Mr. Estep (for) with Mr. Taylor of Colorado (against).
Mr. Hogg (for) with Mr. Ludlow (against).
Mr. Wigglesworth (for) with Mr. Doyle (against).
Mr. Finley (for) with Mr. Stedman (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Bacon with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Selvig with Mr. Sears.
Mr. Thurston with Mr. White.
Mr. Curry with Mr. Sproul of Kansas.
Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin with Mr. Walker.
Mr. Craddock with Mr. Kendall of Kentucky.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain that my colleague the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Cox, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ELIZABETH WILLIAMS

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts with respect to four resolutions and ask for their immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Elizabeth Williams, widow of John Williams, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months' compensation and an additional amount not exceeding $250 to defray funeral expenses and last illness of the said John Williams.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I take this opportunity to report action by the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Tax Refund, which was had this morning, based on the report of Mr. L. H. Parker, chief of staff, Division of Investigation, of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, on the question of the settlement of the Treasury Department in what is known as the California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation fund. This is a case that came up under what is known as the Joint Associations of Agriculture, under the cooperative plan in the 1928 act, where you permit farmers, fruit growers, and similar organizations to organize under a cooperative plan and sell their products exempt from the income tax.

Mr. Parker questioned the settlement of the Treasury Department, as communicated to the joint committee in a letter, giving the reasons therefor, and, Mr. Speaker, I shall ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Parker's communication in the RECORD for the benefit of the membership.

In substance the facts are these: Thirty-three sugar corporations—not cooperatives, but corporations—incorporated under the laws of the States, producing sugar and refining sugar, created what is known as a holding company, and this holding company marketed the products of the 33 corporations. The corporations are not owned entirely by the farmers, but are owned principally by commission men and investors, and the stock of the corporation is sold upon the Honolulu Exchange. So anyone can buy this stock and become a part owner of the corporation.

When a dividend is declared by the holding company, ordinarily it would pay a tax of 12 per cent, but under the construction of the Treasury Department it pays no tax on such dividend. It distributes this dividend to 33 corporations, and in turn the 33 corporations declare dividends and pay no tax.

So you can see just what is happening since the Congress undertook to exempt from taxation cooperative farm organizations in this country. These corporations have organized for the purpose of avoiding payments of income tax, and the record shows they are making millions of dollars, and up to 1926 had paid more than $1,000,000 in income tax; but under the construction of the Treasury Department, a construction that has never been approved by the courts, this settlement has been made. I asked the Assistant Secretary this morning if he did not think he ought to go to court in an uncertain case like this, and he said that it was the decision of the Treasury Department and the Treasury Department was going to adhere to it.

You gentlemen are acquainted with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I believe he is one of the best-posted men on income tax there is in the Congress. Senator REED dissented from the action of the committee this morning, just as I did, and said that undoubtedly if this policy were followed in this country there would be corporations organized for similar purposes, and the result would be they would escape the income tax that others have to pay.

In 1926 we were compelled to give to the Treasury Department this discretion in settling these cases, and we made the sky the limit. The reason for doing this was because the administration of the income tax law was breaking down in the Treasury Department on account of the fact that there were so many cases accumulating that it took a taxpayer from 5 to 10 years to ascertain how much taxes he owed. So, I repeat, we gave the Treasury Department this discretion; but when they come to a doubtful case like this, instead of submitting it to the courts and getting a court decision upon the problem they resolved in favor of this corporate organization and thereby let them escape the income tax.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. What is the amount of this refund?

Mr. GARNER. It is small in this instance, only $166,324.68, as I recall.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. When I get through with this statement; yes.

I will say to my colleague from Georgia that this is only a beginning. As Senator REED said this morning, when the country understands they can form these organizations and escape taxation they will do just that in order to escape paying income tax.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Is not this another sample of what happens with respect to administering a law when we let administrative bodies construe the law instead of the courts?

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. And I agree with the gentleman from Texas. If this construction of the Treasury Department is sound, what is to prevent the packers, the millers, or any other body that deals with farm products going ahead and doing the same thing, and in this way evading the tax?

Mr. GARNER. I think that is true; and, if you were Secretary of the Treasury, you would get a court ruling on this question before you permitted them to deduct these taxes; and that is what I am complaining about now. The Treasury Department, instead of taking this matter to the courts and getting a judicial ruling, have gone ahead and have made this settlement upon a basis which enables them to escape taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope each Member of the Congress will take the time to-morrow to read this letter from Mr. Parker, which sets out the entire facts. The facts are not disputed by the Treasury Department. If you do this, I am quite sure you will come to the conclusion that there has been maladministration of the income tax law once more in the Treasury Department. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

APRIL 28, 1930.

Hon. WILLIS C. HAWLEY,
Chairman Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to the proposed refund in the case of the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation, San Francisco, Calif., for the year 1927 in the amount of $166,324.68. A copy of the decision of the commissioner in this case is attached as "Exhibit A."

All members of the committee were notified as to this refund under date of March 17, and on April 14 the members were also notified that certain issues were being raised with the Treasury Department in regard to the proposed action.

The refund, which is in the amount of the total tax paid by the corporation for the year 1927, is due to the decision of the department that the corporation is exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 231 (12) of the revenue act of 1926. The propriety of this decision has been the subject of two conferences between the department and the staff of the committee. Inasmuch as there is still a difference of opinion on this issue, it is believed that it would be advisable for the committee itself to consider this refund prior to its payment for two reasons:

(1) Because it is doubtful whether or not this corporation is exempt under the law; and

(2) If it is exempt, then the committee might properly consider the necessity for revision of this subdivision of the law, because the 1928 act is identical with the 1926 act.

It is the opinion of this office that the real purpose of section 231 (12) of the revenue act of 1926 and of section 103 (12) of the revenue act of 1928 was to permit farmers, fruit growers, and other persons engaged in agricultural pursuits to form cooperative associations which would be exempt from tax. Such tax exemption doubtless seemed logical to Congress because the greater portion of the farmers are not income-tax payers, and, therefore, it would appear that the tax levied on the association at the source might properly be eliminated, since the profits of such corporations when distributed would not be subject to tax. It was also undoubtedly the purpose of Congress to encourage the formation of cooperative marketing associations by the farmer, in order to enable them to reap a fair proportion of the profits that were going to the commission men.

In this case, however, it will be found that the corporation held tax exempt is not formed by individual farmers but by 32 large and wealthy corporations, and that there is a large beneficial interest among the stockholders of these 32 companies who are not farmers at all. Moreover, it will be found that the entire control of the whole group is in the hands of the commission men and not in the hands of the farmer. It is obvious that in such a situation the intent of Congress should be carefully studied, because many less prosperous refineries in this same business are paying taxes while this prosperous company is going tax free, and this, of course, results in unfair competition.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation, which it is proposed to exempt from taxation, was organized under the laws of California in 1921. It was not organized as a cooperative association or corporation as far as its charter is concerned. It was organized with broad powers "to conduct a general merchandise, manufacturing, mechanical, mercantile, commercial, shipping, and commission business; and especially to deal in, refine, and manufacture sugar and sugar products, etc."

The original issue of stock was $2,500,000 of preferred and $10,000,000 of common. The preferred stock was used to purchase the assets of the predecessor company, namely, the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Co. The common stock was subscribed to by some 32 corporations owning and operating sugar plantations on the islands of Hawaii.

While the charter of the corporation does not disclose any evidence that the corporation was organized on a cooperative basis, it is true that shortly after organization a pooling agreement was entered into by the 32 corporations which had subscribed to the common stock, which agreement provided for actual operation in a way which might be construed to have some remote connection with a cooperative plan.

By the terms of this pooling agreement the corporations holding the common stock of the Refining Corporation placed their stock in the hands of six trustees for a period of 21 years. These trustees were not farmers or sugar producers, but were commission men, shippers, and sugar factors. Thus, the sugar-producing corporations are able to exercise only a very limited and remote control over the affairs of the refining corporation, the real control being in the hands of the commission men.

The pooling agreement also provides that:

(1) The trustees shall possess, and shall be entitled to exercise, all rights of every name and nature, including the right to vote, in respect of any and all of such stock. (Stock of California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation.)

(2) The sugar-producing corporations shall hold as evidence of their stock ownership certain trust certificates which are transferable.

(3) A vacancy in the trustees may be filled by the appointment of the remaining trustees.

(4) It is expressly agreed and understood that the trustees assume no responsibility and shall not be subject to any liability for or in respect of the management of the trust.

(5) The holders of stock-trust certificates shall have the right and be under the obligation to sell each year to the said California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation the sugar produced by said holders each year.

It was not until November 1, 1926, that the operation of the refining corporation was put on a basis which appears to have any substantial relation to a cooperative form of transacting business.

On this date an agreement was entered into between seven sugar factors in their own behalf, as principals, and in behalf of the 32 sugar-producing companies for which they acted as agents and the California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation. The trustees were not a party to this agreement.

The agreement provides in brief as follows:

(1) The sellers (the six sugar factors companies) agree to sell and deliver to the buyer (the California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation) all of the raw centrifugal sugar, except sugar sold for local consumption, produced by the 32 plantations for which the sellers now act as agents and which it is possible to ship for the 1-year period, November 1, 1926, to October 31, 1927.

(2) The agreement continues in force from year to year, unless revoked by either buyer or seller.

(3) As an initial payment the buyer agrees to pay to the sellers, for the account of the respective plantations for which the sellers, respectively, act as agents, for every pound of sugar delivered 75 per cent of the New York market price.

(4) In addition to the initial payments as above provided, the buyer shall pay to the sellers annually, for account of the respective plantations, a further payment in proportion to the weight of sugar shipped by each plantation determined as follows:

Add: (a) Gross proceeds from sales of sugar and molasses purchased from sellers.

(b) Gross proceeds from sales of sugar and molasses purchased from other parties.

(c) Value of sugar and molasses which was purchased during year but which remained unsold at close of year.

(d) All other income of the buyer from every source during the year, except proceeds from sale of Hawaiian plantation feed molasses.

From this sum subtract the total resulting from the addition of the following items:

(a) The initial 75 per cent payments.

(b) The purchase price of all sugars, whether raw, refined, or beet, purchased from parties other than the sellers.

(c) All manufacturing, marketing, operating, and other expenses of the buyer for the year, including "estimated amounts of income taxes payable the following fiscal year," depreciation reserves, sinking-fund reserves, etc.

(d) A sum equal to 6 per cent of the capital net worth of the buyer as shown by its book at the beginning of the year as full compensation for its services under this agreement.

The remainder constitutes the amount of the final further payment.

(5) The sellers may at their own expense employ a certified public accountant to audit the accounts of the buyer, but it is agreed that such auditor shall not be authorized to report to the sellers any figures derived from the records of the buyer except in so far as may be necessary in presenting questions or criticisms as to the accounting.

As pointed out there are six companies engaged in the commission and shipping business which act as agents for the various plantation companies. These companies are not the trustees mentioned in the original pooling agreements, but officers of these commission companies are trustees.

It will be sufficient to point out one group in detail which is typical of the six groups, as follows:

Factor, Alexander & Baldwin (Ltd.); W. M. Alexander, president, H. A. Baldwin, vice president, J. Waterhouse, vice president.

Plantations for which Alexander & Baldwin are agents: Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co. (Ltd.), F. F. Baldwin, president; Hawaiian Sugar Co., J. Waterhouse, president; Kahuku Plantation Co. (Ltd.), J. Waterhouse, president; Maui Agricultural Co. (Ltd.), H. A. Baldwin, president; McBryde Sugar Co. (Ltd.), J. Waterhouse, president.

The net income and rate of dividends paid by these companies for 1927 is shown below (from Moody's Industrials):

	Net income (after taxes)	Dividend rate
		Per cent
Alexander & Baldwin (Ltd.)	$1,409,713	14
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co	1,669,729	15
Hawaiian Sugar Co	619,203	21
Kahuku Plantation Co	141,951	1½
Maui Agricultural Co	722,981	9
McBryde Sugar Co	198,121	0
Total—5 plantations	3,351,985	
Total net income of group	4,761,698	

An equally good record seems to have been made by the other factors and groups of plantations. C. Brewer & Co. (Ltd.), factors, had a net income of $1,450,576 in 1927, and the American Factors (Ltd.) a net income of $1,563,101 for the same year.

The total assets of the plantations alone is in excess of $125,000,000 and the surplus they have built up exceeds $45,000,000. It appears that in 1927 their profits were not less than $10,000,000, while the factors made an additional profit of at least $5,000,000.

An examination of Moody's Yearbook for a series of years shows that these six factors and the 32 plantation companies which they represent have as a whole made a tremendous success in the last seven years and have been very profitable, in marked contrast with the rest of the sugar industry in the United States and its Territories.

In regard to the success of the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation, this may be shown by a comparison of its December 31,

1921, balance sheet and its December 31, 1927, balance sheet. This comparison follows:

ASSETS

	Dec. 31, 1921	Dec. 31, 1927
Property, equipment, etc	$12,947,144	$16,099,218
Trade-marks and good-will	1,762,777	1,857,729
Investments		747,000
Cash	345,052	1,271,598
Accounts and notes receivable	1,266,339	2,888,299
United States Government securities	23,234	
Sundry advances		71,342
Inventory	2,575,288	7,196,053
Stores and supplies	991,482	
Prepaid freight	236,588	
Construction work in progress		176,668
Deferred charges		519,884
Other assets	556,573	
Total assets	20,704,477	30,827,791

LIABILITIES

Preferred stock	$2,500,000	
Common stock	10,000,000	$10,001,500
Bonded debt	6,965,000	7,000,000
Sinking fund		2,000,000
Accounts payable	589,547	1,420,169
Notes payable		500,000
Contingent liabilities		284,655
Depreciation reserve		3,825,326
Other reserves		94,750
Surplus	649,230	5,701,391
Total liabilities	20,704,477	30,827,791

The above figures show that this corporation in six years has (1) retired $2,500,000 in preferred stock; (2) set up a depreciation reserve of about $3,800,000; (3) set up a sinking fund reserve of $2,000,000; (4) increased its investment in plant $3,000,000; and (5) has increased its unappropriated surplus by more than $5,000,000. The dividends paid by the corporation during this period have amounted to $1,600,000 exclusive of return payments to the plantation corporations.

The officers of this corporation and the annual salaries of same are as follows:

A. P. Welch, chairman of board	$50,000.00
George M. Rolph, president	81,250.00
L. R. Compiglia, vice president	29,791.66
W. F. Sampson, vice president	29,791.66
A. M. Duperu, vice president	31,221.66
Total	222,054.98

Mr. A. P. Welch is also president of Welch & Co. (Inc.), of San Francisco, which is a firm in the commission and shipping business. It appears that this company is agent for C. Brewer & Co., Castle & Cooke, and F. A. Schaeffer & Co., which latter companies are all factors acting in turn as agents for the plantation companies as before noted. The extent to which Welch & Co. share in the profits of this group is not divulged in the record.

It appears that during the year 1927 the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation withheld from distribution the sum of $1,137,831.03 after providing for all necessary reserves. This sum is considerably in excess of 6 per cent of the net worth provided for in the agreement of November 1, 1926, and is in excess of 8 per cent of the capital stock which is provided for by law as a reasonable profit.

This company paid taxes for all years from 1921 to 1926 in the total amount of $1,186,932.85. For the year 1927 it paid a tax of $166,324.68. It filed claim for refund of the 1927 tax on December 21, 1928, claiming exemption under the provisions of section 231 (12) of the revenue act of 1926.

DISCUSSION

The first question to be discussed is:

"Can the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation qualify as a tax-exempt corporation under section 231 (12)?"

Section 231 (12) of the revenue act of 1926 is quoted in full below:

"The following organizations shall be exempt from taxation under this title—

"(12) Farmers', fruit growers', or like associations organized and operated on a cooperative basis (a) for the purpose of marketing the products of members or other producers, and turning back to them the proceeds of sales, less the necessary marketing expenses, on the basis of either the quantity or the value of the products furnished by them, or (b) for the purpose of purchasing supplies and equipment for the use of members or other persons, and turning over such supplies and equipment to them at actual cost plus necessary expenses. Exemption shall not be denied any such association because it has capital stock if the dividend rate of such stock is fixed at not to exceed the legal rate of interest in the State of incorporation or 8 per cent per annum, whichever is greater, on the value of the consideration for which the stock was issued, and if substantially all such stock (other than nonvoting preferred stock, the owners of which are not entitled or permitted to participate, directly or indirectly, in the profits of the association upon dissolution or otherwise beyond the fixed dividends) is owned by producers who market their products or purchase their supplies and equipment through the association; nor shall exemption be denied any such association because there is accumulated and maintained by it a reserve required by State law or a reasonable reserve for any necessary purpose. Such an association may market the products of nonmembers in an amount the value of which does not exceed the value of the products marketed for members, and may purchase supplies and equipment for nonmembers in an amount the value of which does not exceed the value of the supplies and equipment purchased for members, provided the value of the purchases made for persons who are neither members nor producers does not exceed 15 per cent of the value of all its purchases."

In the first place, consider the phrase "farmers', fruit growers', or like associations." Can a corporation be a farmer? If we had a law relating to laborers' associations, could it be said that a corporation would qualify as a laborer in forming such an association? Technically under the definition of a corporation as a legal entity it may be possible that a corporation can qualify as a farmer, but looking at the intent of the statute we have some doubt, especially when the stock of such corporations is not held exclusively by farmers. In this case the stock of the member corporations which form the association is not held exclusively by farmers, but largely by commission men and investors. The stock of the majority of the corporations is freely traded in on the Honolulu Exchange. If, therefore, a corporation can qualify as a farmer, a New York capitalist who has never seen a farm can entirely own the stock of a number of corporations engaged in agriculture and these corporations can in turn form a tax-exempt corporation engaged in marketing and manufacturing. In such a case it is evident that the entire beneficial interest of the group will be in one person—the New York capitalist—and, in fact, the real farmers will be at a disadvantage in competing with this powerful group instead of at an advantage as contemplated by the act. In the case of the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation, we find that about $1,000,000 worth of beet sugar is refined for the western farmer, and that the profit on such refining goes tax free not to the western farmer but to the Hawaiian corporations.

In the second place, the statute requires an exempt corporation to be "organized," as well as "operated" on a cooperative basis, "for the purpose of marketing the products of members or other producers, and turning back to them the proceeds of sales, less the necessary marketing expenses." The Treasury appears to base this company's right to exemption on the fact that it operates on a cooperative basis for the purpose described. Conceding that this "operating" test is satisfied, is this sufficient to make the company exempt? It is a well-recognized rule of statutory construction that effect must, if possible, be given to every clause, statement, or word in a statute. (Montclair Tup. v. Ransdell, 107 U. S. 147.) We must, therefore, give effect to the word "organize" as well as the word "operate." The charter of this corporation endows it with powers to "conduct a general merchandise, manufacturing, mechanical, mercantile, commercial, shipping, and commission business, and especially to deal in, refine, and manufacture sugar and sugar products." An organization having such broad powers does not appear to meet the test of "organized on a cooperative basis for the purpose of marketing the products of members or other producers." In fact, the file does not disclose that there is any provision in the charter showing an intention to organize or operate on a cooperative basis. Not even in name does the corporation hold itself out to be such an association.

Provisions requiring more than one test as a condition to exemption have been construed strictly by the courts, which have held that all such tests must be complied with. In the matter of the corporation of Yaddo (216 App. Div., N. Y. 1), decided in March, 1926, the court was construing section 4, subdivision (7), of the tax law of New York, as amended by the laws of 1924, chapter 489, which provides that "the real property of a corporation * * * organized exclusively for the moral or mental improvement of men or women or for * * * benevolent, * * * educational, * * * literary, * * * and used exclusively for carrying out thereupon one or more of such purposes, * * * shall be exempt from taxation." In the case before the court the petitioner was endeavoring to secure an exemption from taxation of its real property in the city of Saratoga Springs. In passing upon the statute the court made the following comment:

"Here are two distinct provisions. To determine the purpose for which such real property is used must necessarily require an investigation after the date of the certificate of incorporation and outside of the language of the law under which the corporation is organized. Actual use might not correspond with the declared use stated in the certificate. In such a case exemption would not be granted."

And the court concludes with the following statement:

"A summary of the argument shows that the exemption in question can only be allowed after it is established that the petitioner was organized exclusively and the real property used exclusively for benevolent purposes, and the certificate, the law under which it is incorporated, and the by-laws, all unite in a determination of the intent of the incorporators. If their operations later do not accord therewith, or if the

by-laws are changed, so as not to comply with the original purposes, then exemption will not follow."

Again, in the case of Commonwealth v. John McGlinn Distilling Co. (108 Atlantic, 823 Pa. 346), the court was construing a Pennsylvania statute (act of July 15, 1897, P. L. 292, No. 2) which imposed a capital stock tax on "companies organized and incorporated for the purpose of distilling liquors and selling the same at wholesale." In passing upon this statute, the court held the test is "not the business conducted, but whether it is organized and incorporated for that purpose."

The original ruling of the department on this point is known as O. D. 190 and sustains this view. It reads as follows:

"In dealing with cases coming under section 231 the character of the corporation must be judged by its articles of incorporation, constitution, and by-laws rather than by the declarations of its officers or the method by which it conducts or has conducted its business. Accordingly, if the activities of a company are confined to cooperative selling for the benefit of its patrons, but it is granted additional powers by its charter, it will nevertheless be required to file returns and pay the tax if any shown to be due."

The above ruling was issued in regard to the 1918 act, but since that act contains the same phrase "organized and operated," it is equally applicable to all the subsequent acts. While this ruling has never been revoked, a later ruling, I. T. 1914 (C. B. III-1 287) appears to reach a different conclusion. The latter ruling reads as follows:

"Under its articles of incorporation, the M Co. has very broad powers to engage in business for profit. These powers, however, are not exercised. Its actual business consists in the taking over of the cattle and sheep of its members, slaughtering them, and crediting the members with the amount of meat or mutton at a rate mutually agreed upon. It then sells the meat at an advance of one-half cent per pound, which amount is used to defray expenses. The by-products are sold at the prevailing market rates. At the end of the annual accounting period a dividend of 7 per cent, and no more, is paid the stockholders in lieu of interest, and the balance, if any, is distributed among the members on the basis of amount of produce furnished. Only producers own its stock.

"Held, that the M Co. is entitled to exemption under section 231 (11) of the revenue acts of 1918 and 1921."

The ruling, last quoted, was based on the revenue acts of 1918 and 1921. It does not appear to have been founded on any court decision, but merely on a policy determined by the bureau. It marks the departure from the policy of strict construction to the one of "great liberality," which was referred to in the conference report on the revenue act of 1926.

In construing the terms "organized and operated" under this more liberal policy, the Treasury appears to rely somewhat upon two decisions, one by the Supreme Court, and one by the Board of Tax Appeals, interpreting the phrase "organized and operated exclusively for religious and charitable purposes;" namely, Trinidad, Insular Collector, v. Sagrada Orden de Predicadores, etc.; 263 U. S. 578; and appeal of Unity School of Christianity, 4 B. T. A. 61. But in both of these cases the companies were organized for purely religious purposes, and, while they did engage in some commercial transactions, all of the profits were devoted to the religious purpose for which they were organized.

In the third place, there is some question as to whether the corporation even operates on a cooperative basis.

The essence of a cooperative association is that the profits of such association, over and above necessary expenses, are returned to its members. In this case it seems plain that only part of the profits are returned, inasmuch as over $1,000,000 is retained by the association, for which no pressing need is shown. Moreover, the members are out of control of the association and can not force distribution. The high officers' salaries paid is another evidence of lack of true cooperative operation. Would the true farmers' cooperative, which Congress meant to exempt under the law, ever pay its five principal officers over $222,000 in salaries? This sum is nearly 20 per cent of the total net income of the corporation, and the president alone draws a salary in excess of $81,000. Attention is also drawn to the fact that the operating agreement between the plantations and the refinery provides for an annual payment by the former to the latter of 6 per cent of the net worth of the refining corporation as compensation for services. It is certainly an unusual form of cooperative association that not only pays its five officers $222,000 annually but also receives nearly $1,000,000 as compensation for the services rendered its members over and above what it requires for expenses and reserves.

While the statute authorizes the retention of a reasonable reserve for any necessary purpose, under the operating agreement the company not only retains all necessary reserves but also a substantial sum as compensation for services.

In the fourth place, under the contract of November 1, 1926, the seven sugar factories deal with the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation not only as agents for the 32 sugar-producing companies but also as principals. Therefore, the corporation is not dealing altogether with producers as such. In the case of the Northwestern Drug Co., which purchased not as agent but with its own funds, the Board of Tax Appeals, in 14 B. T. A. 222, denied exemption.

Finally, the courts have consistently held that a claim to exemption from taxation must be clearly made out. In determining whether a fraternal beneficiary association was exempt from the policy-premium tax imposed by section 504 of the revenue act of 1917, the district court, in the case of Western Funeral Benefit Association v. Hellmich, made the following comment:

"In passing upon the questions herein involved it will be well to keep in mind the rule by which the court must be guided. This rule seems to have run through all of the decisions, and in the case of Bank of Commerce v. Tennessee (161 U. S. 134, 16 S. Ct. 456, 4 L. Ed. 645) the court, after citing several cases, puts the principle upon which is founded the rule that a claim for exemption from taxation must be clearly made out. Taxes being the sole means by which sovereignties can maintain their existence, any claim on the part of anyone to be exempt from the full payment of his share of taxes on any portion of his property must on that account be clearly defined and founded upon plain language. There must be no doubt or ambiguity in the language used upon which the claim to the exemption is founded. It has been said that a well-founded doubt is fatal to the claim; no implication will be indulged in for the purpose of construing the language used as giving the claim for exemption, where such claim is not founded upon the plain and clearly expressed intention of the taxing power."

To the same effect are the decisions of the Board of Tax Appeals in Farmers' Cooperative Milk Co. (9 B. T. A. 696) and United Drug Co. (14 B. T. A. 224) in construing the exempt-corporation provision of the revenue acts.

It is the opinion of this office that the taxpayer has not clearly established a claim to exemption under the statute and therefore exemption should be denied. It is obvious, however, that the members of the committee, all of whom are familiar with the intent of Congress in this matter, are better able to judge of the propriety of the decision than its staff or even the Treasury Department.

If the committee is of the opinion that this corporation is properly exempt under the statute, it is respectfully recommended that consideration be given to the propriety of changing the law, for this office believes that this corporation and the corporations which hold its stock, bound together as they are with the shipping agents and factors, represent a monopoly of the Hawaiian sugar industry. The figures, in fact, show that this group produces and refines over 75 per cent of the annual amount of sugar produced on the Hawaiian Islands.

One very obvious defect in the present law is the failure to tax dividends distributed by exempt corporations. While this might be unimportant in the case of the true farmers' cooperative, since few farmers have enough income to be subject to tax, it becomes very important when the dividends go to highly profitable corporations, as in this case. The result is, of course, that the Government loses its 12 per cent tax, without even securing the offset of the normal tax on individuals.

It also must be pointed out that if such corporations as the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation are tax exempt, Congress is granting tax relief to corporations which already enjoy substantial economic advantages over their competitors. This can be shown by a comparison of the dividends paid by the Hutchinson Sugar Plantation Co., which does not belong to the tax-exempt group, and the dividends paid by the Kekaha Sugar Co., which does belong to the group, both of these corporations being located in Hawaii.

Year	Dividends paid	
	Hutchinson Sugar Co. (nonmember)	Kekaha Sugar Co. (member)
	Per cent	*Per cent*
1921	7½	60
1922		24
1923		24
1924	⅔	24
1925	8	24
1926	2⅔	12
1927		15
1928		15

This economic advantage is not confined to nonmembers located in Hawaii, but applies to all beet and cane sugar producers and refiners of the United States and Cuba. This is indicated by the consistent and substantial earnings of the Hawaiian monopoly in comparison with the meager dividend record of the American Sugar Refining Co. shown below:

Year:	Dividend, per cent
1921	5¼
1922	0
1923	0
1924	0
1925	0
1926	5
1927	5

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is the opinion of the staff that the taxpayer has not clearly established his claim for exemption under the statute and that exemption should therefore be denied. In any event, it is believed that a report on tax-exempt corporations in general should be authorized, for it is feared that if the present interpretation of the statute is persisted in substantial benefit will result to corporations and monopolies, while the real benefit to the individual farmer will remain negligible.

Respectfully submitted.

——— ———, *Chief of Staff.*

EXHIBIT A

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF INTERNAL REVENUE

GC:R:RLC
C1-4223

FEBRUARY 25, 1930.

In re: California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation, San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. COMMISSIONER: A certificate of overassessment has been prepared in favor of the above-named corporation in the amount of $166,324.68 for the fiscal year ended November 30, 1927.

The overassessment is due to holding that the corporation is exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 231(12) of the revenue act of 1926.

The taxpayer filed a corporation income-tax return for the year under review, reporting a net income of $1,262,532.43. A tax of $170,441.88 was assessed on the basis of the return. Subsequent thereto a refund of $4,117.20 was allowed, due to an adjustment to depreciation. A claim was filed under date of December 21, 1928, in which it was claimed that the corporation was exempt from taxation.

It is apparent from the evidence submitted that since December 1, 1926, all of the outstanding stock of the corporation, with the exception of directors' qualifying shares, has been held by producers of raw sugar whose entire output is refined and sold by the taxpayer. The dividends on capital stock have not exceeded 8 per cent per annum. The primary purpose and function of the corporation is to refine and market the raw sugar produced and shipped to it by all of its stockholders and also to market a by-product of the raw-sugar industry commonly known as waste or black-strap molasses. The raw sugar received from the plantations is marketed under a contract dated November 1, 1926, and under the terms of this contract the corporation receives all the raw sugar produced by the plantations and sells the same for their individual accounts.

The blackstrap molasses is not sold under the sugar contract but is handled under a separate contract which is similar to the raw-sugar contract in its effect. The evidence indicates that 100 per cent of the sugar business transacted during the fiscal year ended November 30, 1927, was with members. With respect to the molasses business, which constitutes less than 2 per cent of the gross proceeds realized, it is stated that during the period ended November 30, 1927, 88.12 per cent of the net business was transacted with members. A small amount of molasses of nonmembers was handled by the corporation with the consent of the stockholders as a matter of accommodation to three plantation owners inasmuch as the quantity of molasses available from these plantations was so small that it was impractical for them to arrange for shipping and sale in the United States.

Although the New York market price is used in determining the amount of the initial payment to be made to the members for deliveries of raw sugar, each member receives actual receipts from the sale of refined sugar, less all operating costs and expenses, plus or minus financial gains and losses, and less 6 per cent withheld in proportion to the tonnage of raw sugar delivered to the company. The evidence indicates that 6 per cent deduction mentioned above is in addition to operating costs and expenses and according to the taxpayer constitutes a reasonable amount for necessary purposes of the company to redeem its bonds under a sinking-fund agreement and to provide funds for necessary plant expenditures. It is stated that nonmembers received the net selling price of their molasses, less freight from the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

Based upon the foregoing it is held that the corporation is entitled to exemption under section 231 (12) of the revenue act of 1926 inasmuch as its method of doing business is in accordance with the provisions of the law and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

Based upon the above there is no tax liability. There is, therefore, an overassessment of $166,324.68 which is allowable under the provisions of section 284 (b) of the revenue act of 1926.

In view of the foregoing it is recommended that the certificate of overassessment for the fiscal year ended November 30, 1927, herein outlined be allowed.

C. M. CHAREST,
General Counsel, Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Approved.

ROBT. H. LUCAS,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

HELEN T. SCOTT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives to Helen T. Scott, widow of Walter W. Scott, late an employee of the Joint Committee on Printing, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as such employee, one-half of said sum to be paid by the Senate and one-half by the House, and an additional amount, not exceeding $250, to defray the funeral expenses of said Walter W. Scott, shall be paid by the House.

The resolution was concurred in.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL SERVICES IN THE ENROLLING ROOM

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 249

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, during the remainder of the present session, not exceeding $150 for additional clerical services in the enrolling room.

The resolution was agreed to.

JAMES W. BOYER, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 227

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House $1,200 to James W. Boyer, jr., for extra and expert services as expert legal examiner to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation during the first and second sessions of the Seventy-first Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the figures "$1,200" and insert "$600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

STOP WAR PROFITEERING

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on House Joint Resolution 251, in which the House concurred in the Senate amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, the simple and manifest purpose of this resolution is to have a commission of Members of Congress and of the Cabinet come together, confer, study, consider, and report to the President and to the Congress how the making of profits as a result of war by a part of the people while the other part suffer unusual and extreme hardships and make great sacrifices may be prevented. There is nothing sinister nor mysterious about this resolution. It is not a party question, because both major parties have heretofore declared in their national platforms that it is the duty of Congress to legislate in advance, so that if war should come, the conscienceless profiteering which occurred during the World War, and which has occurred during all the wars that our Nation has engaged in, may be prevented, and if not totally prevented, may be reduced to a minimum, and thus greater equality in bearing the burdens of war be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, the origin of this resolution is not what some of its opponents have imagined. It did not originate in either the War Department or in the Navy Department, nor in the cloistered circle of any jingoistic or militaristic group. When the 4,000,000 citizens who were temporarily in the military service during the World War were demobilized they went home with a resolution firmly fixed in their hearts that they would do all in their power to see that, if another war should come, there would not be a great crop of persons grow rich out of the emergency of the Nation, as was the case during the last war. It has been estimated that at least 20,000 persons became millionaires as a result of mere war profits, and, of course, those who were already millionaires, or, at least, most of them, had their fortunes greatly increased by war profits.

Mr. Speaker, when the American Legion was tentatively organized even in France, and subsequently organized by duly elected representatives after the return to America of our expeditionary forces, one of the first definite objectives set up by these patriotic and unselfish ex-service men was the ultimate enactment into law of provisions to stop war profiteering. In fact, the American Legion has but two great fundamental mis-

sions—first, to see that all ex-service men who have been disabled as a result of such service shall obtain fair and reasonable compensation and hospitalization; and, second, to see that some sore of legislation is enacted to prevent the slacker who dodges military service, or the man who by reason of age or disability may not be liable to military service, from staying at home making his millions of war profits out of the necessities and dislocations and demoralizations of economic conditions while the soldier is at the front forming a wall of defense with his own flesh and sacrificing his time, his family, his health, and perhaps his life.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the hearts of the millions of the American people cry out for peace in common with the longing for peace in the hearts of the masses of the people of every civilized nation. Consequently, after the great suffering and waste and destruction of the World War, the minds of our more than 100,000,000 people were searching here and there and everywhere for plans and methods to prevent or, at least, to discourage future wars. Out of all of this sentiment grew the League of Nations, and the World Court, and the demand for the outlawing of war, and for the codification of international law, and finally more than a half hundred nations ratified and approved the Kellogg peace pact, whereby these nations renounced war as an instrument for promoting their national policies. Thousands of suggestions have been made in newspapers and magazines as to how to discourage war. It has been proposed that before Congress declare war there should be a solemn referendum on the question to all the people of the Nation, so that they might declare by secret ballot their sentiments on the question. Hundreds of plans for international cooperation and for bringing about international understanding have been proposed.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the fundamental idea sought to be accomplished by House Joint Resolution 251 is in the interest of the people. Former President Harding, as he stood among the thousands of dead bodies of our brave boys on the pier at Hoboken, declared, with a voice choking with emotion, while his face was bathed in tears, that "this thing must not happen again." It was this same President Harding who, in his inaugural address, sounded the first official declaration that in the future in the event of any inevitable war of defense there should be equal service and equal sacrifice for all American citizens and special profits to none.

President Harding repeated this sentiment in a subsequent message to Congress. The national convention of the American Legion and various State conventions and thousands of posts solemnly resolved that these noble sentiments of President Harding must be made effective by being enacted into law in advance of war, while the lessons drawn from the mistakes and failures of the recent war are still fresh in the minds of the people.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1922, being moved by the feelings and impulses herein sought to be expressed, I offered the first resolution ever introduced in Congress on this subject, whereby profiteering was denounced and equalization of the hardships and sacrifices of the war demanded, and that a commission be appointed to study the whole question and to make a report to the Congress of the manner and means by which these noble aims might be accomplished. That was House Joint Resolution 400. It was introduced again in the Sixty-eighth Congress and became House Joint Resolution 128. On that resolution hearings were had before the Committee on Military Affairs on March 11, 13, and 20, 1924, and those hearings cover 250 printed pages and constitute a valuable compilation of material on the subject. The original resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. However, in the Seventieth Congress, with my entire approval and consent and cooperation, a resolution in practically the same language was introduced by the Hon. J. MAYHEW WAINWRIGHT, of the State of New York, and that was referred to the Committee on Rules. In the meantime a number of bills had been introduced seeking legislation directly and without any previous study.

Prominent among these bills was one popularly known as the Capper-Johnson bill, which proposed to empower the President, at his discretion, in the event of an emergency as well as war, to mobilize all the material and human resources of the Nation. That and other bills were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Some hearings were conducted on this and other bills from time to time. I expressed my opposition both upon the floor and in committee to the enactment of the Capper-Johnson bill into the law, on the ground that it did not set up any guarantee that profiteering would be prevented in time of war, but on the other hand vested such unlimited discretion in the President as to make it possible for the President, whenever he thought a national emergency existed, to draft directly into the Federal service all the human services of the Nation, and to draft all the material resources of the Nation, so as to result in the scrambling, dislocating, and demoralizing of all the ordinary processes and institutions of business and of life. I did my share to defeat this bill and in calling the attention of the Congress and of the country to the danger involved. If the President were a powerful and ambitious man, or if he were a weak character, subject to the sinister influences of a secret militaristic group, he could, upon slight pretext, throw the whole Nation into a state of war, set up martial law, disorganize and destroy private business and private property, and thus wreck both the blessing of individual and private ownership in property and at the same time destroy the liberties of the people. That bill was riding and parading upon the strength of the noble and unselfish and patriotic sentiment of the masses of our people to stop profiteering in the time of war, but instead of stopping profiteering, it made possible conditions that would be a thousand times worse than profiteering.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was resolved not to be deflected from the primary and original unselfish and patriotic desire of our people to put a stop, as far as possible, to the unfair and unjust practices that have heretofore prevailed in time of war. Hence I supported the resolution of the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], and when I learned that the Hon. BERTRAND H. SNELL, of New York, chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, had introduced virtually the same resolution in the Seventy-first Congress, being the resolution now known as House Joint Resolution 251, I was very pleased and was still firmly resolved to support it with all my energy. Hence, when the matter came up for consideration in the House on April 1, 1930, I did everything in my power to secure the adoption of the resolution. It is true that I supported certain amendments to the resolution which I thought clarified it, and certainly did not militate against the main purpose. Especially did I support the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], which provided that the commission proposed to be set up should not consider and report upon the conscription of labor. When that amendment was offered on the floor of the House I had already made some remarks stating that I was opposed to the conscription of labor and that, as I understood the position of the Hon. Bernard M. Baruch, who was chairman of the War Industries Board during the World War, he also agrees that it is impracticable, unwise, and inexpedient to seek to conscript labor under the guise that human services are necessary for military purposes, and to take human beings by force of law and place them in various industrial and munitions plants to work, not as civilian wage earners but under military law and military discipline.

I hold that Congress has no power to compel a human being to render any service except strictly military service in the defense of the Nation. The war power and all the war power was by the States conferred upon the Federal Government, but that war power is limited to making war upon the enemy, either foreign or domestic. But being bitterly opposed to the absurd lengths to which some persons would seek to carry the principle of universal service in time of war—and, consequently, of universal draft—I have stuck consistently and persistently to the original and fundamental fact of suppressing profiteering in time of war, an object approved of by the minds and consciences of at lease 99 per cent of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I have asserted, and I repeat, that the essential thought underlying this resolution is a part of the world craving for peace. I respectfully call your attention to an article which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly of February, 1925, while the griefs and grievances of the World War were still very fresh in the public mind. This article by Mr. Sisley Huddleston, entitled "An American Plan for Peace," is one of the calmest, most rational, and most suggestive statements of the great objective underlying the declarations of President Harding, underlying the resolutions of the American Legion, and underlying this action of the American Congress. The movement is in the interest of the people. It is believed that certain groups are perfectly willing to permit, if not to foment, animosities, prejudices, and hatreds to grow to uncontrollable proportions and finally to break out in war, in the hope and expectation that these groups will reap the huge profits in money that the history of previous wars shows to be possible.

This selfish and traitorous practice of profiteering upon both the Government and the civilian population in time of war is no new thing in the world. It was practiced to such an outrageous degree during the Revolutionary War that the Congress of the United States resolved—

> That some persons in this city (of Philadelphia) are governed by principles inimical to the cause of America, and with views of avarice and extortion have mobilized and engrossed shoes, stockings, and other

necessaries for the armies, while the soldiers of the continent, fighting for the liberties of our country, are exposed to the injuries of the weather—

and that the State of Pennsylvania should adopt legislation correcting this evil and punishing these practices. For the second time the American Congress was called upon to call this outrage and injustice to the attention of the States which then alone had legislative power, and consequently acts prohibiting and punishing such avaricious conduct were passed by the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and probably other States. George Washington stated about this time in one of his letters dealing with the curse of profiteering that—

I would to God that one of the most atrocious in each State was hung in jibbets upon a gallows five times as high as the one prepared for Haman. No punishment, in my opinion, is too great for the man who can build his greatness upon his country's ruin.

So it was during the War of 1812, during the war with Mexico, during the War between the States, during the war with Spain. The heart and conscience of America have cried out that this thing must not be again. I call your attention to an article which appeared in the December, 1924, number of the magazine entitled "Our World," written by the Hon. Bernard M. Baruch, himself an authority on finance and economic questions, on the methods and machinery by which we can and should stop war profiteering.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, when it became apparent that the so-called Capper-Johnson bill could not pass Congress, the American Legion, through its national commander and national legislative committee, got behind what was originally the "McSwain resolution," subsequently the "Wainwright resolution," and ultimately the "Snell resolution." I have supported all of these resolutions at every stage and here and now state from my personal knowledge of its origin and of the purposes back of it that it is purely patriotic and unselfish and in the interest of the people and justice. But it has this additional angle and advantage. It will discourage the jingoistic spirit among the capitalist classes, because it is notice to them in advance that they can not make profits in time of war and that the taxes on their property to conduct war will be very heavy both during war and after the war. But it also has a deterrent influence upon any nation or people that might be disposed to attack our territory or to deny and to defy our rights. It means that we will not stir up war, that we will not institute and prosecute a war of aggression. We know that the millions who must fight in the ranks, who must suffer in the hospitals, who must languish and die upon the field will never agitate the commencement of an unjust war. But we do know that these same millions of people, of every rank and station, have the Anglo-Saxon spirit of putting justice and honor above life itself, and that if any other country should trespass upon our rights, these Americans will fly to the defense of America.

Consequently, other nations would know, if this principle of universal service without war profits that we are now discussing should become law and be the settled policy of this Nation, that if our country ever does feel justified in fighting in defense of its rights, then it will fight with every power and resource and energy, both human and material, and will thus be able to strike such a blow with its combined and unified strength and resources as to be irresistible. Thus, this American plan for peace means peace with a double aspect. It means that America will never aggressively and selfishly break the peace, and it means that other nations will be afraid to break the peace by attacking America.

