NEW HAMPSHIRE

Nellie C. Chaplin, Belmont.

NEW YORK

Howard Tuttle, Brewster.
Harold G. Haines, Earlton.
Arthur E. Brundage, Newburgh.
Harry A. Pearce, Ocean Beach.
Augustus P. Altemeier, Port Jervis.
Harry Pottenburgh, Rhinebeck.
David R. Dunn, Scarsdale.
William H. Young, Voorheesville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Chapin Hayford, Casselton.
Hugh C. Corrigan, Fargo.
Mabel Dickinson, Fullerton.
Alfred B. Welch, Mandan.

OHIO

Ernest C. Ludwig, Anna.
Roy H. Hannum, Long Bottom.
Marcus S. Roush, Rutland.
Pearl H. Cheney, South Charleston.

OREGON

Harry A. Cool, Drain.
Nellie G. Reed, Gold Hill.

PENNSYLVANIA

Kenneth Cooper, New Kensington.
James S. Fennell, Salina.
James A. Miller, Schellsburg.
Coleman A. Wingard, Spring Mills.
Charles Nahf, Tamaqua.
Anna Kolesar, Terrace.
Henry W. Merritt, Wilkes-Barre.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John C. Spann, Allendale.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Joshua Trumm, Hayti.
James E. McLaughlin, Onida.

TENNESSEE

Alexander H. Hill, Harrogate.
Guy V. Jackson, Humboldt.
Ernest H. Smothers, Camden.

TEXAS

Rebecca White, Carbon.
William T. McRee, Gruver.
Arthur B. Rook, Harrold.
William L. Keeler, May.
Isidore Newman, Mexia.
John B. Reneau, Munday.

WISCONSIN

Darryl V. Lampman, Augusta.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1931

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

We draw near to Thee, our Father, not as unto an avenging God but by the way of a merciful Savior, touched with a feeling of our infirmities. Be with us this day. May we be patient and gentle, courageous and strong without rudeness. Again death has reduced our ranks. Beloved and honored in public and in private life, bearing a dignity and poise, the insignia of a wonderful character. Yes, Father, he has left us. O Death, thou dost come equally to all and make us all equal when thou dost come. We walk in no strange way. It was the way of the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs, the pioneers, and it will be our way. May we wait and walk patiently with Him who sends forth His love even as the sun sends forth the summer. Loving Father, remember her who in weakness is bowed in the silence of an unspeakable sorrow which curtains to-day in darkness, blots the sun out of noonday and the stars out of the night. The companion of the years sits bereaved and alone—the cheerless heavens above, the homeless earth beneath, and the tempest beating against her with its pitiless storm. O God, if Thou art just, and Thou art, then come and be her eternal refuge; take her to the Father's arms, the Father's breast, to the Father's heart, and at the last to the Father's home. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 28, 1931, 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 bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 6169. An act to extend the restrictive period against alienation of any interest of restricted heirs of members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes;

S. 6232. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Fayette and Washington, Pa., either jointly or severally, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Fayette City, Pa.;

S. 6260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Minneapolis, Northfield & Southern Railway to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Minnesota River;

S. 6266. An act authorizing D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the town of New Boston, Ill.; and

S. J. Res. 233. A joint resolution to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Second Division, American Expeditionary Forces.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE HENRY ALLEN COOPER

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. HENRY ALLEN COOPER, who has been longest of all of us in the service of this House and one of the most beloved men who ever sat in this House of Representatives, has fallen at his post of duty. Ordinarily, of course, the House would immediately adjourn. Under the conditions which now confront us, so close to the end of the session, it will not be possible for us to adjourn, but instead, following a very notable precedent, it is my hope that out of respect to his memory we may recess until noon. A suitable resolution will be offered in a few moments to carry this idea into effect.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, as a friend and colleague of many years of Mr. COOPER, I ask for just a moment or two to pay a tribute to his memory.

Representative HENRY ALLEN COOPER, of Racine, Wis., passed away early Sunday morning at his apartment in the Washington Hotel overlooking the majestic Potomac, the Washington and Lincoln Memorials, a view which always stirred his soul to look upon.

In the passing of Representative COOPER the people have lost a friend who for 36 years in the Halls of Congress has been their valiant champion.

In every contest where human rights and property rights have come in conflict HENRY ALLEN COOPER has stood for human rights, and, like Henry of Navarre, his plume has always waved in the thickest of the conflict.

He believed in the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, and held these principles higher than party fealty.

In all places and at all times he had the courage of his convictions, and was never afraid to stand with a small minority or even alone in espousing a cause he believed right.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

A fearless, constructive, painstaking legislator.
A man of distinguished presence.
A classical scholar.
A skilled musician as well as a composer of music.
A cultured, interesting gentleman.

He would have ranked high at any period in the history of the American Congress.

> Statesman, friend of truth, of soul sincere,
> In action faithful and in honor clear,
> Who broke no promise, served no private end,
> Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have had the privilege of serving with Mr. COOPER for several years, and perhaps, so far as committee associations are concerned, no one is in better position to have formed an estimate of his unusual ability, of his great courage, of his high character, and his devotion to the public interests as he understood those interests. Just the other day he rose here and delivered a very beautiful address relative to the designation of one of the avenues of this city so as to relate its name to the Constitution. At the conclusion of that address the membership of the House rose and acclaimed him. That was just a little while ago, and since his sudden demise I have thought of what Cicero in his De Amicitia says of a somewhat similar occurrence. He recites that Scipio Africanus, who had rendered great service to his country, one evening ascended the hill in Rome to the capitol and there was received by the Senate with all of the respect which it could accord him, and with all of the acclamation which could be given a citizen of the Republic. He died that night, and Cicero in his record says that the happiest hour of the life of Scipio was the hour just before he died. So it seems to me in looking back we may believe that the very happiest hour in the long service of our friend here was when the Members of the House of Representatives after having known of his record for so many years, and after having had the opportunity to realize the manner of man he was, did what it did after that fine address of his—rose to their feet and testified to their great regard and affection for him. It would be fortunate for any man serving here or serving the public elsewhere to think that just before the shadows come upon him and he leaves the scene he should receive such splendid recognition as was accorded Mr. COOPER on that occasion.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the Filipino people, I would be recreant to my trust if I did not rise and, on their behalf, join the membership of the House in an expression of the bereavement which all must feel at the departure of Congressman HENRY ALLEN COOPER.

That venerable figure has been removed from our midst, but he will ever be remembered. Mr. COOPER in life always interested himself in the Philippine question and in its proper solution. In season and out of season he defended the rights and the liberties of the Filipino people. Even in the days when it was difficult to stand in defense of those islands, he never swerved from his path of duty. Guided by what he believed to be just and right, he rendered disinterested service to the people of those distant isles, and in so doing he served both the United States and the Philippines.

Standing high in the councils of this Government, his advice was sought by no less than three Presidents on matters Philippine. He was the first chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of this body, and as such he played a prominent part in congressional enactments affecting the people of the Philippine Islands. To him more than any other single individual was due the passage of the act of Congress of July 1, 1902, which was the first organic law for the Philippines when civil government was implanted.

Mr. COOPER was greatly instrumental in the creation by Congress of the first elective Philippine Assembly. In the deliberations of the committee that passed judgment on that historic step toward self-government, there were some who doubted the capacity of the inhabitants to exercise greater autonomous powers. One, in fact, launched an intemperate attack on the Filipinos, calling them "pirates, barbarians, savages, incapable of civilization."

Congressman COOPER came to the defense of the Filipino people. He spoke of the culture and progress of the islanders. He recited with telling effect Rizal's Last Farewell, the epic poem of the great Filipino hero and martyr, and as a fitting climax Mr. COOPER said:

> Pirates! Barbarians! Savages! Incapable of civilization! How many of the civilized Caucasian slanderers of the race could ever be capable of thoughts like these, which on that awful night, as he sat alone amidst silence unbroken save by the rustling of the black plumes of the death angel at his side, poured from the soul of the martyred Filipino? Search the long and bloody roll of the world's martyred dead, and where, on what soil, under what sky did tyranny ever claim a nobler victim?
>
> Sir, the future is not without hope for a people who, from the midst of such an environment, has furnished to the world a character so lofty and so pure as that of Jose Rizal.

For these and other services the Philippines owes Mr. HENRY ALLEN COOPER a great debt.

In the passing of a soul so great, words are utterly inadequate. What he said, what he did, and, above all, what he was—these constitute the best monument to HENRY ALLEN COOPER, the public servant, the defender of right, a friend, true and tried, loyal and beloved.

It is a singular coincidence that Rizal's poem which Mr. COOPER in life used frequently to recite from memory should close with these words:

> To die is to rest (Morir es descansar).

To COOPER death was rest. May he rest in peace.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, HENRY ALLEN COOPER served with me on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for some 18 years. I did not know him so well in the beginning, but when I did become well acquainted with him I found, just as did many other Members of the House, that he was not only a diligent legislator but a very devoted friend. For years I have met him on various occasions, together with Mrs. Cooper. I know of no couple who enjoyed a more lovely life together than did those two good people, whom I shall always revere. Mr. and Mrs. COOPER were always devoted, not only to the legislation and to the interests of the country but they were devoted to those things which bring Members closer together and which make legislation easier and persons better known and understood. Mr. COOPER did perhaps more than any other man to instill in the Foreign Affairs Committee that it was a committee which dealt with international affairs; that it was not a committee which should indulge in partisanship, and he worked to that end at all times. He was always impartial as to which Member or which party was interested in a measure. It was his sole purpose that it should be in the interest of the country through the Department of State and the Foreign Service, and when that appealed to him he was for the bill or against it, regardless of who introduced it or what party might be interested.

I feel I am like many other Members of this House. We have lost a very devoted friend, a very able legislator, and a very great social friend as well.

It is, however, gratifying that Providence spared him to the country and to Congress through so many years during the vigorous period of his life and until the sunset of his brilliant career.

Our committee will miss his wise counsel, his independent action, and his impartiality.

Mr. GUEVARA. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Filipino people mourn the passing to the Great Beyond of the great American, HENRY ALLEN COOPER. At this moment, the 13,000,000 Filipinos are bereft by the death of the man who has been devoted to the cause of the Philippine Islands ever since that country was brought under the American Flag. During the years that Congressman COOPER has occupied his place in the Congress of the United States, he has rendered valuable service to the United States and to the Philippines, and his death is a loss, a great loss, to the American and Filipino peoples alike.

May I assure the American people that the memory of Representative COOPER will live forever in the hearts and minds of every Filipino of this and future generations.

May God give him the place he deserves in that invisible region to which all of us aspire to go some time.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I have no words that need be added to the splendid eulogy of HENRY ALLEN COOPER, uttered by Chaplain Montgomery in his prayer this morning. Those who have already spoken have also voiced their knowledge of the many superior qualities of our distinguished friend and colleague, a man whom we all loved. He was one of the best friends I ever had, and less than 30 days ago it was my privilege to express on this floor the high appreciation of an American patriot and nature's nobleman which this House had for Representative COOPER. He died as he would have wished, "in harness," and I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 387

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENRY ALLEN COOPER, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin;

Resolved, That a committee of 25 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral;

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House;

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the appointment of the committee later.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, this House do now stand in recess until 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 26 minutes a. m.), the House stood in recess until 12 o'clock noon.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock noon, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 487

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENRY ALLEN COOPER, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

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

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian to-day.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 16111. An act to amend sections 1 and 7 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the usual permission for all Members to extend remarks in the RECORD until the last issue of the RECORD of the present Congress is printed. This is the usual request and it means the Members' own remarks. The last issue will be printed, I understand, on the 16th of March.

Mr. SABATH. Does that mean a Member's own remarks on any subject.

Mr. TILSON. It does.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will that include the right to incorporate statements, editorials, data, and things of that sort?

Mr. TILSON. I should think only where they are quotations that are properly explanatory of a Member's own remarks and not editorials or other articles from newspapers and magazines.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does that mean one extension?

Mr. TILSON. No; as many extensions as desired.

Mr. SABATH. Will that permit a Member to extend his own remarks on the procedure of the House, on the rules, and on anything of that kind?

Mr. TILSON. On anything that is of a parliamentary character. Of course, these extensions will be under date of March 2 or March 3.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that with the passing of my colleague Hon. HENRY ALLEN COOPER, in this Congress there will be no memorial services in the next Congress with Mr. COOPER listed as one of those to whom we pay special tribute, and I assume it will be necessary to pay tribute to his services to extend remarks on his life and character in the RECORD of this session.

Mr. TILSON. No; the gentleman is mistaken about this. Mr. COOPER's name will be included in the next list of memorial services held by the House, so that there will then be opportunity for all who are Members of the Seventy-second Congress to extend their remarks. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman restate his request?

Mr. TILSON. My request is that all Members may extend their own remarks in the RECORD until the last issue of the RECORD for the present Congress, which, I understand, will be not later than March 16.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their own remarks until the last issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McSWAIN. Would it be the Speaker's construction that this general request would cover the privilege given to me to revise and extend the remarks which I made on Saturday last, which I have withheld and have not yet printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the privilege to revise and extend remarks would extend back to remarks already made. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is one question I want to ask the gentleman from Connecticut. There are a great many Members who have not yet inserted their remarks on the lives and characters of deceased Members and a great many Members will not be able to do so until after the adjournment of Congress. What I want to know is whether or not those remarks will be included in the bound volumes that are to be issued later?

Mr. TILSON. In my judgment, they will be included, although I have not consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Memorials. However, I believe the resolution already adopted in connection with memorials would authorize what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. RANKIN. That is all I am interested in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RELATION OF THE NEWSPAPER TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address made by H. L. Williamson, editor of the United States Publisher, over the radio, on the subject of "The Relation of the Newspaper to the Public."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address made by H. L. Williamson. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELIJAH P. LOVEJOY AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The death of Elijah Parish Lovejoy, the militant editor and publisher of slavery days in St. Louis and Alton, Ill., did more to strengthen the antislavery sentiment north of the Mason and Dixon line than, perhaps, any other incident preceding the Civil War.

Elijah Parish Lovejoy was born in Albion, Me., November 9, 1802, the son of a Congregational minister. When he was less than 4

years old he exhibited his ruling passion—an ardent desire for knowledge; at that age he read fluently in the Bible. As he grew older this insatiable desire grew more pronounced and he literally devoured book after book in his father's theological library. After reading all of his father's books he had recourse to a public library.

His powers of memory were exceedingly retentive. An incident serves to illustrate these powers. His Sunday-school teacher one day remarked to the class that it might increase its lesson for the next Sunday. During his leisure hours the following week he committed to memory the One hundred and nineteenth Psalm and 20 or more hymns to go with it. Poetry he drank in like water. By reading any piece of one or two pages twice he could accurately repeat it. It was no uncommon thing for him to repeat 150 hymns from Watts at a single recitation.

Under the forming hand of his mother, with a few months in each year at the district school, the first 18 years of his life were passed. At this time he set his heart strongly upon obtaining a public education. He spent a single quarter term in the academy at Monmouth, Me., during which time he read Vergil, Cicero, and Sallust. He had studied Latin but two or three weeks previous to this. His preparatory studies were continued at intervals in China Academy; he entered as a sophomore at Watervelt College in September, 1823, and graduated in 1826 with first honors in his class.

For several months after leaving college he was engaged in teaching in an academy. In May, 1827, he left his friends and native State with his eye fixed upon the inviting and youthful West. It was with great reluctance that he left his family and social circles to make his home among strangers. It was late in 1827 when he arrived in St. Louis. He was immediately engaged in teaching school.

In the course of the next year he was engaged in editing and publishing a political paper advocating the claims of Henry Clay to the Presidency. From letters written to his parents, the paper for which he worked seemed to have been the St. Louis Times—at that time a Whig organ.

In January of 1832 there was a great religious revival in St. Louis. Lovejoy became ardently interested in the work of the church and soon afterward he was wending his way toward Princeton, N. J., and that great school's theological seminary. He was enrolled in the seminary March 24, 1832, and began to educate himself for the ministry. During his summer vacation he visited his parents, who still lived in Maine.

In April, 1833, Lovejoy received a license to preach the gospel. Some months of the summer were passed in preaching at Newport, R. I., and as a temporary supply at the Spring Street Church in New York. While at the latter place he received news of the death of his father.

In the latter part of August, 1833, a number of friends in St. Louis requested, and even strongly urged, that Lovejoy return there and become the editor of a weekly religious paper. The friends furnished a capital of $1,200 for press, type, and other equipment. Lovejoy was to have entire control of the establishment with the right to mortgage the plant in order to secure more equipment and material. If the net income exceeded $500 a year the editor was to pay the surplus to the proprietors.

In pursuance of this arrangement the first number of the St. Louis Observer was issued.

Lovejoy, as editor of the Observer, often rode into the country around St. Louis, preaching and attending meetings of the Synod and Presbytery and other meetings for various benevolent objects.

Articles on slavery were frequently found in the Observer as early as 1834. The space devoted to the subject occupied about one-seventh of the paper a great deal of the time. Lovejoy was thoroughly convinced of the sin of slavery and cherished an ardent desire to see it abolished.

Sun and clouds alternate Lovejoy's life from this period on. One of the sunbeams was his marriage to Celia Ann French. The ceremony took place at St. Charles, Ill., August 4, 1835.

Later in the year, in October, Lovejoy was absent for two or three weeks attending the Presbytery and Synod at Potosi, Mo. While he was gone the publishers of the Observer received a communication advising an entire suspension of all controversy upon the exciting subject of slavery. While Lovejoy was not in his office the publishers agreed not to publish anything about slavery, but attached a string to the announcement by adding that the final policy would be determined upon the return of the editor. The angry mob was not satisfied with the explanation and threatened destruction of the Observer unless the editorial policy was completely and at once changed with regard to abolition.

When Lovejoy returned to St. Louis from his trip the abolition excitement was at its height. The immediate cause of the climax was the abduction of two negroes, who were taken to a field and lashed nearly 200 times. The newspapers carried articles threatening Lovejoy for his stand. "At any moment," he wrote his brother in Maine, "I expect to be hanged or tarred and feathered. * * * In the Observer of Thursday I shall come out openly, fearlessly, and, as I hope, in such a manner as becomes a servant of Jesus Christ, when defending His cause."

In his own office there was turmoil. The publishers requested him to resign. Lovejoy had legal control of the plant and could not have been forced to turn it over to the owners. However, he did not wish to continue the paper against their wishes, so he resigned. When control passed from his hands a note for $500 on the plant passed also. As the note was then due and could not again be renewed, the proprietors turned the plant over to the holder of the note, a Mr. Moore. Then the unexpected happened. Mr. Moore assumed control of the plant and asked Lovejoy to be editor on condition that he remove it to Alton. When he went to Alton to make arrangements the people received him with open arms. While there he received a plea from Mr. Moore in St. Louis to return at once and continue the publication of the Observer there. Lovejoy accordingly returned and resumed publication of the paper.

In June of 1836 came the determination to move the paper to Alton. After much deliberation and consultation with friends Lovejoy decided that the Observer would meet with much better support in the Illinois city and would be even more valuable to the subscribers, for the paper had a large circulation both in Missouri and Illinois.

The St. Louis office was destroyed by a proslavery mob on the eve of his departure for Alton. His press, type, and equipment were safe for the time being, however. The steamboat which carried his plant to Alton arrived on Sunday; Lovejoy declined to receive it on the Sabbath. The press lay on the bank all night. Early next morning five or six men destroyed the press and type and dumped them into the river.

Lovejoy immediately acquitted the citizens of Alton, and he had good reason to do so for later on the same day the citizens voluntarily and unanimously pledged themselves to make good the destruction which the vandals from the outside had caused. Lovejoy took the subscription of money and went to Cincinnati at once and secured new equipment. On the way home he fell ill and was forced to stay in Louisville for some time. Consequently the publication of the Observer was suspended from the middle of July to the 8th of September, 1836.

Lovejoy's paper soon threw Alton into a turmoil. Mass meetings were held to discuss him. Friends insisted upon a recognition of his right as a free citizen to express his opinion.

Proslavery advocates grew violent in their denunciation of him and threatened his property with destruction and his life with death. At one public meeting where the issue was hotly discussed Lovejoy arose and declared he was opposed to slavery but was not an abolitionist. This did not satisfy and the agitation continued with increasing fury.

At a public meeting July 11, 1837, the Observer was publicly condemned, not only because of its utterances and views, but because of its very presence the peace and order of the community was threatened. His reply was resolute and courteous but unyielding. A determination to remain and continue his course, unswerved and unbroken, was shown in every line, gesture, and movement. So on August 21 his office was again wrecked.

Willing friends bought him another press and outfit, which arrived a month later. Lovejoy was not in Alton at the time and the new machinery and material were stored in a warehouse. That night the building was broken open and the press and type were rolled into the river.

A fourth press was ordered. More resolute than ever, even to the point of foolhardy stubbornness, Lovejoy refused to move to Quincy. His friends urged him to accept the offer from a safer haven, but he announced his determination to remain in Alton and fight it out.

A public meeting on November 2 showed the feeling against him had grown. Friends of other days, still believing in his rights, condemned his judgment in inviting upon himself death and upon the town a tragedy and disgrace that could never be wiped out.

Lovejoy appeared to defend himself and his right to free speech. He was passionately and pathetically eloquent. He flamed as he stood for his rights; he wept as he told of his sick wife at home, a nervous wreck from the excitement and the terrors of her life. He recounted her experiences in a garret to which she had been driven by the demonstrations of the mobs. But in spite of his pleas and his fiery defiance the resolutions were against him.

The fourth press arrived November 6, 1837, and was safely stored. A volunteer guard of 60 friends agreed to protect the warehouse. At 9 o'clock the following night, the guard, believing danger past, dispersed and nearly all went home. The mob soon gathered and the remnants of the guard were overpowered. The press was demanded or the building would be destroyed. Every man who would offer resistance was told he would imperil his life. The mob's demand was refused and the attack on the building began. A shot from within the building killed Lyman Bishop. Mayor John M. Krum ordered the mob to disperse, but its fury was only increased.

A ladder was raised against the building to enable one of the rioters to place a firebrand on the roof. Lovejoy and two volunteers offered to dislodge him. At this instance two shots were fired from behind a lumber pile. Lovejoy was in plain view and received five buckshot; he died without a struggle. No inquest was held and his body was buried next day. In January of the following year the defenders of the press were acquitted but the leaders of the mob were never apprehended.

Condemnation of Lovejoy's murder was universal. The reaction, of course, favored the antislavery and abolition press and advocates, and throughout the entire country they enjoyed greater freedom and more favors than had ever before been accorded them, and their cause commanded more and more respectful attention.

Elijah Parish Lovejoy is one of the editors selected by the Illinois Press Association for the Editors' Hall of Fame which will be formally opened at the University of Illinois in October, 1930, at the sixty-fifth annual convention of the association. Mr. Lovejoy was one of the first four editors to be selected by the hall of fame committee. The other three editors are Victor Fremont Lawson, former editor of the Chicago Daily News; Joseph Medill, former editor in chief of the Chicago Tribune; and Henry Wilson Clendenin, former publisher of the Illinois State Register at Springfield.

Eight more busts will be unveiled at the sixty-fifth annual meeting. These editors will be selected at the meetings this fall and next spring. Some pictures will also be hung in the hall of fame, which will be located at the University of Illinois.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that at this moment he will only recognize requests for extensions.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. I see a great many Members, including the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, about to ask recognition, and I want to inquire of the Speaker as to the status of the business before the House when we adjourned on Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that before proceeding with any other business he should state the parliamentary situation. When the House adjourned on Saturday there was pending a motion by the gentleman from Ohio to suspend the rules and pass a bill. The gentleman from New York has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand it is just the reverse. I think the gentleman from New York has 12 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that the gentleman from New York has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio 12 minutes. If the House will indulge the Chair, he desires to state the situation in which we find ourselves. This mass of papers on the Chair's desk represents the requests for suspension of the rules, which the Chair has tentatively promised. Beyond that there are probably 40 or 50 Senate bills on the Speaker's table, similar House bills having been reported and now on the calendar, for which the Chair will grant recognition at some time or another. Besides that, there are a number of conference reports pending, there may be messages from the President, and but a few hours remaining before final adjournment.

Now, on Saturday night when the Chair recognized the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] to suspend the rules, intimation was made—I would not say that the Chair was accused, but it was rather intimated that the Chair was unfair in so doing.

The Chair is very jealous of what reputation he may have for fairness. There is one thing that the Chair has never consciously done, and never will do, and that is to be unfair under any circumstances, but the situation was that some gentlemen were exercising their parliamentary rights, under the rules as they exist, to interpose objections to the passage of the bill and to delay it as much as possible. The Chair has no criticism to make. The Chair thinks that any Member is not only within his rights, but it is his duty, where he is opposed to a measure, to adopt all proper parliamentary methods to prevent the passage of the bill; but in the interest of the speeding up of the business of the House, it is equally the right of Members in favor of the bill to use all proper parliamentary methods to speed its passage. One of these parliamentary methods which has been repeatedly used is the motion to suspend the rules.

