between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, so far as it affects that parcel of land in the Panama Canal Zone known as the Paitilla Point Military Reservation, and the message (with the accompanying papers) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EMPLOYMENT OF A MESSENGER

Mr. PHIPPS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 396), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to employ a messenger to be paid at the rate of $1,680 per annum out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, were referred to the appropriate committees.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. As in executive session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 8, 1931, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 7 (legislative day of January 5), 1931

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

George P. Waller, of Alabama, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a consul, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

George Z. Medalie, of New York, to be United States attorney, southern district of New York, to succeed Charles H. Tuttle, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 7 (legislative day of January 5), 1931

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Edward Adams, Taftville.

FLORIDA

William C. Bretz, Fort Lauderdale.
Fred E. Hall, Winter Haven.

MINNESOTA

Otto W. Peterson, Audubon.
Otis T. Wentzell, Moorhead.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred O. Kossow, Cedargrove.
Clifford R. Bower, Columbus.
Henry C. Allen, Paterson.

PENNSYLVANIA

Asa F. Hockman, Chalfont.
Paul M. Seaber, Lititz.
Isaac L. Shilling, Reedsville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Floyd V. Stephens, Canova.
Arthur M. Hanson, Iroquois.
Robert C. Van Horn, Kennebec.
Elmer N. Rasmussen, Onaka.
Reynold H. Peterson, Pollock.
Daisy B. Chamberlain, Quinn.
Lydia H. Johnson, Sanator.
Harry D. Crosmer, Scenic.
Eloise Holdren, Vale.
Archibald B. Elliott, Valley Springs.
Charles E. Sheldon, Watauga.
Merrill Kaufman, Wood.

TEXAS

Charles J. Steves, Bay City.
John B. Miller, Tyler.

VIRGINIA

Ferdinand C. Knight, Alexandria.
Louise J. Nottingham, Eastville.
Augustus R. Morris, Jetersville.
Georgie H. Osborne, Keysville.
Clinton L. Wright, Norfolk.
Albert L. Taylor, Parksley.
Charles V. Tucker, Phenix.
Patrick J. Riley, Portsmouth.

WISCONSIN

Clayton M. Honeysett, Footville.
Raymond E. Lingsweiler, Sturtevant.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

With the boldness of love and with humble confidence, we wait in this quiet moment, Heavenly Father. Thy chastisements have been most merciful. Come to our rescue, if we are weak and overborne; and if we are captive, release us and become our Redeemer. Be pleased, O God, to remember us, and may everything that is benign and pure rule over whatever is selfish, proud, and hateful. Thou who broodest over the world and dost spread abroad Thy wings and it is night, and let Thy face shine and it is day, make us Thy children of the morning, walking, waiting patiently for that character that shall be in us when we see Thee face to face. Let the divine impulse rest upon us this day. 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 of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 13130. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Bogue Chitto River between Sun and Bush, St. Tammany Parish, La.; and

H. R. 14446. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Prairie du Chien, Wis.

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

S. 4803. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Atchafalaya River at or near Morgan City, La.;

S. 4804. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Atchafalaya River at or near Krotz Springs, La.;

S. 4805. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.;

S. 4806. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Alexandria, La.;

S. 4807. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. 4808. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River at or near Shreveport, La.;

S. 4809. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Sterlington, La.;

S. 4810. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, La.;

S. 4811. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Harrisonburg, La.;

S. 4812. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Black River at or near Jonesville, La.;

S. 5456. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 21 meets Texas Highway No. 45;

S. 5457. An act authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 6 meets Texas Highway No. 21; and

S. 5458. An act authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 7 meets Texas Highway No. 7.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized to propound a unanimous-consent request? I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the drought relief appropriation bill and consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole, so as to facilitate the passage of the measure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that under the circumstances, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee being present and having made a request for unanimous consent yesterday, the Chair would not recognize any gentleman to make such request without at least the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GARNER. In other words, then, I am asked to transfer my allegiance from the Chair, who has the right of recognition, to the man that I have to get the permission from.

The SPEAKER. The Chair accepts the transfer.

Mr. GARNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. WOOD, that we take up the drought relief bill in the House and consider it as in Committee of the Whole, with a view of expediting its consideration.

Mr. WOOD. I do not see any reason why this drought relief bill should be treated in a different way from any other appropriation bill. I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent to take this bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to all Senate amendments, ask for a conference and the appointment of conferees, and act upon it just as quickly thereafter as is possible.

Mr. GARNER. I would suggest to the gentleman that we could have got through with all this yesterday. We could get through now in an hour. There are only two amendments. We could take them up in the House as in Committee of the Whole and in an hour we could finish discussing them, and then the House would have an opportunity to express itself upon the amendments, so that when it went back to the Senate the Senate would know the will of the House, and this is the only way to get it done that I know of.

Mr. WOOD. I do not want to violate any of the courtesies or the ethics we owe to our brothers on the other side of the aisle. We ought to give them at least an opportunity to correct their mistakes. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. Let us determine whether it was a mistake or not. That is what we want to do. We want an opportunity to determine whether they made a mistake or not.

Mr. WOOD. I will ask unanimous consent to take the measure from the Speaker's table.

Mr. GARNER. What about my unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not recognized the gentleman up to this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the drought relief appropriation resolution, House Joint Resolution 447, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and the appointment of conferees on behalf of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 447, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just came into the Chamber. My committee was in session this morning. I take it this is the same bill that was called up yesterday to which I objected, with other Members of the House. Since then I have not heard from the committee that there would be any effort made to meet the objections I stated yesterday. When the Congress appropriates for seeds we in the cities can at least justify that on the theory—and I emphasize the word "theory"—that an area of the country being stricken by a drought and not having seeds to plant for the necessary food from the next crop, we can justify that at home that such a measure was necessary not to have a shortage of food supplies and resulting high prices; but when it comes to the distribution of food, then there is no difference whether the needy are in a drought-stricken area or in a tenement area of unemployment within a city. If food is to be provided by the United States Government I submit the cities must be treated the same as the rural districts.

Mr. WOOD. I think if the gentleman from New York will read the hearings had before the Senate Committee on Appropriations yesterday when Mr. Payne, who is the head of the Red Cross, testified, he will be perfectly satisfied that everything is being done that is humanly possible to be done in taking care of the suffering in the cities. There are community chests and other organizations to do such work in the cities, but there are no such organizations throughout the rural districts and the Red Cross is aiding there. I have been informed by several cities that there is no real suffering but what can be taken care of in the cities, especially in cities of 20,000 inhabitants or more, and I notice it was stated yesterday that $8,000,000 had been raised by the city of New York and that there were ample organizations to take care of the situation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I submit to the gentleman whether it is fair to have the city of New York contribute $8,000,000 for its own relief and then also contribute, through taxes, to these other relief measures that the gentleman is so generously providing?

Mr. WOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the Red Cross is taking care of all the suffering existing in the rural districts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I submit, Mr. Speaker, when an objection is made in absolute good faith, and notice is served, the least the committee can do is to ask to have the bill go back to the committee and give us a hearing on it; but in the meantime I shall renew my objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CULLEN. If the gentleman will permit, in regard to the $8,000,000, the so-called Prosser fund, that has been distributed and the fund will become entirely exhausted by the 1st of April, according to the judgment of those who are handling that fund. So we need some money for the cities as well as for the country.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the gentleman may add that it has been budgeted for the care of 20,000 families, and we have more than that in need now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print, following my speech of yesterday on the question of speak-easies in Indianapolis, an admission published in the Baltimore Sun of to-day by the authorities of Indianapolis.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the newspaper article.

INSPECTION OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a description of an inspection of the lower Mississippi by my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting account of the trip made last summer by members of the Flood Control Committee of the House to investigate flood conditions and works on the lower Mississippi River. This report has been prepared by Hon. U. S. GUYER, of Kansas, and has appeared in print in the Iola Daily Register and the Lawrence Daily Journal-World.

[From the Iola Daily Register and the Lawrence Daily Journal-World]

NEW ORLEANS, July 14, 1930.—The Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives arrived at New Orleans to-day, the guests of the State of Louisiana. The French of the city are celebrating the fall of the Bastille, which occurred July 14, 1789—the French Fourth of July. New Orleans is quite as distinctly French as Milwaukee is German.

The committee is here to inspect the work already done for the control of the Mississippi floods and to see at first hand the lands devastated by the 1927 flood in order more intelligently to deal with the greatest engineering problem before any nation at this time.

There are 750,000 people in the Mississippi Valley trembling beneath the sword of Damocles—the threat of recurring Mississippi floods. The city of New Orleans, nestling behind levees higher than the city, has a population of about 500,000, and if some adequate flood protection is not provided it will sometime suffer a tragedy that will stagger the world. There could be no means of transporting 500,000 men, women, and children the necessary distance to safety in the event of a superflood. If all the tributaries of the North or most of them should be in flood at one time and hurl their mighty waters upon New Orleans, that city would suffer a loss of life and property without parallel in the history of floods.

The Flood Committee of the House intends by protective works to make such a cataclysm impossible. That is why the State of Louisiana, through its dynamic governor, Huey P. Long, invited the committee to spend a dozen sweltering days studying this monumental problem. In constructive and creative statesmanship nothing which promises equal results is before the Congress at this time. It not only deals with flood control but embraces reforestation and soil conservation as well.

New Orleans, like Kansas, gets its title from Napoleon, and its whole history is saturated with the romance of the great Corsican and his ambition. Napoleon longed to send an army to America to regain the gast empire which France lost at the Battle of the Heights of Abraham on September 13, 1759. He at one time contemplated sending General Victor with 25,000 grenadiers to hold Louisiana against the world. He had a vision of an American Napoleonic empire centered around Louisiana, where Mexico would fall into his lap like a ripe peach from the bough of time and his eagles would mingle with those of the American Cordilleras as they did with those of the Alps. He would drive the hated English out of Canada and change the civilization of a hemisphere from Anglo-Saxon to Latin. The world was not too spacious for his ambition.

But in 1803 every royal bayonet in Europe was pointed at the breast of Bonaparte. He could ill afford to spare 25,000 troops or dare to transport them under the Argus eye of Britannia who "ruled the wave." He knew that England, in common with other powers in Europe, disputed his title to Louisiana obtained in the secret treaty of San Ildefonso from the King of Spain in 1800 and he mistrusted that the unusual activity in the British Navy in 1803 portended the seizure of Louisiana. In Pitt's place that is what he would have done. Also before him were Austerlitz and Ulm, Jena and Wagram, and he must feed his hungry cannon. He needed the money. He would sell Louisiana to the United States and perhaps intrigue that country into a war with England to divert the latter's attention from the continent of Europe. So when our ambassador, Mr. Livingston, proposed to buy New Orleans, he sold all of Louisiana, and by so doing executed one of the most important and lasting of all the deeds of his meteoric career. Besides, he knew that a bullet, a dagger, or mayhap a Waterloo, might end his career and that the first demand of England from humbled France would be Louisiana to link Hudson Bay and the Gulf of Mexico in the colonial empire of England. At least he would prevent that. Thus we got Louisiana and Kansas; thus we acquired the Mississippi and the flood problem of a river that receives the waters of 32 States.

NEW ORLEANS, July 15, 1930.—I can think of nothing short of the adoption of our Constitution which left a more profound impression upon human history on this continent than the purchase of Louisiana. Napoleon was also the blind instrument by which we got our first lesson in flood control. After Waterloo, General Simon Bernard, Napoleon's chief of engineers at Waterloo, came to America to visit Joseph Bonaparte, former King of Spain, at Joseph's home in New Jersey. That was in 1816. The Government at Washington secured General Bernard to head the Corps of Engineers of the Army, and ever since then our Corps of Engineers has been one of the best bodies of engineers in the world. Under the eye of Napoleon, General Bernard had constructed the dikes of the Po and thus controlled the floods of that Italian river. In 1818 Congress authorized General Bernard to make a survey of the Mississippi River with a view to controlling its floods. In 1822 he made the first report on the flood problem of the Mississippi and recommended levees. Had the watershed of that river remained as it was then the present levees would no doubt control its floods. This was the genesis of flood control on the Mississippi. After a century of work and study we are still trying to master the floods of this mighty river. That is the purpose of our presence in New Orleans to-day with the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives.

New Orleans is a most interesting city in many particulars, notably so from the standpoint of history. Here is the house built after the style of architecture of Ajacio in Corsica by the French-American admirers of Napoleon designed for his use when they had rescued him from St. Helena. The late Conan Doyle in about 1901 wrote a story, the title of which, as I remember, was, "The Adventures of Brigadier Gerard." Gerard was a swashbuckling French officer who, with most delightful egotism, told of his impossible feats as a soldier of Napoleon. The stirring climax of this amazing story was that on that night of the 5th of May, 1821, amid that terrific tropic thunderstorm, during which the spirit of the great Corsican took its eternal flight, Gerard landed on the volcanic isle when the British guard ships were dispersed by the storm. He made his way to the window of Longwood, the prison-residence of Napoleon, just in time to look through the window as the mind of the Emperor was wandering in the mists of death and his intellect was tottering from its throne. In his delirium the Emperor, hearing the crash of the thunder that split the heavens and seeing the glare of the tropic lightnings, imagined he was on one of his hundred battlefields, and with his expiring breath exclaimed, "Tete d'Armee." The Emperor had escaped. Not, however, to the old house in New Orleans that was to be his refuge. One often wonders what might have happened if Aaron Burr had succeeded in establishing a southwest empire, and Napoleon, whom Burr admired much more than he did Washington, had escaped with a sound stomach from St. Helena at the age of 52 in 1821.

NEW ORLEANS, July 16, 1930.—Yesterday the committee inspected the Bonnet Carre spillway, which is under construction 30 miles above New Orleans. This spillway is for the protection of New Orleans. It leads from the Mississippi to Lake Pontchartrain, a distance of 6 miles. At the river it has a width of about 1⅓ miles and about double that at the lake. The concrete construction of the spillway cost about $8,000,000 and the guide levees will make it cost over $11,000,000. It will be a controlled spillway, which will take at least 250,000 second-feet from the crest of the Mississippi flood and might, if necessary, take as much as 500,000 second-feet. This spillway, the engineers assure us, will maintain a constant flood gage of 20 feet at the Carrollton gage in New Orleans in a flood like that of 1927.

We also inspected the immense docks on the river at New Orleans, which cost over $200,000,000. We rode through 14 miles of these titanic wharves, where 90 steamship lines dock at the second seaport of the continent. Here we saw the latest machinery for loading and unloading shipping of every conceivable sort. One sees here the realization of what can happen at Kansas City on a smaller scale when our barge line is finally instituted on the Missouri.

New Orleans is an heroic as well as an historic city. Her people, living below the level of the Mississippi and in some places, I am told, below the level of the Gulf, bravely hope for security from the ancient menace of the Mississippi floods. With the power and wealth of the United States back of it, the Flood Control Committee of the House will endeavor to deliver the courageous inhabitants of this great city from that menace. After three days here we understand this problem better than before.

To-day we saw the plain of Chalmette, where the Battle of New Orleans was fought two weeks after a treaty of peace was negotiated at Ghent. The British hurried an expedition to take New Orleans, for Britain did not respect our title to it from Napoleon. Wellington declined the command. At that time, August, 1814, Napoleon was on the island of Elba and the congress of Vienna was unscrambling the map of Europe. On what slender threads does destiny hang with Waterloo only a few months away. The brother-in-law of Wellington, Sir Edward Pakenham, assumed command. His idea was to capture New Orleans, and, treaty or no treaty, hold it that it might become the subject of new nego-

tiations. But New Orleans was not taken, and Pakenham was killed with 700 more British soldiers. If Jackson had been driven back at Chalmette, he would have burned New Orleans and let the Mississippi out of its banks and drowned the British out. But the victory of Jackson forever quieted the title of Louisiana and hurried the beaten British Army back to Waterloo in time to fight and die and there earn the title of "Invincible." Those who survived could boast of participation in two battles of everlasting renown and infinite results. The charge of Napoleon's Old Guard at Waterloo had no terrors for men who had faced the storm of leaden death that streamed from the muzzles of Jackson's pioneer rifles.

ON BOARD BOAT "V. J. KURZWOG," ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, July 17, 1930.—The committee is on a boat on the Atchafalaya River. If you can spell that name you can not pronounce it, and if you can pronounce it you never could spell it. It is pronounced as if you spelled it "chaf-a-lie-yuh," evidently without any regard for the first syllable. At least that is the way the natives pronounce it. The river is not a tributary but an outlet of the Mississippi. When the Mississippi and Red Rivers are both in flood the Red overflows into the Atchafalaya. In 1927 the Atchafalaya carried about as much water as the Mississippi, it and its great rich valley. The famous "sugar bowl" is in its vicinity, one of the richest sugar territories in the world. I noticed that the Louisiana Senators voted for the tariff bill last spring.

Before leaving New Orleans we visited the great crevasses at Poydres and Caernarveron. The crevasses were made to save New Orleans in 1927. New Orleans paid $4,000,000 in damages below the crevasses. All the people below on the Delta had to leave. In this way the Atchafalaya River becomes important in flood control. By constructing a floodway through the Atchafalaya Valley in a superflood the excess water that the Bonnet Carre spillway did not take could be turned into the floodway of the Atchafalaya.

This is the valley where Evangeline and the Acadians finally settled after their deportation and dispersion by the British from Nova Scotia 175 years ago, as portrayed by Longfellow in his poem Evangeline. Between 10,000 and 15,000 of these French Canadians were boarded on British ships and scattered along the Atlantic coast from Maryland south. Many of them wandered south to get beneath the French flag in Louisiana. Up to about 1898 there were no English schools. They did not love English overmuch. Among themselves they still speak French, the tongue of their fathers. Here you find such names as Dupres, Le Blanc, Broussard, Dumas, and Beauregard. There are also some Spanish names, a sort of Latin civilization found nowhere else in the United States.

We were all interested in Louisiana cooking, for we were eating at southern tables at hotels, restaurants, and on board steamboats. Coffee here is wonderfully and fearfully made—to us who are from the North. It is considered sufficiently strong if it makes a teaspoon stand up in the cup. One Congressman said he ate his coffee down South. At any rate it was generously strong, and the chicken dinners were so numerous that at the end of a week the management wired ahead for a steak dinner in Mississippi. But the cooking was very good and greatly enjoyed by all, and was doubly appreciated for the wonderful hospitality with which it was served.

ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, July 18, 1930.—All day yesterday we were on the Atchafalaya and Grand Rivers. Their valleys, as far as we could judge, were huge swamps covered by trees about 30 or 40 feet high. There are deer and bear here. Colonel Roosevelt used to hunt here. The flood of 1927 almost exterminated both, but protected by the law they are coming back. These rivers are alive with catfish. Tons of them are shipped out to northern ports, and by the time they reach their destination they are sea trout and several kinds of salmon if we were correctly informed. This is also the great muskrat country. Seven million pelts are taken out of Louisiana every year—more fur than is produced by Alaska. This fur also is metamorphosed into electric seal by the time it reaches the ladies' shoulders. We were told that along these rivers live a peculiar people, in houseboats, and they scarcely ever get away from the low brink of the sluggish rivers. But they seemed to be abreast of the times, though they have no schools, no churches, and no culture. As on the streets of New Orleans, we saw the girls and women, sans hose, and, no doubt to show that they were one jump ahead of their city sisters, sans shoes. Others we saw who were not unsophisticated in the modern feminine art of smoking, though we saw no cigarettes.

BATON ROUGE, July 19, 1930.—To-day we were in the enchanted land of Evangeline. A part of this is known as the "sugar bowl," a country as rich in soil and vernal beauty as it is in legend, romance, and tradition. There were never nobler trees or fairer fields.

Giant oaks of the Teche,
Georgeous and sublime.

Great live oaks that were centuries old 165 years ago, when the gentle heroine of Acadie sought her lover, only to find a faithless Gabriel (Louis Arceneaux) on the banks of the Teche. We held a flood meeting under the sheltering boughs of Evangeline's Oak, right on the beautiful banks of Bayou Teche, where it is said Emmeline Labiche, the Evangeline of Longfellow, met her lover. It is a great live oak from 6 to 7 feet in diameter and festooned with Spanish moss. All day the haunting beauty of this old story crowded out such trivial thoughts as those of levees and floodways. The writer, having spoken early in the meeting, asked a Mr. Le Blanc to take him to the grave of Evangeline by the side of the beautiful old Catholic church. With reverent step he led to where under the deep shade of the magnolias we stood with uncovered head and leaning over the iron picket fence that guards her tomb we read, quaintly carved in French on the marble, yellow with the years: "Evangeline, Emmeline Labiche, the blessed exile of Acadie, the angel of constancy, who after wandering with bleeding feet over a continent in search of her lover, the while she gave to the world a picture of fidelity and constancy sweet and beautiful enough to hang on the walls of all the centuries to come, rests at last beneath this rock, the blessed and beloved exile of all the ages." Only now and then picking up an old French book of college days of a third of a century ago to kindle "the light of other days," our French is necessarily rusty, so if you read the inscription on that aged marble and do not find all I saw it should have been there. This was at old St. Martinsville, La., where the heroine of Longfellow's poem is buried and not in the city of "brotherly love," as the poem avers. This shrine of Evangeline will always remain in our memory an enchanted land of poetic beauty after the story of the Mississippi has faded away.

This evening we were entertained at a banquet in the new executive mansion at Baton Rouge by Gov. Huey Long, who proved to be a royal host.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., July 19, 1930.—With pensive regret we left this morning the winding Bayou Teche, the dreamlike land of Louis Arceneaux and Emmeline Labiche, the "Gabriel" and "Evangeline" of Longfellow. There is something very quaint and romantic about both the country and the people of the Evangeline country. Here are eight or nine generations of Americans, yet they speak the French language among themselves. Their customs are much the same as they were when British exile shattered the dream of happiness of these lovers of long ago.

To-day our pilgramage led us through the rich upper valley of the Atchafalaya River, a great, wide valley over which nature spreads a scourge every time the Mississippi overflows or the Red has a flood. The Flood Committee wanted to see this first-hand, and the people of Louisiana wanted us to see it, in the hope that in the solution of the Mississippi flood problem we do not turn the raging fury of the waters upon them and their farms. Thousands along the route saw us to plead for their homes and property which they think threatened by the Jadwin plan. One thing is certain in the mind of at least one of that committee, and that is that every possible foot of good land must be saved and that where land is taken it must be amply paid for. The United States can afford to pay for such losses, but it can not afford to turn the angry flood upon these defenseless people without adequate compensation for the sacrifice.

We are all in love with the great trees, which, to us of the North, look like they were dressed for a funeral. All the large trees in this latitude accumulate Spanish moss which hangs in sort of ropes about 3 or 4 feet long from the limbs of the trees. In color it is like the green-gray of the old German uniform. It is worth about 4 cents per pound for upholstering. The moss is not a parasite but lives on the moisture of the atmosphere. It is very profuse on the great live oaks and adds much to their beauty. Here we saw much cotton which is now in bloom. We saw much sugarcane, too. It is small and is not harvested until November.