Mr. Speaker, America is a peace-loving people. Our Nation, for the first time in the history of the world, incorporated in its Constitution the provision that war should be declared only by the representatives of the people. Congress alone can declare and make war. The history of our Nation shows that Congress has never been hasty to declare war. When war has been declared it has been by an overwhelming majority and by a nonpartisan vote. In fact, Congress has always lagged behind the popular sentiment. Congress has been slow to gather the feeling of the country, and only after certain assurance that the war will be supported by practically the whole population has Congress ever dared to declare war. In this respect Congress has ever been truly representative of the feelings and desires of the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we come down to the motion before the House to concur in the Senate amendments to the House resolution, I voted to concur and sought an opportunity to explain to the Members of the House that, in my judgment, we should all vote to concur in those amendments. The Senate had adopted only two amendments, neither of which is, in my judgment, material or in any way affects the sense, the purpose, or the object of the resolution. The first amendment which the Senate proposed was to strike out this language:

So as to empower the President immediately to mobilize all the resources of the country.

This ought to be entirely in harmony with the views of those who have opposed the resolution. The striking out of these words does not defeat the object of the resolution, which is merely to authorize the commission to study the question and to make definite and concrete report which will epitomize and express the consensus of the best opinion of the Nation on the subject. As to the other amendment, the Journal of the proceedings in the Senate shows that the words "without profit" were struck out on motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL]. The language of the resolution as it passed the House authorized the commission to—

Study and consider amending the Constitution of the United States so as to provide that private property may be taken by Congress for public use without profit during war.

The amendment offered by Senator DILL merely strikes out the words "without profit." So the commission is now authorized to study and consider an amendment to the Constitution providing for the taking of private property for public use during war.

It says nothing about compensation or no compensation. Furthermore, in the same paragraph of the same resolution the commission shall report if in their opinion any constitutional amendment be necessary to accomplish the purposes desired. Manifestly the purpose is to equalize the burdens of war and to remove the profits of war, and to study and determine the policies that our Nation should pursue in the event of war. Therefore if the commission concludes that a constitutional amendment be necessary to accomplish these purposes, the commission will so report. But the report of the commission will have no force as law. It will only be the concrete, practical, definite statement of what responsible American public officials think on the subject. It will be a statement of the most historic and far-reaching significance. Congress will have the report and recommendations of the commission before it and Congress may consider and deliberate upon that report as long or longer than it has been considering this resolution, which is about eight years. Even if it takes Congress 10 years after such report is rendered to enact suitable and proper legislation to accomplish the purposes desired, it will be time well expended, and the Nation will render its grateful thanks, and posterity will rise up to call such Congress blessed. Even if the report of the commission is never made the basis of any future legislation on the subject, it will nevertheless be a document of surpassing importance. It will be turned to by the Members of Congress during the period of any future war our country may be engaged in, and that report will be appealed to as the solemn declaration of the calm and collected judgment of what reasonable and responsible American public men thought and felt while it was yet peace, and before the fever and furor of war had disturbed the thinking of men.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I voted for the previous question on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments, and I voted for the concurrence by the House in said amendments. If the House had not concurred, then only two courses were open—one would be to let the matter lie upon the table and thus die a natural death; the other one would be to disagree to the Senate amendments and to ask for a conference. I could see no reason nor necessity for such delay. In my judgment the Senate amendments in no way affect the meaning nor purpose nor future results of the resolution. The words stricken out do not control the future action of the commission. The words stricken out do not substantially change the meaning and proper and reasonable construction of the resolution. Feeling this way about it, I could see no necessity for causing delay and possibly having the resolution caught in a jam arising from the necessity of a conference and subsequent action by both Houses. The Senate amendments are perfectly harmless and immaterial so far as the object to be accomplished is concerned. I was informed by the chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Legion that he and his associates among the responsible national officers of the American Legion agree with me in holding that these amendments do not justify a conference between the two Houses. Since the amendments are innocent, since a conference might delay and imperil the passage at this session of the resolution, I voted for the concurrence by the House, and regret that I had no opportunity to explain to the Members of the House before the vote was taken how I regard this question.

In conclusion, let me refute one statement that I have heard made privately and intimated upon the floor of the House. It

is that the national officers of the American Legion in supporting this resolution do not represent the feeling of the rank and file of the ex-service men of America. It has been hinted that these national officers have been inspired by suggestions from Army and Navy officers. Furthermore, it is claimed that the American Legion officers represent only the sentiment of the former American Army officers and not the privates in the ranks. But I respectfully submit that the suggestion is not well founded in fact. The former private soldiers of the American Army are more bitter in their animosity to the war profiteers than any other class. I submit that any speaker can appear before any audience, and if he denounces selfish, greedy, and rapacious profiteering in time of war, he will receive the genuine and sincere applause of 95 per cent of any audience that can be assembled in America. I believe that a vast majority of the Members of Congress have frequently denounced in their speeches to their constituents the practice of profiteering in time of war, and have pledged to their constituents to bring about legislation to prevent that hideous evil. In fact, both great parties by their solemn platform declarations, have denounced this shameful and disgraceful incident and usual consequence of war. The truth is that all our people, men and women, old and young, and especially all our ex-service men, whether officers or enlisted men, not only approve of proper steps taken to suppress this moral crime of war profiteering, but they demand that their representatives in Congress support every reasonable and practical measure moving to that ultimate and desirable end.

Since the World War ended, dozens of bills seeking legislation and quite a number of resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution have been offered by individuals, Members of both the House and the Senate, for the purpose of accomplishing what the American Legion authorities and manifestly a clear majority of Congress now regard will be ultimately accomplished by this resolution. This common object is the suppression of the greedy and avaricious practice of profiteering upon the Government and the people in time of war. The distinguished Senator [Mr. DILL] who offered the amendment to strike out the words "without profit" which was adopted by the Senate and in which the House has concurred, introduced in the Senate a joint resolution on January 6, 1930, known as S. J. Res. 128, proposing an amendment to the Constitution in the following language:

> Congress shall have power in time of war to take private property for public use and for purposes of national defense, and to fix the compensation for the same; and to take private property without compensation by declaring the same to be necessary for purposes of national defense.

By reading this language it is manifest why the distinguished Senator offered the amendment. By striking out the words "without profit" the resolution now passed by Congress will contain practically the same language as is contained in the first part of the proposed amendment sponsored by the Senator from Washington.

As I told the House when that resolution was under consideration, this question is one of the most far-reaching and fundamentally important and most complicated and many-sided of any matter that has been before the Congress in many years. While there has been unjustified delay in the passage of this resolution to provide for the study of the question by a special commission that will sit in the recess of Congress, when it can concentrate its attention upon this subject without the numerous interruptions that we suffer from during the ordinary session of Congress, yet we who believe in the righteousness and justice of the principle involved have reason to rejoice that the matter has come to an end, and doubtless the President will promptly sign the joint resolution and it will thus become law. When the Speaker of the House and the Vice President shall designate the Members of the House and Senate to constitute the congressional members of the commission, then they can begin at once to gather material, to analyze the whole subject, and to prepare individually for the collective and corporate work of the commission, which should begin in the fall and continue from time to time through the winter and the next spring and summer so as to be prepared to make a thorough, comprehensive, and practical report by the time required under the terms of the resolution.

The far-reaching importance of this step can only be dimly envisaged by the most unselfish and patriotic mind. Those who love humanity, those who hate any war other than a war for justice and righteousness and for human liberty, those who believe that the inequality of sacrifices that have heretofore been suffered by our citizens during war should no longer be tolerated, all such will rejoice that a definite step has been taken to put this Nation once more in the lead and in another respect of all the nations in the world. As our Nation has led in constitutional liberty, as we have led in placing the sword in the hands of the representatives of the people, as we have led in making war solely for humanity and for our own defense and in defense of the rights of all men, so we are about to lead in another great fundamental movement of profound and widespread significance to the people of this country, to our children and our children's children, and to the peoples of other nations, who will surely follow our lead in this respect as they have followed in so many other respects. Let us continue to point the way of justice and liberty to all other nations of earth. Let our action on this great question be a new declaration of independence.

VICIOUS JOKERS IN BORDER PATROL ACTS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a discussion of H. R. 11204 by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CLANCY.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following discussion of H. R. 11204 by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY]:

JUNE 19, 1930.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: May I take the liberty of calling to your attention a bill which will injure seriously hundreds of thousands of American citizens and do considerable damage to the small-boat industry in this country if it is enacted into law?

I refer to H. R. 11204 known as the border patrol act of 1930. This bill has been granted a rule and unless the House leaders take action otherwise it will follow the urgent deficiency bill and will come up for consideration on Saturday of this week or early next week.

Very briefly I wish to refer to some of the sensational features of this measure as it now stands. It makes a new crime in American Federal law. Under the present law millions of American citizens who are on foot or in small boats under 5 tons' burden need not go to the trouble of traveling many miles, in most instances, to report at a customs office, if they made an innocent trip to Canada or Mexico and have not purchased dutiable goods abroad.

H. R. 11204 makes it a crime if these pedestrians and small-boat passengers do not report even when they have not purchased dutiable goods abroad. They are subject to immediate arrest, a fine of $100, and the confiscation of their boat, even though it may cost as much as $20,000, if they do not travel to a customs office.

I have talked with members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and of the House Rules Committee, both of which committees were instrumental in reporting out this bill. They were astonished to learn that the bill probably repeals most wise and beneficial navigation laws and tariff acts which were put on the statute books as a result of experience and sage counsel.

The bill provides also for the un-American practice of voluntary or compulsory registration of American citizens, millions of whom live on the border. The American Federation of Labor although opposed to the entrance of aliens into the United States took a stand at its convention at Atlantic City in 1925 against alien registration on the ground that it might eventually lead to registration of American citizens. H. R. 11204 makes registration of American citizens absolutely necessary, if they live on the Canadian or Mexican border and intend to visit back and forth in the future as they have done for decades in the past.

By hampering and restricting innocent travel between Canada and the United States and Mexico and the United States the bill will undoubtedly develop bad feeling with those two friendly neighbors. This is unwise at a time when tariff reprisals are being discussed by their officials.

The bill greatly extends the power of arrest of American citizens, and its aim as is discussed in the hearings is to promote arrest and holding of American citizens on suspicion until some other crime can be proved against them. The bill was never referred to the Secretary of Commerce for report as should have been done, as it proposes changes in the navigation laws, whose enforcement is vested in the Department of Commerce.

The bill was never referred to the House Judiciary Committee, although it legislates a new crime and greatly increases the power of arrests by border patrolmen in the interior of the country, which is a bad public policy and which, as disclosed in the hearings, has met with resistance by both American citizens and American officials in the interior of the country.

The bill vitally changes the navigation laws of 1912, exempting yachts under 15 tons burden from customs inspection when they visited contiguous countries and have not purchased dutiable merchandise.

It also repeals two tariff provisions of the act of 1922 which were wisely put in the law. Yet the bill was never referred to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for consideration of repeal of the navigation laws or to the Ways and Means Committee for repeal of the tariff provisions.

You may consider the unification of the immigration border patrol and the customs border patrol a good measure, as most Members undoubtedly will, but also on grounds of public policy they should object to the punitive and persecution features which have been slipped into the bill.

The smuggling of aliens is already a crime, as is the smuggling of merchandise. Laws already on the books provide for report at immigration and customs offices where there is entry of aliens of foreign merchandise.

The bill should not be thrown on the floor in its present condition, as it will be difficult to amend. The report of the Treasury Department expressly stipulates that while there shall be over 200 new ports of entry on the Canadian and Mexican borders there shall be none on the fifteen hundred miles of border from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Duluth, Minn., as complaint is boldly made that there are already enough ports of entry in this region, although these present ports are widely scattered, and in one instance are as much as 250 miles apart.

On the Great Lakes and rivers the bill works an intolerable hardship to the owners of canoes, rowboats, sail yachts, and motor boats, who are now specifically protected by the navigation and tariff laws.

The bill will create a new class of hundreds of thousands of innocent Americans who will immediately become law violators and probably criminals.

I have scores of protests on the bill from highly reputable yacht clubs, boat builders, village and city officials, and American citizens of unimpeachable character.

I refer you to my extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, pages 11537–11540.

Members of Congress representing States on the Canadian and Mexican borders should be intensely interested in this bill, as undoubtedly there will be a wave of fierce indignation against this repressive measure in all the boarder States, in which millions of good American citizens are adversely affected.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. CLANCY,
Member of Congress.

ANTHONY MARCUM

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of Anthony Marcum and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "$5,000," insert ", said sum to be paid to his guardian or legal representative for the exclusive use and benefit of the boy."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

B. FRANK SHETTER

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 745) entitled "An act for the relief of B. Frank Shetter," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of B. Frank Shetter, who suffered injuries while in the performance of his duties as checker at the arsenal, Rock Island, Ill."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

RUBAN W. RILEY

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3764) for the relief of Ruban W. Riley, with a Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Ruban W. Riley, who lost the sight of his right eye as a result of a fall from a cliff while in the performance of his duties as United States surveyor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday morning, following the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and at the pleasure of the Speaker, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman mean by "at the pleasure of the Speaker"? We have some important business to transact next Tuesday, and I do not want to give way for a 30-minute speech.

Mr. HOWARD. As a Member of the House, sworn to aid the Speaker, I do not want to do anything contrary to his pleasure.

Mr. SNELL. I shall have to object to that at this time.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12902, the second deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to the widow of R. Q. Lee, late a Representative from the State of Texas, $10,000, to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have a matter which I think could be brought up as a matter of personal privilege, but I do not wish to raise that question. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, during all of the years I have been a Member of the House it has been my policy never to attack any individual unless as a matter of personal defense it was absolutely necessary. I have always had the theory that there is plenty of trouble in the world without my trying to add to it. But occasionally attacks made on Members of the House require answer, and one that was made upon me in the last primary campaign, and continues to be made, I think requires an answer. I ask the Clerk to read in my time a letter which was published as paid advertising in many of the papers in the second district of South Dakota during the late primary campaign, and which refers to and misrepresents my attitude on veterans' legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

ONE MORE DISABLED VETERAN WANTS JOHNSON BEATEN

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU HOSPITAL NO. 72,
Fort Harrison, Mont., April 21, 1930

Mr. TOM AYRES,
Manager Dakota Free Press, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

DEAR MR. AYRES: Several of the boys have written to you from this hospital, but I thought I would drop you a line, since I am from Aberdeen, S. Dak. I wish you every success in your campaign for Congressman, and certainly hope that you defeat ROYAL C. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON, I think, is no sincere friend of the disabled soldiers, since in his position as chairman of the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee his vote caused the tie which ruled out the Rankin bill, H. R. 7825.

What made the men here disgusted was the fact that in the next D. A. V. paper ROYAL C. JOHNSON wrote an article where he blandly mentions that he thinks that the rest of Congress should abide by the decision of the committee, since the majority was not in favor of the Rankin measure, when it was a strict tie, and if JOHNSON had not voted the majority would have gone for the Rankin measure. I do not think it is customary for a chairman to vote, and in this case ROYAL C. JOHNSON voted, causing a tie, and then in his position as chairman ruled the Rankin measure out. I would like very much to have this brought to the attention of the voters, as I am sure if they knew the facts they would give you every support in preference to ROYAL C. JOHNSON for Congressman.

Yours for success,

[Name deleted],
Uncompensated T. B.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, some one paid money, and considerable money, to have that published in practically every paper in the district. It is typical of the propaganda which was conducted by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and the same man who wrote this letter has undoubtedly written many letters to all the Members of the House. With all sympathy and thinking that this man might be a World War veteran who was suffering, and came from my home city, I wanted to take care of him and investigated his case. With that in mind I surveyed that case, together with several others. I found that it is typical of the propaganda for the Rankin bill. Instead of having World War service I found that this man enlisted on May 1, 1919, five months after the World War, for the Philippine service. On June 26, 1919, a few days after he enlisted, he shot his own foot. On July 22, 1920, he contracted syphilis. I ask unanimous consent that the complete hospital record may be included as an extension of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand that the hospital and medical records of all veterans in the War and Navy Departments are confidential, and they are held so confidential that an immediate member of the veteran's family can not obtain information relating to the hospital and medical record.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does the gentleman object? I guarantee that this is the official record.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I do not think it is a good policy in view of the fact that the War Department holds the medical record so confidential as to even keep it from the soldier's own family.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request. The record shows post hospital, Scott Field, Illinois, June 26, 1919——

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under the rules of the House the gentleman is not permitted to read that record or any other paper.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know whether the gentleman is reading or stating the contents in his own words.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am stating the facts concerning his service and disabilities. He enlisted May 1, 1919, and was discharged June 11, 1922. His entire service was in the Philippine Islands.

On June 26, 1919, 15 days after he enlisted, he was accidentally shot and was at post hospital, Scott Field, Ill., from June 26 to July 3. In the Philippine Islands on July 22, 1920, he contracted syphilis, not in line of duty, and shows plus Wassermann reaction. On June 29, 1921, he was in the hospital at Manila with syphilis, secondary, double plus Wassermann reaction, not in line of duty. The soldier was not in service in the United States except for a few days, which service commenced nearly five months after the armistice.

Purely out of sympathy and charity I will delete the name of this man from the letter, and it will not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the complete file is available at my office to anyone who questions the statements made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last two words and asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to the gentleman who now wishes to speak out of order, but we must get along with this bill, and I shall object to anyone else who undertakes to speak out of order.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to protest against the action which has taken place in the well of the House a few moments ago. As the Members of Congress well know, we can not obtain a medical record from the Navy Department without the signed authorization of the veteran.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman know that whenever he is inquiring in regard to a case he has no trouble in getting one of these records, and neither does anyone. I got this one to help the man, thinking perhaps he had been abused.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In the case of a member of the Military Establishment, a Member of Congress can obtain the medical record for use in his official capacity without the veteran's authorization, but you can not obtain a medical record from the Secretary of the Navy or the Commandant of the Marine Corps unless you transmit the veteran's signed authorization indicating that the record should be furnished. The records of the Veterans' Bureau are so confidential, under the laws enacted by Congress, that an abandoned wife of a World War veteran can not obtain his residence as indicated in the files in order to locate him in order to prefer charges against him to support minor children.

I do not deem it proper to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and broadcast any man's medical record to all parts of the country. I think practically every veteran of the World War, or any other war, would resent having his confidential medical record broadcast in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In one moment. I believe that the gentleman from South Dakota was hasty in the matter. I realize that there has been propaganda in favor of the so-called Rankin bill, propaganda misstating the actions and votes even of members of the World War Veterans' Committee. But that would not justify broadcasting to the country a confidential medical record. I sincerely hope that upon further consideration the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota will not incorporate in the RECORD any medical record in a manner such as would identify it as the record of any particular service man. I hope the gentleman from South Dakota will withdraw his statement from the RECORD. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer: Page 2, line 8, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$11,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 2, line 8, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$11,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this job of being a Congressman very often is not as pleasant and agreeable as many people may believe.

One of the greatest hardships of a Member is to be the target and subject of unfair abuse and attack, just as we heard read a few moments ago against our colleague, ROYAL C. JOHNSON of South Dakota. [Applause.] Anyone who knows the record of ROYAL C. JOHNSON knows that it is unjustified and manifestly unfair in a political campaign to say that JOHNSON has not been a friend of the veterans. [Applause.]

No one desiring to be fair could say that. The best friend that the veterans have is one who served with them and who suffered with them; and when it comes to real friendship for the veteran I have more confidence in the sincerity and solicitude of ROYAL C. JOHNSON than in some political friend of the veterans just before an election. [Applause.]

I wish I had in my hand now to insert in the RECORD the military service rendered by ROYAL C. JOHNSON. He and two other Members of the Sixty-fifth Congress, one of them being Victor Heintz, of Ohio, and a third Member left this House and went into the Army. While I have not JOHNSON's record here, yet you will find that his military record was a real gallant record of actual combat, right in the trenches, fighting alongside of his buddies. [Applause.] ROYAL C. JOHNSON to-day wears a badge of service, not on dress parades in the shape of a medal, but ROYAL C. JOHNSON has a wound that big [indicating] in his body from a shrapnel shell. I contend that such a man who has been through hell and fire should not be made the subject of an unjustifiable attack in the heat of a campaign, or that he should be attacked respecting his sincerity and solicitude for the veterans. [Applause.]

I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, fiscal year 1930, $6,132.46.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 14, insert the following:

"For expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, fiscal year 1931, $20,000."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed $20,300 of the appropriation "Contingent Expenses, House of Representatives, Furniture and Repairs, 1930," is hereby made available for the furniture repair shops in lieu of the sum of $20,000 heretofore made available for that purpose under such appropriation.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: Page 2, after line 21, insert the following:

"For folding speeches and pamphlets at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, fiscal year 1930 and 1931, $1,000."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the procurement of a portrait of Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, Speaker of the House of Representatives, $2,500, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House under direction of the Speaker.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BOYLAN: Page 2, line 24, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, in support of my amendment I would like to say——

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. WOOD. This portrait has already been painted. It is a completed job. It is paid for.

Mr. BOYLAN. The only thing I wanted to say in support of my amendment is that we have such a good Speaker that we should get a better portrait than one costing $2,500. I think the Speaker is entitled to a $5,000 portrait. Of course, ordinarily you could get a good portrait for $2,500, but on account of the increased cost of everything we should honor the Speaker by getting the proper kind of a portrait, which would cost approximately $5,000.

I am sure there will not be any opposition to this meritorious amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his amendment in view of the statement of the chairman of the committee that a contract has already been entered into?

Mr. BOYLAN. Of course, I will yield to my distinguished chairman, and I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment for expenses incurred by RUTH BRYAN OWEN, contestee in the contested-election case of Lawson against Owen, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 1, $36.40, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WOOD: On page 3, after line 26, insert:

"For payment for expenses incurred by H. F. Lawrence, contestant in the contested-election case of Lawrence against Milligan, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 2, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WOOD: On page 3, after line 26, insert:

"For payment for expenses incurred by Jacob L. Milligan, contestee in the contested-election case of Lawrence against Milligan, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 2, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WOOD: On page 3, after line 26, insert:

"For payment for expenses incurred by John Philip Hill, contestant in the contested-election case of Hill against Palmisano, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 2, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WOOD: On page 3, after line 26, insert:

"For payment for expenses incurred by Vincent L. Palmisano, contestee in the contested-election case of Hill against Palmisano, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 2, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE

Investigation of enforcement of prohibition and other laws: For continuing the inquiry into the problem of the enforcement of the prohibition laws of the United States, together with enforcement of other laws, pursuant to the provisions therefor contained in the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1929, to be available for each and every object of expenditure connected with such purposes notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, and to be expended under the authority and by the direction of the President of the United States, who shall report the results of such investigation to Congress, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, fiscal year 1931, $250,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for these purposes contained in the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1929, which shall remain available until June 30, 1931.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized by law. I will be glad to state my reasons.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, there is not any question in my mind about this paragraph being subject to a point of order, but I believe it would be unfortunate to strike out the paragraph.

Yesterday in my explanation of the bill I pointed out what had been done by this commission already and what their future program is to be, which is set out more in detail in the report and also in the evidence. I stated then that there was a mistaken idea that this commission has devoted its time almost exclusively to the eighteenth amendment and the prohibition proposition. As a matter of fact, they have investigated a great many other things. They have investigated police; they have investigated the courts; they have investigated the prison proposition; they have investigated the reason for the spread of crime. They have suggested quite a few matters of legislation that have been enacted into law by reason of the reports which they have rendered. I do not believe this commission should be stopped in the midst of its labors. I think we will all admit they have done some real good and have served some real purpose, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, one can not contemplate a commission to study law enforcement without naturally inquiring whether the commission is being financed from funds properly appropriated under the law. I want to call the chairman's particular attention to section 673 of title 31 of the United States Code, which is Thirty-fifth Statutes, 1027, the act approved March 4, 1909:

No part of the public moneys or of any appropriations made by Congress shall be used for the payment of compensation or expenses of

any commission, council, board, or other similar body, or any members thereof, or for expenses in connection with any work or the results of any work or action of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, unless the creation of the same shall be or shall have been authorized by law.

Nor shall there be employed by detail hereafter or heretofore made, or otherwise, personal services from any executive department or other Government establishment in connection with any such commission, council, board, or similar body.

In reply to what the distinguished gentleman from Indiana stated, the chairman of the commission appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and stated frankly the limitations of the commission. He admitted, or rather complained, that the commission could not state whether prohibition is enforceable or not. He said:

On the other hand, I would not be candid with you if I did not say that there has been a difference of opinion in the commission on that head. It has been our view that when we came to a thorough inquiry into the problem of the enforcement of prohibition, under the amendment and the laws, if we were convinced that prohibition could not be enforced, we ought to say so, and that if we were convinced that it was very problematical as to whether it could be enforced, we ought to say so; but, at the same time, up to the present the commission has proceeded on the theory that you have expressed, and which I have testified to before the Senate committee, that our job was to see whether the eighteenth amendment was being adequately and efficiently enforced.

Mr. Wickersham states frankly that the function of the commission is to determine whether the eighteenth amendment is "being adequately and efficiently enforced." What the country wants to know is whether prohibition can be enforced. The testimony before the committee indicates that the committee is limited and can not under the provision of the appropriation bill which created the commission study, comment, or advise whether the prohibition law is enforceable or not. That being so, the commission has no useful function to perform.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Indiana I will say that it is not necessary to have a commission—which we all believed was a voluntary commission but now find is costing at the rate of $250,000 a year—tell us what is going on in the way of prohibition. That is very well known.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. WOOD. I suspect the gentleman will remember the controversy which was had over this proposition in the last Congress?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. There was a difference of opinion as to how this investigation should be made, and it was the Congress of the United States that created this commission?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly.

Mr. WOOD. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the appropriation bill which made possible the creation of this commission. It provided:

For the purposes of a thorough inquiry into the problem of the enforcement of prohibition under the provisions of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution and laws enacted in pursuance thereof, together with the enforcement of other laws, $250,000, or as much thereof as may be required, to be expended under authority and by direction of the President of the United States, who shall report the result of such investigation to the Congress together with his recommendations with respect thereto. Said sum to be available for the fiscal years of 1929 and 1930 for each and every object of expenditure connected with such purposes notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, $250,000.

This commission was created by the Congress and it occurs to me the Congress should not stop the job which it put in motion, especially when it is only half through.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, permit me to recall to the distinguished chairman that when Mr. George Wickersham appeared before the committee he was admonished, warned, and lectured as to the limitations of his powers and the powers of the commission by the very forceful gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. You will find that on pages 832, 833, and 834 of the hearings. The distinguished legislator from Michigan pointed out to Mr. Wickersham the limitations of the commission's powers and that brought forth the reply from Mr. Wickersham which I have just read to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is so glaringly and brazenly out of order that I must insist on my point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How much money has the commission already expended? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. WOOD. Out of the appropriation of $250,000 there is an unexpended balance of $80,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. They have made no report as to what this amount was expended for?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; they have made a very detailed report and given an outline of how they expect to use the $250,000 which is asked for in this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It looks to me as though a half million dollars is a good deal of money for what we have gotten.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDBLOM). The Chair is ready to rule. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], has conceded the point of order, but in the opinion of the present occupant of the chair it is incumbent upon every Chairman to act upon an opinion of his own. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] read the statute with reference to the payment of money to commissions appointed without legal authority. The Chair does not find any pertinency in that discussion, because clearly under the legislation which was contained in the deficiency appropriation act of March 4, 1929, authority was given for the expenditure of $250,000, but that expenditure was limited to the fiscal years 1929 and 1930. Therefore the authorization which was contained in the appropriation act of March 4, 1929, is no longer in force, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would the gentleman from New York make a point of order against an amendment which would reappropriate the unexpended balance?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman would make a point of order against that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Eighty thousand dollars?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; the unexpended balance.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I think I would. I know what you are going to do.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will be entirely frank with the gentleman. Since they have this money and it is so near the 1st of July, and having this unexpended balance, it seems to me they certainly ought to be permitted to complete the work so far as the appropriation heretofore made by Congress will permit. If the gentleman would permit an amendment that would apply only to the reappropriation of the unexpended balance, I would be prepared to offer that amendment, but it is useless to do that if the gentleman intends to make a point of order against it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would be constrained to make a point of order against such an amendment. Being in favor of law enforcement, I would have to carry that right out.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not so much concerned about the gentleman's reasons, because they do not always track right, as I am about his declaration of purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses: For an additional amount for contingent expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1930, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $5,000.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. Wood: On page 7, after line 7, insert the following:

"FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

"Cooperative vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry.—Rehabilitation: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment,' approved June 2, 1920 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 35), as amended by the act of June 5, 1924 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 31), and the act of June 9, 1930, fiscal year 1931, $900,000: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $1,097,000, as authorized by the act approved June 2, 1920, as amended by the acts approved June 5, 1924, and June 9, 1930: *Provided further*, That such portions of the sums allotted for the fiscal year 1931 as may not be used in that fiscal year may be allotted in that year proportionately to the States which are prepared through available State funds to use the additional Federal funds.

"Salaries and expenses: For making studies, investigations, and reports regarding the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their placements in suitable or gainful occupations, and for the administrative expenses of said board incident to performing the duties imposed by the act of June 2, 1920 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 35), as amended by the act of June 5, 1924 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 31), and the act of June 9, 1930, including salaries of such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere,

as the board may deem necessary, actual traveling and other necessary expenses incurred by the members of the board and by its employees, under its orders; including attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations, rent and equipment of offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, newspapers not to exceed $50, stationery, typewriters and exchange thereof, miscellaneous supplies, postage on foreign mail, printing and binding, and all other necessary expenses, fiscal year 1931, $80,000, of which not to exceed $59,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the amendment, and pending the withdrawal of the point of order I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether these amounts are merely for the purpose of carrying out existing law?

Mr. WOOD. They are for the purpose of carrying out the law that was recently passed by the Congress. This is just putting new life into the old vocational rehabilitation act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Virtually, you are offering the former authorization of the former board that was in operation under the old law.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; the old authorization expired with this fiscal year and this is simply to continue the authorization.

Mr. DOWELL. If the gentleman will permit, does this take care of all the authorizations made at this session of Congress?

Mr. WOOD. As I understand, this simply continues the rehabilitation of the disabled with the same authority they had before.

Mr. DOWELL. But there was a certain amount authorized by the Congress at this time for the continuation of the board and for the work of the board.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Does this appropriation take care of all of that authorization?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. This amendment also includes a provision making available unexpended balances to the States that are prepared to use them in general conformity with the Couzens amendment?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Of the old law?

Mr. KVALE. Of the new law as passed by the House and amended in the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For carrying out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington," approved December 2, 1924 (43 Stat., p. 671), and all other activities authorized by the act entitled "An act to enable the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans," approved February 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 71), including personal services without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service regulations, traveling expenses, furniture and equipment, supplies, printing and binding, rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, and all other expenditures authorized by the above acts, fiscal year 1931, $362,075, to be available until expended, together with all balances remaining unexpended from appropriations previously made for use of this commission, for each and every object of expenditure connected with the celebration notwithstanding the provisions of any other act relating to the expenditure of public moneys, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the executive committee, or such person as may be designated by him to approve vouchers: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 8, line 14, strike out "$362,075" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LEAVITT). The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 8, line 14, after the figures "1931," strike out "$362,075" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the paragraph now before the committee calling for an appropriation of $362,075 for the activity of the Bicentennial Commission.

I do not seek to strike out the entire amount. My amendment would give them $250,000 for their preparatory work. I am sure the House is not informed of how this money is to be spent. Let me give you some of the items.

They start off with $5,800 to pay for a secretary; $3,600 for an assistant administrator; six clerks, $20,400; a publicity director at $6,000; a special writer at $5,000; a magazine writer at $5,000; an editor at $6,000; two copyists at $3,000; a historian at $5,000; an assistant historian, $2,000.

Then for supplies and stationery, $10,000; for supplies, $5,000; for printing and binding, $97,200; for photostats, $3,000; $10,000 for publication of readings about George Washington; $4,000 for direction of pageants; $12,000 for atlas; $50,000 for George Washington's definitive writings; $7,000 for maps; $10,000 for more printing; $1,200 for photostats; an additional $10,000 for an addition to the George Washington definitive writings; $7,000 for photos in color; $14,875 for rent in the District of Columbia; $6,000 for furniture; $25,000 for a scenario for a moving picture; $15,000 for the woman's committee; $10,000 for newspaper clippings; $20,000 for the direction of pageants; $5,000 for badges and buttons; and $70,000 for a George Washington picture, a total of $364,875.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did the gentleman say $10,000 for atlas?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does he mean Atlas with the world on his shoulders?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; we are carrying the burden.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The people carry the burden and not Atlas.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

This celebration is to take place in 1932 and, of course, there is a great deal of necessary preparatory work to be done. I will grant that.

But I believe the commissioners are anticipating a little too early for clippings, and I think a little too early for buttons. Why, who ever heard of such a staff of publicity and propaganda promotion?

Six thousand dollars for a publicity manager, and $5,000 for a special writer, $5,000 for a magazine writer, $6,000 for an editor, $5,000 for a historian, $2,000 for an assistant historian! Are we to write a history of George Washington to-day? The history of George Washington has been written, gentlemen. Every little schoolboy, every grammar and high-school student, has studied the history of Washington.

Here is an appropriation of $70,000 for pictures of George Washington to be distributed to the schools. I am sure that your schools are just as they are in New York City, and you will find a picture of George Washington in every school in Greater New York.

The testimony shows that they are to be 12 colored pictures, for which we are asked to appropriate $70,000, and I repeat that there is not a school in my city and my State—which are no different from the schools in any other city and State—but that you will find a picture of the Father of his Country in every classroom.

I submit that if we are to have a celebration, if we are to have a dignified celebration, a celebration with solemnity to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Washington, it is not at all necessary to have this enormous pay roll two years before the time of the celebration, and building up this vast machine, and a ballyhoo advertising campaign, paying $14,000 for rent, $5,000 for furniture—for a temporary commission of volunteers. I submit my amendment in all earnestness, and that if we allow the commission $250,000 it is enough.

Mr. DENISON. Does that cover the tire cases?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; the gentleman from New York said that that was being distributed by a private concern. That is not in here.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman from New York suppose that when we passed the original authorization for the bicentennial celebration that if it had been explained to the House that we were going into any such elaborate performance and expending so much money the resolution would have been agreed to?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It has never been done before, and I do not think so.

Mr. SNELL. Was it not definitely stated when they asked for the four and a half million dollars to build the road that they were going to make a permanent improvement and that that would be practically the entire expense?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understood the proponents to say that this was to be a gigantic, but solemn and dignified celebration, and there was nothing to indicate the advertising stunts that they are going into at this time.

Mr. SNELL. Here we have an annual pay roll of $65,000 for salaries two years before the celebration. How much will it be later?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think my amendment of $250,000 is too much. I wish some one would offer an amendment making it $200,000.

Mr. TILSON. This was all covered at the time the original resolution passed the House. The language of this appropriation supplies the items that are there included in more general language.

Mr. SNELL. When was the estimate made for an annual pay roll of $65,000 in salaries?

Mr. TILSON. It was not mentioned in detail, but Members will find that the amount of $352,000 is within the sum authorized in the resolution that was passed some time ago.

Mr. SNELL. I think perhaps the resolution was broad enough to cover it.

Mr. TILSON. Surely it was.

Mr. SNELL. I do not think the House realized that we were going to spend any such amount of money as that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is only for the fiscal year.

Mr. TILSON. It is made available until expended.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But you can not appropriate for two years ahead.

Mr. TILSON. Yes; we have appropriated many times for two years ahead, and often, as in this case, have made it available until expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will agree that the salaries as stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] which are included in this total amount, are annual salaries.

Mr. SNELL. That is the statement by the director.

Mr. STAFFORD. This $364,000 is not the total amount to be expended by this commission for this celebration, but just a part of the expenditures.

Mr. GARNER. It is the ante, and nobody knows what the limit is.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the trouble with the appropriation. There is no telling what it will amount to. The sky is the limit.

Mr. TILSON. My statement was that the sum carried in this bill is still within the amount estimated and passed on in the authorizing resolution.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am grateful for the opportunity to present some of the facts with reference to what my colleague from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] says. In the first place, this is a nation-wide celebration. When the gentleman from New York says that there is a picture of George Washington in every schoolroom in New York City and throughout the United States, I have the records to prove that he is mistaken. When we asked for $70,000 for the placing of these pictures of George Washington in the schoolrooms we did so after ascertaining that there are nearly 1,000,000 schoolrooms in the United States. I can tell you what it will cost to have a picture placed in each and every one of these schoolrooms in the United States. We sent out inquiries to every State in the Union, and I will give you some of the replies. In Alabama there are 15,401 schoolrooms and 6,030 schools. A picture can be placed in each schoolroom there at a cost to the commission of $1,078. Certainly no one would object to spending $1,078 to put a picture of George Washington into 15,000 schoolrooms in Alabama. The picture is to be selected by a special commission. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] spoke about a picture printed in 12 colors. That was selected by the commission long before I had the honor of being appointed with Col. U. S. Grant, 3d, an associate director. If we are going to do this, let us do it right. It costs only 7 cents for each and every picture which will go into the schoolrooms.

In the State of Connecticut it will cost $639. In the State of Delaware it will cost $112, and in the State of Illinois where they have over 46,000 schoolrooms, it will cost $3,223.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, will be the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. I think what the membership of the House would like to be informed about is what the gentleman anticipates the total cost will be, whether or not this is the beginning of what is going to be an enormous cost. Give us some information with reference to that.

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be glad to do that. Most of the things the gentleman from New York is complaining about are already authorized, and out of that sum at least $150,000 is coming back, because that is for the definitive writings of George Washington. The records show that only 50 per cent of the writings of George Washington have ever been printed up to the present time. There will be 3,000 sets printed as authorized by the act. Two thousand sets are to be sold and will be sold for the cost of the 3,000 sets. One thousand sets of 25 volumes each are to be delivered, one set to each member of the House and Senate, and 25 sets to the Library of Congress. So we are going to get back $150,000 of this, but we have to appropriate this money to print these volumes.

As far as the help is concerned, we have been operating now for four months. It is practically the same staff that we have now. We are having articles written so as to be printed throughout the country in the newspapers and magazines, which articles will be historically correct, and will prove just what the complete writings of Washington really mean. The help that we have at the present time is necessary. The bulk of the work must be done between now and next year.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Most of the work that we must do, must be done this year. We can not wait until the end of 1931 and expect this nation-wide celebration to be a complete celebration for 1932. The moving picture the gentleman is talking about costing us $25,000, would cost $500,000 to get the picture produced if we were to pay for it. You are not paying a cent for it. The picture is proposed to be made by the Eastman Teaching Films Co. You could not produce it for $500,000.

The commission should furnish to them a scenario from which to make the picture for the schools that is historically correct, and I think it is up to the commission and up to the Government to furnish to them a scenario that is written by historians of the highest rank. That is why the $25,000 is asked for.

As far as rent is concerned, it is on the basis of $1.75 a square foot, and up to the present time we have not spent a dollar for rent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is an item of $14,875 for next year.

Mr. BLOOM. That is for next year. Here is the statement for this year: Traveling expenses, $41; printing and binding up to the present time, not 1 cent; publicity, $20. That is after four months.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman has $60,000 worth here. We are not concerned with last year. We are concerned with this appropriation.

Mr. BLOOM. Very well. From the beginning of September we must prepare ourselves for this celebration, and we can not prepare for this celebration if we wait until 1932.

You do not want to handicap us. We are trying to give you a celebration that this country will be proud of and it is something that is needed at this time. I ask permission to extend in the RECORD a statement showing the great need at this time for printing the definitive writings of George Washington. Fifty per cent of them have never been printed. That is why we are asking for the $150,000.

The need for a complete edition of the writings of George Washington is greater to-day than ever before not only from the standpoint of biography but from that of American history. The formative period of the United States is so meshed in with the life of Washington that it is impossible to understand it clearly without proper knowledge of the man himself. Fifty years after Washington's death the president of Harvard College published a 12-volume edition of Washington's letters; 60 years after this publication Worthington C. Ford published a 14-volume edition of Washington's letters. Both of these publications—Sparks in the 1830's, Ford at the end of the 1880's—did not use more than half of what Washington wrote. With the exception of three or four lives of Washington, practically every published life of him has been based upon these partial publications of his letters. It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that one of the most eminent American historians of the present day—John Bach McMaster—should state that George Washington is to-day the unknown man. Worse than this, the lack of a complete publication of Washington's letters is largely responsible for the many present-day attacks upon his character. For

where all the facts are not known, it is comparatively easy to misunderstand and to misconstrue.

A thing that is generally felt by the people of the United States, but which is difficult to put into words, is that George Washington in some important manner typifies America. Attacks upon Washington are felt to be attacks upon America and it is only natural that the average man wants to have at his disposal the means of repelling all such attacks. Until the Government of the United States publishes the projected definitive edition of Washington's letters this means is denied. Both Ford and Sparks were hampered by limitation of private publishing, for no publisher with his eye upon profits would dare undertake more than a 12 or 14 volume publication. It is plainly the duty of the Government, which will not be hampered by commercial restrictions, to fulfill this patriotic historical need.

With the complete writings of Washington, easily available in print and distributed throughout the country, the schools, colleges, and universities will be able to teach the younger generation the solid truth regarding the first American and no longer be at a loss to effectively defeat the careless ignorance of youth and the cynicism of age.

It is not only unfair to Washington himself, but it is unfair to healthy Americanism to delay longer in publishing the complete record of George Washington. He is, in a political and social sense, the patron saint of America, and while it does not seem necessary from one standpoint to emphasize such a well-known character as Washington, especially to America, from the larger and more important standpoint of American patriotism, we can not know too much about George Washington.

The idea and purpose behind this publication of the Bicentennial Commission is to clear up for all time every possibility of further innuendo and calumny directed against the memory of Washington; to make clear the reasons and principles which governed the actions of the man who more than anyone else contributed in the formation of the United States as a nation.

Despite the hundreds of books that have been published by historians in their effort to tell the story of the United States, until all of Washington's writings have been made available to the average man he can not picture to himself the real truth and the complete story of the creation of the United States.

The Bicentennial Commission realizes this situation and is well aware of the fact that the only way to insure that the American people can possess for all time the George Washington they know and love is to place upon the shelves of libraries and schools the story of the man's life work as he wrote it himself in the letters that form his daily work.

Had these selections of Washington's letters not been published by Ford and Sparks, we should have had only two or three lives of Washington instead of the scores of biographies and special studies now available.

The pity of it is that all these lives, which have been read with avidity by the American public, have been unsatisfactory because of the lack of complete information.

Interest in Washington is universal and undying. Lives of him and special phases of his life will continue to be published and read, and the Government can perform no greater public duty to the people at large than to make easily available all the real information existent about George Washington.

There is more interest in George Washington than in any other American, and this interest is alive and vital year in and year out, has been thus for years, and will be thus as long as there is any Americanism. The Bicentennial Commission understands this and knows that it will be satisfying the American people in giving them the opportunity to encourage this interest by publishing the complete story of George Washington. There are hundreds of thousands who are so really interested that they will read and judge for themselves; and for the other thousands who are too busy or too lazy to do this for themselves this publication by the Government insures that the authors and historians who write about Washington from now on will be able to present the full truth, a thing that has not been possible up to now.

This publication of Washington's writings really will be the Government's guaranty of the truth about George Washington.

Every Member of this House has received a letter from the commission asking that he send it the names and addresses of the mayors and selectmen of the different cities and towns in his district.

The reason we are doing that is because we are going to bring the celebration to all the people. This is not a celebration alone for the District of Columbia but for every city and town in the United States. That is one of the reasons why we are asking for the money for pageants.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask what has been done in New York State?