The Chair agrees that suspension of the rules is not a normal legislative procedure. In a sense, it is a trifle unfair in that it limits debate and does not permit the right of amendment. If anybody thinks that the Chair covets the right to recognize or not to recognize motions to suspend the rules in the last six days of a session, he is far from being correct. It is one of the most burdensome, unpleasant duties that can fall to the lot of a Member of Congress. It is always unpleasant for the present occupant of the Chair to say no four out of five times, as he is compelled to do.

But there are times when suspension of the rules is vitally necessary to dispatch public business. It is going to be vitally necessary in the next few hours because very few hours remain before adjournment, and the Chair must use his discretion, when he believes it is in the interest of a large majority of the House to use the right of suspension.

I think the Chair is safe in saying that not more than three or four times since his incumbency of this office for the past six years has the motion to suspend the rules, out of hundreds of cases, received less than the necessary two-thirds; in other words, the Chair was in fact aiding the House to carry out its will.

Now, when we speak of the question of unfairness, may the Chair make this observation? If he was unfair on Saturday night in recognizing suspension of the rules, he was equally unfair the other day when he entertained a motion to suspend the rules to provide hospitalization for veterans. If he was unfair on Saturday night, he was unfair two weeks ago when he entertained a motion to suspend the rules to increase the borrowing capacity on veterans' adjusted-service certificates. If he was unfair on Saturday, he is going to be unfair to-day when he recognizes a motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill providing half holidays for Government employees. [Applause.]

I think the tempers of gentlemen were, perhaps, a little ragged the other evening, and I think on mature consideration and deliberation they will withdraw the charge that the Chair was unfair on Saturday. The Chair always tries to be not the master but the servant of a majority of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio to call up the unfinished business.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York has 10 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have recognition on a question of personal privilege with respect to the question of procedure of this House, and I would like to be heard on that question before we proceed with this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds for his question of personal privilege.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is an emergency matter here of such urgent importance that I think the Speaker, by unanimous consent, might suspend consideration of the immigration measure until the matter which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] has to submit is first considered.

THE LATE HENRY ALLEN COOPER

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 524) to provide an appropriation for payment to the widow of Henry Allen Cooper, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $10,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment to the widow of Henry Allen Cooper, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin. Such sum to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

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

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, my impression is, and I believe it is the rule, that procedure before this House should be properly recorded as appears from the stenographer's record which is transmitted and reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Speaker, I charge that this RECORD of Saturday, apparently, underwent a perfect operation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is a question of the privileges of the House and not a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certain remarks brought about this whole unpleasant situation, which arose from the very man, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, who brought about this condition, whereby Mr. LAGUARDIA told some of the folks on the other side that he was just as good an American as anyone on the other side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down. I said or did nothing that brought about that condition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is making a proper statement of the question.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman, Mr. JENKINS, introduced Mr. CABLE as a 100 per cent American from Ohio and that remark and that introduction brought about resentment on the part of one of the gentlemen, Mr. LAGUARDIA, as well as others on this side of the House. As a result of that remark and that introduction by the distinguished gentleman, Mr. JENKINS, from Ohio, of the other gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CABLE, there came about an awful row and confusion and almost blows, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker.

Now, these remarks and introductions have all been eliminated from page 6575 of the RECORD, and I am willing to testify to that.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. If there was anything unpleasant Saturday night that ought not to have been said, is it not a good thing it was kept out of the RECORD? Let us be fair about it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] I am just as fair as any man in this House.

Mr. SNELL. We all want to be fair.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But when they leave out our conversation and objections to the remarks made by the other side, which were obnoxious and un-American, from the RECORD and cut out their remarks, I say that is entirely unfair, and it is about time the House should wake up, and I demand that what was said on the floor be restored to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SNELL. Does not the gentleman think that we had better cut it all out?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is a matter for the House as representatives of the American people.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think it is only fair, as far as the statement I made, to say that I gave consent that one certain statement I made be stricken from the RECORD. Because, in the first place, I can absorb all the punishment that any Members of the House may try to inflict upon me. I do think it was extremely ungenerous on my part to compare my record at a certain time with anybody else's. When I was asked, I consented cheerfully that my statement go out. I do not care what they say about me. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that the gentleman has laid a foundation for a question of personal privilege. It might be a question of the privilege of the House if the gentleman accompanies it with a resolution. The Chair does not see the object——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The object is to call attention to the fact that a part of what occurred on Saturday has been eliminated from the RECORD, that questions and remarks are not printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see how the gentleman can get at that except by offering a resolution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, after hearing the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] I withdraw my suggestion. [Applause.]

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the House joint resolution, restricting immigration. The gentleman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I desire to express my appreciation of the remarks made by the Speaker as to the necessity for orderly procedure of the House. We all know of the Speaker's continuous efforts for exact fairness. I hardly need to call the Speaker's attention to the fact that not one of the Members among the three-fourths or more in this House who favor further restriction challenged the Speaker. Nor did any of our greatly nonpartisan majority run out of the doors of the Chamber in an effort to prevent a quorum being counted.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the bill. That was the point that was made on me last Saturday evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to say that it is probable that the firm of Johnson, Johnson & Johnson, of Washington, is just as good as the firm of Dickstein, Dickstein & Dickstein, of New York [laughter], which may be the firm in power in the next Congress.

Now, as to the need for this bill.

The country would like absolute suspension. This bill does not mean absolute suspension by any means, for it will let in some 75,000 persons per annum, three-fourths of whom, at least, will be relatives. The bill is as liberal as the needs of the country will permit. It will keep out 188,000 each year for two years, or in round numbers 376,000 inhabitants from foreign lands from entering this country to take jobs needed by the millions of unemployed citizens in this country. And mind you, every alien legally in this country has a right under the Constitution and entitled to protection in that right. Please remember, also, that this bill is a suspension for two years, and that it is exactly fair as between all the countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I make bold to predict that when November comes again this country will still have the unemployed in addition to the 1,000,000 who are always out of work through failure to contact with the jobs. I can see when winter comes again many will be seeking jobs which they can not find, in spite of every possible effort of the Government to create work, and in spite of the efforts of the employers to provide work. We may care for 2,000,000 of the 5,000,000 now unemployed that way. We may live and buy and build among ourselves, but so far as I can see there is not a sign around the world of improved world conditions. I hate to make these pessimistic statements, but we must not fool ourselves. In fact, the soviet system points to worse conditions. Here in the United States the continued use of labor-saving machinery, the consolidation of business for economy's sake, the farm situations, the export figures, and the condition of the treasuries of most of our States and of our great Nation all are danger signs. I urge the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOKE].

Mr. COOKE. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in my opinion the bill under consideration is merely another hysterical effort on the part of this Congress to do something to relieve unemployment, and under the guise of patriotic endeavor a great many Members of this House are being deceived as to the real purpose of the legislation. There is not any question but that one can appeal to the patriotic ardor of Members of the House in this period of economic depression and get their support for an exclusion measure, but the bill before you is not as good in its provisions as are the regulations under which we are operating now. The Department of State, under the regulations which it is using, is excluding at least 93 per cent of the applicants for immigration to this country at the present time. This bill is a snare and a delusion, as far as being an exclusion measure is concerned. Gentlemen have not taken into consideration for a moment another principle involved in this

bill, and that is the right of American citizens to have united to them their fathers and mothers who are now in the old countries. From an economic standpoint, you are making a great mistake if this bill is enacted. Over $300,000,000 a year is being sent abroad at this time to support the wives and minor children of aliens and American citizens resident in this country. If you can spell from this bill anywhere a regulation of immigration beyond that which you are receiving now, if you can get from it an economic benefit that we do not now have, then I believe you would be justified in passing the bill; but as a matter of fact, it is wrong from the standpoint of economics, it is wrong from the standpoint of humanity, honesty, and justice on the part of the people of this country.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is with sorrow that I rise here this morning. I shall not attempt seriously to discuss the resolution, because under the rule that might makes right all debate has been throttled. I am sorry as a Member of the House of Representatives at this session to have this record go down to posterity. I am indeed sorry and I say that some day it will rise to plague you. The Rules Committee of the House brought in a rule to grant four hours of debate on this resolution. What happens? Instead of a decent, orderly procedure under the rule, the rule was throttled and the time for debate limited to 40 minutes. Was that fair? Was that just?

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

Mr. BOYLAN. Was that American fair play? Was it fair parliamentary procedure? I am ashamed of the record of this House on House Joint Resolution 500, the Jenkins resolution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I do not know how you are going to vote on this bill, but at least I ask you to be considerate and give me an opportunity to say a few words to you regarding this legislation. In the first place, this is not a proper exclusion or a suspension bill to relieve unemployment. This bill, if passed to-day and signed to-morrow, will not help any American to get one single job. The bill is nothing but a fraud on the American Congress concocted by a few members of my committee to present an opportunity to say that it is going to suspend 90 per cent of the immigration when, as a matter of fact, the State Department has suspended over 93 per cent of the immigration for the last six months.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What are these gentlemen who are going to restrict immigration going to do with the alien seamen's bill? That will be a real step.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And why do not they deport the 400,000 criminal aliens illegally in the United States? That would do justice to the American people.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that the Immigration Committee of the House have been practicing sabotage on the alien seamen's bill because the steamships are against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Our committee put that bill, S. 202, with amendments, on the calendar Saturday morning and we are trying to call it up.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Immigration would advise my good friend Mr. SNELL, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who said on Saturday that I was against all immigration, that I voted in the committee for the exclusion of alien seamen and for other bills in that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have not the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman knows that the seamen's bill is on the calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And I voted for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want the gentleman to tell that to Mr. SNELL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, the gentleman knows that we do not divulge what occurs in executive sessions in the committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I also call to the attention of my very good friend the Speaker of this House, for whom I have the warmest regard and the very highest respect, that on Saturday when I made the point of no quorum he immediately took away the right of debate on this bill so that I might not have time enough to enlighten the people of the country and make you Members of the House understand what you are doing under this bill, and I might have had an opportunity to defeat it.

Under the hammer I can not defeat this bill, because Johnson, Johnson & Johnson of Washington, told the Committee on Rules that he had 75 per cent of the Members in his vest pocket, and 90 per cent of the Members are going to vote for his bill whether they understand it or not.

Now permit me to call attention, ladies and gentlemen of the House, to the fact that on Saturday was the first time in eight years' service in this Congress that I ever made a point of order of no quorum. That was the first time, gentlemen, and I call attention also to the fact that I have never made objection to any man's bill, so that I was not filibustering. All I was asking you was to give me an opportunity to explain and point out to you that by voting for this bill you are going to separate the children of men and women legally in the United States. You are forever going to separate the aged father and mother of American citizens. You are forever destroying the union of families, and, my Republican friends, you seem to forget it. When I tried to tell you something you hoodooed me, and you made so much noise that one would think there was a mob riot. Let me call something to your attention. I say to you, not by way of threat but by way of warning, I may be in the minority, but I am willing to vote to suspend immigration to-day if it will help one single American get a job. But, for God's sake, bring together the blood relatives and families, who will not be in competition with labor but families which will be consumers of American products.

Now I want you to take that home with you, because I hope to see you again, if God spares my life. In 1928 in the Republican platform what did you say? What did you tell the people of this country? That where a hardship is created you are going to unite families. What you are doing now is completely destroying the last vestige of blood between families. That is what you are going to do if you vote for this Johnson, Johnson & Johnson of Washington bill. Read it. The trouble with this Congress is that this kind of legislation is brought up without opportunity of debate. If you only could read the reports and hear the testimony, you would not vote for this bill. You would vote a hundred times against it. I make this promise now, gentlemen: I am willing to vote to suspend immigration and close our doors, but for God's sake let the little babies and the old people whom the Republican platform promised to unite come in. You are now completely destroying the promise, and I hope the people of this country will remember this condition. [Applause.]

For your information let me also present to you some statistics which I was able to obtain from our own State Department after considerable difficulty so as to be in a position to enlighten you as to the details of this proposed measure. Bear in mind, gentlemen and ladies, that we are seeking to pass this legislation for the sole purpose of relieving unemployment. It is therefore important for us to find out just how many competitors in our American labor market can come in under our present immigration laws.

I have before me a letter from the State Department dated January 15, 1931, which shows that during the month of November, for instance, a total of 76 quota visas were issued against the Polish immigration quota. In the month of December, 1930, these Polish quota visas amounted to 165, and as of July 1, 1930, the total demand from Poland for visas within the class of all legal preferences was in excess of 23,000, and in spite of that the monthly issue of visas does not exceed 165. All the visas that were issued were issued only to preferred immigrants. No immigration which was not in the preferred class has ever been able to come into the United States so that the only ones to whom visas were issued were wives, minor children, and parents of American citizens. If we are to cut down the quota it is not going to affect any new blood from immigrant countries who may enter the United States but these very fathers, mothers, wives, husbands, and children of immigrants who are now in the United States. How can any sane person claim that an aged parent or a minor child under the age of 18 or the wife of an American citizen may in any sense be deemed to be a competitor in the American labor market? These people are wholly innocent of any design to take away jobs from citizens of the United States and, of course, can not possibly combat with any one of us.

What is the purpose of such legislation? Can anyone be helped by it? As I said, if I can be convinced that a single American citizen will obtain any relief after this bill is passed I will be whole-heartedly for it. As it is I necessarily must be against it.

Turning, however, from opposition to the bill as a whole, serious questions arise, above indicated, that can and ought to be remedied by amendment. Limitation to one year has already been referred to as desirable. Much more oppressive and unjust, however, is the new provision contained in section 1, cutting down maximum quotas to one-tenth. Immediate relatives, such as wives and minor children of resident aliens born in some of the European countries involved, have been separated in shocking fashion for many years by the brutalities of the quota laws, which have called practically unanimously for rectification, and pledge after pledge to remedy these evils has been given, but practically wholly disregarded by Congress. Such wives and minor children are not breadwinners and do not come over to seek employment, and their presence here would not aggravate the employment situation in any way. Even after some slight but really inadequate relief was furnished by the act of May 29, 1928, amending section 6 of the quota law of 1924, repeated pledges were given that adequate relief would be afforded to the countries with small quotas, whose citizen husbands and fathers had been coming over here in large numbers in late years.

The Republican national platform adopted June 14, 1928 (a few weeks after this amendment of 1928), on which President Hoover and the present Republican Congressmen were elected, while favoring continued restrictions, expressly provided:

> Where, however, the law works undue hardship by depriving the immigrant of the comfort and society of those bound by close family ties, such modification should be adopted as will afford relief.

The Democratic national platform adopted two weeks later contained the following clause:

> Laws which limit immigration must be preserved in full force and effect, but the provision contained in these laws that separate husbands from wives and parents from infant children are inhuman and not essential to the purposes or the efficacy of such laws.

Although President Hoover has repeatedly declared himself as favoring such modifications, as did also his predecessors, and his Secretary of Labor and the Immigration Bureau again and again recommended such remedial legislation, Congress failed to carry out this pledge, and now is even asked to strike out practically nine-tenths of the inadequate relief it granted in 1928. Its Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is proposing to do this, despite the recommendation of Secretary of Labor Davis, contained in his annual report dated November 1, 1930, reading:

> I would exempt from this plan of control immigrants coming to join near relatives already in the United States. I have always advocated liberality in the matter of reuniting families, and my attitude has not changed in this respect.

The present bill arbitrarily treats wives and minor children of resident aliens quite differently than of citizens, section 4 (a) of the act of 1924 applicable to them not being modified in any way, though it is elementary that such residents ought to enjoy the same civil rights and family happiness as those already citizens. Separation of families is quite as inhumane, antisocial, and contrary to American interests in the case of the resident alien and prospective citizen as in the case of the man already naturalized.

Figures recently furnished by the State Department as to the number of applications of such near relatives of resident aliens registered at our consulates down to July 1, 1930, are striking as showing the number of persons involved, and how largely residents of southern and eastern Europe are discriminated against because of the small quotas assigned to them.

Twenty-seven thousand seven hundred and thirty-five wives, children, and parents of residents born in southern and eastern European countries are registered as seeking admission, as compared with 1,566 from northern and western Europe, as also 23,404 fathers, mothers, and husbands of United States citizens from the former group of countries, as compared with 692 from northern and western Europe. It will take many years for many of the former group before these near relatives can come over under our oppressive quota laws, even without such new curtailment.

As already pointed out, wives and minor children who are not breadwinners are involved, whose maintenance must be and is provided for by the husband and father resident in the United States.

Far from aggravating the employment situation in the United States, their presence here would keep hundreds of millions of dollars within our country to be spent here instead of being sent abroad for their maintenance there. Trade Information Bulletin No. 698, issued by the United States Department of Commerce for the year 1929, gives what it calls a conservative estimate of the amount of money sent that year by residents of the United States to their relatives abroad, namely, $247,000,000, exclusive of currency sent by mail. Figures kept by the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society as to remittances by residents of the United States to near relatives abroad through its bureau during 1929, compared with the first 11 months of 1930, show that despite the hard times the amount did not greatly fall off in 1930, it having been more than 79 per cent of the preceding year's totals, and figures from other sources indicate a still higher percentage than this for 1930. The total of $247,000,000 for all races and creeds, reported by the Department of Commerce for 1929, reduced to the same 79 per cent for 1930 amounts to over $195,000,000. It is thus obvious that far from injuring our economic condition, just and humane laws authorizing reunion of families would keep enormous sums here to be spent in our own country. Nay, more, the narrow and oppressive provision barring reunion of families, and consequently involving transmission of such enormous sums to relatives abroad for their maintenance there for years past, is itself a serious contributing cause to our present economic troubles.

I believe that very few Members of Congress and Senators know the hardship and suffering that has been created by the act of 1924, which has cut immigration down to 150,000 for all of the world. As a result of the 1924 act thousands of families have been separated and have been waiting all these years with the hope that they can join their relatives. They have suffered untold hardships, and millions of dollars

have been sent for their support and maintenance, and furthermore, since 1924 at least $1,000,000,000 has been forwarded to the European countries for the support of these relatives.

These families could not be united because of the small quota allotment to the countries under the national origin scheme. We are now trying to add additional hardships and burdens by cutting the quota down 90 per cent, which is practically closing the doors, as these relatives of persons entitled to come here under their preference quotas would never during their natural life be able to join their families.

In the past several months the State Department, through its consuls, have denied visas to persons legally entitled to come to the United States, whose preferences have been established for many years, and who are now refused admission on the ground they are liable to become a public charge. I have information that even children and wives of American citizens were denied admission on the ground of becoming a public charge; that aged parents of American citizens whose visas have been established and who are entitled to enter have been refused admission on the ground of liability to become a public charge, in spite of the fact that proof has been presented to the consuls of their financial ability.

The State Department, through its consuls, takes the position that under the 1917 act it has the power to exclude all persons likely to become public charges. I can not emphasize the matter more strongly or emphatically than to submit to this honorable body the additional and recent report of the State Department, published under the heading of Press Releases, dated January 24, 1931, which is marked "Exhibit C" of my minority views on this bill, and I hope that this Congress will find the time to thoroughly examine this report, which will prove my case beyond question of doubt that this bill, known as House Joint Resolution 500, to cut 90 per cent of immigration does not come in good faith and is not going to help labor conditions in the United States. On the contrary, it is destroying the firesides of American citizens whose husbands, whose fathers, whose mothers, and whose children will be forever debarred.

The principle so ably set forth by Theodore Roosevelt in his famous presidential message of 1906 should be heeded:

> We must treat with justice and good will all immigrants who come here under the law. Whether they are Catholic or Protestant, Jew or gentile; whether they come from England or Germany, Russia, Japan, or Italy matters nothing. All we have a right to question is the man's conduct. If he is honest and upright in his dealings with his neighbor and with the State, then he is entitled to respect and good treatment.

It is as plain as the nose on the face that if this bill passes, with only 10 per cent left of the quota, that 10 per cent will be classed by American consuls as public charges. In other words, we are building a fence around the United States and completely closing our doors regardless of rights of citizens.

I spoke to you a few moments ago of statistics which I have been able to obtain from our State Department. In order to make the situation clear I am inserting in the RECORD the information obtained from the department, together with the letters accompanying the same.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 15, 1931.

The Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: In accordance with the request made upon your call at the department on January 14, 1931, I am transmitting herewith a copy of the department's pamphlet entitled "Admission of Aliens into the United States"; also a copy of the latest press release on visa statistics, indicating further and continued reductions in visas issued to immigrants during November, 1930, as a result of the enforcement of the existing provisions of law in the light of the present economic conditions. As may be seen therefrom, 76 quota immigration visas were issued during the month of November against the Polish quota.

I may add that the records indicate that 165 visas were issued under the Polish quota during December, 1930.

Sincerely yours,

A. DANA HODGDON,
Chief Visa Office.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 17, 1930.

VISA STATISTICS, INDICATING CONTINUED AND FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN VISAS ISSUED TO IMMIGRANTS DURING NOVEMBER, 1930

I. QUOTA IMMIGRATION VISA STATISTICS FROM EUROPE[1]

Reports from American consular officers assigned to 21 countries, whose annual quotas represent 148,466 of the total quota of 153,714, indicate that of the possible portion of the monthly 10 per cent of the total quotas, which 10 per cent equals 14,846, that only 944 visas were issued to nonpreference aliens as compared to 1,687 in October. This means that there was an underissue in November of 12,647 numbers which were available for issue to such applicants from those countries. In other words, there was an underissue of 93 per cent of numbers to this class of aliens who would normally have received visas during that month.

The underissue of the possible monthly 10 per cent of the above quotas, amounting to 14,846, is 85 per cent if the visas issued to aliens entitled by law to preference as well as those classifiable as nonpreference aliens is taken into consideration.

The consuls of the United States, in the enforcement of existing provisions of law in the light of present economic conditions, have brought about the above results without arbitrary rejections of applicants.

Incomplete reports received to date from the remaining countries whose annual quotas amount to 5,248 and whose quotas are not restricted to a 10 per cent monthly issue indicate that only 41 numbers were issued during the month of November.

II. NONQUOTA IMMIGRATION VISA STATISTICS FROM NORTH, CENTRAL, AND SOUTH AMERICA

The two countries which have furnished the volume of nonquota immigrants to this country are Canada and Mexico, which contributed 89 per cent, or 70 and 19 per cent, respectively, of the total of 61,504 visas reported as issued to nonquota aliens during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930. Consular officers in Mexico initiated stricter enforcement in that country in February, 1929, and in Canada in April, 1930. Reports received for the month of November indicate a continued decrease in visas issued in these two countries.

(*A*) *Canada*

Reports received from Canada indicate that only 808 nonquota visas were issued in November, 1930 (which figure includes unmarried minor children, the wives or the husbands of American citizens married prior to June 1, 1928, as well as certain professors, ministers, students, and previous lawful residents of the United States who would not be chargeable to the quota if there were a quota for Canada), as compared with 3,669 visas issued during the same month in 1929, which represents a reduction in visas issued during this period of 76 per cent. The 808 nonquota visas issued in Canada in November show a reduction of 800 visas issued when compared with 1,608 visas issued in October of the current year (a further reduction of 50 per cent).

(*B*) *Mexico*

Only 189 Mexicans (which figure includes unmarried minor children, the wives or the husbands of American citizens married prior to June 1, 1928, as well as certain professors, ministers, students, and previous lawful residents of the United States who would not be chargeable to the quota if there were a quota for Mexico) were issued visas in November, 1930, as compared with 2,889 in November, 1928 (the last corresponding normal month before stricter enforcement began), or a decrease of 93 per cent. The 189 nonquota visas issued in Mexico in November, 1930, show a reduction of 47 visas issued when compared with the 236 visas issued in October of the current year (a further reduction of 20 per cent).

On the basis of these figures, both quota and nonquota, it is estimated that 135,000 aliens who would have come into this country during the quota year ended June 30, 1931, will not receive visas.

The attached table of quota visa statistics for the month of November, 1930, represents reductions in visas issued to immigrants during the second month of the enforcement of the "likely to become a public charge" provision of the immigration act of 1917 by consular officers in the light of present unemployment in the United States, which policy was put in effect in October following the announcement in this regard by the President on September 8, 1930, based on a report presented by the State Department at his request.

In this connection consular officers have been informed that in view of the serious unemployment which exists in the United States particular care should be taken before issuing immigration visas to determine whether the applicants may become public charges.

If any alien, upon whom the burden of establishing admissibility is placed by section 23 of the immigration act of 1924, should be unable to establish that he is not likely to become a public charge the consular officer to whom he may have applied for a visa would have no other choice under section 2 (f) of the

[1] Includes all countries in the world other than most of the countries in the Western Hemisphere and certain parts of the Far East known as the so-called Asiatic barred zone.

immigration act of 1924 than to refuse a visa. Section 2 (f) of the act cited provides in part that "no immigration visa shall be issued to an immigrant if it appears to the consular officer * * * that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws * * * nor shall such immigration visa be issued if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws."