VICKSBURG, MISS., July 20, 1930.—The committee to-day saw the basins of the Tensas and Boeuf Rivers, whose rich lands are partly in the proposed floodway. Part of it is a semiswamp, covered with one of the few remaining hardwood forests. The writer has lived in Kansas 52 years, but he has not seen as much of Kansas in that time as he seems to have seen of Louisiana in a week. But the committee will know more about the flood problem of Louisiana than we could learn in a year of hearings in Washington. We have just been in the oil and gas regions of the State and there seems to be inexhaustible supplies of both.

In Richland Parish we saw the great gas well which has been burning for over two years. It has blown out a crater 600 feet wide and 300 feet deep. There is about enough gas burned in that well to heat Kansas City in winter. At Lake Caddo we saw the great oil wells in the middle of the lake.

This Sunday evening we came across the Mississippi River to Vicksburg. Congressman COLLIER, who resides here, had told us much about the national cemetery here and the battlefield, so we were prepared for the treat of visiting this beautiful cemetery and battlefield. Next to Gettysburg, its sister battle, this field has more monuments than any other in our country. The old trenches are still visible on the ragged field. Like Gettysburg, it is a rugged and picturesque field. These two great battles culminated almost on the same day, in 1863, and practically settled the issues of the war.

MEMPHIS, TENN., July 23, 1930.—The Flood Committee spent the 22d inspecting the valleys of the Tensas and Boeuf. Their flood problem is mainly one of backwater from the Red, Arkansas, and White Rivers. In this way 2,800,000 acres of rich lands are flooded whenever there is a Mississippi flood. In these flood matters human nature does not change. The interests of those above and those below conflict. The patriotic inhabitants of the two upper valleys are perfectly willing that their flood waters be turned upon the valley of the Atchafalaya, below which would tend to

make a frog pond and an alligator resort of the "sugar bowl," to which the thrifty French Acadians (Cajuns) exclaim: "Non, non! Mon Dieu!"

Over in Mississippi a good judge made an earnest plea for the Yazoo River valley in Mississippi, saying that there was but one thing to do and that was to make a vast floodway of the valleys of the Tensas, Boeuf, and Atchafalaya. He said that would settle the whole matter, and he informed the committee that it must be done now. Of course, that would be a fine thing for the Yazoo Valley and Mississippi and, incidentally, a fine thing for the Louisiana alligators, but it would all but sweep from the earth one of the richest regions in agricultural wealth and romantic history on this continent. It would be as cruel and heartless an act as ever the Brtish perpetrated when they drove the Acadians and Evangeline before their bayonets into everlasting exile from their beloved homes in Nova Scotia. It required considerable restraint and the obligation of incomparable hospitality to properly answer that selfish judge who, perhaps, for the favor of a thoughtless constituency, was willing to crucify once more an heroic people who, under the lash of tyranny, had built homes in far Louisiana as fair as the gardens of the gods. Perhaps he was not to be blamed too much, for true to nature he was thinking of nature's first law.

One just can not miss points of romantic history here in Louisiana. At or, rather, near New Roads, where old Poydres College stood, is the ancient oak upon which James Ryder Randall looked one night in the southern moonlight and in his homesickness wrote "Maryland, My Maryland." At Natchitoches we saw the celebrated statue of the old-time slave, by which the South expresses its gratitude to the fidelity of the old war-time slave who, when his master drew his sword to keep that slave in bondage, this master intrusted to the slave the safety of his mother and sister, wife, and daughter, and it is one of the miracles of human virtue that there is not a single instance on record where that trust was betrayed. I did not learn who the sculptor was, but whoever he was, he was poet and artist at once, for in every line, posture, and curve is portrayed courtesy, fidelity, and devotion, and in the shoulders bent by the burden of 200 years of bondage is written infinite service to his master, a monument which is a tribute to all humanity. Virgil in his picture of faithful Achates never drew a truer picture of fidelity than did the creator of the slave of Natchitoches.

Memphis is an enterprising and growing city. It will benefit immensely by reason of the renewed navigation of the Mississippi with the development of the barge line for which it is now preparing. After a day's rest here we leave for Cairo, Ill.

This, though a strenuous and tropical journey, has been a most delightful and enlightening experience, which will be of great value in flood work of the future. We had a fine group of Congressmen from the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives and we met hundreds of interesting gentlemen all along our route. Our sojourn in the South justified everything that has been said about southern hospitality and it will always remain a pleasant memory. The Flood Control Committee was represented by Chairman REID, of Illinois; WILSON, of Louisiana; SEARS, of Nebraska; DRIVER, of Arkansas; SINCLAIR, of North Dakota; WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi; GUYER, of Kansas; COX, of Georgia; DUNBAR, of Indiana; GREGORY, of Kentucky; SHORT, of Missouri; JOHNSON, of Oklahoma; STONE, of Oklahoma; and COOPER, of Tennessee.

EMERGENCY RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all other business now before the House or on the Speaker's table or elsewhere be laid aside for two hours for the consideration of the emergency legislation with reference to drought relief and unemployment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is a special order for this morning.

Mr. HOWARD. But I am asking unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, under the circumstances stated, and also in his intense desire to protect Calendar Wednesday, can not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK].

THE MEMORY OF JOFFRE

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker and my fellow members, I am greatly honored in being the interpreter of the sorrow which I know this House feels in the passing of that great soldier, Marshal Joffre.

The gracious presence of his excellency the ambassador of France and Madame Claudel in the gallery is an added honor which I greatly appreciate.

It would be quite impossible at this time to pay an adequate tribute to Marshal Joffre's memory, but it is fitting that on this day, when his mortal remains are given a place of honor in the Invalides, some record should be made in the proceedings of this House of the deep sympathy which the United States feels for its ancient ally, France, in her irreparable loss. While the soldiers of France fought under one flag and the brave sons of America under another, yet in the World War, as in our epic struggle for independence, they fought for a common objective and achieved a common victory, and a tribute to the immortal memory of the great Marshal therefore seems appropriate.

This has been a day of grief in Paris. The "City of Light" is for the moment darkened.

> O proud death,
> What feast is toward in thine eternal cell?

It is the passing of a hero, and for that

> * * * passage
> The soldiers' music and the rites of war
> Speak loudly for him.

The booming cannon are his mourners, but the greatest tribute to Joffre, the man, lies in the silent tears of unnumbered Frenchmen who to-day lined the streets of Paris as his body was conveyed from the Arc de Triomphe to Notre Dame and thence to the Invalides, there to rest for a little while beside the greatest commander of modern times. As Motley said of William the Silent, "While he lived he was the guiding star of a brave nation, and when he died the little children cried in the streets."

To Americans it is a touching fact that Joffre was so impressed with the simple beauty of Mount Vernon that he desired no grandiose resting place, either in the Invalides or in the Pantheon, but preferred to rest in the garden of his little home by the Seine. This suggests a true parallel that could be drawn between Joffre and Washington, for each of them was supremely great in those qualities of gentleness, modesty, and courage which mark the great quality of soul, magnanimity.

If time permitted, it would be easy to draw a striking parallel between their military careers, for each proved a Fabius who could create victory out of preliminary reverses. The quality that they had most in common was their modesty. Washington never claimed credit for any victory, nor did Marshal Joffre. In proof of this let me cite the striking fact that from the time on September 4, 1914, when he issued his inspiring call to his soldiers to advance or die in their tracks in defense of France, and notwithstanding that his was one of the most dramatic and significant victories in the annals of mankind, yet, neither by voice or pen, did Joffre ever make any claim for credit or the world's applause. Even the commanders whom he vanquished have written many pages in vindication of their respective achievements, but the heroic victor of the Marne has been content to let his epic achievement speak for him. In all the controversies that have arisen since the last cannon awakened the echoes in the Valley of the Marne Joffre remained as silent and serene as he was on that fateful 4th day of September, 1914, when, after several hours of silent deliberation, he turned to his staff and simply said, "We will make our stand on the Marne." No commander of a French army ever reached a more momentous decision or accepted a greater responsibility. The fate of France itself depended upon the wisdom of that decision—possibly the fate of a liberal civilization in Europe!

One evening I sat down in a London drawing-room before an open fire with another distinguished participant in this battle of the nations—Field Marshal French. Our discussion turned upon the question, who would be to posterity the great military hero of the World War? And I ventured to say that it would be Marshal Joffre. When challenged to give a reason, I said that the World War was so vast that to posterity it would seem like the lofty range of the Himalayas, with few dominating peaks; and I ventured to predict that to posterity the dominating peak of the World War would be the first Battle of the Marne.

The "Miracle of the Marne," as it has been aptly called, is in many respects the greatest battle ever staged upon

this "wide and universal theater of man," and this whether it be judged by quantitative or qualitative values.

Measured by the battle frontage, the battle is unequaled in its immensity. Before the Great War, a battle that raged over a 20-mile front was exceptionally great. The battle front of the Marne was 170 miles—if it be measured from Paris to Verdun—but if, as is proper, the Nancy sector be added, the true frontage of these embattled millions was 220 miles—or approximately the distance from New York to Washington.

In numbers, no single battle of open movement fought simultaneously under a unified command is comparable with it; for while the exact statistics of the combatant armies have never yet been given, there is substantial reason for believing that the seven German armies that participated numbered not less than 1,200,000 men, and the Allied armies, if inferior at all in numbers, did not differ greatly. Never before was the earth shaken with the rumble of so many cannon, whose "rude throats the immortal Jove's great clamor counterfeit"; for, according to a German commentator on the Marne, the German Army had 6,000 cannon in action in this greatest duel of artillery that the world up to that time had ever witnessed.

Passing these quantitative tests, which are the least satisfactory criteria, the greatness of a battle may also depend upon two circumstances—one, the gravity of the issues which depend upon its outcome, and the other, the difficulty of the obstacles which the victor was required to overcome. As to these the battle of the Marne need not be undervalued to any other of the so-called decisive battles of history, for upon it depended the fate of Europe and the relative strength of its historic master states. Had it been lost, France would have become a third-rate power and could have said with Pitt after Austerlitz, "Let us roll up the map of Europe."

As to the inherent difficulties of the problem, it is enough to say that, by every law of probability, the invader should have won the battle of the Marne, and that he lost it is due chiefly to the profound sagacity, the indomitable courage, and the untiring energy of Marshal Joffre.

Other great generals justly share in the triumph. If Castelnau had not held Nancy; if Foch had not stood as a stone wall in the Fére-Champenoise sector; if Franchet d'Espèrey and French with the brave British Army had not broken into the gap between the First and Second German Armies, in the Meaux-Château-Thierry sector; if Manoury had not held the left wing of the Allies, with the aid of Gallieni—the result would have been different; but the genius who coordinated all the movements of the six allied armies and whose inspiring presence was felt everywhere along the whole battle line, who took the supreme hazard of the long ordeal of battle, and who therefore preeminently deserves the palm of victory, was the one known and beloved by all his soldiers under the simple title of "Father Joffre."

Lest I be accused of undue praise, let me quote the words of a distinguished German commentator on this battle—himself one of its participants—Gen. Baumgarten-Crusius, of the Saxon Army, who said:

> Incessantly active, Joffre was always at the point where his presence was most needed to stimulate, explain, or arrange. * * * The untiring Joffre never lost his head, gradually restored confidence, and maintained a united front. The French leadership grew in calm and resolution from day to day. Necessity and anxiety lifted the generalship of Joffre to still greater grandeur.

Let me confirm this estimate of a chivalrous opponent—which, I note, has been echoed by the entire German press in the last few days—by some more direct evidence to the extraordinary poise and courage which Joffre showed in those fateful days between August 20 and September 10. In 1921 General Buat, then the chief of staff of the French Army and during the World War one of Joffre's principal aides, did me the honor to visit me in my home and our conversation related almost wholly to the battle of the Marne. General Buat regarded the unfailing courage and unvarying wisdom of Joffre as the chief cause of the French victory. He said to me:

> He had communicated to all of us his calm confidence. When in the darkest hours, we saw him the absolute master of his physical and moral equilibrium, we too felt absolutely calm and sure of ourselves. And we, in turn, gave calm and confidence to the others. Every day and at every hour of the day liaison officers from all the armies at the front reported to general headquarters. They saw for themselves that the atmosphere that reigned throughout was tranquil and serene. They returned to the various armies calm and confident; and, to all who questioned them, they replied: The commander in chief says that all is well. And all were sure that everything was well, because it was the opinion of the commander in chief.

I had a further confirmation of this when I attended a luncheon a few years ago in Paris, given by that noble and well-loved French Ambassador, M. Jusserand, and sat next to M. Millerand, who was the French Minister of War in 1914. I asked him what was the feeling in the French Government when late in August it hurriedly left Paris for Bordeaux, and thus apparently abandoned Paris to the invader. Replying for himself, he said that he was profoundly disheartened until he visited Joffre in the rapidly shifting seat of war and received from him such a calm assurance of ultimate victory that he returned to Bordeaux and all officials there took fresh heart. Viviani, the Premier, gave the same testimony when he said that during that fateful retreat in the last 10 days of August, 1914, he twice a day called up Joffre on the telephone from Bordeaux and was always encouraged by the calm and peaceful voice of Joffre: "Have faith! Everything is all right. Have faith!"

Another distinguishing feature of this battle was the fact that it had been planned by both sides many years before it actually took place. Other battles have been more or less the fortuitous synthesis of events which were at least not wholly anticipated; but in this long-anticipated war the German high command had planned the whole campaign with such pedantic nicety that everything that happened up to the beginning of the Battle of the Marne accorded with the schedule, and it was confidently anticipated that when the French Army was pushed away from Paris its left wing would be overwhelmed about September 1 (the anniversary of Sedan) and crushed near the Forest of Fontainebleu. This was nearly realized, for the fighting in the center of the vast battle line was not very far from Fontainebleu.

This explains the distinguishing characteristics of the two commands.

The German High Command directed the battle from a point as far removed as Luxemburg and treated the army as though it were a system of transportation, to be operated on schedule time. No place was left for contingencies and no need for improvisation was anticipated.

Joffre, on the other hand, treated his army not as a machine but as a great collective soul, and he showed the highest genius of a commander in changing his plans from day to day and almost from hour to hour to meet the exigencies of the moment.

Five times from Mühlhausen to the Marne he changed his plan of campaign. He showed the greatest of all mastery in the art of war by rising superior to obstacles and defeats. It was genius against pedantry; the soul against a perfect system.

Until the culminating triumph, the campaign which culminated in the Marne had been a series of seeming disasters. The reverses in Alsace; the crushing defeat at Morhange in Lorraine, and, above all, the failure of the attack at Charleroi, would have discouraged any ordinary general; but Joffre, like Antaeus, seemed to get fresh strength every time he was hurled by disaster to his mother earth—the soil of France. He conducted without a flaw one of the most difficult and hazardous retreats in history; and, to visualize it, let me give you a geographical analogy.

Imagine an army of a million men guarding the front between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Imagine that it had sustained three serious reverses, at least two of which were comparable in size to battles like Sadowa or Gettysburg. Pivoting his left wing on Pittsburgh, and with the most powerful military machine then known in the world pressing upon him with all the resources of modern chemistry and

engineering, he slowly swings his line, standing on a frontage of 200 miles, back in the face of an advancing foe, until, with the new alignment, his left wing is still at Pittsburgh, his right wing in Washington. While doing this, and in the midst of all the demoralization of this rapid retreat, and with tremendous pressure upon him to stand and fight, he simultaneously creates, in the 10 days that elapsed between Charleroi and the beginning of the Marne, two new armies—one under General Foch, which Joffre, with wonderful prescience, placed in his center, where it would be vitally needed, and the other, under Manoury, with which he launches, at the opportune moment, his thunderbolt.

One can search even the annals of Napoleon and find no strategic movement so difficult in execution and so wonderful in its ultimate success. Let it be remembered that Napoleon fought one battle at a time, while the Marne was in fact five great battles, fought simultaneously by Joffre against the German High Command, and each of these battles was as great in numbers and in space as Waterloo, Sedan, Gettysburg, or Plevna.

I mention all this only to emphasize a fact to which I think the present generation has as yet not done full justice, and that is that the campaign of the Marne was one of the most stupendous intellectual achievements in the annals of war. If, as Napoleon said, the greatest quality of a true commander is to keep cool in the hour of adversity, then assuredly that palm belongs to Joffre. Undoubtedly the victory was also due to the fact that in the supreme crisis of France her soldiers, down to the humblest poilu, were in truth Bayards, but all these would have been unavailing had not the intellectual power of the German High Command been overcome by an even more masterful intellect; and if you seek a symbol of the underlying cause of the "Miracle of the Marne," then, when you are next in Paris, go to the Pantheon, where many of her mighty dead are buried, and in front of it you will see a statue fashioned by the greatest of her sculptors—and possibly the greatest of all sculptors since Michel Angelo—the statue of "Le Penseur." One could fittingly strike out the name Rodin gave to this inspired statue and write under it the single name Joffre, for it was Joffre, "The Thinker," who triumphed on that fateful day.

I wish that time permitted me to say more, for, in common with all who knew Joffre, I have for him a feeling of great affection. To say that I enjoyed his friendship would be an overstatement, but I did enjoy a friendly association with him, which was more than a perfunctory acquaintance. I met him on five occasions and never was more impressed with the sturdy strength of a man.

The first time was in 1916, when I visited by invitation his headquarters at Chantilly. He came into his working cabinet dressed in the fatigue uniform of a division general, and after a cordial welcome asked us to be seated. He was good enough to talk with us a half hour and the subject related largely to the Battle of the Marne. I noted with interest that as he spoke he looked intently upon the center of the table, as if there were there an invisible chessboard, and after each question there would be a pause, and then, in a voice so low and gentle as to be scarcely audible, he would give my interpreter and me an answer. I remember I asked him what he regarded as the chief cause of his victory, and he replied, "We won through the error of General von Kluck," the commander of the First German Army. At that time he could not have known the information, which the archives of the German general staff have since given, but he had divined the fact that Von Kluck's mistake, which made possible the counterattack, was due to his excessive zeal in disregarding the order of the German general staff, of which mistake Joffre took advantage and launched his counteroffensive. At that time only one book had appeared on the strategy of the Great War. It was by Hilaire Belloc, and Belloc had said that the reason why the German First Army waited over 10 days after the fall of Liege before beginning their rapid march through Belgium was because they were trying to lure Joffre's northern armies into Belgium. I asked the Marshal whether he thought this was true, and I remember that he replied that the German general staff was much too capable to suppose that he would ever have marched far into Belgium.

I next saw General Joffre when he came to America in 1917 as one of a French commission, which was headed by Viviani, and here I must record an unrecorded bit of history. Among the many festivities in New York in their honor was a great meeting in the Metropolitan Opera House to raise funds for the orphan children of French soldiers. It had been announced that Viviani and Joffre would be in a box. In New York, as elsewhere, the interest of the public was largely in Joffre and very little in Viviani, and this had annoyed Viviani. On the night in question Viviani felt this so keenly that he declined to go to the Metropolitan Opera House. Joffre, who neither sought nor desired the superior interest which he excited, thereupon stated that if his superior on the commission could not attend, he was unable to do so. Those of us in charge of the affair were in despair, but finally some one said to the Marshal that if he failed to attend it would greatly injure the movement to raise a large fund for the orphan children of French soldiers, and the old soldier straightened up and with an unwonted gleam in his gentle eyes simply said, "I will go," and he went without Viviani.

I next saw him in New York in 1921, and very pleasantly renewed the acquaintance that had begun at Chantilly. Finally I sat next to him at a luncheon in Paris several years ago and was shocked to see how he had failed in health, for his sturdy frame, that "tower of strength which had stood foursquare to every wind that blew," was physically in ruins, due to the fact that he was even then suffering from diabetes in its malignant form. His failing health could not change that sweet smile which endeared the Marshal to all who were privileged to meet him.

While he said little about it, I think the tragedy of his life was when the politicians in Paris deprived him of his high command. He had no taste for politics, and when, in the interests of the service, he demoted many generals and lesser officers who had not stood the test, he made, for the time being, many enemies who conspired to relieve him of his high command, with the disastrous result that Nivelle, his successor, almost lost the war in the ill-fated advance of 1917. But the people of France never lost their faith in Joffre, and when, after the armistice, the French Army marched in triumph under the Arch of Napoleon and down the Champs Elysees the French people demanded that the Marshal should ride side by side with Foch down the "Via Triumphalis."

More I would gladly say, but time does not permit. Joffre belongs to the immortals and he will be known "to the last syllable of recorded time" not merely as a great general, as Napoleon was, but as a noble gentleman in the best sense of that word, for—

> His life was gentle, and the elements
> So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up
> And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Before concluding this inadequate tribute I can not refrain one final comment, although it relates not so much to Joffre as to the cause for which he fought. Whatever be the merits of that cause, the greatness of his achievement and the simple splendor of his character remain, although it immeasurably adds to his place in history if he drew his sword in a righteous cause.

Time was when few intelligent men had any question as to the merits of the diplomatic conflict that precipitated the World War. The embattled nations could not themselves sit in judgment upon their quarrel, but who can question that the verdict of the neutral world favored the justice of the allied cause? In recent years, however, the subtle poison of propaganda has run through the veins of the allied nations and we are now taught that the World War was either a stupendous economic fatality, for which no nation was to blame, or that it was a culpable and fratricidal conflict, for which all nations were equally responsible. If this latter view be correct, then the sons of France and England and America who followed what to them

seemed a heavenly vision of justice were the victims of a great delusion. In that event there is no torch that the dead of Flanders Fields could pass to the living.

As the war recedes, the minds of men are becoming increasingly perplexed upon this question, due to such monumental pieces of special pleading as have been recently published by two American college professors, Barnes and Fay, who have seemingly found a joy in arguing that the well-considered verdict of civilization was a monstrous error. I can not accept their conclusions.

At the beginning of the war I wrote a book called "The Evidence in the Case," in which I discussed the moral responsibility for the outbreak of the conflict, and I take this occasion to say that, having read all the testimony that has been since adduced, if I were to rewrite that book, which appeared in December, 1914, I would not have occasion, so far as its ultimate conclusions, to change the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." It seemed to me to be the truth then and it seems to me to be the truth to-day.

There was an everlasting right and wrong involved in this stupendous conflict, and while the people of the allied nations, especially Americans, can have now none but the kindliest feelings for the Germanic peoples, who, in my judgment, were "more sinned against than sinning" by their rulers and statesmen, yet magnanimity does not require that we sit silent when the justice of the cause, to which our soldiers gave the "last full measure of devotion," is called in question. We, therefore, honor Joffre to-day not only as a great man and a distinguished soldier but also because he was the victor in a just cause.

To his mighty shade we say:

Ave et vale! Hail and farewell! [Applause, the entire membership rising.]

ADDITIONAL RECEIPTS OR CERTIFICATES OF MAILING

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3273) to authorize the Postmaster General to issue additional receipts or certificates of mailing to senders of any class of mail matter and to fix the fees chargeable therefor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the bill S. 3273, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3273, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3273, with Mr. RAMSEYER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose when this bill was last under consideration general debate had not been concluded on the bill. Twenty-six minutes remain in charge of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANDERS] and 36 minutes in charge of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further demands in general debate.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have nothing further.

The CHAIRMAN. No further debate being asked, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of February 14, 1929 (39 U. S. C., p. 260), authorizing the Postmaster General to furnish receipts showing the mailing of ordinary mail of any class and to prescribe the fee for such receipts, is hereby extended to include additional receipts or certificates of mailing covering registered, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, in the parentheses, strike out the word "page" and insert "sec."