Mr. BLOOM. This [indicating] book is published by New York State and outlines what they intend doing. I think New York State has paid as much money for the reception of Admiral Byrd yesterday as we are asking here for the celebration of the Bicentennial of George Washington. New York State alone spent $200,000 to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington. We do not want this commission to be handicapped if the celebration that we are talking about is to be a success.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman said they are asking $50,000. He is asking for only $50,000, which, together with the $10,000, makes an appropriation of $60,000.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment may be considered as an amendment to the paragraph that we are now on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] may be considered without prejudice to his right to offer an amendment to the pending paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 8, after line 25, insert:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

"For each and every purpose requisite for and incident to the work of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission necessary toward carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including technical real-estate services at rates of pay to be fixed by the commission and not exceeding those usual for similar services and without reference to civil-service rules and the classification act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses; purchase of two passenger-carrying automobiles at not to exceed $1,000 each and the operation and maintenance thereof; survey, searching of titles, and all other costs incident to the acquisition of land, reimbursements to be made as prescribed in such act, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the reimbursement to be made to the United States by the District of Columbia for advances under section 4 of such act of May 29, 1930, shall commence on June 30, 1932, instead of on June 30, 1931, as provided in such section."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, on page 8, line 25, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid as salaries or otherwise to any person receiving a salary from the United States Government.

Mr. BLOOM. That is all in there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 8, line 25, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid as salaries or otherwise to any person receiving a salary from the United States Government."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the House has just voted $364,875 in the belief that they are doing something to promote the celebration of the bicentennial of George Washington, when it is nothing else but a salary grab of $6,000 and $5,000, and $6,000 and $5,000 for publicity directors, for special writers, for magazine writers, for editors, all in the name of George Washington. You would think you were inaugurating a campaign to sell soap. What is the need of all this publicity, all this pay roll here? The gentleman says that the Library of Congress has already edited and has ready the works of George

Washington; and yet we have an editor at $5,000 and an assistant editor at $4,000.

Mr. BLOOM. The historian, Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, and Dr. John C. Fitzpatrick are now editing all the writings of George Washington.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. At this time when people are in distress, people who need the aid of Congress, the gentleman comes here and asks to provide for clerks $20,400; $6,000 for a publicity manager; $5,000 for a special writer; $5,000 for a magazine writer; $6,000 for an editor; $3,000 for a copyist; $5,000 for a historian; $1,000 for clippings. Why do we need clippings? All in the name of George Washington, and you gentlemen have voted for it, and yet we can not get a bill before the House to employ men to take care of employment agencies! Just because some one shouts "George Washington" appropriations are blindly voted. You talk about doing Federal work. You are going to provide pictures for local classrooms. I will say that the schools in my city have a picture of George Washington and are not waiting for this commission to provide a picture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman know anything about the method by which the historian is paid $6,000 or $8,000 and the editor $5,000? What is the system by which some of these people are paid $6,000 and some $8,000?

Mr. BLOOM. Dr. Bushnell Hart is the historian; Doctor Fitzpatrick is the editor of the definitive writings, and he has an assistant. Those are the men the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is talking about. If you want a list of the employees, I have them here.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Who is the publicity manager?

Mr. BLOOM. E. P. Allen.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is his job?

Mr. BLOOM. He is a publicity man and writer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is he going to do? He gets $6,000.

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer the gentleman. It is his duty to look up stories on George Washington and the things of George Washington's time, and to see that those are sent to the magazines and newspapers throughout the country and published. They must be historically correct when they come from this commission.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is your publicity man?

Mr. BLOOM. They are all writers.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Very well. Let us take one at a time. What is your historian going to do? I thought that was his job.

Mr. BLOOM. The historian, I have just told the gentleman from New York, is the man to get out the definitive writings, "Honor to George Washington," and everything that is provided for in this act. That was all provided for before Colonel Grant and I were appointed associate directors.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then what is the special writer going to do at $5,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are doing it now. They have been since March 1.

Mr. BLOOM. The special writers are writing special stories.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. About whom?

Mr. BLOOM. About George Washington and the people of George Washington's time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I thought the publicity man was doing that.

Mr. BLOOM. You can not expect one man to do it all.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How about your magazine writer? What is he going to do at $5,000 a year?

Mr. BLOOM. All of those writers are writing special stories and articles for the newspapers. I hope the gentleman from New York gets that clear.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I do not. I do not get it clear at all.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know how to say it. The gentleman can understand the English language?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is the gentleman's pay roll and not mine.

Mr. BLOOM. They are writing special articles for magazines, newspapers, and periodicals throughout the country, in the 48 States. Do not think they are doing it alone for the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In addition to that, you have an editor of works at $6,000 and a historian at $5,000.

Mr. BLOOM. I just told the gentleman that was the historian. That is the editor of the definitive writings and other things that are in the act.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But this is another one.

Mr BLOOM No; it is not

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly. You have an editor of works of Washington, $6,000. Then you have a historian at $5,000 and an assistant historian at $2,000.

Mr. BLOOM. The historian was appointed when the commission was appointed. I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We want to know what they are going to do for the money that is appropriated here. That is what we want to know. Let me ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman said it would not cost a cent for the moving picture. How is the gentleman to explain the $25,000 appropriated here?

Mr. BLOOM. Why, I told the gentleman from New York that this is for a scenario. We have to prepare and give to the moving-picture producer the scenario and everything to work with.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is writing again. That is the scenario?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; it is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Who is going to get the $25,000?

Mr. BLOOM. Whoever writes it. Does the gentleman want to write it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No I do not. I am trying to strike it out. I do not believe George Washington needs an advertising campaign.

Mr. BLOOM. If you strike it out some one is going to be very much disappointed and you will lose the brightest opportunity in the world to record for all time everything pertaining to the history of our country and George Washington.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am pretty sure that the United States of America and the 120,000,000 people are not waiting for any high-pressure publicity campaign to tell them about George Washington.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, if you will allow me to insert in the RECORD a speech that I asked permission to insert I think it will convince the gentleman and people like himself who think they know something about George Washington that they do not know anything about George Washington.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman say what he is going to do with the $25,000 for a scenario? How does the gentleman break that up?

Mr. BLOOM. How can I do that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is asking for the appropriation. I do not know.

Mr. BLOOM. Suppose it only cost $20,000. It is impossible to break it up. If we do not spend $25,000, we may spend $20,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the matter under consideration simply for the purpose of some little discussion of a very fine project commemorative of Washington which is being carried on in Virginia, without any expense to the Government, by a patriotic society.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks upon the subject of a project commemorative of George Washington in the State of Virginia. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the home life of George Washington, born in 1732, was confined to Wakefield, his birthplace; the Ferry farm, where he spent most of the time of his early youth and school days from 1739 to 1747, and Mount Vernon, where he lived from his 16th year until his death.

The Ferry Farm, which the family occupied until Washington's father, Augustine Washington, died there in 1743, and where his mother continued to live until 1772, is picturesquely located on the Stafford Heights on the north shore of the Rappahannock River opposite the city of Fredericksburg, and is now being restored. The restoration work, in charge of a patriotic association, the George Washington Foundation (Inc.), which depends upon private contributions, is being steadily carried forward and has every prospect of being successfully completed.

This fine effort has the approval of the Legislature of Virginia, expressed in a resolution which commends it to the public

"as being worthy of its liberal patronage," and which among other things states that—

The George Washington Foundation (Inc.) is endeavoring to restore the place, as near as possible, to its condition existing during Washington's boyhood days so that the youth of this land may understand the conditions under which he was reared in order that they may be taught that he was a natural rather than a deified being; and that it is not impossible for every child to emulate his wonderful example for probity and firmness of conviction.

It also has the approval of the United States George Washington Bicentenary Commission, which, through its executive committee, has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the executive committee of the bicentenary commission indorses the patriotic effort of the George Washington Foundation (Inc.) through private contributions to purchase and restore the boyhood home of George Washington on the Ferry Farm north of the Rappahannock River opposite the city of Fredericksburg, the purpose being to dedicate the property as a shrine for the boys and girls of America, in order to impress upon the younger generation the lessons that are taught by the life of General Washington, and expresses the hope that the plan may be successfully carried out in advance of the bicentenary year.

The property, which Augustine Washington purchased from the executors of William Strother, is thus described in the advertisement of sale published by the executors in the Virginia Gazette, of Williamsburg, in April, 1738:

One tract containing 100 acres, lying about 2 miles below the falls of the Rappahannock, close on the riverside, with a handsome dwelling house, three storehouses, several other convenient outhouses, and a ferry belonging to it, being the place where Mr. Strother lived. It is a very beautiful situation and very commodious for trade.

Washington, on reaching manhood, made a large addition to the original acreage.

On his first appearance in Fredericksburg, after resigning his commission as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, General Washington referred to the Ferry Farm as—

The place of my growing infancy and the honorable mention which is made of my revered mother, by whose maternal hand, early deprived of a father, I was led to manhood.

That is one of his many references to the farm which was the only land left him by his father.

While living at the farm he attended school in Falmouth, a near-by village, and in Fredericksburg, across the river. To it attach the famous story of the cherry tree, for which Parson Weems is responsible, and many traditions pertaining to his unusual youthful vigor and activity.

Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard University, Dr. H. J. Eckenrode, of the University of Richmond, and other historians, by their investigations, have removed all doubt, if any ever really existed, as to Washington's identification with the Ferry Farm.

Recent biographers of Washington have a good deal to say about the Ferry Farm. One of them, Dr. Charles Moore, says:

The earliest home that Washington knew was Ferry Farm; and all a precocious boy could acquire up to the age of 11 years he here acquired, in company with his sister and brothers and a large troop of cousins. There is no place like a small town in which to gain a knowledge of good and evil, together with some proficiency in practice, and George was not unlike other boys. He even bore teasing for romping with the big girls at school.

Another biographer, Joseph D. Sawyer, says:

The old farm buildings have disappeared with one noteworthy exception. This is the little 1-story structure which the youthful Washington used as a workroom—the only structure now in existence which is positively known to have been in constant use by him during his boyhood. The new farm buildings nestling among the trees on the highland occupy practically the same site as those of George Washington's day.

Again, he says:

On these heights are the breastworks where—on the Washington farm land—the Federals planted some of their artillery and on December 13, 1862, shelled the town of Fredericksburg. One hundred and eighty cannon in all, some carrying 70-pound projectiles, were strung along those heights. Here the northern troops made their stand, and, obeying orders, crossed the river on pontoons to attack the Confederate stronghold on Maryes Heights, meeting defeat with unprecedented slaughter.

Mount Vernon, under the control of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union, is in a splendid state of preservation, and is every year visited by hundreds of thousands of people. As the bicentennial year approaches, the house at Wakefield is to be rebuilt, its surroundings beautified, and ample protection provided for the graveyard where many of the Washington family are buried. And now, by the execution of the plans of the George Washington Foundation (Inc.), there is to be constructed on the Ferry Farm a duplicate of the house which stood there in the old days, exact pictures of which are available, and much else done which will serve to create a shrine of as great interest as the other two at Mount Vernon and Wakefield, which are not far distant from it.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

PORTO RICAN RELIEF

For the employment of labor and the purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment for repairing and constructing insular roads, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be disbursed by the Porto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission with the approval of the Governor of Porto Rico.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures in line 22 and make them read "$1,200,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 9, line 22, strike out the figures "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on one of the committees which I have the honor to serve in this House we have heard the sad story of the sufferings of the people of Porto Rico. We have heard the story in detail from the lips of Colonel Roosevelt, governor of that insular possession, where all of the people—1,600,000—are citizens of the United States, except, perhaps 40 or 50 families who continue to hold allegiance to the Government of Spain.

The distress in Porto Rico among those citizens of ours is almost beyond words to express; not individual cases of distress but distress by the thousands of families; undernourished mothers, hundreds of them, unable to supply milk for their babies, trying to feed those infants by chewing rice and with that rice spittle trying to keep life in the bodies of little 4-months-old babies. We have heard that more than 600,000 people of Porto Rico are woefully undernourished. They work when they can, but there is so little work at so little pay—pennies not dollars.

The people of Porto Rico are citizens of the United States. It is an organized insular possession. They are a proud people. They do not want to feel dependent. I am afraid our great Federal Government has not extended its blessings into Porto Rico as far as it should.

The appropriations heretofore made for hurricane relief have been very helpful. I am very much pleased to see this appropriation for $1,000,000. I have offered an amendment to add the modest sum of $200,000, and even that is not enough.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. I would like to get the gentleman's viewpoint as to why he wants to add this $200,000 to the $1,000,000. For what express need is this $200,000 required that is not already met by the $1,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If we are going to quarrel about it, I shall not press it, but I offered the amendment in the hope that the meager sum of $200,000 would give some employment to a country with a population of 1,600,000, where more than 600,000 people are on the edge of starvation.

Mr. BEEDY. Does the gentleman understand that Governor Roosevelt has been before the committee and expressed himself as entirely satisfied with this sum?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. He asked for $3,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As I understand, he asked for $3,000,000, and he has asked other committees for an extension of certain governmental activities to Porto Rico to assist down there. Bills for that purpose are now on the calendar, but they are so far down they are not likely to be reached. Perhaps the $200,000 additional proposed by me is not so important, but I wanted to get the picture before the whole membership of this House.

Porto Rico has the second heaviest agricultural population in the world. The only other agricultural place more heavily populated is the island of Java, where there are 35,000,000 agricultural people living not like human beings, hardly living at all. Perhaps they are coming to that in Porto Rico. They are at the limit of possibilities under present conditions.

My friends, there is great distress and unemployment in the United States, far more than we sitting here—we have not been home for a long time—realize. It is not fair to lay it to any political party. In the district which I have the honor to represent there are 1,000 Filipinos out of work, and they are offering

to work for 20 cents an hour. The white people will not let them work, and many of the white people themselves are out of work.

In that same district 10 or 12 days ago, there marched right through these lines of starving Filipinos 1,000 Mexicans, who were being transported into Montana. These Mexicans were migrating from California, for they had become unemployed even in that State, although they claim they need Mexicans. They were marched through Seattle on their way to Montana, for the purpose of working in the sugar-beet fields.

Are we, in Congress, going to pay no attention to conditions like these, with probably 5,000,000 citizens out of work?

Then, again, in these late days of this session of Congress, we are fussing back and forth about the Couzens resolution to regard and investigate the merger of railroads. Some fear the House of Representatives will get awake and find out that this is a plan to slow down those mergers, so that more people will not get out of work.

In the district I represent, at one of the termini of the three transcontinental railroads, men have been working in the roundhouses and railroad shops only 16 days a month. Trains have gone off the line by the dozens. Why? Because the great Mogul engines and great electric engines which haul 175 cars, are doing away with many smaller freight trains. Electric lines and auto busses are taking the place of railroad lines, and more railroad men are being forced out of work. What do they do when they are out of work? They fall back on those engaged in some other line of work, and this crowds somebody else out of work.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. WOOD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman should not object. This is a very important subject I am discussing. It is one of the prime subjects in the United States to-day. The gentleman will save time by not objecting, I can assure him.

Mr. WOOD. I want to say to gentlemen here that we have consumed two hours and have only covered six or seven pages of the bill. The bill must be passed to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We have from now until midnight to pass it. We have plenty of time.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman promise to stay here until midnight and help to pass it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Absolutely. I am here as much as any other man in the House. I love to be here and to help with passing important legislation. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, many men other than the railroad men are getting out of work——

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman has had his time extended. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me first finish one sentence. The railroad man is thrown back onto the next line and he finds people out of work there on account of consolidation of stores, chain stores, and that sort of joint cooperation, so that the unemployed line falls back, until finally they go on the road, or go to the farmer, and the farmer is poor and can not pay much wages, so they all move around, and wherever they turn they meet the invading people from Mexico, from the Philippines, and even from Canada. Why, only a few months ago Canada issued the third of its positive orders against the arrival of American workers into Canada. If you are a mason, a carpenter, a barber, or a workman of any kind, you can not go into Canada for permanent domicile, and here in the United States, with tremendous unemployment, we fail to stop the admission of competitive immigrants. I insert one of the recent Canadian orders:

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION,
Ottawa, Ontario Canada.

Circular of immigration inspectors, eastern division.

Subject: Labor conditions—Movement of unemployed from the United States.

The attention of the department has been directed to the fact that there is a large amount of unemployment existing at the present time in the United States and to the possibility of a number of these unemployed endeavoring to enter Canada for the purpose of seeking work in localities where there is considerable activity in construction and engineering work.

In this connection care must be taken to see that the regulations are most strictly applied, should it develop that this class of labor is endeavoring to move across the international boundary, as it will be appreciated that at the present season of the year there is no demand in Canada for additional labor from the United States.

GUY G. CONGDON,
Assistant Division Commissioner.

Nevertheless, I think we are plenty big enough to take care of these literally starving people in Porto Rico. But I am really appealing to this House, before it goes home, to find a way to get an opportunity to act on a resolution that will postpone threatened gigantic mergers of railroads or that will meet some of the unemployment and, if possible, meet the immigration conditions in the country. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNELL. The gentleman refers to the Couzens resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Couzens resolution; yes.

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman help us in the passage of that resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am helping you now as hard as I can, and have been opposing these mergers two or three years.

Mr. ALMON. Why does not the gentleman bring in the Harris immigration bill and stop some of the immigration to which he refers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman should not ask me such an embarrassing question.

Mr. ALMON. Is that an embarrassing question? Why does not the gentleman bring up the Harris bill for consideration in the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman knows why I can not. The bill is on the calendar, and that is all I can do. I can not bring it up without help.

Mr. ALMON. Who is keeping it from coming up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. You see the leaders and see if you can have it brought up.

Mr. ALMON. They are your leaders, they are not mine.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. I am very much impressed with the gentleman's statement, and I wish to say to the gentleman that there are thousands of railroad employees in my district who will not only be thrown out of employment if these mergers take place, but their property will depreciate in value and the communities as a whole will greatly suffer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will say in conclusion that this is fundamental to all parties and to all of us as citizens of this country. The duty of a government is to spread its benefits as far as it possibly can to all the people, and when a government permits mergers, consolidations, or any of those things to exist to such a point that too many men have no chance to find employment, the Government is not doing its best for the people. We are reaching that condition now. This is fundamental and is not political.

Mr. O'CONNELL. If the gentleman will permit, there should not be any politics in the matter at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not the slightest.

There has been referred to the committee of which I am chairman a Senate resolution to provide for a committee of Congress to investigate the needs of agriculture for labor. I do not know what we will do about it in our committee, because if we send it out here it will go to the bottom of the calendar, where there are 15 pieces of immigration legislation that are not likely to be reached. I believe it is five or six years since the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has had the call on Calendar Wednesday. There is something wrong with that system. Some committees are never called. We postpone Calendar Wednesday at the beginning of a session, the program lags, and then in the last days of the session we hear appeals like the one just made by the distinguished and hard-working chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. WOOD] that there is no time; that we must pass the bill under consideration.

I will tell you it will be a shame and a pity to go home to your constituents with so much pressing, important, vital legislation pending and ready for action. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVILA. Mr. Chairman, I arise to express my thanks to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] for his kind words in behalf of Porto Rico. I may say that I have always found in the gentleman from Washington a real friend of my country. He has always shown a great interest in our welfare and has been very helpful in obtaining legislation for Porto Rico.

I wish also to express my appreciation to the Committee on Appropriations for recommending this appropriation of $1,000,000 for the present year. I may assure you, gentlemen, that your action is fully appreciated by the people of Porto Rico.

It is true that we have been unable to obtain at this time the $3,000,000 recommended by the President, but we feel confident that next year we will secure an additional appropriation with the purpose of continuing the work of rehabilitation in Porto Rico.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I agree fully with the statement made by the gentleman from Washington and the reasons urged by him to add $200,000 to this appropriation. Surely $200,000 is nothing, either to this committee or to the country, at the rate we are spending money for other reasons, and this is a matter of human life.

Conditions in Porto Rico have been presented to the Committee on Appropriations. You will find them in the hearings. Since the hurricane on the island there has been actual distress. Here daily we appropriate millions of dollars on the mere say so of a Member from a State, overlooking the fact entirely that Porto Rico is just as much a part of the United States as any State in the United States. [Applause.] I appeared before the committee and presented facts which I obtained direct from Porto Rico.

Unemployment is very acute in Porto Rico, just as it is acute in the United States. If we can rehabilitate the public roads and public buildings that have been destroyed we will immediately provide partial relief for the destitute on the island.

There is another angle to this question. A large percentage of both of the large industries of sugar and tobacco in Porto Rico are under the control of citizens living in the United States. The island is literally drained of its own resources by reason of these absentee landlords who exploit the people and the soil of that country. Therefore we have a direct interest, and we are not wasting any money out of the Treasury when we consent to a paltry million dollars for Porto Rico at the present time.

The request was for $3,000,000. You spent more than that in Florida looking for a fly that did not exist. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Indiana knows that. We appropriate lavishly for roads almost in every section of the country to rebuild roads damaged by floods. Here there is a serious condition, given in detail which will be found in the hearings. The amount asked was $3,000,000, and you appropriate $1,000,000.

Of course, that will do some good. The Delegate from Porto Rico generously thanked the committee for it, and let me say that the people of Porto Rico do not have to place themselves in the position of begging anything from the United States Congress. It is not necessary for Porto Rico to thank Congress or to thank the committee, because they are entitled to everything we are giving them in this bill and a great deal more. Porto Rico is a part of the United States. We are giving them only a part of something that is theirs.

Gentlemen of the committee, a similar item was stricken from a previous bill in conference between the Senate and the House. As I stated on the floor of the House at the time, I think a grave error was made and a most deplorable injustice committeed against the people of Porto Rico. There seems to be considerable confusion in the minds of many of our colleagues in the consideration of this needed appropriation and the so-called Porto Rico relief bill which we passed some time ago. With the exception of $2,000,000 for the rebuilding and repair of the schoolhouses destroyed by the hurricane, the bulk of the money authorized to be appropriated by the relief bill is to be used for loans. The loans, as the gentlemen of the committee will recall, are to be made to private individuals for the rehabilitation of their farms and property. This money, of course, will be returned and paid back into the Treasury of the United States. The $3,000,000 that we now seek is to be expended for rehabilitation work entirely and to partially repair some of the damages wrought by the hurricane which swept over Porto Rico.

In this respect I desire to say that the people of Porto Rico should not be placed in the position of supplicants or in the slightest way embarrassed or humiliated in the consideration of this appropriation. In this respect Congress is establishing no new precedent. The people of Porto Rico are not asking for anything to which they are not really entitled. Congress has long since established the precedent. I need not go back many years, but only recently we appropriated for direct relief for the reconstruction of roads and bridges for the States of Vermont and Kentucky. Only a few days ago, gentlemen, the House passed on the Consent Calendar some $600,000 for this very same kind of relief for the State of Georgia and some $800,000 for the State of North Carolina. I examined these bills thoroughly, as I do all bills on the Consent Calendar. The many precedents dating many years back were cited in the reports accompanying those bills. It is simply an appropriation made by the Federal Government to rehabilitate in part the damages to public property arising from the acts of nature. Whether it is a flood or a cyclone or a hurricane, it makes no difference. There is no question as to the irreparable damage suffered by Porto Rico from the last hurricane. The figures and statistics above described have been presented to this committee. The question is, Congress should treat people of Porto Rico, who are as much a part of the United States as the citizens of Washington, D. C., or the citizens of any other State, in exactly the same manner and with the same kindly consideration.

In dealing with matters like this we are discussing now, the Members of Congress must understand, first, that Porto Ricans are citizens of the United States and a part of our political organization, and second, that, being as they are, under a very peculiar form of colonial government, they have not the means, nor sufficient power or authority to solve certain problems, created as a consequence of the system, neither any authority to do things that a sovereign State in the Union has to do in the exercise of its ample form of government. In discussing matters referring to Porto Rico these two things are generally overlooked by many of the Members of Congress only because of lack of proper information.

The reason for getting the $3,000,000 included in one of the deficiency bills for the present fiscal year was to have the money available immediately, and if possible, as intended, before the adjournment of the insular legislature, because the effects of the measure would have been felt as promptly as local conditions demanded. I believe that this money should now be appropriated for the present fiscal year. Taking into consideration the very difficult financial conditions under which the insular government is operating, it is absolutely impossible to expect that the Porto Rican government at the present, or in many years to come, could be able to repair or reconstruct their municipal and rural roads and those school buildings which are still waiting for repair or reconstruction. Bananas, plantains, sweet potatoes, and many other vegetables and food staples which are grown up in the mountains and distant rural zones are being lost at the present and will continue to be lost, while there are people practically starving to death in other zones and in the cities, thus becoming more and more acute the problem of feeding the people, simply because there are not available roads to bring at least by trucks to the towns and cites those products. The inhabitants of the cities and towns are suffering and will continue to suffer because of the scarcity of such products and the higher prices paid for those than can be secured and brought on horesback, since such products can not be brought in large quantities and duly marketed at fair prices.

The inhabitants at the distant rural zones and up in the mountains growing these food staples are also suffering and will continue to suffer because they can not sell even a good portion of what they grow, because there are no proper roads to bring the products to the cities, after having been damaged by the hurricane. These being the conditions, the crops perish, and ruin is the consequence. Hence the need of main and rural roads. Hence the need of repairing those rural roads and construct new ones, if possible, as a means of rehabilitating the island. The insular government is taking care, although partially and inadequately, of the insular highways and main roads, but they can not fairly expect any possibility of the insular government taking care of the municipal and rural roads. Gentlemen, they simply can not do it because they have not the funds. The people of Porto Rico and the insular government are not lacking in initiative, ability, willingness, or desire to do these things. They are simply lacking in public funds through no fault of their own.

School facilities on the island are also inadequate. They were before the hurricane. Long before the hurricane they had, and this has been repeatedly told Congress, over 200,000 people of school age without school accommodation. That number has been considerably increased. Schools are being suppressed every month, not because their government is not inclined to encourage education, but for lack of financial means to keep them operating. No vacancy of any teacher which takes effect can be filled, because there is not sufficient appropriation to pay the teacher, or there is lack of money to repair the school, to rebuild it, to build one if necessary, or to rent a house where the school must be established. The rehabilitation work started by the Federal Porto Rico Hurricane Relief Commission was only started. And most of the money spent will be practically lost unless the work is finished. This is one of the reasons for the same Federal Porto Rico Hurricane Relief Commission having recommended the additional appropriation of $3,000,000.

I say that because of the great loss suffered by the island, reaching over $100,000,000, their taxpaying system has been greatly demoralized as a logical consequence. The treasury of the island could not cause property to be sold to collect taxes, because the consequence would have been then no property and

no taxpayers. Because of their colonial system of government, they have no reserve funds to attend to these cases of catastrophes in their government. There is an explanation for this. Most of the invested capital belongs to nonresident stockholders who drain the island every year, taking out from this country in the form of profits and dividends over two-thirds of the product of labor and leaving there only the meager wages paid for long hours of labor. They, the investors, reside in the continental United States and in foreign countries, where the product of the Porto Rican labor goes to make prosperity in other communities. Since the product of their labor is not reinvested in the island in new industries or in the intensification of those already established, the consequence is that the Porto Ricans are getting poorer and poorer all the time and their island left in misery and hunger with no hopes and no means for rehabilitation and reconstruction.

This appropriation must be granted by Congress not only as a matter of human wisdom but at the same time as a practical business proposition to build up the strength and consuming power of the island. It will result in the mutual benefit of Porto Rico and the mainland as well. The island and the Nation will be equally concerned and equally benefited, considering that Porto Rico occupies amongst the customers of the United States and in all Latin America the fifth place.

I am glad to have the assurance that if more money is needed the committee will include it in one of the appropriation bills next year.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word in opposition to this amendment. Governor Roosevelt came before the committee and in a great deal of detail described the conditions in Porto Rico. I do not care to take your time or the time of the committee for the reasons that I have stated before, that we must be getting on with this bill.

Governor Roosevelt stated that the $1,000,000 would be all they could use for a year. As I stated on yesterday, the purpose of the committee is in the event they can make proper use of this next year, if necessary, we will give them more, but there is no use in giving them money now that they can not use at present. So I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, strike out line 13 and insert "Grain Futures Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the grain futures act: For an additional amount to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the grain futures act, approved September 21, 1922 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 1–17), including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1931, $17,640.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WOOD: Page 20, after line 19, insert "Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest roads and trails: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal highway act approved November 9, 1921, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1931, and including not to exceed $24,500 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,500,000, which sum is composed of $1,445,000, part of the sum of $7,500,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1931 by the act approved May 26, 1928, and $2,055,000, part of the sum of $5,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1931, by the act approved May 5, 1930: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the approval of this act, apportion and prorate among the several States, Alaska, and Porto Rico, as provided in section 23 of the said Federal highway act, the sum of $5,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, by the act approved May 5, 1930: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall incur obligations, approve projects, or enter into contracts under his apportionment and prorating of this authorization, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation on the part of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WOOD: On page 23, after line 3, insert:

"Roosevelt Memorial: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation,' approved June 2, 1930, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question with reference to the item on page 12 of the bill. At the time of the hearings before the Roads Committee it was understood that we could use the whole $5,000,000 authorized for the year 1931. Provision is made here for only $2,055,000. This is the road-building season. I am wondering why more of that authorization was not appropriated?

Mr. WOOD. That is all they thought they could use.

Mr. COLTON. Is that the statement of the Bureau of Public Roads?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment in order to inquire about this Roosevelt memorial, for which $25,000 is appropriated. What kind of a memorial is that to be?

Mr. WOOD. It is an archway at the entrance to one of the national forests.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is on the continental divide in Montana, between the Lewis and Clark and Flathead National Forests, and will be a fine stone archway dedicated as a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt as the leader in forest conservation. It is being erected this year because of the fact that this is the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the founding of the present Forest Service under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn, and the Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Hydraulic laboratory: For the construction and installation upon the present site of the Bureau of Standards in the District of Columbia of a suitable hydraulic laboratory building and such equipment, utilities, and appurtenances thereto as may be necessary, as authorized in the act entitled "An act authorizing the establishment of a national hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and the construction of a building therefor," approved May 14, 1930, including the obtaining, by contract or otherwise, of the architectural services at a fee not exceeding that usual for such service, without regard to civil service laws, rules, and regulations, the Classification act of 1923, as amended, or to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $350,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Inasmuch as I sponsored the authorization bill that has led to this appropriation of $350,000 for the construction and installation of a hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards I feel that I should avail myself of this opportunity to get into the RECORD a letter from the Chief of Engineers to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in regard to a survey of the Industrial Canal that connects the Mississippi River and Lake Pontchartrain within the corporate limits of the city of New Orleans, that I proposed through a resolution which enabled the engineers to make the examination, though the investigation was not as complete as I wished and hoped. But that survey was of great value to the proponents of inland waterways as a reading of the letter from General Brown will show.

Hon. S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DEMPSEY: 1. Referring to letter of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, dated February 27, 1929, inclosing a copy of a resolution of the committee of the same date, requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on Mississippi River, La., with a view to securing an outlet to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico by the most practicable route for a permanent channel of a depth not exceeding 35 feet, submitted in response to a provision in the river and harbor act approved June 5, 1920, with a view to determining the

advisability of constructing an outlet of this nature at this time, and for the purpose particularly of ascertaining the desirability and advisability of the United States reimbursing local interests for the expenditures made in constructing the Industrial Canal and finding its importance as a part of the inland waterways, I inclose herewith the report of the board in response thereto.

2. Recommendation was made in the reports under review that no modification be made of the existing projects, since adequate facilities were already provided for deep-draft vessels between New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. The particular improvement now desired is that the Federal Government take over the New Orleans Industrial Canal for use in connection with an additional outlet to the Gulf or provide a toll-free route for the intracoastal canal.

3. A large commerce moves through the Passes of the Mississippi River, the tonnage in 1928 having been 17,107,959 tons, exclusive of cargoes in transit, amounting to 2,384,788. The foreign commerce amounted to 11,738,614 tons. The total number of ocean vessels arriving at and departing from New Orleans was 6,228, the maximum draft being about 32 feet.

4. An artificial waterway between New Orleans and the Gulf would have to be not less than 500 feet wide and 35 feet deep. Duplicate locks would be necessary to overcome the difference in the elevation of the water in the Mississippi and in the Gulf and to facilitate shipping. Nine possible routes for such a waterway have been given consideration, the estimated costs ranging from about $19,400,000 to about $41,000,000. Some of these routes would be exceedingly difficult to maintain. The most advantageous is probably one passing through Barataria Bay, which is somewhat shorter to western points than the routes via the Passes. Allowing 50 minutes for passing through the lock, however, the sailing time would be about the same by way of Southwest Pass and by way of Barataria Bay. Vessels bound from New Orleans to eastern points would find the route via South Pass more advantageous than any of those considered.

5. The Industrial Canal is already part of the existing intracoastal route between the Mississippi River and New Orleans. The commerce on this route is increasing and the district engineer believes that the Industrial Canal has some prospective value as part of the inland-waterway system. Reimbursement of the owners for the cost of the canal is not considered advisable by him, since the improvement has been carried out on a much more extensive scale than is required for the intracoastal service. The owner might be reimbursed, in the opinion of the district engineer, in an amount equivalent to the cost of constructing a 9 by 100 foot canal with a suitable lock, the estimated cost of which is $2,270,000, assuming that all rights of way and highway bridges were furnished at local expense. Since the question of improving the inland waterway from New Orleans to Columbus, Ga., is now being studied, the district engineer considers it preferable to consider the question of the Industrial Canal in connection with that report. He finds no necessity for an auxiliary route between the Mississippi River at New Orleans and the Gulf, as the continued maintenance of reliable channels in the two passes is now assured. He therefore recommends that no further steps be taken toward providing such a route or toward the acquisition of the Industrial Canal at the present time.

6. The division engineer concurs in the opinion of the district engineer. He points out that the toll charge for the movement of inland waterway traffic through the Industrial Canal is 5 cents per gross ton, and that the total payments made by the Federal barge line average less than $10,000 annually. The cost to the United States, in interest charges alone, of providing a toll-free canal, should such be possible by the payment of $2,270,000 to the owners, would be nearly ten times the toll charges now paid by the Federal barge line.

7. The board finds that the improvement of the mouths of the Mississippi has now reached a point where dependable channels can be assured indefinitely. The cost of maintaining these channels, including the extension of the jetties, which may be necessary within 50 years, is less than the annual carrying charges on any of the auxiliary channels considered. While there are some dangers and hazards to navigation through the passes, it is not to be expected that any more favorable conditions would be found in the restricted side channels which have been considered. The two improved passes have a capacity of several times the present commerce of New Orleans, and there is no necessity for another deep-water outlet, either for emergencies or to provide for increasing commerce. The question of making the Industrial Canal an integral part of the intracoastal waterway extending eastward from New Orleans has been given consideration in connection with recent studies, on which was based the recommendation of the department for channel improvement between New Orleans and Mississippi Sound. The traffic moving over this route is small and there appears to be no justification for the United States to take over the Industrial Canal, reimbursing the owners for its cost. That privately owned waterway is a much more extensive improvement than is considered necessary for an inland waterway; and, should further consideration be given in the future to its acquisition by the Federal Government, it would not appear equitable for the United States to assume the total expense. The board recommends that the expenditures made in constructing the Industrial Canal be not reimbursed to local interests by the United States, and that no additional outlet to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico be provided at the present time.

8. After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur in the recommendation of the board.

Very truly yours,

LYTLE BROWN,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

The development of existing channels and the digging and construction of necessary waterways will occupy a larger part of the thought of the people of the Mississippi Valley as the years move on. They are alive to the necessities of our situation to-day, but the interest of to-day is feeble with what it will be within the next 10 years. New men are coming on the stage of life, young men, sun crowned, who live above the fog in public duties and in private thinking, young men who know their rights, and, knowing them, dare maintain them, young men who realize that the future of the valley and every individual in it depends upon how valiantly each State in the valley and every individual therein fight for their rights. Old theories, old dogmas, old policies will not be accepted or venerated as in the past, because of their antiquity. I have a letter from my friend and constituent, Walter Parker, who has been laboring for flood control for many years without even the hope of being rewarded with "well done, good and faithful servant." He has been a determined advocate of inland waterway development, confident that some day in the not-distant future, triumph will crown the efforts of those who foresaw the glories of the coming day. Listen to the toiler who has spent the best years of his active life in promoting the renaissance of the Mississippi and its tributaries, as carriers of commerce, by and through a proper adequate flood-control policy and who has cried out for a discussion of every feasible proposition that will make for the beneficial use of the waters that now run not only to waste but to destructive ends in their mad race to the Gulf during the flood periods.

A new element in community leadership is being introduced at New Orleans.

A group of 1,800 young business men, functioning as the Young Men's Business Club, has selected 50 of its members to make a special and thorough study of community economics, as a first step in a comprehensive movement to develop well-informed and basically trained leadership among the young men of the city.

We have a right to demand an accounting of the stewardship of the community exercised by the older generation, in order that we may know to what extent our inherited environmental opportunities have been improved or diminished by those who have held community leadership in the past, and we have a right to improve those opportunities in every way we can for the benefit of our generation, and the generations yet to come—

is the way the young men of New Orleans state the case.

Continuing, they say:

It is obvious to us that each succeeding older generation is more concerned with promoting security for an existing environment, which it understands, than with so improving that environment as to make it yield maximum economic opportunities for each succeeding generation of younger workers.

It is our purpose to prepare for civic and economic leadership in our community by learning what it is all about before, not after our turn to lead comes.

Ex pede Hercules—from the foot of Hercules build his stature. From the succinct and powerful description of the membership of the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, see the young men of the valley. They are coming not 10,000, not 100,000, but millions strong, and they are coming to fight for their rights, as part of the bone and sinew and patriotism of this country which we proudly call our own and scorn to give ought other reason why. If a canal 35 feet deep and 500 feet wide from St. Louis or Cairo to the Gulf be the proper channel through which to carry on the commerce of the valley, leaving the Mississippi itself as a drainage ditch pure and simple then they are going to demand it and fight for it to the last ditch. In this connection I might be permitted to say that some days ago I made the plan of the far-seeing J. H. O'Donnell, of Pittsburgh, a part of an address I delivered on flood control and the utilization of the waters that now inundate the alluvial valley, for beneficial purposes. And I am, in this address, going to incorporate a letter written me by my friend and constituent, George H. Maxwell, for he, too, has been a hero in the strife and has won his laurels on many a hard-fought field. It is on the anvil of discussion that the spark of truth will fly. It

is from papers such as that written by Mr. O'Donnell and the letter written by George Maxwell that the truth will be brought home to the people of the valley, and the truth will make them free—free from the errors of the past, free from prejudice against or veneration for any policy until it establishes itself by going through the fiery furnace of reason and the flames of logic. Listen to Maxwell, and you will understand his viewpoint as well as the plan which he assails, but without passion or acrimony:

Hon. JAMES O'CONNOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE O'CONNOR: I am under obligations to you for calling my attention to your speech on flood control, on pages 10953 and following of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, June 16, 1930, and containing the statement by Mr. John H. O'Donnell, of Pittsburgh. You have done the cause a service in again calling the attention of Congress to the idea of straightening the channel of the Mississippi and making a real inland waterway through the great central valley of the United States instead of a barge canal. I say this without any purpose of casting any animadversions on the barge transportation. It may be one of those small beginnings from which things at last some day reach their full stature.

I have followed the evolution of the idea underlying Mr. O'Donnell's article for a good many years. My attention was first called to it in an article in the Orange-Judd Farmer, then published by Mr. Herbert Myrick. The article was entitled "Double-Tracking the Mississippi," and was published not long after or during the flood of 1912. It was based on a plan presented by Mr. Carroll D. Riker. I have before me at this moment a pamphlet issued by Mr. Riker in 1914 containing a bill introduced by Mr. Griffin in the Sixty-third Congress, second session, on July 31, 1914, which contains a map of the proposed project showing the proposed course of the "Mississippi spillway from Cairo to the Gulf." The chief features of Mr. O'Donnell's plan were then embodied in Mr. Riker's plan, including automobile highways and railroads to parallel the great auxiliary channel proposed as a waterway and flood way. Mr. Riker has stuck to his guns, and has now on exhibition in the basement of the Senate Office Building a model of his project.

If the map of the O'Donnell project is laid beside that of the Riker project, about the only difference between the two as they appear on the maps is that the Riker project follows a somewhat different route. The Riker project crosses the Mississippi River just below Memphis, crosses the Delta in the State of Mississippi, and returns to the west side of the main river above Vicksburg. It thus follows all the way through the low swamp country from Cairo to the mouth of the Red River. The O'Donnell project is laid out on the map as a straight line from Cairo to the Gulf, which takes it across much high ground which could easily be avoided by following the natural drainage line through the swamps which nature left straight when building the crooked channel of the Mississippi River. Wherever the two projects differ the Riker project shows that it has been more carefully studied, but if such a channel is ever built (and I believe it will be), it will start at Cape Girardeau and follow the low swamp natural drainage channel all the way from Cape Girardeau to mouth of the Red River and thence south to the Gulf by whatever route may prove the most feasible. The plan of the Morgan Engineering Co. for a flood way from Cape Girardeau to the mouth of the St. Francis River is the project which will ultimately prove to have been the initiation of the ultimate project, but it is entirely practicable to carry the channel around Crowleys ridge to the north, where the flood water ran in 1927, and thence to the Gulf, without ever going back into the channel of the Mississippi River.

The plan of the O'Donnell project, which is a modification of the Riker project, brought to my mind an incident that might interest you, now that you have shown your friendliness to giving publicity to these larger aspects of the Mississippi River problem. When Senator Newlands was living, and Bryan was Secretary of State, I once went with Senator Newlands to talk with him about the Mississippi River. The mind of Mr. Bryan was centered on just one phase of the Mississippi River problem, and could consider no other. That phase was the value of the river for a great national central waterway. His idea was that the river should be straigthened from Cairo to New Orleans. That, of course, being impracticable, the next question is whether a new straight channel might be created, and the fall in the river used to develop power, instead of cutting a canyon at Cairo about 300 feet deep. The Riker and O'Donnell projects both propose an excavated channel, and both propose to utilize the fall of the river for the power.

Some day, however, some St. Louis man will wake up and want to know why ocean steamships are not docked at St. Louis. He will be an engineer with the vision of Lyman J. Cooley, who told a committee of Congress that with modern methods of excavating with hydraulic giants under water you can make any river over, make it any size you want, and make it run wherever you want. And the fact is that whenever St. Louis gets to work at it they will find that they could make the old Mississippi over again and make it run on a dead straight line from Cape Girardeau to the Gulf, with a bend a little once or twice to follow the low swamp drainage line, and make the river do its own excavating. That, of course, is a new proposition, but there was a time when electric busses were new and when airplanes were new. The Atchafalaya has proved how a river will dig its own channel. Before the war there was no Atchafalaya River and now it is there with a channel big enough to carry 750,000 second-feet of flood water and that will be the main river before many years if New Orleans does not wake up and control the outlet at the mouth of Red River. The Colorado River dug a channel in a few weeks through the Imperial Valley big enough to carry 300,000 second-feet of flood waters from the Colorado River. In Burma, English engineers have made the Rangoon River dig channels through a level delta to carry the floods, instead of building levees. That is all explained in the book by Leete, which I showed to the Flood Control Committee on May 2, when I was before that committee; and that whole proposition of excavating a straight channel for the Mississippi from Cape Girardeau to the Gulf is explained in my statement before that committee two years ago. And a map is attached to that statement, opposite page 4172, of part 6 of the 1928 hearings, showing the route for such a channel from Crowleys Ridge, where it would connect with the flood way of the Morgan Engineering Co., to the Gulf of Mexico.