Immigration quota visa statistics, November, 1930

[Countries with quotas of 300 or more]

Country	Monthly 10 per cent of quota[1]	Number relatives of American citizens	Farmers	Number relatives of aliens	Nonpreference	Total quota visas reported issued	Per cent issued	Per cent under-issued	Per cent nonpreference issued	Per cent nonpreference underissued
Column	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Austria	141	1	6	3	15	25	0.18	0.82	0.11	0.89
Belgium	130	2	1	10	11	24	.18	.82	.09	.91
Czechoslovakia	287	28	3	39	------	70	.24	.76	.00	1.00
Denmark	118	2	6	4	12	24	.20	.80	.12	.88
Finland	57	------	10	------	------	10	.18	.82	.00	1.00
France	309	3	4	14	67	88	.28	.72	.23	.77
Germany	2,596	22	2	106	91	221	.09	.91	.04	.96
Great Britain	6,572	9	------	138	398	545	.08	.92	.06	.94
Greece	31	16	------	15	------	31	1.00	.00	.00	.00
Hungary	87	42	------	------	------	42	.48	.52	.00	1.00
Irish Free State	1,785	2	------	3	52	57	.03	.97	.03	.97
Italy	580	296	------	131	17	444	.77	.23	.11	.89
Lithuania	39	17	3	18	------	38	.97	.03	.00	1.00
Netherlands	315	2	11	19	74	106	.34	.66	.26	.74
Norway	238	4	13	16	40	73	.31	.69	.20	.80
Poland	652	58	1	17	------	76	.12	.88	.00	1.00
Portugal	44	14	------	30	------	44	1.00	.00	.00	.00
Russia	278	20	8	25	111	164	.59	.41	.49	.51
Sweden	331	3	5	11	43	62	.19	.81	.14	.86
Switzerland	171	3	------	------	9	12	.07	.93	.05	.95
Yugoslavia	85	20	10	9	4	43	.51	.49	.09	.91
Total	[2]14,846	564	83	608	944	2,199	.15	.85	[3].07	.93

[1] Only 10 per cent of quotas which are 300 or over may be issued each month.
[2] Per cent of total monthly 10 per cent issued or underissued.
[3] The figure given under totals in column 9 represents the percentage of total nonpreference visas issued as compared to the monthly 10 per cent ratio after reduction of the preference cases listed under columns 2, 3, and 4. The figure under column 10 represents the corresponding underissue of visas.

NOTE.—The above figures represent visas actually reported as issued under each quota. In some instances reports on other visas for which quota numbers have been allotted to distant consulates are received by the quota control officers only after the end of the month for which allotted. The figures given for visas issued at the end of a given month are therefore in some cases provisional in character and are slightly less than the total obtained at a later date.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1931.

The Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: Referring to your request over the telephone, I am inclosing a statement to show the reported demand as of July 1, 1930, against the various quotas on the part of aliens coming within the first preference and second preference classifications. I may add that these figures have been hastily prepared and may, therefore, require revision.

Very truly yours,

ELIOT B. COULTER,
Assistant Chief Visa Division.

Registered demand for visas as of July 1, 1930, as reported by consuls

[First-preference relatives and second-preference relatives only]

NORTHERN AND WESTERN EUROPE

	First preference	Second preference	Total
Belgium	5	8	13
Denmark	24	70	94
France	44	41	85
Germany	190	811	1,001
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	6	120	126
Irish Free State	38	28	66
Netherlands	30	56	86
Norway	105	171	276
Sweden	220	206	426
Switzerland	29	55	84
Total	691	1,566	2,257

Registered demand for visas as of July 1, 1930, as reported by consuls—Continued

SOUTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

	First preference	Second preference	Total
Austria	72	------	72
Czechoslovakia	953	2,481	3,434
Finland	80	157	237
Greece	720	176	896
Hungary	636	25	661
Italy	10,000	------	10,009
Lithuania	322	61	383
Poland	3,463	19,887	23,350
Portugal	60	938	998
Russia	2,871	121	2,992
Yugoslavia	422	77	499
Total	19,599	23,923	43,522

ALL OTHER COUNTRIES[1]

Albania	32	324	356
Armenia	4	------	4
Australia	1	9	10
Bulgaria	25	224	249
Egypt	------	21	21
Estonia	5	18	23
Iraq	------	15	15
Latvia	94	95	189
Luxemburg	1	------	1
Palestine	16	87	103
Persia	10	17	27
Rumania	800	300	1,100
South Africa	------	1	1
Spain	27	963	990
Syria	564	72	636
Turkey	1,535	101	1,636
Total	3,114	2,247	5,361

[1] Quotas less than 300.

These statistics can convince the impartial listener of only one thing—of the great clamor made by relatives and others entitled to preferences to obtain visas to enter this country and of the policy of restriction which the State Department has been pursuing for some time past, as I had occasion to speak on the floor of the House, and which policy results in a curtailment of immigration even beyond the terms of the proposed legislation.

We can, therefore, conclude that this legislation is wholly useless and unnecessary. That the State Department has already done as much and more as this bill proposes to do. That those who desire to come to the United States to-day are not coming in competition with our labor, but are coming to join relatives in the United States. We may, therefore, safely vote against this proposed bill, and whether we agree or do not agree with the policy of the State Department or with the general tenor of the existing immigration laws, no useful object can be served by passing this new bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, it shall be my purpose, if I possibly can, to make a statement of facts with reference to what this bill will do and will not do.

In the first place, permit me to say to you this is not a partisan bill. It is not a Republican bill. It is not a Democratic bill. It is a bill that comes out of the urge, the great demand of the people of America for further restriction of immigration. It comes indirectly to us, I might say, from a paragraph of the President's message.

This bill has the support of the Secretary of State in exact language, in unambiguous language. It has the support of the Secretary of Labor in unambiguous language. It has the support, I might say, of organized labor in unambiguous language. It has the support of the patriotic organizations of America in unambiguous language. Consequently, I am proud to stand on this floor and attempt to explain a bill that I think the American people would like to have passed at this time.

Saturday's RECORD shows a reference to me in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]. If the gentleman sought to convey the impression that I am in any

way a devotee of the "hooded figure" referred to by him he was giving me a classification that I am not entitled to. He was mistaken.

I have prepared a table of figures which I have had made up into a chart. That table is as follows:

Exhibit A

	Present law	New bill
European (non quota): Wives and children of American citizens, teachers, ministers, returning visitors, all others	45,097	45,097
Western Hemisphere (no quota at present):		
Canada	41,248	
Mexico	11,801	7,637
All others	9,323	
Total	62,372	
European (quota):		
Great Britain, North Ireland, etc	65,721	
Germany	25,957	
Italy	5,802	
Poland	6,524	19,703
	153,714	72,437
All others	49,710	
	261,183	
Difference	188,746	

There is a great influx of population into this country that comes in without coming within the provisions of the quota laws. It is given no consideration in these figures which I have prepared on this chart. There are many thousands of people who come here to visit; people who come as transients. They are not considered as immigrants. They are absolutely not taken into consideration in this chart. They are outside all quotas and they come in in unlimited numbers. This bill under discussion will not curtail them in the least. There are two classes of people that I took account of here in this chart. They are all "immigrants," these two classes are the "nonquota" people and the "quota" people. At this point on the chart are represented the nonquota people who come here. They come outside of the quota, and it makes no difference where they come from just so they comply with the law as to health and literacy and other similar tests.

Mr. SABATH. Who are they?

Mr. JENKINS. They are the wives and children of citizens.

There are teachers, there are ministers, returning visitors, and a few other minor classifications.

Last year, ending with June 30, there were 45,097 of those people who came in from various countries. They came from all countries. I may tell you that Italy, of that 45,000, sent 17,872 people. They come in this list which I have indicated on the chart. They are mostly wives and children of American citizens. While Italy was sending in that number, Poland sent in 4,022; Rumania, 1,053; Greece, 1,875; Turkey, 1,039; while Germany was only sending 1,840, and Sweden was only sending 453. It is readily apparent that in this classification the southern European countries have a decided advantage. The opponents of this bill fail to explain this.

Now, let us go further. At this place on the chart is shown the Western Hemisphere. This bill seeks to deal with the Western Hemisphere. Up to this time we have had no quotas on the Western Hemisphere. Canadians and Mexicans come in without restriction whatever, except as to health, criminal records, and other requirements of a similar character.

A few days ago Canada issued an edict calling for a total suspension of immigration into Canada for two years.

I want to say to you that our bill provides for a 90 per cent suspension for two years. They have gone further than we have on this question of restriction. Let us see how many people came in from Canada last year—41,248. They were people who were seeking to become citizens, and not people who were merely passing over the border. I tell you men and women who live on the Canadian border that this bill will not interfere in any way with any man who daily crosses the border as a visitor or as one who wishes to transact business in our country or with a man wishing to pass from our country into Canada for the same purpose. They can cross from Canada in their cars just the same as they are doing now. A man who lives on either side can go and come like he has been doing. This bill does not interfere with him in the least.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. For a question.

Mr. HALE. Then why any restriction on Canada?

Mr. JENKINS. This is a restriction against those who come here to secure employment, to take the jobs of those who are citizens of this country.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What about a man who lives across the Canadian border and comes to Ogdensburg, in my district, to work during the day and goes back at night. Will he be shut off?

Mr. JENKINS. He will not be shut off if he comes within the purview of the agreement made by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor with corresponding officers in Canada, an agreement made two or three years ago.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman tell me what that agreement does?

Mr. JENKINS. It is a very exhaustive agreement, and I do not believe I have the time to go into it now. But I am advised that there will be no difficulty in that respect as to a man who has a job now, but it will affect those who in the future wish to come across to take the jobs that belong to our people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It applies to a man who is domiciled here, even though he sleeps in Canada at night.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand that the officers have worked that out. They appeared before us and gave us the absolute understanding, without any question, that the thing would be worked out satisfactorily to both nations.

Mr. SNELL. They can come here and continue here if they have a job here.

Mr. JENKINS. If they have a job here now; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If that is their status now.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. When this matter was before our committee the gentleman will recall I offered an amendment whereby no visa should be issued to an immigrant unless he came from a country to whom we could deport.

Mr. JENKINS. I remember the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GREEN. That was voted down. Another amendment I offered was that no visa should be issued to anyone except he be of the Caucasian race, and that was voted down.

Mr. JENKINS. Referring to this chart, as I said, Canada sent in last year 41,248, Mexico 11,801, and all other Western Hemisphere countries 9,323, a total of 62,372. Under this bill this number will be reduced to 7,637.

Let us go down to the next classification. I have been referring to the nonquota countries, and now I will discuss the quota countries. Great Britain, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and some of the other principalities of Great Britain have a quota of 65,721; Germany, 25,957; Italy, 5,802; Poland, 6,524; and all the other countries of Europe have a combined quota of 49,710. That makes a total of 153,714. This is the total quota of Europe. This number together with the 45,097 nonquota from Europe represents the total influx of immigrants from Europe for the year ending June 30, 1930. This does not include visitors, and so forth, heretofore referred to. There are thousands who come in as visitors and in other ways who lose themselves in our population and never return to their native countries.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. Under the head of Europeans, wives and children, teachers, ministers, and so on, the gentleman said over 10,000 came from Italy?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; 17,872.

Mr. DUNBAR. Yet in the European quota the gentleman says that 5,802 came from Italy.

Mr. JENKINS. I confess that the immigration law is complicated and hard to understand. The first figures, 17,872, are nonquota immigrants; for instance, wives of citizens count. There is no limitation on these. If 50,000 Italians were naturalized this year, they at once bring in their wives and children, regardless of any quota limitation. But the second number, 5,802, that represents the quota fixed for Italy. That deals with immigrants who wish to come for the first time and the wives and children of aliens within this country who have not as yet been naturalized. The total quota immigration from Europe is 153,714. The total nonquota for 1929 and 1930 was 45,097. This figure can fluctuate, but the quota figures are fixed by law.

Now, what does this bill propose to do. It reduces quota immigration 90 per cent. In other words, each of these European countries will be reduced to 10 per cent. Ten per cent of 153,714 will be 15,371. You ask me then, how do I arrive at the figure 19,703. That figure is 10 per cent of the original quota plus the addition that comes by reason of the provision that allows a minimum quota of 100 to each country. Under this bill, therefore, the total European quota is reduced from 153,714 to 19,703.

Let us now consider the Western Hemisphere. What does it do in the Western Hemisphere? As heretofore explained, the Western Hemisphere is not under a quota. It is proposed by this bill to give to each of the countries of the Western Hemisphere a quota equal to the number of aliens arriving from that country into the United States during the fiscal year 1929–30. Then take 10 per cent of that number. In other words, fix a quota for these countries and then reduce it by 90 per cent, just like it proposes to do with all other quotas. From this chart you can see that Canada sent us 41,248 immigrants in 1929–30, while Mexico sent us 11,801, a total from the Western Hemisphere of 62,372. A 90 per cent reduction from this figure plus the additions that come from allowing each country a minimum of 100 gives a total of 7,637 which will be the quota immigration from the Western Hemisphere. In addition, as heretofore explained, any Canadian wishing to come to the United States for business or to cross daily about his business, if he is known to the immigration authorities on the border, will not be interfered with. Also, the wives and children of Canadians who have become American citizens can come in, in unlimited numbers. The same is true as to Mexico. Also, a Canadian or Mexican living here but who is not yet a citizen may bring in his wife and children; they must come under the quota, but are given preference ahead of new stock. By that I mean that a Mexican in the United States for permanent residence under this bill will be permitted to ask that his wife and children be permitted to come in, and they will be preferred ahead of a young single man or another married man still in Mexico wanting to come in.

You will note from this chart that the number of nonquota immigrants heretofore given as the number coming in under the present law is 45,097. You will also note that I carry that same figure over into the column headed "New bill." I do that for there will be absolutely no change in this class under the new bill. The number of this class coming next year may not be the same as given here. It may be larger or it may be smaller. This new law does not limit it any more than the present law does.

There is no change in that respect. They can come right along and this statement proves it.

Now, if you will total these columns, you will see that the column listed "new bill" totals 72,437. A total of the same classifications under the present law is 261,183. This shows a net gain of 188,746 per year for two years. [Applause.]

Now, I want to say again, ladies and gentlemen, like everyone else, I feel very kindly toward the Canadians, and I am glad that we can say to them, "You can come over and trade with us, you can come over and buy from us, you can come over and visit with us, with the little tickets, like you have always had, and we will go back and forth, as we have always done." There will be absolutely no trouble about it. If there is no trouble with Canada, our nearest neighbor and one of our finest friends internationally, we certainly should have no concern whatever with the results of passing this bill, from a diplomatic standpoint.

Now, what else are we doing under this bill? Great Britain takes a cut of 90 per cent, from 65,000 down to 6,572; Germany takes the same kind of cut, Italy takes the same kind of cut, and so does Poland.

If I have the time, I want to show you how the quotas of Poland and Italy and Turkey and the other southern European countries work out to the benefit of the women and children. As you know, in 1928 we passed a bill for the uniting of families. I was the author of that bill and I am proud of it, and I may say to you that the Department of Labor has repeatedly in its reports said that this bill has worked out wonderfully for the benefit of women and children. That bill provided that preferences within the quotas should be given to fathers and mothers of American citizens and wives and children of aliens within the country for permanent residence. Let me illustrate: Germany has a quota of about 26,000 per year. The law provides that preference be given to fathers and mothers of American citizens and husbands married before June, 1928. This preference applies to the extent of 50 per cent of the total quota, and a preference is given to the wives and children of alien residents to the extent of the other 50 per cent, and these wives and children are given the balance of the 50 per cent going to fathers and mothers if that class does not consume their percentage. To explain further, the German quota would be divided so that 13,000 could be used by fathers and mothers, if necessary, and 13,000 by wives and children. But in Germany only a small percentage is used for any of these preferences and the great bulk goes to new stock. But in countries like Poland every single item there of that whole 6,524 can go to the women and children [applause]; and I want to say to you that every single item does go to the women and children in Poland and in all the southern European countries. The Polish quota is divided so that 50 per cent goes to fathers and mothers and the other 50 per cent to the wives and children. The total quota is, under my bill of 1928, applicable to reuniting families.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to explain the amendment which we were anxious to offer. We could not do so because the bill is being considered under suspension of the rules and no amendments are possible. It was an amendment to permit the fathers and mothers of citizens, who could show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that they would be properly cared for and would not engage in gainful occupation, to come in within the limits of the existing quota. This is the only request that we had to make, and it seems to me it was a humane, reasonable request, and I am sure would have had the support of American people. Such an amendment would not have weakened the bill. It would not have, in any way, defeated the purpose of keeping out peon labor. It would have given the opportunity of uniting families and getting in the many aged parents who have been waiting for years to join their children. Under the bill reducing quotas 90 per cent, these mothers will never live to reach their turn. It is without doubt the most scientific legislative cruelty ever devised by man. The failure to exempt parents of citizens from the 90 per cent cut can not be justified. Why not permit parents who will not look for work and who can be properly supported by their citizen children to enter? What justification can be given for this arbitrary general reduction? None. I have made every effort humanly possible to make you see the wrong, the hardship, the mental torture you are inflict-

ing on thousands of good families. It seems it is all futile. Our only hope is that the Senate will not permit this outrage to become the law.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I want to call your attention to this chart. This chart is made up for the purpose of showing figures that do not belong here at all. These figures have nothing to do with the wives and children and fathers and mothers, because if a man comes here on a visit from a foreign country he has to go back, whether he goes back in one month or two months, whether he is a teacher or a minister. They also have nothing to do with the aged parents of 60 or 65, or the babies or wives of aliens legally admitted to the United States.

Mr. SABATH. And they would not take anybody's job.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They would not take one single job away from anybody.

This is just another attempt to close the doors to make you believe that there are thousands of immigrants coming in here, when the truth of it is there are only 150,000 who can come in under the national-origins scheme, and Great Britain and the Nordic races, including Germany, get almost 112,000, thereby continuing to separate families as they have been separated since 1924.

As already pointed out, wives and minor children who are not breadwinners are involved, whose maintenance must be and is provided for by the husband and father resident in the United States.

Far from aggravating the employment situation in the United States, their presence here would keep hundreds of millions of dollars within our country to be spent here instead of being sent abroad for their maintenance there. Trade Information Bulletin No. 698, issued by the United States Department of Commerce for the year 1929, gives what it calls a conservative estimate of the amount of money sent that year by residents of the United States to their relatives abroad, namely, $247,000,000, exclusive of currency sent by mail. Figures kept by the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society as to remittances by residents of the United States to near relatives abroad through its bureau during 1929, compared with the first 11 months of 1930, show that despite the hard times the amount did not greatly fall off in 1930, it having been more than 79 per cent of the preceding year's totals, and figures from other sources indicate a still higher percentage than this for 1930. The total of $247,000,000 for all races and creeds, reported by the Department of Commerce for 1929, reduced to the same 79 per cent for 1930 amounts to over $195,000,000. It is thus obvious that far from injuring our economic condition, just and humane laws authorizing reunion of families would keep enormous sums here to be spent in our own country. Nay, more, the narrow and oppressive provision barring reunion of families, and consequently involving transmission of such enormous sums to relatives abroad for their maintenance there for years past, is itself a serious contributing cause to our present economic troubles. In fact, Jane Addams, who has no superior in familiarity with conditions among the foreign born, in her newly published work, The Second Twenty Years at Hull House, suggests that our quota law immigration policy is responsible for much of our present disturbed economic condition in barring so many immigrants from our shores. She says (p. 278):

> The economists, it seems to me, have never sufficiently stressed the fact that the great number of immigrants formerly arriving represented an enormous mass of consumers who needed food, clothing, and shelter on a constantly rising standard of living. We are told that in this country of ours every person, on the average, eats about 5 bushels of grain a year. How far is our annual plethora of foodstuffs due to the fact that we were long accustomed to having to have markets come to us, so that we are slow to learn how to overcome the difficulty in disposing of our products in foreign markets.

There is no need to point out the elementary fact that the family is the basis of our civilized life and that laws separating near members of families are brutal and inhuman. This applies equally to resident aliens admitted for permanent residence as to citizens. The United States Supreme Court, in Meyer *v.* Nebraska (262 U. S. 390), well pointed out that among the inalienable rights granted by the fourteenth amendment to all residents is the right "to marry, establish a home, and bring up children," and it is pure despotism to deny this right to domiciled aliens under cover of our immigration laws. Far from remedying this evil, in accordance with party pledges, this bill reduces present maximum quotas to 10 per cent, subject to much additional administrative curtailment.

As already pointed out, this proposed legislation, I predict now, is intended as an entering wedge for the future, to build a fence around the United States and to continue to separate the families of resident aliens and to persons entitled to preference under the law, who are seeking to join their citizen children and citizen wives.

One does not have to argue very much to convince you gentlemen if you will just read Mr. Johnson's majority report accompanying this House Joint Resolution 500. I call your attention particularly to the statement contained in the report on pages 4 and 5:

> While it is true that immigration from Canada, Mexico, and Cuba was greatly reduced during the last fiscal year (and still further reduced during the past few months), it is apparent that the present economic situation assists United States consuls in applying the "likely to become a public charge" clause of the 1917 act, and when conditions change it will be increasingly difficult to use that clause as a barrier.

Now, what does the author mean by saying "that when conditions change it will be increasingly difficult to use that clause as a barrier"? Is not this legislation intended solely as temporary legislation to meet the present economic conditions, and if economic conditions should change to-morrow or next month why should there be any barrier against anyone who can meet the requirements of the law and be admitted under the 1924 act? What is intended by the author, Mr. JOHNSON, when he said "when conditions improve we will not be able to use the 1917 act as a barrier"? In other words, the chairman of immigration is now laying a foundation, using the depression as an excuse, that although conditions will improve to-morrow he wants something permanent to keep people away from the United States who would lawfully be entitled to come—from those bound in blood and from those who would have a right to bring them in.

This bill is going to separate the parents of American citizens forever, because they come within the preferred quota of the countries of their nationality. If you are going to take away 90 per cent of the small-quota countries you might as well have turned around and built a fence and let no one in, for as a matter of fact they will never in their lifetime be able to see their dear children, and you Members of Congress will have to carry the burden and carry it on your conscience, that you were the cause and support of this un-American piece of legislation, bearing in mind that you are not helping one single American job, but you are destroying the last breath of liberty among free people for which our forefathers fought and died.

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

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SIROVICH. Coming from the most congested district in this Nation, I have not had an opportunity to say a word. May I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to have five minutes to proceed out of order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, I shall object unless we may have five minutes to reply.

Mr. SNELL. If we start that procedure we will have to keep it up. We want to be fair. The gentleman is one of my very best friends, but I shall have to object.

Mr. SIROVICH. May I make an appeal to the House? I spoke to you, Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, and I spoke to you this morning to show the unfairness of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman to make his request, but objection is heard.