Line 7, strike out the word "is" and insert the word "are."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Postmaster General is authorized to charge a fee, under such regulations as he may prescribe, for the issuance to the sender of ordinary mail and of registered, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail, a receipt or certificate showing such mailing."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, when we last had this bill under consideration criticism was made of the form in which the bill was presented for consideration. I think the criticism made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH] was well taken. In the compilation of laws we would have a very awkward condition if the bill should remain as it is reported. I think the substitute amendment that I have offered accomplishes the purpose.

Mr. KELLY. As I understood the reading of the bill, it simply places in better phraseology the purpose of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It does more than that. It actually states the legislation. The bill as it came from the Senate does not state the legislation. It states some other law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think my amendment answers the objections made by the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment 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. RAMSEYER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill S. 3273 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, the title was not considered in the Committee of the Whole. The title is not quite correct. Would it be in order, or must unanimous consent be obtained, to suggest an amendment to the title? The title reads:

To authorize the Postmaster General to issue additional receipts or certificates of mailing to senders of any class of mail matter and to fix the fees chargeable therefor.

The bill does not do that. It extends the present law to certain new classes. This does not make this bill applicable to all classes. It makes it applicable to other classes than ordinary mail. The proposed provisions were already applicable to ordinary mail, and the bill extends these provisions to other matter than ordinary mail. The title would be correct if it read "to certain classes," instead of "any class."

Mr. KELLY. These special services are regarded as classes, and therefore this covers everything.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No. This bill, together with the other existing law, will cover everything, but this bill does not alone cover everything.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in order now to offer an amendment to the title.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the title by changing the words "any class" to the words "certain classes."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM to the title of the bill: Strike out the words "any class," and insert in lieu thereof the words "certain classes."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SANDERS of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

POSTAL CHARGE FOR DIRECTORY SERVICE

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3178) to authorize the collection of additional postage on insufficiently or improperly addressed mail to which directory service is accorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the bill, S. 3178, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3178, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] will take the chair.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3178, with Mr. RAMSEYER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3178, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each piece of insufficiently or improperly addressed mail which is accorded directory service in effecting or attempting to effect its delivery shall be charged with 2 cents postage in addition to the regular postage, to be collected and accounted for in the manner in which postage due on other mail is collected and accounted for: *Provided*, That such additional postage charge may be prepaid by the sender under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General: *Provided further*, That such charge shall not apply to matter mailed under the franking and penalty privileges.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, in cases where insufficiently or improperly addressed mail is accorded directory service in order to effect its delivery, the mailer, at his request, and upon payment of an additional charge of 5 cents, shall be notified of the completed or corrected address: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to require or permit the withholding or delay of delivery of mail to the addressee pending the collection of such additional charge."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide a postage charge for directory service."

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to explain this bill as briefly as possible and then consider another postal question which has been brought to the attention of every Member of the House, namely, the proposed 2½-cent first-class postage rate.

This measure under consideration, Mr. Chairman, is a provision dealing with directory service. This service at the present time is costing the Post Office Department between two and three million dollars a year, for which not a penny is received. The Postmaster General recommended that Congress establish a 2-cent fee to be levied upon the addressee of the mail matter wherever directory service was accorded. The Senate accepted that recommendation and passed the bill in that form. The House committee has refused to accept that exact plan as being a just charge for directory service and has amended the Senate bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and changing the scope of the bill so that it will provide for an optional charge to be levied upon the sender of the mail and not upon the addressee.

We take it for granted that the addressee is an innocent party who should not be penalized for incorrectly addressed mail sent out by another party. Therefore, we provide an optional service, whereby the sender who desires to have this service accorded, may, upon the payment of a 5-cent fee, receive a card back through the mail showing the correct address of each addressee. It is approved by many large mail users as a beneficial service. They will agree to it, and it certainly should not arouse any objection, since no one has to pay it except those who desire to use this particular service.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Why not have an additional proviso at the end of the committee amendment providing that no additional charge shall be made for directory service unless the sender is to be given a notice?

Mr. KELLY. Under this amendment, of course, the sender is not only given notice but he originates the request.

Mr. BLANTON. But suppose a farmer in the gentleman's district in Pennsylvania mails a letter to his relative in Pittsburgh and has not given the correct street address, he is entitled to and should be given directory service, and there should not be a charge for directory service on a letter like that.

Mr. KELLY. There is no charge, and there will be none.

Mr. BLANTON. But under the language of the committee amendment the Postmaster General is authorized to make regulations whereby there might be an attempt to charge for that directory service.

Mr. KELLY. No. The gentleman is mistaken. No charge can be made unless in the first instance the mail user states he desires to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, we ought to clearly and distinctly direct the Postmaster General and his department that there shall be no additional charge for directory service, and that every letter addressed should have careful and adequate directory service without an additional charge, unless there should be some notice sent back to the sender.

Mr. KELLY. I am sure if the gentleman will read the bill carefully he will admit that that is exactly what we are doing in this bill. We do not propose a fee shall be paid in the case to which the gentleman calls attention. This will only apply to large mail users who are willing to pay 5 cents to get a corrected address.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In other words, the department will continue to attempt to deliver mail, even though the address be incorrect?

Mr. KELLY. And give full directory service; yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But if the sender of the mail wants to be informed as to the correct address he must apply for it and pay for it?

Mr. KELLY. That is it exactly. He will have his desire printed on the envelope.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to discuss the recommendation of the Postmaster General as to first-class postage rates.

I am sure I can not be charged with attempting to obstruct any reasonable desire of the Post Office Department to collect additional revenue. These measures which I have endeavored to have enacted and that have come in with the unanimous report of the Post Office Committee prove that.

Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General, representing the Executive, has the privilege and the duty of making recommendations to Congress as to matters which concern his department.

In accordance with that privilege and duty, Postmaster General Brown has recommended that the rate of postage on letter mail be increased from 2 cents to 2½ cents.

The responsibility for action upon this or any other recommendation rests with Congress, as the lawmaking power.

In dealing with a question such as first-class mail rates, which affect every American, long-continued doubt and uncertainty have an injurious effect upon the service. The present rate has been in force for 45 years, and mail users, large and small, have come to regard it as beyond any chance of increase.

At the present time many business organizations and many individuals are requesting Members to oppose the proposed increase. I know of none urging its adoption.

The proposal has been advanced by the Postmaster General and others in the department for more than a year. It is renewed in the report of the Post Office Department for 1930.

In spite of that fact, no Member of the House has introduced the suggested legislation, and it is therefore not before the Post Office Committee for definite action.

However, in order to help allay the uncertainty which exists in the country as to the possibility of this change in first-class rates being made, I will take the responsibility of saying that not one member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is in favor of increasing first-class rates to 2½ cents.

I shall make a further statement and if any Member disagrees with it I shall give him an opportunity to correct me. I do not believe there is 1 Member out of the 435 in the House who would sponsor such an increase or support it.

No one disagrees with that statement. Then there ought to be confidence on the part of the mail users of the United States that the Congress is definitely determined that there shall be no increase in first-class postage rate.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania think it is a remarkable situation that out of 435 Members of the House not 1 would introduce the bill, and yet the Postmaster General is attempting to foist this proposal upon the people as a burden?

Mr. KELLY. Well, Mr. Chairman, whenever there is such unanimity in the lawmaking body, it may be safely assumed that there is good reason for it. It is easy, of course, to say that Congress views only the political angle of this subject and that the statesmanlike course would be to secure greater revenues for the Post Office Department by assessing further burdens on first-class mail.

I do not believe that either contention is correct. It is not political timidity to refuse to injure one of America's greatest institutions, the Postal Service. It is not statesmanship to throw overboard a policy which has been of inestimable value for many years.

There is a fundamental question in this proposal of the Post Office Department and the attitude of Congress upon it. There are two conflicting policies involved and they should be clearly understood. The real question is, What is the primary aim and objective of the Postal Service?

The Postmaster General in his report for 1930 makes the following statement:

> It is no more logical to expect the Government to transport and deliver private mail for less than cost, than it would be to ask a telegraph or telephone company to furnish communication service at less than cost. * * * Obviously some of these rates must be increased if the service as a whole is to be made self-sustaining. * * * The only practical solution appears to be an increase in the rate on first-class mail where the Government has a monopoly, and therefore would run no risk of driving business to competitors.

In an address delivered in Washington on November 10, 1930, Third Assistant Postmaster General Tilton made the following statement:

> Inasmuch as every worthy project must have a worthy objective we have set as our objective the aim of having the Post Office Department made self-sustaining so far as its business relates to the transportation of mail. The objective of private business is long life and profit. To secure long life it must give compensating service and to insure profit it must apply business principles, guard its expenses, and sell its product for more than cost. The Post Office Department is a business, the management of which has been entrusted for the time being to the present administration. It is a mutual business. * * * The Post Office Department should be self-sustaining.

Should the great objective of the post-office establishment be to acquire the basis of a self-sustaining business?

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

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. In carrying out that policy, I find they are doing this around the country; they are trying to save expense by consolidating rural routes and they are depriving the rural districts of the service they ought to have.

Mr. KELLY. Well, I am in favor of service first. If service can be maintained to its full degree of usefulness and with it economies can be effected, well and good. The trouble is that if the balance sheet is to furnish the keynote of the service many things follow as a matter of course when they should not follow at all.

The service will be curtailed and cheapened; vacancies in the personnel will be left unfilled; substitutes will be used instead of regulars; collections and deliveries of mail will be skimped; distribution en route will be lessened; additional duties will be laid upon employees; feeble functioning will take the place of complete and comprehensive service.

All these actions, which mean deterioration of the service, as well as increase in postage rates, are involved in setting up the slogan, "Make the Post Office pay its way" as the first and foremost consideration.

Now, I do not believe that such an objective is worthy of the United States Postal Service. The balance sheet is not the primary but a secondary consideration. Rather I would say that the paramount duty of this Congress, which alone has the rightful power to determine the objective of the Post Office Department, is to continue in the path followed by Congress for a century and a half of marvelous postal progress. The true objective is to furnish the most complete and useful postal facilities which can be devised, and to do that whether the postal revenues meet the full cost or whether the General Treasury is chargeable for part of the expense. [Applause.]

The only reason for the maintenance of the post office by the Government is found in its character as an agency of public service. The transmission of messages, governmental information, and the dissemination of intelligence are so vital to a highly organized society that it must be in the hands of the Government, representing the people themselves.

There is no method of measuring in dollars and cents the value of this great agency of communication. Its value is in the past and the present and the future as the cementing force which binds a country into a community and a nation into a neighborhood. It pays dividends more vital than money.

There should be no confusion because a schedule of charges has been set up for certain classes of mail matter and services extended by this governmental institution. If Congress thought it wise to provide a free mail, it has the same power to do so as to build a lighthouse or a fort.

Congress has fixed certain rates, and, in most instances, they have been fixed on a public-welfare basis, not primarily to make the Post Office self-supporting.

Only once in postal history has a postage-rate law been adopted solely to meet additional costs. That was the postal salary and postage rate bill of February 28, 1925.

That one experience was enough. It did not even accomplish the end desired. The higher rates curtailed the volume of the mail, and thus the revenues, to such an extent that Congress was immediately forced to reconsider the action and enact a law which reduced those rates to practically their former level. The Post Office Department urged such action and it was taken by practically a unanimous Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if you scan the history of the Post Office Department, you will find that occasionally the Postmaster General has become imbued with the idea of making the Post Office self-sustaining. He would take whatever admin-

istrative power was in his hands to curtail and cheapen the service. However, in every case it was proven a mistaken policy and was speedily reversed.

For instance, in 1859, Judge Joseph Holt, of Kentucky, was made Postmaster General and sought to carry out the policy that a postal deficit must be prevented at all costs. He found mail lines to the Pacific operating at a great loss and endeavored to do away with them.

That policy was counteracted by Congress and fortunately, indeed, for the United States mail lines to the West bound that great empire to the Union in the crisis of the sixties.

It was in that critical period that the distance factor was eliminated in first-class postage rates. At that time a letter sent more than 300 miles cost 10 cents. Congress established a uniform rate of 3 cents, regardless of distance, although there was a postal deficit at the time. Within eight years postal revenues had doubled.

Congress, which alone has the power to establish postal policies, has always refused to act on any other policy than that of giving the most complete and useful service possible, without regard to a possible discrepancy between revenues and expenditures.

Great new services have been established; postage rates have been lowered; compensation and working conditions for employees have been kept up to an American standard, and as a result the Postal Service has been maintained on a basis which excels any similar service in the world.

Congress has always wisely maintained that the Post Office Establishment is not a money-making agency but an instrument of service.

Nor, Mr. Chairman, should we forget that the head of the Post Office Department has, as a general rule, supported the congressional policy. Call the roll, and a large majority agrees with that declaration of Postmaster General Hays in his report for 1921.

> The department should not be conducted for profit. Its only purpose should be to serve the people fully and efficiently.

Hidden away in the dusty tomes which chronicle the year-by-year history of the Postal Service are to be found some inspiring things. In the Postmaster General's Report for 1885, the year when the present 2-cent letter rate went into effect, there is a gem which should be carried in every report of every Postmaster General. Postmaster General William F. Vilas deserves to be remembered for his statement of true postal policy. I quote his words:

> The Postal Service has in some countries been employed as a means of gaining revenue to contribute toward the support of the general government of the State. No such end is sought by the Government of the United States. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to the idea of a government of the people by and for themselves. Nor is the notion that the Postal Service is a business carried on by the Government, which should be at least self-sustaining, if not profitable, a just or wise one, and to so regard it tends to impair its efficiency and retard its improvement. The Government properly engages in no business as such, but undertakes, as their agent, to supply to the people those conveniences which it can furnish, by comprehensive appliances and with the aid of law, in a far superior and cheaper manner than they can by other means provide for themselves.
>
> It is obvious that the Postal Service is of a general public value of vast importance, quite distinct from that value which is only the combined sum of its usefulness to particular persons whose errands it performs. The chiefest feature of this general kind is the common good which arises from the dissemination of intelligence, the spread of intercourse, and the increase of facilities for procuring the small things which bestow the comforts of life, resulting in the diffusion of a greater happiness among all the people.
>
> It is an undeniable consequence that an equitable assessment of the expenses of the Postal Service would impose a goodly share upon the common public to be drawn from the Common Treasury * * *. It seems only fair and safe judgment to decide that when the revenues derived from as moderate an assessment upon first-class matter as but two of the smallest coins upon an ounce of weight and much less charges on inferior matter will approximate the whole cost of the service, the remainder is but a fair burden upon the common public, be it more or less, because it proves the employment of the service to have become so general that to distinguish between the public who bear the burden of general taxation and the public who enjoy the facilities of the Postal Service is both impossible and unimportant. Assuredly from such distribution as may exist of that kind, no human discrimination is nice enough to confidently decide that the present burden of deficiency is inequitable. It ought therefore neither to give the slightest concern upon that account, nor much less qualify with hesitation any desirable step toward the improvement of the efficiency or the enlargement of the valuable functions of this excellent minister of universal comfort and convenience.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fallacy to class the United States Postal Service with a business like a telephone company whose reason for existence is making money.

It can not be denied that the telephone business is a great success considering that its objective is profit making. Its service is dependent upon the money return. Only those families and business concerns which pay a fixed monthly charge for the telephone instrument get service and they pay that charge whether they use the telephone or not. Would it be sugggested that the American family must pay a monthly fee for the purpose of the installation of a mail box in which to receive mail?

Poor's Manual gives some facts about the outstanding telephone company which practically controls the entire telephone field. In 1929 the total operating revenues were $1,070,794,499. Profits paid to stockholders in the form of dividends were $132,223,833. The cash surplus was $84,881,037.

That means total profits, after every possible expense, including depreciation of over $164,000,000, is deducted, of $217,104,872. That is more than 20 per cent of revenues.

From the facts it could be argued not that postal charges should be modeled after those in the telephone business, but rather that the general public would be benefited if telephone communications were included in that people's agency of communication known as the United States Postal Service.

Mr. Chairman, no private business can serve as model for a public service such as the post office.

May the day never come when the truthful answer to the question as to the purpose of the Postal Service will be either "to earn profits" or "to collect money to meet expenses."

As a matter of fact, the postal establishment and a private business are founded on exactly opposite principles. In a business, when the conflict comes between profits and increased service, profits always win. In the post office, when that conflict comes, service wins and profits are disregarded. Judged on this primary principle, the post office is not a business; it is a public service.

If the post office were conducted as a business, a great many conveniences and services would be immediately discarded. The Rural Free Delivery Service, with all its value but with its $50,000,000 loss a year, would be the first to go. The only test put to each of the multitude of services given would be, "Does it pay its way?" And if the answer were negative, it would be sunk without a trace.

The heart and essence of private business are profits. Take profit out under our present system and there can be no business. When any business continues without profit for a time it is in the hope of making profit, and if that hope is not realized the business stops.

In a business it is profits which determine wages and salaries, working conditions, and selling prices.

Mr. Chairman, I protest against binding this great agency of intercommunication between 120,000,000 Americans in that kind of a vise. In this institution the extent and quality of the service given and the compensation and working conditions of those who give it must not depend on a dollar-and-cent balance, but on its purpose of advancing the common welfare to the greatest extent possible. A money balance in this service no more decides its true worth than it does in the conduct of a public school.

The Postal Service is a part of the American educational system far more than it is a part of our business system. The Postal Service System is a great human organization composed of 375,000 workers, banded together in a cooperative, enlightenment enterprise. Such a service pays dividends not primarily in dollars and cents but in better citizenship.

Of course, I do not mean to say that financial considerations should be entirely forgotten. We can and do make charges for services rendered and three-quarters of a billion dollars are brought in. But those charges are established on the lowest possible basis, so that the service shall be as wide

as possible. The first consideration is service; the charge is secondary.

I favor the highest efficiency in the post-office establishment. Still there is a vast difference between efficient service and efficient money-making. If a private business took over the Postal Service and rebuilt it on a profits basis, it would reduce service and increase charges. If, however, a private enterprise were ordered to continue the traditional policy of the post office and give the present service at the present charges, the deficit would be much higher than it is to-day.

In other words, as a service-giving institution the post-office establishment is to-day the most efficient organization on earth.

Let profits be the dominant motive in private business. It must be so under our present system, and no better motive has ever been discovered for the conduct of such business as is naturally competitive.

But let us keep one great institution as the embodiment of another motive—that of cooperative service. Here is no business to show a favorable balance or be branded as a failure. Here is a service to be extended to the utmost, whether the extension shows a money loss or a money gain. That service is one of the birthrights of every American and we should not curtail it now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, putting aside the fundamental policy involved, let us analyze the specific contention that first-class rates should be increased 25 per cent, thus substituting a 2½-cent rate for the 2-cent rate in force since 1885.

In that connection it will be interesting to consider the cost-ascertainment report of the Post Office Department for 1930. The summary is as follows:

TABLE A.—*Recapitulation of allocations and apportionments of postal revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1930 to the classes of mail and special services, not taking into account relative priority, degrees of preferment, and value of service in respect to expenditures*

Fiscal year 1930	Revenues	Expenditures	Excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues	Excess of revenues over apportioned expenditures
1	2	3	4	5
Classes of mail:				
First class—				
Other than local-delivery letters	$253, 680, 859. 57	[1] $209, 745, 011. 11		$43, 935, 848. 46
Local-delivery letters	105, 776, 334. 80	[1] 68, 902, 479. 64		36, 873, 855. 10
Air mail	5, 272, 616. 45	[1] [2] 15, 168, 778. 58	$9, 896, 162. 13	
Total, first class	364, 729, 810. 82	[1] 293, 816, 299. 33		70, 913, 541. 49
Second class—				
Publications exempt from zone rates on advertising under act of Oct. 13, 1917 (par. 4, sec. 412, P. L. and R.)	2, 354, 123. 64	[1] 17, 258, 116. 13	14, 903, 992. 49	
Zone rate publications—				
Daily newspapers	13, 093, 562. 96	[1] 45, 354, 313. 13	32, 260, 750. 17	
Newspapers, other than daily	2, 238, 426. 86	[1] 12, 834, 456. 37	10, 596, 029. 51	
All other publications	11, 379, 643. 02	35, 974, 257. 86	24, 594, 614. 84	
Free in county, all publications		[1] 7, 810, 161. 45	7, 810, 161. 45	
Total, publishers' second class	29, 065. 756. 48	119, 231, 304. 94	90, 165, 548. 46	
Transient	1, 643, 053. 50	1, 179, 342. 67		463, 710. 83
Total, all second class	30, 708, 809. 98	120, 410, 647. 61	89, 701, 837. 63	
Third class	61, 490, 185. 87	82, 992, 233. 49	21, 502, 047. 62	
Fourth class—				
Local delivery	2, 453, 522. 11	2, 111, 593. 69		341, 928. 42
Zones 1 and 2	51, 954, 933. 82	74, 595, 680. 88	22, 640, 747. 06	
Zone 3	30, 747, 939. 80	34, 017, 415. 11	3, 269, 475. 31	
Zone 4	28, 580, 871. 24	25, 468, 796. 91		3, 112, 074. 33
Zone 5	19, 896, 194. 42	16, 818, 746. 47		3, 077, 447. 95
Zone 6	6, 789, 869. 19	5, 652, 547. 31		1, 137, 321. 88
Zone 7	4, 392, 692. 03	3, 547, 698. 05		844, 993. 98
Zone 8	6, 302, 685. 27	5, 016, 789. 42		1, 285, 895. 85
Total, fourth class	[3] 151, 658, 537. 13	167, 229, 267. 84	15, 570, 730. 71	
Foreign—				
Other than air mail	18, 195, 679. 96	34, 142, 849. 06	15, 947, 169. 10	
Air mail	332, 988. 03	[2] 4, 300, 000. 00	3, 967, 011. 97	
Total, all foreign mail	[4] 18, 528, 667. 99	38, 442, 849. 06	19, 914, 181. 07	
Penalty—				
For the Post Office Department		3, 998, 992. 71	3, 998, 992. 71	
For other branches of the Government		3, 808, 540. 65	3, 808, 540. 65	
Total, penalty		7. 807, 533. 36	7, 807, 533. 36	
Franked—				
By Members of Congress		575, 676. 51	575, 676. 51	
By others		124, 978. 88	124, 978. 88	
Total, franked		700, 655. 39	700, 655. 39	
Free for the blind		65, 178. 98	65, 178. 98	
Total, all mail	627, 116, 011. 79	711, 464, 635. 06	84, 348, 623. 27	
Special services:				
Registry—				
Paid registrations	[5] 13, 822, 559. 88	21, 093, 698. 14	7, 271, 138. 26	
Free registrations—				
For the Post Office Department		1, 840, 028. 63	1, 840, 028. 63	
For other branches of the Government		327, 893. 86	327, 893. 86	
Total registry	[5] 13, 822, 559. 88	23, 261, 620. 63	9, 439, 060. 75	
Insurance	[6] 8, 775, 399. 61	11, 302, 844. 62	2, 527, 445. 01	
C. O. D	5, 817, 070. 03	10, 308, 860. 13	4, 491, 790. 10	

[1] These computed expenditures do not take into account the preferential treatment accorded to first-class mail and to newspapers.