The desperate tenacity with which the Federal Government and the levee boards have clung to ancient and discarded methods on the Mississippi River is well illustrated by the fact that if they had, when the Mississippi River Commission was created, built two parallel double-mesh-wire fences through the swamps on the line of the Morgan Engineering Co.'s flood way from Cape Girardeau through the St. Francis Basin to a junction with the route shown on the map accompanying my statement above referred to, and thence on to the Gulf of Mexico, there would now be a river that whole distance as big as the Atchafalaya River, and St. Louis would at this moment be an inland-ocean seaport, loading and unloading oceangoing steamships at her docks. And the only cost would have been for the mesh wire and building the fences to guide the flood waters in digging the channel, supplementing the work of the river to dig this new straight channel for itself by a little work here and there with a hydraulic giant in the nose of a boat. It would be cheaper to turn the river to work on the job of digging that new straight channel for itself than to try to revet or straighten the old channel. The new channel would straighten the distance and cut it in half from the Gulf to St. Louis.

If St. Louis doesn't take advantage of this opportunity, some enterprising speculator, some American Cecil Rhodes, will build a new city at Cape Girardeau or thereabouts, and the slogan that will make his name famous will not be "Cape to Cairo" but "Cape to the Gulf"; and if New Orleans is wise in her day and generation, they will add "via New Orleans."

Yours very truly,

GEORGE H. MAXWELL.

I have been the mouthpiece of the Flood Control Association, of which Walter Parker has been and is the directing influence, ever since I came to Congress. I cried aloud as if in a wilderness, with apparently no one to hear me, about the coming terror of 1927, except a few brave souls such as the choice spirits who gave to the country the Newlands bill, which was permitted to languish and give place to the Federal water power bills through which it was repealed. And that repeal came not with tidings of a great joy but with a message of grief to the men who had worked for it and who saw it suffocated to death in the cradle of its birth. But they still march on, saddened but undeterred, disheartened but not defeated, for they see in the coming the young fighting men whom Mr. Parker describes, and who will know no failure. Problems have to be solved before the valley becomes the land flowing with milk and honey. Those problems will be solved.

And one of the instrumentalities that will be of tremendous service in the solution of those problems will be the hydraulic laboratory. Through it the civilian engineers of the United States, and they are a vast host of intellectualists, will aid and support the Army engineers for whom I have a great affection, attested, I think, in many instances and in many a debate. The laboratory will be a servant of the people and a mighty hunter, a Nimrod in the search for those laws that govern running waters, and the means which will change a menacing liability into a valuable asset. It is through a properly controlled river that we are going to restore "The farm, best home of the family, main source of national wealth, foundation of civilized society; the natural providence."

A properly controlled river will make many of what are desolate places prosperous, and it requires no visionary eye to see that the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.

A properly controlled river will make for power development that intrigues but blinds the imagination so dazzling is its splendor. A power which will generate that electricity which will bring into existence thousands of factories, establish new industries, and illuminate hundreds of cities and millions of homes, electricity—carrier of light and power, devourer of time and space, bearer of human speech over land and sea,

greatest servant of man, itself unknown; thou has put all things under his feet.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF FISHERIES

Auxiliary fish cultural station, Oklahoma: For replacing the dam destroyed by flood and repairing other flood damage, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $17,500.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 25, line 22, after the word "damage," insert "and for completion of ponds," and in line 22 strike out "$17,500" and insert "$25,000."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment, because that completes the project and we will not then be bothering Congress any further about it.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, we can not accept the amendment, for the reason that there has been no estimate for it, and the testimony from the Bureau of Fisheries is for this amount to replace the dam that was destroyed. Until we have something from the Bureau of Fisheries with reference to the necessity for this we would not be justified in permitting the amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Fisheries made an application to the Bureau of the Budget for the full $25,000 with which to complete the ponds and to rebuild the dam. The Bureau of the Budget allowed them $17,500, but did not allow them the $7,500. Here is the situation: The Bureau of Fisheries in that part of the country is two years behind in supplying fish. If we can complete these ponds for the small amount of $7,500, it will save that amount in freight and expenses in distributing fish. It is an economical situation, so far as the Government is concerned.

To leave that project down there to be completed after a while will cost more by a great deal, when it can be done now while they are finishing these ponds. They can complete the work for $7,500, and it will cost twice as much if we have to go back there another year, and these people move their machinery away from the place it is now being used. This is only a small amount. It is only to give us a chance to get it completed while the machinery is there. I ask the committee to adopt this amendment. The Bureau of Fisheries want it. They want to complete the work while they are there and while the machinery is there.

Mr. WOOD. The Bureau of the Budget went into this, and they came to the conclusion that this is not necessary at this time. Nothing will be hurt by letting it go along for a time. There is no emergency for it.

Mr. McKEOWN. It will cost the Government more money. If you give us $7,500 now we can complete the project while the machinery is on the ground.

Mr. ALMON. How much will be saved by finishing it now?

Mr. McKEOWN. Fifteen thousand or twenty thousand dollars.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McKEOWN) there were—ayes 37, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PATENT OFFICE

Photolithographing: For an additional amount for producing copies of weekly issue of drawings of patents and designs, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1930, $40,000.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman in charge of the bill a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. PATTERSON. I did not notice the item when we passed it in regard to the Agricultural Department. I do not want to delay the proceedings, but I would like to get some information here. I notice in the Budget estimate submitted $80,000 was carried for expenses in connection with the eradication of the peach disease, and also an item for farm management. That is not carried in this bill, is it?

Mr. WOOD. Those were estimated for, but the committee did not allow them.

Mr. PATTERSON. Why not?

Mr. WOOD. If the gentleman will read the speech that I made yesterday he will get the reasons better than I can give them to him now.

Mr. PATTERSON. I notice the reasons for these appropriations were pointed out in the hearings, and that some of them are quite convincing.

Mr. WOOD. The committee did not think they were convincing.

Mr. PATTERSON. The farmers and the peach growers did not "make out their case" at that time, according to the committee. I regret this, especially since we are all interested in farm relief.

Mr. WOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Education: The appropriation "Industry among Indians" for the fiscal year 1931, and the appropriations from Indian tribal funds for industrial assistance during the fiscal year 1930, the unexpended balances of which were reappropriated by the act of May 14, 1930, for the same purposes during the fiscal year 1931, are hereby made available for making advances to worthy Indian youths to enable them to take educational courses, including special courses in nursing, home economics, forestry, and other industrial subjects in colleges, universities, or other institutions, advances so made to be reimbursed, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, in not to exceed eight years.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee to what extent the Indian Service makes allotments of appropriations for Indian youth—girls and boys—to secure college and university education, as provided in this paragraph?

Mr. WOOD. I will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is an experiment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought it was a new venture. I rose to inquire what is the idea of the committee as to the extent that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is going to be privileged to allot Indian funds to be used for university and college education?

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I would like to inform my colleague that this is for the purpose of higher education, the money to be derived from tribal funds and made reimbursable. As the gentleman will recall, on the Menominee Reservation there are each year a number of girls and boys graduated from the high school. This money, which is to be paid back, will give them that opportunity. That also applies to other tribes. These children ought at least be given the same opportunity for higher education as private citizens.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am in sympathy with the proposition to give higher education for Indian girls and boys. We have heretofore maintained the Carlisle Indian School, but I understand that has been abandoned. What advantages for college education do we accord generally to the Indian youth?

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding concerning that Carlisle School. We have been accustomed to speaking of it as of Yale or Harvard. The fact is that at the Carlisle School nobody went beyond about the second year of high school. We have never had an opportunity to extend a real university course to individual Indians. We have now brought them to the point where education should go beyond that afforded by the ordinary Government schools.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the Government ever conducted any activity for the education of Indian youth in professional schools? Has it made any provision for such activity?

Mr. LEAVITT. Not heretofore.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the method for the allotment of this fund? Is it going to be parceled out, or specialized to a favored few? What is to be the policy?

Mr. LEAVITT. It will have to be a matter of selection in the judgment of the Indian Office. The amount is not sufficient to go to the extent of an indiscriminate assignment of these funds to the Indian youths. But those who will be selected will be at the discretion of the commissioner.

Mr. STAFFORD. The authorization is without limit except as to the amount of the item. Are we going to appropriate

$2,000,000 or $3,000,000 or $5,000,000 for the higher education of Indian youth? I am mindful and most of the Members of the House are mindful of that movie picture of the Indian Red Skin which rather decries the idea of the higher education of the Indian.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. The gentleman is certainly aware of the fact that not many Indians are seeking education higher than the high-school grade. The money is to come from reimbursable funds belonging to the tribes.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much money is expected to be expended for this purpose?

Mr. WOOD. There is no definite amount and the sums available are not large. It is a matter of selection, and the selection is to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior. I have said this is an experiment and the money is to be reimbursed, as has been stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHNEIDER].

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman happens to be a colleague of mine.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I want to say that there were 10 young Indians from the Menominee Indians last year who were graduates from the high school who wanted to go to the University of Wisconsin and did not have the money to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am not desirous of interposing a point of order against this worthy purpose because, as the chairman says, it is an experiment. I think there should be some limit imposed, otherwise it might run ad libitum into the millions. We will see about it in future years. I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] will be here; perhaps I will not; I withdraw the reservation, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk reads as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Boulder Canyon project: For the commencement of construction of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon, to create a storage reservoir, and of a complete plant and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy from the water discharged from such reservoir; to acquire by proceedings in eminent domain, or otherwise, all lands, rights of way and other property necessary for such purposes; and for incidental operations; as authorized by the Boulder Canyon project act, approved December 21, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 33, ch. 15A); $10,660,000 to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund, which amount shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and for all other objects of expenditure that are specified for projects included under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation" in the Interior Department appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1930 and 1931, without regard to the limitations of amounts therein set forth: *Provided*, That of the amount hereby appropriated, not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for investigation and reports as authorized by section 15 of the Boulder Canyon project act.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order, under Rule XXI, clause 2, and the first sentence thereof, which reads:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

In speaking on the point of order, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I ask your indulgence. The matter is an important one in itself, and the point of order is one of great interest.

The first matter which I will call to your attention is that pertaining to the theory on which the Boulder Canyon project act was passed by Congress. In speaking on that I desire to call to your attention the provisions of section 4 (b) of the act, which reads:

Before any money is appropriated for the construction of said dam or power plant, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues by contract, in accordance with the provisions of this act, adequate in his judgment to insure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance—

And so forth.

Secondly, I desire to call to the attention of the Chair the provisions contained in the first sentence of section 5 (c), which reads:

Contracts for the use of water and necessary privileges for the generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy or for the sale and delivery of electrical energy shall be made with responsible applicants therefor who will pay the price fixed by the said Secretary with a view to meeting the revenue requirements herein provided for.

And, further, in section 5 (c) the provision which reads:

Provided, however, That no application of a State or a political subdivision for an allocation of water for power purposes or of electrical energy shall be denied or another application in conflict therewith be granted on the ground that the bond issue of such State or political subdivision necessary to enable the applicant to utilize such water and appurtenant works and privileges necessary for the generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy or the electrical energy applied for has not been authorized or marketed, until after a reasonable time, to be determined by the said Secretary, has been given to such applicant to have such bond issue authorized and marketed.

I desire further, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to the language on page 12 of the majority report submitted to the House with the bill, coming from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which reads:

Not only does the bill specifically require the complete refinancing of the project but the nature of the agencies which will underwrite the cost.

And further, Mr. Chairman, the language in the majority report——

The CHAIRMAN. Is that on page 12?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Page 12 of the majority report, Report No. 918, of the Seventieth Congress, first session.

The CHAIRMAN. The other quotation was from the Boulder Canyon project act?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I am now speaking of the majority report of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, dated March 18, 1928.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call your attention to the language on pages 28 and 29 of the majority report on the Boulder Canyon project act, dated March 20, 1928, by the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation when it reported the Boulder Canyon project act to the Senate, which reads:

The provisions of the bill and the character and solvency of the organizations with which the Secretary will contract assures to the Government full return of the money advanced, with interest. It will be no experiment. The Secretary will not contract with organizations of doubtful solvency.

These contracts will be binding and enforcible, and the Secretary is not permitted to make any expenditures on the project until such contracts are secured.

Further, I desire to call to your attention an amendment which was accepted by the House of Representatives on the 28th of May, 1928, which involved the striking of the language "or otherwise" from section 4 (b), heretofore quoted. The language originally read:

Before any money is appropriated for the construction of said dam or power plant, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues by contract or otherwise.

The amendment offered in the House in 1928 to strike the words "or otherwise" from the language of the bill was approved by the House, and the gentleman from California accepted the amendment.

I further call to the attention of the Chair the acceptance by the Senate of the same amendment.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I call to your attention the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], delivered on the 23d of May, 1928, when the Boulder Canyon project act was being debated in Committee of the Whole House:

The pending bill contains a provision which has never been inserted in any legislation heretofore, and provides that before a dollar can be appropriated or before any contracts can be made or any money expended there must be in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior solvent and binding contracts.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that therefore it can not new be denied that the theory on which the Congress passed the Boulder Canyon act was that there were to be guaranties of the return of the cost of the project, plus 4 per cent interest, before one single cent could be appropriated by the Congress. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, it can be positively affirmed without any fear of contradiction that when the Congress passed the Boulder Canyon project act it contemplated that there were to be no mistakes, that there were to be no expenditures made out of the Treasury of the United States until there should have been submitted guaranties that every dollar so taken out would be returned. Further, when Congress passed the Boulder Canyon project act it was contemplated that there must be protection against the situation in which the United States would have constructed a great, beautiful dam, with a great, beautiful

generating equipment, in the heart of the great American desert, but would have found no outlet for its power and no revenue flowing therefrom; protection against a situation similar to the one with which the Congress has been confronted for 10 years, namely, that of Muscle Shoals; a protection against the necessity for construction of a transmission line to Los Angeles by the United States.

Mr. Chairman, on the point of order two questions arise. The first is, whether or not the conditions precedent to an appropriation, as expressed in the explicit language and in the implicit meaning of the enabling act, have been complied with, and, second, whether or not that question is one of which the Chair should take jurisdiction.

I shall, Mr. Chairman, direct my remarks to the second question first, since that is the logical arrangement.

It does not seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that it can be urged that the Chair should not take jurisdiction for the reason that all of the matters precedent——

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order. If the gentleman will confine himself to the point of order, well and good, but this is not the time to be discussing the merits of this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that at the present moment the gentleman is certainly directing his discussion to the exact question whether the Chair has jurisdiction of the point of order he is making.

Mr. WOOD. I do not care to limit the gentleman's argument in opposition to this appropriation, but I do think that at this time he should confine himself to the point of order and not intermingle it with other matters.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. May I say this to the gentleman from Indiana, that everything I have to say or propose to say will be confined entirely to the parliamentary situation.

Mr. WOOD. Perhaps it will be hereafter, but it has not been up to date.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I believe it has been. Mr. Chairman, it does not seem to me that the Chair can reasonably urge that this is a question over which it should not take jurisdiction on the ground that all of the matters pertaining to conditions precedent are solely within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

I call the attention of the Chair to the language of 4 (b) of the Boulder Canyon project act heretofore read. It is obvious from the language of that section of the act that two conditions precedent, if none others, are required before an appropriation is in order. The first is that contracts for revenues "adequate in his judgment"—referring to the Secretary of the Interior—"to insure payment"—shall have been made. I do not argue, Mr. Chairman, that with respect to the adequacy of the revenues the Secretary of the Interior, in so far as the parliamentary situation is concerned, has not complete discretion. The language of 4 (b) expressly delegates to him that discretion; but I do hold, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that the language reads:

By contract, in accordance with the provisions of this act—

In view of the fact that "adequate in his judgment" modifies revenues, whereas "in accordance with the provisions of this act" modifies contract, and in view of the further fact that "adequate in his judgment" does not modify contract, the Secretary of the Interior has not complete discretion with respect to the nature of the contracts which shall be made; that, on the contrary, the nature of a contract "in accordance with the provisions of this act" is at least partially defined by the act authorizing the appropriation, and I call the attention of the Chair again to the first sentence of section 5 (c), which defines the parties with whom the Secretary shall contract. I submit to the Chair that in that language there is no discretionary power delegated to the Secretary to define what a contract is or who the party shall be; that Congress has defined that matter.

Further, I call the attention of the Chair to the language in the latter part of 5 (c), which refers to the voting of bonds by a political subdivision, in the event there is an application in conflict therewith, and I call to the attention of the Chair, with respect to the language of the act referred to, that there is but one discretionary power delegated to the Secretary of the Interior, and that is to determine the period of time which shall be given to a political subdivision in which it shall vote the bonds necessary to permit it to utilize the electrical energy applied for. It follows, it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that inasmuch as the contract and the parties with whom the Secretary must make contracts and the provisions with respect to political subdivisions in the event they are contractees—inasmuch as all those matters are defined by law, the Secretary of the Interior has not complete jurisdiction with respect to the definition of a contract.

It further follows, Mr. Chairman, that section 4b is more than a condition. It is, as a matter of fact, a prohibition against the making of an appropriation until the conditions precedent over which the House and the Chair, as the interpreter of the rules of the House, has jurisdiction.

I submit the following to the Chair. Let it be assumed that the Congress were to pass an act authorizing an appropriation of $5,000,000 for the construction of barracks at Fort Snelling; that the authorization were contained in the first section of the act and that in the second section there were language to the effect that before any appropriation can be made the Secretary of War must have decided that there existed a necessity for barracks at Fort Snelling, and provided, further, that no money should be appropriated prior to the year 1935. Then, Mr. Chairman, let us assume that in 1930 the Secretary of War appears before the Committee on Appropriations and says that a necessity for barracks at Fort Snelling has arisen and that it is now 1935; and let us assume that in 1930 the Committee on Appropriations, acting upon that statement of an executive officer, reports to the House a bill containing an item of $5,000,000 for the construction of barracks at Fort Snelling. Surely, the Chair would not hold that the Secretary of War had been delegated discretion to state in 1930 that the year 1935 had, as a matter of fact, arrived.

This language in the authorization act assumed is a prohibition, a limitation, a statement of conditions precedent, just as the words in the Boulder Canyon project act are prohibitions, limitations, and conditions precedent. Just as the Chair would be compelled to take cognizance or jurisdiction of a point of order in the event cited with respect to Fort Snelling, so now must the Chair take jurisdiction over the point of order which has been raised; nor can the Chair urge that section 3 of the Boulder Canyon project act is the only provision of the act dealing with an authorization.

Just as the Chair, in the event of the Fort Snelling case, could not hold that the only authorization was contained in section 1 and that the provisions of section 2 were simply directions, a statement of policy and no more. Were the Chair to rule otherwise, the ruling would, in effect, nullify all subsequent or prior language in the act, and would vitiate an act of Congress. Nor can the Chair urge that because it is more difficult in the case now before him to determine whether the conditions precedent have been met than it would be to determine whether in the year 1930 the year 1935 had arrived, he need not take jurisdiction in instant case; nor can it be urged by the Chair that the Chair has no jurisdiction to determine a question of fact.

There are many precedents in which the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has taken jurisdiction to determine a question of fact, and I refer the Chair to Hinds's 376, case of February 22, 1907, in which the Chair directly went to the hearings to determine a question of fact. The question was on an item carried in an appropriation bill for $25,000 for additional land in the District of Columbia, in connection with a public building. The point of order was raised by Mr. TAWNEY to the effect that the land was not adjacent, and that there was no act of authorization; and the Chair went to the hearings to determine the question of fact.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 12902, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 3.10 o'clock p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Speaker.

VISIT OF REAR ADMIRAL RICHARD E. BYRD

During the recess—

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] to escort our distinguished guest, Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, to the Chamber.

Rear Admiral Byrd entered the Chamber and was escorted by Mr. TILSON and Mr. GARNER to the Speaker's rostrum and took his place at the Speaker's right.

The SPEAKER. Admiral Byrd, on December 2, 1929, the opening day of the first regular session, Seventy-first Congress, this House, as its first official act, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Speaker is requested by means of the radio to convey to Commander Richard E. Byrd and his associates the congratulations of the House on their recent successful flight over the South Pole, which was marked by such unerring skill and dauntless courage, and to express its confident hope that the further activities of the expedition under the able and brilliant leadership of Commander Byrd will greatly contribute to the world's scientific knowledge.

These were the sentiments of the House, Admiral, when you were many thousand miles away. We desire as one man to reiterate them to you here in your presence. [Applause.]

Gentlewomen and gentlemen of the House, I present to you one of America's most beloved sons, brilliant and intrepid explorer, scientist, aviator, the one man in all the world who has no more poles to conquer, Admiral Dick Byrd. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Admiral BYRD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I stand here as the representative of my companions, for it was my companions who did that for which you have honored me. So in their name, I give you our most humble gratitude for your reception to-day and for the big honor that you did to the expedition. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Admiral Byrd's companions are in the gallery and on the floor. I will ask them to rise that the House may do them honor.

The members of the Byrd expedition rose and were greeted with prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER. Admiral Byrd will now be glad to meet the Members of the House of Representatives.

Admiral Byrd stood in the well of the House, and the Members were individually presented to him by Mr. TILSON.

The following is a list of the members of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition visting the House to-day:

Rear Admiral R. E. Byrd, commander; Dr. L. M. Gould, second in command, geologist and geographer; Capt. A. C. McKinley, third in command, aerial photographer; William C. Haines, fourth in command, meteorologist; Charles E. Lofgren, aide to Admiral Byrd; Clair Alexander, assistant sailmaker; Bernt Balchen, chief pilot; G. Hamilton Black, supply officer; Quin A. Blackburn, topographer; Christofer Braathen, dog driver, ski expert; Kenneth Bubier, aviation mechanic; Jacob Bursey, dog driver; Arnold H. Clarke, assistant to meteorologist; Dr. F. D. Coman, medical officer; Frederick E. Crockett, dog driver; Victor Czegka, machinist; Prof. Frank T. Davies, physicist; E. J. Demas, aviation mechanic; James A. Feury, snowmobile operator; Joe De Ganahl, dog driver, navigator; Edward E. Goodale, dog driver; Charles Gould, carpenter; Lieut. Malcolm Hanson, radio engineer; H. T. Harrison, jr., aerologist; H. I. June, pilot; Howard Mason, radio operator; T. B. Mulroy, fuel engineer; John S. O'Brien, surveyor; Russell Owen, New York Times correspondent; A. U. Parker, pilot; Carl Peterson, radio operator; Martin Ronne, sailmaker; Benjamin Roth, aviation mechanic; Joseph Rucker, motion-picture photographer; Paul A. Siple, boy scout; D. C. Smith; pilot; Sverre Strom, ice pilot; George Tennant, cook; George A. Thorne, surveyor, ski man; Willard Van der Veer, motion-picture photographer; Norman D. Vaughan, dog driver; Arthur T. Walden, in charge of dogs.

AFTER THE RECESS

At 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Speaker called the House to order.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the recess may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman include a list of Admiral Byrd's associates who are visiting the House to-day?

Mr. TILSON. I will include that in the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12902, the second deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. When the House took a recess the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS] had the floor on a point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Secretary of the Interior has not complete discretion with respect to the nature of a contract; inasmuch as section 4 (b) of the enabling act in conjunction with the provisions of section 5 (c) are prohibitions against making an appropriation; inasmuch as it can not reasonably be held by the Chair that sections of the enabling act other than section 3 are merely statements of policy; inasmuch as the difficulties implicit in a determination of the question can not be urged as a reason for avoiding jurisdiction; inasmuch as avoiding jurisdiction can not be claimed on the grounds of parliamentary incapacity to determine a question of facts; and inasmuch as the House and not the Secretary makes appropriations under the rules of the House of which the Chair is the interpreter, I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair must take jurisdiction of the question, Have the conditions precedent to an appropriation as defined in the Boulder Canyon project act been met?

If the Chair should rule that, in determining the question, the only evidence of which he may take knowledge is the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior, I shall show further on in the argument that the Secretary of the Interior has stated that the conditions precedent have not been met.

Mr. Chairman, I shall hereafter direct my argument to the question, Have the conditions precedent to making an appropriation as defined in the Boulder Canyon project act been met?

The first query arises, What are the conditions? Section 4 (b) provides that contracts must be made. Section 5 (c) provides that contracts must be with responsible parties who "will pay the price," or, in other words, that contracts must be made with parties who not only agree to pay but who as a matter of fact are able to and will pay. The proviso of section 5 (c) means that contracts must be made with parties which have available the necessary funds to construct the facilities with which the contractor will be able to utilize the water and power contracted for. These three provisions with respect to contracts and contractors taken together are susceptible of but one interpretation—the provision for revenue must be made by contract with a contractee who agrees to pay, who is able to pay, and who in addition has available the necessary financial resources with which it may construct the facilities to permit it to utilize the electrical energy and the water contracted for. There are three contracts which have been negotiated and executed.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that the gentleman has iterated and reiterated the points he thinks are involved in this question. It occurs to me that there has been sufficient time occupied by the gentleman already.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am not attempting to be dilatory, but I do want to complete my argument on the point of order. It will require approximately 10 minutes to complete it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has stated that the question divides itself into two parts—first, whether a point of order exists of which the Chair has jurisdiction and should take cognizance, and, secondly, if such a point of order does exist, then there are other matters which the gentleman desires to discuss in connection with the point of order. However, it might expedite matters if the gentleman now discusses those further questions as briefly as possible. The Chair will indulge the gentleman if he thinks he can conclude in 10 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, three alleged contracts have been made—one with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for water, the second with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for power, and the third with the city of Los Angeles and its department of water and power and the Southern California Edison Co. for a lease of power privilege. Each one will be discussed separately. With respect to the contract with the Metropolitan Water District for water, nothing more need be said than that it is an option, as evidenced by the testimony of the executive secretary to the Secretary of the Interior, to be found on page 958 of the hearings. With respect to the second contract with the Metropolitan Water District for power, it need only be said that the city of Los Angeles is its generating agency, and that further the city of Los Angeles under the terms of the contract is to transmit energy over its transmission lines for it, and that further all damages which the Metropolitan Water District may claim must be obtained from the city and not from the United States. It follows, therefore, that the second contract hinges on the contract with the city. If the city contract is not within the meaning of the law, the contract with the Metropolitan Water District is likewise not within the meaning of the law. So the discussion hinges entirely, then, upon the contract with the city.

The obligations under the last-named contract are fourfold. First, the city and the company agree to pay in 10 equal annual

installments throughout the first 10 years of the lease an amount sufficient to amortize the cost to the United States of the generating equipment, plus 4 per cent compounded thereon, plus 4 per cent interest, for the occupancy of and the right to use the generating equipment for a period of 50 years. The second obligation is that the city agrees to take and pay for 37 per cent of the power to be generated, and the company agrees to take and pay for 27 per cent of the power at a price for water equivalent to 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour for electric energy. Both agree to transmit energy. In the language of the Attorney General to be found in the hearings it, therefore, follows "as none of the transmission lines have been built, the performance of these obligations will require their construction." Third, the city is therefore obligated to construct a transmission line. The fourth obligation is to generate electrical energy for all of the allottees, and I refer the Chair to section 10-d of the contract.

Inasmuch as the Southern California Edison Co. owns in its own name property valued at in excess of $300,000,000, and inasmuch as it has liquid assets of $10,000,000 it must be concluded that this contract is within the meaning of the law; that it can be enforced, and that in the event of default the United States will have recourse against values sufficient to meet damages.

But with respect to the city the query arises, What is the obligation in terms of dollars? First, on the completion of the dam, according to the Attorney General, it must have constructed a transmission dam at the cost of $30,000,000, exclusive of interest—page 978 of the hearings. Second, it must have paid the first annual rental, which amounts to between $1,700,000 and $2,500,000, and I refer the Chair to the hearings on page 972, in which it is stated that the cost to the city will be $12,000,000 plus interest at 4 per cent compounded, plus interest at 4 per cent. The total, therefore, which the city must pay at the expiration of eight years, which is the period within which it is estimated the dam will be constructed, is a minimum of $31,700,000. Thereafter it must pay, first, throughout the first nine years $1,700,000 annually; and, second, $2,427,070 every year for 50 years for services to be rendered, namely, the use of falling water.

The next query that arises, Mr. Chairman, is to what extent, if any, is the city bound. I might refer the Chair to the provisions of the charter to prove the point, but it is not necessary inasmuch as the Attorney General himself has determined the question, and I refer the Chair to the opinion of the Attorney General in which he says that the contract for lease of power privilege between the United States and the city of Los Angeles and its water and power department and the Edison Co. is "in my opinion a valid contract, binding upon the city and its department to the extent to which funds are available under the provisions of the charter to the department."

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman read the next words?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I am coming to them.

Mr. SWING. Put them in there.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The question then arises if the city is bound only to the extent of the department, how can the department meet the obligation? The department owns no property, and I refer the Chair to section 423 of the charter of the city of Los Angeles. The resources of the department are limited entirely to its earnings, and I refer the Chair to the opinion of the Attorney General on pages 7 and 8 in which he concludes that—

> Inasmuch as the department of water and power is not authorized to levy taxes, it is apparent that its resources are limited to its earnings from the sale or use of water and of electrical energy.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I regret I can not. I have a very limited time. I will yield if you can obtain for me more time.

Mr. Chairman, I again refer the Chair to the language of opinion of the Attorney General, in which he says, in effect, speaking of the contract—

> It is valid only to the extent to which funds are available to the department under the charter.
>
> The department had available cash on hand—its only assets, for it has no property—$1,996,000. Its construction funds can not be used for meeting the obligations and amounts required by the provisions of the contract. (Hearings, pp. 1196–1199; audit by Price Waterhouse & Co.)

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOOD. The point of order is that the gentleman is talking about things that have nothing whatever to do with the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I was allowed 10 minutes, and gentlemen have taken 3 minutes by their objections.

Mr. WOOD. The thing I am objecting to is that the gentleman has not been speaking more than one-fifth of the time on the point of order but on the merits of this item.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I think those who have followed this matter differ widely from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] as to the pertinency of this argument. Instead of the gentleman from Arizona not speaking to the point of order, I think he has said nothing that is not pertinent and relevant to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is anxious that the discussion be concluded as speedily as possible and would ask the gentleman from Arizona if he has not practically finished.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, 8 minutes ago I was permitted 10 minutes to finish. A considerable part of that time has been taken up by interruptions.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman is satisfied, the Chair will listen for two minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. May I have the time that was taken up by others in interruptions?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will conclude as speedily as he can.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. It follows, Mr. Chairman, that the power and water department of the city of Los Angeles owns no property, that its only assets are its cash on hand and whatever future earnings it may have at the time it must meet the obligations sought to be imposed.

The Secretary of the Interior at one time thought the accumulated earnings would be sufficient to meet the obligation.

I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the department has not agreed to accumulate funds, and I refer the Chair to the contract. I call the attention of the Chair to sections 83 and 369 of the charter of the city of Los Angeles and the opinion of the Attorney General, in which it will be found that the city and the department are prohibited from binding themselves to accumulate in future until prior assent of two-thirds of the voters has been had.

Again, I call the attention of the Chair to the opinion of the Attorney General on page 11, in which he says:

> Therefore, the only effect of section 369 is to require an appropriation in each annual budget.

So that it is clear that the department can not bind itself to accumulate, and therefore it is entirely optional with the power and water department whether it will attempt to accumulate whatever earnings it may have in order that its accumulated earnings may be sufficient to meet even a part of its obligations.

But if it elected to accumulate its earnings, it could not in any event accumulate more than $15,000,000 to meet obligations which amount to a minimum of $31,700,000. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it follows that the contention of the Secretary of the Interior and the advocates of this appropriation can not, on the facts presented by the Secretary to the Committee on Appropriations, be sustained. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, it follows that because the department is and will be incapable of meeting its obligations, and because the city is bound only to the extent that the department is bound, the city will be unable to meet its obligations under the contract, and that therefore the contract is not within the meaning of the law.

I have two points left to which I wish to call attention. The first is that the Secretary of the Interior, having entertained some doubt about this contract, submitted it to the Attorney General for his opinion. The Attorney General replied in effect that if the Secretary thinks the city, through its department, will have the money, then the obligations will be paid. The Attorney General concluded that the contract would provide revenues if the Secretary thought they would—surely a beautiful circle. The Attorney General, in his opinion, supports every point of law urged here this afternoon, but bases the validity of the contract solely upon the opinion of the Secretary.

And, second, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to page 1001 of the hearings, in which the Secretary was asked by Mr. BYRNS, of Tennessee, the following question:

> Mr. BYRNS. I am talking about the legal liability of the city of Los Angeles. If it does not, as in the opinion of Judge Matthews it does not, carry with it full, complete, legal liability upon the part of the city of Los Angeles to see that this contract with the Government is carried out, would you say that this contract ought to be accepted?
>
> Secretary WILBUR. My idea is that the city should be liable in case there is a breach of the contract.

The Secretary himself, therefore, believes that the city should be liable, which the Attorney General concludes is not the case.

Therefore if there is any default and the water and power department has not accumulated the money, the United States will have no recourse whatever against what the gentleman from California calls "one of the wealthiest cities in the United

States." The result will be that there will be a great dam out in the middle of the desert from which no revenue will flow unless subsequently Congress appropriates $50,000,000 for a transmission line.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the conditions not having been met, there is therefore no authorization for this appropriation, and that the point of order must be sustained. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state before any other argument is commenced that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS] very kindly and entirely in accordance with the wishes of the Chair submitted his brief to him some days ago. The Chair has therefore been advised of the situation, and the Chair believes that he is ready to rule unless there is some one else in support of the point of order who desires to be heard.

The point of order is that this appropriation violates Rule XXI, clause 2 of the Rules of the House, reading as follows:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

There is no claim that the present appropriation comes within the last clause of the rule which has just been read. The claim is that there is no authorization in existing law under which this appropriation can be made.

The Boulder Canyon project act approved December 21, 1928, contains the following section 3:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, not exceeding in the aggregate $165,000,000.

There is no claim that that authorization, standing alone, would not cover every item contained in the appropriation now pending before the committee. The claim is, however, that the authorization granted in section 3 is modified and controlled by the following provision in paragraph (b) of section 4, namely:

Before any money is appropriated for the construction of said dam or power plant, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues by contract, in accordance with the provisions of this act, adequate, in his judgment, to insure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance of said works incurred by the United States, and the repayment, within 50 years from the date of the completion of said works, of all amounts advanced to the fund under subdivision (b) of section 2 for such works, together with the interest thereon, made reimbursible under this act.

The pertinent question before the Chair, therefore, is the construction of that proviso in the Boulder Canyon project act contained in paragraph (b) of section 4. It is a most unusual provision. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS] argues that it is a prohibition against the power of Congress to make any appropriation unless certain conditions precedent have been complied with. A pertinent inquiry becomes: What is the condition precedent before an appropriation may be made? The gentleman contends that the various contracts must have been properly made within the meaning and according to the conditions of the act, and that the chairman presiding in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has the duty to determine for himself and to rule upon the question whether those contracts have properly been made, whether they are in legal force and effect, and whether they have in general complied with the terms of the law.

The Chair thinks that the language of paragraph (b), section 4, must be construed, viewing it in its entirety, as creating a condition precedent to the effect that the Secretary of the Interior shall have made provision for revenues, by contract, in accordance with the provisions of the act, adequate, in his judgment to insure the payment of all expenses of operation, and so forth.

The question then is: How is compliance of the Secretary of the Interior with that condition precedent to be evidenced? How is his compliance with that condition to be brought to the attention of the Congress and of the presiding officer of the Committee of the Whole House?

We have a budget law under which the President sends estimates of appropriations, and in which he sets forth the grounds upon which he bases a suggestion or an estimate for an appropriation. The President of the United States, in compliance with the budget law, on the 1st of May, 1930, sent a communication to the Speaker of the House, and this is a public document, brought to the attention of the House officially, in which he transmits, for the consideration of the Congress, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1930, to remain available until expended, for the items contained in the appropriation now in question. With his own letter the President submitted a communication from the Bureau of the Budget. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget made this statement in his communication to the President:

The purpose of this estimate is to provide funds for the commencement of construction work on the Boulder Canyon project authorized by act of December 21, 1928. The Secretary of the Interior advises that, as required by the act, contracts have been secured which will provide revenues adequate in his judgment to pay operation and maintenance costs, and to insure the repayment to the United States within 50 years from date of completion of the dam, power plant, and related works, of all amounts to be advanced for the construction of such works, together with the interest thereon made reimbursible by the act.

In other words, the Director of the Budget advised the President and the President advised Congress that the Secretary of the Interior has advised or certified to the Director of the Budget that he has complied with the conditions precedent set forth in section 4, paragraph b of the Boulder Canyon project act.

It is argued that it is the duty of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to go back of the report by the Secretary of the Interior that he has complied with the conditions precedent for the appropriation. The Chair does not think the Boulder Canyon project act makes that requirement of the Committee of the Whole or of its chairman. The Chair thinks that the Appropriations Committee, in the first place, the Committee of the Whole, in the second place, and the House, in the third place, under the law, would have full authority to rest its appropriation upon the report from the Secretary of the Interior that he has complied with the conditions precedent for the appropriation. However, it is perfectly proper for the Committee on Appropriations in this case, as in other cases, to ascertain for itself whether the Congress should make the appropriation, notwithstanding the fact that the conditions precedent may have been complied with. It is perfectly proper for the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to make a similar inquiry and for the House itself to make such an inquiry. When that is done the discussion by the gentleman from Arizona with reference to the contracts will be pertinent, and the Chair was disposed to permit the gentleman to complete his argument—although the Chair held the view then which he holds now—in the hope that the presentation of the matter at that time would obviate further discussion of that subject matter.

The Chair will state that the gentleman from Arizona has worked out and presented a very able and a very ingenious argument upon his point of order and the Chair will not say his position is entirely without merit, but the Chair has, after much consideration, not only during the presentation of his point of order by the gentleman from Arizona but prior to this discussion to-day, reached the conclusion that the point of order is not well taken and it is therefore overruled.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Page 32, line 17, after the word "act," insert: *"And provided further,* That no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be expended until the city of Los Angeles and the Metropolitan Water District at a duly authorized election shall have obtained the assent of their respective electors, as required by the constitution and statutes of California, to the sale of bonds in sufficient amount to enable them to construct the facilities with which the power and water may be utilized and to the obligations and liabilities with respect to the purchase of water for all purposes, including that of generating electrical energy and rental of generating equipment."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. My point of order is that it is a change of existing law and it is placing upon the Secretary of the Interior a duty in addition to the obligation that is placed upon him by the organic act and that it is new legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I take the position that the amendment offered is not, as a matter of fact, new legislation, but is simply a limitation imposed upon the appropriation authorized. The Chair has held many times that limitations are not and do not constitute new legislation. As I interpret the amendment offered there is nothing new by way of legislation in its language; it is simply a limitation imposed upon the expenditure of the money appropriated.

The basic act provides that contracts shall be let to responsible parties who will pay the price, section 5 (c).

Further, in section 5 (c), there is a proviso with respect to the voting of bonds by political subdivision. There is then no addi-

tional obligation imposed upon the Secretary of the Interior. There is no obligation imposed upon him which is not already in the enabling act; namely, that he must determine the financial responsibility of the parties with whom he is to contract.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is there anything in existing law that requires the holding of an election in the city of Los Angeles to pass upon the issuance of the bonds?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. There is a requirement in existing law which provides, by inference, that where political subdivisions have not the necessary funds to construct the facility with which it may utilize the water or the power contracted for, then the Secretary of the Interior must give it sufficient time, within his discretion, in which to vote the bonds.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is clearly discretionary.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. This imposes no additional obligation upon the Secretary.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This adds one more condition to the law under which we are now appropriating, and you specify that an election shall be held. You not only specify that an election shall be held, but you go so far as to provide in the amendment, under the guise of a limitation, what should be done at that election. Surely that is legislation in every sense of the word.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, of course, under the gentleman's theory, which he has just presented to the Chair on the point of order, there is legislative authority to support some of his amendment, but that theory has been overruled by the Chairman, and I take it the Chair is not yet ready to reverse himself.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The question here was not determined by the Chair. There was no statement on the face of the documents to which the Chair referred in rendering his decision with respect to whether bonds had or had not been voted.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the gentleman's argument was all on the theory that certain things must be shown with reference to the making of a contract by the city of Los Angeles. The gentleman was attempting to add new requirements to what the law had provided and the Chair declined to follow him in that theory. I take it the Chair is not yet ready to reverse himself.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I take it that the gentleman is arguing in a beautiful circle.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The proposed amendment reads as follows:

And provided further, That no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be expended until the city of Los Angeles and the Metropolitan Water District at a duly authorized election shall have obtained the assent of their respective electors, as required by the constitution and statutes of California, to the sale of bonds in sufficient amount to enable them to construct the facilities with which the power and water may be utilized, and to the obligations and liabilities with respect to the purchase of water for all purposes, including that of generating electrical energy and rental of generating equipment.

The Chair does not think the provisions of this limitation have any relation, so far as the parliamentary question is concerned, to the powers given the Secretary of the Interior in the substantive law.

The Chair, personally, has frequently been out of harmony with the trend of decisions on the subject of limitations. The Chair has thought that the precedents of the House go too far in sustaining limitations; but this is only, after all, a limitation upon the present appropriation—"no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be expended" until certain things have been done—entirely without reference to existing law. It imposes a condition of its own with reference to the expenditure of the instant appropriation.

The Chair has at hand a couple of precedents. On February 5, 1916—Cannon's Precedents, section 8646—when the Indian appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HARRISON, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to an amendment, and the amendment to which this amendment was offered related to the payment of money out of the Treasury for the benefit of certain Indians. The amendment of Mr. HARRISON read as follows:

Provided, however, That the provisions of this paragraph with respect to the Choctaw Tribe shall not be operative until the Court of Claims shall determine the rights of the Mississippi Choctaws, who have been identified as Mississippi Choctaws by the Dawes Commission in its report of March 10, 1889—

And so forth. Mr. Martin D. Foster, of Illinois, overruled a point of order and held the amendment to be a proper limitation upon the appropriation.

On another occasion, which the present occupant of the chair well remembers—Cannon's Precedents, section 8755—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] offered a proviso or an amendment to an appropriation in a naval appropriation bill reading as follows:

No part of this money shall be expended until the President of the United States shall have invited the governments of all nations to send accredited delegates to an international convention to be held in the United States to consider ways and means of bringing about a joint disarmament.

A point of order was submitted by the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. Mondell, and the question was decided by Mr. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, whom many of us will remember as a very able parliamentarian. Mr. Walsh said:

The amendment which is offered, in the view of the Chair, is a limitation upon the appropriation and withholds or denies the expenditure until the President shall have called a conference, which under a fair interpretation of the naval bill of 1916, he is authorized to do, and while it is very close to being a directory provision in the law, the Chair is of the opinion now, as he was on a former occasion, that it is within his power and overrules the point of order.

The Chair thinks the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS] is, within the precedents of the House, a limitation upon an appropriation, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is willing to hear what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Chair having so promptly stated, he was ready to rule, without any argument on our side of the question, we thought that perhaps any argument was unnecessary.

I feel sure that if the Chair will consider this a little more closely, he will see that it goes beyond what can be properly considered a limitation. The amendment provides that—

No part of the money appropriated shall be expended until the city of Los Angeles and the Metropolitan Water District at a duly authorized election shall have obtained the assent of their respective electors.

There is the requirement that an election shall be held. The law does not require that any election be held before the money is appropriated or expended. This requires an election to be held before the money is expended.