All time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to couple with that request that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] have five minutes thereafter.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, there is important business that we must conclude to-day, and I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 82, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—299

Abernethy	Dickinson	Johnson, Ind.	Pittenger
Ackerman	Dominick	Johnson, Nebr.	Pou
Adkins	Doughton	Johnson, Okla.	Pratt, Harcourt J.
Allen	Douglas, Ariz.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pritchard
Allgood	Dowell	Johnson, Tex.	Purnell
Almon	Doxey	Johnson, Wash.	Quin
Andresen	Drane	Jonas, N. C.	Ragon
Arentz	Drewry	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Henry T.
Arnold	Driver	Kading	Ramey, Frank M.
Aswell	Dunbar	Kelly	Ramseyer
Ayres	Dyer	Kendall, Ky.	Ramspeck
Bachmann	Eaton, Colo.	Kendall, Pa.	Rankin
Bacon	Eaton, N. J.	Kerr	Rayburn
Baird	Edwards	Ketcham	Reece
Bankhead	Elliott	Kinzer	Reed, N. Y.
Barbour	Ellis	Knutson	Reilly
Beedy	Englebright	Kopp	Rich
Beers	Erk	Lambertson	Robinson
Blackburn	Eslick	Lankford, Ga.	Romjue
Bland	Esterly	Lankford, Va.	Rutherford
Blanton	Evans, Calif.	Leavitt	Sanders, Tex.
Bohn	Evans, Mont.	Leech	Sandlin
Bowman	Finley	Lehlbach	Schafer, Wis.
Box	Fish	Letts	Schneider
Brand, Ga.	Fisher	Linthicum	Seiberling
Brand, Ohio	Free	Loofbourow	Selvig
Briggs	French	Lozier	Shaffer, Va.
Browne	Fuller	Ludlow	Shott, W. Va.
Browning	Fulmer	McClintic, Okla.	Shreve
Brumm	Gambrill	McClintock, Ohio	Simmons
Buckbee	Garber, Okla.	McCormick, Ill.	Simms
Burtness	Garber, Va.	McDuffie	Sloan
Busby	Gasque	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Butler	Glover	McKeown	Smith, W. Va.
Byrns	Goldsborough	McLaughlin	Snell
Cable	Green	McLeod	Sparks
Campbell, Iowa	Greenwood	McMillan	Speaks
Campbell, Pa.	Gregory	McReynolds	Sproul, Ill.
Canfield	Guyer	McSwain	Sproul, Kans.
Cannon	Hadley	Maas	Stafford
Carter, Calif.	Hall, Ill.	Magrady	Stalker
Carter, Wyo.	Hall, Ind.	Manlove	Steagall
Cartwright	Hall, Miss.	Mapes	Stone
Chalmers	Hall, N. Dak.	Menges	Strong, Kans.
Chase	Halsey	Michener	Strong, Pa.
Chiperfield	Hancock, N. C.	Miller	Summers, Wash.
Christgau	Hardy	Milligan	Sumners, Tex.
Clague	Hare	Montague	Swanson
Clancy	Hartley	Montet	Swick
Clark, Md.	Hastings	Moore, Ky.	Swing
Clarke, N. Y.	Haugen	Moore, Ohio	Taber
Cochran, Mo.	Hawley	Moore, Va.	Tarver
Cochran, Pa.	Hess	Morgan	Taylor, Tenn.
Cole	Hickey	Mouser	Temple
Collier	Hill, Ala.	Murphy	Thatcher
Collins	Hill, Wash.	Nelson, Mo.	Thurston
Colton	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Timberlake
Cooper, Ohio	Hoffman	Newhall	Tucker
Cooper, Tenn.	Hogg, Ind.	Niedringhaus	Turpin
Cox	Hogg, W. Va.	Nolan	Vestal
Crail	Holaday	O'Connor, Okla.	Vincent, Mich.
Cramton	Hooper	Oldfield	Wainwright
Crisp	Hope	Oliver, Ala.	Walker
Cross	Hopkins	Owen	Warren
Crowther	Huddleston	Palmer	Watres
Culkin	Hudson	Parker	Watson
Darrow	Hull, Tenn.	Parks	Welch, Calif.
Davis	Hull, Wis.	Parsons	Welsh, Pa.
Dempsey	Irwin	Patman	Whittington
Denison	James, Mich.	Patterson	Williams
De Priest	Jeffers	Peavey	Williamson
DeRouen	Jenkins	Perkins	Wilson
Wingo	Wolverton, W. Va.	Woodrum	Yon
Wolfenden	Wood	Wright	Zihlman
Wolverton, N. J.	Woodruff	Wyant	

NAYS—82

Aldrich	Cullen	Howard	Ransley
Andrew	Dallinger	Hull, Morton D.	Rogers
Auf der Heide	Dickstein	Hull, William E.	Sabath
Bacharach	Douglass, Mass.	Igoe	Sears
Beck	Doyle	Kahn	Seger
Black	Estep	Kvale	Sinclair
Bloom	Fenn	LaGuardia	Sirovich
Bolton	Fitzpatrick	Lindsay	Snow
Boylan	Fort	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Brigham	Foss	McCormack, Mass	Stobbs
Britten	Freeman	Martin	Sullivan, N. Y.
Buchanan	Garner	Mead	Sullivan, Pa.
Burdick	Gavagan	Merritt	Tilson
Carley	Gibson	Mooney	Tinkham
Celler	Gifford	Morehead	Treadway
Chindblom	Goss	Nelson, Me.	Wason
Christopherson	Graham	Norton	White
Condon	Granfield	O'Connor, N. Y.	Whitley
Connery	Griffin	Palmisano	Wigglesworth
Cooke	Hale	Prall	
Crosser	Hancock, N. Y.	Pratt, Ruth	

NOT VOTING—49

Bell	Golder	Kurtz	Spearing
Brunner	Goodwin	Langley	Stevenson
Clark, N. C.	Houston, Del.	Lanham	Taylor, Colo.
Connolly	Hudspeth	Larsen	Thompson
Corning	James, N. C.	Lea	Underhill
Coyle	Johnson, Ill.	Mansfield	Underwood
Craddock	Johnston, Mo.	Michaelson	Vinson, Ga.
Davenport	Kearns	O'Connor, La.	Whitehead
Dorsey	Kemp	Oliver, N. Y.	Wurzbach
Doutrich	Kennedy	Reid, Ill.	Yates
Fitzgerald	Kiefner	Rowbottom	
Frear	Korell	Sanders, N. Y.	
Garrett	Kunz	Short, Mo.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. Connolly and Mr. Vinson of Georgia (for) with Mr. Kennedy (against).

Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Lanham (for) with Mr. Oliver of New York (against).

Mr. Kurtz and Mr. Stevenson (for) with Mr. Brunner (against).

Mr. Larsen and Mr. Taylor of Colorado (for) with Mr. Golder (against).

Mr. Garrett and Mr. Coyle (for) with Mr. Corning (against).

Mr. Johnson of Illinois and Mr. Reid of Illinois (for) with Mr. Kunz (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Doutrich with Mr. Clark of North Carolina.
Mr. Frear with Mr. Dorsey.
Mr. Underhill with Mr. James of North Carolina.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Sanders of New York with Mr. Underwood.
Mr. Korell with Mr. Whitehead.
Mr. Short of Missouri with Mr. Spearing.
Mr. Kiefner with Mr. Bell.
Mrs. Langley with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Hudspeth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber during the call, but if present I would have voted "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

House Resolution 370 was laid on the table.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH AND WELFARE OF MOTHERS AND INFANTS

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 255, for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers, infants, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 255), an act for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

JAMES S. PARKER,
JOHN G. COOPER,
SAM RAYBURN,
Managers on the part of the House.
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
W. L. JONES,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 255, entitled "An act for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the conference report, namely, that the Senate has receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, which provided that in addition to promoting the health and welfare of mothers and infants the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the general health of the rural population of the United States and extending the provision of the act to Alaska and authorizing an additional appropriation in order to take care of the additional territory. The second amendment corrects the title so as to make it conform to the body of the act.

JAMES S. PARKER,
JOHN G. COOPER,
SAM RAYBURN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate receded from its disagreement and accepted the bill exactly as we passed it on Friday. The conference report shows that it is exactly the same bill that the House voted on and passed on Friday.

Mr. TUCKER. How about the increased appropriation?

Mr. PARKER. Five thousand dollars was added to take care of Alaska. That was done in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

REDUCED CAR FARE FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the special reduced street car fare bill for school children which has been signed by the President. That is a measure for which I have been fighting ever since the convening of the Sixty-sixth Congress. It is a shame that for all these years the 69,875 school children of Washington have had to pay full car fare. They will now have a 3-cent fare.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAYS FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 471, providing for a Saturday half holiday for certain Government employees, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act providing for Saturday half holidays for certain Government employees

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the effective date of this act four hours, exclusive of time for luncheon, shall constitute a day's work on Saturdays throughout the year, with pay or earnings for the day the same as on other days when full time is worked, for all civil employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, exclusive of employees of the Postal Service, employees of the Panama Canal on the Isthmus, and employees of the Interior Department in the field, whether on the hourly, per diem, per annum, piecework, or other basis: *Provided*, That in all cases where for special public reasons, to be determined by the head of the department or establishment having supervision or control of such employees, the services of such employees can not be spared, such employees shall be entitled to an equal shortening of the workday on some other day: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not deprive employees of any leave or holidays with pay to which they may now be entitled under existing laws.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER]

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Civil Service last May. It was understood at that time that if the bill reported by the Post Office Committee granting a half holiday each week to postal employees was passed and sent to the President, that this bill would be allowed to come up for the consideration of the House.

This bill grants the Saturday half holiday to the other employees of the Federal Government, and I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that 44 out of the 48 States of the Union have laws providing for a Saturday half holiday to all State employees.

Moreover, this legislation has repeatedly been recommended by the Civil Service Commission and by the Comptroller General.

Mr. GREEN. Does this apply to the District of Columbia or all over the country?

Mr. DALLINGER. With one or two slight exceptions, it applies to all civilian employees of the Federal Government, except the postal employees, who are taken care of by a law enacted by this Congress. The Civil Service Commission has recommended this legislation for the reason that the practice of granting a Saturday half holiday to Federal employees is not uniform throughout the country. It depends upon the official in charge. In many cases the collector of customs or the collector of internal revenue or some other Federal official in charge, as the case may be, gives his employees a Saturday half holiday because throughout the country, particularly in the cities, the Saturday half holiday has come to be an accepted fact. On the other hand, other officials in charge of Federal offices do not give their employees the Saturday half holiday but make them work Saturday afternoons whether there is anything really important to do or not. It, therefore, frequently happens that the clerical offices in the Federal building or a Federal establishment, such as a navy yard or arsenal, are the only mercantile or manufacturing establishments in their neighborhood where the employees are obliged to work Saturday afternoon. It is for that reason that the Civil Service Commission has recommended and urged that the practice in this regard be made uniform throughout the country.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. GLOVER. We have already passed a bill granting a half holiday to the postal employees.

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. And this will place all of them upon the same plane?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BURTNESS. The postal employees' bill is a 44 hour a week bill, with Saturday afternoon off.

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. How many hours do the Federal employees in the District of Columbia, generally speaking, work during the week?

Mr. DALLINGER. I am very glad the gentleman has raised that question.

Mr. BURTNESS. I have the impression that most of the employees now work 7 hours a day for 6 days, which would make a total of 42 hours, or two hours less than the postal employees work.

Mr. DALLINGER. I take it the gentleman is referring only to the clerks in the District of Columbia, as the employees of the Government Printing Office, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the Washington Navy Yard work eight hours a day.

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. As a matter of fact, the determination of the hours of labor of the clerks in the District of Columbia is entirely in the hands of the heads of the departments. A good many years ago, in fact in 1901, Congress passed an act making Saturdays after 12 o'clock noon legal holidays for all purposes in the District of Columbia, but the heads of the executive departments have apparently paid no attention to the law. The clerks in the District of Columbia actually enjoy a Saturday half holiday during four months in the year by Executive proclamation.

Mr. BURTNESS. I am glad they do.

Mr. DALLINGER. But when the matter has been brought to the attention of the different Presidents—and the gentleman will find this law in the District Code, title 22, section 126, page 308—and they have been asked why it has not been enforced, the matter usually has been referred by them to the members of the Cabinet and that has been the last of it. So far as the law is concerned, all of the clerks in the District of Columbia are now supposed to have every Saturday afternoon in the year.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Will this cure that defect?

Mr. DALLINGER. I think so. If the law recently enacted providing for a half holiday for postal employees is carrried out, there is no reason why the provisions of this bill should not be carried out.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Will it be carried out?

Mr. DALLINGER. I think so, because, as I am informed, President Coolidge told representatives of the Government employees that he was unwilling by Executive proclamation to extend the Saturday half holiday beyond four months in the year, as he thought the matter ought to be decided by the Congress. In regard to the hours during the day that the clerks in the District of Columbia work, the shorter hours in the District are entirely due to the action of Congress. When I first came to Congress a Representative from the State of Missouri, Mr. Borland by name, tried year after year to have enacted in the form of a rider on an appropriation bill a provision compelling Government employees in the District of Columbia to work eight hours each day, and Congress every time by an overwhelming vote defeated the proposition. So if the clerks in the District of Columbia are working less than an 8-hour day it is due entirely to the action of Congress.

Mr. BURTNESS. The fact is, is it not, that they are now working 7 hours a day, and if this bill passes it will mean 7 hours for five days, or 35 hours, plus 4 hours on Saturday, or a week consisting of 39 hours? Is that correct?

Mr. DALLINGER. It will be a 39-hour week, but, as I have already stated, the hours they have to work are entirely in the hands of the heads of departments. As a matter of fact, a great many of them frequently work more than 44 hours a week, and some of them much longer than that. I know of one employee in the Supervising Architect's office who has worked every night until almost midnight for weeks.

Mr. BURTNESS. That is because of his interest in his work and his desire to do so, is it not?

Mr. DALLINGER. Not only that, but because of the rush of work. A head of a department or bureau can compel any clerk in the District of Columbia to stay after hours, and even can make that clerk come back in the evening and work, is he so desires, and there is no overtime paid.

Mr. BURTNESS. But that is the exception and not the rule?

Mr. BEEDY. Why is there not any provision in this bill for a 44-hour week, so as to make it uniform with other employees? Why make a distinction here?

Mr. DALLINGER. We are simply carrying out the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission for a uniform Saturday half holiday throughout the service.

Mr. BEEDY. But in getting that uniform half holiday you are making a 39-hour week for thousands of Federal employees as against the 44-hour week for others. I am wondering whether we will get into trouble on account of that.

Mr. DALLINGER. As a matter of fact, as I have already pointed out, so far as the law is concerned, all the Government employees in the District of Columbia are already supposed to have every Saturday afternoon off, but they do not get it.

This law was passed in 1901, making every Saturday after 12 o'clock noon a legal holiday for all purposes in the District of Columbia. The reason that Government clerks in the District of Columbia do not work as many hours per day as similar Government employees in the rest of the country or as many hours as the employees in the navy yards, the Government Printing Office, or the production department of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is because Congress has refused to increase the time and require them to work eight hours. As a matter of fact, the heads of departments can make them work just as many hours as they desire.

Mr. BEEDY. But I do not see how this bill will correct the fact that they now have a half holiday but do not get it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CARTER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. CARTER of California. I am very much in sympathy with the legislation, but I notice there is excluded Interior Department employees in the field. I presume there is some particular reason for doing that.

Mr. DALLINGER. We tried to make this bill acceptable as far as possible to the heads of departments. The Secretary of the Interior represented to the committee that there were certain employees in the field in his department that were seasonal; that is, young men who were working their way through college and who were employed in the national parks during the summer, and it was felt that the Saturday half holiday should not apply to them. With regard to employees of the Panama Canal, the President and Secretary of War already have full authority to regulate the hours of labor there.

Mr. CARTER of California. Just one other question. This applies to those who are working on part time or piecework.

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of California. How does the gentleman propose to reckon their earnings in the hours they are not working?

Mr. DALLINGER. I will ask the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of our committee, Mr. LEHLBACH, to answer that question.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The piecework basis is estimated. Today's pay is estimated on the average piecework, and in that way the matter is adjusted. With regard to piecework in the Government, the pieces are not actually counted, but an average is struck.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts one additional minute.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend as a part of my remarks the report of the Committee on the Civil Service on this bill, which I prepared by direction of the committee, and which concisely states the reasons for this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[House Report No. 1498, Seventy-first Congress, second session]

SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAYS FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DALLINGER, from the Committee on the Civil Service, submitted the following report (to accompany S. 471):

The Committee on the Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill S. 471, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with a recommendation that the bill as amended be passed. The amendments are as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

"A bill providing for Saturday half holidays for certain Government employees."

Strike out all of line 7 after the word "all," in line 8, and line 9 to and including the word "Government" in line 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "civil employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, exclusive of employees of the Postal Service, employees of the Panama Canal on the Isthmus, and employees of the Interior Department in the field," so that the bill will read as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That on and after the effective date of this act four hours, exclusive of time for luncheon, shall constitute a day's work on Saturdays throughout the year, with pay or earnings for the day the same as on other days when full time is worked, for all civil employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, exclusive of employees of the Postal Service, employees of the Panama Canal on the Isthmus, and employees of the Interior Department in the field, whether on the hourly, per diem, per annum, piecework, or other basis: *Provided*, That in all cases where for special public reasons, to be determined by the head of the department or establishment having supervision or control of such employees, the services of such employees can not be spared, such employees shall be entitled to an equal shortening of the workday on some other day: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not deprive employees of any leave or holidays with pay to which they may now be entitled under existing laws."

This bill, if enacted, will establish a 4-hour workday on Saturday throughout the year, without loss of pay, for all civil employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, except those employed in the Postal Service, those in the field service of the Department of the Interior, and employees of the Panama Canal on the Isthmus, practically all of whom are working under the provisions of the 8-hour law.

Employees of the Postal Service have been excluded from the provisions of the bill for the reason that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has already reported a similar bill applying to all postal employees, which is on the Union Calendar. The field service of the Department of the Interior was excluded by the committee on account of the objections made by the Chiefs of Bureaus of Reclamation, Forestry, and National Parks, and the Indian Bureau, the field services of the three latter bureaus being very largely composed of temporary employees during the summer vacation period. The Panama Canal employees on the Isthmus were excluded because the committee felt that this service has other compensating advantages, and that the conditions of employment can be regulated by the Secretary of War under authority of the President without congressional enactment.

Employees of the Government Printing Office are included in the provisions of the bill, although legislation affecting this branch of the Government service does not ordinarily come before the Committee on the Civil Service. This action was taken in view of a statement made under date of February 11, 1930, by the Public Printer to S. M. Lee, clerk of the Committee on Printing of the United States Senate, which read in part as follows:

"I respectfully recommend that your committee propose an amendment to the Jones bill (S. 471), which is now on the Senate Calendar (No. 70), striking out the words "and the Government Printing Office" from line 9, page 1, of the bill. The elimination of those words would make the Jones bill, providing for a 44-hour week, applicable to the Government Printing Office as well as to other Government employees."

The United States Civil Service Commission, to which a number of House bills granting Saturday half holidays to different groups of Government employees were referred for comment, stated, through its secretary, Mr. John T. Doyle, in a letter to Hon. FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH, chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service, that—

"The commission desires to state with reference to these bills in general that in the larger cities especially, in conformity with business usage in their localities, many, if not all, of the Federal establishments, in common with private business, observe the half-day holiday on Saturday afternoon. It is important to note that the District of Columbia Code provides that every Saturday after 12 o'clock noon shall be a holiday in the District for all purposes. Under an Executive order of May 9, 1927, from the first Saturday of June to the last Saturday of September, both inclusive, of each year, four hours, exclusive of time for luncheon, constitutes a day's work on Saturdays for all clerks and other employees of the Federal Government. The order permits exceptions to be made by the head of the department or establishment where the practice authorized is inconsistent with the provisions of existing law.

"It will be seen that there is thus an inconsistency of practice between the field and the departmental services, since the Government for only four months of the year follows the customs of banks and business houses in closing on Saturday afternoons.

"By statute the departments properly have the right to require employees to serve additional hours or on holidays when necessary.

"The legislation proposed is in general in keeping with the trend in outside business, and the commission favors conformity with the code in this matter. Reference is made to the comment by the Reclassification Commission on March 12, 1920, in House Document No. 686, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled 'Report of the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries,' on page 92, where it is stated that as contrasted with the Government's policy regarding leave of absence 'many progressive employers in the business and industrial world, especially in the larger cities, grant their office employees two weeks' vacation and every Saturday afternoon with pay.'

"It is believed legislation of the kind proposed should affect all classes of Federal employees alike, and no particular class or group should be favored unless for administrative reasons."

The Comptroller General also favors the proposed legislation. In a letter to Chairman LEHLBACH, of the Civil Service Committee, under date of May 16, 1930, he writes:

"In view of the lack of uniformity and because of the long-existing practice of the executives of requiring a full day's work on Saturdays except during the summer months, it would no doubt avoid much confusion and complaint if the matter should be covered by specific legislation * * *. As the administrative head of the General Accounting Office I would favor the granting of Saturday half holidays to all Federal employees where services may be spared, which would be in harmony with the trend of employment policies in the commercial world."

The language of the bill in question follows in a general way the Executive order issued by the President on May 9, 1927, which grants a 4-hour workday on Saturday for four months of the year, and which permits full pay for all those employees whose services can be spared. The Executive order above mentioned, however, does not provide compensating time off on any other day of the week in the few exceptional cases where the services of employees can not be spared on Saturday. These employees, under the terms of the proposed bill, would be entitled to a shortening of the workday on some other day of the week, which, of course, would be determined by the head of the department or bureau in which they work.

By enacting this legislation, therefore, Congress will not be establishing a new practice, but will merely be keeping pace with developments that have been going on in private industry for some time.

The cost to the Government of the proposed legislation can not very well be estimated since it does not involve a direct cost and may or may not reduce the quantity of work performed. In private business the experience has been that it has not materially reduced the output. Moreover, there is no evidence that the granting of Saturday half holidays to the Government employees of the District of Columbia four months of the year has resulted in any increased cost to the Government.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. This bill will in no way disturb the half holiday law that was passed for postal employees?

Mr. DALLINGER. Not in the least. The postal employees are specifically excepted from this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It would not disturb the other law in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. DALLINGER. Not at all.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. In correspondence with the gentleman or his committee it was indicated that employees of the Interior Department who were not actually in the field, as far as outside the cities is concerned, would be benefited by this bill, and the amendment has not been made. The employees of the Interior Department in the field have been excluded. Now, "employees in the field" has been construed by the Comptroller General to mean everybody away from Washington. For instance, in the city of Denver, Colo., there are over 250 employees in the Interior Department, and they are in the office and not in the field.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to see this Saturday half holiday bill being favored by my colleagues from Massachusetts. It seems that Massachusetts rather has the floor to-day, with Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. DALLINGER.

In Massachusetts, of course, we have the half holiday for State employees on Saturday. I am glad to see that Congress to-day proposes to make Saturday a half holiday for Government employees.

Incidentally, I understand that this bill which is reported to the House to-day is the product of the brain of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK.

The bill proposed by the gentleman, Mr. McCORMACK, of all bills which were introduced in the committee, when the bills were referred to the different departments of the Government, was the bill which received the sanction of all de-

partmental heads, and therefore I think great credit should be given to Mr. McCORMACK to-day for his fine work in behalf of the Government workers and seeing to it that they get this Saturday half holiday.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Is Mr. McCORMACK the gentleman who is responsible for making the people who work in the offices outside of Washington, work on Saturday afternoons in the Interior Department?

Mr. CONNERY. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] explained that matter thoroughly a few moments ago.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] did not answer a word.

Mr. CONNERY. That is the gentleman's judgment. I listened to him and I thought he explained the matter very fully.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I do not want to detract at all from the credit which should go to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], but I call attention to the fact that we are considering the Senate bill introduced by Senator JONES, of Washington.

Mr. CONNERY. This bill was introduced in the House and it is substantially the same bill which Senator JONES introduced in the Senate except that the McCormack bill goes further and covers all Government employees rather than a limited class.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; they are similar bills.

Mr. CONNERY. But the real credit, as I understand the matter, belongs to my colleague, Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts, who has been making a valiant fight for a long time for this measure.

I expect this measure will pass the House overwhelmingly, and I wanted to take this opportunity to congratulate the House on passing such fine legislation for the Government workers.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Hearings were held on the McCormack bill?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Did the hearings develop the economic effect this would have on labor throughout the country?

Mr. CONNERY. I think so. When this bill passes, other employers will follow the practice of the Government on the Saturday half holiday and, eventually we will get around to a 5-day week, which I think will do much to clear up the depression and do away with overproduction.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I think the country generally is more interested in this national effect, of which the gentleman speaks, than in limiting it to the District of Columbia.

Mr. CONNERY. I think the national effect will be very salutary, and eventually we are coming to the 5-day week anyway, which, in my opinion, will be a fine thing for the country and necessary in view of the tremendous substitution of machinery for human labor that has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. [Applause.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this House recently passed the 44-hour bill for the postal employees and the President signed that legislation. I sincerely hope he will approve this measure when it reaches him, and thus put the great number of employees in other branches of the Federal service on the same basis. I am quite sure there is no man in this House who really opposes this legislation. We have reached a point in our development in this country where we recognize the fact that 44 hours a week is long enough for any man to have to work in the Federal service. In spite of that fact, however, we have in the Federal prisons of this great Government guards who are working 70 hours a week, and I hope that in the next session of Congress legislation will be provided to stop that condition, which is deplorable. This bill in itself will give them at least a half day off each week, and it will help them to that extent.

It is a pleasure to pay tribute to our colleagues on the committee who have so diligently pressed this legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. DALLINGER, and the chairman of the committee. They deserve full credit for all that has been done in behalf of this measure. As I recall, no member of the committee was opposed to it, and the committee has been diligent in its efforts during this entire session in trying to get this measure before the House. We want to express our gratification to the Speaker for his courtesy in permitting us to bring it up at this late hour. I hope it will go through conference without any objection on the part of the Senate to the changes we have found necessary to make.

The employees of this great Government are diligent and faithful and I know they are entitled to this Saturday half holiday which this bill will give them. It is a pleasure for me to support it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I wish to say a word in opposition to this proposal. We passed a bill some days ago which, I understand, is in the hands of the President, limiting the hours of employees in the Postal Service to 44 hours a week. It occurs to me that is about as little as anybody ought to work; in other words, they ought to be gracious enough and liberal enough to work 44 hours a week for Uncle Sam. If this bill becomes a law, this is going to be the situation under it: They will work but 39 hours a week, and the next thing that will happen will be the postal employees coming in and asking that they be permitted to work only 39 hours a week. Following what we did for the postal employees the employees in the service here are using that as a leverage to accomplish this purpose. If we do the thing they are now asking us to do we will again be discriminating against the postal employees, and at the very next session of this Congress or very soon thereafter there will be a bill before this House from the postal employees asking that their hours of labor be reduced at least to 39 hours per week, or perhaps under that, and directly we will yield to the demand.

It strikes me that we have been very liberal in fixing the hours of employment for Government employees. I remember when Mr. Borland, with all the earnestness of his being, and he was a very earnest man, thought that the employees of the Federal Government should work at least eight hours a day, but he failed in his endeavor.

They have gotten along pretty well, and we have not heard of anybody being overworked in the Government departments. There may be occasionally some man conscientious enough or some woman conscientious enough to work a little bit of overtime, but they are the exception. I will warrant you that if you go into any of these departments you will find that most of them quit at noon for their luncheon and at the end of the day's work on Government time. They are already up and ready to go; they have fixed themselves and ready to quit when the gong rings, and some of them ahead of that time, with the exception of those who are conscientious enough to work up to the required time. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that the majority of the people in the Government service have more regard for their hours and their wages than they have for the work they are doing. There is no doubt about that. If you will go into any of these departments to-day, you will find at least one-third more employees than you would find in a commercial institution doing the same character of work. So to my mind there is no justification for the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of the House, I hate mightily to differ with my friend Mr. WOOD, because as a rule he is a very safe man to follow in matters of legislation. However, I am particularly interested in the navy-yard employees. It does seem to me that it is unthinkable in this modern day that they should be required to work from 8 o'clock in the morning until 4.30 in the afternoon, from Monday until Saturday, and not have Saturday afternoon off. I do not know what effect this is going to have in the District, and I do think that 44 hours a week is enough for any Government employee to work.