[2] These items represent the payments made to contractors for the transportation of mail by airplane on domestic and foreign routes, respectively, together with the cost of transporting the mail to and from air mail fields and the cost of distribution in air mail transfer offices.

[3] Includes $539,829.25 revenue from special-handling service.

[4] Includes $161,767.55 receipts from foreign countries for handling foreign mail in transit through the United States, and $104,076.18 revenue from miscellaneous special services in connection with foreign mail.

[5] Includes $1,067,206.93 revenue from return receipts for registered mail.

[6] Includes $28,335.26 revenue from return receipts for insured mail.

TABLE A.—*Recapitulation of allocations and apportionments of postal revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1930 to the classes of mail and special services, not taking into account relative priority, degrees of preferment, and value of service in respect to expenditures*—Continued

Fiscal year 1930	Revenues	Expenditures	Excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues	Excess of revenues over apportioned expenditures
1	2	3	4	5
Special services—Cantinued.				
Special delivery	$12, 064, 054. 80	$12, 057, 705. 62		$6, 349. 18
Money order	17, 841, 910. 72	28, 890, 168. 32	$11, 048, 257. 60	
Postal savings	1, 562, 106. 84	1, 426, 243. 92		135, 862. 92
Total, special services	59, 883, 101. 88	87, 247, 443. 24	27, 364, 341. 36	
Total mail and special services	686, 999, 113. 67	798, 712, 078. 30	111, 712, 964. 63	
Unassignable	17, 587, 237. 68	4, 025, 458. 24		13, 561, 779. 44
Total related	704, 586, 351. 35	802, 737, 536. 54	98, 151, 185. 19	
Unrelated	1, 905, 827. 30	2, 203, 424. 91	297, 597. 61	
Grand total, 1930	706, 492, 178. 65	804, 940, 961. 45	98, 448, 782. 80	
Revenue credits (act of June 9, 1930):				
Penalty matter, other than that of Post Office Department, including registration	9, 347, 505. 00			
Franked matter—				
By Members of Congress	718, 060. 00			
By others	154, 545. 00			
Second-class matter, free in county	753, 263. 00			
Free matter for the blind	63, 779. 00			
Publications exempt from zone rates	414, 388. 00			
Expense credits (act of June 9, 1930):				
Aircraft service		13, 863, 174. 10		
Differential favoring vessels of American registry		14, 355, 004. 29		
Grand total, 1930 (adjusted to the act of June 9, 1930)	717, 943, 718. 65	776, 722, 783. 06	58, 779, 064. 41	

NOTE.—The above segregations of the computed total expenditures chargeable to first-class, second-class, fourth-class, foreign, penalty matter, franked matter, and to registry service, and of the revenues from fourth-class matter have been developed by processes of approximation.

Mr. Chairman, this table states that the excess of revenues over expenditures as to first-class mail, eliminating the loss on air mail, which is not counted as a charge against postal revenues, is over $80,000,000. The obvious comment, and one which is being widely used, is that if first class shows such a gain at the present rate, there is certainly no justification for increasing it.

However, I will be frank in saying that my opposition to the proposed increase is not affected by the figures of the cost ascertainment. Only a disregard of all reasonable apportionment of costs in handling the different classes of mail matter could result in such a statement of gains and losses.

Certainly there is no profit of $80,000,000 in handling first-class mail matter any more than there are losses in second and third and fourth classes, such as may be deduced from this report.

I agree with every contention of the Post Office Department that the carriage of first-class mail is the primary function of the service and that other classes are subsidiary or incidental. Railroads have no difficulty in applying a rate-making formula based on such facts. For instance, the rates on sand and gravel are but 8 per cent of the rate on automobiles.

However, even by an arbitrary formula of assessing one-half of all true postal expenditures against first-class mail, the fact remains that under the 2-cent rate first class pays its full share of costs. For my part, I believe that if we charge one-half of all expenses against first-class mail we have given it all it should rightfully carry. If a higher proportion is justifiable, let us have the facts to support it.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General in his report states that the 2-cent rate has been in effect since 1885, and that since that time there have been increasing commodity prices, and mounting labor costs. Therefore, he argues, there should be an increase in first-class mail rates.

That argument is not conclusive by any means. Let us look at the situation in 1885. In that year the total revenues were $42,560,000. The expenditures were $50,947,000, with a deficit of $8,381,000, or 20 per cent of revenues. It required about 69,000 employees to carry on the service.

The per capita expenditure for postage that year was 79 cents.

Compare that with 1930. The total revenues were $705,484,000. The total expenditures were about $803,700,000, making a total deficit, including nonpostal expenditures, of $98,215,000, or about 14 per cent of revenues. It required 375,000 employees to carry on the service. The per capita expenditure for postage was $5.75.

If the same rate of deficit had occurred as did occur in 1885, the deficit would have been $140,000,000. If the per capita expenditure for postage had remained the same the total revenues would have been $90,000,000 instead of $705,000,000. If the number of employees had increased in relation to revenues there would have been 1,200,000 employees instead of 370,000.

What does all this mean? Simply that low postage rates multiplied the volume of mail, while the increasing efficiency of postal employees absorbed it without corresponding increase of cost. Remember, too, that many and expensive services were added after 1885. The rural free delivery, parcel post, collect on delivery, and many other services and facilities have been extended to the people regardless of cost.

The fact is that in spite of all improvements in service, all increases in compensation, the unit cost of handling the letter carried by the Postal Service is lower to-day than in 1885.

From that standpoint and in line with modern industrial practice of a low price reduced as increased volume warrants it, there should be a reduction in the present 2-cent rate rather than an increase.

One thing can not be denied, and that is that every argument now urged for an increase in the 2-cent rate applied with greater force in 1885. With a deficit of $8,000,000 on a $42,000,000 business, there were strong arguments to be made for an increase by those who could not vision the service because of the deficit.

Why did the Congress of that day adopt the 2-cent rate instead of increasing the rate of 3 cents for half an ounce which then applied? Solely because Congress deliberately and wisely chose to rely on increased volume at the low rate. Congress desired to increase the extent of the service, and the record since shows how well they acted.

Mr. Chairman, it should be remembered that rate increases do not always mean profits.

That is proven by recent experiments in postage rate making. In the act of 1925 the rate on souvenir post cards and private mailing cards was fixed at 2 cents instead of 1 cent. The Post Office Department estimated that such increase would result in increased revenues of $10,000,000. The first year's experience showed that instead of an in-

crease there was a decrease of $6,000,000 from the revenues received at the lower rate.

As a result Congress restored the 1-cent rate in the act of 1928.

On transient second class the rate was increased substantially and the result was a loss of 63 per cent of the entire mailings at the lower rate.

The same thing applies even in private industry. Rates may be made so high that business fails. I remember that in 1919 the Pittsburgh Railways Co., which operated street-car lines in Pittsburgh and its suburbs, came before the city council in McKeesport, Pa., and demanded the right to increase its rates on street-car tickets from 33 for a dollar to 10 for 55 cents.

The company finally secured the permission from the public-service commission and the new rate was established. So rapidly did receipts fall that within three months the company voluntarily restored the low rate.

Mr. Chairman, the question will be asked, What do you propose to do about the deficit?

I should answer that nothing is to be gained by being stampeded into unwise action because of a deficit which is largely due to abnormal conditions.

One great step we have taken in disclosing the real postal deficit as distinguished from the fictitious deficit which was reported for many years. By the act of June 4, 1930, sponsored by myself, authority is given for the segregation of the cost of certain free and public-welfare projects which are not justly charged against postal revenues. For 1930 the sum was about $40,000,000. Eliminating this cost, the postal deficit for 1930 is about $58,000,000.

While there still remain certain reductions of postal revenues due to deliberate policies of Congress, we may say that the difference between the receipts and expenditures is $58,000,000.

That amount can be eliminated, not by curtailing service and increasing first-class postage rates but by increased volume of mail and increased morale of the service.

Increased volume lowers costs. If the expense of carrying one message to a certain destination is $2 the messenger can carry 40 messages to the same address for 5 cents each.

The post office has been built on the basis of low rates and large volume. In 1835 it cost 37½ cents to send a single-sheet letter from Washington to Boston. That year the average American spent 8 cents for postage. To-day a letter is sent from Washington to San Francisco for 2 cents and the average American spends $5.75 for postage.

There is a certain fixed overhead in the conduct of the post office. That must be met regardless of the volume of the mail. But once that is met increased volume lowers the unit cost of handling mail.

For the 18 years between 1913 and 1930, inclusive, the average yearly increase in postal receipts was $30,000,000. That takes in times of depression as well as times of booming business. It is conservative to say that if normal times prevail for four years postal receipts will increase $120,000,000.

It is the record of the service that it can absorb additional volumes of mail without corresponding increase in expenses. That is the reason for the absorption of all increased costs between 1913 and 1928 without permanent increase in deficit.

The present times are far from normal and we should not take any permanent action based upon them.

The postal receipts at 50 selected cities for November, 1929, were 3.19 per cent over November, 1928. The receipts from the same cities for November, 1930, were 13.27 per cent less than for November, 1929.

It would be folly to attempt to meet the present situation by a general increase in rates. We should act in the light of normal business, not abnormal. Additional receipts of $120,000,000 can be handled by the Postal Service at a cost of $60,000,000. The difference alone would eliminate the postal deficit.

Mr. Chairman, there never was a time when it was an act of wisdom to sell the Postal Service short. It is folly to do it now. We have not reached the end of postal progress. The steady advance since 1789 in volume of mail and in revenues per capita has not come to an end this year.

So recently as 1923, the average revenues per capita were $4.78. In 1928, they had increased to $5.78.

It requires no great stretch of the imagination to state that it will be $6.78 within a short period.

That will mean increased revenues of $122,000,000, from which increase alone the deficit can be eliminated.

Public policy demands that we deal with the Postal Service on a permanent, stabilized basis, not through makeshift attempts to meet every spasmodic change in business conditions.

Mr. Chairman, besides normal growth in business a great deal depends upon the morale in the service itself. Engaged in this great enterprise of peace are 375,000 American men and women, each with an important task, no matter how humble it seems.

When that great army is imbued with loyalty, teamwork, and comradeship, the Postal Service is a marvel of efficiency.

When morale is broken through loss of confidence, injustice, doubt, and uncertainty, the work goes on, but there is less efficiency and higher cost.

It is entirely natural and can not be condemned. Countless millions were spent by the United States during the World War to break the morale of Germany and the Central Powers. That effort succeeded and it determined the result of the war.

G. Stanley Hall, at the invitation of the United States Government, prepared an article on Morale for the students' Army training corps. In it he said:

> Does a man find his pleasure in the things he ought to? Can he face the world with confidence and joy and get real happiness out of the fundamental things of life? Or is he discouraged, depressed, and prone to lose hope? That is morale or lack of it.

The morale of the Postal Service is the biggest factor in its efficiency. Usually it is at a high pitch. There are splendid traditions of rushing the mails through to destination, regardless of difficulties, from 1776 to the present.

There is a common cause, that of serving every American, whether in the city or in lonely places.

There is sentiment about the service, something like that aroused by the flag itself.

There is an ideal, like a flying goal, which beckons on to more useful service every year.

There is faith in the justice of Uncle Sam and the hope which tides over discouragement.

There is public good will which makes postal workers try to merit it.

All these things inspire and strengthen the morale of the Postal Service.

Still, that morale can be lowered. If the seeds of division are sown and one group is set against another; if faith in a square deal and hope for bettered conditions are dissipated; if the sentiment is blotted out and the ideal of eager, willing service is obscured; if public good will is alienated, the cost can not be made up by increased postage rates.

All these things follow surely upon the policy of branding the Postal Service a failure if it does not bring in as many dollars as it pays out. We did not tell the American soldiers in the World War that they were costing us millions of dollars a day and force them to keep their minds on that. We told them to do the job which had to be done regardless of cost, and it was their invincible morale which enabled them to do it.

Mr. Chairman, let me sum up what I have been trying to say. The post office is not a business, organized for profit making or for balancing receipts and expenditures to the penny; it is a service, organized by the people for their manifold benefits.

Increasing the first-class rate, which has become an institution through 45 years of marvelous postal progress, is not justified from any standpoint.

The best means of making expenses and receipts balance approximately is to keep rates to the lowest point possible, increase the volume of mail, and lower the unit cost. Just as important is maintaining the morale of the service at the highest pitch possible by emphasizing the vital importance of the post office and by assuring a square deal to every

worker in the service from the highest official to the humblest laborer.

In my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, increased volume and increased morale will do more to accomplish the ends desired by the department officials than this recommendation for an increase in first-class rates. And the fact that not one Member of the House or Senate has voiced his support of this increase is gratifying proof that Congress regards the postal establishment as an agency of service rather than as a business to be weighed in the balances of money making. [Applause.]

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield to answer some questions concerning the bill we have before us?

Mr. KELLY. I will.

Mr. BUSBY. I want to ask several questions. The gentleman has given us a lecture which is very interesting, but I think if anybody cared to make a point of order the gentleman would have to confine his remarks to the bill. I would like to ask some questions concerning the bill itself.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman can have plenty of time to ask all the questions he desires to ask about the bill. I was discussing a question which is pressing upon every Member of the House in connection with postal rates, and I have finished my remarks on that matter.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. There is much misunderstanding as to the cause of this deficit. I wonder if the gentleman, in the extension of his remarks, will show how this deficit is made up. The country generally seems to believe that the franking privilege is responsible for a large percentage of it, when, as a matter of fact, it is responsible for a very, very small percentage.

Mr. KELLY. A fraction of 1 per cent; yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I hope the gentleman will put those figures in the RECORD.

Mr. KELLY. I will be pleased to do that in connection with the cost-ascertainment report.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. I notice from the gentleman's statement he believes the Post Office Department should give service rather than try to make the department pay its way entirely.

Mr. KELLY. That is my belief.

Mr. BUSBY. Does not the gentleman believe that the bill he is proposing now will tend to give the employees an excuse to curtail a service that the Post Office Department has been boasting about during all these years; that is, making delivery of mail matter submitted to it where the address was not at all sufficient?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is in error about that. This will rather have the opposite effect.

Mr. BUSBY. What sort of regulations does the gentleman have in mind the Postmaster General should adopt in order to put into effect his proposed legislation?

Mr. KELLY. In the first place, he will put this regulation into force——

Mr. BUSBY. How? That is what I want to know.

Mr. KELLY. Everyone knows how a regulation is put into force. The department will notify the mail users who want to take advantage of this optional service the conditions which must be complied with.

The first regulation put out will be that any mail user who desires to get a return card with corrected address and pay 5 cents must print on his own envelope a statement that he desires the card back, and will pay for it.

Mr. BUSBY. Then the receiving office must go through and inspect all the pieces of mail as they come in to see if the sender has complied with the regulation?

Mr. KELLY. The receiving office has nothing to do with it. The card goes back from the office of destination.

Mr. BUSBY. But suppose the delivery address is not entirely sufficient according to the opinion of the office to which the mail is addressed. What happens?

Mr. KELLY. Nothing happens, unless there is printed on the envelope of the sender a statement of his desire for the return of the card.

Mr. BUSBY. If it is printed on there that does not help in determining where it is going.

Mr. KELLY. The purpose is simply to get the card back giving the corrected address, thus preventing the sending of more misdirected mail.

Mr. BUSBY. Has the legislation anything to do with the efficiency which the Post Office Department has been boasting about in delivering mail with obscure addresses?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman will understand that this does not affect the directory service except where, at their own option, the senders desire to avail themselves of the service and get the card back.

Mr. BUSBY. How does the gentleman determine the amount that this will cost?

Mr. KELLY. The Post Office Department has ascertained it through their own sources of information.

Mr. BUSBY. Is their estimate of the cost as reliable as that of Mr. Stewart when he was before the Post Office Committee as to the raise in the rate of postal cards where he said that the raise from 1 cent to 2 cents would bring in a revenue of $20,000,000 and the result was that instead of $20,000,000 we got less than half.

Mr. KELLY. I do not know how the figures were secured, but I will ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the figures, which state the cost of directory service at between two and three million dollars a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed to the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly am.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin for one hour.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we have all been interested in the eloquent address of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as to the increase to 2½ cents on first-class mail. For the time being he diverted the attention of the committee from the bill before the House. I am against this bill and I will tell the reason why.

There are two reasons. The indirect effect of the committee's substitute in permitting a charge of 5 cents to be levied on the sender of the mail when it has no correct address will have the ultimate result of no mail being delivered to the addressee unless some fee is charged.

The bill as originally presented to the Congress by the Post Office Department carried an idea entirely foreign to the one recommended by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It provided that the receiptee should pay a charge of 2 cents to be collected and accounted for in the manner other postage due is accounted for. That due postage of 2 cents was to be paid by the receiptee and not by the mailer.

You seek by this bill to authorize a charge of 5 cents to be paid by the mailer for the purpose of having the Post Office Department act as a detective agency to disclose the whereabouts of persons to whom mail is addressed. That is the ulterior purpose back of this bill.

The chairman of the committee in a side remark takes exception to my charge of an ulterior purpose. I made the charge here when the committee, of its own motion, not upon the recommendation of the Post Office Department but of its own motion, suggested a fee of 20 cents on parcel-post matter for the purpose of ascertaining the address of persons to whom parcel-post mail is sent by mail-order houses for their private advantage, and my charge was not denied by the chairman of the committee or by any member of the committee. That was an emanation of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and not of the Post Office Department, and

this suggestion under consideration now is an emanation of the Post Office Committee and not of the Post Office Department, and seeks likewise to aid certain mail-order houses or collection agencies to ascertain the address of a party. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] stated that the mailers are willing to pay a fee of 5 cents if they can ascertain the address of the person to whom the letter is directed. I assert that when you establish this policy it is only a step before you are going to have no mail delivered to the person to whom it is addressed, where it does not contain the correct delivery address, except on payment of a fee. That was the purpose of the bill as originally presented by the Post Office Department, and now the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads substitutes an entirely different idea by accommodating these mail-order houses and certain collection agencies, so that they can find the address of a person by paying a fee of 5 cents. I ask gentlemen to seriously consider this phase of the matter. Do you wish the Post Office Department to be used as a detective agency to ascertain the address of people who wish for some good reason that address withheld? I do not. I know of instances where collection agencies would give any amount of money to find the whereabouts of people. I want the Postal Service always to be free and to hold the information confidential as to the address and whereabouts of people to whom mail is sent. I may be in a small minority in my view of the purposes for which the Postal Service should be used, but that is my view to-day, and I am going to hold to it until some person can change that view.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY. Is the gentleman in favor of the original proposal of the Senate bill to levy 2 cents, through a compulsory fee, upon every bit of mail?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not.

Mr. KELLY. Then the gentleman is not in favor of the Senate bill as it came from the Senate?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not. I am following the logic of the gentleman's position when he elaborated on the virtues of the Postal Service of having that department used for public service. There are many people in this country who do not know the street addresses of people to whom they address mail, and if they place 2 cents on a letter they are entitled to the directory service of the Post Office Department.

I take issue with the gentleman as to the reasons he is opposed to increasing the postage on first-class mail to 2½ cents. I am opposed to that increase because 2 cents is more than compensatory for the service rendered. Your country people and my city people do not always know the address of the people to whom they send mail in different cities, and they are entitled to have the Post Office Department ascertain that address, even in case the party moves. During the holidays much of my mail is addressed to me at my home, but I direct to have my mail come to my office. That change is accomplished by a notice sent to the superintendent of delivery. The work is inconsequential, and why should I pay more than the 2 cents when the 2 cents is more than compensatory for the service.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I would like to know from the capable gentleman from Wisconsin if he does not always seek to have the correct address on his own mail?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do; but some mail is sent to me at my home, as, for instance, Christmas cards. I notify the superintendent of delivery when I come home that all of my mail should be delivered to my office. That is a change of address. Yet some of the mail comes to me, as to many Members of Congress, at my home. How do I know when I want to write a letter to any of my colleagues when Congress is not in session as to their exact city address. I address it to their home city but not to their home address. Why should not that address be adequate?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Will the gentleman explain why he thinks that all large users of mail have an ulterior motive in wanting to have the correct address on their mail?

Mr. STAFFORD. Did the Post Office Department recommend the substitute submitted by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the testimony to that effect?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. This was changed after they testified.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. It is the emanation of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. I served years ago on that committee, and I knew then how some publishers of advertising sheets were only too desirous of having unrestricted use of the second-class mailing privilege. There is some ulterior purpose back of this bill. Why not be frank and tell who are the parties who are willing to pay 5 cents for these addresses?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is irresponsible in making such a statement as that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Irresponsible! And yet the gentleman's committee reports a bill that has not the recommendation of the Post Office Department, when it is clearly distorted from the original purpose of the Post Office Department.

Mr. KELLY. What the gentleman says as to any ulterior purpose in this bill is unjustifiable. The idea of the bill is that we have endeavored to work out an optional charge instead of a compulsory charge. We understood there was a loss of $3,000,000 and we desired to make up part of that loss. We refused to put the burden on the addressee. As a result of our deliberations—and the Post Office Department helped to shape this bill as it stands—we have worked out the proposition where the mail sender may have additional service for a 5-cent fee. That will help decrease the loss now sustained through directory service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why does not the Post Office Department levy higher rates on parcel post, when it is acknowledged by all that the rates for the carriage of parcel post are below that which is compensatory?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I would like to advance the thought to the gentleman that if this bill is passed in its present form it is going to conference, and when it comes back here you will probably have the Senate bill with the House amendment added. What assurance have we the Senate will not insist on the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. STAFFORD. Sooner or later, if this bill is passed, you will see a charge made upon the recipients of the mail when the mail does not contain the street address.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY].

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is an adequate way in which the sender of mail may secure the address of the sendee if the mail reaches him, and that is by asking for a return card on a registered letter. He can be certain in that way. It will cost him a little more than this, but the peculiar thing about this bill is that we are having a charge levied in the Post Office Department, not a charge fixed by Congress but a charge fixed by regulation of the Postmaster General, under conditions to be prescribed by him, pursuant to this legislation.

Following that, I assure you that every employee in the delivery departments throughout this country will be cognizant of the fact that there is a letting down of the efficiency that they are called upon to render, in the service which they render, to the people who have mail addressed to their places. They will look this over and they will use it as an excuse for not rendering that efficiency that has been characteristic heretofore. They will say that Congress has passed a law

saying that "unless this party put a stamp on the corner, whereby he paid 5 cents for a notice, that we are not required to exercise that diligence that we formerly exercised." They now take down their city directories and they use every means at their command and they very nearly find the addressee, if he is to be found, without any additional charge.

Now, it will be said, if this bill becomes the law, "Why do you not give the correct address?" Frequently you write to a man at a post office where the postmaster knows his particular address better than the man who writes the letter, and he is rendering that service to you and to me and to everyone else, and he does it simply because he is on the ground and has peculiar information that is necessary to make the delivery.