More than that, the language of the amendment is such that I am sure the chairman would have given consideration to it—what kind of an election can be held which the city of Los Angeles and the Metropolitan Water District shall jointly take part in? This amendment has to do with an election, "a duly authorized election," at which the electors will authorize two entities—the city of Los Angeles and the Metropolitan Water District shall be joined—

The assent of the electors as required by the statutes and constitution of the State of California.

What business has Congress in an appropriation bill to declare what the constitution and statutes of California require?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the well-established foundation for this rule. It has, time after time, been said in passing upon a question of limitation that the House has complete authority to refuse to make an appropriation——

Mr. CRAMTON. Absolutely; there is no question about that. The House may go so far as to say that the use of an appropriation is dependent upon some certain facts, but this goes further and requires the happening of an event which can never happen. There never can be a joint election held by these two entities.

Further than that it goes on and says that the constitution and statutes of California require that the city of Los Angeles and Metropolitan Water District shall obtain the assent of their respective electors. How do we know, why should Congress say what the statutes of California require? These are things outside of the opinion which the Chair just started to render. I am emphasizing the fact that it goes far beyond the limit. It restricts the discretion fixed in the Secretary of the Interior by the Boulder Dam act—fixes certain requirements that would bind the Secretary of the Interior. Boulder Dam act left certain things to his discretion. The main purpose of the amendment is to take away that discretion. Even beyond that, even if it were in order to take away the discretion, certainly it can not be in order to declare here what the statutes and the constitution of California require as to the assent of electors of Los Angeles.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, may I make one observation. This rule, I assume, is the Holman rule, a limitation on the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not the Holman rule; it is a limitation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SWING. I submit that the amendment requires the city of Los Angeles to vote upon building a transmission line, which is no part of the Boulder Dam project, and which is no part of the contract between the Federal Government and the city of Los Angeles.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that that is the declaration of the Attorney General in his opinion to the Secretary of the Interior on that very point, wherein he says that the city, acting through its department of water and power, will be under the necessity to construct transmission lines over which the power for which it has agreed to pay may be transmitted; but in so far as the parties to this contract are concerned, it is under no obligation to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has much sympathy with the view that the precedents of the House go far in the matter of sustaining limitations, but if the House chooses in making an appropriation to impose an impossible condition, a condition impossible in law, impossible in fact, impossible of fulfillment in any way, the Chair thinks that the precedents of the House hold that such a limitation may be made upon the specific appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the Chair to one decision, and then I am through. I refer to the House Manual, page 366:

> In construing a proposed limitation, if the Chair finds the purpose to be legislative, in that the intent is to restrict executive discretion to a degree that may be fairly termed a change in policy rather than a matter of administrative detail, he should sustain the point of order.

That was rendered by Chairman LUCE on January 8, 1925.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is familiar with that line of cases.

Mr. CRAMTON. That describes this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. They refer to cases which affect the duty of officers of the Federal Government, where it is sought to change existing law with reference to the power, or the duty or the authority of a Federal officer by imposing a limitation which would compel him to execute the law or perform his functions in a particular way. The Chair would not construe the pending amendment as one changing in any way the duties of the Secretary of the Interior. It does not affect the duties of the Secretary of the Interior, but simply says that before any part of the appropriation can be used, a certain state of facts shall exist.

Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be very glad to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the only thought that I have in mind is this—I am in sympathy with the older decisions of the presiding officers just referred to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. Those decisions were consonant with the idea that a limitation could not invade the discretion of an executive officer, nor can there be a limitation on an appropriation bill that in its effect is new legislation.

This amendment in effect is new legislation in that it prescribes a new condition which does not exist in the present law. It violates the existing Boulder Dam act in that it prescribes the legislation under which this appropriation may be voted, whereas under the Boulder Dam act there are limitations prescribed by which that appropriation can be made and only those limitations. The House is now attempting under this limitation to accomplish by indirection something it can not accomplish by direction, which is legislating. If we want to carry the law of limitations on appropriations to the extreme that you legislate, then of course the Chair will sustain any and every thing. The amendment under consideration is legislation in its direct effect, and nothing else. There is nothing in the existing Boulder Dam act which says that the appropriations for the carrying out of that authorization shall be subject to the electorate of Los Angeles. The conditions on which those contracts shall be made and the appropriations had are fixed and stated in the law. In this amendment you are changing that law. Then, in an appropriation bill, in the form of a limitation, you might change any existing law, if the provisional ruling is adhered to. There will be no end to appropriation-bill legislation, under the specious guise of limitation. In my opinion this is legislation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, it goes farther than changing existing law. Under an existing law a contract has been entered into between the United States and a certain city. If the provisions contained in the amendment now under consideration were enacted, it would then destroy the terms of that contract and impose new conditions, to wit, the holding of certain elections in accordance with the terms contained in the amendment itself. This amendment is not analogous to the cases cited by the chairman where an appropriation was limited awaiting a decision of the Court of Claims. There something was existing, something that had to happen. Nor that of an appropriation for naval construction should not be made unless a naval limitation conference was called by the President. The conference could be called by the President, but here you have not only an existing law as suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but a contract already entered into, all under that law, between the Government and the city of Los Angeles. This not only changes the laws, but changes the terms of an existing contract.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as offered should read, if it does not, in the Chair's copy "at duly authorized elections" rather than at an election. That refers to the argument made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. It is not pertinent to the point of order.

So far as the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is concerned, that this amendment would nullify or require amendment to contracts already negotiated, I call the Chair's attention to the fact that nothing of the sort would be the result of this amendment. This amendment would simply give the United States a guaranty which should have been required, and will not affect the contracts. Further, Mr. Chairman, it is a limitation for only a year and imposes no additional obligation upon the Secretary whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Hon. Frederick C. Hicks, of New York, on January 6, 1923, within the memory of the present occupant of the chair (Cannon's Precedents, sec. 8744), rendered a very exhaustive opinion on the subject of the inclusion of a limitation in an appropriation bill. At that time he had the collaboration of the Speaker of the House and of the leading parliamentarians in the House. In the course of that decision Mr. Hicks said:

> Without endeavoring to lay down any hard and fast rule, the Chair feels that the following tests may be helpful in deciding a question of order directed against a limitation, first having determined the powers granted or the duties imposed by existing laws:
>
> Does the limitation apply solely to the appropriation under consideration?

In this case, of course, it does. I quote further:

> Does it operate beyond the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made?

In this case it does not. I quote again:

> Is the limitation accompanied or coupled with a phrase applying to official functions; and if so, does the phrase give affirmative directions in fact or in effect, although not in form?

It gives no directions here as to official functions. It does not even change the duty of the Secretary of the Interior. Again, I quote:

> Is it accompanied by a phrase which might be construed to impose additional duties or permit an official to assume an intent to change existing law?

Clearly, the amendment does not attempt to do that. Quoting again:

> Does the limitation curtail or extend, modify or alter existing powers or duties, or terminate old or confer new ones? If it does, then it must be conceded that legislation is involved, for without legislation these results could not be accomplished.

The pending amendment does not offend against this test.

Chairman Hicks concluded by saying:

> If the limitation will not fairly stand these tests, then the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. DOWELL. What is that citation that the Chair has read as controlling in this case? Does not the amendment change existing law, and therefore does it not come within the rule that the Chair has just read?

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair thought the question pertinent, the Chair might suggest that the amendment itself is at least in harmony with the theory of the existing Boulder Dam project act. But the Chair does not think that is a pertinent question. It is a limitation only upon, and it relates only to, the appropriation in this bill for a single year, and it does not operate beyond this fiscal year or change the duties of any officer of the United States, or impose any new duties upon any officer, but simply lays down a limitation that no part of the money shall be used unless and until a certain state of facts exists.

Very reluctantly, because of the Chair's own views, but in view of the precedents of the House, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it matters not how widely you may differ from the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS], and I often differ with him, yet I think the Members of the House who on many occasions have listened to him will concur in this statement that no Member presents his views in a clearer, abler, more logical, and more courteous manner than does he, and I confess when one listens to his arguments he finds himself very much in the attitude of Agrippa when he exclaimed, "Almost thou persuadest me." [Applause.]

Now, with reference to the wisdom of imposing a limitation like this amendment seeks to do. If Members of the House have read in the hearings on this bill the searching inquiries and pungent comments by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], you must have been impressed with the fact that these contracts which the Secretary of the Interior feels give promise of a money return sufficient to refund to the Federal Government all sums expended in the building of Boulder Dam, are contracts resting largely on mere faith and confidence as to what may be done or what may happen between now and the completion of the Boulder Dam project. The Secretary assumes that present estimated net earnings of one of the lessees, with no assets other than its earnings, will continue for the next eight years and that all moral obligations and promises will be faithfully kept.

I doubt whether any unbiased reader of the hearings on this bill will conclude, after mature reflection, that the contracts on which the Secretary bases his judgment of money returns are so drawn that they constitute absolute enforceable contracts, but, rather, I think you will find they fall in the class of "possible voidable contracts"; voidable in the sense that contingencies may arise or happen before or when the Government shall have completed its construction of Boulder Dam, where what now seems to give promise of money returns, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior sufficient to cover all obligations assumed, will be unenforceable until and unless the city of Los Angeles shall take the necessary steps to meet certain statutory and constitutional requirements; and why?

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman has mentioned me. Permit me to assert that in the hearings I endeavored to develop the facts without fear or favor, in order to determine whether the law was being complied with. I was impressed in the development of those facts with the conviction that the Secretary of the Interior, in very, very difficult circumstances, has succeeded remarkably well, on the one hand being obliged to negotiate a contract that would in 50 years return the cost, and on the other hand being required to hold open for any future demand power desired by the two States—Nevada and Arizona.

On the one hand, requiring a rigid contract, and on the other hand requiring to hold something open, an entire uncertainty, so that when the Secretary reported that he had contracts which, in his opinion, through the sale of 64 per cent of the power, would repay the cost, and then had, as a margin of safety another contract for 36 per cent of the power, I was fully satisfied that he had performed his duty as well as was humanly possible.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the gentleman accurately quotes what he may have said at some time during the hearings. He has not, however, I submit to him in his statement just made, quoted to the House all that he said questioning the sufficiency of the contracts made by the Secretary. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that I may be permitted to select from the hearings some questions asked and comments made by the gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from Indiana, and the gentleman from Tennessee, and insert them later under extension of remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest that five minutes should be sufficient.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I have given most of my time to questions, and I will likely have to yield for further questions, since I have no desire to place my views before the House without permitting those who may differ with me from asking pertinent questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, may we not agree upon a limitation of time for this amendment and all amendments to the paragraph?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Well, I am asking for only 10 minutes.

Mr. WOOD. I do not intend to object, but let us agree now.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I finish? And then the gentleman can make his request.

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

Mr. ARENTZ. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. There can be no continuation of debate unless the gentleman from Alabama is permitted to continue after the expiration of five minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama to proceed for 10 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I trust in the quotations which the gentleman inserts he will differentiate between my statements before the contract was amended and after.

Mr. ARENTZ. That is the thing I wanted to refer to.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I shall certainly endeavor to do no injustice to any member of the committee, because I recognize that the members of the subcommittee who conducted the hearings deserve the thanks of the House for the very thorough way in which they wrote into the hearings everything they felt was pertinent and informing and which might help the House in its deliberations. I commend the committee for having conducted perhaps one of the most thorough and complete hearings with reference to Boulder Dam that it has been my pleasure to read on any important subject. It is full of information.

I do not call attention to the comments and questions by the committee for the purpose of doing any injustice to members of the committee but simply to show that those gentlemen talking over the table to the Secretary and his advisers felt some hesitancy and expressed doubts as to the legal efficacy of the contracts to accomplish the purpose the Secretary had in mind.

Without in any way intending to reflect upon the Secretary, since it is but a human element I call attention to and such as one might refer to before a jury, permit me to say the Secretary was in an embarrassing position. Here was a matter that California was deeply interested in, and you had conferred on him very plenary powers, involving judgment and discretion. He is a Californian. The President is a Californian. The head of the Reclamation Service, who was also to be consulted, is a Californian. The assistant to the head of the Reclamation Service is a Californian. The gentleman selected to solicit the necessary contracts is a Californian. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior is a Californian.

I submit then that when we come to determine for the Nation the efficiency of a contract or contracts drawn by friends, who may perchance unconsciously lend too great faith, too great force to promises of Californians, it behooves Congress to be careful, and I submit that while to some of you the proposed limitation may seem to be stronger than you now wish to impose, you will find, I venture to predict, before you have finished making appropriations for Boulder Dam that you will require exactly what this limitation seeks now to do. You may postpone it; you will not omit it. Why? Because if you will read the opinion of the Attorney General you will find that this contract, on which the Secretary of the Interior bases his estimate of returns sufficient to compensate the Government for all moneys appropriated is largely dependent on the contract of an agency of the city of Los Angeles, namely, its water and power bureau, whose only assets are receipts from the sale of water and power, and which agency now has a bonded indebtedness, I am informed, of about $78,000,000, and whose properties in the way of tangible effects are vested in the city and not subject to its debts. There is no obligation under any of these contracts, binding at present on the city of Los Angeles, by which you could compel the city of Los Angeles, when you complete Boulder Dam, to build the transmission line. Yet the transmission line is the key to every contract that the Government has made or may make, if the obligations of the lessees are to be kept.

I wish to invite your careful reading of that very able statement made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], a member of the committee, appearing in Wednesday's RECORD, who

like myself voted for this project and who like me wants to push it forward, believing it will serve in a helpful way a great public purpose.

Yet, friendly as we are to the project and to the supplying of funds to begin its construction, there are sound business considerations and legal reasons which you can not ignore, and which impair and make doubtful the contracts that have been obtained and on which the Secretary of the Interior—perfectly honestly, I grant—bases his hope and expectations that sufficient funds will be realized to retire all of the expenditures which the Federal Government may make.

When you come to deal with a sovereign—and you are dealing with a sovereign when you deal with the city of Los Angeles—you must bear in mind the limitations that its over sovereign, the State of California, has imposed upon it. You will find that the gentleman from Arizona, whether you now agree with him or not, has correctly cited limitations imposed by the constitution, and statutes of California on the city of Los Angeles, which must be met and complied with before any enforceable contract can be entered into, binding the city to provide funds for the building of the necessary transmission lines as contemplated.

I know the representatives from California acted in good faith when they stated to the committee that the city of Los Angeles will take the steps necessary to provide funds for the construction of the transmission lines, but the Government has the right and it is our duty to require that every legal step be taken to secure an absolute enforceable contract.

Let me here quote a very apropos comment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], appearing in the hearings in connection with these contracts, when he said:

There is many a person who would give anything he had in the world for a good-filled larder, but after he gets it he is not so anxious to pay for it.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LEA. Does the gentleman know of any method under this contract by which the city of Los Angeles can secure the power and the water without paying for it?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The trouble about it is this: That when the Government builds this dam and is prepared to deliver to the lessee the power it has agreed to take it will prove of no avail unless the city has constructed at that time the transmission line which the contract contemplates it will build. If the Government should find itself in that condition, I invite the gentleman as a California lawyer to tell the House what rights and remedies the Government would have to enforce this contract against the city of Los Angeles. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment compels the city of Los Angeles to hold a bond election for the purpose of building a transmission line from Los Angeles to Boulder Dam, which line is not included in the contract between the Government and the city of Los Angeles and for which the city of Los Angeles may not desire to issue bonds, but it may, and I think it will, desire to construct the transmission line out of the revenues of the bureau of light and power.

This amendment does not in any particular add to the legality of the contracts. It does not in any particular relate to the contracts. It is not proposed that the contracts shall be voted upon, approved, or ratified. It is merely substituting the judgment of Congress for that of the city as to how Los Angeles shall manage its own business, particularly its fiscal and power business. What right or necessity is there for us to do that?

The Secretary of the Interior in appearing before the Appropriations Committee made it definite and certain that in his opinion the bureau of light and power would have ample means not only to pay the Government for the power but also to pay for the machinery and also to pay for the transmission lines. The financial sufficiency of these contracts have been passed on and approved not only by the Interior Department but also by the Budget, by the President, and by a majority of the Committee on Appropriations. They have found that the revenues of the city of Los Angeles derived from its power business would be sufficient to meet all of these obligations, both direct and indirect, which the city will have to make in order to avail itself of the Boulder Dam power. The commissioners of the bureau of light and power have likewise found that their revenues will be sufficient to meet these obligations, and the city council of the city of Los Angeles has found that the current revenues will be sufficient. Now, in order for the city of Los Angeles to hold a bond election, under the laws of the State of California, the very first thing the council must record in its minutes is a finding of fact to the effect that the revenues of the city and of the bureau of light and power are insufficient to meet the proposed expenditures. This they can not truthfully do.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I can not. I have only five minutes.

They have already found to the contrary and the facts are otherwise. They can not truthfully make a finding of fact that the revenues will be insufficient when all the evidence shows that the revenues will be sufficient. Therefore, if this proposal is adopted you have tied up this appropriation to something which can not happen, and which, if it could happen, would not add a single scintilla to the legality or effectiveness of the contract or to the rights of the Government under the existing contracts.

I am going to quickly call your attention to the facts shown on these charts which were prepared by the Interior Department after exhaustive study of the entire situation.

There are three contract agencies now under contract with the Government, the Metropolitan Water District, the city, and the company. Assuming, as shown on chart 1, that only two of these agencies go through with their contracts and the third one fails entirely, and those two take only firm horsepower, which would be 64 per cent of the entire firm horsepower, those two contracts alone will meet all of the obligations due to the Government under the Boulder Dam act.

This second chart [indicating] shows a sale of 64 per cent of the firm horsepower, plus the secondary power, which is fixed by the Secretary of the Interior at a price of 0.5 of a mill per kilowatt-hour, which is so cheap that no one can produce steam power in competition with it. This shows that two contracts taking 64 per cent of the firm horsepower and the secondary power will meet all of the obligations due the Government in 50 years, including the $25,000,000 flood-control appropriation. Coming down to this chart showing the sale of the entire electricity, plus the water, all of which is provided for under these contracts, you get a provision whereby the Government gets back all of its money with 4 per cent upon all of it, including the $25,000,000 allotted to flood control, gives to the States of Arizona and Nevada $62,000,000, and leaves a surplus besides of $66,632,000. And after the full and complete repayment to the Government you will still own this great revenue-producing project product by which you will have solved once and for all, the flood-control problem upon the lower Colorado River.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arizona rise?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. To submit a unanimous-consent request. By mistake the amendment which was submitted to the Chair contained the language "at a duly authorized election." It should have been "at duly authorized elections," and I ask unanimous consent that the change may be made.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona) there were—ayes 29, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

For a topographic survey of the proposed Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, for expenditure by the Geological Survey under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the computation and adjustment of control data; the office drafting and publication of the resulting maps; the purchase of equipment; and for the securing of such aerial photographs as are needed to make the field surveys, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $25,000.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: Page 33, after line 8, insert:

"Any unexpended balance in the appropriation for topographic surveys of the boundaries of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N. C., and Tenn., contained in the 'second deficiency act, fiscal year 1929,' is continued and made available for the same purposes during the fiscal year 1931."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, after line 17, insert:

"George Washington, birthplace, national monument, Wakefield, Va., for an additional amount for removing the monument marking the

birthplace of George Washington to a new site, including a road around the monument and landscape treatment of said monument site as provided by the act of January 23, 1930, the fiscal years 1930 to 1931, $15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the widow of Edward T. Sanford, late an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, a sum equal to a year's compensation at the rate received by him at the time of his death, $20,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana what is the policy of Congress as to voting a salary to the widows of the Justices of the Supreme Court? I notice that you provide here compensation for the widow of the late Justice Sanford, but there is no provision for the widow of the late Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. WOOD. I will state that there are four precedents in the last 20 years for this, and the practice is followed only in cases where a special need is shown.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the policy is to make the appropriation only when there is need for the honorarium?

Mr. WOOD. That is it.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the reason why the committee has not provided it for the widows of any other Justices—it is only in case of certain circumstances where the widow needs it?

Mr. WOOD. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fees of United States commissioners and other committing magistrates acting under section 1014, Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 591), fiscal year 1930, $50,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have examined section 591, title 18, and do not find any provision in that paragraph as to the fees the United States commissioners shall receive for committing criminals for trial. Is that a correct reference or is it an inadvertence?

Mr. WOOD. That is the language we have been following in the bill heretofore.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that the increase is owing to the large number of violations of the Volstead Act?

Mr. WOOD. A great deal of it; I do not know that all of it is.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the total amount paid commissioners and committing magistrates for violations of the law?

Mr. WOOD. I have not those figures here. The total appropriation is $600,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of bailiffs, etc.: For bailiffs and criers, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1930, $40,000.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not desire to detain the House, but I want to call attention to the fact that this deficiency bill carries over $10,000,000 additional appropriation, all due to prohibition and the Volstead Act.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in the last few minutes, before I had an opportunity to rise, you have appropriated for the superintendents of prisons an additional $52,000; $135,000 additional for judges and for United States commissioners, for committee magistrates another $50,000, for bailiffs and criers, $40,000, for miscellaneous expenses in the courts $396,000; and within a few minutes you will vote for and approve approximately additional ten millions for penitentiary and prison camps at Leavenworth and Atlanta and for new jails, including additional pay and appropriation for more judges, more bailiffs, more clerks, more marshals, more commissioners, more magistrates, more district attorneys, more penitentiary guards; yes, for additional jail superintendents and officials; to say nothing about additional tremendous appropriation for the Coast Guard Service for new speed and gun boats, and this is all in addition to the already tremendously large appropriation that has been made early in the session of this Congress. I am satisfied that if all the appropriations made for the fiscal year, or the cost of enforcing the Volstead Act would be computed, it would be found that we have appropriated over one hundred millions for this fiscal year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman's figures may be correct, but that increase is not all due to prohibition. As a matter of fact, the increase of prison population by reason of the Dyer Act concerning theft of automobiles has been as great as the increase due to prohibition.

Mr. SABATH. I stand corrected that it is not all due to prohibition. However, I still maintain that about 90 per cent is due to prohibition.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, a few minutes ago I looked over the appropriation for the Army and the Navy for the following year after I entered Congress and I find that we are appropriating this year more money for enforcing prohibition than we appropriated at that time for the Army or for the Navy. We expended for the Navy in that year about ninety-six millions and for the Army about one hundred and twenty millions; I may have the figures reversed, but those are about the figures, and, as I have stated, the amount that will be expended due to prohibition this year will exceed either of these two amounts.

When the Volstead Act was being enacted the advocates assured the House and the country that the cost of enforcing it could not reach $1,000,000. It is over one hundred times that amount now, and I repeat that if you will appropriate two hundred or three hundred millions in endeavoring to enforce the prohibition law you can not enforce it, because the great majority of American people are not in sympathy with it—in fact, are opposed to it—and resentment against it grows and increases daily. The man who takes a glass of beer or wine is classed as a criminal. Congress could be charged with criminal extravagance by voting ever-increasing appropriations for prohibition enforcement.

A few months ago, to relieve the tremendous overcrowding of our penitentiary, we have voted over eight millions for new buildings; here again we are voting additional millions for more buildings to provide additional room for those that have been apprehended as criminals because they have made or sold some home-brew or somehow been guilty of minor violations of the Volstead Act. For the professional bootlegger and manipulator you would not need to increase these penitentiaries—very few of them are convicted; it is invariably the small and unfortunate fellow who has no means of securing expensive lawyers.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, by increasing the border patrol and Coast Guard Service, prohibition inspectors, agents, and snoopers and increasing the number of judges in every section of the country and by giving judicial powers to commissioners or by approving additional expenditures for jails and penitentiaries you will still not be able to house all those sentenced or convicted without forcing them to sleep four in a cell made for one, in hallways as well as in basements.

Mr. Chairman, within the last few weeks I have read several reports where the State and county and city officials have refused to accept in their jails and workhouses any more Federal prisoners and the reasons they assign are that they are overcrowded and that they can not find additional room.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think that it is high time that you stop and listen and place your ear to the ground, but, of course, there is none so deaf as he who will not hear nor so blind as he who will not see. It seems to me that you are in that position—you do not wish to see or hear what is transpiring. The prohibition leaders charge that the Literary Digest poll, which shows that the country is overwhelmingly in favor of repeal of the eighteenth amendment or the Volstead Act, was not accurate, but since that time a few elections have been held and the people had an opportunity to vote directly, and if you do not know what the results were, ask the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FORT. I am satisfied that what happened in New Jersey will happen in Illinois and in the majority of States where that question will be raised. How many of the Members of Congress, had they known what prohibition would bring about, would have voted for prohibition? Very few indeed. To-day you know the conditions and are not courageous enough to take a firm stand. Though I admire nearly all of you personally, I feel that I will be deprived of the pleasure of serving with many of you who refuse to rectify or right the serious mistake that has been committed. Only this morning I have read where not only the laboring men but physicians, lawyers, business men, and other organizations, in their meetings and conventions, have gone on record demanding the repeal of the prohibition amendment.

If instead of appropriating additional millions, you would listen to reason and repeal the Volstead Act, which Congress has the right to do under the Constitution, and adopt some sane regulatory law, you would do the country a great service, and I repeat that passing laws that make easier and speedier convictions of prohibition violators and by building new jails and penitentiaries to satisfy Bishop Cannon and the prohibitionists you will not relieve the present deplorable condition, and you know it; but I realize the futility of my efforts to convince you,

but time will tell. We are about to adjourn, and you are going home, and you will then realize the situation, as I have every reason to believe that in the November elections, wherever there is a contest and where the people will be permitted to cast their vote according to their convictions, that they will vote for men who will stand for the repeal or at least modification of the prohibition law because they realize that in that way, and in that way only, can they secure action for which they have been clamoring. They are fed up on prohibition—they want to return to sanity, sobriety, law, and order.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I agree with much that the preceding speaker has stated. If in the future the prohibition fanaticism should increase to such a degree in this country that the Congress adopts the Texas theory of putting the purchaser of a gill of distilled liquor or a bottle of 2.75 home-brew in jail for five years, we will have to appropriate several hundred million dollars to build penitentiaries and provide for additional court machinery and enforcement officers. That idea is advanced in Texas, where the eighteenth amendment was conceived.

I suggest that instead of advocating putting the purchaser of a gill of distilled liquor or a bottle of 2.75 home-brew in jail for terms up to five years, in the name of law enforcement and respect for the Constitution, that those strong advocates of that vicious prohibition legislation, particularly from the State of Texas, the cradle of the eighteenth amendment, advocate legislation along the lines of the Dyer bill, with an amendment providing for antiburning as well as antilynching, so that we might enforce provisions of the Constitution that were incorporated many years before the eighteenth amendment was ever thought of.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman spoke of prohibition fanaticism. It is now a quarter past 5 o'clock and we are trying to pass this appropriation bill before we adjourn to-night. What kind of fanaticism is it that leads men to make wet speeches here in the House at this time of day?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It is not any fanaticism at all. I suppose if some of the devoted disciples of Politician Cannon, who ought to be forced before a committee of this House to testify under oath about his nefarious activities in the last election, should take the floor and expound the Cannon theories of the eighteenth amendment, it would be highly satisfactory to the gentleman from Michigan, who is one of the dry leaders of the House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman might reply to the gentleman from Michigan that that fanaticism is caused by the appropriations for judges and district attorneys and marshals and sheriffs and jails.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Absolutely; and in the debate on the floor of the House on this appropriation bill it is highly proper to take the floor and express our views. I do not take the position that some legislators do on great questions, such as prohibition, that of riding along on both sides of the fence. I sincerely hope that the Judiciary Committee will before this Congress adjourns report out legislation having for its ultimate purpose the modification of and the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and laws enacted thereunder, so that the membership of the House can go on record and send word out to their constituents and the rest of the country how they stand on this important question prior to the forthcoming elections.

Mr. SHAFFER of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, for a second time a Virginia citizen has been ambushed here on the floor of the House and stabbed in the back. I want to say that I hold no brief for Bishop Cannon. He did not support me in my campaign, but made speeches against me. I am not here to defend Bishop Cannon. He needs no defender. He can defend himself. However, I believe, as the American people do, in fair play. I admire, as the American people admire, a bold and fearless man. I condemn, as the American people do, cowardice. Say what you will about Bishop Cannon, he is bold and fearless and can take care of himself. Go out in the open, meet him, and strike him from the front.

What was the purpose of the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] and the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]? They are a fraud and a deception. They attempt to hide behind the great American principles of separation of church and state, pure and honest elections, and the protection and immunity thrown about Members in this Chamber for the purpose of hitting prohibition in the dark, but the American people will not be deceived. Yes; it is an attempt to persecute a bishop, to cripple the great Southern Methodist Church, and to destroy prohibition.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], charged Bishop Cannon with violating the law and with embezzlement. Unless he goes out in the open and repeats those charges he will be condemned in the eyes of all fair-minded American citizens as being unfair, a coward, and a slanderer; and I challenge him to go on the soil of old Virginia and denounce one of her citizens in the open.

The gentleman from Wisconsin saw fit to follow in the footsteps of the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, no one will be deceived by his speech, as it is all done for the one purpose of hurting prohibition and giving to the wet press another opportunity to strike Bishop Cannon and prohibition.

I believe that the assaults of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Wisconsin elevated prohibition and Bishop Cannon in the sober minds of the people of the South.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] has cited on different occasions certain statistics which he has received from police headquarters in different States to the effect that there are more drunken drivers arrested to-day than in 1918. The gentleman cites these statistics to lead the country to believe that there is more drunkenness to-day than under the old régime. A man who believes this has had but little experience. The gentleman ought to compare drunken drivers to-day with drunken riders in former days. There is not one drunken driver to-day to where there were thousands of drunken riders in the old days. The gentleman would have us repeal the eighteenth amendment, throw the bars down, give the boys all the liquor they want, and thereby reduce the number of drunken drivers.

This is but an example of the logic of the wet Representatives on the floor of the House. If we should adopt their policy, our highways would be drenched with innocent blood from end to end. The figures given us by the gentleman are not evidence of an increase in the quantity of whisky used but show the high standard set by our people for the observance of law and order. They are but evidence of law enforcement. In the olden days but little attention was paid to a drunken man. An old judge once gave an instruction as to how drunk a man should be before he should be arrested therefor:

> Not drunk is he who from the street can rise again and drink once more, but drunk is he who from the street can neither rise nor drink once more.

In other words, if a man could stay out of the ditch he was allowed to go home, and in many cases the officers themselves assisted him on his way.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] would tell the country that there is more liquor to-day than ever before. I want to say that from my own observation and experience there is one drop of liquor to-day to where there were barrels in the old days. We can remember that during those days we would see more drunken men on one court day than we have seen all together since we have had national prohibition. During barroom days it was unsafe for a lady to go out on a public day, and we have all seen more misconduct, such as street fights and so on, in one public day than we have seen all together since we have had national prohibition.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] tells us that there are 30,000 speak-easies in New York. The gentleman from the same city [Mr. SIROVICH] disagrees with him and places the number at 100,000. They should have told the country that there are a hundred thousand open saloons in their city. Mr. SIROVICH is also deeply concerned about the quality of liquor sold in his city, and complains loudly of the fact that industrial alcohol is denatured and that the bootleggers of his State are selling this poisonous liquor. But who is to blame for this condition and situation in New York? These gentlemen from New York would have you believe that prohibition and the Prohibition Department are responsible for this condition and that prohibition is a failure, but I say it is the State of New York violating her obligation under the Constitution.

We will analyze the facts and see what the situation is. The Government of the United States never engaged in police regulation. The police power was retained by the several States. The Government did not have and does not now have governmental machinery with which to enforce police regulation, and can not enforce the same without radical changes and a great multiplicity of officers at a tremendous and unnecessary cost to the people of the country. The drafters of the eighteenth amendment knew this fact and therefore made it equally the duty of the Government and the several States to enforce prohibition by appropriate legislation.

I know this position will be challenged by able wet lawyers. Therefore, I will insert the clause of the constitution in the

RECORD so that the country may judge the duties of the several States.

The first paragraph of the eighteenth amendment declares the great principle of prohibition and makes it applicable to the entire country.

The second paragraph in this connection is all-important, and it reads as follows:

The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I leave it to the people of the country as to the interpretation of this clause and as to the duty of the several States thereunder.

The Government assumed its obligation and enacted the national prohibition act, while several States have failed.

For example, New York has violated her obligation and has nullified the constitution in that State and in a large measure throughout the entire country by repealing the State enforcement act. I want to analyze this condition in order that the country may see the true situation.

According to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], we have to deal with, say from 30,000 to 100,000 speak-easies in New York. The Government of the United States has in that State the following officers to deal with this proposition:

Four district courts with 17 judges and approximately 350 prohibition agents. So you see at a glance the impossibility of 17 judges and 350 officers dealing with such an aggregation of criminals and wide-spread violation of the law.

On the other hand, we will look at the power New York could wield in dealing with this question, if she saw fit to discharge her obligation under the Constitution.

New York has approximately the following officers:

Judges of courts	209
Police judges	304
Justices of the peace	3,543
Total	4,056
Police officers	22,500
Other peace officers	7,500

In other words, a bootlegger can stand on the street corner in New York in the presence of 22,500 police officers and sell liquor in violation of the Constitution, and it is not their official duty to interfere.

A steamship can sail into the harbor of New York, loaded with intoxicating liquors to be sent throughout the entire country in violation of the Constitution, and unload the same in the presence of approximately 30,000 peace officers, and it is not their official duty to interfere. Can you beat such a condition? Is there any wonder that New York has nullification, and whose fault is it? Ah! you wet Representatives from New York should never speak the words "prohibition" or "constitution."

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] represents a State with a similar record. Wisconsin has approximately 2,000 peace officers, and it is not their official duty to assist the 38 Federal prohibition officers in that State.

We will look at this situation from a practical and real standpoint. Suppose the department should abandon all the country but New York and send the entire 2,200 Federal prohibition agents into the State, and suppose these agents should purchase intoxicating liquor from one violator in each of the 30,000 speak-easies. We would then have 30,000 criminal cases and 30,000 padlock proceedings or civil cases, making in all 60,000 cases. It would take the 17 Federal judges 15 or 20 years to dispose of these cases, while on the other hand it would only take the 4,000 State courts of New York from 10 to 15 days to dispose of all these cases.

This comparison demonstrates the wisdom of the lawmakers in making it incumbent upon the several States to assist in the enforcement of prohibition.

I admit that the prohibition conditions are not what we want them to be, but they are a thousandfold better than ever before. It is easy to criticize, denounce, condemn, and tear down, but we are building for the future, and no amount of unwarranted and unjustified criticism can deter us. My State (Virginia) was the second State to ratify the eighteenth amendment, and she will never repudiate that action.

Intoxicating liquors have been outlawed, and making, manufacturing, or drinking intoxicating liquors in the home, or elsewhere, violates not only the spirit of the Constitution and the law, but the very letter thereof, unless the same was legally acquired.

The eighteenth amendment was indelibly written into our organic law, not by big business but by the churches and moral forces of the country. Prohibition will ever be guarded by these same forces together with our modern business. Prohibition owes big business nothing. Our modern business owes prohibition all. Some would minimize the influence of the church on our national life, but it is immeasurable. The church is the cornerstone of our economic life and civilization.

I strongly favored transferring the Prohibition Department to the Department of Justice and thereby place the development of cases in the hands of the men who will prosecute them, and I believe in giving the Attorney General full power and authority and to place under his control all the power and resources of the country in order to suppress this illegal traffic.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] would lead the country to believe that we intend to destroy the first and fourth amendments to the Constitution.

No one wants to deprive a man of his right of free speech as guaranteed in the first amendment, but men in high places ought to be careful in exercising that right when what they say may lead to violence, breach of the peace, and, possibly, bloodshed. No man is justified under this amendment in lending encouragement to crime and criminals throughout the country.

The fourth amendment guarantees the people to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures. No prohibitionist wants to in any way disregard or violate the sanctity or security of the home.

All searches made under the national prohibition act must be reasonable; otherwise they are void. The national prohibition act provides:

No search warrant shall issue to search any private dwelling occupied as such unless it is being used for the unlawful sale of intoxicating liquor.

In other words, the officer who seeks a search warrant to search a private residence must furnish an affidavit that whisky has been sold in the residence, and is now being sold therein, before a United States commissioner will issue a warrant. I submit that this is not unreasonable and in no way violates the spirit of the fourth amendment and in no respect invades the sanctity of the home. If a man converts his residence into a saloon, why should it not be searched? The time has now arrived when law and order must triumph over crime and criminals.

The gentleman above referred to would have the country believe that prohibition is a failure, but I want to say that in my judgment prohibition has done more good for mankind generally in this country than any law placed upon the statute books in all our history. It has made possible untold blessings to all our people and made it possible for many homes to have luxuries where in former days there existed want, privation, and suffering. Under this prohibition system our people have better homes than any other people on earth. We have more radios, automobiles, telephones, better schools, colleges, libraries, hospitals, and churches than any other people in the world, and above all our women and children have more, are better cared for, and are happier than those of any other country in the world. All made possible by prohibition.

In conclusion I want to say to the wet Representatives that the legalized liquor traffic may be brought back to curse my home and my children and the children of this Nation by your vote and your influence, but it shall never be brought back to curse your homes and your children and the children of this Nation by my vote and my influence. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Consolidated prison industries working capital fund: For an additional amount for the consolidated prison industries working capital fund, fiscal year 1931, $500,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 41, line 5, after the figures "$500,000" add the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for purchase of material or equipment for the manufacture or repair of mail bags or other classes of articles produced at the Mail Bag Equipment Shops at Washington, D. C., at any United States penal or correctional institution."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope the committee will accept this amendment. The gentleman will remember that when we considered the bill providing construction of new penal institutions and the general prison bill, the House adopted an amendment which is now part of the law, to the effect that the workshop of the prison should not be so operated as to reduce the output of any Government shop, arsenal, or mail-bag repair shop.

Since the committee has provided this item in the bill preparations have been made in the mail-bag repair shop in Washington to decrease the force. In other words, if a worker resigns or dies he will not be replaced; and it is pro-

posed now to take two foremen of the Washington shop and assign them to set up a repair shop in the Federal penitentiary at McNeil Island. I have no criticism to make as to the zeal and industry of the present Superintendent of Federal Prisons, who is asking to establish these shops. That is his job. He has only one side of the question to look at. We have to look at both sides, and it is just as necessary to provide for honest men and women the means of earning an honest living as it is to keep the inmates of prisons employed. [Applause.]

I do not think Congress wants to go so far at this time as to establish a new mail-bag repair shop in one of the penitentiaries if it means to abolish the present mail-bag repair shop in Washington.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Was not that adopted in the last bill that we considered for penitentiaries?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and I do not want to see the purpose of the amendment avoided.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, it would apply only to the McNeil Penitentiary?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If my amendment is adopted, as I hope it will be, the appropriation can be reduced by $32,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us whether there are any transportation facilities at McNeil Island, where it is proposed to establish this new mail-bag repair shop?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; but I appeal to the House to support this amendment. The shop is in Washington, D. C. Let us not put these men and women out of business by establishing competition with those confined in a penitentiary. They are getting little enough pay as it is.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Has not the subcommittee of the gentleman's committee appointed to investigate the penitentiaries of the United States reported against this practice, and have they not recommended a change in the practice?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is purely a governmental function. It will result in a very great saving to the Government, and it will give some kind of employment to these men who are incarcerated in these prisons. Not to do so would be more inhuman than to deprive somebody of some labor. This paragraph does not propose to take one day's work away from anybody. The provision is that there shall be no person discharged from the institution. In order to impose no hardship at all, there will be no discharges, and everybody who is now employed there will be retained at work; and the law requires it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand they are preparing to dispense with that shop.

Mr. WOOD. Oh, no. There will not be a single person discharged there. Every person now employed there will be continued there as long as he or she desires to work, so that there will be no hardship on anybody, and under the law they can not compete with anybody on the outside.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent the Atlanta district where one of these Federal penitentiaries is located. We have in that prison over 3,900 prisoners. They have very little to do as it is. I think it would be very unfortunate if any further handicap were placed on the authorities in regard to providing work for those men confined there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I suggest to the gentleman that he support my amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think we ought to further handicap the Department of Justice in furnishing employment to prisoners in our Federal institutions. The greatest menace to the administration of prisons is idleness. They have not sufficient work now for the men in the Atlanta prison, and the authorities ought to be able to give them additional work, in consequence of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York some time ago and adopted by this House. This item is simply to allow them to carry on the industries they have there now.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I dislike very much to antagonize the committee on any of its proposals, but, supplementing what the gentleman from New York has said, I would like to quote from a letter addressed to me by employees in the mail-bag shop in this city, just one sentence to show what is going on, to show how this work of making and repairing mail bags is being diverted to convict labor. This is the first paragraph of the letter:

> We as Government employees from the mail-equipment shop feel that an injustice has been done by the influence of the Department of Justice and by consent of the Post Office Department in allowing the work of the mail-equipment shops to be taken from us, or from honest people walking the streets of the District of Columbia seeking employment, and giving it to convicts at Atlanta, Chillicothe, Leavenworth, or McNeil Island.

That, according to this statement, is going on at the present time, and if the policy of the committee is carried out, there is no guaranty that any of the work will be maintained here. On the contrary, there would seem to be every reason to believe that the work will be taken away.

Mr. WOOD. The gentleman does not want to misrepresent the facts.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No, I do not.

Mr. WOOD. We have the absolute assurance, and I do not think the Department of Justice would make a promise to this committee or to this Congress which it does not intend to keep, that there will not be a single person employed in this station that will be discharged. They can have work as long as they live.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I know that the gentleman believes that, but what I have quoted is from a statement of people in whom I have confidence, who are on the scene. The fact is that officials come and go. Agencies of the Government are continually changing. The gentleman from Indiana, the eminent Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, says he has assurances. Assurances are not written into law, and nobody can foretell how soon it may be possible, whatever the assurances may be, that the conditions will become such that the work here will be transferred to McNeil Island, and the people here deprived of the occupation in which they are now engaged.

It is stated in the hearings that McNeil Island is a convenient point for distribution. I understand it is on the water between Olympia and Seattle and has no rail service, and no service of any kind in the way of transportation, in or out, except a boat line which operates three times a week. I do not know why that place should have been selected.

Mr. MILLER. I will say to the gentleman there are a number of daily boats to and from McNeil Island.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I made my inquiry of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I, of course, defer to the gentleman, but I made inquiry of the Interstate Commerce Commission which has the schedules covering all transportation routes, and the reply to my inquiry was that there are no rail lines to McNeil Island, and the service by boat line is three times a week.

Mr. MILLER. It is true there is no rail line, but I am thoroughly acquainted with conditions there, and there are plenty of boat lines.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, simply to call attention to the danger of hastily, under some idea of sympathy, adopting an amendment to an appropriation considered. It is suggested that the adoption of the LaGuardia amendment would close the present duck mill at Atlanta.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; it is not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Because it says that—

> No part of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of material for the manufacture of mail bags produced at the mail-bag shops at Washington.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman wants to be fair. My amendment goes to the paragraph, and the gentleman knows that we read appropriation bills by paragraphs. It reads:

> For an additional amount for the consolidated prison industry working capital fund, $500,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. And a part of this money is to be used to buy material for the making of duck at Atlanta.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All I have to say is that I wish all the gentlemen would give as much attention and effort to finding work for honest men and women as they do finding work for prisoners. Vote it down if you want to. I do not care. The responsibility is yours. You will protect prisoners who do not need it, and you will not do anything for the men and women on the street.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the last two pro forma amendments are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAGUARDIA) there were ayes 16 and noes 55.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prison camps: For the construction and repair of buildings at prison camps, the purchase and installation of machinery and equipment, and all necessary expenses incident thereto, and for the maintenance of United States prisoners at prison camps, including the same objects specified under the caption Support of United States Prisoners in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1931, $750,000, to be expended so as to give the maximum amount of employment to prisoners.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to prolong the debate, but I think the RECORD should carry this statement from the hearings on the deficiency bill with reference to the mail-bag item discussion. Mr. Bennett in the hearings made this statement:

We must start slowly at first as we can not curtail the production of the mail equipment shops here in Washington. We merely get the increase over present output of the mail equipment shops. No employee now on the Government pay rolls is to lose his job through our activities.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Probation system, United States courts: For an additional amount for salaries and actual expenses of probation officers, including necessary office expenses, as authorized by section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 726), fiscal year 1931, $175,000.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I just want to take a minute, Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, to congratulate the House and the committee upon their wonderful work in carrying out the recommendations of the prison commission appointed in the Seventieth Congress. I want to say that every one of the increased appropriations and the appropriation for a new prison in the northeastern part of the United States, the parole system, and the probation system were recommendations of that commission.