It does seem to me, however, that in this modern age we should give them at least Saturday afternoon off, and I hope that the measure will carry. I am glad it has come up, even at this late day in the session. I have been hoping it would come up all during the session.

Giving these men Saturday afternoon off is what I am interested in and what they are interested in. They are willing to give full service and full time if they can get Saturday afternoon for recreation and enjoyment. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GRANFIELD].

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. DALLINGER] to urge the passage of the Saturday half holiday bill for certain Federal employees.

I wish to take the time to preface my remarks to compliment Mr. McCORMACK, the gentleman from Massachusetts, whose indefatigable and successful advocacy of this legislation brings it for consideration to the floor of the House to-day. He is the author of this bill, and I know that he will receive the gratitude of thousands of employees who will be benefited by its passage.

The gentlemen who have preceded me have presented to the House clearly and ably the purposes of this bill. This legislation should have been enacted into law years ago. Nearly every State in our Union allows its employees a half holiday on Saturday. The greatest commercial and industrial institutions throughout the United States have followed this policy of half holidays on Saturday. It is only fitting and proper that our Government which has already adopted this policy should extend its policy to the Federal employees affected by this bill.

It is possible to bring to the attention of the Members many other reasons why this legislation should be enacted into law. In doing so I would be covering, partially at least, the trend of the arguments already advanced by other Members who have spoken in behalf of this bill. I am heartily in accord with this legislation, and I trust it will receive the unanimous support of the Members of this branch of the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the pending bill, but it is not my purpose to discuss this measure now. I have asked for time to-day to discuss another subject, and respectfully request that I not be interrupted until I have finished.

Mr. Speaker, during the closing hours of each session of Congress that it has been my privilege to be a Member, administration leaders have deemed it their duty to arise and solemnly announce from this floor that the administration in power at Washington has been eminently successful with its legislative program. The Congress and the country have been assured by the leaders near the close of every session, irrespective of whether it happens to be a regular or lame-duck session, that the powers that be have given the country "the most constructive legislative program in the history of this Republic."

I have been wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the House leaders of this Congress would, in the face of the record of the present session, follow the usual course of handing the House the same old stereotyped speeches. But I see they are running true to form. Already the annual speeches have begun. The distinguished and affable majority leader, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], will no doubt soon arise on this floor and perform his usual annual task. It is amusing that even the many "swan songs" of our retiring Members have been brimming over with praises for the G. O. P. and its "constructive" party program that most of them have followed so blindly in the past, and which, in a great measure, is responsible for the defeat of over 50 Members of this House at the last election.

Not only have our Republican leaders persisted in their solemn declarations that each Congress has been the "most constructive" in the entire history of the Republic, but we are invariably told by the leaders on the other side of this aisle that the party in power has been the only real, true friend of the farmer and small business man. The Republican Party, however, has pledged its undying support to agriculture and business so often and broken those promises so regularly the public has begun to realize, as evidenced by the last election, that such pledges were insincere and obviously made for campaign purposes only. [Applause.]

A quarter of a century ago the slogan of the Republican Party was, as many of you no doubt recall, "the full dinner pail"; but with five to seven millions of men out of work, walking the streets and highways looking for jobs, and with unemployment in the most deplorable and distressing condition for the past 50 years, our Republican friends have long since been forced to abandon that time-worn slogan. "The full dinner pail" is now a memory. It was discredited and junked and a new slogan was of necessity born and brought forth to bolster up the party in power.

Despite the serious and unprecedented slump in business within the last several months, a condition that is the natural consequence of unfair and stupid legislation, the Republican Party has the unmitigated gall to continue to boldy declare its perpetuation in power is essential to a guaranty of good times. "Vote the Republican ticket and insure business prosperity" is another time-worn slogan that was adopted years ago as a sort of substitute for the "full dinner pail"; but that slogan, like the former, has been demonstrated to be a myth, a sham, and a fraud. For the past two years "Hoover prosperity" has been the butt of many jokes. However, with unprecedented poverty and want stalking through this land, it has ceased to become a joke. It is now a national tragedy. It is a serious situation when millions of American citizens are on the verge of starvation; when countless children of honest, loyal, American citizens go to bed each night hungry for bread, while at the same time granaries of American farmers are literally bursting with wheat they can not sell. It is not a joke, but a travesty and a humbug for the party in power to boast of being the alpha and omega of business prosperity in the face of the depressed and panicky conditions that have so far unmistakably marked the Hoover prosperity program. [Applause.]

In January, 1930, the then Secretary of Labor issued a statement reluctantly admitting that business had been "somewhat depressed" since the stock-market crash in 1929, but added, in effect, that business was then "picking up." Two weeks later the world was again assured that many were going back to work and that business in general was, by that time, "looking up." Some one has suggested that business was then, and is still, "looking up," lying flat on its back and helpless—but "looking up." It is interesting to recall that every two or three weeks thereafter for several months the distinguished Secretary of Labor sent forth statements from the Capital assuring the country that "every day in every way" business was becoming better and better. Similar reassuring statements came out of Washington at regular intervals throughout the year 1930, and

yet, in the face of such high-powered political propaganda, it must be now admitted that from the date of the inauguration of President Hoover until this hour business conditions have grown constantly worse. To-day legitimate business in America is not crippled—it is paralyzed!

Some of our Republican friends say it is unfair to charge the party in power with responsibility for this extended panic. Then, may I ask upon whose shoulders the responsibility may properly fall? Had prosperity smiled upon America the G. O. P. would have claimed all credit and glory, but when disaster comes the party in power throws up its hands in holy horror and vainly attempts to shun all responsibility.

Still another slogan of the Republican Party we heard so frequently in 1928, but which party leaders are now trying to forget, is the famous farm plank in their platform adopted at Kansas City, which so solemnly pledged that if returned to power the party would "place agriculture on equality with industries." The first gesture of the Hoover administration to carry out that campaign pledge was the calling of a special session and the rushing of the so-called farm relief bill through Congress. A bill was prepared behind closed doors and sponsored by a few of the faithful followers of "Farmer" Mellon and others who "farm" Wall Street. That so-called farm bill was presented to Congress by a committee of 15—11 of whom lived north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi Rivers—and passed with little debate and practically no consideration. We were forced to accept the administration's bill or nothing. Under that so-called relief bill the Federal Farm Board was set up, and the farmer has been "relieved" of about everything he had left. Every time the Farm Board has made a move with respect to any farm commodity the price of that commodity has gone down. The board went into the stock market and bought 60,000,000 bushels of wheat, and the price of wheat went down to the lowest levels within the past quarter of a century. The board still holds that wheat, the inevitable effect of which is to terrorize and practically destroy the wheat market. The same or similar situation exists in the cotton market. The "noble experiments" of the Farm Board have been so disastrous to the farmers and so universally criticized that two of the Farm Board members have expressed their intention to resign. That seems to be about the only move made on the part of the Farm Board which will meet with the unanimous approval of the farmers of America. [Applause.]

Surely, Mr. Speaker, no one will arise on this floor and pretend to say that the present administration has fulfilled its sacred pledge to place agriculture on a parity with industries.

Then, to add insult to injury, the next step for the alleged purpose of keeping campaign promises of helping agriculture and restoring prosperity was the passage of a high tariff bill, the highest known in history. Rates were made higher than the highest of high-tariff advocates ever dreamed. A tariff wall was constructed so high around America that it virtually destroyed foreign commerce, and now other countries have retaliated by passing measures against the United States. The tariff bill was written and rushed through Congress in a similar fashion as was the farm bill. Farmer Mellon and his faithful followers were again the guiding factors. The tariff bill was lobbied and logrolled through the Congress of the United States in a shameful manner. During the limited discussion of the measure we were promised that business conditions would immediately revive upon the passage of the tariff act, and within six months, we were repeatedly assured, the country would be back to normalcy. Had business improved in the slightest the tariff bill would have been held up by its sponsors as the predominating factor. It is fair, then, to say that the tariff is responsible in a large measure for the nation-wide depression that followed, and has continued since its passage. It heaped additional burdens upon the American people—farmers, laborers, and business men—without giving anything in return, and an outraged public expressed itself in no uncertain terms at the election held the following fall.

It was during the consideration of the tariff bill that the people of America really began to understand the oft-repeated declaration of the party in power that it is the friend of business. It was plainly discernible then, as now, that "business" with our Republican friends means "big business"—corporate wealth, special interests, power trusts, steel trusts, international banks, and bond brokers with foreign securities. These special interests did not hesitate to send their representatives to Washington and ask for everything but the dome of the Capitol at the hand of this "business" administration; and "big business" got all it asked. For example, the Steel Trust demanded increased protection in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. Some of the steel corporations had made only 37 per cent interest on their investments the year previous, while others boasted of profits of 82 per cent and more. Their business had also shown a decided increase, while the farmers and small business men were going bankrupt.

On the other hand, the utter lack of any consideration shown the independent oil producers of the United States by this administration that has professed its loyalty and love for business men is one of the many glaring examples of the lack of sympathy or understanding on the part of the powers now in control at Washington of an American industry in dire distress.

Thousands of independent oil operators representing some 30 States, who have been reduced to poverty on account of the importation of foreign oil produced by cheap foreign labor, came to Congress and asked for relief in the tariff act, and again we saw the mighty hand of the Secretary of the Treasury, whom "big business" has designated as the "greatest Secretary since Alexander Hamilton." Never in the history of this Republic has any other one individual so completely dominated the Government at Washington as has Mellon. Although this "business administration," by its last tariff act, raised the price on all materials the oil producer must use in connection with his operations, which incidentally includes steel, it turned the deaf ear to the independent oil producers and 100,000 laborers in their employ and favored the Royal Dutch Shell, a foreign corporation, and the Standard Oil, that connived with the Mellon crowd to put the independent oil operators out of business.

During the session now drawing to a close, the independent oil producers again presented their case to Congress. I attended these hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, and what an unusual case they made. These independent producers sponsored the Capper-Garber embargo bill and presented abundant and overwhelming evidence in their demands for immediate relief, but again the boasted party of protection ignored the pleas of these American business men. Again the party in power decided in favor of foreign corporations which with foreign capital and cheap foreign labor have all but destroyed a legitimate American industry. The action of that great committee in recommending another investigation of the oil situation and report back to Congress is in keeping with the policy of the Hoover administration of evading issues by appointing commissions. "Passing the buck" seems to be the order of the day at Washington.

And so the Republican Party, in full control of all branches of government, has failed dismally as the protector of American business, except, of course, the special interests that call themselves "big business." The party's pledges and slogans must needs be relegated to the scrap heap. The Steel Trust and Oil Trust have replaced the "trust" the farmers and legitimate business interests once had in the Republican Party.

It is needless for me to add that such a deplorable, nation-wide economic situation presents an excellent opportunity for real service by the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Bryan, and Wilson. Never in the history of this Republic has the time been when progressive thought throughout the country, including many independent Republicans, was so thoroughly

disgusted as it is to-day with the party in power. The eyes of the world are turning to the Democrats to lead the way in bringing order out of chaos. Will our party be able to rise to the occasion and stand foursquare for a constructive program, or is it possible that the party of Jefferson, with its splendid record of outstanding achievements in the interest of humanity and honest government, will forget fundamentals and go off after strange gods? With a progressive, constructive program and sane leadership the Democratic Party will again come into its own, and the party of special privilege, which has demonstrated so conclusively that it is long on promises but decidedly short on performance, will be scourged and driven from high places of power. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this legislation which provides a half holiday on Saturday for all Government employees for the entire year for two reasons especially. One is I believe the employees are entitled to a half-day holiday each week for rest and attention to their own affairs, and, in the second place, I believe they will render better service to the Government if it is given to them. By Executive order half holiday on Saturday for four months in the year has been granted for a numbers of years in the District of Columbia. There is no evidence that it has resulted in any increased cost to the Government. The enactment of this legislation will not be establishing a new practice, but will merely be in keeping with the development that has been going on by private industry for a long while. In other words, it will be in accordance with the prevailing and growing sentiment in private industry to grant a half holiday all the year on Saturday. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. I am pleased that this bill, unlike the immigration bill you forced through the House under false and misleading representations, by the professional restrictionists, will be of some benefit to the few Government employees; and I regret that it does not apply to the working people of the United States in general.

I hope that in the near future there will be passed such legislation that will establish not only a 4-hour workday on Saturday but also a law that will establish a 40-hour week. And if you gentlemen are really the friends of the laboring man, as you profess to be, and as you assure them—before the elections—you are, and if you will show but one-half of the interest for them, in this bill, as you have shown in the immigration bill, such legislation could be passed without delay.

The statements made on the floor of the House as to the number of immigrants coming over were untrue and were deliberately made for the purpose of misleading the House and the Nation.

For five years I have advocated the restricting of Mexican, Canadian, and West Indies immigration; but the administration and the beneficiaries of this cheap labor—needed for the lumber and textile industries—on the one hand, and the railroads and the cotton planters' Sugar and Beet Trust on the other, have had such remarkable influence with these professional restrictionists that they have remained blind to the true situation and have failed to assist me. Under the pretext that it will aid unemployment, this bill was forced through in violation of all the rules of the House, and in a most arbitrary manner. Anyone with any degree of intelligence knows that this is nothing more than a false sham; since these people—to be prohibited from coming, by this bill—are for the greater part the wives and children of declarants and parents of American citizens, too old on the one hand, or too young on the other, to "seek the places of the American laboring man." Nevertheless, these false statements are being used constantly to unload on these few unfortunate immigrants the sins of the administration and its staunch "protectionists" in total disregard of their party pledge, adopted June 14, 1928, and on which President Hoover and the present Republican Congressmen were elected, which, while favoring continued restrictions, expressly provided:

> Where, however, the law works undue hardship by depriving the immigrant of the comfort and society of those bound by close family ties, such modification should be adopted as will afford relief.

How strange it is, that in one breath the President and some of you would-be leaders on the floor, say that the panic and depression is world-wide, and in the very next charge it to the few innocent children, wives, parents, and relatives of those American citizens who sacrificed their lives for our flag. The most ignorant will see through these false accusations and untrue charges.

I am now ready and willing to vote for the restriction of immigration from Mexico, Canada, and the West Indies; and am equally willing to put a complete stop to the immigration from the Philippines. But that can be done only by giving them their independence. For, to first refuse their release on the one hand and to then deny them admission on the other would meet with condemnation on the part of the civilized world.

The gentleman from Texas made a statement to the effect that—

> The 5,000,000 immigrants in the last five or six years are responsible for the depression.

That statement is as untrue as the others made by the proponents of this bill. The reports of the Department of Labor show that during the five months, from July to November, 1930, there were but 69,082 immigrants admitted to our shores.

If you gentlemen were in earnest in your desire to restrict Canadian, Mexican, British, and the Indies immigration to the same extent as European—even stopping completely all immigration from Europe—you could have easily done so, at any time during the session, without violating the rights and the privileges of the Members of the House in gross disregard of all the rules of the House.

In the palmiest days of Cannon and Cannonism and of Reed czarism, the constitutional rights and privileges of the Members of the House were never so wrongfully and brazenly violated as they were last Saturday night, when all precedents and rules were entirely swept aside by the Speaker. It is to be regretted that in the last few days of his service as Speaker he should have permitted himself to be used and "bullied" by the small coterie of crazy restrictionists to make impossible the reuniting of unfortunate families after many years of separation.

If that bill is of such vast importance as some of those representing certain secret, vested organizations pretend it to be it could have been called up for consideration anytime during the last week. Instead of devoting days to the Navy specialists, agricultural, and farmer bloc interests, as the oleomargarine bill, the three battleships bill, the "silk stocking" Navy officers' bill, and the real estate steal bill, as well as several other equally unimportant bills, this immigration bill, I repeat, could have been taken up instead. But as is the usual procedure of the Speaker and the manager of the House in the case of immigration bills, they waited until the very last moment—Saturday evening at 7, when all the Members were desirous of leaving and were in no mood to consider same—before calling it up for consideration. And then, after it was taken up under the agreed plan of a special rule, one hour for the rule and three for debate, at the very last moment, in flagrant violation of the rights of the Members, the Speaker, in a high-handed manner, ignored the rule which was being considered and recognized the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] to move to suspend the rule and pass the bill, thereby depriving the Members of any chance or opportunity of offering any amendment thereto or even debate thereon. Such action is unprecedented; it is to be regretted, for it will plague those responsible.

In my 24 years of service, it is the first time that I have witnessed the spectacle of a Speaker, without a quorum, and immediately after a vote has indicated that there were approximately only 136 Members present, with 12 or 16 not

voting, to count (as present) 230 or 240, and to declare a quorum present.

It is, of course, possible for men to err; but it is inexcusable for one occupying the high and important position of the Speaker of the House to make so deliberate and wrongful a count, in violation of true procedure and fair play. I hope that never again will such action be witnessed and permitted in this House, as I feel that the country will not tolerate for long such deplorable methods by the Speaker, who, drunk with power in his temporary occupancy of the chair of this so-called "greatest deliberate body in the world," with impunity, so flagrantly disregarded his oath of office and the rights of the duly elected Representatives of the American people.

And in conclusion, gentlemen, let me state that this bill, which has been forced through by such high-handed and unprecedented procedure, is not in the interests of American labor, as section 3 of the bill clearly makes possible and permits the importation of labor into the United States. And, judging the future by the past, the large industries will be able to import, at any and all times, the labor they seek or the labor they desire, even though this might result in beating down the wages of the American wage earner. But, as I stated, it does prevent the reuniting of unfortunate families.

I am satisfied that in the years to come, you who forced through this legislation will bow your heads in shame at the part which you have played in this manner.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to answer an inquiry that was made by several Members on the Democratic side of the House when they asked me whether or not this bill applied to Federal employees outside of the District of Columbia. The answer to that question is that the bill applies throughout the entire country. It applies not only within the District but also to the field service throughout the entire country, affecting approximately 400,000 employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. And I assume, of course, it applies to the Territories?

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Then why is it you except from the operations of this bill the office employees, almost 500 in number, who work for the Interior Department in the western part of the country?

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I understand the only ones that are excepted from this bill in the Interior Department are those whose work is temporary. These people in the Department of the Interior outside of Washington are in the field. Such was the intention of the members of the committee. If some permanent employees of this department are affected, it is unfortunate, as such was not the intention of the committee. The committee was informed by the department, as I remember it, that during the summer time they employ temporary help whose work is such that this bill would be impracticable in its application to them. So far as the Canal Zone is concerned, I did not want them outside of the provisions of this bill, but it was necessary to make this compromise. Outside of the Canal Zone provision, whatever inequities exist are slight, and can be corrected later. The employees of the Canal Zone should be taken care of at the next session. I am sorry that it was necessary to make a compromise with reference to them, otherwise there was danger of a bill being reported that would have been broader than the limited provisions of the Senate bill.

The only ones excepted, as I understand it, are the temporary employees and those employed in the Panama Canal. This bill is a step in the right direction. As a result of mass production and the substitution of machcinery for human labor it is only fair and proper that the Government should lead the way in trying to induce private employers to adopt ultimately a 5-day week. Practically every State in the Union gives to its employees a Saturday half holiday. Federal employees now get Saturday half holidays four months in each year. I might say that the principle of this bill was approved by all of the departments.

In conclusion, I want to pay my respects to the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEHLBACH] and all members of the committee and to the Member [Mr. DALLINGER] who opened the debate to-day for the manner in which they have devoted their efforts to secure passage of this bill. It is a unanimous report of the committee; all of the membership without regard to party voting to report it. There is complete harmony among the Members on the bill. The Speaker is to be congratulated on permitting the House to pass on this measure. If he had failed or refused to recognize the chairman of the committee to suspend the rules, this bill would have died with this session. This bill ought to pass, and I sincerely trust that the rules will be suspended and the bill sent over to the other body for action, in which event I am confident it will pass at this session. [Applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Civil Service Committee, which drew up and reported out favorably this half holiday bill for the benefit of Federal employees, I wish to state that I worked for this bill in committee and did all I possibly could to see that it reached the floor of the House.

The difficulty up until Saturday was that we could not get this bill on the floor of the House. Some of us drew up a petition to Speaker LONGWORTH to grant us a suspension of the rules, and he has very graciously done so this morning, and now we will pass this bill without difficulty. I was very glad to sign the petition to the Speaker.

This is the richest country in the world, and the Government can very well afford to set a reasonable standard of wages, hours, sanitary conditions, pensions, and retirement to private business and private industry by granting fairness and justice to its own Federal employees.

The Federal Government should also set a high standard for State, municipal, county, and township governments as to the manner in which they should treat their employees. It is to be regretted that private business and private industry, however, has set the standard for the Federal Government. There are 44 States which have already adopted half holidays for employees.

The half holiday on Saturday in private business and private industry is a common thing. Even further, such companies as the Ford Motor Co. of my city have advanced a five-day week with six days' pay as a forward step. Labor is better satisfied and can perform better and develop a higher standard of existence all along the line if it can obtain a five-day week.

People are entitled to more of the open air and of the sunshine and of recreation and are entitled to more letting down of the strain and tension of modern life.

I was very happy to vote and work for the half holiday for postal employees which has already become law during this session of Congress.

This bill covers other Federal employees in the service.

I was very glad to have assisted in the salary increase bill for Federal employees which came out of my committee and has been made law recently. I was also very glad to make the motion to put the retirement legislation as the first order of business in my committee during the last session of Congress. That retirement bill is now law and ended the struggle of many years of Federal employees to make their old age more secure.

This bill as passed to-day has already passed the Senate and will undoubtedly be signed by the President as he has signed the half holiday bill for postal employees. It is a great boon to thousands of Federal employees in Michigan and particularly in my own city of Detroit.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in the West there are a large number of employees in the Department of the

Interior whose work is office work and others who work outside of the offices and literally in the field. The exception in this bill reads:

Employees of the Interior Department in the field.

And the construction of these words by the Comptroller is that everybody outside of Washington are in the field.

Some months ago I pointed out the effect of this construction upon the office employees of the Department of the Interior who were not in the offices in Washington, and received the following letters from Comptroller General McCarl and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER]:

JUNE 5, 1930.

Hon. WILLIAM R. EATON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. EATON: Further reference is made to your letter of May 28, 1930, in which you request answer to an inquiry as follows:

"I have an inquiry in regard to S. 471, which was reported to the House by the Committee on the Civil Service upon May 16, 1930, concerning the interpretation of the language in lines 3 and 4, page 2, consisting of the following words: 'Employees of the Interior Department in the field,' as to whether that language was confined in the land department to the employees of the inspection department, or whether your rules would include in its interpretation the register and other empoyees of a land office such as is operated in Denver, Colo."

In order to show the connection in which the words quoted by you are used, the following is quoted from the bill:

"That on and after the effective date of this act four hours, exclusive of time for luncheon shall constitute a day's work on Saturdays throughout the year with pay or earnings for the day the same as on other days when full time is worked, for all civil employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, exclusive of employees of the Postal Service, employees of the Panama Canal on the Isthmus, and employees of the Interior Department in the field, whether on the hourly, per diem, per annum, piecework, or other basis: * * *."

The term "field service" or "service in the field" is ordinarily used to designate service other than the departmental service in the District of Columbia. Hence, the field service of the Department of the Interior ordinarily would be understood as including all employees under that department employed outside the departmental service in the District of Columbia. There is nothing in the wording of the bill here under consideration to indicate that the term "field," as used therein, is intended to have a more restricted meaning. It would seem, therefore, that there would be no justification for confining the application of the language in question to employees in the inspection service of the land department, but that it will be necessary, if the bill should become a law, to apply the language to all employees in the field service of the Department of the Interior, including the personnel of the local land offices, all of whom would be excluded from the benefits of the act.

Referring to the report of the Committee on the Civil Service of the House of Representatives, No. 1498, dated May 16, 1930, it is stated:

"* * * The field service of the Department of the Interior was excluded by the committee on account of the objections made by the chiefs of Bureaus of Reclamation, Forestry, and National Parks and the Indian Bureau, the field services of the three latter bureaus being very largely composed of temporary employees during the summer vacation. * * *"

If it is desired to give employees in local land offices the benefit of the act, it is suggested that there be inserted after the word "field" the words "other than employees in local land offices."

Sincerely yours,

J. R. MCCARL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1930.

Hon. W. R. EATON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have read with interest your letter of the 10th inst. with inclosure regarding S. 471 which I recently introduced favorably to the House from the Committee on the Civil Service.

As you perhaps know, this bill was objected to when it came up in the House a few days ago but I believe it will again be considered at the next session of Congress.

As introduced the bill was intended to exclude only those employees of the Department of the Interior in the field who work temporarily during the summer months, although its wording was such that it applied to all field employees generally. I am happy to say that if the bill is eventually enacted it will be amended so that only the temporary employees above mentioned will be excluded and all permanent employees will enjoy the Saturday half holiday throughout the year.

With warmest personal regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

FRED W. DALLINGER.