I am not in favor of passing any legislation which will tend to lessen that peculiar efficiency that the Post Office Department has been pointing to with pride throughout the years. The particular thing that we all commend the Post Office Department for is making delivery of almost every piece of mail; so nearly so that not more than 1 in 7,000 goes astray under the present system; and yet the sponsors of this bill come here and say that it is costing between two and three million dollars to render directory service. That is a rough guess, a worthless guess, and first-class mail was overpaying the cost of handling by $80,000,000 six years ago. Surely it is overpaying for this service that they say costs between two and three million dollars. Let us not do anything that will break down the morale and efficiency of those who handle mail and who hand it out to the people to whom it is addressed.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE].

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this explanation to the Members of the House. There seems to be some confusion as to just what this proposed legislation means. The history of this proposed legislation began in this way: The Postmaster General recommended the passage of a law similar to this, except that the payee was to make a contribution for the service, for the misdirected mail. The Post Office Committee, after considering that, objected to it and referred it back to the Postmaster General, suggesting that they did not believe this penalty or expense, or whatever you may choose to call it, should fall upon the receiver of the mail, but should fall upon the person who addressed the mail and made a mistake, if it should be borne by anybody.

So this bill comes here now.

Something was said about breaking down the morale of the Postal Department. The law as it is to-day, before the passage of this bill, will work just exactly as it is working now. It will make no change whatever in the delivery of mail in the future, but it does make this change, that 5 cents will be paid. It will be paid by whom? By the man who sends the mail and who makes the mistake in misdirecting the mail, but even that expense does not fall on him unless he first seeks an opportunity and expresses a desire to pay it when he asks for corrected addresses. So there is no expense to anybody unless the man who sends the mail makes a request of the Post Office Department and states that he is willing to pay 5 cents per name for this misdirected mail. Otherwise it costs him nothing.

To illustrate it, suppose I desire to mail out a large quantity of mail. Perhaps I have 25 per cent of my addressees' names wrong. The Post Office Department now and after the passage of this act will seek out the addressee of mail and deliver the mail, but they do not make any report back to the sender of the mail as to the correct address of the recipient of the mail. Three weeks from now suppose I mail out another bundle of mail and I get no report back from 25 per cent of the people to whom I wrote. Their addresses are still wrong. But, if this legislation is enacted, I can go to the Post Office Department and say, "I have been mailing out 50,000 letters every three weeks and 12,500 come back misdirected. Now, I would like to get those names corrected so that I will not be causing the Post Office Department extra labor all the time. I am willing to pay 5 cents for it per name, so that after this when I write to John Jones at a certain village he will get the mail."

As a matter of fact, gentlemen, it will save labor to the Post Office Department. It will be a saving of time and money to the Post Office Department, and nobody is put to any expense except the man who seeks the information, and he requests the service and pays for it himself.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBY. Then, as I understand the gentleman's explanation, this law would furnish a method whereby mailing lists could be corrected so that dead names, where deliveries could not be made, would not remain on the list at the time of the second mailing?

Mr. ROMJUE. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania very frankly admitted that it was the purpose of the Post Office Department in presenting this bill to Congress for passage, and that it was the purpose of the other body in passing it, to permit the Post Office Department to charge an additional 2 cents for directory service on all mail. That is the purpose stated in the title of the Senate bill, which reads:

> To authorize the collection of additional postage on insufficiently or improperly addressed mail to which directory service is recorded.

This committee has seen fit to change the title of the bill. I want you to note the title of the bill after the committee changes it. It still reads as it read before, as follows:

> Amend the title so as to read, "An act to provide a postage charge for directory service."

Does not that mean to provide a charge for every piece of mail to which directory service is given? Why, certainly it does, and if you pass this bill with that kind of a title, as proposed by the committee, you are going to find one of two things existing in the department. You are going to find that they are going to make some regulation to charge for directory service or they are not going to give directory service to mail that is entitled to it.

I have in mind an important letter I addressed some time ago to Mrs. Fanny Armstrong Smith, 337 Hickory Street, in a certain city. There was no 337 Hickory Street, but there was 335 Hickory Street, at which this woman had lived for several years and was getting her mail daily there, and yet that letter came back to me as improperly addressed. That ought not to be the case.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania stated that his idea was that the Postal Service should render the very maximum of service to the people of the United States. That is what we ought to impress upon the Post Office Department, and in my judgment, instead of passing this bill, if we would pass a resolution and tell the Post Office Department from the Congress just what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said from this floor, that we expect the Post Office Department to render to the people of the United States the very maximum of service, we would be accomplishing something constructive rather than to pass a bill of this kind.

Mr. KELLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman certainly can not see any objection to comprehensive legislation of this kind which will give an optional service to those who desire to avail themselves of it.

Mr. BLANTON. But this is not a proper title to carry on this bill, because, as I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if this bill were passed Congress would expect this department to give directory service to every letter that comes into it, whether there is any request for it or not. So what is the use of putting a title on the bill that is false and is an improper title?

Mr. KELLY. The only thing is that the title can not carry the whole bill. We are providing this charge for optional directory service.

Mr. BLANTON. But the committee has seen fit to change the title of the Senate bill, and if they are going to change it why not put a proper title on the bill and not put a title on the bill which states that the Post Office Department is "to provide a postage charge for directory service." Make it provide that the sender must pay a postage charge whenever he wants a return card giving him the correct address. Why not put a proper title on it and not put a title there that will permit the Post Office Department to change its present regulations and refuse directory service to a letter.

When one of my constituents, living out in the country, writes a letter to a city and gives an address there and that address can be found by the distributing clerk by merely referring to the city directory that reference ought to be made and the proper address ought to be put on the letter and it should be delivered immediately.

What would have happened if this Senate bill had been passed just as it was written? Every time a letter went to a post office and it did not have the exact and proper address on it the Post Office Department would ascertain the address and then would send notice to the addressee to the effect that there was a letter there addressed to him, but that it had an improper address on it, and if he would send 2 cents they would send it to him. In that event there would be a delay of two or three days, and such delay ought not to occur in the Post Office Department of the United States.

I think this bill ought to be withdrawn, and if the committee does not withdraw it, I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], who watches these things on the floor all the time—I hope one of them will move to strike the enacting clause out of this bill.

This bill ought not to pass. It is not a good bill; it is not properly written; it will not benefit anybody but a few big mail-order houses of the United States; it will not benefit my constituents; it will not benefit the constituents of the gentleman from Pennsylvania; it will not benefit the constituents of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wisconsin. But it will add a burden to all of them. We ought to defeat this bill by sending it back to the committee or by striking out the enacting clause and not permit it to pass.

I have just received a notice from the Post Office Department, after urgent supplication on the part of a lot of people living out in a mountainous region in my district for a little change in a route which would give them some mail service, that the Postmaster General finds that it would cost a little more than the revenues will permit, and that being so they can not grant this service to these people, and they will have to go 5 miles for their mail.

These people living in that mountainous section are entitled to the same postal service from the United States that the people here in Washington get, where you can go to the main post office any time at night or on Sunday and send a parcel-post package or send a letter anywhere in the United States. This is the kind of service they give here in the Nation's Capital; but when you go down into the mountainous sections of Texas, because, forsooth, it will cost a little more than the revenues warrant, they refuse good people rural mail service and make them go 5 miles for their mail.

The time has come when, in addition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania coming on the floor here and giving us an outline of his splendid policies and his ideas about the mail service, we ought to bring home to Postmaster General Brown and his department the fact that we expect the very maximum of service for all of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are considering a Senate bill with all the language after the enacting clause stricken out and a paragraph substituted by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

What concerns me is what is going to happen if this bill passes and is sent to conference. An average of 75,000 people in my city (St. Louis) move every year, and I judge the same number of people move every year in the city of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. Now, the Senate bill provides, without any ifs or ands, that in using directory service 2 cents shall be charged, but it gives the privilege to the sender, if he desires, of paying the 2 cents, and if he does not pay the 2 cents it is collectible from the person to whom the letter is addressed. Am I correct about that?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman refers to the Senate bill.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes. What assurance is the gentleman from Pennsylvania going to give the House of Representatives than when this bill comes back from conference it is not going to contain that Senate provision?

Mr. KELLY. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania can say the same thing that any other one Member can say. We absolutely refused in the committee to accept the Senate bill and no change in that attitude is anticipated.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. We have here a situation where the committee offers one proposal and the Senate has offered another. I am not so much concerned with the proposal that is offered by the House, but I do object to the Senate provision.

Mr. KELLY. So do I, and just as vigorously as does the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. And in order to get what you want you are liable to give way in some respects to the Senate, and the result will be that people residing in the large cities, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I reside, are going to be affected by the provisions of this Senate bill. Our constituents will be required to pay this additional charge if the Senate bill prevails in the end.

I think a bill which passed the Senate without a roll call, and with practically no consideration, should not be brought up here in this way, sent to conference, so that the conferees be given an opportunity to rewrite the bill and get what the Post Office Department desires, which is a 2-cent charge for directory service.

Mr. KELLY. If the gentleman will permit, the Post Office Committee unanimously had his view of the matter and refused to accept the Senate bill and substituted an optional proposal. The gentleman ought to be able to trust the House in refusing to accept the Senate provision in case it should come back to the House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Well, in the end you will be required to compromise. You will probably have to give something to get something, and what are you going to give? You are going to have influence brought to bear on you by the Post Office Department to agree to the Senate bill, because it is their recommendation. The recommendation for the 2 cents additional charge comes from the Post Office Department; is not that true?

Mr. KELLY. That is true.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The Senate conferees owe as much to the Senate as the House conferees owe to the House. I am willing to trust the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]; but the other conferees have not spoken. Here is what can happen under the Senate bill: A family moves from one street to another in a large city. For a year or more thereafter the mail, the large portion of their mail, will be addressed to the old home. Every time such a letter reaches the post office it will be subject to directory service, and before that mail will be delivered 2 cents additional for each letter must be paid. Wait until your constituents are asked to pay this additional 2 cents, if such a provision is enacted into law. Your constituents will be told the Congress passed the law, and you will then hear from the people who sent you here to protect their interests in more ways than one.

I would like to do something to reduce the deficit in the Post Office Department, but I do not feel we can take the chance on this bill coming back to the House without some of the Senate provisions in it. I propose to vote against it.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOGG].

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this bill is simple in operation and advantageous in results. There are hundreds of millions of pieces of mail bearing the wrong address given to Uncle Sam every year for delivery. Unnecessary expense is thereby added to the Postal Service.

The bill that came over here from the Senate said that the Postmaster General might charge 2 cents for putting on the correct address. I am opposed to any such measure as that, and so is the entire membership of the House committee. The present bill provides that any user of the United States mails may enter into a contract with the Government whereby, if he agrees in advance to pay 5 cents, he will be informed of the correct address of any addressee.

The large users of the mail—and they are not all bad people—will pay the nickel and have the corrected address returned to them. Then the great volume of mail that does not have the correct address will be thereafter correctly addressed and there will follow a material lessening in the amount of necessary directory service. This will be a good thing for the service. And for that reason I ask for the passage of this bill.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BUSBY. Suppose a person does not want the mail to follow him when he moves about? Does the gentleman mean to tell the House that the post-office authorities will furnish to mail-order houses his correct address so that they can keep harassing him with mail that he does not wish for?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. A person is not obliged to receive any mail that he does not voluntarily wish to receive. He may refuse any or all mail addressed to him.

Mr. BUSBY. What is the purpose of following him with mail from the mail-order house if he does not want to do business with them?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I have no connection with any mail-order house.

Mr. BUSBY. How much revenue would be received by the Post Office Department by the passage of this bill—the bill submitted by the Senate—the proposition by the department?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I am unable to say. I think that is an unwise measure.

Mr. BUSBY. How does the gentleman know that the conferees will not come back with that bill if you pass this bill?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I can not believe that any conferee of the House would agree to it.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HARE. I am much interested in the statement and in the bill, and I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I understand it, if I address a letter to John Jones, Smithville, and the man is not there, and I had no notice on the envelope guaranteeing 5 cents for the correct address, the postmaster at Smithville will get the proper address?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. HARE. But suppose the condition arises where you are unable to find the proper address of John Jones, have I paid my nickel in advance or do I wait until you determine whether the address is correct and get the proper address? I think there is a possibility of the large mail-order houses placing a great burden upon the Post Office Department in trying to locate John Jones, Sam Smith, and Tom Brown. If the money is to be paid before the correct address is furnished, then, so far as the Government is concerned, it would be protected, but if it is paid afterwards, then the Government would not be protected and the sender would be the loser.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. The point raised by the gentleman will be covered by regulations of the Post Office Department.

Mr. HARE. If the addressee is not found the deposit is returned. I can see a possibility of a great burden being devolved upon the Post Office Department, because in every office there would have to be an additional clerk. It is going to require one or more clerks in every second or third class office in the United States to take care of the demands of the mail-order houses.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. The department already has the clerks, the fact is that it will relieve them of some of their duties in that it will eliminate a part of their work by aiding the sender of mail to correctly address his mail.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BUSBY. If they have the clerks now, how does it cost the Government any more to render this service?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I do not believe it will cost the Government any more. It should eventually cost less.

Mr. BUSBY. Is this an effort to raise the revenue of the Post Office Department?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Yes. It seeks to take away the necessity of handling so great a volume of misdirected mail. It will cost the department less to handle it.

Mr. KELLY. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. KELLY. The Post Office Department estimates that the salary paid for this service is $1,548,000 per year for these directory clerks alone.

Mr. BUSBY. What would it be after this system goes into effect?

Mr. KELLY. Of course it would be exactly the same, except there would be some return on part of this service.

Mr. STAFFORD. There will be a return receipt, and there is expense.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Five cents will more than pay for that.

Mr. Chairman, the real purpose of this bill is to take out of the mail a great unnecessary mass of misdirected mail. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, of course we all know that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is a splendid committee, and one of the hard-working committees of the House. All I say in criticism of the committee in respect to this bill is that the bill is ill advised. I want to point out simply the mechanics of the proposition involved, and a fundamental postal principle which this proposed law will naturally disturb. In the first place, the directory service available to the post office is likewise available to the sender of mail. I am talking, of course, of conditions in the large cities, and not of small places. In small places where there is no directory, each individual is, as a rule, known, and a local street address is not a matter of importance. But when you are furnishing directory service, and a letter is addressed to John Jones, at No. 16 East One hundred and sixteenth Street, New York City, and he is not at that address, all that the Post Office Department can do under the regular routine of the office is to look in the general directory or the telephone directory and ascertain the address. If all you are seeking to do is to provide directory service, then I submit that that same information is available to the sender of the mail as is to the post office.

Next, what other source of information has the post office? This involves what I believe to be a fundamental principle of postal policy. We have always considered and respected the sanctity of the mail. You can not receive any information, direct or indirect, concerning the mail or the character of mail or the receipt of mail or of mail sent to any individual from the Post Office Department.

This other source of information is that which is furnished by any individual to the post office of his change of address. If he moves and changes his address, the post office will redirect all mail addressed to his former address to his present address. That information is not now available. That has always been considered confidential information. The post office is not free now to give that information or to sell it. So that the service contemplated

in this bill will not be the giving of simple directory information, because that is available now to the mailer, but it will be to giving or selling of confidential information which every individual is entitled to repose in the post office at the present time with the assurance that it will not be made public.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In just a moment. I am not questioning the good faith of the inquiry or the people who would desire information under this bill. I am not questioning the desirability of ascertaining the whereabouts of any individual in many cases, but I am questioning the wisdom of making the Post Office Department an agency for locating individuals or furnishing addresses, regardless of what the purpose may be. That is something that you must consider in voting for this bill to-day.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is mistaken about the scope of this bill. There is nothing involved in this bill except directory service. It specifically states that only where this directry service is given this charge shall apply.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then I ask the gentleman if he will resist an amendment providing that nothing herein shall be construed to furnish any change of address?

Mr. KELLY. I think that is covered in the law as it is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is covered under existing law, but the purpose of this is to amend existing law and do that very thing. I am not questioning the good faith of the inquiry, no matter who makes it, but let us pause for a moment to see whether or not we are going to use the Post Office Department by payment of 5 cents to look up individuals. What will happen? Naturally, the post office wants to render service. I consider the Postal Service in this country above par. It is better than the postal service in any other country in the world. I think there is no doubt about that. Suppose an inquiry is made through the very simple procedure of mailing a letter accompanied by a request for information provided for in this bill. Is the post office going to send out its carrier to investigate and locate that man? That will be the next step.

The next step will be for the mailer to say, "We pay 5 cents for information and we are entitled to it," and they write to their Congressman, and especially if it is around August or September, the Congressman will want to have service given to his constituents and he will go to the Post Office Department and demand service and ask them to send out their clerks, carriers, and investigators to locate addresses. Are we going to establish in the post office a detective service, a bureau of lost persons, at 5 cents for each service? This bill is far more reaching than appears at first reading, and I ask the gentlemen to pause for just a moment before we convert our post office into a bureau of lost persons or a private detective agency, and thus destroy one of the safeguards that we have been able to maintain in this country, which is the absolute sanctity of the mail.

Mr. BLACK. In New York City we no longer have a general directory, and if they want to find out a change of address they will have to send out a post-office inspector and that will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly; I have so stated. Telephone directories are now used in large cities, and the same directories are available to all—not only to the post office but to the sender of mail.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Not only in New York City, but in every city throughout the country. General directories are no longer being published.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; they are, by the R. L. Polk Co. One is being printed now in Detroit—one every year. New York is behind the times.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no; New York is ahead of the times, as usual. They will realize presently in Detroit that general directories are no longer necessary.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is it not a fact that through this bill confidential information with reference to a person may be given, which was purposely and deliberately prevented from being given out when we established the service?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. You can not get the addresses through the census; but now, to break down the principle of the census through the Post Office Department, they are going to let lawyers, collection agencies, stock brokers, and so forth find out where any victim or sucker is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And we must protect, even in the smallest minority, those cases rather than to break down the fundamental, necessary safeguard which we have maintained all this time of the secrecy and sanctity of mails.

I wonder how many would vote to open the files of the Census Bureau at 5 cents a name and address? I do not think we would get far with that, because I remember distinctly when the census bill was being considered there was no opposition to the secrecy clause. Everybody was for that, and properly so.

Gentlemen, the Post Office Department is a useful, necessary service. In our modern life we could not live without it. Please, for the sake of increasing revenue, and with all the good intentions of the committee and the department, let us not destroy that safeguard and that fundamental principle of good, orderly postal service. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each piece of insufficiently or improperly addressed mail which is accorded directory service in effecting or attempting to effect its delivery shall be charged with 2 cents postage in addition to the regular postage, to be collected and accounted for in the manner in which postage due on other mail is collected and accounted for: *Provided*, That such additional postage charge may be prepaid by the sender under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General: *Provided further*, That such charge shall not apply to matter mailed under the franking and penalty privileges.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, in cases where insufficiently or improperly addressed mail is accorded directory service in order to effect its delivery, the mailer, at his request, and upon payment of an additional charge of 5 cents, shall be notified of the completed or corrected address: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to require or permit the withholding or delay of delivery of mail to the addressee pending the collection of such additional charge."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide a postage charge for directory service."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the committee amendment that it is not germane to the Senate bill.

The bill sent over by the Senate provides for a charge of 2 cents to be paid as postage due by the receiptee of the letter. The amendment offered by the committee, now before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration, carries an entirely different idea. It is entirely foreign to the purpose of the Senate bill, in that it provides a charge of 5 cents, to be paid by the mailer upon receipt of the address of the receiptee.

The original idea was a charge of 2 cents to be paid by the receiptee of the letter when the letter did not carry the proper address. Now, it is proposed by the committee substitute to obtain a new character of service, the address of the receiptee, whenever it is in possession of the Post Office Department, to be paid for in advance, whether the letter is delivered or not. It is something entirely apart from the original idea as carried in the Senate bill. That merely provided a charge for ascertaining the address. This substitute provides a charge to the mailer for receiving a certificate or receipt giving the address. Therefore it is not akin to the original proposition.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to join in the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and say to the chairman in the consideration of this point of order, that the amendment proposed by the committee of the

House clearly establishes a new kind of service, which not only is entirely foreign to the Senate bill and the purposes of the Senate bill, but I venture to say is entirely foreign to any present activity in the entire Post Office Department. There is no activity in the Post Office Department now which relates to anything except the proper receipt, carriage, and delivery of matter committed to it. This committee amendment provides a different service, a new service, by which people can get information as to what address people have or where they may be found. I call attention also to the fact that under the very terms of the committee amendment, the giving of this additional service has nothing to do with the delivery of the mail. There is a proviso particularly that "nothing in this act shall be construed to require or permit the withholding or delay of delivery of mail to the addressee pending the collection of such additional charge."

This charge of 5 cents, therefore, has nothing to do with the delivery of the mail. It simply provides that where the Post Office Department has come into possession of certain information it may divulge that information to people in the country upon payment of a fee of 5 cents for an entirely new service.

I presume it is not necessary to argue to the present occupant of the chair that a committee amendment, whether offered to a House bill or to a Senate bill, must be germane to the bill that comes before the committee. The question of the jurisdiction of the committee is not involved. The committee might have jurisdiction to bring in a bill of this kind as an original bill, but when another bill is before the committee, whether introduced in the House or in the Senate, any amendment proposed, even by the committee itself, must be germane.

I submit with entire confidence that it is clear that the amendment is not germane to the Senate bill. The Senate never intended any such thing. The Post Office Department, which recommended it, never had in mind any such thing as that the Post Office Department should be put in the business of furnishing information as to the whereabouts of people.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, this, I am sure, is a matter that is easily understood. It deals with the directory service only. The Senate bill provided that the sender might prepay the fee of 2 cents. Certainly it was within the power of the House to change that fee from 2 cents to 5 cents. The committee saw fit to strike out the further provision which compelled the addressee to pay it and held the bill to an optional service for 5 cents to the sender.

If the Chair will notice the original Senate bill, it is provided in the bill itself as to the payment by the sender and the 2-cent fee. We have confined it to the sender and established a 5-cent fee. Certainly a committee of the House has a right to deal with two methods by adding a third or taking one alone. Both bills deal with directory service.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] said, this is a new service. At the present time directory service is given free of charge. The Senate undertook to provide a 2-cent charge and have the addressee pay it. The House committee provided that the sender may pay it if he desires, and instead of 2 cents he must pay 5 cents.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman say that the payment of the 5-cent fee has anything to do with the delivery of the mail?

Mr. KELLY. That is not involved in the bill, nor was it involved in the Senate bill. This bill has nothing to do with the delivery of the mail; it is only a charge for directory service, which, at the present time, could be barred by the Post Office Department. If the Post Office Department issued a regulation to-morrow that mail will not be given directory service, that service would not be given unless we passed a law providing that it should be given.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The Senate bill reads as follows:

> That each piece of insufficiently or improperly addressed mail which is accorded directory service in effecting or attempting to effect delivery, shall be charged with 2 cents postage.

Such is the purpose of the 2-cent fee proposed in the Senate bill, but that is not the purpose of your 5-cent fee. Your 5-cent fee is to make it possible, for instance, for me to find out where you live.

Mr. KELLY. No; the gentleman is mistaken. If the gentleman will refer to page 2 he will find that we use the identical words in the House amendment.