Personally I am not in favor of sending people to jail. A great deal of my time is taken up in trying to get them out of jail. I believe that many men and women who are now confined in prison should not be there at all. They ought to be in hospitals. If the Congress will stop creating new penal offenses and give the prison and penitentiary building program a chance to go forward, so we can catch up with new buildings to properly care for those now incarcerated, much good will result. We will then be able to have proper accommodations for the prisoners instead of having them sleep in basements and corridors.

I think the Congress and the committee are to be commended for the expedition with which they have responded to the recommendations of this commission, but in order that the fruits of their work may be appreciated I hope the Congress will cease passing additional laws providing for jail sentences for the inhabitants of the United States for at least 5 or 10 years, then we can catch up with and improve the present accommodations.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I fully agree with what the gentleman says in reference to these appropriations. I think the House owes the gentleman from New York and his associates on the special prison commission a vote of thanks for the great work they did with reference to these important questions, which resulted in the passage of these appropriations.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, Forestry, and Animal Industry: For the expenses of an Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, Forestry, and Animal Industry, to be held in Washington, D. C., in 1930, as authorized by Public Resolution No. 63, approved April 14, 1930, including salaries in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, rent in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, exhibits, transportation, and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), official cards, entertainment, and such expenses as may be actually and necessarily incurred by the Government of the United States in the observance of proper courtesies, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $25,600.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: On page 51, after line 23, insert:

"Eleventh annual convention of the Federation Interalliee des Anciens Combattants, District of Columbia: For the contribution of the United States toward the expenses of entertainment, while in the United States, of delegates from foreign nations participating in the eleventh annual convention of the Federation Interalliee des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930, including compensation of employees, travel, and subsistence of per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), stenographic or other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of necessary books and documents, printing and binding, entertainment, official cards, rental, operation and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such other expenses as the Secretary of State shall deem proper, to be expended by the national treasurer of the American Legion under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

One hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Va.: For the expenses of inviting foreign governments and individuals to participate in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Va., to be held in 1931, and for the expense of entertaining the guests of the United States as provided by the public resolution approved May 14, 1930, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, travel expenses and subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, stenographic and other services by contract, if deemed necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), purchase of equipment, hire, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, printing and binding, official cards, entertainment, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, $25,000, to remain available until June 30, 1932.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: On page 52, after line 17, insert:

"Land at Punta Paitilla, Panama Canal Zone: For the payment, as authorized by the act entitled 'An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone,' approved August 24, 1912, for land at Punta Paitilla, Panama Canal Zone, acquired under the provisions of the convention concluded November 18, 1903, between the United States and the Republic of Panama, for the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, fiscal year 1931, $160,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. This is not an ordinary $25,000 appropriation, which we should not stop to consider at this late hour, but it involves an appropriation of over $100,000. I think there should be some explanation.

Mr. WOOD. It is for the purpose of paying for land we took in Panama and which has been occupied by the Army for many years. The amount that was agreed upon, with interest, was $163,000, but they have agreed that if this item is included in this bill they will take $160,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Agreed with whom?

Mr. WOOD. With the State Department; the Government of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand, this is a claim by some property owners against the United States because the Government poached on their lands?

Mr. WOOD. No; it is property taken by our Government, and the Government has never paid any rental for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many years ago was it taken?

Mr. WOOD. I understand it was taken in 1918. It has been occupied by the Army and they have not been paying for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It seems passing strange at this late day, when we took possession of the Canal Zone in 1900, that 30

years afterward a claim should be unearthed against the United States Government, and that they are willing to discount that claim $60,000 if they are paid at once.

Mr. WOOD. No; they are only discounting it $3,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. That makes me more inclined to raise the point of order or to oppose the amendment.

Mr. WOOD. If the gentleman will read the document of the State Department, he will find this statement:

Acting under its rights contained in the convention, the United States on November 30, 1918, acquired for defense purposes 50.6 hectares, or 125.3 acres of land, which belonged to the Bermudez family of Panama. When the United States and the owners of the land failed to agree on the price to be paid for same the matter was submitted to the joint commission established by the convention for appraisal and settlement, and the commission being unable to agree, it was referred to the umpire for decision. On May 8, 1920, the umpire rendered a decision in favor of the claimants, awarding them $101,200 for the 50.6 hectares of land acquired and an additional $1,200 for the occupancy during five years of other land estimated at 100 hectares, making the total award $102,400, with the condition that the sum awarded should bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum after June 8, 1920, in the event that the award was not paid by that time. The United States refused to recognize the validity of the award on the ground that the umpire based his decision upon the value of the land at the time it was acquired, whereas the convention provides that the appraisal of private lands and property and the assessment of damages to them shall be based upon their value before the date of this convention.

The award of $102,400, with simple interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, from June 8, 1920, to June 8, 1930, a period of 10 full years, would amount to $163,840. The American minister to Panama advised the Secretary of State on June 6, 1930, that claimants definitely agree to accept $160,000, foregoing additional interest, provided that final payment is made within six months, and the estimate submitted herewith is for the purpose of making settlement on that basis.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman, who is a shrewd bargainer, think it is a good settlement to just throw off $3,000 on a claim of $163,000, when the State Department stated they did not think the award was based on a proper foundation?

Mr. WOOD. But they afterwards determined that it should be settled upon that basis, and I think it is a good deal better to save the $3,000 rather than to let the interest run along and in the end pay more than the $163,840.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, personally, I do not think it is a good bargain at all. I thought the gentleman was a good, shrewd bargainer, but in this instance I can not agree with him.

Mr. WOOD. I want to say to the gentleman I did not make this bargain. It was made by the State Department, and they think it is the best bargain they can make. Perhaps, if the gentleman and I were to go down there we might fix it up better.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman went to Florida and has a record so far as the Mediterranean fruit fly is concerned, and I know if the gentleman had anything to do with this claim he would not agree to any cut of only $3,000, but would say, "Take $100,000 or nothing."

Mr. GREEN and Mr. COLLINS rose.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. In many respects the gentleman's visit to Florida was a great benefit.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman benefits any section he visits, not only Florida, but anywhere in the United States, and the gentleman has been instrumental in saving the Treasury of the United States $25,000,000 or $30,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. And we hope the gentleman is going to help us get some reimbursement.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman stopped a big steal down in Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ship claims of former German nationals against the United States: For carrying out the provisions of the settlement of war claims act of 1928, approved March 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 254), so much as may be necessary is appropriated, to be available upon the date on which the awards of the war claims arbiter in respect of the merchant vessels *Carl Diederichsen* and *Johanne* (including any equipment, appurtenances, and property contained therein), are certified for payment to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to remain available until expended, to pay said awards, plus interest thereon at the rate of 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1921, until date of such payment: *Provided*, That the aggregate amounts paid, exclusive of interest, shall not exceed in the case of the *Carl Diederichsen* $166,787.78, and in the case of the *Johanne*, $174,600.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: Page 54, strike out lines 1 to 15, inclusive.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, these claims have been settled under a previous paragraph. They had the option to determine how they should settle them, and they elected to settle them under a paragraph which has already been passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the word "exceeding," in line 20, and the word "herein," in line 21, of page 59, will be corrected.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

New York (N. Y.) post office: The act of March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1660), authorizing and appropriating $1,500,000 for the acquisition of a cite for an annex to the New York, N. Y., post office, is hereby amended to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional land for the enlargement of the post office, New York, N. Y., from the Pennsylvania Railroad & Tunnel Co., being the remainder of the blocks bounded by Eighth and Ninth Avenues and West Thirty-first and West Thirty-third Streets, not now owned by the United States, subject, however, to the right of said railroad company, its successors and assigns to retain, occupy, and use, the subsurface of the above-described property for its railroad and station purposes, said rights to be specifically defined in the contract of conveyances of the property, under such terms and conditions as are satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, at a total cost not to exceed $2,500,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, lines 7 and 8, strike out the following words: "From the Pennsylvania Railroad & Tunnel Co."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

St. Louis (Mo.) post office, etc.: The limit of cost fixed in the act approved March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1661) is hereby increased from $400,000 to $1,500,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the site as enlarged the land needed by the city for street-widening purposes in exchange for the land vacated by the closing of streets which traverse the enlarged site.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the item providing for $1,500,000 to purchase ground for a new post office in St. Louis is for a much-needed project; in fact, it is properly classed by the building commission as an emergency. When I tell you that for the want of space it has at times been necessary to handle parcel-post mail in the boiler room of the present building you will realize the conditions existing in St. Louis. As has been pointed out by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General in his testimony before the committee, St. Louis, next to New York and Chicago, is the most important mail-distributing center in the country. This because we are the gateway to the great Southwest.

No train ever passes through St. Louis. It either makes up or discontinues its run in that city. Therefore you will see that all mail directed to the Southwest, or, in fact, to any part of the country, brought to St. Louis by rail must be rehandled in my city. We have a headquarters for the Railway Mail Service there. We also have a terminal division there. As was pointed out in the hearings, that while this post office is to be constructed in St. Louis, it is not alone for the post-office needs of that city but space must be provided for the handling of the mails that are directed through St. Louis.

The plans provide for a building some 800 feet long and over 500 feet wide. They are to consider bringing the mail cars in the building for loading and unloading, and also going to provide a roof where they hope in time to have the air-mail planes land. It has been shown that right now the Post Office Department can save $175,000 a year by the construction of this building.

It is a striking example of the way the new building law is working to the benefit of the Government. Had the building been constructed 15 years ago it would have saved an amount sufficient to meet the cost. The people of St. Louis are spending $87,000,000 for improvements, one of the projects being a plaza in front of Union Station, and this new building will face that plaza. It will be a credit to the Government as well as to the city.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stuttgart (Ark.) post office, etc.: For acquisition of site and construction of a building under an estimated total cost of $95,000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in the early part of this session I introduced a bill for the building of a post-office building at Stuttgart, Ark. Stuttgart is a city of about 5,000 inhabitants and is situated in the heart of the fine rice belt of Arkansas, which can not be surpassed by any place in the United States or elsewhere. There are several of the largest rice mills in the United States situated and operating in this city.

No finer people can be found in the world. The receipts of the post office at Stuttgart were shown last year to be more than $33,000; I have not had the report on their receipts for this year just past, but I am sure they have increased. They have been handling the post office there in a small room, and it is a compliment to their efficient postmaster that he has handled it so well under the adverse conditions that he had to contend with, and with no room to work and handle the large mail that comes through this office. It has been their hope and dream for years that the Government would build a nice post-office building in this city and with the passage of this bill it will soon be no longer a dream but a reality. There is another city in this county that should have a post-office building very soon, and that is the city of DeWitt. It is a nice, growing city, nearly as large as Stuttgart, and I hope to see a nice post-office building there very soon. It is my belief, and I shall not be satisfied until every county site and every city of importance has its own post-office buildings. It is economy to do this. The buildings, when built, will stop the payment of the heavy rentals that the Government is now paying and beside that it will give better efficiency in the handling of our mails, that every man is vitally interested in. I hope the bill will pass without a dissenting vote.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sweetwater (Tex.) post office, etc.: For construction of a building under an estimated total cost of $130,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, we have just passed without a dissenting vote an appropriation of $100,000 to construct an adequate post-office building for the city of Coleman, Tex., and an appropriation of $130,000 to erect a proper post-office building in the city of Sweetwater, Tex.

I am deeply grateful to and thank my colleagues for allowing these two appropriations to pass without objection. My worthy constituents who are citizens of these two enterprising cities duly appreciate this generous consideration shown them. They have patiently waited a long time for these public necessities.

This action to-day successfully terminates a long fight I have unceasingly waged for these two buildings ever since I first entered Congress, and especially since the Federal building program was resumed in the Sixty-ninth Congress. With my service that began March 4, 1917, in the Sixty-fifth or war Congress, all building activities were suspended for 10 years to permit the Government to recuperate from its enormous war expenses.

The up-to-date, enterprising cities of Breckenridge, Eastland, Ranger, Cisco, Ballinger, Lampasas, and San Saba, in my district, all had meritorious claims for buildings, and it would be wise business judgment and sane economy for the Government to own its buildings in all of them; but the United States owned no building sites in them, while for years the Government has owned suitable building sites centrally located in both Coleman and Sweetwater. Inasmuch as the appropriations proposed in the building program would permit not more than two buildings to be allocated in any one district just now, I felt that the claims of Coleman and Sweetwater were superior by reason of the sites already acquired there, so I had their buildings allocated first.

The people of Coleman and Sweetwater are greatly indebted to Senator SHEPPARD for the help he has so generously and untiringly given me in this matter. He has promptly responded each and every time I have called on him. He has several times left his arduous office work and gone with me to the Post Office Department to present in detail and argue at length the claims of Coleman and Sweetwater with Governor Bartlett, the then First Assistant Postmaster General. He has gone with me to the Treasury Department to see the then Assistant Secretary Schuneman and Supervising Architect Wetmore. Whenever I have called on him Senator SHEPPARD has immeditely dropped everything and gone with me, lending me his time, aid, and help in every way possible.

When the proposal in the building program first came before us for Congress to delegate its power and authority to the Post Office and Treasury Departments to determine and say where new buildings should be located I was against that provision, as I was afraid that politics would prevent a fair distribution of buildings to the various districts. Then I was definitely assured that both Coleman and Sweetwater would be placed in the building program. Hence, when S. 4663, carrying the new building program, was passed in the House on February 7, 1927, under suspension of rules I supported and spoke for it, then calling attention to the fact that my promised buildings had been assured. Likewise, when H. R. 278 was passed by the House on December 17, 1927, under suspension of the rules, I spoke for it and again called attention to the fact that the assurance of buildings in Coleman and Sweetwater caused me to support the bill. My colleague Mr. HUDSPETH then mentioned from the floor my getting the building for Sweetwater, and my colleague Mr. BUSBY then mentioned that I had opposed the proposition until I had been promised my two buildings.

On February 2, 1929, I spoke for 20 minutes in the House and called attention to the fact that I would soon retire from Congress and that the departments must keep faith with me and provide buildings for Coleman and Sweetwater. On February 27, 1929, buildings were duly allocated to Coleman and Sweetwater, which constituted authority for appropriations to be made therefor; and I retired from Congress five days later, on March 4, 1929. And I am happy to be back here to-day when we have voted the two specific appropriations for these buildings at Coleman and Sweetwater which assures their prompt construction. And so ends the usual long delays and Government red tape incident to all building construction.

I must mention one ludicrous incident: As soon as Governor Moody called the recent special election in my district Mr. Venus Earl Earp announced against me for Congress, thinking that with him running from the west, Judge Dean from the south, Mrs. Lee from the east, and Judge Long from the north, they could keep me from getting a majority, and then might defeat me by combining forces against me. Learning, however, that the candidate receiving the highest number of votes would be elected, a majority not being required, Venus got cold feet and withdrew. But before withdrawing he wrote a circular letter to lawyers on April 22, 1930, telling them that my enemies in Congress would not allow an appropriation for Sweetwater's building to be passed if I were elected, and also telling them that the farmers would be too busy to leave their farms to vote in the special election, and he believed there was a possibility of his being elected if the lawyers would organize the towns against me. Venus was right about the farmers being busy with their planting, for only a few voted, but they made their votes count. I did not lose a vote at Hodges and Swenson in Jones County, or at Camp Colorado in Coleman County, or at Bitter Creek in Nolan County, or at Marie in Runnels County, or at Fir in Eastland County, and my majority was 110 to 1 at Oplin in Callahan County. If at an election Venus would seek to take advantage of farmers busy planting their crops, he might in Congress try to take advantage of them, and the farmers of my district are going to resent Earp's form letters he addressed to "Dear Brother Attorney."

While official duties keep me here busily engaged in Washington Venus is having the young lady in his office go to various business men to get the names and addresses of their acquaintances in my district, and, when they will stand for it, takes their letter heads to his office and writes strong letters boosting himself for Congress, and then has them to sign and mail them. Thus numerous form letters written on the stationery of the West Texas Retail Druggist Association, and signed Lawrence Davis, its president, have been sent to numerous druggists who have resented this attempt to inject their organization into partisan politics. This letter asserts that Mr. Venus Earl Earp has the best law practice in the city. This amusing information will interest some of his creditors who have informed me that he would not pay his bills they held against him. This form letter also asserts that he was "one of the disabled who came back from France," indicating that he was wounded in battle, which is not correct. The draft act was passed May 18, 1917, requiring all men between 21 and 30 to register under the draft. Thereafter on August 13, 1917, Mr. Venus E. Earp enlisted at Fort Sam Houston giving his age as 21 years and 5 months, was sent to Georgia, then sailed April 19, 1918, and was transferred to Depot Division July 26, 1918, attended Army candidates school, Langres, France, from July 29, 1918, to September 24, 1918, was returned to the United States May 13, 1919—armistice occurring November 11, 1918—and his military

record shows that he was not wounded or injured in any way while in the service. The Government allowed him adjusted compensation of $1,579, and I helped him for several years with his claim for compensation for disabilities he claimed to exist. And he will not deny that I exhausted every means possible in his behalf. But he must not claim wounds that never were inflicted.

I must mention another amusing thing about post-office buildings before I conclude. My home city of Abilene must have enlarged quarters for both post-office and Federal-court facilities at the earliest date possible. Mr. F. A. Blankenbeckler, of Cisco, is the Republican committeeman for the seventeenth district of Texas. He has tried to make our Abilene citizens believe that they could get such a building right away through him and State Committeeman R. B. Creager. He junketed to Houston to see Mr. Creager, when he was lately there on business, and junketed to Dallas to see our friend Jack Philp while he was visiting there, and he thought that Abilene would junket him to Washington. They ought to have known that if he could reach up in the skies and pull down Federal buildings at will, he would have long ago pulled one down for Cisco, where he lives. And Abilenians ought to have known that if Mr. Creager could hand them out, he would have long ago handed one out for Brownsville, where Mr. Creager lives. Our colleague and minority leader of this House, Mr. GARNER, has succeeded in getting a needed Federal building for Brownsville, but the appropriation for it is in this same bill we are passing now, which at the same time appropriates for Coleman and Sweetwater, and Mr. Creager would not want to take the credit for it away from Mr. GARNER.

Every Member of this Congress knows that neither Mr. Creager nor Mr. Blankenbeckler have anything whatever to do with locating Federal buildings. This was a cheap attempt on the part of F. A. Blankenbeckler to try to discredit the Representative in his own congressional district, just as other attempts have been made to try to discredit our colleague, HARRY WURZBACH, from the San Antonio district. Blankenbeckler reported in my home city that Abilene would get a new $400,000 building immediately, as he had gotten Jack Philp and Mr. Creager to approve it, and his great achievement was heralded in the Abilene Reporter-News just a few days after my election.

While I was campaigning preceding the special election, different Abilene chieftains of the Republican organization there were spreading the report that they would get a building for Abilene before BLANTON got back to Congress. All of the above was pure political bunk and misrepresentations made to injure me.

Hon. John W. Philp, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General of the United States, is my classmate and my personal friend, and he is the personal friend of all of the other Members from his own State of Texas, and he would gladly assist any and all of us on every just and meritorious project we were interested in, and he did not make any such promise to Blankenbeckler or to anyone else. He knows that with all conditions most favorable and with the greatest dispatch possible, it will be 1931 before the enlargement of Abilene's building can be made.

The people of Abilene are my loyal, faithful, dependable friends and have done much for me and they have confidence in me and they know that I will go the limit for them all away down the line and that they need have no uneasiness about their best interest being well cared for by me at all times.

Abilene has a building already, even if it is old, wholly inadequate, containing only half enough room and facilities both for the post office and the Federal court, and I have already arranged for it to get relief in 1931. It can not be arranged sooner. The other worthy cities in my district had no building at all, and Abilene has grown and thrived because it has never been selfish or jealous or unjust, but has always had a friendly feeling for every other growing, deserving city in west Texas, and has rejoiced with them in their every attainment and success, and Abilene did not expect me to provide for it at the expense of all other cities in my big district.

Coleman and Sweetwater came first, because their claims stood ahead of all others. I have arrangements made with the powers that be for Federal buildings to be constructed in Cisco and Breckenridge in December, 1930, when we pass the next appropriation bill, and then after that we will provide for the other cities in my district just as fast as the active building program will permit. Hon. John W. Philp, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, has assured me that he will have the Abilene project carefully surveyed out this summer. But I know that it can not be definitely provided for with specific appropriation before 1931, and I am not going to fool my neighbors in Abilene with any idle promises.

The cities that get results here worth while are those whose chambers of commerce have learned to act through and depend upon their own Representatives in Congress, and not subsidize and be deceived by alleged "handlers of political patronage."

Senator SHEPPARD has helped me present to the departments the meritorious claims of Ranger, Eastland, and Ballinger, and I know that my friend, Senator CONNALLY, will also assist me whenever I need him in every way possible, and it is only a question of time waiting for the building program to justly embrace these projects and those of the other cities in my district. All are to be reached in time, and none are to be overlooked.

Since my opponent, Mr. Venus Earl Earp, missed it so badly when he said the farmers would be too busy to leave their farms to vote in the special election, when enough did vote to elect me, and since he missed it so far in stating that if I were elected my enemies here would not permit the appropriation for Sweetwater's building to be made, when we have just passed the appropriation of $130,000 for Sweetwater without a dissenting vote against it, the people will not pay any further attention to his prognostications. When he enlisted he signed his name "Venus E. Earp." Now he announces for Congress as "V. Earl Earp." I guess that he thought an Earl might fare better than a Venus at the polls. He has written one of my lawyer friends at Anson asking him to procure for him an affidavit from some one about my speaking for the National Democratic ticket there during the last presidential campaign, saying:

> I am going to have some fun down in the lower part of the district, and assure you your name will never be mentioned in the matter at all.

If my speaking for the great Democratic Party would make "fun for him in the lower part of my district," why would not it make fun in all parts of the district? The above is why the people are not taking Venus seriously. Hence, without alarm I may remain here and attend to the business of the people, knowing that they will take care of me when I need it.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Post Office Department Building: For construction of building, under an estimated total cost of $10,300,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this provision.

I dislike very much at this late hour to take up any time and to interfere with the speed with which the bill is going through. But there has been a protest on the floor here to the demolition of the present Post Office Department Building. The item under consideration appropriates for this building an estimated cost of $10,300,000. I wish to inquire of the chairman whether it is the purpose to raze the present Post Office Building and erect another building in harmony with the modern character of architecture?

Mr. WOOD. That is up to the Congress. They can not tear that building down unless we say so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that the purpose of this provision on page 99, lines 15 and 16?

Mr. WOOD. There is not anything in the provision that authorizes the tearing down of that building.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am serious in this.

Mr. WOOD. And I am serious also.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a $10,000,000 item. I think the Congress can find much better use for its funds than tearing down a fine office building and replacing it with a modern building to harmonize with the æsthetic idea of some architects. We have need for office buildings and also for conserving the revenues of the Government. If it is the purpose of this item—and I am directing my query in all seriousness—to substitute another post-office building on the same site for the one now there, I ask the gentleman to inform me and also the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Indiana will yield, the present post-office building is not to be torn down before the new post-office building is erected, and the present language has nothing to do with the destruction of the present post-office building.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has any legislation been enacted which would prevent the present post-office building from being utilized for other departmental purposes?

Mr. CRAMTON. My understanding is that before the present post-office building is demolished, there will have to be specific action by the Congress. In any event I can state positively that it was brought out in the hearings on the bill that it is not contemplated this year or next year to disturb that building.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

> State, War, and Navy Building: For removal of upper story, refacing and refinishing of exterior, and such remodeling and reconstruction of building and changes in approaches as will make it harmonize generally in architectural appearance with the Treasury Building, and for mechan-

ical equipment and changes therein, at an estimated total cost of $3,000,000; and such building shall hereafter be named the Department of State Building.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I am not a student of architecture, and yet the one building that impressed me when I first came to Washington nearly 30 years ago and that has always appealed to me, is the State, War, and Navy Building. It is now proposed to expend $3,000,000 to have the exterior made to conform to the style of architecture of the Treasury Department Building. If there is ever an instance where this Government is going wild in its ideas of conforming to æstheticism, it is in the idea of remodeling the exterior of the State, War, and Navy Building.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman, who has been more active toward this beautification according to the modernization ideas than anyone else in the Congress or the country.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, no. The gentleman does me too much honor. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] is entitled to more credit than anyone else, and I to very little. This is an effort to make effective what Congress ordered in the first place. The Treasury Building ranks among the world's best buildings. It is unfortunately situated, so that it is not appreciated. When Congress authorized the present State, War, and Navy Building, it directed that it should be a counterpart of the Treasury Department Building, the Treasury Department Building being on one side of the White House and the proposed State, War, and Navy Building on the other. But the directions of Congress were not followed. It was a case where the executive branch thought that it knew better, and they put up the building which has met with the praise of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], though not very generally, however, has it been praised. Certainly it does not harmonize with its surroundings. If the instructions of Congress had been followed, it would have been a great deal better. The two buildings then would have harmonized, and that would have meant a great deal in the beautification of Washington. The architecture that resulted no one has ever found a name for.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, just a word. As I view these expenditures, they all tend toward wasteful extravagance. I recall the time when the columns of the Treasury Building, which happened to be in sections, when the Treasury was overflowing with money, were taken away and replaced so that the columns could be in one solid piece of granite, at an expense of millions of dollars. I think we could better afford to withhold the $3,000,000 for changing the façade of the State, War, and Navy Building, and use it for other necessary appropriations, and then if thought best at some time in the future we may have it conform to the architecture of the Treasury Department. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the reservation of the point of order and offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 99, line 19, strike out the paragraph from line 19 to line 26, inclusive.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, if the people of Europe had been as iconoclastic as the modern Washington architects, there would not be a monumental structure in existence between Bordeaux and the Balkans or between the Baltic and the Bosporus. If modern European architects had been as unappreciative of the monuments that came down to them from former generations as American architects are seemingly unappreciative of our outstanding and historic structures, there would not have been left a single example of medieval architecture between the Orkney Islands and Land's End, between Gibraltar and Copenhagen, between Hamburg and Malta, or between Constantinople and St. Petersburg.

The modern architects have done much to improve architecture and make our buildings more stable, beautiful, and useful. They have utilized the philosophy of utilitarism in the construction of residential and business structures. They have designed many edifices of surpassing beauty and harmonious proportions. They have conceived and fashioned monuments of exquisite symmetry and comeliness. I would not withhold from the modern American architect the distinction and full measure of honor to which his genius and accomplishments entitle him.

But I can not refrain from saying that some architects are perhaps more destructive than constructive. Some lay ruthless hands on structures that have come down to us from former generations and that speak eloquently of the culture and attainments of the age that gave them birth. They are legacies from those who preceded us. They typify the conceptions of those who lived in former generations. They embody the ideals and conceptions of beauty, symmetry, harmony, order, and proportions of our forefathers. They are gifts contributed by the never-returning past to the ever-oncoming generations. We should be slow to lay vandal hands on them.

The pending measure, known as the second deficiency appropriation bill, carries an expenditure of over $69,000,000. Of this amount $29,000,000 is for public building. Included in these building projects is one for the construction of a new Post Office Department Building, to cost $10,300,000, after the construction of which the present Post Office Department Building will be torn down.

The destruction of this building has been decreed by the administration forces because it does not harmonize with the æsthetic tastes of a few architectural experts. I am opposed to the demolition of this building. It is one of the most substantial and useful of the many public buildings in Washington. It is probably the most spacious, the best lighted and best ventilated of any of our public buildings. It was erected in 1899, at a cost of $2,500,000, which would now mean $5,000,000 when we take into consideration the increased cost of labor and material.

This massive structure is built of Vinalhaven (Me.) granite, on the Romanesque order of architecture, or an adaptation of the Renaissance type. It was designed by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and is a perfectly good building. There is no more reason why we should demolish this splendid edifice than there is for wrecking the White House and in its place constructing an edifice conforming to the classic Grecian type. This Post Office Department Building will stand for centuries and serve generations yet unborn just as efficiently as the new structure which will be built on classical lines and cost $10,300,000 of public funds. The only objection to this building is that it is of the Romanesque and not of the classical Hellenic type.

Now, why should the Romanesque style of architecture be prohibited in our public-building operations? It is one of the eight great orders of architecture. It originated in the early part of the eleventh century of the Christian era. It was the most popular type for about two centuries—the greatest castle-building era in the world's history. All over Europe may be found examples of this great type of architecture. Its outstanding characteristics are massive stone construction, round-arched openings, stone vaults or arches, molded and carved jambs and archivolts, small windows, and somber dignity.

There are several distinct types of the Romanesque order of architecture—the Italian, French, English, Norman, German, Rhenish, and Spanish. Kenilworth Castle in England, the Cathedrals of Notre Dame, Durham, Speyer, and Pisa are examples of this Romanesque style. Romanesque architecture reflected the bold and rugged spirit of the age that gave it birth, and there is no reason why we should be ashamed of the Post Office Department Building, which typifies this famous building system.

There are many demands for public buildings from all parts of the United States, and it is a wasteful and foolish policy to tear down perfectly good public buildings simply because they happen to represent an order of architecture that is not now popular with modern architects, the Commission on Fine Arts, and the Public Buildings Commission. I wish the people in your districts could see the present Post Office Department Building or a picture of it; and if they did, I am sure they would not approve your vote to wreck it.

Now, in the consideration of this bill we have reached another paragraph that proposes to lay destructive hands on our State, War, and Navy Building and spend $3,000,000 in transforming its exterior so that it may resemble the Treasury Building a few blocks away. To my way of thinking, this proposal is outrageous and a wanton destruction of one of our monumental buildings. This structure was designed by A. S. Mullet, Supervising Architect of the Treasury. It cost $11,000,000. It was completed in 1887, after having been in process of construction 16 years. It is one of the largest public buildings in the world. Its style is Italian Renaissance, the designer, Mr. Mullet, having had a fondness for this type of architecture.

The Library of Congress is said to be one of the most beautiful structures in the world, and it is of the Italian Renaissance type of architecture. The beauty, symmetry, and harmonious proportions of the Library of Congress are probably excelled only by the Taj Mahal, the marble mausoleum at Agra, India, built by the Mogul Emperor, Shah Jahan, in memory of his favorite wife.

The State, War, and Navy Building is probably the most perfect example of the Italian Renaissance order of architecture in America. It is not an ugly building. Hundreds of similar structures in Italy, France, and Spain are venerated and no despoiler's hand will ever demolish them. This building represents one of the eight outstanding orders of architecture which the world has so far produced. From an architectural standpoint its lines are graceful and its details symmetrical. Of course, beauty is essentially a matter of taste and opinion.

There are different conceptions as to what type of building is most attractive. Those who favor the Hellenic order of architecture very naturally fail to appreciate the outstanding qualities of the Romanesque, Saracenic, Gothic, Tuscan, or Renaissance types. What to one man may be a beautiful residence does not necessarily appeal to others. As in nature, we have an infinite variety, so in architecture no one order embodies all that is beautiful, symmetrical, harmonious, or grand.

While my artistic tastes are not cultivated, I can see much to admire in each and every type of architecture. Each embodies exquisite harmony and indescribable grace in some particular. Each system surpasses all others in some respect. Here the column is more graceful, there the capital more richly embellished; here the arch more sublime, there the architrave more rugged; here the frieze more delicate, there the base more sturdy; here the cornice more ornate, there the pediment more beautifully decorated.

The Renaissance order of architecture is that style of building and decoration that originated in the early fifteenth century in Italy. It is based on a modification or adaptation of the Roman-classic orders and design. It spread through western Europe, succeeding the Gothic order. It was the product of the Renaissance period, which marked the revival of European learning, art, and culture, especially a revival of the classical design in letters and art. The Renaissance was the transitional period between the medieval and modern world. In this epoch there was a marked advance in painting, sculpture, and architecture.

This revival was accentuated by the fall of Constantinople, which drove the Byzantine scholars, with their Grecian literature and ideals, into western Europe and was immensely stimulated by the invention of printing and the discovery of America. The term means "a new birth, or revival."

The Renaissance style of architecture for 400 years was the most popular type of construction. A large majority of the famous buildings in Europe, especially in Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, Germany, and England are of the Renaissance type, among which might be mentioned the Ricardo Palace at Florence, the Chateau of Blois, the Louvre, the Tuileries, St. Peter's (Rome), the Luxembourg, the Hotel des Invalides, the Pantheon (Paris), St. Mark's Library (Venice), Blenheim Cathedral and St. Paul's Cathedral (London).

Probably the two greatest architects of all time were Michelangelo, who built St. Peter's at Rome, and Sir Christopher Wren, who built St. Paul's Cathedral in London. In building these monumental structures these eminent architects would not have patterned them after the Renaissance order of architecture had it been an ugly type, as some modern architects would have you believe. I would not consider this historic style of architecture ugly if it satisfied the tastes and æsthetic conceptions of Michelangelo and Sir Christopher Wren.

The State, War, and Navy Building is the one outstanding type of Italian Renaissance architecture in our Capital City, and it should not be despoiled. In the Capital of our Nation it is fitting and proper that we preserve this typical example of a system of architecture that marked the awakening of the world from the lethargy of the Dark Ages.

I do not think that our public buildings should be of one type or follow closely classical lines. I wish that we might have in Washington public buildings representing each of the eight great orders of architecture, with others representing types or modifications of these various systems, so that those who visit our National Capital might see in our public buildings examples of the various styles, orders, types, and systems of architecture. The educational value of buildings of this kind would be incalculable. The men and women and boys and girls who make pilgrimages to the Capital of the Nation could then come face to face with these different types of architecture, and could better understand and appreciate the genius that gave each of them birth.

From a cultural standpoint, what a wonderful city Washington would be if each order of architecture were represented in our public-building program. In the construction of new buildings why not have one example of ancient Egyptian architecture with rock-cut façade, lotus bud and palm columns and capitals proclaiming majesty, solidity, and colossal size; another of the archaic or Doric type, the oldest and simplest of the Greek orders; another typical of the Greek transition type, perchance fashioned after the temples at Ægina, Zeus, or Paestum; or of the Periclean or Ionic type, breathing simplicity, symmetry, and monumental repose, like the Temples of Theseum, the Parthenon, and the Erechtheum, at Athens; or like the Greek-Alexandrian or Corinthian type, ornate and richly decorated, like the Temple of Artemus at Ephesus or the mausoleum at Halicarnassus; or the Greek decadent type, like the temples at Samothrace?

And while we are building, why not have one structure of the Byzantine type, another of the Saracenic, another Gothic. Structures of this kind, typifying the several great styles or orders of architecture, would cost no more and would make Washington the most beautiful and magnificent city in the world.

I call your attention to the architectural features of some of our public buildings in Washington. The Patent Office is of the Grecian-Doric type and the front on F street is an exact reproduction of the front of the Pantheon at Rome. The Treasury Building is of the pure Grecian Ionic order of architecture, with 74 monolithic Ionic columns, modeled after those of the Temple of Minerva at Athens. The Corcoran Art Gallery is of the Neo-Grecian type; the bronze lions at the entrance are duplicates of the Carnova lions from the Tomb of Clement XIII in Rome. The American Red Cross is a classic structure of monumental character, with stately Corinthian pilasters; the Memorial Continental Hall, with its Ionic columns, represents a classic building of the Revolutionary period.

The Pan American Building is of the Mediterranean blend of the Renaissance type, or a combination of the classical Spanish, Italian, and French derivations. The Lincoln Memorial, with its Doric colonnade, is of the classic Grecian-Doric type. The Natural History Building of the National Museum is of the modern classic order, modified by French influence. The old National Museum, though considered an unattractive building, represents the modified Romanesque style. The Freer Gallery of Art is of the Italian Renaissance type. The columns at the Carnegie Institution are Ionic. The Scottish Rite Temple was modeled after the mausoleum at Halicarnassus on the coast of Asia Minor, which was considered by the ancients as one of the seven wonders of the world.

The Interior Building is of the western or modern business type, practically free from ornaments. The Carnegie Library is of Greek and Roman architecture, combining the beauty of the one and the stability of the other. The six Doric columns at the Arlington Mansion were modeled after the Temple of Paestum, near Naples. The Supreme Court room was patterned after an ancient Greek theater. The District Building, with its 16 Corinthian columns, is a structure patterned after the classic order. The Senate and House Office Buildings are of the classic type, as modified by French interpretation. The new Memorial Ampitheater at Arlington is patterned in part at least after the theater of Dionysius at Athens, and the Roman theater at Orange, France. Christ Church in Alexandria, built in 1765, has arches and pediments of the Tuscan order.

On Pennsylvania Avenue, at Seventeeth Street, stands the Court of Claims Building, built in 1859 by William W. Corcoran. It is of the Renaissance style. In 11 niches are statues 7 feet high, of sculptors and artists: Phidias, Raphael, Michelangelo, Dürer, Titian, DaVinci, Rubens, Rembrandt, Murillo, Canova, and Crawford. In front of this structure is a pair of colossal bronze lions, replicas of the famous lions by Canova at the tomb of Clement XIII in St. Peter's, Rome. I am wondering how long this historic building will escape the vandal's hammer.

The White House is an adaptation of the Italian Renaissance type of architecture and was patterned probably after the palace of the Duke of Leinster, near Dublin, or possibly the Vice Regal Lodge in Phoenix Park, Dublin.

We are going mad in Washington in our efforts to destroy every kind of architecture that does not harmonize with the Grecian classic type. If the architects have their way, future generations will have no examples of the monuments of our earlier times. If these modern iconoclastic architects were transported overseas to Cambridge or Oxford, no doubt they would recommend that these ancient colleges be wrecked and replaced with modern structures, although these buildings are the pride and glory of the English race. If these modern architects were sent to France and given control of building operations, they would no doubt wreck the monumental French buildings which have been the wonder and admiration of the ages and replace them with structures reflecting their conceptions of classic architecture.

Be it said to the everlasting credit of the European people that they have preserved their national monuments. Millions of men and women come from all corners of the earth to look

upon these ancient structures. It is a national disgrace that the American people have not preserved their unique colonial and pre-Revolutionary buildings. In our national existence of 140 years, we have in each decade destroyed the monuments created by those who preceded us. Ours has been a policy of vandalism.

A nation that destroys its ancient monuments will not be respected by posterity. There is no reason why every public building in Washington should be patterned after the Hellenic order of architecture. There should be a diversity of types and not a sameness.

Travelers in Europe who visit the ancient monumental buildings typical of different orders or systems of architecture, when they see the magnificent cathedrals, temples, and public buildings, constructed a thousand years ago, are thrilled with interest and admiration. But in America an iconoclastic spirit is abroad in the land, and there is a tendency to destroy everything that is ancient. I hope this spirit will be confined within reasonable limits, and I do hope that when our public-building program is completed, we will have in Washington examples of every great order and type of architecture.

I am opposed to the remodeling of the State, War, and Navy Building. Its value is now in excess of $5,000,000. It is in perfect condition, and will stand for centuries. As an outstanding example of the Renaissance order of architecture, it should be preserved. [Applause.]

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

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 17, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts: For the construction of barracks at Fort McKinley, Me., in accordance with the act approved May 13, 1930, to remain available until expended, $50,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. COLLINS: Page 101, line 25, before the period insert:

": *Provided*, That no appropriation for the fiscal years 1930 and 1931 that may be available for the purchase of wooden furniture for Army barracks, quarters, or other buildings shall be expended for such furniture not wholly constructed out of wood grown in the United States."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. I hope the gentleman will accept that amendment.

Mr. WOOD. No. We can not accept the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. It is not subject to a point of order because it is a limitation upon an appropriation.

Mr. WOOD. I will state the point of order, Mr. Chairman. This is a limitation upon an appropriation in other bills than this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the amendment as offered relates to appropriations for the fiscal years ending 1930 and 1931. That might be elsewhere than in the pending bill. Therefore the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Barbour: Page 101, after line 25 insert:

"That no construction shall be undertaken on that part of Governors Island west of a line running in a northwesterly and southeasterly direction across the island, and coinciding with the western faces of the two wings of the new barrack buildings."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order——

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from California, if this amendment in any way does any more than what was presented to the gentleman from California when I was present, providing for the 14 feet on one of the wings of the main barracks?

Mr. BARBOUR. It permits them to move the buildings up 14 feet, so as to align them with the wings of the main barracks. As it is now, under the existing law, they would have to keep them back 14 feet.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will recall, there was a mistake made in the measurements——

Mr. BARBOUR. Three hundred feet instead of 314. It should have been 314 feet.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is just the one wing? You are not going to bring all your buildings up to that, are you?

Mr. BARBOUR. Not all of them, but it permits them to build up to that line. The amendment that was offered by the gentleman from New York to the War Department appropriation bill provided that no construction should be at a distance of more than 300 feet westerly from the front line of the barracks building. Now, this permits them to line them up with the wings of the building, which extend 314 feet back from the front line of the building.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the proposed amendment the support of the War Department?

Mr. BARBOUR. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. It is at their request. Some of us are trying to preserve Governors Island, as it will be used eventually, for a terminal airport, a landing spot. As soon as the General Staff heard of this movement they started building all over the island. In order to prevent that a dead line was drawn across the island, south of which no buildings can be constructed. The engineers, I will not say the engineers of the Army, in measuring it made a mistake of 14 feet, and, as I understand, this will simply permit the two wings of this building, that have been constructed, to remain there lawfully. I did not understand they were going to build a whole string of buildings down there.

Mr. BARBOUR. No. There is a hospital building which they are erecting near-by, and if this provision is not made and, under the law as it now stands, they will have to move it back 14 feet, out of alignment. They desire to build it on a line with the rear ends of the wings of the barracks building. There will be no building built west of a line running in a northwesterly and southeasterly direction across the island, and coinciding with the western faces of the two wings of the new barrack buildings.

Mr. STAFFORD. This conforms to and carries out the idea of the gentleman from New York, the author of the original amendment?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And does not propose to encumber the lower end of the island any more than is estimated here?

Mr. BARBOUR. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that the form does not quite fit the place at which it is offered.

Mr. BARBOUR. I had intended to offer it on the next page, but it seemed that this was the proper place to offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. If it were preceded by a reference to Governors Island, leaving out the word "that," the Chair thinks it might be better.