I notice that the amendment suggested by the comptroller has been omitted. In discussing it recently with members of the committee, I was assured that an amendment to bring about the same result would be incorporated, and just a few moments ago I was informed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] that it was proposed to amend the words on lines 3 and 4 on page 2 of this S. 471, so that they will read:

And such employees of the Interior Department in the field as the Secretary of the Interior may by regulation exempt from the provisions of this act.

He says these words will meet the situation, and they probably better express the idea to be incorporated. At any rate, with such an amendment, there will be given the opportunity to the Secretary of the Interior to designate which of the office employees outside of Washington will be given the same privileges as to Saturday afternoon work as will be enjoyed by those who work in the city of Washington.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, the title of this bill is an act providing for Saturday half holidays for certain Government employees. The length of time for work during the week has no relation to this Saturday half holiday at all. Saturday half holidays are universal in industry and in business. Forty-four States of the Union have Saturday half-holiday legislation for their own employees. For four months of the year the Government employees in the District have Saturday half holidays. The vast majority of the clerical forces in the field in the Government service have Saturday half holidays all of the year round. This extends an accepted practice. I ask for the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken and, in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17163) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of participation by the United States in the Conference on the Limitation of the Manufacture of Narcotic Drugs, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 27, 1931; and

H. J. Res. 524. Joint resolution to provide an appropriation for payment to the widow of Henry Allen Cooper, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution relating to loans to farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken or hail stricken areas of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to a bill of the following title:

S. 471. An act providing for Saturday half holidays for certain Government employees.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 17163) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year end-

ing June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent to have the statement read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana calls up a conference report upon the bill H. R. 17163 and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17163) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 7, 18, 20, 27, 41, 56, 60, 63, 64, 68, and 99.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 62, 65, 67, 71, 74, 75, 78, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, and 98, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "Any" and insert in lieu thereof "Not exceeding $25,000 of any," and in line 6 strike out the word "are" and insert in lieu thereof "is," and in line 10 strike out "$265.000" and insert in lieu thereof "$240,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "for," insert the word "temporary," and in line 12, after the word "February," insert "27"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "July 1, 1931," and insert in lieu thereof "on the date of the approval of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Department of vehicles and traffic, District of Columbia: For personal services, fiscal year 1932, $34,300, together with the amount of $36,060 for personal services, office of the director of traffic, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932: *Provided*, That the appropriation of $80,100 contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932 for the purchase and installation of electric traffic lights, etc., office of the director of traffic, shall be available for similar expenditures under the department of vehicles and traffic, District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The appropriation of $3,000,000 for roads on unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, and so forth, contained in the act entitled 'An act making supplemental appropriations to provide for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, with a view to increasing employment,' approved December 20, 1930, is hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1932."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "(Public—No. 616—71st Congress)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "approved" insert "February 28"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 7 and 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "year 1931 and to remain available until expended" and insert in lieu thereof "years 1931 and 1932"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment after "ruary" insert "27"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment in lieu of the dash insert "28"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended until the State of Tennessee, or any county or municipality or local subdivision thereof or any highway commission or equivalent public authority of the same concerned shall have given to the Secretary of War satisfactory assurances that immediately upon the completion of such improvements as may be made under this appropriation they will accept title to and maintain such portion of the road under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1104), and the Secretary of War is authorized to convey title to such road in accordance with the provisions of such act, except such portions thereof upon which have been erected by the Government or by States or by veterans' organizations or societies, monuments, markers, or tablets to mark and commemorate historic events connected with the battle"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 10, 14, 23, 25, 33, 36, 37, 44, 45, 46, 59, 61, 66, 72, 77, 79, 81, 82, 95, and 100.

WILL R. WOOD,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
EDWARD H. WASON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS
J. P. BUCHANAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
REED SMOOT,
FREDERICK HALE,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17163) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for the following expenses of the Senate as proposed in the Senate amendments—$600 to William A. Folger for expert services rendered to the Senate Committee on Pensions; $50,000 for miscellaneous items; $50,000 for expenses of inquiries and investigations; and $2,500 for folding speeches and pamphlets; and strikes out the appropriation of $25,000 inserted by the Senate for printing and classifying certain data submitted to the Senate by the National Commission on Law Observance and Law Enforcement.

On No. 7: Restores the House provision continuing during the interim of Congress a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, and strikes out the provision inserted by the Senate for a joint select committee on postal affairs.

On Nos. 8 and 9, relating to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Increases the amount which may be expended during the fiscal year 1931 for traveling expenses from $2,500 to $4,000, as proposed by the Senate, and retains the appropriation of $100,000 inserted by the Senate for fire protection in the Senate wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building.

On No. 11: Reappropriates for the Federal Power Commission for 1932 the unexpended balances in the 1931 appropriation modified so as to limit the amount so carried forward to not to exceed $25,000.

On Nos. 12 and 13, relating to the Veterans' Administration: Inserts the appropriation of $2,000,000 proposed by the Senate for salaries and expenses in connection with the making of loans to veterans under the act of February 27, 1931, modified so as to restrict such expenses for temporary purposes; and inserts the amendment proposed by the Senate making the 1932 appropriation for the adjusted-service certificate fund available immediately instead of on July 1, 1931, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 15, 16, and 17, relating to the District of Columbia: Appropriates $100,000 as proposed by the Senate for expenses of the District of Columbia Commission for the George Washington Bicentennial; appropriates $36,060 additional for the department of vehicles and traffic of the District of Columbia for carrying out the new traffic law; and appropriates $4,500 additional for the fiscal year 1932 for the Public Employment Service.

On Nos. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 24, relating to the Department of Agriculture: Strikes out the increases of $25,000 and $50,000 proposed by the Senate under the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Forest Service, respectively, for blister-rust control; appropriates $35,000 as proposed by the Senate for western irrigation agriculture; appropriates $800,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of buildings on Government Island, Alameda, Calif., for the Bureau of Public Roads, the Forest Service, and the Coast Guard, as provided by law; and strikes out the appropriation of $5,000,000 inserted by the Senate for roads on unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, etc., and inserts in lieu thereof a continuance during the fiscal year 1932 of any unexpended balances under the appropriation of $3,000,000 for this purpose for the fiscal year 1931.

On Nos. 26, 27, and 28, relating to the Department of Commerce: Appropriates $90,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Federal Employment Stabilization Board; strikes out the appropriation of $15,000 inserted by the Senate for district and cooperative offices under the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; and appropriates $147,000 for facilities for radio research investigations by the Bureau of Standards as authorized by the act of February 20, 1931.

On Nos. 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38, 39, and 40, relating to the Department of the Interior: Appropriates $1,217,221.25 for payment to the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of the Ute Indians in accordance with the act of February 13, 1931; appropriates $165,000, as proposed by the Senate, for additional land for the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz., as authorized by the act of February 21, 1931; makes technical corrections in connection with the House appropriations for the Frazer and Poplar, Mont., school districts appropriations; appropriates $75,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general support of Indians and administration of Indians' property; reduces the House amount of $100,000 for fees and expenses in connection with litigation involving Osage mineral rights to $25,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides, as proposed by the Senate, that $30,000 of power revenues on the North Platte irrigation project shall be available for the construction of transmission lines within the project.

On Nos. 41 and 42, relating to the Department of Justice: Provides for one passenger automobile at $3,000, as proposed by the House, instead of two with an appropriation of $6,000, as proposed by the Senate; and inserts the appropriation of $2,900, proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On No. 43: Appropriates $140,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the fiscal year 1932.

On No. 47: Appropriates $10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for alterations to naval vessels as authorized by the act of February 28, 1931.

On Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52, relating to the Department of State: Appropriates $15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of the Fourth Pan American Commercial Conference; makes $290.58 of the appropriation for the International Technical Consulting Committee on Radio Communication available for payment of expenses incurred for entertainment; appropriates $56,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the arbitration between the United States and Sweden of a claim of a Swedish corporation under the special agreement between the two countries signed December 17, 1930; appropriates $400, as proposed by the Senate, for payment of an indemnity to the British Government on account of losses sustained by H. W. Bennett, a British subject; and appropriates $50,000 additional for expenses of participation by the United States in the International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries at Paris, France.

On Nos. 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, and 65, relating to the Treasury Department: Appropriates $9,160, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,860, as proposed by the House, for an additional amount for the Division of Mental Hygiene of the Public Health Service; appropriates $150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for acquisition and enlargement of the laboratory for studies and research in connection with spotted fever at Hamilton, Mont.; provides a limit of cost of $75,000 for a public building at Bingham Canyon, Utah; strikes out the increase proposed by the Senate in the limit of cost for the Durham, N. C., public building; makes technical corrections in connection with the public buildings at Ellwood City, Pa., and Englewood, N. J.; strikes out the increase proposed by the Senate in the limit of cost of the public building at New London, Conn.; strikes out the increase proposed by the Senate in the limit of cost for the public building at Rockingham, N. C.; strikes out the increase proposed by the Senate in the limit of cost for the public building at Silver City, N. Mex.; and inserts the authority proposed by the Senate for the public building at Texas City, Tex.

On Nos. 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, and 83, relating to the War Department: Transfers $400,000 from the appropriation "Subsistence of the Army, 1931," to the appropriation "Pay of the Army, 1931"; strikes out the appropriation of $188,850 proposed by the Senate for an addi-

tional amount for construction of buildings, and so forth, in Porto Rico; appropriates $73,528.61, as proposed by the Senate, for the Government road across the Fort Sill (Okla.) Military Reservation; appropriates $10,000, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the Senate, for repair of docks at Fort Screven, Ga.; appropriates $142,000, as proposed by the Senate, for completion of the sea wall, construction of a warehouse, and construction of water mains, Selfridge Field, Mich.; appropriates $53,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of buildings and utilities at Tucson Field, Ariz.; makes $126 of the appropriation for national cemeteries for the fiscal year 1929 available for the payment of obligations incurred during such fiscal year; appropriates $237,230, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $118,615 as proposed by the House, for paving Missionary Ridge Crest Road in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park from Sherman Heights to the Georgia State line, and modifies the limitations of the House and the Senate so as to exempt the State of Tennessee from contributing to such improvements, but to require that the State, upon completion of such improvements by the Federal Government, will accept title to the road and maintain the same in the future as an approach road to the park; appropriates $650 additional for a tablet to Nancy Hart; and appropriates $800, as proposed by the Senate, for a survey of flood control on the Salmon River, Alaska.

On Nos. 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, and 89: Provides for the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the different departments in accordance with existing law and certified to Congress for payment after the bill had passed the House.

On No. 90: Appropriates $19,906.23 for the payment of judgments rendered against the United States by United States District Courts in special cases, and certified to Congress for payment after the bill had passed the House.

On Nos. 91, 92, 93, and 94: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of judgments of the Court of Claims, certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

On Nos. 96, 97, and 98: Appropriates $16,327.38 for the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, and certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House, and corrects section numbers in the bill.

On No. 99: Strikes out the appropriation of $48,852.83 inserted by the Senate for refunds to certain railroads of interest payments made to the United States under sections 209g and 212 of the transportation act.

DISAGREEMENTS

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments, upon which the managers on the part of the House will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendments or concurrence in the Senate amendments with amendments:

On No. 10: Authorizing the Public Printer to continue the employment of William Madden, a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD messenger at the Capitol, notwithstanding the provisions of the retirement act.

On No. 23: Appropriating $2,700,000 for the boulevard to Mount Vernon.

On No. 25: Appropriating $134,466.69 for reimbursement to the State of Florida for roads and bridges destroyed by floods.

On No. 33: Appropriating $150,000 for the Hopi-Navajo Sanatorium, Winslow, Ariz.

On No. 37: Appropriating $75,000 for investigations in connection with proposed and existing reservoirs for irrigation purposes on the North Platte River, Wyo.

On No. 61: Establishing a limit of cost for a new Federal building at Omaha, Nebr.

On No. 72: Appropriating $150,000 for construction of buildings and utilities at Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y.

On No. 77: Appropriating $37,770 for paving Missionary Ridge Crest Road and Crest and Gap Road, Ga.

On No. 81: Appropriating $20,000 for dredging the channel of Fort Pierce Harbor, Fla.

On No. 95: Remanding to the Court of Claims the case of the Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Co., with instructions to find the facts in the case and report to Congress.

On No. 100: Appropriating $2,500 to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services on May 30, 1931.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following additional amendments, upon which the managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments:

On No. 14: Appropriating $5,000,000 for additional hospital construction under the veterans' administration.

On No. 36: Advancing $5,000,000 to the reclamation fund from the general fund of the Treasury.

On No. 44. Appropriating $1,500,000, or an alternative of $500,000, for the United States Employment Service.

On No. 45: Appropriating $1,000,000 to the Children's Bureau for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants.

On No. 46: Appropriating $150,000 for improvements at the Charleston (S. C.) Navy Yard.

On No. 59: Repealing a previous limitation in connection with the New Bern (N. C.) public building.

On No. 66: Authorizing a limit of cost of $1,225,000 for a new building for the Court of Claims.

On No. 79: Appropriating $100,000 for a monument in memory of the first permanent settlement of the West at Harrodsburg, Ky.

On No. 82: Appropriating $10,000,000 for beginning construction of the Cove Creek Dam in Tennessee, in connection with the Muscle Shoals project.

WILL R. WOOD,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
EDWARD H. WASON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. On page 62 of the bill, amendment No. 45, under the heading "Children's Bureau," $1,000,000 is provided to carry out the purposes of the maternity act. I make the point of order that this is not an act. The bill is in the making. It is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will wait until we get to that, he will find out why we are insisting upon our disagreement.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What has happened to the appropriation for the additional hospital building program to take care of the disabled veterans?

Mr. WOOD. The committee is waiting for the conferees to come to some agreement so that there can be an authorization.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Indiana is one of the Republican leaders of the House. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] is one of the conferees. The gentleman from Indiana can ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to have the Republican conferees accept the Senate amendment, so that we can take care of these disabled soldiers.

Mr. WOOD. I wish I had that much influence.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Amendment 37 is to take care of the dam and reservoir on the North Platte River. What has become of that?

Mr. WOOD. If gentlemen will just wait, we will take up these separate items and they can then propound questions

and the matter can be taken care of in an orderly way. We will take up the items that are in disagreement.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I know the gentleman from Indiana is in favor of providing additional hospitals for the veterans. Will the gentleman yield so that I can ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] what is the present status of the hospital bill which is in conference?

Mr. LUCE. The conferees have not agreed.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does it appear that the conferees will likely agree, so that an appropriation can be made before this Congress automatically adjourns within a short time?

Mr. LUCE. It is beyond the power of a Member of the House to read the intention of gentlemen in another body.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Then I say that the Republicans in this Congress who are in favor of providing hospital facilities for the disabled veterans better ask the Republican leaders to see what they can do to get this legislation enacted at this session and an appropriation made. The gentleman whom most of the Republican Members followed the other day when the Rankin motion was up for consideration was one of the Members of the House who made a speech against the hospital bill when it came before the House, and I sincerely hope that the Republicans will not be responsible for having this Congress adjourn without an authorization enacted into law and an appropriation made for the hospital building expansion program.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have not come to any conclusion, and there has been no action yet by the conferees. I am in hopes that that fact will have no influence upon the action on this report. I am hopeful that there may yet be an agreement on this hospital legislation. If there is, I say to gentlemen now that immediately after that agreement I shall introduce an independent resolution carrying the appropriation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. It looks to me as if the conference is adjourned sine die. So far as we are concerned, as the gentleman knows, the minority members of the conference are willing to accept the Senate amendment rather than see the bill killed. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] has two of the conferees right behind him. If either one of them had voted with us we could have brought the bill to the floor of the House to-day. Why not interrogate them and find out whether or not there is a shadow of hope for the bill to be agreed on in conference. It is with the Republican conferees of the House, and they must take the responsibility if this bill is killed.

Mr. LUCE. I would like to have it known that the House conferees have stood up for what the House directed them to do. [Applause].

Mr. CONNERY. And I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if that means that standing by the House is going to kill the hospital bill. Is he willing to see this bill killed simply because the House wants $12,000,000 and the Senate wants $20,000,000?

Mr. LUCE. The responsibility for that rests with the Senate conferees.

Mr. CONNERY. The responsibility rests with the gentleman and his colleague, according to the gentleman who is one of the conferees on this side.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. Regular order is demanded.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I very much regret that Senate amendment No. 5 has not been agreed to. This Senate amendment provides $25,000 to print the hearings taken by the Wickersham Commission. We have the Wickersham report. We have the report of the individual members, and then we have the consolidated report of all the members, which does not agree with their individual views. This House has always demanded that hearings be printed so that the Members can form their own judgment, but in the case of the Wickersham Commission we are prevented from having the hearings printed and we must depend entirely upon the report, to which the members themselves do not agree.

I understand the Senate has receded from this amendment, and I deplore the situation, because we all know from what has been stated in the newspapers that the hearings did not justify what some of the individual reports purported they did.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is one advantage, and that is that those papers are now in the custody of a Senate committee, and sooner or later we will have them printed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that because it may be that later on we can have the hearings printed; but, gentlemen, that is nine months from now. Much can take place in nine months. We should have had that nine months in which to study and find out for ourselves what the hearings contained before the Wickersham Commission so that we ourselves might have information upon which to base our judgment. I very much deplore the fact that the Senate has receded from its amendment. It was a matter of only $25,000 and it would have been a satisfaction not only to Congress but a satisfaction to this country to know what the commission based its report upon. Of course, there is nothing that can be done. We certainly can not defeat this conference report which would be necessary, and the matter must go over for nine months. I certainly trust that Members of this House will consider the matter between now and the next session of Congress, and that we may have the hearings printed at that time.

Mr. WOOD. I may say to the Members of the House that each one of the items in this group of amendments in disagreement, and on which there may be diversified opinions, will be called up separately, so that for the purpose of expediting the business I trust there will be no further debate upon the conference report itself.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD]?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the action that has been taken by Congress in the building program. I believe in internal improvement. There are only two links in the chain that are left out in the completion of our building program throughout the Nation. We have taken care of the large cities. I have recently introduced a bill that will take care of the courthouse sites and towns and cities with postal receipts ranging from ten to twenty thousand dollars a year. In taking up the completion of our building program with the Post Office Department, I ascertained that $30,000,000 will build post offices at every courthouse site in the United States at which there is not now a Federal building. There are approximately 600 county sites without Federal buildings. Fifty thousand dollars is sufficient to construct a splendid post-office building. Just think of it, gentlemen. This Congress appropriated $30,000,000 only last week to recondition three old battleships, and yesterday England, France, and Italy agreed to discontinue their shipbuilding race for supremacy until 1936, when another disarmament conference will convene. By this agreement these leading nations of the world are indicating the way for peace.

Many of our people who live in the small towns and county sites have no symbol whatever of the Federal Government. They can see nothing that has been done by the Federal Government of a lasting nature. Millions of them will never have an opportunity to visit our National Capital. That they have a pride and patriotic spirit is evidenced by them having taxed their property for the construction of suitable courthouses, and there is no class of people who are more appreciative, and since introducing this measure my colleague from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] informs me that

many towns have offered to donate sites to the Government in order to insure the construction of suitable Federal buildings. The Post Office Department officials estimate that $70,000,000 will provide buildings at all places other than county sites with receipts between ten and twenty thousand dollars. In addition to meting out justice to these small places, our Government will also save enormous sums annually now paid for rents.

I know it is too late in the session for hearings to be held on this bill, but I am inserting it in the RECORD so you will have the opportunity of studying it during the summer, and when we return to the Seventy-second Congress I expect to reintroduce this measure and hope to get favorable action during that session. [Applause.]

H. R. 17307

A bill to provide for the construction of post-office buildings in all county seats in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to provide a post-office building construction program to secure adequate post-office building facilities throughout the United States at advantageous costs by the utilization of local labor, services, and materials.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the proviso at the end of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 264), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such sites and additions to sites as he may deem to be necessary, and to cause to be constructed thereon, or upon lands belonging to the United States suitably located and available for the purpose, adequate and suitable post-office buildings (1) in every county seat in the United States (without regard to the volume of postal receipts), and (2) in every town or city in the United States where the postal receipts have reached the sum of $10,000 annually, except in any county seat, town, or city in which the construction of a post-office building has been provided for by Congress. In carrying out the provisions of this section priority shall be given to the county seats eligible under this act. The buildings authorized by this act shall be so constructed as to combine high standards of architectural beauty and practical utility. The sketches, plans, and estimates for buildings shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is authorized to provide space for other activities or branches of the public service in buildings authorized to be constructed by this act.

SEC. 3. (a) In providing for the construction herein authorized the Secretary of the Treasury shall in all cases let the contracts to, or employ, responsible contractors or construction companies who are residents or inhabitants of the respective congressional districts wherein the construction is proposed.

(b) All contracts or other provisions for or on behalf of the United States made under authority of this act shall contain provisions—

(1) That in the performance of work under such contract or provision or any subcontract thereunder, preference in the employment of mechanics, laborers, and draftsmen shall be given to American citizens who are inhabitants of the congressional districts wherein the construction is proposed, who are available and qualified to perform the work to which the employment relates.

(2) That in the procurement or use of materials and supplies in the performance of any contract or other provision for or on behalf of the United States made under authority of this act preference shall be given to materials and supplies produced or manufactured within the congressional district wherein the construction is proposed, whenever such materials and supplies are available and suitable for the purposes of the construction, at costs which are not disadvantageous to the United States in comparison with costs of materials otherwise readily procurable.

(3) That there shall be deducted from the amount payable to the contractor by the United States under the contract or other provision for performance of the construction, a penalty of $5 for each laborer or mechanic or draftsman for each calendar day during which such laborer, mechanic, or draftsman is willfully required or permitted to work in violation of the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

SEC. 4. (a) The work of preparing designs and other drawings, estimates, specifications, and awarding of contracts, as well as the supervision of the work authorized under the provisions of this act, shall be performed by the Office of the Supervising Architect, Treasury Department, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, except as otherwise provided in this act.

(b) In so far as the Secretary of the Treasury deems it practicable and consistent with the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to procure by contract with architects and engineers, residents of the congressional district wherein construction is proposed under this act, the floor plans and designs of buildings developed sufficiently to serve as guides for the preparation of working drawings and specifications, or to employ advisory assistance involving design or engineering features, and to pay reasonable compensation for such services.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to employ such additional technical, scientific, and clerical assistance in or under the Office of the Supervising Architect, both in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as he deems necessary, giving preference wherever practicable to inhabitants of the congressional district wherein the construction is proposed, and to fix such rates of compensation therefor as he deems proper, not, however, in excess of the maximum rates paid for the same or similar services in other departments, and to submit to Congress, through customary channels, estimates for appropriations for compensation for such personal service and for travel, subsistence, and other expenses involved in making any survey in preparation for the program and report herein provided for or in the examination of sites.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law the Secretary of the Treasury shall employ, in the performance of legal services connected with the procurement of title to sites for public buildings herein authorized, attorneys resident of the city or county wherein the construction is proposed, and may expend moneys for the construction herein authorized upon the rendering of a written opinion of such attorney or attorneys in favor of the validity of the title to the site or sites on which the buildings are proposed to be constructed.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 to be expended by the Secretary of the Treasury in carrying out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10. Page 6, line 16, insert the following: "The Public Printer may continue the employment under his jurisdiction of William Madden, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD messenger, at the Capitol, notwithstanding any provision of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and any amendment thereof, prohibiting extensions of service for more than four years after the age of retirement."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14. Page 15, line 1, insert the following: "Hospital and domiciliary facilities and services, Veterans' Administration: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital, domiciliary, and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes,' approved February —, 1931, $5,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23. On page 31, after line 8, insert: "Bureau of Public Roads: For an additional amount for paving and other expenses of constructing the highway from Washington, D. C., to Mount Vernon, Va., including all necessary expenses for the acquisition of such additional land adjacent to said highway as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary for the development, protection, and preservation of the memorial character of the highway, $2,700,000, to remain available until June 30, 1932."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur, with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Before the period at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", and this amount shall provide for the entire completion of such project and all objects of expenditure incident thereto."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very unfortunate if the House recedes on this amendment without a little further information in regard to it. I suppose

that road must be completed. It is like every other kind of work which the Government undertakes and then spends more money than it ought to. We appropriated $4,500,000 for that George Washington Memorial Boulevard, and certainly for 16 miles of road that is ample money. I am opposed to this additional sum, even though you add the proviso offered by the gentleman from Indiana. What earthly chance is there of that proviso being lived up to, if the commission sees fit to go ahead and obligate the Government for additional money? That is exactly what they have done. They spent the $4,500,000 and now say they want to spend $2,700,000 more. The same proviso might have been carried with reference to the expenditure of the $4,500,000, but instead of completing the road within that sum, they now ask for additional money. I am opposed to the amendment and still I realize that we can not leave a dirt heap down there and not complete it. I think the commission is very blameworthy for not having done its work within the provisions of the appropriation. They should at least have come back to Congress for more money before they obligated the Government.

I am further opposed to it on the ground previously referred to, namely, that we are spending $7,200,000 to build a most elaborate memorial highway to George Washington and then have it lead to a privately-owned property, and the only purpose of the road is to have it reach this privately-owned property. The fact that a group of patriotic women bought this property when it was going to decay about 1855, does not make it applicable in 1931. There is no reason why the Government should not to-day own that great shrine, probably the greatest shrine within all the world. [Applause.]