> In cases where insufficiently or improperly addressed, mail is accorded directory service in order to effect its delivery.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But the 5-cent fee is not for the purpose of effecting delivery. The 5-cent fee is for the purpose of giving somebody information which could not be obtained in any other way. As a practicing lawyer, I would not like anything better than to be able to obtain this information for a 5-cent fee. If I send a letter to John Jones, who five years ago lived at a certain address, I would be very willing to pay the Post Office Department 5 cents to find out for me where he is now living. I have frequently spent $5, $10, or more for the purpose of obtaining information which I could not gain in the ordinary way. When a letter carrier comes around asking for an address, people believe he has the authority to ask for such information and they will give it.

Mr. KELLY. No letter carrier, under this bill, is going to come around asking for addresses. This is to provide for directory service in the post office, and it only applies to the clerical service given.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. About the 1st day of May and about the 1st day of October there are many removals in the big cities, and the gentleman knows that when a carrier comes with a letter for John Jones living at 215 Main Street, if John Jones is not living there and the carrier asks where John Jones is living the people living at that address will, because they believe he has authority, give him that information, and the next step in this legislation will be to give that information to people who inquire for it.

Mr. KELLY. We are dealing here with directory service. In the case the gentleman suggests the forwarding address will be given at the post office and the mail will be sent out through a carrier to that forwarding address, without directory service.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, so far as the merits are concerned, I am against both the Senate bill and the House committee amendment, but I am concerned in orderly procedure. This is a legislative committee of the House. It has jurisdiction to bring in any kind of a bill of this character. It has just as much jurisdiction to put this amendment on a Senate bill as it would have to report this amendment in an original bill of its own. I do not think that an amendment proposed by a legislative committee must be germane.

Mr. STAFFORD. Suppose a member of the committee should offer this amendment on the floor of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. That is different.

Mr. STAFFORD. Wherein is it different?

Mr. BLANTON. I will remind the Chair of a decision rendered by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Hicks, on this very point, where he held that while a committee member from the floor could not offer an amendment that was not germane, a legislative committee itself could present to the House any kind of amendment that was within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman has such a decision the Chair would like to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. There is such a decision. I can not put my fingers on it at the moment, but the parliamentary clerk will probably be able to show it to the Chair. It was a decision by Mr. Hicks, wherein he called attention to the distinction between the authority of a member of a committee on the floor and the authority of the committee itself.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken in his proposition that an amendment must not be germane to the original bill, and I assume there can be no question that any amendment which is offered by the

committee or by any member thereof must be germane to the bill before the House.

I want to call the attention of the Chair to this proposition: The original bill provides for an additional fee for directory service and the delivery of a certain piece of mail. That is the whole proposition in the original bill. For that a charge is made and there is but one proposition, the delivery of that mail to the person to whom it was sent. I want to read the amendment offered by the committee because it calls for an entirely different proposition and has nothing whatever to do with the delivery of the letter or the mail. It reads as follows:

The mailer, at his request, and upon payment of an additional charge of 5 cents, shall be notified of the completed or corrected address.

In other words, the Post Office Department must go into the business of furnishing to the sender the address of a certain person, who is inquired about, and without reference to the delivery of the mail.

It seems to me we are adding a different branch of service to the Post Office Department. It is not germane to the question of delivering the letter to the one to whom it was sent, but it is merely to furnish to the sender of that letter the address or the location of the person he is desirous of having located. When the Post Office Department gets beyond the question of the delivery of the mail dropped in the office it is getting into another, a different and a wider field.

It seems to me, irrespective of the merits or demerits of either of these propositions, the amendment is not germane to the question of the delivery of the mail.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman might add that we have a confession from the committee itself that this is an entirely different proposition and they admit that by even offering an amendment to change the title of the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. KELLY. Just a moment. The title of the bill as offered by the House is exactly the title as amended by the Senate bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It does not appear so here.

Mr. DOWELL. The change the gentleman is seeking to make by the amendment is to have the Post Office Department, instead of delivering a letter that is put in the box, notify the sender where the man lives. It is another and a different service, and it seems to me it can not be said in any sense to be germane to the question of directory service and the delivery of a certain piece of mail. I think it is clearly not germane and therefore is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RAMSEYER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair thinks that it is clear that a committee amendment must be germane to the bill that is reported by the committee. The Chair does not care to take up the time of the committee to discuss that, but refers as authority to Volume V, section 5806, of Hinds' Precedents in support of this position.

The question arises, Is the committee substitute amendment germane to the Senate bill (S. 3178) which is up for consideration?

The title of the bill reads "To authorize the collection of additional postage on insufficiently or improperly addressed mail to which directory service is accorded," and then the bill goes on and states "that each piece of insufficiently or improperly addressed mail which is accorded delivery service in effecting or attempting to effect its delivery shall be charged with 2 cents postage in addition to the regular postage, to be collected and accounted for in the manner in which postage due on other mail is collected and accounted for."

Here is a piece of mail which requires directory service. There is a charge of 2 cents imposed upon it, which will be collected by the employee of the post office who delivers that piece of mail.

There is a proviso which provides that under regulations of the Post Office Department the sender of the mail may prepay this charge, but, in any event, each piece of mail which requires directory service is charged 2 cents additional postage.

The committee substitute for the Senate bill provides—

That under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, in cases where insufficiently or improperly addressed mail is accorded directory service in order to effect its delivery, the mailer, at his request, and upon payment of an additional charge of 5 cents, shall be notified of the completed or corrected address: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to require or permit the withholding or delay of delivery of mail to the addressee pending the collection of such additional charge.

Here is a piece of mail that requires delivery service. There is no additional postage charge levied against it by the committee substitute. Under the proviso that piece of mail must be delivered without additional postage.

The committee amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, provides for selling a new service to the mailer, and if the mailer requests or seeks that service he pays 5 cents for such service, but that has nothing to do with the delivery of the mail. No additional postage is charged against the piece of mail requiring directory service, while, on the other hand, the main purpose of the Senate bill is a charge of additional postage on each piece of mail requiring directory service.

The proposition in the amendment is quite different from the proposition referred to the committee in the Senate bill, and the Chair is of the opinion it is not germane and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the enacting clause and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, would not a motion to recommit the bill be in order?

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SANDERS] moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSEYER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 3178, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The question was taken, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PAYMENT OF MONEY ORDERS

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8568) to compensate the Post Office Department for the extra work caused by the payment of money orders at offices other than those on which the orders are drawn.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8568, with Mr. RAMSEYER in the chair.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate the payment of postal money orders," approved February 6, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 280; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 727), is amended to read as follows:

"That under such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe postal money orders may be issued payable at any money-order post office, and on and after the date upon which such rules and regulations become effective all money orders shall be legally payable at any money-order post office, although drawn on a specified office; and as compensation for the extra labor involved in paying a money order at an office other than that on which the order is drawn the Postmaster General is authorized to exact an adequate fee; and that all laws or parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an effort to reduce the loss on money orders. On money orders for 1930 there was a loss of $11,048,000, meaning that excess of expenditures over receipts. This bill will not so much raise revenues as it will decrease the loss on money orders.

At the present time there is a system growing up by which large concerns—some of them the mail-order houses about which so many fears have been expressed to-day—get their money orders collected in a central post office although they are drawn on many different post offices. That means that the present system in regard to the payment of money orders is overturned by such a practice, and additional expense is involved.

Our money-order system was established in the interest of travelers and the orders were cashed at the offices on which they were drawn.

However, these mail-order establishments and others have the practice of taking all their money orders and cashing them at one post office.

The bill provides that where that is done, where the money was collected at an office other than the office stipulated in the money order there shall be an additional fee varying with the size of the money order. Money orders are issued from $2.50 for 5 cents up to the amount of $100. This will produce some revenue and decrease the loss on money orders. It is no burden on the general public and it will not be placed upon anyone who carries out the original purpose of the money-order system.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill as originally introduced authorized the Post Office Department to determine an adequate fee for this service. The committee has provided an amendment to charge a like fee to that which was originally paid for the issuance of the money order. My first impression when I read the bill was that it would be better to leave the additional fee that would be levied by this service to the determination of the post-office authorities rather than prescribing the fixed fee that was paid originally for the issuance of the money order.

For instance, let us take a concrete case. A large money order is issued in San Francisco payable in Chicago. The person deposits it in the South Chicago office or at the post office in Gary, and because of that the service will be much less than if the money order was cashed in New York. I think in that instance it would be an unfair burden on the person cashing the order. I would like the opinion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it would not be better to leave the determination of the amount of the fee to the Postal Department rather than fixing mandatorially in all instances a duplication of the fee?

Mr. KELLY. There was objection in the committee to leaving these fees to the discretion of the department. In the main we have tried to put specific fees in these bills. In this case it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that if we charged the same fee that was paid for the issuance of the money order it would not be burdensome, because the fee was low and there would be a specific fee for the service rendered.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have submitted a concrete case where the charge might be too large.

Mr. KELLY. As far as the office being near at hand is concerned, there is no difference in the expense involved. The moment a money order made out for South Chicago is cashed in the Chicago post office all expense immediately attaches to the records and the bookkeeping service; so that so far as that is concerned, it would make no difference whether it was San Francisco and New York, or two adjacent offices, the additional expense would be the same.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was my impression that the Post Office Department sent a voucher in advance to the office on which the order is drawn, and, of course, if it is cashed in a near-by office, the expense would be less than if it was cashed in an office a considerable distance from the original designated office.

Mr. KELLY. No; the additional bookkeeping, or accounting, would be exactly the same. The usual money order will not be affected, but abuses growing out of methods of some concerns are increasing every month and should be dealt with if we are to prevent increasing losses.

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

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will a man who has been issued a money order have to be identified at the office where he is not known? For instance, if a man takes money orders and travels throughout the country and uses them instead of cashiers' checks, what is the custom of the Post Office Department in respect to identification?

Mr. KELLY. There is a regulation that there should be identification, but as a matter of fact, banks will sometimes take them in on slight identification and send them in numbers to the Post Office Department.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Do you know what the policy of the Post Office Department is itself?

Mr. KELLY. It endeavors to have the man identified, but even at that postmasters are sometimes deluded into paying money orders on false pretense.

Mr. ALLGOOD. So it will not help the ordinary traveler?

Mr. KELLY. Well, the ordinary traveler will get an advanced payment from his home concern and go into the post office and get the money without the payment of this fee.

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

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Can the gentleman assure us that there will be no effort, through this zeal to raise additional revenue by the Postmaster General, to charge an extra fee, if this bill is passed, at the post office on which it is issued?

Mr. KELLY. The Postmaster General can not do that without the action of Congress.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am glad that the gentleman takes that position. I had a great deal of confidence in the Post Office Committee before it brought in this other measure, but when this other measure was brought in——

Mr. KELLY. Oh, we have not degenerated so badly, I will say to my friend.

The CHAIRMAN. No one desiring recognition, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate the payment of postal money orders," approved February 6, 1914 (38 Stat. 280; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 727), is amended to read as follows:

"That under such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe, postal money orders may be issued payable at any money-order post office, and on and after the date upon which such rules and regulations become effective all money orders shall be legally payable at any money-order post office, although drawn on a specified office; and as compensation for the extra labor involved in paying a money order at an office other than that on which the order is drawn the Postmaster General is authorized to exact an adequate fee; and that all laws or parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "an adequate fee" and insert "a fee of the same amount as that charged for the issue of the order."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSEYER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8568) to compensate the Post Office Department for the extra work caused by the payment of money orders at offices other than those on which the orders are drawn, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

CLASSIFYING CERTAIN OFFICIAL MAIL MATTER

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 357, classifying certain official mail matter, on the Union Calendar, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up House Joint Resolution 357, on the Union Calendar, and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. This joint resolution is on the Union Calendar. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 357, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] will kindly resume the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 357, with Mr. RAMSEYER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 357

Resolved, etc., That hereafter the limit of official matter mailed by any person having the franking privilege to his own address shall be the same as that for public documents.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, this measure is a resolution to make the present practice correspond with the law. It is a well-known fact that many Members of Congress in sending their official correspondence to their home offices after the adjournment of a session use the boxes furnished by the House itself and send them through the mails. That practice has been established and has been continued for many years. However, under the strict letter of the law the right to send over 4 pounds in official correspondence is prohibited. Public documents, which include any publications issued by any department, have no limit as to weight.

One of these trunks might be filled with these bulletins or books issued by a department, and there is no question about the legality of it. The committee thought we should make the practice square with the exact legal statement of the law, and therefore this bill simply classifies official mail matter on the same basis as public documents, giving it the same weight privilege. In other words, there will be no definite weight limit for strictly official correspondence mailed to his own address by a Member of Congress. You will note that the bill provides that the privilege only operates to the Member who mails to his own address.

I can say that while the Post Office Department did not recommend this or bring it to us of its own motion, they assisted in framing this bill as it is written here, and I am certain no objection can be lodged against it, although naturally no recommendation is here in its favor.

I will be glad to answer any questions or ask for a reading of the bill.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSBY. In the event a Member goes from Washington to his home after the short session of Congress and desires to transfer his files containing correspondence concerning his official business, what method or manner would the gentleman suggest he would use in transferring his files?

Mr. KELLY. He will do it under the operation of this resolution. He will simply put his frank tag on his official trunk containing his official correspondence.

Mr. BUSBY. That is not Government printed matter. It is ordinary correspondence that has come in as first-class mail.

Mr. KELLY. There is a meaning for "official correspondence" which is well known.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. We are permitted to send telegrams on official business where matters are urgent, and I think it is a good privilege. It inures to the benefit of every one of our constituents. We are permitted to send regular mail under our franks for the benefit of our constituents. Why does not the gentleman's committee extend that privilege to air mail? There are occasions when we could send matter by air mail rather than by telegraph that would inure to the benefit of our constituents in emergency matters and on occasions when we could save much money over the cost by telegrams.

Mr. KELLY. I will say frankly to the gentleman from Texas that I would oppose an extension of the franking privilege to air mail.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean where it is marked "an emergency."

Mr. KELLY. Well, even that. Air mail is under a contract system and we are paying considerably more than the revenues we derive.

Mr. BLANTON. My idea was that in instances where we are now forced to send telegrams we could use air mail at much less cost to the Government.

Mr. KELLY. I would suggest a better plan of reaching it, and that is an appropriation of a certain amount of money to be used for air mail correspondence by Members of Congress. Then the money would be paid to contractors for carrying that air mail.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it would be a saving to the Government.

Mr. KELLY. I agree that it would be.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Since there seems to be some misunderstanding of the extent of the use of the franking privilege, I think it would be well to say that that privilege is not extended to air mail, nor is it extended to special-delivery service nor to registered-mail service. In all of those special cases Members of Congress must pay and do pay the necessary fees.

Mr. KELLY. That is true, and the entire cost of the franking privilege is only about 0.1 of 1 per cent of postal expenditures, so that it is an infinitesimal amount.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. As a matter of fact, the franking privilege should be distinctly separated from the so-called penalty service.

Mr. KELLY. It is. It is so segregated in the report of the Postmaster General.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The average amount of the franking service is a small part of the business of the Postal Department.

Mr. KELLY. And as a matter of fact the operation of this bill will not increase it.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will it not be necessary for a Member of Congress to tell an untruth on the face of it if he sends his letter files through the mail? It says:

This measure makes it possible for him to send his files through classifying such official correspondence on the same basis as public documents and making it weigh no more than 4 pounds.

I do not believe we can do that. What is the use of incorporating in a law such proposals and conditions which will make a man tell an untruth, because I do not see how he can get around it unless he does.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is mistaken about that. A package can be sent to-day, legally, containing stationery and official correspondence to the weight of 4 pounds. This bill simply lifts the 4-pound limit up to the same basis as public documents. It does not propose to call official correspondence public documents.

Mr. ARENTZ. How could a public document weigh much more than a definite amount, such as 4 pounds, or 6 or 8 pounds?

Mr. KELLY. You can send 100 Agricultural Yearbooks in one package, and it is legal, but if you send more than 4 pounds of your office files you are running counter to the letter of the law.

Mr. ARENTZ. And this would make it possible to send your stationery through the mails in excess of 4 pounds?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; and to use the boxes furnished by the House itself for the convenience of the Members.

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman believes, then, under this provision, that a Member of Congress would not be caught up like he was last year by sending letterheads and envelopes under a frank to his home town?

Mr. KELLY. No; he would not, if it were official stationery for his use as a Member.

Mr. ARENTZ. Well, he was.

Mr. KELLY. Perhaps he was sending over 4 pounds.

Mr. ARENTZ. Then this bill provides that he can send more than that?

Mr. KELLY. That is true as concerns official matter.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. DALLINGER. Has there been any interpretation of the phrase "official matter"?

Mr. KELLY. Yes. That has been held to mean stationery and correspondence constituting the official files of a Member of Congress.

Mr. ARENTZ. I like to believe that everything said here is perfectly frank, but I find this language in the report:

A package containing stationery and correspondence constituting the official files of a Member of Congress, addressed to himself, to be mailable under frank must not exceed 4 pounds in weight.

Mr. KELLY. That is exactly what I told the gentleman, as frankly as I could make it.

Mr. ARENTZ. You now make it so that such a package may exceed 4 pounds in weight.

Mr. KELLY. Yes. I hope the gentleman will not say that I was not frank with him.

Mr. ARENTZ. I do not say that; but the report does not show that this legislation changes the situation so that such a package may weigh more than 4 pounds.

Mr. KELLY. Why, the entire purpose of this legislation is to bring the stationery and correspondence constituting the official files of a Member of Congress in the same position as public documents, and there is no weight limit on public documents.

Mr. ARENTZ. So that they will be frankable?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; that is exactly what I stated to the gentleman.

Mr. DALLINGER. What is the present law in regard to public documents?

Mr. KELLY. I will say to the gentleman that at present there is no weight limit whatever. In other words, you can send 100 pounds of Agricultural Yearbooks in a bag to your own address or any other address and there is absolutely nothing contrary to law or regulation, but if you go over 4 pounds on the official files in your office in sending them to your own address you run counter to the present requirements.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I want to ask particularly in regard to blank letterheads. Suppose you order 1,000 letterheads and send them to your office in Pennsylvania. Will the language of this bill permit those letterheads to be franked in a package?

Mr. KELLY. The definition of official matter covers stationery and correspondence.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Where is that definition to be found?

Mr. KELLY. That is to be found in the regulations, and I have it in a letter from the Clerk of the House, Mr. Page, who urgently urged the passage of this resolution on the ground of the convenience it would afford to the Clerk's office. His statement is that stationery and official files are included in the definition of official matter. We took him into conference, as well as officials of the Post Office Department, on this measure.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does not the gentleman know that they have a rule in that office which prohibits the sending of 1,000 envelopes in a package to a Congressman's home address but that they must be sent by express and do not come under the franking privilege?

Mr. KELLY. I imagine that is on account of the present situation. This will change that; it will take the weight limit off and make official matter the same as public documents.

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

The Clerk read the joint resolution for amendment.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the joint resolution do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSEYER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 357, classifying certain official mail matter, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the same do pass.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were—ayes 70, noes 0.

So the joint resolution was passed.

On motion of Mr. SANDERS of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. 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. 9]

Abernethy	Bell	Brunner	Celler
Arnold	Blackburn	Buckbee	Chase
Auf der Heide	Bohn	Canfield	Clancy
Bacharach	Britten	Carley	Clark, N. C.
Bacon	Browne	Carter, Wyo.	Colton

Connery	Hale	McSwain	Sloan
Cooke	Hall, Ill.	Mead	Somers, N. Y.
Craddock	Hoffman	Michaelson	Steagall
Davis	Hopkins	Newhall	Stevenson
Dempsey	Hudspeth	Niedringhaus	Stobbs
De Priest	Hull, Morton D.	Nolan	Sullivan, N. Y.
Dickstein	Hull, William E.	Norton	Sullivan, Pa.
Dorsey	Johnson, Ill.	O'Connor, La.	Sumners, Tex.
Douglas, Ariz.	Johnson, Ind.	O'Connor, Okla.	Swanson
Douglass, Mass.	Johnson, Nebr.	Owen	Taylor, Tenn.
Doutrich	Johnson, Wash.	Palmer	Thompson
Doxey	Johnston, Mo.	Perkins	Underhill
Doyle	Kearns	Pou	Underwood
Drewry	Kemp	Pritchard	Vinson, Ga.
Dunbar	Kennedy	Purnell	Walker
Edwards	Kiefner	Ramey, Frank M.	Williams, Tex.
Eslick	Langley	Reid, Ill.	Wolfenden
Fish	Lindsay	Reilly	Woodrum, Va.
Garber, Va.	Lozier	Rowbottom	Wright
Gasque	McCormack, Mass.	Sears	Zihlman
Gavagan	McCormick, Ill.	Seiberling	
Golder	McLeod	Short	
Griffin	McMillan	Sirovich	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-two Members are present, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. TILSON, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday, and the committee which was on call to-day has finished its work for the day. I should like to see the remainder of the day utilized in consideration of the deficiency bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that further Calendar Wednesday business for to-day be dispensed with.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that Calendar Wednesday business for the remainder of the day be dispensed with.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, further Calendar Wednesday business was dispensed with.

THE DEFICIENCY 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. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—ayes 265, noes 6.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15592, with Mr. LEAVITT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PROHIBITION

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prohibition, including the same objects specified under the Bureau of Prohibition in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1931, $543,370, of which amount not exceeding $10,000 may be expended for the collection and dissemination of information and appeal for law observance and law enforcement, including cost of printing, purchase of newspapers, and other expenses in connection therewith, and not exceeding $25,000 may be expended for stationery and office supplies: *Provided*, That expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia for the Bureau of Prohibition during the fiscal year 1931 shall not exceed $319,061.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language contained in lines 16 to 21, providing $10,000 for propaganda purposes, as not being authorized by law.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the lines to which the gentleman's point of order referred.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning with the word "not," in line 17, on page 8, and ending with the word "and," in line 21, providing $10,000 for propaganda purposes, on the ground that such an appropriation is not authorized by law.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman and to the committee that if the gentleman insists upon it there is no question but what this is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the whole paragraph.

Mr. WOOD. The whole paragraph is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] makes a point of order against the entire paragraph. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] makes a point of order against that part of the paragraph beginning with the word "not," in line 17, and ending with the word "and," in line 21, but may withdraw in favor of the point raised by Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the point of order is then found to be good against any part of the paragraph, the entire paragraph will go out on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on my point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, there are two points of order pending, the first one by the gentleman from New York is to a portion of the paragraph and the second one by another gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is to the entire paragraph. If the Chair would permit the suggestion, the Chair might rule first on the first point of order made and then take up the second one.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Would it be in order for me to amend my point of order, it having first been made, applying it to the whole paragraph?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the chairman of the committee has already conceded the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] as good. If the Chair will rule upon that, then the question will come upon the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that the Chair has not yet ruled on the point of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, I amend my point of order and make it to the whole paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman can not do that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then I press my point of order on the whole paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that that comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has not yet been acted upon. The Chair is ready to rule on the second point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the paragraph goes out.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

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 8, after line 10, insert:

"BUREAU OF PROHIBITION:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prohibition, including the same objects specified under the Bureau of Prohibition in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1931, $543,370, of which amount not exceeding $25,000 may be expended for stationery and office supplies: *Provided*, That expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia for the Bureau of Prohibition during the fiscal year 1931 shall not exceed $319,061."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is entitled to recognition if he desires it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. WOOD. I do not care to say anything on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA to the amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: At the end of the Wood amendment, after the figures "$319,061" insert "*Provided*, That no money herein appropriated shall be used to pay any regular or special employee for educational work in connection with the collection and dissemination of information and appeal for prohibition observance and prohibition law enforcement."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I was under the impression——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman from Texas a moment ago claimed that a point of order came too late. His point of order comes too late.