Mr. BARBOUR. Very well. I will modify the amendment to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 101, after line 25, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Governors Island, N. Y.: No construction shall be undertaken on that part of Governors Island west of a line running in a northwesterly and southeasterly direction across the island and coinciding with the western faces of the two wings of the new barracks building."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Marker at New Echota, Ga.: For every expenditure requisite for or incident to the erection of a marker upon the site of New Echota, capital of the Cherokee Indians prior to their removal west of the Mississippi River, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 28, 1930, $2,500, to remain available until June 30, 1931.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: Page 106, after line 4, insert:

"Marker or tablet to Col. Benjamin Hawkins: For every expenditure requisite for or incident to the erection of a marker or tablet in Crawford County, Ga., commemorating the life and public service of Col. Benjamin Hawkins in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1930, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PANAMA CANAL

Maintenance and operation: Toward the construction of a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal as authorized by the act approved May 27, 1930, $500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In doing so I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon this bill, especially on the item just read, relating to the construction of a ferry and highway across the Panama Canal, as authorized by the act approved May 27, 1930, and to include as a part of my remarks quotations from the hearings on that act and quotations from the report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reporting the bill; also a cablegram received by me from the President of Panama touching the enactment of said measure, and my response thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the second deficiency appropriation bill for the present session of Congress is a very important one. It carries appropriations for various departments of the Government and for many of the independent establishments. At this time I venture to call attention of the House to certain items of appropriation carried in the bill which may be of interest.

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF THE MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

One of the items carried by the bill is the following:

Geological survey

For a topographic survey of the proposed Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, for expenditure by the Geological Survey under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the computation and adjustment of control data; the office drafting and publication of the resulting maps; the purchase of equipment; and for the securing of such aerial photographs as are needed to make the field surveys, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, $25,000.

This appropriation is being made to cover the cost of a topographic survey of the Mammoth Cave National Park area in the State of Kentucky. In May, 1926, Congress enacted a measure, of which I had the honor to be the author, authorizing the creation of this national park upon condition that the necessary cave properties and lands be conveyed to the Federal Government without cost to it. As I have heretofore indicated to the House at the present session, by popular subscription and by the enactment of legislation by the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky the necessary funds have been provided to cover the cost of this property, and the same is in the process of being purchased and otherwise acquired for national-park purposes. The maximum boundary under the act of Congress referred to is 70,618 acres, the same to include the original world-famed Mammoth Cave and the various other great cave units of that section.

In order to have the boundaries laid down with sufficient accuracy to enable the purchase of the necessary surface lands, it appears to be necessary to have a topographic survey made of the general area involved. To this end recently I made request of the Interior Department, the National Park Service, the Geological Survey, and the Southern Appalachian National Park Commission that there be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget the necessary item for the appropriation which will be required for this survey; and then aided in presentation of the item to the officials of the Bureau of the Budget. Thereupon, the Bureau of the Budget and the President, in due course, submitted the estimate to Congress with recommendation for such appropriation to be made in the sum of $25,000; and, accordingly, it has been included in this appropriation bill.

I need not repeat what I have heretofore said on the floor of the House concerning the great benefits which will be derived by our people through the establishment of the Mammoth Cave National Park. It is sufficient to state that I have every reason to believe that within a comparatively short time this great scientific recreational area, containing, as it does, the most extensive cavern systems in the world, will be thrown open to the public under the very efficient supervision of the National Park Service, and that thereupon, with the improvements which will take place under that supervision, it will become the most popular of all our national parks.

PANAMA CANAL FERRY-ROADWAY

Mr. Chairman and members, I call attention to another item carried in the pending appropriation bill, as follows:

The Panama Canal

Maintenance and operation: Toward the construction of a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal, as authorized by the act approved May 27, 1930, $500,000, to remain available until expended.

This item is also a very important one. It was my pleasure to introduce and press to enactment the act of May 27, 1930, referred to in the appropriation item.

Under authority to do so, I include as a part of my remarks touching this item, quotations from the hearings on the bill (H. R. 4293) before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on December 28, 1929, and also certain portions of the committee's favorable report on the measure. I believe that they may prove of interest.

The following quotations are from the committee hearings:

STATEMENTS OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY, AND COL. HARRY BURGESS, GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. DENISON. We will now take up the bill H. R. 4293, introduced by Mr. THATCHER, to provide for a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal.

The bill referred to is as follows:

[H. R. 4293, 71st Cong., 1st sess.]

"A bill to provide for a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is authorized—

"(a) To establish, maintain, and operate, near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal, from a point at or near Balboa on the eastern side of the canal to a suitable point on the opposite shore of the canal, a ferry for the accommodation of the public and adequate to serve military needs, and for such purposes is authorized to acquire such ferryboats and other equipment, and to construct and maintain such wharves, docks, and approaches, as may be necessary; and

"(b) To construct and maintain a highway for the accommodation of the public and adequate to serve military needs, to extend from the western terminal of such ferry to a point at or near the town of Arraijan at or near the Canal Zone line.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Panama Canal, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, is authorized to make rules and regulations governing the operation, use, and maintenance of the ferry, equipment, wharves, docks, and approaches established, acquired, and constructed under this act. Any person violating any such rule or regulation shall be punished by a fine of not to exceed $100 or by imprisonment for not to exceed 30 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(b) The ferry and highway provided for by this act shall be operated and maintained free of tolls.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to establish the ferry and construct the highway provided for by this act, and there are authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

* * * * * * *

Mr. DENISON. The purpose is to provide means by which Panamanians can cross from one part of their country to the other, which they do not have now. Governor, we will be glad to have you make a statement on this bill, giving the committee the benefit of your views and recommendations in respect thereto.

Colonel BURGESS. The Canal Zone, as you know, cuts the Republic of Panama half in two. The city of Panama is east of the canal, while the bulk of the agricultural section of Panama is west of it. The United States has never provided a suitable crossing over the zone to connect with the improved roads of Panama and with the city of Panama. In other words, we have a very poor trail that has been somewhat improved connecting the town of Paja with the city of Panama, and a very inadequate ferry service. In fact, the ferry service consists of an old barge towed by a gasoline launch. As a matter of duty, or moral obligation, the United States should provide a connection between the improved roads of the Panama Republic, so that the

eastern half of the Republic can be in contact with the western half. To this end we should provide a suitable ferry service. There have been constant demands for the erection of a bridge, these demands coming both from Panamanian organizations and American organizations. They believe that a ferry service is inadequate; but, in my opinion, for the present volume of traffic a ferry service is adequate. Doubtless, if Panama had had improved roads at the time the canal was constructed there would have been included in the treaty a proviso that the United States should provide a suitable crossing over the 10-mile strip that we took out of the very center of the Republic of Panama. However, at that time there was nothing but trails leading across, and nobody thought about it. This is something that has been recommended by my predecessors, and I have repeatedly recommended it myself.

Mr. DENISON. You referred to the matter of road construction by the Republic of Panama. What has been done in that direction?

Colonel BURGESS. The Republic of Panama has borrowed I do not know how many millions of dollars in the United States, and has issued bonds to secure the loans. The bulk of that money has been put into an improved road system, especially in the section west of the Canal Zone. The city of Panama is right on the border of the zone.

Mr. THATCHER. I have a map of Panama here, and the governor can explain it better by reference to the map.

Colonel BURGESS. The city of Panama is located here [indicating], and between there and Arraijan, which is the next town in the Republic of Panama, there is no connection. There is no connection between the town of Arraijan and Panama at all. The little town of Paja is up in here [indicating], and from that town there is a road leading to Pedro Miguel, where we maintain a very inadequate ferry service across the canal. The distance from there to the city of Panama is long, and the ferry service is poor. The road they have to use to reach the ferry is unsatisfactory. The bill contemplates a route from Panama to Balboa, with a ferry across the canal at Balboa, and a road from there to Arraijan, connecting up with the improved road system of the Republic of Panama.

Mr. DENISON. About how many miles is that you have indicated?

Colonel BURGESS. About seven and a half miles.

Mr. DENISON. At Arraijan you would connect up with the road system of the Republic of Panama.

Colonel BURGESS. Their system of roads is west of here [indicating]. Here [indicating] is the road from Arraijan to Chorrera. Here [indicating] is where they end, but the Republic of Panama has already graded a new highway from Chorrera to Arraijan. However, there would be no purpose to be served in paving that road until we get this connection. At present all the traffic west of here [indicating] goes by way of the little town of Paja over old roads. This [indicating] is an old road from Paja to Pedro Miguel and then from Pedro Miguel to Panama City.

Mr. DENISON. You stated that the Republic of Panama had borrowed money for the construction of roads. To what extent have they been doing that sort of work?

Mr. THATCHER. There are about 250 miles of roadway that have been constructed by the Republic of Panama, beginning at the zone line here [indicating], coming by way of Chorrera and San Carlos, then on down here [indicating] near the coast, and then up into the interior via Agua Dulce and Santiago to a point beyond Sona, with a branch road leading from Agua Dulce via Los Santos and Los Tablas to the port of Senabe on the Pacific coast; in all, an improved highway system of about 250 miles. The Panamanian Government is also engaged in the construction of a continuation of this road system from Sona [indicating] so as to connect with David and the Boquete region, which is a high country, where they raise coffee of very high grade. It is a mountainous section, comparable to the Costa Rica coffee country. This road system leads through a cattle district, and back up in the hills here [indicating] is a coffee district. This section [indicating] is the granary of the Republic of Panama, and, of course, so far as the Panama Canal is concerned and from the standpoint of all of our Canal Zone activities, it is very important to keep this contact between the two sections clear. So far as the Canal Zone is concerned, it is important that this connection be maintained in good condition.

* * * * * * *

Mr. LEA. How far is the western terminus of this proposed road from the western boundary of the Republic?

Mr. THATCHER. It is close to the Costa Rican boundary and near the western or northwestern boundary line of the Republic of Panama. At present there is an improvised ferry at Pedro Miguel. Of course, necessarily its operation interferes more or less with the locking of ships through the Pedro Miguel Locks.

Colonel BURGESS. The locking of ships interferes with the operation of the ferry, because we make the ferry service conform to the operation of the ships. Consequently there has to be an interruption of the ferry service.

Mr. THATCHER. For several hours a day there is practically no ferry service.

Colonel BURGESS. When we come to Balboa Harbor, there is plenty of room for the operation of the ferry service.

Mr. THATCHER. The estimated cost of operating the ferry is about $45,000 per year.

Mr. LEA. The ferryboats would be self-propelled?

Colonel BURGESS. Yes, sir; they would be Diesel ferryboats.

Mr. LEA. Is there one ferry across the canal now?

Colonel BURGESS. The present ferry is a barge towed by a gasoline launch.

Mr. LEA. You have a ferry at only one location at the present time?

Colonel BURGESS. Yes, sir; and it is a very inadequate service.

We are proposing to construct two ferryboats at a cost of $250,000 for the two. The ferry slips, including the road approaches to the ferry slips, will cost $165,000. The grading of 7.2 miles of road, including culverts, will cost about $242,000, and the concreting of the roadway will cost about $343,000, giving a total cost of approximately $1,000,000. That is as near an estimate as we can give at the present time.

Mr. LEA. How much of a population will use that road?

Colonel BURGESS. Panama has a population of somewhere in the vicinity of from 450,000 to 500,000 people. The cities of Panama and Colon contain a population of about 110,000. Then there are some people who live east of the canal; I do not know just how many there are of those. Practically all of the farming district is west of the canal.

Mr. LEA. Roughly, 250,000 people will use it?

Colonel BURGESS. Roughly, that number; yes, sir.

Mr. LEA. And Panama is the main location, politically and economically, is it not? It has a very central location?

Colonel BURGESS. Yes; Panama is the capital and also the industrial center of the Republic. But the farm products and the cattle products are all, or practically all, raised west of the canal.

Mr. DENISON. What is the attitude of the people of Panama with reference to this? Do they feel very forcefully on the matter?

Colonel BURGESS. I think they have resented very greatly the failure of the United States to give adequate crossings over the Canal Zone for many years after it has been requested.

As I said in the beginning, there were no roads leading up to the zone, and nobody apparently expected it. At that time what movement of freight there was was from the farms by road to the small coast towns and then by boat to the Republic of Panama. But the improvement of the roads in the Republic and the introduction of trucks has made the movement of freight now parallel with the axis of the Isthmus, instead of down to the coast and thence by boat.

Mr. LEA. If the time should come when we have a highway to connect our country with South America, would this line be a link in the chain?

Colonel BURGESS. Yes, sir. I might say that the American Road Congress has passed resolutions on several occasions demanding that the United States build a bridge across the canal, with suitable road connections, but the cost of that would be very great, because the bridge would have to be high enough to clear the highest ships that go through the canal.

Mr. DENISON. And there are other objections to the construction of such a bridge?

Colonel BURGESS. Yes; there is an objection from the standpoint of sabotage at any time, but particularly in time of hostilities, whereby the bridge might be precipitated into the canal by an explosion just prior to the passage of our fleet, which would involve a very great danger. Even in time of peace it would be inadvisable, with the amount of traffic we need to take care of.

Mr. DENISON. How is the work progressing on the road to the Alhajuela Dam?

Colonel BURGESS. The road from Balboa to Summit is an old road, and from Summit to Alhajuela, about 12½ miles, the road is completely graded and all the culverts and bridges have been erected. We expect to begin concreting that road as soon as the dry season definitely sets in. The road should be finished and ready for service by the 1st of July.

Mr. DENISON. Then the work on the dam will be commenced, I assume.

Colonel BURGESS. We can not begin work on the dam with the appropriation we have asked for for this year.

Let me recall to your mind the fact that Governor Walker asked for $3,000,000 for the fiscal year 1930, and the Bureau of the Budget reduced that to $1,000,000. That $3,000,000 was intended to complete all preparations for the actual construction of the dam, with a view to beginning the work on the 1st of July, 1930.

But because of the fact that the amount of money was reduced so much we have been forced to set the beginning of construction for July 1, 1931; in other words, we have added one year to the preparation period.

Mr. DENISON. There has been a bill introduced by Congressman THATCHER.

Mr. THATCHER. To bring out more clearly the military value of this road to the United States Government, permit me to suggest that this bill provides that the proposed ferry, and the proposed road from the western terminal of the ferry to Arraijan, must serve the military

needs of the United States, and in the governor's report on the subject he refers to that, and I think he might say something in reference to it.

Mr. DENISON. If the governor wishes to express any opinion here, we will be glad to hear him.

Colonel BURGESS. A road of some sort is absoluely essential for the defense of the canal, and the better the road the more easily will the defense of the canal be maintained.

The Army, in time of war, can, if necessary, build its own roads; but this will give it a road already constructed.

As part of the defense plans of the canal there are certain military maneuvers each year in the dry season, and the road would be very useful in connection with those maneuvers, and in time of war a road is absolutely essential.

* * * * * * *

Mr. THATCHER. The ferry, of course, would serve the same purpose.

The committee, I believe, has a letter addressed to the chairman of the full committee from the Secretary of War, dated November 11, 1929, and I would like to have that letter inserted in the record.

Mr. DENISON. Very well. It may be inserted at this point.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 11, 1929.

Hon. JAMES S. PARKER,
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PARKER: Referring to the request of your committee dated October 7 for a report on the bill (H. R. 4293), entitled "To provide for a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal," and to my acknowledgment of October 12 stating that the bill was being referred to the Governor of the Panama Canal for his comments, there is quoted below a self-explanatory letter dated October 25 received from Governor Burgess regarding this proposed legislation:

"The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of October 12, with inclosures, relative to the request of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a report on the bill (H. R. 4293) 'To provide for a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal.'

"The need for an adequate and permanent ferry of this kind is of long standing. Its installation and the construction of the highway referred to in the bill would provide vastly improved and necessary transportation facilities between the Pacific side of the Isthmus and the interior Provinces of the Republic of Panama. Important military purposes would likewise be served. Aside from these considerations, it is my opinion that there is a moral obligation on the part of the United States to give to Panama a suitable highway across the Canal Zone and convenient and adequate ferry service.

"During the past few years the Republic of Panama has constructed an excellent system of improved roads throughout its Provinces west of the Panama Canal. At the present time the connection between these roads and Panama City, the capital of the Republic, is maintained through a barge ferry, towed by a tugboat, operated by the Panama Canal at Pedro Miguel Locks. This is an extremely unsatisfactory arrangement, as Pedro Miguel is approximately 8 miles from Panama City. Aside from this it is necessary for the road on the west side of the canal to follow a tortuous and lengthy detour in order to connect with the ferry at Pedro Miguel Locks. On the other hand, the highway proposed in H. R. 4293 would follow a practically straight course from the Pacific entrance of the canal to where it would connect with the main highway near Arraijan.

"In addition to its inaccessibility, the site of the present barge ferry at Pedro Miguel Locks is unsuitable for military reasons as a site for a permanent ferry. The locks constitute the sensitive points in the defense of the canal and any damage sustained by them in time of war might precipitate a critical situation. If civilian traffic is allowed to cross the canal at or near the locks, the difficulties of effective protection would be vastly increased.

"The project has been under consideration for some time and preliminary surveys and estimates have been made. A blue print showing the most suitable location for the ferry and also the route of the proposed highway is forwarded herewith. The estimates show that the total cost of the highway, ferry slips, and ferry boats would be approximately $1,000,000. This would be divided as follows:

(a) Cost of 2 ferries (1 in reserve during wet season), each with a capacity of 32 average motor vehicles	$250,000
(b) Cost of ferry slips ($105,000), including road approach to ferry slip on east side ($22,000) and dredging channels to ferry approaches ($38,000)	165,000
(c) Cost of grading, including culverts, of 7.2 miles (38,000 feet) of road	242,000
(d) Cost of concreting roadway	343,000
	1,000,000

"The cost of maintaining and operating the ferry is estimated at $45,000 per year.

"The project has the approval of the State Department and the Secretary of War, and it has been urgently desired by the Republic of Panama for several years. The bill introduced by Mr. THATCHER covers the project completely, and is indorsed by me as being entirely satisfactory in every way in so far as the canal administration is concerned."

The blue print referred to in the foregoing is inclosed herewith.

In connection with the last paragraph of the governor's letter, quoted above, the interest of the State Department in this project was brought to my attention in a letter dated June 14, 1929, reading as follows:

"I am informed that the Governor of the Panama Canal proposes to present in the near future a recommendation for an appropriation which will permit the establishment of an adequate ferry across the Panama Canal to connect Panama City with that portion of the Republic lying to the west of the Canal Zone. I should like in this connection to express this department's interest in the governor's proposal and its hope that the appropriation referred to may be approved by Congress.

"During the past few years the Republic of Panama has constructed an extensive system of improved roads in the Provinces lying west of the Panama Canal, and it has naturally desired to connect these roads with the capital through the Canal Zone. The new highways are of relatively little value until such connection is provided. This matter, as you know, was dealt with in the treaty negotiated with Panama in 1926, but this treaty has not yet been ratified by either Government.

"As the Panaman Government can not establish land communication between the two halves of the Republic except through the Canal Zone, I feel that this Government, in view of the cession of the zone by Panama to the United States and in view of our interest in promoting the welfare and prosperity of Panama, should cooperate to make such communication possible. I have the honor to express the hope, therefore, that the proposal of the governor may be carried into effect."

In view of the comments of Governor Burgess, and the indorsement of the State Department, I favor the passage of legislation along the lines of H. R. 4293, and recommend that your committee make a favorable report on the bill.

The proposed legislation has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who advises that it is not in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. GOOD, *Secretary of War.*

Mr. THATCHER. It will be noted that in this letter full approval of the bill, as drawn, is given not only by the Secretary of War and by Colonel Burgess, the Governor of the Canal Zone (his letter being quoted at length), but there is also set forth a statement from the State Department expressing its approval of the bill. The letter of the Secretary of War, it will be noted, also indicates that the proposed legislation has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who advises that it is not in conflict with the financial program of the President. Therefore the proposed legislation has the approval not only of the Canal Zone officials but also of the War Department, the State Department, the Budget Bureau, and incidentally, of course, of the President, as not being in conflict with his financial program.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Did Mr. McDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, approve it?

Mr. THATCHER. No; it has not gone to the Department of Agriculture. There is no reason why it should go there. The Panama Canal is under the supervision of the Secretary of War.

Now, anyone who has been in the Canal Zone can see the great importance of this ferry and road. The ferry at Pedro Miguel is an obstruction to the transiting of ships there, which means, of course, an imperfect ferry service. There are several hours every day when you can not cross there on this ferry, because it can not be operated at the time when ships are being transited through the locks. This ferry is located above the locks and is on the "cut" side of the canal. The elevation is 85 feet above the sea there, and it is not a proper place for a ferry. Now, this ferry service, if established at Balboa, at the Pacific entrance of the canal, will be a continuous service for all practical purposes. It will not interfere with shipping, but it will be like a ferry in New York Harbor in tidal waters.

Mr. HOCH. Is the present ferry operated by the Government?

Mr. THATCHER. Yes; it is a free ferry, and this will be a free ferry, too. It will be operated in such a way as not to interfere with the operation of the canal.

Mr. HOCH. What is the estimated operating cost of the ferry?

Colonel BURGESS. About $45,000 a year.

Mr. THATCHER. The statement I referred to awhile ago, and included in the letter of Governor Burgess, quoted by the Secretary of War, sets out in detail the items that go to make up the estimated cost of the ferry, amounting to about $415,000, I believe; and about $585,000 for the roadway. I think that the roadway, like the proposed ferry service, is of the utmost importance, because there is no roadway contact at the present time from Balboa across the canal and across zone territory to the western portion of the Republic of Panama. This projected road makes a much shorter route there. The Panaman Government is building several miles of roadway from Chorrera to Arraijan, to connect its present system with the roadway that we propose to build to Arraijan. They will connect that roadway up with their system of highways, extending for 250 miles now, and ultimately and within a short time

(perhaps in a year or so) for more than 400 miles. I think that from a military standpoint this project is highly important to the United States, because this roadway system penetrates the agricultural portion of the Republic, the coffee-producing section and the cattle-producing section.

For that reason I think that in time of war or in time of other emergency, when we might have to draw a certain amount of supplies from this local source, this ferry and road system will be of the greatest importance. Also from a strategic standpoint this road and ferry will have undoubted military value. Even in times of peace they will be important, because cattle procured in the western portion of the Republic of Panama may be slaughtered in the Canal Zone, in the city of Panama, and the city of Colon for the use of the shipping passing through the canal and for the use of the canal and Panama Railroad employees. The same statement applies to coffee and other products of the western section of the Republic. This proposed roadway would also be useful for general military purposes, as Governor Burgess has pointed out, especially in the dry seasons, when the military forces can be deployed over all these roads in making expeditions for the purpose of gaining information and experience.

There has been some suggestion of constructing a tunnel under the canal, but I understand that the cost of that would be very high, running to perhaps four or five million dollars. In view of the great cost, that would hardly be satisfactory, and a ferry seems to be the best solution of the problem.

I believe that the Panaman people, the public officials, and others down there feel that the proposed ferry and roadway would constitute a happy solution of the problem, and I am sure they would very much like to see this measure enacted. Since we have cut in two the Republic of Panama, by means of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone, I consider that there is a moral obligation resting upon us to permit the people of Panama to have this contact between the two sections of the Republic. The establishment of this ferry and the building of this roadway will constitute, as I see it, a simple act of justice to the Panaman people with adequate benefits to ourselves.

Mr. HOCH. Was the omission of any provision for traffic across the Canal Zone in the treaty due to the fact that the traffic was largely by water?

Mr. THATCHER. There is traffic across the zone where we have roads now. There is free traffic.

Mr. HOCH. I am talking about traffic across the canal.

Mr. THATCHER. There is a ferry at Pedro Miguel now. Of course, that goes across to the west side. It is a free ferry.

Mr. HOCH. But I understood that there was no provision in the treaty for that.

Mr. THATCHER. There was no specific provision for it in the treaty. I think perhaps that was largely due to oversight. Everything was done in a hasty manner in November, 1903, when the Republic of Panama was formed and when it seceded from the Colombian Confederation. That was when the treaty was made.

Mr. DENISON. Practically the only method of transportation then was by water.

Mr. THATCHER. Yes; there were no roads at all then. Now, when the Republic of Panama is showing such a liberal spirit in the establishment of a road system, I think we should connect up with that system by providing this ferry and the 7.2 miles of proposed zone roadway. Thus will be provided the connecting link.

In this general connection I desire to submit herewith a letter from Dr. R. J. Alfaro, the Panamanian minister to the United States:

LEGACION DE PANAMA,
Washington, January 10, 1930.

Representative MAURICE H. THATCHER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THATCHER: With reference to our pleasant conversation over the telephone a few days ago, and to the map I sent you showing road development in the Republic of Panama, I take pleasure in transmitting to you the following additional information which I have just received from Panama:

There have been completed already 450 kilometers of improved highways and 300 kilometers of main thoroughfares are under construction. Besides this there are 200 kilometers of sectional country roads which are being improved gradually.

The total amount expended by the Republic of Panama up to the end of the last year is 12,500,000 balboas (dollars), a sum which includes 2,600,000 balboas from the last loan.

The work on the main highway to David and the highlands of Chiriqui is progressing in a satisfactory manner. It is expected that automobiles will be able to reach David in March, 1931, that regular traffic will be established in 1932, and that this highway will be finished by 1933, thus completing the largest national longitudinal link in the future Pan American highway.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express once more to you the deep gratitude of my Government and myself for the interest you are taking in seeing that we may reap all of the benefits that are to be expected from our road development through an easy and efficient communication across the Canal Zone, and with renewed assurances of my highest consideration, believe me, my dear Mr. Thatcher,

Very sincerely yours,

R. J. ALFARO, *Minister.*

As indicating the views of the Panamanian Government touching the desirability of enacting this ferry-road bill (H. R. 4293), I desire to insert in the record the following letter received by me from the present President of the Republic of Panama, Hon. F. H. Arosemena:

REPUBLICA DE PANAMA,
PRESIDENCIA,
Panama, October 31, 1929.

Hon. M. H. THATCHER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THATCHER: I acknowledge the receipt of the information you have sent me concerning the proposed law for the construction of a permanent ferry across the canal, which is a necessity, and whose realization will be of positive benefit to my country.

I thank you heartily for all you may do to further the success of this proposed law, and I assure you of the eternal gratitude of the citizens of Panama.

* * * * * * *

Most sincerely, your friend,

F. H. AROSEMENA.

Mr. DENISON. What was your official connection with the canal?

Mr. THATCHER. I was a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and was the head of the department of civil administration of the Canal Zone during the years 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913. In that way I had direct contact with many of these problems.

Mr. DENISON. Governor Burgess, you started to make a statement.

Colonel BURGESS. The necessity for the ferry did not become apparent until about 1923. It was established at Pedro Miguel by the Army in 1924, and after the Army ceased to operate the canal. It costs about $30,000 a year for the operation of this makeshift ferry.

Mr. MILLIGAN. How many ferries do you have on the canal now?

Mr. THATCHER. Just one at the Pedro Miguel Lock. The proposed ferry at Balboa will abolish that ferry.

Mr. MILLIGAN. You will have but one ferry.

Mr. THATCHER. Yes. I think it should be operated free of tolls, and the bill so provides; and that it should be under the control of the canal authorities. Of course, it will be administered in such a way that traffic on the canal will not be interfered with. You know, of course, that there are adequate roadways leading from Panama City and Ancon, through Balboa, to the Balboa Docks at the Pacific entrance to the canal.

Mr. DENISON. We thank you very much, Mr. THATCHER, for your statement.

The following is from the committee's report:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4293) to provide for a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it pass.

After the passage of the original act of Congress authorizing the acquisition of territory from the Republic of Panama and the construction of an interoceanic canal therein, a treaty was made between the United States and the Republic of Panama by which the United States acquired a strip of land across the Isthmus of Panama, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, 10 miles wide, being 5 miles on each side of the proposed canal. There were reserved to Panama out of this 10-mile strip the territory then comprising the city of Colon on the Atlantic side and the city of Panama, the capital of the Republic, on the Pacific side. At that time, 1904, practically the only method of transportation in the Republic of Panama was by ships and other small watercraft that traveled along the coast of the Republic on both the Atlantic and Pacific sides.

In negotiating the treaty with Panama no provision was made for allowing the inhabitants of Panama to cross the Canal Zone from one part of the Republic to the other. The canal and the Canal Zone which passed under the jurisdiction of the United States completely divided the Republic of Panama into two divisions and no arrangements were made for those on either side of the Republic to reach the other side except by boat. This was evidently an oversight, and was due, no doubt, to the fact that at that time there were no improved highways or railroads in the Republic of Panama; motor transportation had not been far enough developed, nor had it reached the Republic of Panama in any form. The people of Panama had always depended upon intercoastal water craft for travel and for the transportation of their products.

But in recent years the Government of the Republic of Panama has been expending large sums on internal improvements. They have built some railroads into the interior, and for several years have been constructing improved highways from various cities and villages in the interior to the capital of the Republic. But, of course, they can not construct roads over the 10-mile strip under the jurisdiction of the United States, nor have they any method of crossing the canal to

reach Panama City except by a rather antiquated barge ferry and tug boat which our Government has been furnishing and operating free just above the Pedro Miguel Locks. With the construction of improved roads into the interior of the Republic and the agricultural development that has followed such construction, travel to and from the capital has increased to such proportions that the present ferry service is wholly inadequate to take care of the traffic. Moreover, the maintenance of this barge-ferry service just above the locks is objectionable for other important reasons.

For several years negotiations have been conducted between our Government and the Government of Panama with a view to providing a crossing of the canal and the Canal Zone, but no definite arrangements have yet been made. The Government of Panama has urged very forcefully the necessity of providing this crossing for their people; and the State Department of our Government has recognized the moral obligation on the part of our Government to afford this facility to the people of Panama. The Government of Panama has urged that an improved road be constructed by our Government leading from the canal to connect up with the improved roads of the Republic, and that a bridge be built over the canal. For military and other reasons the United States is unwilling to have a bridge constructed over the canal. In the event of war such a structure could be easily destroyed and the transit of our fleet through the canal could be indefinitely delayed. The alternative is to provide a suitable modern ferry to be installed for crossing the canal at a point where it would be least objectionable from a military point of view, and most advantageous to the people of the Republic of Panama desiring to cross the canal in order to reach their capital.

The Republic of Panama has constructed something over 250 miles of improved highways leading from the Canal Zone back into the interior where several towns are located. They have planned and will soon begin the construction of a continuation of this road farther into the interior to connect up with an agricultural section where a great deal of coffee and other agricultural products are produced.

The committee feels that the United States should construct across its own territory, a distance of about 8 miles, an improved road to connect with the improved highways of the Republic of Panama in order to allow access to the capital of their country.

This bill provides for the construction of such a road and for the installation of two suitable modern ferryboats with necessary docks and approaches.

The bill has the approval of, and is strongly urged by the Governor of the Canal Zone, Col. Harry Burgess, who appeared before the committee and testified regarding it. The bill also has the approval of the Secretary of War, as is shown by a letter of the Secretary made a part of this report. It also has the approval of the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget. The amounts necessary to purchase or construct two ferryboats, the necessary docks and approaches, and the road leading from the ferry across the zone out to the territory of Panama are shown by the letter of Governor Burgess, made a part of this report, and appropriations of such amounts are authorized by the bill.

The construction of the two ferryboats will cost about $250,000. The ferry slips or docks, including the approaches thereto, will cost about $165,000. The grading of 7.2 miles of road, including culverts, will cost about $242,000, and concreting the roadway will cost about $343,000, making a total of $1,000,000 necessary to complete the work.

The Republic of Panama has a population of about 500,000 people. The cities of Panama and Colon have a population of about 110,000. Practically all of the farming district of the Republic of Panama is west of the canal and until this road is constructed and these ferries provided the people of that part of the Republic will have no suitable means of access to their capital.

Service on these ferries will be furnished free to the public and the cost of maintenance and operation will be about $45,000 per year.

It is believed by the committee that our Government ought to meet this obligation to the people of the Republic of Panama by providing these facilities for crossing the canal and the Canal Zone without further delay.

The measure (H. R. 4293) also passed the Senate and became a law upon its approval by the President on May 27, 1930.

The item now carried in the second deficiency bill for $500,000 is one-half of the total authorized by the act. The present appropriation of $500,000 is for the purpose of paying the cost of constructing two vessels for the ferry, each with a capacity to carry thirty-odd automobiles besides passengers, and to grade the required roadway from the west terminus of the proposed ferry to Arraijan at the Canal Zone line adjacent to the western portion of the Republic of Panama. It is expected that the remaining half million dollars for the completion of the entire project will be appropriated at the next (December) session of Congress.

The officials of the Panamanian Government and the people of the Republic of Panama are deeply appreciative of the action of Congress in enacting this measure and in providing and in making provision for establishment of the ferry and the construction of the indicated roadway. The purposes of the ferry and roadway are fully explained in the quotations from the hearings and the report already given. As evidence of the appreciation of the officials and citizens of the Republic of Panama, under leave therefor, I herewith include cablegram received by me from the President of the Republic immediately following the enactment of the measure referred to and my response thereto.

(Cablegram)

PANAMA, *May 23, 1930.*

Hon. M. H. THATCHER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Cablegrams to daily newspapers here announcing that Congress approved law relative to the establishment of ferry in the canal and Arraijan Road. As you are the author of the bill and its enthusiastic supporter, permit me to send you in the name of the Government and people of Panama the most sincere gratefulness (appreciation), also made extensive to all your colleagues, for the service now rendered to my country which has made generous efforts to enhance the greatness and prosperity of the American people and which is confident that justice will always be done her in all her claims. Receive my personal greetings and felicitations for your triumph.

Yours affectionately,

President AROSEMENA.

(Hon. Florencia H. Arosemena, President of the Republic of Panama.)

(Radiogram)

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 23, 1930.*

President AROSEMENA, *Panama:*

Am deeply grateful for your very kind message regarding the passage by Congress of the Panama Canal ferry road bill, of which it has been my very great pleasure to be the author. This enactment, I am sure, will prove of the greatest value and benefit both to the Republic of Panama and the United States and will also serve to discharge, after long delay, the duty and obligation of the United States to Panama, to provide a convenient and satisfactory mode of communication across the canal and the Canal Zone between the two great sections of the Republic. I am always very happy to be able to be of any service to the Government and people of Panama, and to yourself, Mr. President. Mrs. Thatcher joins me in assurances of high regard and affectionate esteem for yourself and family and for all the Panamanian people.

Congressman MAURICE H. THATCHER.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the enactment of this measure I desire to acknowledge, with appreciation, the effective aid and cooperation rendered by Representative DENISON, of Illinois, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, dealing with Panama Canal matters. He has had long and intimate acquaintanceship with the needs and requirements of this great waterway and the Canal Zone, and is rendering very important service touching these matters.

This ferry and highway will not only serve greatly beneficial purposes in the practical manner indicated in the hearings and report, but will also prove of the highest value in promoting good will between the United States and the Republic of Panama. Also, in the years to come, the ferry and roadway thus authorized will constitute an invaluable link in the great Pan American or inter-American highway that will extend for thousands of miles from Canada through the United States, Mexico, and Central America, across the Panama Canal to the southern regions of the South American Continent.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have been successful in getting a building or any item in this bill for their districts have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Chair understand the gentleman to ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks?

Mr. KEARNS. All Members who have succeeded in getting an item in this bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the request is out of order in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be done in the committee.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman can make his request in the House and there will be no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For expenses of regulating immigration, $36.84.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, when William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appeared before the House Judiciary Committee on June 11 concerning the Wagner bills, he said:

We have reached the point where we feel some authority ought to be conferred upon some one to stop all immigration for certain periods of

time when these unemployment situations are threatening or when they come upon us.

The situation referred to by Mr. Green is world-wide. Great Britain has 1,475,000 unemployed (over a million insured under the dole system); Germany is paying a dole to over 2,378,000; Russia is feeding a line of unemployed of over 1,000,000; even Austria is having to look after 225,000 who have been out of work for over a year; and Italy has 400,000 idle men. Conditions justify the suspension of immigration to the United States in order to protect the American workingman.

In the United States there has been consolidation of industries, both large and small, thereby terminating the employment of many faithful and industrious men and women, in spite of the fact that they have devoted the best part of their lives in helping build up and make these corporations a success.

Then there has been a widespread introduction of new labor-saving machinery, making it possible for one machine and three men to do the work done previously by a dozen men, although in many instances new machines and new consolidations do create additional work and make possible better wages. Nevertheless, during the change or slack period, if too abrupt, many men and women are at least temporarily thrown out of work and suffer unnecessarily.

Expansion of American industry has created a surplus of products for both home consumption and foreign trade. But the most important factor in the present employment situation is immigration, and the most objectionable newcomers enter unlawfully, whether bootlegged in, or lawfully here as temporary visitors or deserting seamen, becoming lost in our population and remaining here in defiance of law.

Control of foreign immigration is strictly a domestic question for every country. America has the absolute right not only to determine the number, but to exclude immigrants of occupations not needed here, just as every other nation has that unquestioned sovereign right and exercises it. Charity and sentiment should begin at home. And yet the United States seems to be about the only country in the whole world to-day that does not absolutely bar the coming of the immigrant who will be detrimental to its economic working and production conditions. There is no telling how much worse conditions now might be had it not been for the Johnson quota restriction law. That law has kept out millions of aliens who were preparing to migrate to America in order to escape the aftermath of the World War in Europe. But good and effective as it is, the Johnson law does not go far enough. Of course, at the time that law was enacted it was impossible to anticipate the recent rapid development of labor-saving devices in the United States. But even now it is not too late to profit by present conditions and the example of other countries. We should authorize the President to suspend immigration whenever, in his discretion, economic and industrial conditions warrant it. We should stop, as President Green and other experts point out, the influx of unneeded labor, hurtful to workers already here, whether native or foreign born.

Australia, for example, empowers its Governor General to prohibit by proclamation all immigration, when economic and industrial conditions, in his opinion, justify that step. Australia has not only such emergency legislation but it also has a dictation test which an immigration examiner can give all immigrants, either prior to entry or any time within two years thereafter. The immigrant can be required to write 50 words dictated in any language selected by the officer. Thus, Australia has two means of suspending immigration.

The United States has a good selective and numerical restrictive law, but it is not flexible, in that the law does not lodge any discretion in the President or the Secretary of Labor or the Commissioner General of Immigration or give authority to prevent the coming of immigrants within the quota detrimental to working conditions here.

The immigration act of 1917 prohibits the coming of the physically, mentally, and morally unfit, and was enacted because some foreign nations were actually giving passports to their deficients, dependents, and delinquents in order literally to dump them upon us. The act of 1924 limited the number that can come from Europe, because of a threatened inundation of immigrants. The law should go further and Congress should clothe some official with full power to check unnecessary immigration in times of unemployment. The quota law of 1924, limiting annual immigration from Europe to 153,714, is not fully adequate. Four hundred and seventy-nine thousand, three hundred and twenty-seven aliens lawfully entered our country, and 252,479 aliens departed, leaving a net alien addition of 226,829 to our population during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929. Of these 479,327 aliens that entered the United States last year 199,649, or nearly one-half, were nonimmigrants, coming here temporarily as visitors, tourists, foreign officials, and the like, with no declared intent to remain permanently.

Our immigration restriction legislation is the most humane and generous of any country with any considerable immigration. Our laws permit many aliens to come without regard to quota restriction and list them as nonquota immigrants, such as wives, husbands, children, and other near relatives of American citizens. More distant relatives are allowed preference within the quota. So many relatives are coming from southern and southeast Europe that the quotas of these countries are almost completely filled with near relatives of nationals from those countries already here. On the other hand, comparatively few relatives come from northwest Europe, and the quotas of these countries are filled largely with new immigrants. The existing law gives skilled farmers preference, but few are taking advantage of it, in all only 8,309. And if it were taken advantage of, there is little likelihood that the skilled farmer would follow farming in this country, in view of the higher wages paid around the factories and in the cities.

While our lawful net immigration last year was 226,829, to this must be added about 150,000 unlawful entries and about 25,000 deserting alien seamen. Thus our total net immigration at present may be fairly estimated at about 400,000, as compared with a million before the World War and before the really restrictive Johnson quota law was enacted. Such a volume of immigration is not needed and should not be allowed.

The time has come for the United States to suspend all immigration, as suggested by President Green, at least during periods of unemployment. In Europe alone there are now 2,000,000 prospective immigrants who have already applied for visa admission to the United States. Such legislation should apply not only to Europe, but it should apply also to countries of the Western Hemisphere. Every other nation, either by law or by administrative order, seeks to protect its working men and women from foreign competition. Such legislation is a necessary supplement to our protective tariff. As long as we have a carpenter, bricklayer, or day laborer out of employment, we should not admit another carpenter, bricklayer, or day laborer. Our first duty is to our own.

A law should be passed at once, without impairing in any way our existing contract labor law, not only restricting immigration from all the countries of this hemisphere and cutting down immigration from Europe, but also giving the President on recommendations of the Secretary of Labor authority to suspend all immigration if and when justified by economic and industrial conditions in the United States. Last year 64,440 immigrant aliens entered from Canada, 40,154 from Mexico, 2,011 from Newfoundland, and 3,026 from Cuba. Unquestionably many of these, being in a strange land, had to find work at any wage that would keep body and soul together, and consequently many now have taken places that persons already here ought to have had. Because of this situation many of our own people must have suffered hardship. There is no reason why a visa should be given any intending immigrant by our consuls abroad unless that alien can show that his presence will not be detrimental to working people already here.

I call attention to and conclude my remarks with the following brief digest of the legislation of various foreign countries:

Albania: All alien workers are refused admission.

Australia: The Governor General may by proclamation prohibit immigration wholly or in excess of certain numerical limits on account of economic and industrial conditions in the Commonwealth.

Argentina: The law lodges full discretion in its immigration officials.

Belgian Congo: Aliens who do not have adequate means of support, who are not under contract of employment, or who are undesirable for economic reasons may be excluded.

Belgium: Alien workers who have to obtain visas can be admitted upon producing certificates issued them by employers, stating that such aliens will be employed.

Brazil: The director general of land settlement is empowered to suspend or restrict immigration when he deems it necessary.

Bulgaria: No foreigner domiciled there may take up an occupation unless he obtains an authorization from the Ministry of Commerce, Industry, and Labor.

Canada: The Governor General may prohibit or limit in number immigration because of economic or industrial conditions. Admission of immigrants under labor contracts is now prohibited.

Czechoslovakia: Alien workers are admitted only upon obtaining certificates from the Minister of Social Welfare and Labor.

Denmark: No alien seeking employment may be admitted unless he first obtains certificate from the Minister of Justice.

Finland: An alien seeking employment will not be admitted unless he obtains a labor certificate from the Minister for Social Affairs.

France: Contract laborers, except skilled miners or agriculturists, are admitted only when contract is visaed by Minister of Labor.

Germany: Immigration of laborers is restricted to needs as determined by Federal Minister of Labor.

Great Britain: No immigrant seeking employment may be admitted without a permit from the Minister of Labor after that minister is satisfied by a certificate of the prospective employer that no British labor will thereby be displaced.

Greece: Aliens seeking employment are admitted only after obtaining licenses from the Minister of the Interior. Furthermore, no alien who is not able to maintain himself and family may enter.

Hungary: Aliens seeking employment are admitted only on permit issued to the employer by the official employment exchange, the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Interior.

Iceland: All aliens must prove that they have sufficient money to keep themselves for at least two years after arrival before they are admitted.

Irish Free State: Any alien seeking employment will not be issued a visa until he produces a certificate from his prospective employer. Also, no alien is admitted who is not in a position to support himself.

Japan: Competent officials may prevent the entry of any alien who may become a public charge.

Latvia: Minister of Interior may decide whose entrance is or is not desirable.

Mexico: Aliens coming to work must show contract of employment. The Minister of Interior may suspend the admission of immigrant workers from certain countries, as well as all those who may become public charges.

Netherlands: No aliens are admitted unless they can prove sufficient means of existence or possibility of maintaining themselves by employment.