It ought to be owned by the Federal Government, and I for one object to spending $7,200,000 on a road which will reach to a turnstile, and there an admission is charged to enter that great shrine. I do not care how patriotic these women are. They never make a report to anybody and it is just a close corporation, a corporation that ought not to be given the privilege of having this free highway as a memorial reaching to their concession. It is time, my colleagues, that this matter was given serious attention by Congress. I have had a bill before the House for some years, although I have not pressed it, but I want to say to the ladies who are the regents and own that property that I shall press that bill in the next Congress to the best of my ability, and endeavor to reach an amicable arrangement for the Government ownership of Mount Vernon. Then if there is a road which reaches it, paid for by the Government, there will be some excuse. The only excuse given as to why these ladies do not want to disgorge is that they enjoy a trip there annually, and they say that if the Government should own this shrine it would become a picnic ground. If I know anything about the patriotic spirit of the American people, they are never going to desecrate Mount Vernon in any such manner as we are told they will. The property, if controlled by the Federal Government, will be as carefully managed as it is now. My bill will leave the women's organization in active charge.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. How much per mile is this road supposed to cost?

Mr. TREADWAY. That was explained by the gentleman from Nebraska by putting silver dollars together. He showed that it would cost the number of silver dollars put upon end. Then the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR] went him one better and said:

> Let us build it with gold, so that it will be sixteen times more expensive.

I am for his proposition if we are going to spend money as carelessly as that.

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

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Why would it not be a good idea in these Government appropriations to make these officials who make the estimates liable, so that in case of failure to live within the estimates made they would be cut off the pay roll.

Mr. TREADWAY. If that could be done, that, of course, would accomplish the purpose the gentleman has in view. And that is the only way you will ever do it.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time particularly for the purpose of paying a tribute to the ladies who compose the Mount Vernon Association. I want to remind my good friend from Massachusetts that if it had not been for these good ladies, who come from every section of the country, Mount Vernon would not be what it is to-day. [Applause.] These ladies, out of their patriotism, their love for the traditions of this country, and their veneration for the memory of the Father of his Country, when the Government failed to take charge of Mount Vernon, formed a voluntary patriotic association of their own, more than 75 years ago. It is due to them that you have Mount Vernon out yonder to-day, preserved as it was when Washington lived. I think those ladies deserve the thanks and gratitude of the entire country for what they have done.

There are other patriotic associations composed of good women of the country which have performed similar services in connection with the homes of patriots, statesmen, and ex-Presidents, which the Government for one reason or another has neglected to preserve. The Ladies' Hermitage Association, in my own State, for years has preserved the home of Andrew Jackson—the Hermitage—just as Andrew Jackson left it when he died.

Now, one word as to this appropriation. It is true that when these estimates were submitted the commission was told that $4,500,000 was, in the judgment of those who were going to have the authority to make expenditures, all that was required to complete that highway. The act authorizing the building of the highway was passed by Congress, and the George Washington Bicentennial Commission was given authority to select the route. It has had nothing to do with the actual construction or the expenditures.

There were two propositions which came before the commission, of which I am a member. One of them was to take what is known as the river road, which was finally selected, and the other was to take the ridge road. There were those who favored the river road because under the estimates then submitted it only involved an expenditure of $150,000 or $200,000 more, and it was said by those who professed to know about such things that it had greater scenic value. Personally, I favored the ridge road because I felt it could be more economically constructed and at the same time afford scenic advantages on both sides of the road, which we do not have on the road which is now under construction. I may say that we were told that four and a half million dollars was all that would be required for the river route.

I want to say to my friend from Massachusetts that the commission has had nothing to do with the building of this road.

It is not its proposition and was not a part of the commission's work in doing honor to the memory of George Washington. It was an independent matter taken up by Congress and put through the Congress; and the money is being expended, not under the supervision of the commission, but under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Now, how has this money been expended? I took occasion the other day to say that I could not understand why a sum of money amounting to an average of $462,000 per mile should be expended to construct this road.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BYRNS. But how has it been expended? We are to have a great memorial boulevard, 200 feet wide, for a distance of 14.6 miles. Those in authority have either bought or acquired in one way or another 805 acres of land, at an

average cost of $1,549 per acre. There is not any land in Virginia outside of the cities worth that amount. And do not forget that the most of this land is low, marshy land lying close to the river.

Two years ago it was proposed to establish a municipal airport for the city of Washington at Gravelly Point, and it was sought to pass a resolution providing that the first cash payment of $500,000 should be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. I objected to the request for the consideration of the resolution, and it was never passed. But now it appears that this appropriation has been used to acquire this whole property at the expense of the people of the United States. The appropriation provided that the Secretary might acquire the roadbed and additional lands when he thought it necessary for "parking." Undoubtedly Congress understood this to mean for parking automobiles, but those in authority have construed it to mean for public-park purposes. I do not understand why the Comptroller General, who is usually so technical, should have approved the payment or expenditure of money under any such strained construction. Congress was appropriating for a road, and I do not believe it would have made the appropriation if it had been informed that it was to be used for purchasing land not needed for that purpose. If such was the intention, it certainly should have been so advised. Whether so intended or not, it had the effect of a joker in the law as passed.

If the Washington Star states the facts, this has been acquired for the direct purpose of providing a municipal airport in the event Congress shall later on decide to establish one. I wish I had the time to read you all the Evening Star had to say on this subject after what is purported to have been an interview with the Director of Public Roads. It says this:

The Mount Vernon Boulevard development is being carried on with a view to the creation of a great airport at Gravelly Point, according to plans of the Bureau of Public Roads.

I want to know what the Bureau of Public Roads has to do with providing an airport for the city of Washington when Congress has refused up to this time to obligate the Federal Government to engage in that sort of business?

These plans—

So the article says—

provide for a great double airport site with two systems of runways connected at either end by taxi strips forming two great circles.

And later on, the article goes on to say that—

Despite the failure of Congress to go ahead with the Gravelly Point airport plan, the area will be developed just as though an airport were to be built, it was indicated. The aeronautical branch of the Department of Commerce, in line with the Gravelly Point airport plan, has located a radiobeacon station for the National Capital airways station adjacent to the Gravelly Point area. This beacon is in a position to serve the Gravelly Point area and is more than a mile away from the Washington-Hoover airport site.

Now, I would like to again ask what business has the Bureau of Public Roads or the Department of Commerce to undertake to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of this money, appropriated as it was for the purpose of building a great monumental boulevard to the memory of George Washington, to develop the Gravelly Point area down there on the assumption that Congress may sometime, out of its generosity, devote the public funds of the United States to the building of a municipal airport, a commercial airport, if you please, for the city of Washington, which ought to do like all other cities of this country—build its own airport at its own expense. [Applause.]

Under the guise of being required for boulevard purposes, some one has unloaded on the Federal Government a lot of land—worthless in so far as the Government is concerned—at an enormous and unjustifiable price. What a pity an appropriation can not be made for a highly patriotic purpose without some one trying to make a personal profit out of it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. As a member of the commission may I ask the gentleman, in view of the fact we are going to have a beautiful boulevard and memorial to George Washington extending down the river to Mount Vernon, is there any likelihood of doing away with that large dump heap just as you leave the new bridge and as you get on the road, where for 24 hours a day there is a lot of smudge and smoke and débris being dumped in there? Under whose authority is this done and is there any chance of its being removed? It is a disgrace to the city of Washington, in my opinion. There should not be a dump heap for the rubbish of this entire neighborhood so near this city or along this new boulevard.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that I have, to some extent, changed some of the views I expressed the other day after hearing Mr. MacDonald with reference to the expenditure of some of this money. Some of it is being expended for the purpose of acquiring unsightly land upon either side of the boulevard, so as to make it a real monumental road, and one that will be pleasing to the eye as well as satisfactory to the tourist as he travels over the road. But while approving the purposes, I seriously question whether he has the authority to do so under the law applying to this appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I suggest to my friend from Massachusetts that if he would give the great influence that he has to the support of the bill which I have pending for amending the parkway act, we would be much nearer to cleaning up all those eyesores along the Potomac.

Mr. TREADWAY. Let me ask the gentleman in reply, if I may, whether the very disgraceful situation I am referring to is not south of the Memorial Bridge and along the line of the George Washington Boulevard, extending to Mount Vernon?

I understand the gentleman's effort is to secure a further boulevard running up to Great Falls, or north of the new bridge.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is in error about that; there is no boulevard proposed to Great Falls on the Virginia side. The act proposes to acquire all the land along the Potomac in Virginia, to remove all the eyesores, and the gentleman could not do anything to better expedite it than to support my bill, which he has not been inclined to do in the past.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am still inclined to oppose it, and I still maintain that this smoky dump that brings smoke into the White House and along the lower part of Washington whenever the wind is that way, is a blot on the landscape where we are to have a fine boulevard.

Mr. BYRNS. The remarks of the gentlemen have further confirmed me in the belief that this additional land should have been purchased under some such act as that to which the gentleman from Michigan has referred, and not under an act providing for the building of a memorial highway. I can not understand why it was permitted by those having supervision of the expenditures, or those charged with the auditing of the accounts.

In conclusion, having said what I have, let me say that under the circumstances I do not think there is anything Congress can do except to vote this appropriation. You have already appropriated $4,500,000 on this road, of which $3,500,000 has been actually expended. If you fail to make this appropriaton you simply lose what you have spent. The road is being built in the honor of the memory of George Washington. It is to be a great memorial boulevard. Notwithstanding what we may think of the extravagance of those in charge of the work, or what we may think of the manner in which they have expended the money, I believe that it would be very unfortunate if Congress should fail to appropriate this money and complete this boulevard to the home of Washington. Congress is assured that this will be all that will be required to complete this boulevard, and for that reason I think the amendment ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

This highway is being built as a memorial to Washington. Let me say that it might also be considered as a monu-

ment to the able and efficient service which our distinguished friend and colleague Judge MOORE of Virginia has rendered to the district which he has so faithfully represented. We all regret that he is soon to voluntarily retire to private life. His retirement is a distinct loss to the Congress and to the country.

Mr. WOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY].

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Speaker, at the present time I am opposed to the expenditure of $2,700,000 for this road while there are to-day thousands of ex-service men that do not have hospital and home facilities.

A few days ago when the hospital and home bill was before the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who, if I remember correctly, has heretofore opposed hospital legislation, stood on the floor and made a plea that the bill go to conference because, as he said, he felt that he had been insulted by not being allowed to speak on the bill.

It went to conference, and I thought at the time that the chairman of that conference committee, judging from his record on this floor, had no intention of ever bringing that bill back to this House. I interrogated the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, for I felt then that she was being led into a position where she might be responsible for defeating the legislation.

What is the result? Let me talk to you about the condition in the home in Danville, Ill. Since the matter was on this floor a veteran was turned out of the Danville home on Saturday because they did not have room for him. On Sunday morning his dead body was found in a box car, a short distance from the home. That is not the only instance of that kind that has occurred this winter.

I do not want to go back to the veterans of Illinois and say to them that we had $2,700,000 to add to $4,500,000 to build a driveway, but that we did not have money with which to build hospitals and homes for the veterans. I do not want that responsibility to be on the Republican Party.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. How does the gentleman know that we will get the hospitals if the Senate amendment goes through?

Mr. HOLADAY. I do not, but I do not want to accept the responsibility for a fancied insult that may or may not have been given to a Member of this body, and if it was, we are all sorry for it. For this trivial reason I do not want it to go out to the people of the country that the Republican Party—and we may as well face the facts, for that party will be responsible if it fails—is in the position of spending $2,700,000 for a driveway and yet can not spend $2,800,000 for soldiers' homes when there is no dispute about the need for them. As far as I am concerned I am going to do my best, irrespective of the outcome of this measure, to bring back to the House the item for the soldiers' homes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows that if the pending amendment should be voted down that would not build any hospitals, and if the amendment should be adopted that will not prevent the building of any hospital. One does not depend upon the other.

Mr. HOLADAY. And I bring to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] who not only favors this, but I understand favors a few million dollars more for some more parks, that I believe it is a better policy to take care of the veterans in their hospitals and in their homes before we go to spending millions of dollars for parks, be those parks ever so desirable.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, I voted for the hospitals, as the gentleman well knows.

SETH PARKER

Mr. SNOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for one minute out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNOW. Mr. Speaker, Bowdoin College is a typical small New England college, located in the beautiful town of Brunswick, Maine.

In its early days it graduated Longfellow and Hawthorne, and a little later a President of the United States, Franklin Pierce.

In 1896 three graduates of this little institution were occupying, respectively, the offices of Speaker of this House, President of the Senate, and Chief Justice of the United States—Thomas B. Reed, William P. Frye, and Melville W. Fuller.

It is my privilege to introduce to you this afternoon another Bowdoin graduate. He is not, however, a poet, a novelist, a statesman, or a jurist. He is, in fact, a mere boy, but is known from one end of this country to the other. His voice is familiar to 90 per cent of the membership of the House, but not 1 per cent of you have ever seen him.

He is in Washington at this time for the purpose of appearing to-night at Constitution Hall in a benefit performance for a very worthy Washington charitable organization. His services are donated, and such is his drawing power that all tickets were completely sold out over two weeks ago.

In my opinion this young boy is the source of more joy and cheer, and contentment, and wholesome enjoyment than any person living in the United States to-day.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a peculiar degree of pride that I now present to the House—in private life, Phillips H. Lord, of New York, but on each Sunday evening lovably known in radio as Seth Parker, of Jonesport, Maine. [Applause, the Members rising.]

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I agree with every statement of our Republican colleague from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY] with reference to the hospital building expansion program. I was one of those who voted against the motion to send the bill to conference. I gave at that time the reasons why; first, that the Senate bill provided $5,000,000 more for hospitals than the House bill; and, second, that if the bill went to conference in the closing days of the Congress, it might get into the legislative jam and die.

I understand that the conferees have failed to agree because the House conferees have held out against the Senate amendment. Perhaps I was too critical in my brief statement a few moments ago when referring to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who opposed the Rogers hospital bill when it was first considered in the House. I understand that the author of the bill, who has the reputation of being a strong supporter of veterans' legislation, particularly legislation for disabled veterans, can by her vote accept the Senate amendment so that the legislation can be enacted and appropriations made before this Congress adjourns. I say to the members of the conference committee that there is nothing which indicates that the House by sending the bill to conference put its approval on an attitude on the part of the House conferees which would hold out for the House provision and let the bill die instead of giving way and accepting the Senate amendment. The least that we can expect of the Republican membership of the House is to demand that the Republican members of that conference committee make a report to this Congress and let the Congress on a straight issue decide whether we are going to have additional hospital facilities for the veterans or let the bill die in conference because of the pet hobby of one Member of Congress who has a reputation of being strongly in favor of the veterans.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I think the gentleman knows that I feel exactly as he does. We have no partisan interest in this matter.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. No. In fact the allocation as embodied in the committee report from the Committee

on Military Affairs contains an additional domiciliary barracks for the Northwestern Branch National Home in my district. I do not consider that report absolutely binding, and even if I should lose that building, I would gladly lose it in order that the thousands and thousands of veterans throughout the country outside of my district may have additional hospital facilities available. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. There is nothing partisan in this matter. The American Legion in Massachusetts sent a telegram asking that this matter be adjusted. I say to the gentleman as a Republican, and I am a Democrat, that if this dies, it would be a wonderful political issue for us in Massachusetts, but I do not want it to die.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Oh, its death would no doubt result in more lame ducks in the present Republican membership than the last election did.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not want to have that political issue.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. No; it should not be a political issue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I had supposed that the House had some sort of loyalty to its own body. While the House did not instruct the conferees, still, the Members knew we were going to the conference with the understanding that we would stand up for the report written by the subcommittee of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. If the Members listened to my speech on the floor on that day, they will remember I stated I would be willing to go along with the Senate bill and allow them to have over $2,000,000 for additional soldiers' homes and an additional $5,000,000 for Veterans' Bureau hospitals. But I did feel, in order to secure prompt hospital construction, that we should stand by our House report. Why should the House yield in every particular? Why should not the Senate yield to us on one point in order to secure at least prompt building to the extent of $12,500,000? [Applause.] Every one of the Members who has had any dealings with the Veterans' Bureau knows before we initiated the custom of putting in our committee report the general locations for hospitals that the building program went forward very slowly. I want hospitals built for our disabled. I know the needs. I have watched the boys.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the lady yield?

Mrs. ROGERS. I have watched your Yankee Division boys. I have watched them get well and I have watched them die. I do not believe anybody wants hospitals more than I. [Applause.] It is because I want them so much that I feel the Senate should go along with us and at least yield to our program for the $12,500,000 while we let them have an added $5,000,000 for additional hospitals. It seems a curious thing that the Senate is willing to kill the bill, and I can not believe it will. It is up to the Senate.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the lady yield?

Mrs. ROGERS. I yield to the heroic color sergeant of the Yankee Division, Mr. CONNERY. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. I would like to say to the lady from Massachusetts she knows and the House knows I have the highest respect for all she has done for the disabled men of the Nation. We are up against a parliamentary situation. Is it not a fact that the Senate conferees will not yield, absolutely will not yield?

Mrs. ROGERS. I believe they will yield. They are not going to kill that bill. Does the gentleman think they will dare face those veterans? [Applause.] I do not think so. I do not believe they will dare do it.

Mr. CONNERY. Then, if the situation comes at the last moment when the lady is positively convinced that they will not yield further or will not yield, will the lady then agree with the Senate so that the bill can be passed?

Mrs. ROGERS. The gentleman knows perfectly well that the Senate will yield. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. I hope they will.

Mr. WOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons, among them that I do not feel particularly like making a speech, I will not take much time, but I feel I ought to make a few remarks in order to state the facts in respect to the situation. In all the 16 years I have been a Member of this House I have seen the close of a great many short sessions, but I do not believe I have ever seen so many excitable Members who were on this floor as I saw last Saturday night and again to-day.

The facts are clear with reference to the hospital-bill situation. About a year ago, as chairman of the committee, I appointed a subcommittee to decide what should be done with reference to hospitals, because the Senate had never initiated such legislation. It was a very competent committee on both the Republican side and the Democratic side. They have conducted hearings for a year. They brought in from 28 States members of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and State officials, and they have studied the situation. Without disagreement, that committee, for which I have a great deal of respect, prepared this bill. It affects about 14 States. It is the only committee that has given any consideration to the matter. There were no hearings held in any other legislative body. Some of the gentlemen of another legislative body have taken the position that if they do not get a hospital in their States or in their voting precincts we will have no bill. They have given no consideration to the bill whatever. I am wondering when there are 14 States affected by this bill how 28 Members of another legislative body are going to be able to explain next year just why they killed this bill. Do not forget it will be another legislative body that kills it if it is killed. It will not be killed by this House of Representatives.

As far as the amount to be expended for hospitals is concerned, as a matter of fact none of us care whether there are two or three million dollars more or less appropriated. We want to appropriate enough, however, and are willing to expend $20,000,000. If they wanted to add more, why did not the Members of another legislative body come out in the open and say, "I want a hospital in my voting precinct or in my State?" There probably would have been no objection to the appropriation being increased. As a matter of fact, I think there will be agreement on this bill. I can not conceive of the Members of another legislative body, when there is necessity for these hospitals, standing out against agreement. It will be very regrettable if they do stand out against it. There has never been a moment that they could not have had hearings in that other body. There has never been a moment that they could not have presented the facts with reference to their States. Those demanding hospitals never appeared before the committee. As a matter of fact, all the facts have been presented to the committee, a very competent and a very able committee, consisting of the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FENN], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERS]. Nobody can say they are not competent. Nobody can say they did not work. In my opinion the House conferees are taking exactly the right attitude at this time. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will yield four minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and then I shall move the previous question on my motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have but one motive in this matter and that is hospitalization for disabled veterans. We had as well face the facts. Unless the House conferees recede, we are going to lose this hospital bill.

I do not mind telling you that my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] and I were willing to stand by the House allocations if the Senate conferees would

go along with us, but in case that was found to be impossible we were willing to accept the Senate amendments.

Now, here is your trouble: There is not a chance on earth for the Senate conferees to accept the House allocations. They can not do it. Because in this bill—and they pointed that out to us plainly, honestly, and I think, clearly—there are certain allocations provided for, and if they take these allocations back to the Senate and recommend them the bill will never get through. Because the House bill leaves out entirely the State of Virginia, which has not a single hospital, while in this bill there are at least two States that will get two or three additions if not new hospitals, that already have two or three. If you think the Senators from Virginia are going to stand for that you are mistaken. The Senators from Maryland are almost in the same predicament, and Senators from other States have served notice that they are not going to let these allocations go through.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Is this a pork barrel bill you are fixing up between the House and Senate?

Mr. RANKIN. It looks like it. But what does the Senate bill do? Why, it leaves the allocations to the President of the United States or his subordinates. Do you distrust your own President? If I, a southern Democrat, can trust the administration, can you not do so?

Now, I am going to be perfectly frank with you. I am opposed to "pork barreling" these hospitals about the country.

But the Senate conferees can not yield, and you can applaud until your hands are sore and you may talk from now until Congress adjourns on Wednesday, but unless the Republican House conferees yield, we are going to lose this bill, and I am not going to take the responsibility.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think the House conferees should bring the question back to the House and let the House instruct them as to what they should do?

Mr. RANKIN. I am willing to do that. I made this fight the other day and I was ingloriously attacked for it. I knew what we were getting into. I am willing to bring it back and submit it to you, but I am just serving notice now that the Senate is not going to yield. They would never get it through the Senate. If we want to take care of these disabled men who are pleading for hospital beds, the thing to do is to have your House conferees yield or bring the question back and submit it to you.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Why impose any more duties on the President? Why should he be compelled to look after these hospitals?

Mr. RANKIN. The President is not shirking the responsibility. It is not my duty to come here and defend the President against you Republicans.

One distinguished Senator from a State that is seriously affected said frankly in the conference that he would go to the President and ask him to carry out our allocations as far as he could and so far as the House bill went, and another distinguished Senator from another State said he would do the same thing. I lay these facts before you gentlemen in order that you may know just exactly what the situation is. You may wave the party flag, as you did the other day, but I want to tell you that you are about to kill the hospital bill by your action.

If you do, the Republican conferees on the part of the House must assume the responsibility. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: On page 32, beginning at the top of the page, insert:

"For reimbursement to the State of Florida, for 50 per cent of the expenditures made by said State or subdivision thereof for repairing and rebuilding Federal highways as a result of the floods of 1928 and 1929, the sum of $134,466.69."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert:

"For the relief of the State of Florida as a complete contribution and reimbursement in aid from the United States induced by the extraordinary conditions of necessity and emergency resulting from the unusually serious financial loss to such State through the damage to or destruction of Federal aid highways and bridges by the floods of 1928 and 1929 imposing a public charge against the property of the State beyond its reasonable capacity to bear, fiscal year 1931, $65,000: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed as an acknowledgment of any past or future liability on the part of the United States in connection with the restoration of such roads and bridges."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, this amendment was put on in the Senate. You will recall that some years ago we passed an act with reference to reimbursing Georgia, South Carolina, and some of the other Southern States for damage to Federal-aid highways by reason of floods. A bill has passed the Senate and been reported in the House in favor of Florida. Florida claims to have expended $268,000 on account of floods in 1928 and 1929.

In order that this matter might be settled there was an agreement, as we supposed, between the Members of the Senate and the Representatives from Florida, but the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. YON], tells me there is not such an agreement or that there is a difference or misunderstanding as to the amount. We understood they were willing to accept $65,000 as a complete acquittance. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON] is insisting on $80,307.

This matter will have to go back to the Senate. So, if the motion I have made is adopted, it can go back again to conference and if the Florida gentlemen can get together or if they will finally conclude to accept this amount, all well and good; if they can not, of course, it will have to go out entirely.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. YON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I would like to make a little explanation of this matter. We introduced a bill, and it went before the Committee on Roads a year ago, asking for damages for 1928 and 1929. I was out of town some at that time and the matter was delayed. For the year 1929 the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and some other of the States of the Union got a full settlement about a year ago for as much as $1,500,000 each, approximately. We have a little bill here for $134,000 for the two years—1928 and 1929—and I have agreed with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in charge of this bill, that we will forego claiming anything further than the year 1929 if they will give us the full amout of $80,307 that the 1929 damage amounts to, and I would ask the chairman of the committee at this time if he can not accept that as an amendment and let it go to the conference.

Mr. WOOD. I have already stated to the House that we have a tentative agreement between the conferees of the

House and the Senate upon the amount stated in this amendment. I do not know whether the Senate will agree to this proposition, but, at any rate, we had to bring it back here and our action here will have to be concurred in by the Senate. So, when it goes back, if the gentleman from Florida can agree among themselves in conjunction with their Senators, perhaps we can get together. If we can not, we will have to throw it all out.

Mr. YON. The Members of the House from Florida have agreed to this, rather than to continue it, and in order to close the matter up; but if the conferees can not agree to the amount stated above as of damage for and in full for damage for year of 1929, I will not agree to the amount stated as to the conference agreement for $65,000, for it would be manifestly unfair and would prejudice our claim, and I would rather than do so that the whole figure be thrown out, than to accept less and thereby prejudice my State's fair and just claim in the matter, and would rather risk the judgment of another Congress in passing on our claim.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL].