Mr. BLANTON. I am making the point of order before there is any argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland has been recognized and debate has started. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I understood that the gentleman from Indiana in his amendment eliminated the $10,000. That would leave $309,000 instead of $319,000 as read by the Clerk.

Mr. WOOD. That does not change the total.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment read by the Clerk is exactly as presented by the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the House to the fact that by a point of order the language originally contained in the paragraph for this so-called propaganda was stricken out, but I also call attention to the fact that the Prohibition Bureau, regardless of the provisos in the language, has been hiring unemployed people around the country to go about making speeches, telling people to please observe prohibition. I have just been informed by the comptroller, and I give this as an illustration of how some of this money is expended, that a former Member of this House who was defeated, I think, in a primary, was employed for a period of six months at $10 a day with $5 a day expenses to go around and tell the people of the country what a good thing prohibition is.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not just now. From January 23 to June 30, 1930, he received $1,166.98 for expenses, and $1,590 for pay at $10 a day.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not our former good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Winslow, employed on the Mediation Board for the railroads, and is not our former friend, Eugene Black, of Texas, employed now as a judge? What is to keep former Congressmen from being employed?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Winslow and Mr. Black are rendering useful and necessary service, and the gentleman I refer to is Mr. William D. Upshaw, and I say that public funds should not be wasted in this way.

Besides that, the Prohibition Bureau employed a 16-year-old boy and gave him a pay-roll job, because the boy happened to be the son of a prominent lady in the Anti-Saloon League movement. I think she comes from the State of my distinguished friend, Mr. LINTHICUM—a Mrs. Nicholson.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; but she does not come from my city. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mrs. Nicholson's boy was employed and paid out of this money appropriated. Besides that, the Prohibition Bureau issued a pamphlet, for which they spent $1,700, which is replete with misstatements and misquotations, to which I have already called the attention of the Attorney General. In one instance the author of it purports to quote from a report of a factory in respect to the attendance on Monday morning, and purposely leaves out a paragraph that says that the better attendance on Monday is due to improved labor conditions and not to prohibition. With the permission of the House I will quote from that letter to the Attorney General, which gives an idea of the misrepresentations made by the Prohibition Bureau and printed and circulated at public expense:

DECEMBER 13, 1930.

Hon. WILLIAM D. MITCHELL,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I beg to call your attention to a recent official publication issued by the Bureau of Prohibition entitled "The Value of Law Observance" and to request its immediate suppression. This book would have no importance were it not for the fact that on the cover it bears the legend "The Department of Justice" and on the title page a facsimile of the seal of the great Department of Justice. This gives it an authority which its contents do not warrant. Surely, the good name of the Department of Justice and the good faith of the United States Government can not be used to indorse a stupid compilation of distorted facts written in poor English containing misrepresentation and willful misstatements for propaganda purposes.

To be specific, on page 11 this statement appears:

"A table that shows the trend in one large industry, namely, that of a large manufacturer of powder in the State of Delaware, that absenteeism on Monday has decreased materially in the last 25 years is given:

Disappearance of "Blue Monday"

Day	Per cent absent			
	1907	1913	1924	1929
Monday	7.41	6.17	3.66	2.35
Tuesday	6.89	5.22	2.86	2.10
Wednesday	5.77	5.49	2.90	2.15
Thursday	5.68	5.06	2.37	2.01
Friday	5.38	5.05	2.10	1.89
Saturday	6.94	6.59	3.93	2.95
Average for week	6.35	5.59	2.96	2.24

The above statement and tabulation are taken from page 210 of a book entitled "Prohibition, Its Economic and Industrial Aspects," by Herman Feldman. Part of the same paragraph and explanation of the table are purposely omitted from the department's pamphlet. The omitted part says:

"The company explains: 'You will note that the absenteeism has become less and less in subsequent years. We feel that the improvement in attendance is more due to improvement in labor than to any influence from the prohibition amendment.'"

Any lawyer purposely omitting part of a quotation cited in a brief, thereby changing its very meaning, would have his entire brief thrown out by the court.

Another glaring piece of deception may be found on page 14, under the title "Has Prohibition Been Harmful to the Farm Producer," which reads:

"From the point of view of a nation-wide survey of agricultural products it may be pointed out that the production of grapes from 1917 to 1926 has increased 400 per cent; the production of corn sugar and molasses has increased fully 100 per cent; and while the benefits derived from these raw products have come to different sections of the country, nevertheless the industry, viewed as a whole, does not seem to have lost in its total monetary production during the last decade."

Here the Prohibition Bureau seeks to make it appear that the increase in corn sugar and molasses and grapes due to prohibition was consumed for legitimate purposes. The increase was due to prohibition, but used for the unlawful manufacture of alcohol. The same Bureau of Prohibition is the authority for this statement. In another publication, Possible Production of Illegal Liquor, the bureau shows that no less than 45,900,000 gallons of 100-proof alcohol might have been illegally manufactured annually from corn sugar. On page 20 of this latter publication it is shown that 4,000,000 gallons of 100-proof alcohol, the bureau believes, was made from molasses, corn meal, and other grain, in addition to the 10,000,000 gallons of alcohol the bureau "believes to have been manufactured from cane or beet sugar." But, Mr. Attorney General, note this significant statement appearing on page 17 of the bureau's publication entitled "Possible Production of Illegal Liquor": "On the other hand, the cost of producing alcohol from cane sugar is greater, so that with corn sugar still available for illicit purposes violators have chosen the cheaper product." This is where the increase of corn sugar is going, but not mentioned in Law Observance.

Now, as to grapes, while in the Law Observance pamphlet it appears that the grape industry has increased 400 per cent because the American people are observing the law and eating jelly, on page 35 of the other publication of the same department it is stated that "the quantity of alcohol in homemade wine is estimated to average 12 per cent. On this basis the absolute alcoholic content would amount to 14,185,436 gallons for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930." This alcoholic content is based on a possible production of wine from the available grapes to the extent of 118,320,300 gallons for the year quoted by the bureau. This is where the 400 per cent increase of grapes is going—silence on this in Law Observance.

On page 25 of the Law Observance factual monograph there is a paragraph on Inebreity in America, which reads:

"Prior to the passage of laws prohibiting the unlimited use of alcohol in any State, the States tacitly licensed inebriety and drunkenness. Under the laws existing in the United States before prohibition, a man had a right to become a drunkard and remain one, and the State had, therefore, its duty of taking care of him.

"The theory underlying the law is that an individual has no inherent right to interfere with the orderly development of the complex society in which he lives."

This startling statement attempting to convey the information as a matter of fact that inebriety is decreasing, is brazenly made in the face of actual conditions right in the city of Washington under the nose of the Bureau of Prohibition. Here are the figures:

Arrests for drunkenness in the city of Washington

Prior to prohibition:	
1914	8,837
1915	9,751
1916	9,394
1917	9,648
1918	6,896
1919	6,793
After prohibition:	
1925	10,571
1926	12,907
1927	13,375
1928	13,796
1929	13,942
1930	14,409

On page 32 of Law Observance there appears this statement:

"It is stated by students of criminology that alcoholism is responsible for 80 per cent of the antisocial propensities that make necessary jails and correctional institutions."

If that is so, then why has it been necessary for Congress to provide since prohibition for the building of additional penitentiaries, additional detention jails, and additional correctional institutions? The paragraph fails to state that prohibition has not cured the evils of alcoholism, because the figures of the Department of Justice will show increased criminality, increased prison population, and increased violations of law since prohibition. Is such a misleading statement proper in a "law observance" monograph?

Several pages are devoted to quotations from newspapers published in 1890, 1892, and 1898 on the speak-easies of those periods. Not a word is said about the speak-easies that are now flourishing and doing business. Does "law observance" attempt to imply that there are no speak-easies to-day? There is a chapter on "Typhoid Mary," and one on "Vaccination" and "Pure Food," but the relevancy of these subjects to prohibition is not made clear. Perhaps it was a desperate attempt to conceal the total breakdown of prohibition by emphasizing the efficiency of the United States Public Health Service.

Permit me to call your attention to the paragraph marked "Conclusion." Here is a gratuitous insult to the great States of New York, New Jersey, and Maryland. The paragraph reads:

"In observing the reaction of the national prohibition act, which is naturally emphasized, the only basis for a sane appreciation of the effects of this law is a study of what it has accomplished in the country at large. Not in New Jersey, Maryland, and New York alone but in the home, the school, upon the youth of the land, in industry, and its sociological aspects."

The figures in the Prohibition Bureau will show that just as much liquor is consumed per capita in any other State of the Union as in the States singled out in this publication. While on the other hand, young people in schools have been debauched by reason of prohibition as much in one State as in any other.

I am informed that over 50,000 copies of this pamphlet, the Value of Law Observance have been printed at the cost of $1,800. This is a waste of public funds. Owing to the misleading statements, willful misrepresentations, and misquotations in this pamphlet, I respectfully request that same be withdrawn from circulation.

I can not imagine a worse example of misrepresentation of facts and waste of public funds.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Just before the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] moved to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], who is the leader of the wet forces of the country on the floor of this House, made a point of no quorum to get the membership over here. He did it merely to get his wet forces on the floor and have them vote on the question, I take it, as to the sentiment of the wets on not taking this item up in this bill. On whether we would go into the Committee of the Whole, he forced a division vote, and there were only six votes on the floor of this House which the distinguished wet leader of the House could muster to back him up in that proposition.

Mr. BLACK. And those were six who admit they are wet.

Mr. BLANTON. And if you were to bring up any prohibition question here, it is well known to the membership of this House that the wets can not muster over 67 votes under any circumstances. So why just keep on raising this question? Is that the way to repeal the eighteenth amendment, which is their object? Is that the way for the wet leader, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] to get their beer back? And when I say that I mean no reflection on the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], because in practice there is no drier man in the House. He lives dry. He does not drink himself, but is the leader for the wets here, to force drink on the other people of the country. If we are going to give the President the power and authority to enforce the law, and that burden is upon him by the Constitution, why not give him everything he needs to enforce it; why give him just the Coast Guard and a few antiquated cutters and a little money?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What about the Army and the Navy?

Mr. BLANTON. I am in favor of giving the President of the United States everything he needs to enforce the law. I am in favor, if he needs them, of giving him the Army and the Navy and marines and all the resources of the United States Government as well as the Coast Guard and money, and let the lawbreakers understand that the President of the United States in the White House means business, and that he is going to enforce the law. Your Republican President got the support and votes of practically every preacher in my State in 1928 because they believed that he was a law enforcer. They carried Texas, a rock-ribbed Democratic State, for the first time in its history for a Republican President on the sole issue that he would enforce the law. [Applause.]

If you want him to mean business; if you want him to keep faith with the people of the country; if you want him to keep faith with the Texas people, give him the means of enforcing the law.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Did the gentleman from Texas oppose Mr. Hoover in the campaign because he was going to enforce the law?

Mr. BLANTON. I am a Democrat and I support my party. The preachers of my State were ignorant of the facts about Mr. Hoover. I knew he would not enforce it. I have a letter from a prominent citizen of Wisconsin that I would like to put in the RECORD. I would like for the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. SCHAFER] to read the letter and he will find out that there is a sentiment back in the State of Wisconsin that stands behind the Constitution and enforcement of the prohibition laws.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks and to put in a letter from this citizen of Wisconsin.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, can the gentleman assure the House that the letter is not from a highjacker, a rumrunner, or a bootlegger, who does not desire a change in the prohibition laws?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and I will not mention any names quoted in it.

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

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

BOSCOBEL, WIS., *January 5, 1931.*

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your idea in granting more power to President Hoover for the enforcement of the dry law is a good one, and I am with you.

Wisconsin is in bad shape, because the dry law was abolished by the State, and we should therefore have more Federal help.

* * * Most violators of the law are guests, not prisoners, and they receive no punishment. They now do not fear the law. There should be a fine of $500 and 500 days at hard labor for the first offense, and then double it for each successive offense. Now, a few little bootleggers are taken, but the big ones are never touched. This is not enforcement. Who are the boozers that they should be protected? And who are the people who tolerate them?

I can't see why any Senator, Congressman, governor, or any other officer, or newspaper, can be allowed to shield criminals. We should stop this foreign immigration who are not in sympathy with our laws. We want to check up on these undesirables smuggled in, and send them back home. They are making every kind of an excuse to do away with the dry laws. They should be strongly enforced to the letter.

Yours truly,

JOHN ROUNDS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish that the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] and his wet cohorts would read all of the many letters I received on this subject in this morning's mail. I received one from Mr. M. V. Vantine, whose address is seventh floor, 1816 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, Calif., recommending that "all forces should aid in enforcing the law." Another came from Mrs. J. E. Stevens, of 451 Hickory Street, Waukegan, Ill., hoping that Congress will have courage, power, and strength to fight back this organized liquor sentiment and deal it a blow that will stop it. Another came from Mr. Amos A. Pletcher, of Oxford, Ind., stating that the sentiment in favor of the eighteenth amendment has a big majority in his section and that Congress must not let the lawless element run this Government, else conditions now existing in Chicago and New York will be prevalent all over the United States, and that he is backing his Representative in providing for strict law enforcement.

I am constrained to believe that it is the purpose and intent of the organized "wets" of this House to raise this question continually on the floor and to keep the subject agitated in the wet press of the country and to keep the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD filled with wet orations, thinking that it will influence and manufacture wet sentiment over the United States.

I am one of the many so-called "drys" of this House who is going to mix it with them on this speech making. During the eight years I served on the circuit bench, at a time when open saloons were in practically every State, I tried just about as many criminals produced by the liquor traffic as are now being tried in that district for violating prohibition laws. Conditions now are far preferable to conditions then. Surely it is a strange sort of a citizen who would go back to the days of the open saloon. And we would all be headed that way were the eighteenth amendment repealed. Who would take such a backward step?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMTON) there were—ayes 43, noes 145.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, after the figures $319,061, line 25, following the amendment offered by Mr. WOOD, insert: *"Provided,* That no part of said money shall be expended in the establishment of any speak-easy, pool room, or other means for the entrapment of any person to violate the Volstead Act or the eighteenth amendment."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that interferes with the discretion that is given executive officers by the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana and requires an investigation on the part of the executive department as to what is a speak-easy.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is on all fours with the amendment with reference to poisonous liquor which was sustained by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair this is a negative limitation and not subject to the point of order. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, as usual, the gentleman from Texas was all wrong to-day. The gentleman from Texas intimated that I made the point of no quorum to take up this question and vote against it. The truth is I found that the House was doing business with only about 73 Members, and I thought that out of 435 there ought to be more than 73 when a question of this importance was coming before the House.

I therefore made the point of no quorum, with the splendid result that we have the Chamber filled with Members interested in this question, both for and against it.

As to my amendment, I spoke before the committee on yesterday, in which I said that speak-easy had been established in Indianapolis, Ind., and that 18 policemen had been inveigled into this speak-easy established by the National Government. I read into the RECORD a letter from my Maryland friend, Col. Amos W. Woodcock, Director of the Bureau of Prohibition, in which he admitted that he had paid the rent for the property in which the "speak-easy" had been established.

This matter went to the Baltimore Sun, and, the Baltimore Sun being very meticulous in what it does, and being one of the finest newspapers of the country, wired to Indianapolis to find out whether this was absolutely true, and this is the information they received.

UNITED STATES AGENTS ADMITTED HAVING SUPERVISED PLACE

INDIANAPOLIS, January 6.—The reference in the House to-day by Representative LINTHICUM, Democrat, Maryland, to a Government-owned "speak-easy" in Indianapolis, recalled a Federal court trial here last month, at which Federal agents testified they had supervised the operation of a liquor-selling establishment in order to obtain evidence.

The agents who testified that Government money had been used in setting up the "speak-easy" were Herman P. Kroencke, Hugh T. McGrath, and Smith Wilson, a negro, all of Chicago. They said they were assisted by Horace E. Lyle, a negro, investigator for James M. Ogden, attorney general of Indiana.

Judge Robert C. Baltzell, during the trial and in imposing sentence on those convicted, criticized the methods of the Government agents, saying that their operations smacked of entrapment.

My amendment simply provides that you prevent any part of this money being used by the United States Government in setting up speak-easies, pool rooms, or other devices intended to entrap citizens, whether they be police officers or not. It is intended to prevent establishing such devices to entrap citizens of the United States and then having the men who were conducting the speak-easies for the Government appear against them at the trial.

Now, it is up to you. I am not going to argue the question any further. It was up to you before about the poison-liquor question. That has now been eliminated. It is up to you whether you want this Government to adopt this plan. How can you expect foreigners who come to this country to respect our country and its institutions if you are going to commit the Government to such practices as this?

I ask you to determine whether you want the Government to continue it; whether you want any part of this money used for such purposes. It is entirely up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were—ayes 54, noes 106.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] offers an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOOD], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH to the amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: On page 8, line 16, strike out the figures "$543,370" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I notice in this appropriation we are asked to provide for 257 additional persons to be used in the field. I believe that that money is unnecessary and will be wasted.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who addressed the House a few minutes ago, can not forget the 1928 election. He does not realize that the people during that campaign were misled, were made to believe that they were voting for prosperity and for real possible enforcement of prohibition. Since that time there has been an election during which the question of prohibition was made an issue in all of the larger States. In my own State, the State of Illinois, the Republican lady candidate tried in every way to evade the issue, despite the fact that the Republicans, believing it would be beneficial to them, submitted the proposition to the vote of the people by referendum.

It seems to me the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has not been informed of the result of that vote. For the first time in history, the State of Illinois, a Republican, dry State, having experience and knowledge of what prohibition has done to America, voted for a wet candidate for United States Senator and elected him by a majority of nearly 750,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAMTON. Did the gentleman note the election of the gentleman from Illinois, Governor YATES?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will give me more time I will be delighted to take up the question as to Governor YATES.

On the question of prohibition the people have voted from 2 to 1, to 10 to 1 to repeal the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act.

Not only in my State but in the Speaker's State that question was submitted to the people, and a real, sincere wet has carried that State. In the States of New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, as well as in other States, the same thing occurred. By the way, the gentleman who rose comes from the State of Michigan, and he should know by a sad experience that that question has been raised in his State. I think the gentleman's colleague, his assistant dry leader, whom we heard often on this floor, will remember that election, as even in that State some of the outstanding leaders of prohibition have been defeated by tremendous majorities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, wishing to comply with the mandate of the people of my State and of a majority of the people of the United States, I can no longer vote the people's money and the taxpayers' money for the purpose of supplying means to the professional prohibitionists, who are trying to create a few more positions for their favorites, knowing that the law can not be enforced and that the money will be needlessly expended or wasted.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question, but not for an argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman referred to Illinois. Is it not a fact that the State of Illniois gave Governor YATES a big majority, and has given him a majority of nearly a million votes, when it was known he was an ardent dry and has always been a dry? [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Are you drys through with the applause? You better be, because the facts I will give you will not be so pleasing.

Again, as usual, my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is wrong. It was believed and reported on the night of the election, and even the next day after the election, and the newspapers so stated, that Governor YATES was defeated; but he was found to be elected on the third day after the election, by a very small majority. It was not by a million but by a small vote.

Mr. WOOD. Twenty-seven thousand.

Mr. SABATH. The final figures might have been 27,000 votes. But, mind you, our colleague ex-Governor YATES comes from old, respectable stock. The name of Yates is revered by every man and woman in our State. [Applause.] It was his name, aside from and notwithstanding his record on prohibition, that pulled him through. Had he been right on the question of prohibition he would have carried the State by the million the gentleman believed he carried it by.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that in the last election in which he ran before his death Hon. Henry Rathbone, who was an ardent dry, carried the State of Illinois by nearly a million votes?

Mr. SABATH. We know all about our former colleagues. Rathbone was victorious in 1928, but if he had been a candidate on the dry Republican platform of 1930 he would have suffered the same fate as did the lady candidate for Senator. The conditions in 1930 were different from those of 1928. The people now are better informed, and they will not be fooled in the future. They will continue to demand the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and while that is pending they will insist and demand the repeal or, at least, the modification of the Volstead Act. It matters not how often you arise in your seat here or how many letters you may get from these professional prohibitionists, you can not arrest the persistent demand of the people of this country to eliminate and eradicate the crime-breeding—yes, the infamous—law that has been forced upon the people against their wish and against their will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman from Texas a while ago was bragging very strongly about the President carrying Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I was ashamed of it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask whether the President would carry Texas to-day?

Mr. SABATH. That thing is well known to the gentleman from Texas; and notwithstanding the fact that he likes to be contrary, that is one thing he will have to admit, that a Republican has no longer any chance in Texas or in any other section of the country, because the people demand an honest and efficient Democratic administration that will again secure prosperity for the Nation, as it did under Woodrow Wilson, and once again secure a liberal, humane government in all of the States of our Nation. [Applause.]

I am going to expect in the future not only the cooperation of 67 gentlemen, as the gentleman has pointed out, but the cooperation of about 167 in the next House; and I assure you, Colleague BLANTON, the representative and leader of the drys——

Mr. BLANTON. I only speak for myself, and the people I represent.

Mr. SABATH. I can well understand the underlying reason for your refusal to assume the leadership of prohibition. You undoubtedly foresee that the 1930 election was the forerunner of what will occur in the presidential election in 1932; and I therefore invite you—yes; I invite all of you gentlemen—to join with me in that great popular movement to restore to the people and to the States their rights and personal liberties of which they have been deprived by

the prohibition law; as by this time, you must well realize, that the noble experiment has failed.

Regardless of what you or other prohibition leaders may say, I am convinced that the will of the people—as expressed in the last election, not only in the States I have mentioned, but in all other States where the question has been submitted—will prevail. The senatorial election in Illinois clearly indicates that the people will not be hoodwinked or misled. In their efforts to becloud the issue, fool the people, and aid the lady candidate, the prohibition Republicans and astute chieftains submitted the question to a referendum. The clever candidate, with her well-organized group of capable managers adroitly endeavored to side-step the prohibition question, but fortunately, the chivalrous Democratic wet candidate, Hon James Hamilton Lewis, refused to follow the lady's method; and try, hard as she did, she could not persuade him from the outstanding and all-important issue—prohibition.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, for nearly 11 years Congress has permitted itself to be dictated to by a small but shrewd, clever, and cunning group of prohibition preachers and professional prohibition beneficiaries.

However, the people of the country have begun to resent this domination and demand the repeal, or at least the modification of the present prohibition law, and refuse any longer to follow the selfish, fanatical prohibition leaders.

The majority of the people recognize that prohibition has been a destructive, crime-breeding law and force. As I have pointed out, in every State where the question has been directly submitted to a vote, the people, by a great majority, voted for the repeal, not only of the Volstead Act but of the eighteenth amendment as well.