Newfoundland: No alien is admitted who can not prove he has the means of supporting himself and family or is in a position to obtain such means.

New Zealand: No person of other than British birth or parentage may be admitted unless he has obtained a permit from the Minister of Customs.

Norway: Alien workers are not admitted unless they can show special permit to work issued by communal (local) authorities.

Palestine: Chief immigration officer prepares monthly schedule to determine the number of immigrants who would have definite prospect of employment. This schedule is approved by the high commissioner, and immigration is limited accordingly.

Poland: Permission to enter is withheld from any person who is not in a position to support himself.

Rumania: Aliens likely to become a public charge are not admitted. Quarterly surveys are made to determine which occupations are crowded. Then alien workers are admitted only on the authority of the Minister of Labor.

Salvador: No alien whose maintenance is not assured may be admitted.

Siam: Yearly quota is fixed, and this quota must not be exceeded. Every alien immigrant must have a certain amount of money specified by the Minister of Interior.

South Africa: No alien who is deemed by a competent minister to be undesirable for economic reasons may be admitted.

Sweden: Aliens coming for employment may be excluded if there is reason to believe they can not earn a living honestly. Alien immigrants must obtain an entry visa of Minister of Social Affairs, who has discretionary authority to determine what immigrants are or are not necessary.

Switzerland: Any alien desiring employment may be rejected by the central police office upon refusal of officials of the canton in which the alien wishes to reside to allow his entry.

Syria: Immigrant laborers are admitted only if they have employment contracts visaed by the public security of the high commission.

Turkey: No person not of the Turkish race going there to settle is admitted except in accordance with the terms of special conventions.

Uruguay: No person who may become a public charge may be admitted.

Venezuela: Admission is denied aliens not having a legitimate occupation or the means of subsistence.

Western Samoa: The administrator is empowered to prohibit immigration that would be detrimental to the public interest of the territory.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, audited claims, section 2, $63,260.08, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to congratulate the Appropriations Committee on reporting out a bill carrying appropriations of over $68,000,000, with so many and varied projects and giving such universal satisfaction. You have allowed several days to the discussion of this bill, and every Member has been given an ample opportunity to be heard.

I am gratified that your committee has seen fit to recommend an appropriation of $125,000 for a post-office building for Wisconsin Rapids, Wis. Wisconsin Rapids is a very beautiful and prosperous up-to-date city of between 8,000 and 9,000 inhabitants, situated in the central part of Wisconsin on the majestic Wisconsin River; it is a city of home owners; a city where employer and employee meet on common ground and work in harmony for the advancement and development of their city.

The early pioneers who selected the location of this city were men of broad vision. They sensed the great possibilities of the splendid water power that might be developed at some future time and did not allow this priceless heritage to be preempted by foreign corporations or syndicates. As a result this valuable power and the industries dependent upon it are locally owned and managed and give employment to a large number of men and women.

WISCONSIN RAPIDS UNIQUE

A stranger visiting this city would not realize that it was a large manufacturing city, for it looks more like an exclusive residential city. The skilled landscape architect has hidden all the unsightly places, and the green lawns and park spaces leading down to and along the river banks are in marked contrast to most manufacturing towns. One would know at first glance that absentee ownership did not prevail.

Three railroads serve this city, affording excellent transportation. They enter the city in such an unobtrusive way on the outskirts as not to mar the beauty or interfere or disturb the activities of the city.

Splendid bank buildings, public libraries, excellent school building, a high school building which will soon be under construction, to cost $600,000, public swimming pools and parks, one of the best and safest aviation fields that can be found anywhere, consisting of a 360-acre field, as level as a floor, with such perfect drainage that it is never muddy, equipped with the latest hangars and a beacon that illuminates the field at night, and can be seen for many miles, attest the pride and public spirit with which the citizens of this community are imbued.

The people of this prosperous city own their own waterworks and electric-light plant, and besides having very efficient service at low rates, these utilities turn back into the city treasury each year a substantial sum of money which helps lower the citizens' taxes. The Federal Government received from Wisconsin Rapids post office in receipts in the last fiscal year $67,727.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING

It is not only a just, but a worthy undertaking, for the Federal Government to erect a building of approved architectural design to carry on a business of the magnitude which this city furnishes—a building in keeping with the dignity and stability of the Federal Government and the important business it carries on.

A comparatively few people come in contact with their Government in any way other than through the post office. The post office is a Government department which touches elbows with practically all of our 120,000,000 people. If it is important, and it surely is, for banks and other business institutions to have imposing structures in which to conduct their business, it is doubly important for the Federal Government to erect substantial public buildings of good architectural design where the citizens and the Government transact business.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the deficiency bill will pass unanimously, and I hope it will meet with the same hearty approval in the Senate, so that it may become a law before the adjournment of Congress. [Applause.]

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 12902, the second deficiency bill, had directed him to report the same back to the House, with sundry amendments, with the recom-

mendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. WOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

STANDARDS FOR PRESERVES, JAMS, JELLY, AND APPLE BUTTER

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules for printing in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 267

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11514, a bill to define preserve, jam, jelly, and apple butter, to provide standards therefor, and to amend the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. JONAS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] may have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address which he delivered at the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Ramsours Mill, Lincolnton, N. C., on June 20, 1930.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF RAMSOURS MILL

Ladies and gentlemen, the Battle of Ramsours Mill was one of the battles of major importance in the American War for Independence. Contrary to the general impression in the average mind the importance of a battle is not measured in terms of the number of men engaged, the duration of the fighting, nor the carnage and bloodshed accompanying. Some of the smallest battles in history, apparently insignificant at the time, changed the whole course of civilization, while other battles of staggering magnitude, which chilled the blood in the veins of men and women throughout the world on account of the horrible destruction to human life and property, have been of slight permanent significance. The importance of a battle is properly determined by its permanent effect upon the future course of events. Measured in these terms Ramsours Mill deserves a prominent place in the true history of America.

This battle was no mere accidental or incidental isolated military engagement. It was a logical part of a war game played by master military minds, the colony of North Carolina being the immediate stake and the destiny of the entire South the final result. The British were moving on North Carolina on three fronts and the colony was threatened at three points by three armies—Cornwallis at Charlotte, Ferguson in the neighborhood of Kings Mountain, and Tarleton farther west. Their immediate object was to subdue western North Carolina. There was comparatively little Whig sentiment in the eastern part of the colony and if the west was subdued the east would declare allegiance to the crown. That was the British theory, and it was probably fairly correct. A large Tory army in North Carolina in striking distance from each of the three British armies would materially aid Cornwallis in his purpose. On the other hand, if the patriots could prevent the embodying of a powerful Tory army and could render ineffective Tory efforts to support Cornwallis it would be impossible for him and his armies to overcome the rapidly assembling Whig armies in the colony. Therefore the battle of Ramsours Mill was inevitable. Both sides appreciated its importance and the far-reaching consequences of its outcome. This fact accounts for the presence at the battle of so many prominent patriot military officers from western North Carolina. It accounts for General Rutherford leaving Charlotte exposed to an attack by Cornwallis and Rawdon and marching his entire army to Ramsours Mill. The Tory army at Ramsours Mill was recruited upon direct orders from Lord Cornwallis, and the results may have been quite different had His Lordship's orders not been in part ignored. His purpose was to recruit a Tory army and have it ready to arm and assemble on short notice when he and his three armies were ready to move in force on North Carolina.

Moreover, from Rowan County west to the Blue Ridge the colonists were fairly evenly divided in sentiment, probably the royalist sentiment prevailing slightly. This section was settled by a sturdy people. Many of them came here solely for the sake of being free. Others came to seek wealth, and still others were only adventurers and pioneers. They were, most of them, brave and fearless and ready to fight for the principles they believed in. Feeling against each other was extremely bitter, almost as much so as feeling between Lincoln County partisans to-day just before election. Both sides were ready to "fight it out" and partisans of both parties, in many cases, were as cruel and vindictive in taking reprisals as ever characterized the activities of Chicago gang land.

It is well to get a perspective of Lincoln County at the time of the Revolution and the events which led up to the Battle of Ramsours Mill.

Lincoln County was formed in 1768 from Mecklenburg County and was named Tryon, in honor of William Tryon, royal governor, but his oppressive measures, culminating in the cold-blooded murders at the Battle of Alamance in 1771, caused the general assembly in 1779 to blot out his odious name and divide the territory into Lincoln and Rutherford Counties.

The intense partisan feeling existing and the whole-hearted and enthusiastic determination with which the Whigs of the county espoused the cause of independence is shown by Articles of Association, prepared the 14th day of August, 1775, by the Whig leaders of Lincoln County, and "ordered to be signed" by every freeholder in the county, setting forth that "unprecedented, barbarous, and bloody actions committed by British troops on our American brethren, together with the hostile operations and treacherous designs now carrying on by the tools of ministerial vengeance, for the subjugation of all British America, suggest to us the painful necessity of having recourse to arms for the preservation of those rights and liberties which the principles of our constitution, laws of God, nature, and nations make it our duty to defend. We, therefore * * * do hereby faithfully unite ourselves under the most solemn ties of religion, honor, and love for our country, firmly to resist force by force in defense of our national freedom, * * * against all invasions, and * * * do solemnly engage to take up arms and risk our lives and our fortunes in maintaining the freedom of our country whenever * * * the Continental Congress or the provincial convention shall declare it necessary * * * and do firmly agree to hold all such persons as inimical to the liberties of America who shall refuse to sign this association."

This association was first signed by the Committee of Safety, consisting of 48 enthusiasts for American independence or conciliation with the British Government on terms that would guarantee to the Colonies constitutional rights, local self-government, and representation in the Parliament. It would be interesting and instructive to read the names of all the members of the committee of 48 and also to know how many citizens of the county signed the pledge. Hunter's History contains the names of 17 of the signers. They were William Graham, Charles McLean, Frederick Hambright, John Walker, Jacob Forney, Thomas Espey, Andrew Neal, Joseph Neal, John Dellinger, George Dellinger, Joseph Harden, Jacob Costner, Valentine Mauney, Peter Sides, Joseph Kuykendall, James Coburn, and James Miller. The historian says there were, in fact, other signers, which indicates there may be somewhere a record of the complete list. If so, it should be published. However, we know a large portion of the population did not sign. They sincerely believed those advocating independence and armed opposition to their King to be rebels and traitors. Opposition to duly constituted power is rebellion if it fails, but revolution if it succeeds, and those who participate are rebels if they meet failure but heroic partiots if they win. Such is the popular verdict of society, though some of us can not understand why success or failure alone should characterize a man's conduct if he is acting in the furtherance of principles he believes to be right, guided by an enlightened conscience.

It should not be forgotten that the loyalists or Tories were sincere in their beliefs. They were simply standing by their king and his government, which was duly established. They were for the most part conservative, substantial, dependable citizens. We all know now they were mistaken in their judgment. But they and their descendants have contributed much to the stability of this Government. We need the conservatives to apply the brakes. Never in our history did we need them more than now. Radicalism is rampant throughout the land. It is manifest in government, in politics, in church, in business, in commerce, in society—everywhere. Unless the brakes are applied we are riding for a fall. Our institutions, bought by the blood of the patriots we honor to-day, are not secure. The Federal Government, State governments, municipal governments, neighborhoods and communities, railroads, drainage districts, and a majority of even nationally known

industrial, commercial, and banking corporations, and a large percentage of our individual citizens have borrowed recklessly until there is scarcely money enough in the country to pay our annual interest, and the average individual scarcely earns income to pay the interest on his debts, to say nothing of the principal. Yet we stand up on our hind legs and howl over the havoc we have wrought in our headlong rush to the poorhouse, and blame the governor, the legislature, the Congress, or the President, whichever we desire to see defeated at next election.

On the other hand, through all history men of vision who saw beyond their day and were willing to junk the established order and customs that civilization might advance have constituted the world's greatest benefactors. Such were the men whose memory we honor to-day. They looked beyond the present and sacrificed popularity and friendship to serve the general good and establish free government for themselves and their posterity. They were called radicals and cranks by those who were satisfied with the status quo. They left us a priceless heritage. In their day they were not appreciated for what they were. Many of them and their faults and personal eccentricities. I would like to speak about the peculiar personalities and habits of some of them. They were cranks. We are all cranks. We are made cranks to enable us to help turn the wheels of civilization along the upward road. The crank, if properly attached, makes the business, social, political, industrial, economic, and religious world go round. The only thing to worry about is whether one is properly attached. Some of us are attached and are spending and being spent in serious effort to help make the world a little better, and to safeguard the heritage of the fathers, while the rest of us are detached as clubs to beat over the heads and cripple those who are trying to carry the load.

Let us get a proper setting of the battle of Ramsours Mill in the War of the Revolution. It was fought June 20, 1780.

In the North, during the year 1778, the fortunes of war strongly favored the British, but in 1779 slightly favored the patriots.

In the South conditions were quite different. In the fall of 1778 General Prevost, after completely subduing the feeble opposition to the British cause in the Florida Territory and after establishing British authority there, marched into Georgia for the purpose of subduing that colony. March 3, 1779, at the battle of Briar Creek the American Army was defeated and almost destroyed. The British conquest of Georgia proceeded rapidly and almost unhampered and on October 8, 1779, Savannah was sacked, and the last organized army of opposition crushed.

These disasters so disheartened the colonists of Georgia and South Carolina that they practically ceased for the time opposition to British arms, most of their militia disbanded, and many of the colonists professed allegiance. Only General Lincoln was left with an army of about 4,000 to oppose the apparently certain and rapid conquest of the South. The patriot cause was desperate and the spirit of the patriots at a low ebb.

Sir Henry Clinton and General Cornwallis with more than 7,000 men under arms came south determined to overrun this section and then attack the American armies of the North from the rear or, if necessary, grant the northern colonies independence while retaining the South as a British colony.

February 11, 1780, they began the siege of Charleston, which was defended by General Lincoln and his little army of 4,000. After two months Charleston fell and was partially burned, and a large part of the American Army was lost in killed, wounded, and captured. The remnant fell back into the interior. Clinton returned to the North flushed with victory and left Cornwallis to complete what seemed to all the easy task of completing the subjugation of the South. Colonel Buford was at the head of a small American force in South Carolina. In May, 1780, the British practically destroyed his army, and now only Gen. Horatio Gates—who had been placed in command of the American forces in the South—and his army at Camden, S. C., was left to defend the patriot cause. Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina had been overrun, and Cornwallis, flushed with victory after victory prepared to crush North Carolina, where loyal sentiment was strong and apparently growing stronger. It seemed that nothing could prevent his success. The South appeared inevitably lost. The question of suing for peace on terms of independence for the northern colonies and leaving the South a British possession was seriously considered in the Continental Congress. Benedict Arnold had deserted the patriot cause. Even Washington had said, "I have almost ceased to hope."

British oppression, a cruel army of invasion, conquest, and loss of freedom hung over North Carolina like a black cloud. Cornwallis was already knocking at the doors of Charlotte, and two armies under two trusted and brave subordinate officers, Ferguson and Tarleton, were marching on that Colony from the south and west of Charlotte, supporting Cornwallis on his left. They sent messages through North Carolina that if the patriots would surrender to British rule their property and their women and children would be cared for, but if they offered resistance their country would be laid waste by fire and sword.

Faced with a choice between slavery to a foreign monarch and a last death grapple at arms with an apparently invincible foe, a number of brave and heroic patriot leaders in North Carolina decided to meet the invader in combat, with the determination to preserve freedom for themselves and their posterity or give their lives in the cause.

Colonels Shelby, Sevier, and McDowell were at the head of the irregular patriot armies in western North Carolina and South Carolina opposing the advance of Tarleton and Ferguson. Early in June an army of approximately 900 men under command of Gen. Griffith Rutherford was assembled near Charlotte to oppose the British army under Cornwallis and Rawdon which was threatening that city.

The first of June, 1780, Cornwallis dispatched two Lincoln County Tory officers, Col. John Moore, son of Moses Moore, and Maj. Nicholas Welch, who had fought with the British in the South Carolina campaigns, to recruit the loyalists in Mecklenburg, Rowan, Lincoln, Burke, and Rutherford Counties, to apprise them of the Whig disasters in South Carolina, and to assure them that British arms would soon bring them deliverance from the "Whig rebellion." On June 10, Colonel Moore assembled about 40 Tories on Indian Creek, west of Lincolnton, for conference. Maj. Joseph McDowell, with about 25 patriots, apprised of the presence of this Tory force, maneuvered near by, but when Moore and his followers offered battle he retreated, and was vainly pursued as far as Burke County line near Three-County corner. Colonel Moore disbanded his followers, but ordered them to reassemble at Ramsours Mill June 13. On that day more than 200 Tories assembled. Major Welch was present. He brought glowing accounts of the brilliant successes of British arms. Native loyalists believed the "rebellion" was about over. The reports made by Moore and Welch spread rapidly, and recruits assembled in force from as far as Burke County, until, on the 19th, an army of more than 1,300 men, over 900 of whom were under arms, had assembled and were in training. It is stated by some that the native loyalists did not assemble for the purpose of making offensive warfare on the Whigs, but that they assembled for the purpose of deciding upon the best method of protecting themselves and providing for the support of the King's army when it should come into the community.

What the truth is I can not say, but it is a fact that more than one-fourth of those assembled were unarmed. I think it probable they had in mind to recruit an army for the King's service when called for. They were true royalists. Their known officers were Col. John Moore, Maj. Nicholas Welch, and Capts. Patrick Moore, Cumerland, Carpenter, Keener, Williams, Warlick, Whiston, and Murray, the latter two being Burke County men.

On June 14 General Rutherford, having received intelligence that the Tories were assembling in force in Lincoln County, ordered Col. Francis Locke, of Rowan, Maj. David Wilson, of Mecklenburg, and Captains Brandon, Knox, and Falls, and other officers to recruit a patriot army to disperse the Tories—being unwilling at the time to weaken his own army or to remove it as a barrier to the threatened invasion of North Carolina by the British Army under Cornwallis and Rawdon. These officers, under orders of General Rutherford, hastened to recruit a patriot force from Mecklenburg, Rowan, and Lincoln, and by June 19 they joined forces with Col. James Johnson, of Lincoln, and Maj. Joseph McDowell, of Burke, on Mountain Creek, in Lincoln County, at "the glade" just east of Little Mountain. Meantime the British Army had withdrawn toward Camden, S. C., and General Rutherford had marched his army across the Catawba River at Tuckaseege Ford and camped, June 19, 16 miles from Ramsours Mill, on the farm of Col. Joseph Dickson northwest of Mount Holly, where he was joined by Cols. William Graham and Joseph Dickson and Peter Forney.

The purpose of Rutherford was to join the forces under Colonel Locke and attack the Tories at Ramsours Mill jointly on June 20. But, through some misunderstanding, Colonel Locke at the head of his recruited army of 400 began his march from Mountain Creek toward Ramsours Mill late on the evening of June 19, while Rutherford remained in camp at the Dickson place until the morning of the 20th.

Locke's army met the Tories at Ramsours Mill shortly after daylight on the morning of June 20 and immediately engaged them in battle, Major McDowell and Captains Brandon and Falls with their mounted cavalry leading the attack. The armed Tories outnumbered the Patriots more than 2 to 1, the Tories engaged numbering about 900 while the Patriots numbered scarcely more than 400. Both armies were composed entirely of raw, untrained troops, practically none of whom had ever before engaged in battle. But they were brave, hardy frontiersmen on both sides, fighting for the right as they saw it. The battle was fierce and sanguinary and bloody. It was Turk against Greek, brother against brother, kinsmen against kinsmen, friend against friend, and neighbor against neighbor. The Tory army occupied the crest of the hill east of Clarks Creek, and the Patriots attacked from the east. Officers and men fought side by side without regard for discipline, order, or military tactics. The fortunes of battle varied from time to time as these two untrained, irregular armies engaged in deadly combat, often fighting at close quarters, using their rifles as clubs.

The reckless bravery and heroism of the patriot officers is evidenced by the fact that Capts. Gilbraith Falls, Patrick Knox, Dobson, Smith, Bowman, Sloan, and Armstrong were killed, and Capts. James Houston, Daniel McKissick, and William Wilson, together with several inferior officers, were wounded. Dauntless courage and daring bravery and not superior military strategy turned the tide of battle in favor of the patriots. They doggedly marched straight through the Tory line of

battle in the face of a withering and deadly fire from the guns of the enemy.

When the smoke of battle cleared the patriots were in charge of the field. Their victory was complete. The Tory army had been cut to pieces and the fragments had retreated to the opposite side of Clarks Creek, where they rejoined their more than 400 unarmed comrades who had not been engaged. Seventy men were killed and about 200 were wounded, the casualties being about evenly divided. Fifty Tories were taken prisoners.

General Rutherford and Cols. William R. Davis, William Davidson, William Graham, James Johnson, Peter Forney, and Joseph Dickson and their army of 1,200 men arrived on the field of battle in time to help bury the dead and care for the wounded and celebrate the patriot victory.

Ramsours Mill completely destroyed the morale of the loyalists. Colonel Moore with about 30 followers made his way to South Carolina and rejoined the army of Cornwallis, but the remainder of the Tory army disbanded and returned to their homes. There was not another serious effort to recruit a Tory army in North Carolina. The contribution of this battle to the final success of the patriot cause can scarcely be estimated. Defeat of the patriot army at Ramsours Mill would have been disastrous to the patriot cause in the South in all probability. It would have meant a call and general rally to arms of the loyalist sympathizers all over North Carolina which would have made it well-nigh impossible for the patriots to prevent the conquest of the colony by the armies of Cornwallis. Ramsours Mill paved the way to victory at Kings Mountain where on October 7, 1780, was fought the most decisive battle of the war, marking unmistakably the definite turning of the tide of war in favor of the Americans. Truly, as Thomas Jefferson said, "Kings Mountain was the turning point in the War for Independence." No other such battle is recorded in American history—none so decisive, none showing such bravery and heroic daring by untrained soldiers, and none so far-reaching in its contribution to American independence.

A few weeks after Kings Mountain, Colonel Tarleton was utterly defeated at Cowpens by Colonel Morgan, and the rout of his army was almost as complete as that of Ferguson at Kings Mountain. Meantime Cornwallis had run into a "hornet's nest" at Charlotte and was compelled to withdraw into South Carolina. Ramsours Mill, Kings Mountain, and Cowpens lit the spark of patriot fervor that caused a general uprising in all the southern colonies and the rapid assembling of patriot armies to drive the invader from their borders. A new spirit of victory and independence thrilled the patriots, especially in North Carolina. The doom of the British cause in the South was sealed. After that Cornwallis maneuvered and conducted a defensive campaign, the inevitably disastrous end of which was known to none better than to himself. Ramsours Mill made possible Kings Mountain, Cowpens, Guilford Courthouse, Yorktown, and American independence.

An accurate biographical history of the officers and men of the patriot army who distinguished themselves at Ramsours Mill would constitute a fair general outline of the history of Piedmont, N. C., from the period of the Revolution through the first quarter of the nineteenth century. I can not name them all.

Among the officers actually engaged were Col. Francis Locke of Rowan, officer in command and hero of the battle, Col. Hugh Brevard and several brothers, Maj. Abram Forney, Maj. Joseph McDowell, Maj. David Wilson, Maj. James Rutherford, and Captains Falls, Brandon, Armstrong, Dobson, Smith, Bowman, Daniel Alexander, McKissick, Houston, Knox, Sloan, Hugh Torrence, Robert Ramsay of Rowan, distinguished for bravery also at Charlotte Courthouse and Cowpens (who in a hand-to-hand encounter with a Tory at Ramsours Mill, after the Whigs had gained the top of the ridge, felled his antagonist with his gun barrel and broke it and took the Tory's gun, which for many years was, and probably still is, preserved by the Ramsay family of Salisbury as a trophy), David Caldwell, and John Reid. Other distinguished officers who came up with Rutherford's army too late to take part in the battle were Gen. Griffith Rutherford, Cols. William P. Davidson, William R. Davie, James Johnson, Joseph Dickson, William Graham; Captains Harden, Martin, and Simmons, and Gen. Peter Forney, who by forced marches from the Waxhaw section, upon hearing of an impending battle with the Tories in his home county, joined his little army to that of General Rutherford on the night of June 19.

Among other men engaged at Ramsours Mill with the patriot army were David Vance, grandfather of Zebulon Baird Vance; John Duckworth, who was wounded in battle; Adam Reep, William Feimster, of Iredell; Francis McCorkle, who displayed great bravery and daring on the battlefield and in other battles of the Revolution (his wife was Sarah Work, of Rowan, and he is said to have been a physical giant, over 6 feet tall, with red hair and quite florid complexion); Adam Brevard, brother of Col. Hugh Brevard; and probably, but not surely, Col. John Nixon, who was at Kings Mountain and was killed in 1781 by the Cherokees; John Stamey and Jeremiah Mundy, of Lincoln County. Those participating on both sides having been volunteers and not enlisted in any regular army, there is no official muster roll of the heroes who fought there, and probably there never can be compiled anything like a complete list of those engaged. But the Jacob Forney Chapter should engage seriously in the task, if it has not already done so, of enrolling as many as possible of the names of our pioneer ancestors who fought here that we might be free.

I make special mention of Col. Joseph Dickson for the reason that he later was a member of the committee that selected the site for the town of Lincolnton and was made the holding trustee for the lands embraced in the town site. It was he who executed and signed all the deeds to original purchasers of lots in Lincolnton.

He also became the first clerk of the superior court of Lincoln County and was designated colonel of militia for the county. He was a State Senator from Lincoln County from 1788 to 1795 and in 1789, when the University of North Carolina was established, he became one of the 40 original trustees. He was a Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from Lincoln County from 1799 to 1801. In this connection I might add that a few years later, 1815–1818, Daniel M. Forney, of Lincoln County, oldest son of Peter Forney, also served two terms in the National House of Representatives.

It should be recounted here that Ramsours Mill battle ground is famous not alone for the battle that was fought here. No other community in North Carolina was the scene of as much military activity during the Revolution as Lincolnton and surrounding territory.

Ramsours Mill seems to have been desirable as a mustering and assembly ground. We know that during the war prior to the great battle here, Ramsours Mill was the scene of frequent Tory assemblies and conferences. Early in 1780, before the Battle of Ramsours Mill, Maj. Abram Forney and Capt. John Baldridge were stationed at Ramsours mill, from which point as a base they harrassed the Tories in this section. The 1st of October, 1780, when the patriots were feverishly assembling an army to meet the seasoned troops of Colonel Ferguson, who was overrunning the country around Kings Mountain, South Carolina troops under Williams, Hill, and Lacy, of Kings Mountain fame, had marched east through South Carolina and up the Catawba River endeavoring to join General Davidson's army in its campaign against Cornwallis at Charlotte.

Learning of the plans of the "mountain men" under Shelby and Campbell to engage Ferguson, they crossed the Catawba at Beatties Ford, joined Cols. William Graham and Frederick Hambright and Maj. Abram Forney and Major Chronicle, and with their combined forces decided to join the "mountain men" under Shelby, Campbell, and McDowells. They crossed the upper forks of Duchmans Creek and camped at Ramsours Mill and lingered in the community several days until they could get information as to the whereabouts of the "mountain men." Learning it was the purpose of the mountain leaders to assemble near Cherry Mountain, in Rutherford County, they marched through Lincoln County on the Flint Hill Road, arriving at Cowpens on the evening before the Battle of Kings Mountain, in which battle Major Chronicle fell mortally wounded in the first charge, and every other Lincoln County participant made himself immortal.

After the Battle of Cowpens, January 17, 1781, there began the most protracted and famous retreat and pursuit ever staged between two armies in America. The Tories had been defeated and discouraged at Ramsours Mill; Ferguson and his army had been completely destroyed at Kings Mountain, not even one man escaping; Morgan had disgraced the haughty Tarleton and killed, wounded, or captured nearly all his army, taking over 500 men prisoners; and Cornwallis had been driven from Charlotte.

These reverses had disheartened and made desperate Lord Cornwallis. He was exasperated that rough, untrained, uneducated mountain pioneers armed only with hunting rifles should thus cut to pieces the flower of the King's army. He was not only exasperated but humiliated and determined to get sweet revenge by himself destroying General Morgan's army. Morgan decided not to engage Cornwallis until he could effect a junction with the army under General Greene. I do not know the route traveled by Morgan's army through Lincoln County. All I know is that he crossed the Catawba at Island Ford, where he was joined by Gen. Nathaniel Greene, who assumed supreme command of the army. But Cornwallis came into Lincoln County by way of Tryon Court House, where he camped on January 23, 1781. The next day he arrived at Ramsours Mill, where he remained with his army until the 28th. He came to Ramsours Mill over the Flint Hill Road. General O'Hara covered his left flank and crossed the South Fork 1 mile above the Rutherfordton Road and camped at the Reep place 2½ miles northwest of Ramsours Mill. Colonel Tarleton covered the right flank and crossed the South Fork in Cobbs Bottoms and marched across the ridge on which Lincolnton now stands and halted for refreshments at Dellinger's Tavern, north of the present court square.

Here at Ramsours Mill Cornwallis abandoned all his excessive equipment and heavy wagons, so eager was he to overtake and punish Morgan. On the 29th of January he marched to Beatties Ford, but due to swollen waters by heavy rains he could not cross and fell back to Jacob Forney's place, where he remained until February 1. On February 1 he marched his army across the Catawba at Cowans Ford in the face of a withering fire from a patriot army stationed on the east side of the river, under Cols. William P. Davidson, Peter and Abram Forney, Joseph Graham,

and others. Thus Cornwallis lingered in Lincoln County for eight days, so hospitable were our people, and our boys accorded him a warm farewell as he left our borders.

The State militia was called out early in May, 1782, to quell a Cherokee Indian uprising. Maj. Abram Forney was placed in command of a company and ordered to rendezvous at Ramsours Mill. He remained there with his army from June 1 to August 1, when he marched to the headwaters of the Catawba, where he joined Col. Joseph McDowell and his forces and proceeded to Buncombe County and the Cherokee Nation, where they carried out a successful campaign and returned home in October.

Thus it will be seen that Ramsours Mill was the scene of military activity and felt the tramp of marshaled soldiery on at least five distinct occasions during the Revolutionary period.

We stand on hallowed ground, enriched by the blood of a brave and noble ancestry who sacrificed all for the cause of freedom and liberty for themselves and for us and for those to come after us. Their blood and treasure contributed in large measure to the establishment of our glorious Republic and made possible this flag which to-day kisses the breezes in every civilized country and on every ocean and sea on the globe—emblematic of those virtues in government and political activity which alone can bring to fruition the hopes and aspirations of men and women everywhere who seek freedom under God and equality of opportunity to achieve that happiness and well being ordained to be the heritage of all mankind by the Creator of the Universe. Let us here dedicate ourselves to the task of preserving for ourselves and for our children and our children's children our glorious heritage of liberty under law which was made possible by the sacrifices of those noble and daring men and women whose contribution here to human liberty we remember to-day, and whose memory we shall cherish forevermore.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement submitted to the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders of the House to-day by a number of gentlemen residing in the District of Columbia, on the subject of the District of Columbia appropriation bill?

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement submitted to the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders of the House to-day by a number of gentlemen residing in the District of Columbia on the subject of the District of Columbia appropriation bill:

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority floor leaders of the House of Representatives of the United States:

In the city of Washington, on June 20, 1930, there gathered a voluntary meeting of men representing all walks of life and all interests in the District of Columbia, including merchants, officers of the city's leading bank and trust companies, leaders of organized labor, the responsible officers of the city's most active trade and commercial organizations, and professional men.

This gathering resulted from a deep concern over the threatened failure of the pending District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year beginning on July 1.

As a result of that concern and of the discussion caused thereby, the undersigned committee was designated to present to the Congress the following:

We urge—

1. A resumption of conferences between the two Houses for the purpose of making further efforts to bring about the enactment of the above-mentioned bill, including the appropriation of the sums which, in equity and fairness, should be borne, on the one hand, by the National Government and, on the other, by the taxpayers of the city of Washington.

2. That earnest and careful consideration be given to the extremely deplorable effects of the failure of the pending legislation not only locally in the city of Washington but nationally.

3. That the Congress of the United States do not adjourn, in this time of widespread unemployment, leaving unenacted legislation the failure of which would increase unemployment.

We directly and earnestly invite your attention to the fact that if the regular appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year is not enacted, but that the running expenses of the municipality are merely provided for by a legislation continuing the ordinary appropriation of the current fiscal year, the following will result:

There would be a failure of appropriations for greatly needed additions to and repairs in the public schools of the city of Washington. Entirely aside from the importance of efficiently maintaining the public schools, this would deprive several hundred men engaged in the "building trades" of employment.

For projected improvements, such as the Public Library Building, extensions and new equipment in the city's sewer and fire departments, and for the new buildings and extensions to buildings needed to carry on the work of public welfare, including a children's tuberculosis sanitorium, the pending bill carries appropriations. Here again needed employment will be unavailable, unemployment increased if these appropriations fail; and this entirely aside from the deplorable consideration of marking time when work of this vital nature should be going forward.

The bill provides for important street improvements. Among no class is the present problem of lack of work so vital as among the laboring men, of whom it is estimated from 1,200 to 1,500 would fail of employment if this work of street improvement is not carried on in the Capital City during the ensuing 12 months. We stress, as we think should be stressed, the hardships which would result from this unemployment; but we do not overlook, as we submit it should not be overlooked, the resulting condition of disrepair and of failure to provide the street improvements which will confront the Capital during the period of the contemplated Washington bicentennial. The greatly increased future cost of highway work following a period of neglect is as obvious as it is inevitable. The unemployment which would result among laboring men who, should the pending bill be unenacted, would work on the public streets, can not be made good by legislation enacted at the next regular session of Congress, for, as it is well known, that character of work can not be done in cold weather.

We are informed that if provision for the District of Columbia expenses for the ensuing fiscal year is made by continuing resolution rather than by the pending bill, approximately $14,000,000 less will be available.

We have spoken only of direct results. Neither time nor space suffices for an adequate reference to indirect results, involving manufacturing and transportation. The numerous industries producing materials which the projected improvements require will readily come to mind. Their employees are concerned.

The existing unemployment problem, we repeat, is unfortunately nation-wide. We are sure it is temporary; but while it exists it is very real and certainly our National Legislature will do nothing to increase it, nor leaving nothing undone which can appropriately be done by that body to diminish it. It is not possible to increase the seriousness of that situation here without indirectly affecting it all over the country.

We realize that in the above we have stated nothing that is new and nothing of which the Members of our legislative bodies are not fully aware. We here emphasize them, however, that their seriousness may not be overlooked in the closing days of this extraordinarily busy session of Congress.

ROBERT V. FLEMING.
JOHN POOLE.
JOHN B. COLPOYS.
CHAS. C. GLOVER, Jr.
JOSHUA EVANS, Jr.
JOHN JOY EDSON.
FRANK J. HOGAN.
SIDNEY F. TALIAFERRO.
E. F. COLLADAY
SAMUEL J. PRESCOTT.
THOMAS P. LITTLEPAGE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania, for a few days, on account of death in his family.

Mr. LANHAM, for to-day, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next it may be in order to call the Consent Calendar, beginning where the call last left off.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next to consider bills on the Consent Calendar, beginning at the star. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the Speaker inform the House if he will recognize any motions to suspend the rules on that day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not do that except by unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what other legislation will this push aside?

Mr. TILSON. None whatever. It really is necessary to have at least one consent calendar day every week. Alternate Mondays we have already for this calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask the majority leader a question. I understand the Senate has agreed to vote on the veterans' bill Monday and the bill will possibly be messaged over here not later than Tuesday. Will we have time to consider the Senate amendments on Tuesday?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know as to that, but there is certainly no intention to delay action on that bill.

Mr. RANKIN. This unanimous consent request does not apply to Tuesday?

Mr. TILSON. No; it simply refers to Monday next.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall not object.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 4123. An act to provide for the aiding of farmers in any State by the making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, levee and drainage districts, counties, boards of supervisors, and/or other political subdivisions and legal entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of Seth J. Harris; and

H. R. 7997. An act authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of additional land for the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4017. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928, pertaining to certain War Department contracts by repealing the expiration date of that act.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of Seth J. Harris; and

H. R. 7997. An act authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of additional land for the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, June 21, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

557. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting report dated June 20, 1930, covering refunds and credits of internal revenue taxes for the calendar year 1929 (H. Doc. No. 478), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 258. A resolution that a special committee be appointed by the Speaker to investigate expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 264. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 12549, a bill to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright and to permit the United States to enter the International Copyright Union; without amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 236. A resolution to pay Elizabeth Williams, widow of John Williams, six months' compensation and an additional amount not exceeding $250 to defray funeral expenses and last illness of the said John Williams (Rept. No. 1986). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. S. Con. Res. 30. A concurrent resolution to pay to Helen T. Scott a sum equal to six months' compensation of the late Walter W. Scott (Rept. No. 1987). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 249. A resolution authorizing additional clerical service in the enrolling room for the balance of the present session (Rept. No. 1988). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 227. A resolution to pay James W. Boyer, jr., for extra and expert services to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation (Rept. No. 1989). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 367. A joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to create in the Treasury Department a Bureau of Narcotics, and for other purposes," approved June 14, 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10658. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. p. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174, ch. 21, title 26); with amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PURNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 267. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 11514, a bill to define preserve, jam, jelly, and apple butter, to provide standards therefor, and to amend the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 4345. An act for the relief of Lillian G. Frost; without amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9914. A bill for the relief of John W. Harllee; with amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12915. A bill for the relief of D. M. Leypoldt Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 11558. A bill providing for the disposition of orders, medals, decorations, diplomas, certificates, and gifts now deposited in the Department of State, tendered by foreign governments to certain retired, resigned, or deceased officers of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1591) to authorize Col. Cornelius W. Wickersham, Infantry Reserve, to accept from the French Government the brevet and insignia of Officer de la Legion d'Honneur, and the same was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 13075) providing for the reconditioning of the old Federal post office and Federal courthouse building in the city of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 13076) providing for the voluntary liquidation of Federal land banks and joint-stock land banks, the establishment of a Federal merger land bank, and the lowering of interest rates to borrowers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 265) providing that the Committee on Flood Control, or a subcommittee thereof, be authorized to conduct hearings relative to the proposed revision of or changes in the Mississippi River flood-control project; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. OWEN. Resolution (H. Res. 266) to investigate flood conditions in the Lake Okeechobee region in Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 13077) granting a pension to Ida Goldthwait; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 13078) granting a pension to Cloyd B. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13079) granting an increase of pension to Mary Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 13080) granting a pension to Matt G. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13081) for the relief of Lloyd Massie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 13082) granting a pension to Henry Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 13083) for the relief of Capt. Walter Carl Merkel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13084) granting a pension to Sarah E. Goine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 13085) granting a pension to George Brill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 13086) for the relief of Alexander H. Bright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 13087) granting an increase of pension to Eva Calvert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13088) granting an increase of pension to Maria S. Carsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13089) for the relief of Sarah Maddocks Ferguson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13090) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Adamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEECH: A bill (H. R. 13091) granting a pension to Edmund James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13092) to authorize and adjust and settle the claim of Leslie W. Morse; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13093) granting a pension to Mary M. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 13094) for the relief of H. L. Todd; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7617. Petition of Hennepin County commissioners of Minneapolis, Minn., urging immediate passage of the Couzens joint resolution suspending consolidation of railroads until Congress has further legislated on the subject; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7618. By Mr. REID of Illinois: Resolutions adopted by the Illinois Association of Sanitary District Trustees in convention assembled at Aurora, Ill., on June 12, 1930, requesting that reservoirs be constructed upon the headwaters of the rivers and streams in the State of Illinois so that they may be conserved, purified, and their flow facilitated, the cost thereof to be borne in equal parts by the local districts, the State of Illinois, and the United States, or such other division of the cost thereof made as shall be determined to be fair; to the Committee on Flood Control.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, *June 21, 1930*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Most Gracious Lord, in the quiet of this noonday moment, with its ministries of help and light, may we receive wise incentive for the labors before us. Whatever our tasks may be, may we feel that they are Thine, and with Thy direction may we move forth with trust and dignity. During the days of our lives we would walk with Thee and with our fellow men in a life of loving service. At the eventide to-day may it be our highest joy to find ourselves at the hearths of happy firesides. In the name of Jesus, the lover of men. 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 with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11781. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

LETTER FROM AN EX-SERVICE MAN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] took the floor in my absence and without notifying me and made an unwarranted attack upon me. He also inserted in the RECORD a letter from an ex-service man whose name I do not recall ever having heard before. It was a letter I had never seen and for which I was in no way responsible. It seems to have been written by an ex-soldier who lives in Mr. JOHNSON's home town of Aberdeen, S. Dak. Since he has inserted it in the RECORD, I reproduce it here. It reads as follows:

ONE MORE DISABLED VETERAN WANTS JOHNSON BEATEN

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU HOSPITAL NO. 72,
Fort Harrison, Mont., April 21, 1930.

Mr. TOM AYRES,
Manager Dakota Free Press, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

DEAR MR. AYRES: Several of the boys have written to you from this hospital, but I thought I would drop you a line, since I am from Aberdeen, S. Dak. I wish you every success in your campaign for Congressman, and certainly hope that you defeat ROYAL C. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON, I think, is no sincere friend of the disabled soldiers, since in his position as chairman of the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee his vote caused the tie which ruled out the Rankin bill, H. R. 7825.

What made the men here disgusted was the fact that in the next D. A. V. paper ROYAL C. JOHNSON wrote an article where he blandly mentions that he thinks that the rest of Congress should abide by the decision of the committee, since the majority was not in favor of the Rankin measure, when it was a strict tie, and if JOHNSON had not voted the majority would have gone for the Rankin measure. I do not think it is customary for a chairman to vote, and in this case ROYAL C. JOHNSON voted, causing a tie, and then in his position as chairman ruled the Rankin measure out. I would like very much to have this brought to the attention of the voters, as I am sure if they knew the facts they would give you every support in preference to ROYAL C. JOHNSON for Congressman.

Yours for success,

[Name deleted],
Uncompensated T. B.

I had the cloakroom call the office of the gentleman from South Dakota and notify him that I expected to refer to him on the floor to-day and to reply to some of the statements made by him on yesterday.

In discussing this letter Mr. JOHNSON said:

It is typical of the propaganda which was conducted by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

That statement is untrue. I wrote no such letter, I inspired no such letter. I leave it to the membership of this House—yes; I will omit my Democratic colleagues and leave it to you Republicans—and ask you if I have not been absolutely fair in this fight for veterans' relief.

Some Members on the Republican side asked me to get them paired for the bill in case they were not here. I did my best, but could find no one to pair with them. They were later criticised by the leading service organization in their State for not voting, whereupon I wrote the leaders of that organization a letter explaining the situation and sent the Members involved a copy of it. Does that look as if I was conducting a propaganda campaign to injure some one politically?

The gentleman from South Dakota went on and, in my opinion, violated one of the most sacred obligations which one ex-service man owes to another. He violated the rules of every department of our Government in reference to the publication of records of ex-service men when he inserted the record of this man's alleged misconduct in the service, to try to discredit him.

It is true that he deleted the man's name from the RECORD, but he read it on the floor, and every man who reads the RECORD and who saw the paper in which this letter was published will know that this is the same man and without going back and digging up the facts they will take them as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I only regret that I have not the right to expunge it from the RECORD, because it ought to be expunged. Every service man in the House resents the insertion in the RECORD of the alleged misconduct of this ex-soldier.

Not only that, but he alleges that "on June 26, 1919, a few days after he enlisted, he shot his own foot." I called up the