Not only the States I have mentioned but other States as well demand a change of the intolerable conditions that have developed under the prohibition law. They demand, and justly so, that law, order, and safety be again restored, and that the racketeers and bootleggers—the only people prosperous under prohibition—be put out of business, and that racketeering and bootlegging cease so that public officials will no longer be influenced by the powerful combination, the Anti-Saloon League on the one hand and the rich bootlegger on the other.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, not only where the question has been submitted officially to the people have they voted for the repeal of the prohibition law, but wherever submitted to a referendum—whether to the bar association, the medical groups, universities, colleges, commercial, and other organizations—in every instance the vote was from 2 to 10 for the repeal of this unscrupulously forced upon the Nation prohibition law.

For that reason, I shall henceforth refuse to increase the number of so-called prohibition agents, who are in reality high-life seeking snoopers; yes, adventurous murderers.

It is amazing how the administration disregards the demands of the majority of the people and continues to be controlled and dictated to by that small group of fanatical and professional beneficiaries, organized under the title of Anti-Saloon League and Law Enforcement League—which organizations have been able to fill the prohibition offices with their hangers-on, and have even been able to obtain the appointments of judges and officials of the court; and who now, in this bill, demand 257 additional places. And from present indications in this House, they will not only secure this number, but if desirous and unashamed to ask, would receive 10 times that number; and this, notwithstanding the fact that the money could be utilized to relieve the unfortunate millions now out of employment.

I regret that there is still a majority in this House, who, although otherwise well-meaning men, permit themselves, like the President and the administration, to be governed and controlled—yes, "bunked"—by this prohibitionist group.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 100, noes 41.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin to the amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: At the end of the amendment insert "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be spent for salaries or expenses of any Government employee who taps any telephone or telegraph wires."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I understood the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to apply to the amendment then pending to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the motion—and so put it—to apply to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana and all amendments thereto. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMTON) there were—ayes 118, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUDICIAL

Salaries and expenses of commissioners, Court of Claims: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, commissioners, Court of Claims, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1931, and as authorized by the act approved June 23, 1930 (46 Stat., p. 799), $37,390.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a deficiency appropriation bill and the committee has just authorized an appropriation of $319,000 for the Prohibition Bureau. I am informed that several million dollars more will be asked in the regular appropriation bill for the Department of Justice.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] offered a few moments ago an amendment and the information of a speak-easy maintained at Government expense, which he gave in support of his amendment, must have shocked a great many of the Members of this House. I have heard some Members say that the Indianapolis speak-easy case or the entrapment case described by the gentleman from Maryland was an exceptional one, and was not the rule. I want to say to the House now, so that you may be advised, that public funds have been spent for entrapment purposes and maintaining unlawful resorts during the last five or six years. I brought to the knowledge of the House the case of the Bridge Whist Club in New York City, which was operated by the Prohibition Bureau. The furniture, the rent, the personnel, and the liquor were paid for out of public funds, and I have copies of the vouchers which I received from the comptroller's office. In Norfolk, Va., the Government operated a pool room where liquor was sold for purposes of entrapment. The vouchers for the moneys that were spent in that case by the Government are also in the comptroller's office. In Elizabethtown the Government operated a still to entrap persons into violations of the law, and this was discovered when one set of Government officials, not knowing that the still was a Government-operated still, was trying to collect graft from another set of Govern-

ment officials. The Prohibition Bureau financed a corporation in New York City known as Le Shone de Paris, incorporated it under the law of the State of New York, and financed the corporation to get an alcohol permit, purchased denatured alcohol, and unlawfully sold denatured alcohol to manufacturers for beverage purposes. Some 18 or 20 persons were indicted, and when all the information came out that Government agents engineered the whole scheme every case was thrown out of court.

Although you have voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland, public funds have been and are now being spent improperly to entrap citizens and make cases.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. At St. Cloud, Minn., an undercover man came running into a drug store late one night saying that his wife was very ill and asked for a pint of liquor. He received it with the understanding he would bring a prescription around the next morning. The next they heard was when they were raided. They raided one hundred and twenty odd places in that neighborhood and this man received $25 per information, or $3,200 in the aggregate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is typical. In my city a certain prohibition agent went to places and gave the distress signal of a great fraternal order and got liquor on the pretext that he was ill and a stranger in the city, and then made an arrest on the liquor he so obtained.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is nice business, is it not?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is outrageous, it is disgraceful. The Department of Justice is going to be contaminated and its usefulness is going to be destroyed just as the Treasury Department was dragged down into the mud by the attempted enforcement of this impossible law.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why speak in the future tense?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Gentleman, you may have voted down the amendment to-day preventing improper use of public funds, but just as sure as day follows night the time will come, perhaps in the appropriation bill for the Department of Justice, when public opinion will force Congress to put a limitation upon any branch of the Government that seeks to go out and entrap people into violation of law. I ask for the sober judgment of the membership of this House. I ask every dry in this House to give the matter his attention and to check up on every fact I have stated to-day and put a stop to the improper use of public funds in connection with prohibition enforcement.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the Chair and also to the gentlemen of the committee that the item with reference to the prohibition question has been passed. In order to get the bill through and expedite business I must insist that the debate from now on be upon whatever item is then under consideration. I shall not object to the gentleman from Pennsylvania proceeding if he wants to make a speech; but after that I shall insist upon the regular order.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Chairman, the time will come when this and similar debates in the House of Representatives will be regarded by a future generation with the same sorrow and humiliation as those of us who are descended from the Pilgrim fathers regard the debates that once took place on the subject of witchcraft. [Applause.] It will be regarded by a future, and a not very distant, generation as extraordinary that the House of Representatives should have sustained invasions of personal liberty such as have been retained in the present bill within the last hour in this House.

I do not intend to discuss the question except in one aspect and to make one comment for what it is worth. I appreciate the futility of discussion. The present is with the drys, the future is with the wets, and it will not be any very distant future, if we can judge from the returns of last November's election. [Applause.]

But I want to say this very solemnly to the House, and I did not intend to say it when I came into this Chamber. If it were within my power to visualize to the House the consequences of such legislation I could change the present minority of the House to a majority and majority to a minority, or else I would not have the high regard for the humanity of each Member of the House that I now have. According to the last report of the Commissioner of Prohibition, there were indicted in this country 68,173 people, of whom 54,085 were convicted, with prison sentences aggregating 14,172 years, under the Volstead law. If I could assemble those 54,000 men, women, and even children, and invite the House to witness them pass in solemn procession before the Capitol, men and women who have been changed from self-respecting citizens into either avowed or actual criminals—if I could invite this House to witness this procession of misery, and they were to march in military formation, it would require at least five hours to pass a given point.

When I listen to my friend from Texas, always zealous and always eloquent, speak about the President of the United States having the Army, the marines, and every executive source to enforce this law, including the methods of prohibition enforcement officers, of which we have heard something to-day, then I would like to know how many American criminals you are going to make of otherwise self-respecting citizens before you can enforce a statute which, if experience in the last 10 years counts for anything, with all the wealth of the Government, with the Army and the Navy, and the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, has proved ineffective to change the primary instinct of individual liberty that is in the human breast of the average American. [Applause.]

Edmund Burke, the most philosophical of all students of government, once said that "politics ought to be adjusted not to human reasonings but to human nature, of which reason is but a part and by no means the greater part."

To the same effect that eminent senior Justice of the Supreme Court said that the "life of the law is not in logic but in experience."

Experience has shown that you can spend all of the money in the Treasury and you will not destroy in the hearts of the American people that instinct of freedom which they have, that in the use of such beverages they have the right to order their own lives and that without unreasonable interference of any government. Convict 120,000 a year, and not as this year over 50,000, and yet you will not terrorize the American people. [Applause.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

JUDGMENTS, UNITED STATES COURTS

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," as amended by the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911 (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41, par. 20; sec. 258; secs. 761–765), certified to the Seventy-first Congress, in House Document No. 690, under the following departments, namely: Navy Department, $4,697.08; War Department, $14,498.47; in all, $19,195.55, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Yesterday, just before the committee rose, I suggested that I would make an inquiry as to the policy of the Government in paying interest on judgments. Here is a paragraph in which you prescribe that the rate of interest shall be 4 per cent. In the following paragraph there is no limitation on the amount of interest that is to be paid on judgments. And so also in the first paragraph, on page 13, you place a limit and say that interest shall not continue for more than 30 days after the approval of the act.

It was my impression that in prior years we did not make any provision for interest on judgments. I would like to inquire whether I am wrong or not.

Mr. WOOD. These judgments are rendered under different statutes and some provide for interest and some do not. The rate of interest is within the limits of the statute. We do not fix the rate.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have looked over the code and I do not find any law for the payment of interest on judgments other than on judgments entered against the Government in suits instituted in the United States district courts. Here is a provision where you prescribe a limit of 4 per cent.

Mr. WOOD. I will say that if the gentleman will turn to pages 11 and 12 he will find the acts under which interest is to be paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. I examined the code yesterday, and as far as judgments on actions begun in the United States district courts are concerned the provision is that the rate of interest shall be the same as that on judgments carried in the State courts. I do not find any provision anywhere in the code restricting the rate of interest to 4 per cent. I think there should be some general law prescribing the rate of interest on judgments against the United States. In the paragraph before us we prescribe one rate and the next paragraph another rate is prescribed.

Mr. WOOD. Those were fixed by law, and it is not the function of this committee to change it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I doubt whether there is any law authorizing the payment of 4 per cent, and if there is I would like the gentleman to cite me the law.

Mr. WOOD. I cite the gentleman to page 11 of the present bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I refer to the special paragraph now under consideration.

Mr. WOOD. There are various laws affecting these judgments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under one law they prescribe 6 per cent. Under the present paragraph by a limitation you prescribe the rate of 4 per cent. Why should there not be a uniform rate? Why should there not be legislation by Congress prescribing a uniform rate?

Mr. WOOD. I agree with the gentleman that there should be uniformity; but there is no uniformity in the present statutes. I think it would be a splendid thing if the gentleman from Wisconsin would introduce a bill to have this uniformity provided, and send the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, it is very kind of the gentleman to make that suggestion.

Mr. WOOD. I make the suggestion in all seriousness. I think there should be some study of the advisability of a uniform rate.

Mr. STAFFORD. My purpose in rising was to call the matter to the attention of the House. Here you are prescribing 4 per cent, and in another paragraph 6 per cent. I hope this discussion will cause some member of the Committee on the Judiciary that is not overburdened with work, except in bringing in bills to provide additional judges to take care of prohibition cases, to provide substantive law-making uniformity in interest charges on judgments entered against the United States. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 3, line 4, for the purpose of offering the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to return to page 3, line 4, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, let us have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 4, insert the following:

"For payment to Louis L. Ludlow for expenses incurred as contestee in the contested-election case of Updike against Ludlow, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 1, $1,033.50.

"For payment for expenses incurred by Ralph E. Updike, contestant in the contested-election case of Updike against Ludlow, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 1, $1,309.75.

"The two foregoing appropriations to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is still busy with "relief" work, I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana to return to page 3, line 4, for the purpose of offering the amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEAVITT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation 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 amendments 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 en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended 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.

Mr. GARNER. May I have the attention of the gentleman from Indiana? Of course, this is quite an important bill, the first deficiency bill. The gentleman hopes to get it through at an early date, I imagine. What is the gentleman's hopes with reference to the final passage of the bill?

Mr. WOOD. I had hoped that this bill would be passed within the next week by both Houses.

Mr. GARNER. During the week?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. It is a very important bill, and the earlier it can be passed the earlier the matters can be taken care of for which the appropriations are made.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

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

S. 5456. An act to extend the time for construction of a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 21 meets Texas Highway No. 45; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5457. An act authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 6 meets Texas Highway No. 21; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5458. An act authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 7 meets Texas Highway No. 7; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. 13130. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Bogue Chitto River between Sun and Bush, St. Tammany Parish, La.; and

H. R. 14446. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Prairie du Chien, Wis.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 8, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 8, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

A joint subcommittee hearing to discuss the Boeuf and Atchafalaya floodways projects.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

763. A letter from the president of Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting annual report of said company for the year ending December 31, 1930; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

764. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a bill to prohibit the recovery of any indebtedness to the United States from either the principal or the interest due and payable to a depositor in the military naval service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 12037. A bill authorizing the payment of a claim presented by the Polish Government for the reimbursement of certain expenditures incurred by the community authorities of Rzeczyczany, Poland, to which place an insane alien was erroneously deported; without amendment (Rept. No. 2183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 12067. A bill for compensation to the owners of the Danish motor ship *Indien* for damages sustained as the result of a collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Shawnee* at San Francisco on April 5, 1925; without amendment (Rept. No. 2184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 12352. A bill to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government in full and final satisfaction of all claims arising as a result of the detention of the Norwegian steamer *Tampen* by the United States Coast Guard in June, 1925; without amendment (Rept. No. 2185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15064. A bill to reserve 440 acres of public-domain land for addition to the Temecula or Pechanga Reservation, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15603. A bill to extend the restrictive period against alienation, lease, mortgage, or other encumbrance of any interest of restricted heirs of members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2188). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3869. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional land for the use of Walter Reed General Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 12960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thomas Doyle (Margaret Doyle); without amendment (Rept. No. 2186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 11081. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Martinez Viuda de Sanchez, a Dominican subject; without amendment (Rept. No. 2189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 12959. A bill for the relief of John T. Doyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 2190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 325. A joint resolution to provide for the payment of an indemnity to Li Ying-ting (Li Ing Ding) for the deaths of four members of his family who were drowned as a result of a collision between a Chinese junk and a United States naval vessel and for medical and burial expenses incurred as a result of the collision; without amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15239) for the relief of the heirs of Facunda Gonzales; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 15663) granting a pension to James F. Deal; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15754) granting a pension to Sarah V. Dent; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 15860) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River east of Serene, in La Salle County, Ill., between sections 20 and 29, township 35 north, range 5 east, third principal meridian; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 15861) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Lansing, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15862) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Emlenton, Venango County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 15863) to regulate the practices of professional engineering and land surveying; creating a registration board for professional engineers and land surveyors of the District of Columbia; defining its powers and duties, also imposing certain duties thereon in

connection with public work; and providing penalties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 15864) authorizing refund of 50 per cent of the duties collected upon certain carillons and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 15865) for the retirement of employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 15866) to amend section 6 of the national charter of the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 15867) to provide for the retention by the United States of a site within the Hot Springs National Park formerly occupied by the Arlington Hotel and Bathhouse for park and landscape purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 15868) to increase disability allowances to certain soldiers and sailors of the World War, and to certain widows, minor children, and mothers of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 15869) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Rulo, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 15870) authorizing the State of Texas and the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Texas Highway No. 45 meets Louisiana Highway No. 21; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15871) authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 7 meets Texas Highway No. 7; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15872) authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 6 meets Texas Highway No. 21; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: A bill (H. R. 15873) to add certain public lands to the Washakie National Forest, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 15874) authorizing the temporary employment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs without regard to civil-service rules of an adequate force to catch up promptly with the work of the Veterans' Bureau and the Pension Bureau and authorizing necessary appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 15875) to provide for the entertainment of members and delegates to the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the French Veterans of the World War, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1932; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 15876) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 15877) to authorize exchanges of land with owners of private land holdings within the craters of the Moon National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 15878) to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1931; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 15879) for the relief of Francis Joseph Meade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 15880) granting a pension to Charles C. Lockhart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15881) granting an increase of pension to Ophelia Roseberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15882) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15883) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Falsoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15884) granting a pension to Fredrika Monstrom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 15885) to correct the Coast Guard record of Frank P. Barbour; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 15886) granting a pension to John Malasi; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15887) granting an increase of pension to Mont Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15888) for the relief of James Joseph Kain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 15889) granting a pension to John A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 15890) granting a pension to Ernest P. Garlach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15891) granting a pension to Minerva C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15892) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Kellams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15893) granting a pension to Mary E. Sillings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 15894) for the relief of certain United States naval officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 15895) for the relief of William A. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 15896) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Plunkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 15897) granting an increase of pension to James P. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15898) granting a pension to Nelle L. Axe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15899) granting a pension to Luther Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 15900) for the relief of Dawson A. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 15901) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 15902) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Pinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15903) granting a pension to Ivan W. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15904) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Dugan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 15905) for the relief of Sophie Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15906) granting a pension to Henry K. Dinan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 15907) granting an increase of pension to Edna A. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 15908) for the relief of Luke Francis Brennan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 15909) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 15910) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Clutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15911) granting a pension to Robert C. Roseberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15912) granting a pension to Joseph Morton Finney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: A bill (H. R. 15913) granting a pension to Charles Ross Darsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15914) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Holcomb; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 15915) for the relief of Carl Walter Olsen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15916) granting a pension to Leo J. Nagele; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15917) granting a pension to John Wesley Smailes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15918) granting a pension to Hannah A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 15919) granting an increase of pension to Eliza McBroom Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15920) granting an increase of pension to Eleveann Albert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15921) granting an increase of pension to Susan Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 331) to pay Dr. George Campbell an amount equal to six months' compensation of the late James Campbell; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

8441. By Mr. BLACKBURN: Petition of Corde Rena, of Owensboro, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8442. Also, petition of Malcolm Bayley, George Carter, and 16 other Christian Scientists of Louisville, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8443. Also, petition of Helen B. Robinson, of Bowling Green, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8444. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. P. H. Munson, Christian Scientists, of Covington, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8445. Also, petition of Mrs. J. D. Heil, C. C. Curley, and Minnie Schmidt, of Bellevue, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8446. Also, petition of Ella May DeVoss and Florence DeVoss, of Newport, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8447. Also, petition of Ada May Cromwell, of Jett, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8448. Also, petition of Lillian Ewalt, Theresa Stern, Dorcas Rose Levy, and six other Christian Scientists, of Paris, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8449. Also, petition of the district convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union held at Georgetown, Ky., signed by Mrs. T. L. Shannon, of Lexington, Ky., as president, and Mrs. W. H. Whitaker, of Winchester, Ky., as secretary, calling upon Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures licensed for interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8450. Also, petition of Jeanette Dwing, Mrs. E. G. Sanders, and Mrs. R. G. Wolfley, of Frankfort, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment; to the Committee on Patents.

8451. Also, petition of Kate Logan Bronaugh, of Lexington, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8452. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Charles L. Babbitt, of Lexington, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8453. Also, petition of Ophelia Childs, Aries Wickliffe, Sallie G. Stone, and five other Christian Scientists, of Lexington and Winchester, Ky., urging enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8454. Also, petition of Jennie Skidmore, representative of the Christian Science Monitor in Lexington, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8455. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. James G. Thomson, Christian Scientists, of Winchester, Ky., urging the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8456. Also, petition of Mrs. H. A. Paynter, Mrs. G. C. Fox, and Mary Jane Stephenson, Christian Scientists, of Winchester, Ky., praying for the immediate enactment into law of the Vestal copyright bill, without amendment from its present form; to the Committee on Patents.

8457. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of National Executive Council of the Women's Moderation Union, urging the relief of unemployment by passing legislation which will end prohibition and reduce taxes by the reestablishment of industries which the eighteenth amendment prohibits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8458. By Mr. CONNOLLY: Letter from the Philadelphia Real Estate Board inclosing copy of resolutions unanimously adopted by the board of directors of that organization, protesting against any increase in the postage rate on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8459. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Board of Commissioners of Pilots of New York, asking the Congress for an early appropriation of necessary funds to permit of the acquirement, by construction or otherwise, of additional vessels of a suitable type to enable the captain of the port to meet increasing demands for a more efficient patrol and supervision over the waters of New York Harbor; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8460. Also, petition of the executive committee of the unemployment emergency committee of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging upon the Congress the importance of immediate initiation of scheduled public improvements and construction enterprises in order to relieve the present situation by furnishing employment at once for as many men and women as possible; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8461. Also, petition of the Government Club (Inc.), of New York City, protesting against the proposed reduction in the appropriation for the pay of retired officers on active duty and recommending the restoration of this item in order that the military training in the New York public schools may continue unhampered; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8462. Also, petition of national executive council of the Women's Moderation Union, asking Congress to help relieve unemployment by passing legislation which will end prohibition and reduce taxes by the reestablishment of industries which the eighteenth amendment prohibits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8463. Also, petition of the Union League Club, of the city of New York, asking that the Government of the United States further restrict immigration of undesirable persons from Russia to the United States, and take measures to promptly deport any aliens guilty of unlawful action in subversion of the form of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8464. Also, petition of the Bronx Chamber of Commerce, urging Congress to note the advice of the President in the matter of bringing about relief under present labor conditions, and to back his policy of discretion by making such provisions as he might suggest; to the Committee on Labor.

8465. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of Mining Association of California, through its secretary, Mr. C. S. Brooks, favoring the elimination by repeal of all income taxes on the income from gold mines operated in the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8466. Also, petition of Grand Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, approving without reservation the policy indicated in measures now before Congress for suspension of immigration from all countries, including the Philippines, for a term of years; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8467. Also, petition of the annual meeting of the California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif., December 13, 1930, indorsing the efforts of Farm Board to place system of marketing agricultural products on a firm and sound foundation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8468. Also, petition of Hydraulic Parlor, No. 56, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Nevada City, Calif., approving without reservation the policy indicated in measures now before Congress for suspension of immigration from all countries, including the Philippines, for a term of years and protesting against an exception being made in favor of Filipinos, as demanded by Hawaii, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8469. By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of Claude L. Hammons and other ex-soldiers of Barbourville, Ky., urging part or full payment on adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8470. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition signed by Keld M. Bache and other World War veterans of Sprague, Wash., asking for the prompt passage of the Garner bonus bill, H. R. 15589; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8471. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Adwell-Ashley Post, No. 180, American Legion, Renville, Minn., by Paul W. Glander, commander, and Quincy E. Boynton, service officer, urging enactment at once of legislation providing for immediate and full payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8472. By Mr. PRALL: Petition from residents of the eleventh district of New York, urging the passage of House bill 7884 providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8473. Also, petition from residents of the eleventh district of New York, urging the passage of House bill 7884 providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8474. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Advertising Club, of Huntington, W. Va., protesting against the proposed increase on first-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8475. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of Boston (Mass.) Local, Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America, for the use of local stone in public buildings, the use of local labor in preparing stone, the payment of prevailing local wages, and the limitation of working hours to eight hours a day and five days a week; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

8476. Also, petition of certain registered voters of the first congressional district of Massachusetts, for the enactment of legislation exempting dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8477. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of 50 citizens of the fifth congressional district, San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate, as in legislative session, will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3273) to authorize the Postmaster General to issue additional receipts or certificates of mailing to senders of any class of mail matter and to fix the fees chargeable therefor, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8568. An act to compensate the Post Office Department for the extra work caused by the payment of money orders at offices other than those on which the orders are drawn;

H. R. 15592. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 357. Joint resolution classifying certain official mail matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 13130. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Bogue Chitto River between Sun and Bush, St. Tammany Parish, La.; and

H. R. 14446. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Prairie du Chien, Wis.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fess	King	Shortridge
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	McGill	Smoot
Black	George	McKellar	Steck
Blaine	Gillett	McMaster	Steiwer
Blease	Glass	McNary	Stephens
Borah	Goff	Metcalf	Swanson
Bratton	Goldsborough	Morrison	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Gould	Morrow	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Norbeck	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Bulkley	Harrison	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Hastings	Oddie	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hayden	Partridge	Walcott
Carey	Hebert	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Couzens	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Cutting	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dale	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	Williamson
Davis	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Dill	Keyes	Shipstead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.