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this matter, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON] has suggested, was before the Committee on Roads.

The Committee on Roads having heard this question, the same as the others, believed that Florida should be treated the same as the other States.

I have been opposed to the bill that was presented because it included the year 1928 as well as 1929, but I believe Florida should be treated the same as the other States.

This appropriation will end all the flood road claims, so far as I know, before Congress, and I want to say that hereafter, so far as the Committee on Roads is concerned, in my judgment, it will be the policy to stand very firmly, and it will have to be a case where an unusual flood has occurred before consideration will be given to these flood road bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 33: page 44, line 10, insert "Hopi-Navajo Sanatorium, Winslow, Ariz.: For construction and equipment of a sanatorium, including quarters for employees, at Winslow, Ariz., on a site to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and furnished to the United States free of cost, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, $150,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 36: Page 46, beginning in line 1, insert: "Advances to the reclamation fund: To carry out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize advances to the reclamation fund, and for other purposes,' approved ———, 1931, $5,000,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 37: Page 45, after line 8, insert: "Secondary projects: For continuation of investigations of the Seminole Dam and Reservoir and other possible storage sites and power development in connection with proposed and existing reservoirs on the North Platte River and its tributaries in Wyoming, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, $75,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 37: Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the sum "$75,000" insert the following: "*Provided*, That nothing done in pursuance hereof, or under the authority hereof, shall be construed to initiate or enlarge or constitute any water right or appropriation of water, or any priority of appropriation of water whatever."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 44, page 61, after line 3, insert:

"UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

"To carry out the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes,' if said act becomes law, all unexpended appropriations available at the time of the enactment thereof for expenditure by the Employment Service of the Department of Labor, shall be available for expenditure by the United States Employment Service, Department of Labor, in the same manner and to the same extent as if the said United States Employment Service had been directly named in the laws making such appropriations; and in addition to such sums there is hereby appropriated for expenditure by such United States Employment Service for such purposes, a sum, which, together with the sums hereinbefore mentioned in this paragraph, shall not exceed $1,500,000, all of which shall be available immediately after said act becomes law: *Provided*, That if the act herein referred to does not become a law at the present session of Congress, the amount herein appropriated shall not exceed $500,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC].

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I sent a telegram to the California Fruit Growers Exchange at Los Angeles, Calif., which has resulted in the donation of five carloads of oranges and lemons to the destitute who reside in the drought-stricken area. The telegram is as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1931.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS EXCHANGE,
Los Angeles, Calif.:

I have noticed public statement that California orange growers are raising a fund of $5,000 to buy up surplus crops of oranges to destroy in order to prevent break in market. In view of the fact that certain south Texas vegetable growers have recently donated a carload of turnips and cabbages to be distributed through the Red Cross in southwestern Oklahoma it was my thought your purpose could be served in a wonderful manner by allowing this fruit to be eaten by people residing in a section of Oklahoma and elsewhere who are in destitute circumstances occasioned by the drought. I am especially interested in southwestern Oklahoma where a very large per cent of the people are now being fed by the Red Cross; therefore if some of these oranges could be shipped to the Red Cross at Altus, Hollis, Frederick, or Hobart, Okla. I know that the citizens supplied would be grateful. Answer collect.

[Official.] J. V. MCCLINTIC.

This donation has proved to be a godsend especially to those who were sick and unable to obtain this kind of food. This most worthy contribution was obtained for the entire devastated area in the United States. However, one carload was received by those residing in the district that I have the honor to represent, and distributed through the activities of the Red Cross.

I am advised to-day that Mr. Clem V. Williams and other patriotic citizens residing at Hooker, Okla., have donated a carload of wheat which will be shipped to Hon. George C. Wright, chairman of the Red Cross at Altus, Okla., to be milled into flour and distributed through the activities of the various Red Cross chairmen in Beckham, Custer, Washita, Jackson, Harmon, Greer, Kiowa, and Tillman Counties, to those in need of food. I am very appreciative for the fine motives which have prompted those to render this kind of help to a splendid citizenship, who have been made destitute because of a situation that they could not control, and I want to make this public announcement so that the donors may know that our people who have received this aid are thankful for such benevolence, which is worthy and honorable from every standpoint. [Applause.]

The motion of Mr. WOOD was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 45, page 62, beginning in line 1, insert:

"CHILDREN'S BUREAU

"For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants, and for other purposes,' approved March —, 1931, $1,000,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 46, page 64, beginning in line 1, insert: "Navy yard, Charleston, S. C.: For improvement of shipbuilding ways, $150,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 46.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. WOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I should like very much to have the attention of the membership of the House and particularly the members of the conference committee on the second deficiency appropriation bill for just a few moments. The amendment now before the House has to do with providing building ways, or rather the repair to the building ways, at the Charleston Navy Yard. During the World War, building ways were erected at the Charleston yard to provide for the construction for four vessels at a time. This fact alone it seems to me shows the need of such facilities along the South Atlantic area of our country.

A few weeks ago the Navy Department recommended the sum of $150,000 for permanent repairs to one of these building ways. The item has the formal approval of the President through the Budget Bureau, and it has already twice passed the Senate during the present session of Congress. You gentlemen will recall that only a few days ago the Navy Department appropriation bill passed this House and carried an appropriation for the construction of 11 destroyers which has heretofore been authorized by Congress. Ten million dollars was carried in this bill for such a purpose.

In view of such affirmative action having been taken by the Congress I sincerely hope, and earnestly request, that the House and the committee on conference will favorably consider the incorporation of the Senate amendment in anticipation of the construction of these destroyers.

I desire to call attention of the House to the fact that in the fiscal year 1930 there was appropriated $570,000 by Congress for repairs to building ways in other navy yards of the country in anticipation of the construction of the new cruisers that were authorized to be built by Congress. In the fiscal year 1931 the sum of $565,000 additional was appropriated to complete such repairs. Surely it is proper and fair to now ask the House and the committee to provide for repairs to the building ways for the construction of destroyers in the only navy yard in the South which is admirably qualified from every standpoint to do such work, which, I repeat, has now been authorized and for which money has already been appropriated.

Many of you gentlemen, certainly those who were Members of the Seventieth Congress, will recall that two years ago without a recommendation of the department, without approval of the Budget, and over the objection of the committee on Naval Appropriations, this House by a record vote appropriated $300,000 for the extension of the dry dock at the Charleston Yard. This action it seems to me should convince every Member of Congress that it proposes to see maintained and operated a first-class navy yard along the South Atlantic coast of this country. I earnestly hope, therefore, that the conference committee when it goes back into conference on this item with the Senate conferees will concur with the Senate amendment and permit the Charleston Yard to be placed on a parity with other navy yards and thus be enabled as the only really southern navy yard to bid on the construction of one or more of the destroyers in the building program that will soon be under way by the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the House further insist upon its disagreement.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 59: Page 119, after line 18, insert: "New Bern, N. C., courthouse, customhouse, etc.: The proviso in the act of July 3, 1930, that no new site shall be acquired unless the city of New Bern shall agree to purchase the old site and building for a sum not less than the cost of the new site, and in the event that such an agreement is entered into, the Secretary of the Treasury may sell such a site and building to the city on such terms as he may deem proper, is hereby repealed."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I make a preferential motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment and ask the gentleman from Indiana to yield me time.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am undertaking now a rather difficult task, practically futile. I am appealing to the House on this matter and I am not coming to the House empty handed on reports. I have worked this matter out with the interdepartmental committee, the Bureau of the Budget, the President, and then I went before the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and got a unanimous report from them. I appeal now to the membership of the House. I see many a Member before me whom I have helped with my vote when the matter did not concern politics. Here is my situation: New Bern is my home city. It is also the home city of Senator SIMMONS, long a Senator with a distinguished record retiring now from office on March 4. Both North Carolina Senators are behind the Senate amendment, the Senate conferees are insisting that the House recede and concur. New Bern, N. C., is suffering on account of its three bank failures. We do not get any new building in New Bern on a new site until the Secretary of the Treasury says we get it.

If we can not satisfy the Secretary of the Treasury that we need a building in New Bern, on a new site, how can striking out the proviso hurt? I have begged the chairman of this committee to let this go in. I pleaded with him, because it is my home city. It does seem to me that the House should recede and concur in this amendment.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. As I understand it, the city of New Bern has sufficient receipts to authorize the construction of a building there. Does the gentleman remember what the receipts are?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Oh, we have plenty of receipts.

Mr. BYRNS. It has been adjudged that New Bern is entitled to a new building, and that you get a new building?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Absolutely.

Mr. BYRNS. As I understand, this is the only limitation that has ever been imposed on any building?

Mr. ABERNETHY. There never has been a limitation of this kind proposed before in any city.

Mr. DUNBAR. On what ground is this city deprived of a public building?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Because the city had three bank failures. It agreed to buy a new site, and it could not buy a new site at this time. That is all there is to it.

Mr. DUNBAR. How does the gentleman expect us to help him?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Just vote to recede and concur. That is all. I am appealing here now to the distinguished chair-

man of the Committee on Appropriations. I am asking him to give me this consideration.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I think when you hear the facts with reference to this matter you will not be carried away by reason of the appeal made for any special individual. It seems to me the Appropriations Committee has been trifled with in this case. I speak advisedly. In the first instance, when a post office at New Bern was asked for, the proposal was approved to buy more ground and put an addition on to the present building at a cost of $210,000. Then the people thought there was not sufficient ground for that. The department agreed.

Then a new proposal was submitted to Congress to change that $210,000 proposition by giving the Secretary of the Treasury authority to build an entirely new building at a cost of $250,000 on a site which the city would furnish and in return for furnishing that site the city would get the old building for use as a city hall. The new site to be furnished was estimated to cost about $75,000. While that proposal was before the committee the gentleman from North Carolina came before us and explained that the city was financially in trouble on account of the failure of some banks and could not buy the new site but that if we would raise the amount of the proposal from $250,000 to $325,000 so the Government could buy the site they would agree to buy the old building for whatever the new site cost. The committee and Congress accepted that suggestion by placing the following provision on the authorization of $325,000 for the new site and new building:

Provided, That no new site shall be acquired unless the city of New Bern shall agree to purchase the old site and building for a sum not less than the cost of the new site and in the event such agreement is entered into the Secretary of the Treasury may sell such old site and building to the city on such terms as he may deem proper.

Now he proposes to repeal that condition. All in the world they have to do is to keep faith and complete the agreement that they promised to make with the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I told the gentleman and the Members of the House that we have agreed with the Secretary of the Treasury that no new building shall go on this new site until we do make satisfactory terms with him, but we will not get a building for the next 18 months, and our people down there are suffering. Let us give the Secretary of the Treasury a little discretion in the matter.

Mr. WOOD. Now, the gentleman is not fooling me, and I hope he will not fool you. He has said he has an understanding or agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury. Why does he not take his agreement to the Secretary of the Treasury? All the Treasury is asking is an agreement. All he has to do is to make an agreement upon such terms as the Secretary and the officials of the city of New Bern will make between themselves. They were satisfied when we gave them this proviso so that they could make an agreement that would be satisfactory to all concerned. That is not the trouble. It looks as though they want to repudiate this entire business.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has control of all the time, and I hope the gentleman will not charge me with that.

Mr. WOOD. I am stating the facts exactly as they appear to me. They apparently do not want to give $75,000 for the present building. They want a new site that is going to cost the Government $75,000. In consequence they do not want to enter into this agreement that they said they would enter into, to pay the Government that price for this property. If they will enter into the agreement which they promised to enter into, that they would pay the Government exactly for the present property what the new site cost, there would be no trouble here at all. We have changed this thing three different times for them and finally gave them exactly what they wanted, in order that this building might be put up. The Government is to furnish the money in the first instance to buy the site. All they have to do is to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury and keep faith by agreeing to pay for the property what the new site costs, upon such terms as they might agree upon.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No 61: Page 123, line 4, insert the following: "Omaha, Nebr., Federal office building: For demolition of building and construction of a new building on a site owned by the Government, under an estimated total cost of $740,000, and there is hereby transferred from the War Department to the Treasury Department the land comprising the site of the old Post Office and Customhouse Building at Omaha, Nebr., together with the improvements thereon, which was turned over by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of War, under authority of the act of Congress, approved January 21, 1889 (25 Stat. 652.)"

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 66: Page 140, line 3, insert the following: "Washington, D. C., Court of Claims Building: For construction of a building, under an estimated total cost of $1,225,000.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 72: Page 144, beginning after line 21, insert the following "Plattsburg Barracks, Plattsburg, N. Y.: To carry out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize appropriations for construction at Plattsburg Barracks, Plattsburg, N. Y., and for other purposes,' approved February —, 1931, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, $150,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "After the word 'February' in the matter inserted by said amendment insert the numerals '28'."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 77, on page 149, beginning in life 16, insert: "Paving Missionary Ridge Crest Road and Crest and Gap Road: For improving and paving the Government roads known as the Missionary Ridge Crest Road and the Crest and Gap Road in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, from the Lafayette Road, in the State of Georgia, to the Tennessee-Georgia State line, a distance of approximately 1.1 miles, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, $37,770: *Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the State of Georgia, or any county or municipality or local subdivision thereof or any highway commission or equivalent public authority of the same, shall have given satisfactory assurances to the Secretary of War that it will at all times maintain said road in good repair."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Paving Missionary Ridge Crest Road and Crest and Gap Road: For improving and paving the Government roads known as the

Missionary Ridge Crest Road and the Crest and Gap Road in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, from the Lafayette Road, in the State of Georgia, to the Tennessee-Georgia State line, a distance of approximately 1.1 miles, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, $27,770: *Provided*. That no part of this appropriation shall be expended until the State of Georgia or any county or municipality or local subdivision thereof or any highway commission or equivalent public authority of the same concerned shall have given to the Secretary of War satisfactory assurances that immediately upon the completion of such improvements as may be made under this appropriation they will accept title to and maintain such portion of the roads under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1923 (43 Stat. 1104), and the Secretary of War is authorized to convey title to such roads in accordance with the provisions of such act, except such portions thereof upon which have been erected by the Government or by States or by veterans' organizations or societies monuments, markers, or tablets, to mark and commemorate historic events connected with the battles."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79: On page 153, after line 9, insert: "For the erection of a suitable monument to the memory of the first permanent settlement of the West at Harrodsburg, in accordance with the terms of the bill S. 4384, which passed the Senate on February 17, 1931, $100,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. May I ask the gentleman whether there is any chance of getting together on that item.

Mr. WOOD. There is no chance of getting together on it unless the bill authorizing it passes the House. It has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House. It is the understanding that if it finally passes before this bill is concluded it will be inserted.

Mr. THATCHER. Of course, the chairman knows the merit of the proposition.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I am in entire sympathy with it.

Mr. THATCHER. The item will go to conference again, awaiting the action of the House on the bill now pending?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 81: On page 153, after line 13, insert: "Fort Pierce Harbor: For dredging the channel of Fort Pierce Harbor, Fla., fiscal years 1931 and 1932."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment, insert:

"Fort Pierce Harbor: For dredging the channel of Fort Pierce Harbor, Fla., fiscal years 1931 and 1932, $20,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended until local interests shall have agreed to maintain such channel upon completion of the dredging herein provided for."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 82, page 153, after line 16, insert: "Muscle Shoals: For beginning the construction of the Cove Creek Dam in Tennessee, as provided in Senate Joint Resolution No. 49, approved February —, 1931, $10,000.000, to be available until expended."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 95: On page 179, after line 17, insert: "The case of the Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Co. against United States of America, No. J-543 be, and hereby is, remanded to the United States Court of Claims with complete authority, the statute of limitations or rule of procedure to the contrary notwithstanding, to hear testimony as to the actual facts involved in the litigation and with instructions to report its finding of facts to Congress at the earliest practicable moment."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

Mr. STAFFORD. On what page does this amendment appear?

Mr. WOOD. On page 179.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is moving to concur in the Senate amendment?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. This will send it to the Court of Claims in order to endeavor to get the facts for Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there are many such provisions carried in public bills?

Mr. WOOD. If the gentleman wants an explanation I will say that it involves a claim that was allowed by the Court of Claims for the burning down of a vocational institution occupied by the Government, and there is a question as to whether the Government is responsible or whether it is not. However, a judgment was rendered against the Government and there is a great diversity of opinion as to whether that judgment ought to be honored. Until the matter is further investigated the Congress should not propose to pay it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 100: On page 190, beginning in line 1, insert: "To aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1931: To aid the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Day Corporation in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1931, and in the decoration of the graves of the Union soldiers, sailors, and marines with flags and flowers in the national cemeteries in the District of Columbia and in the Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia, fiscal year 1931, $2,500, to be paid to the treasurer of such corporation and disbursed by him for the foregoing purposes."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment before the word "To" insert the following: "Sec. 7."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House ask for a further conference with the Senate and that conferees be appointed.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. WOOD, CRAMTON, WASON, BYRNS, and BUCHANAN.

ECONOMIC INVESTIGATION BY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer the following joint resolution to provide for the investigation of economic conditions in the oil, coal, lumber, manganese, asbestos, and agricultural industries, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 525

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of obtaining information necessary as a basis for legislation, those members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-first Congress who are Members elect to the Seventy-second Congress, after March 4, 1931, and until the organization of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of the Seventy-second Congress, are authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee or otherwise, to investigate the economic conditions in the oil, coal, lumber, manganese, asbestos, and agricultural industries.

SEC. 2. For such purposes the committee is authorized to select a chairman, and the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places in the United States or elsewhere, to hold such hearings, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths and affirmations, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. The expenses of the committee, not to exceed $50,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

SEC. 3. Subpœnas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. In case of disobedience to a subpœna the committee may invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents. Any district court of the United States, within the jurisdiction of which any hearing is carried on, may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpœna issued to any person, issue an order requiring the person to appear before the committee or subcommittee thereof or to produce books, papers, and documents if so ordered or to give evidence touching upon any matter under investigation, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof. The provisions of sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192, 193, and 104) shall be applicable with respect to any person summoned as a witness under the authority of this resolution in the same manner as such provisions are applicable with respect to any person summoned as a witness in the case of an inquiry before a committee of the House of Representatives. Witnesses subpœnaed under authority of this resolution shall be paid the same fees and expenses as witnesses subpœnaed to appear before committees of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. The head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the Government shall, upon request of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, furnish such records, documents, papers, correspondence, and information in the possession of such department, independent establishment, or agency as may assist the committee, and may temporarily detail any officers or employees of such department, independent establishment, or agency to assist such committee or subcommittee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which I hope not to do, I will ask the gentleman what his thought is with reference to the production of sugar in the United States. I note that unless the gentleman construes it to be, as it really is, one of the agricultural products, it would not be reached in this investigation.

Mr. BLANTON. This is nothing in the world but a "sugar" bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not asking the gentleman; I am asking the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. HAWLEY. Undoubtedly, investigation of the sugar industry would be included in these terms.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am very glad to have that assurance.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if this resolution is expected to appease the 20 stalwart Republicans who were about to balk on the gentleman the other night and refused to attend the Republican caucus, when they could not get oil relief. Does the gentleman expect to appease them with this kind of "sugar" resolution?

Mr. HAWLEY. The purpose of this resolution is to obtain material information that the committee did not have when we were considering certain resolutions heretofore.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but the gentleman knows that nearly two months ago, at the instance of the governors of oil States, the independent oil operators came to Washington and held a convention, and they appeared before the gentleman's committee and before they appeared member after member of the Ways and Means Committee appeared before them, including our good friend, Doctor CROWTHER, and told them they must have relief immediately, but nothing has been done by the gentleman's committee.

The gentleman's committee is familiar with every fact about the oil industry. The gentleman's committee knows that Mr. Mellon's big company can lay gasoline down in New York from South America in their tankers for 4 cents a gallon, and it is still selling here in Washington at 16 cents.

This $50,000 is to be wasted. It is a mere gesture, and I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 525) to provide for the investigation of economic conditions in the oil, coal, lumber, manganese, asbestos, and agricultural industries, and for other purposes, just read by the clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon moves to suspend the rules and pass the resolution just read.

Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the time to the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I think in this connection that whoever is opposed to the resolution ought to control half the time.

Mr. BLANTON. I am opposed to it.

Mr. GARNER. I would not want to take all the time.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall yield the gentleman whatever time he wants.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] for 20 minutes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means have held hearings on a number of bills proposing duties or embargoes on products of various kinds. After the hearings were concluded and the committee gave consideration to the bills, in the light of the information so received, it was discovered that there was material information which affected the situation which they did not have. Such information can not be obtained without the authority given the committee by the pending resolution. On the subject of transportation of oil by tankers, numbers of vessels available, pipe lines, and other means of transportation further information was desired. Also the cost of production was involved, varying with the different fields in the country, which was not sufficiently presented to the committee. There was also presented the subject of the leases made on farm lands by oil companies. It was stated that farmers receive considerable revenue from the leases made on their lands; but no estimate was presented of the amount, or what value such leases are to the farming industry, except in a very general way. Undoubtedly this is an important factor.

Then there was also presented the question of the difference in cost of production of foreign and imported oils and domestic oils.

Incident to this discussion, the question was raised of the value in the refining of the different kinds of crude oil; what values were derived from crude petroleum imported from Venezuela, for instance, and how much per barrel of the different products of oil were so obtained; also the question as to the amount of different kinds of products were obtained from the domestic oil and their values. This involved the ascertainment of the comparative value of foreign and domestic oils when refined and the market values of the products.

Also the question of proration of oil among the different fields and different wells—how that could be effected by legislation and whether anything could be done in the matter of proration of imported oil.

One material question was that involved in the question of fuel oil. It appears that the imported oil produces more fuel oil and less gasoline than American oil. The American oils produce a greater proportion of gasoline and other products and a less proportion of fuel oil. That was a material

question that was pending when the committee finally concluded.

There are many other inquiries involved in the oil question which I will not take the time to name.

Similar questions were raised regarding agriculture, coal, lumber, manganese, and asbestos. This information still lacking, which can only be obtained satisfactorily by going to the various places where these products are, taking testimony of witnesses in regard to them, and making examination of books and operations.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that Mr. Wirt Franklin, of Oklahoma, president of the Independent Oil Operators, being a wealthy man, has generously expended about $100,000 himself gathering facts and statistics which he placed before the gentleman's committee. This comprehensive information has been placed in the RECORD, both by the Senate and the House. What information does the gentleman expect to gather in addition to that fine statement of facts presented by Mr. Franklin? You can get all the facts from Mr. Mellon. If you ask Mr. Mellon to come before you and you want information that he does not want to give you he will not give it. He would laugh at you but he would not give the information.

Mr. HAWLEY. When the committee desires to get information from any great oil companies, we will get that information. We have the power to punish recalcitrant witnesses and make them testify.

Mr. BLANTON. If you put the minority leader [Mr. GARNER] at the head of the subcommittee he will get it, but I doubt if the chairman would.

Mr. HAWLEY. It was stated in the committee that the subcommittees would be made up in the usual manner. Undoubtedly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will be on any subcommittee he selects. He is never backward about asking questions.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Oregon held him out of order every time he asked a question.

Mr. HAWLEY. The chairman held him out of order when he was out of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, and he would be out of order when he asked a question for information that the chairman did not want to give.

Mr. HAWLEY. That would not necessarily follow, and in the cases referred to is an error.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does the gentleman feel, as far as this resolution is concerned, that if he gets the information he wants to secure it will result in the Republican Party seeing the mistake it has made and ask for a downward revision of the tariff at the next session? I am of the opinion if our export trade continues to decrease as it has since the present law was enacted even big business will be demanding a revision downward.

Mr. HAWLEY. The chairman can not tell what will happen until he sees what information is obtained. However, the proposals recently before the committee have all been for increases.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Is it the intention of this committee to go to Russia to investigate the oil question?

Mr. HAWLEY. If such a joint resolution were passed by Congress and signed by the President it would be an official act and if the Government of Russia were asked to admit the committee so designated to make an investigation in Russia, that would be a recognition of the Soviet Government.

I have taken the advice of Doctor TEMPLE, of Pennsylvania, who, I think, all agree is a competent authority on international questions.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] who demanded a second, appears to be strongly in favor of either a tariff on oil or an embargo. I wish the gentleman from Oregon would ask the gentleman from Texas whether, if a protective tariff or an embargo had been placed on oil in the last tariff bill he would have supported it.

Mr. BLANTON. I will support a tariff on any product that needs a tariff to equalize the difference in the cost of production between this country and any peon country in the world.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And he would double-cross the people of Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not double-cross anybody. I would not even double-cross BOB LA FOLLETTE.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman is aware that the coal-mining industry of this country is in quite as depressed a condition as any others mentioned in the gentleman's resolution. Is it the intention under this resolution to make an investigation of the causes of that depression?

Mr. HAWLEY. All the questions involved in the economic situation with respect to coal will be investigated.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. If the committees of the Senate and the House are authorized to make the investigation——

Mr. HAWLEY. The pending resolution applies only to the House committee.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Would other parties, unofficial, be permitted to appear and take part in the investigations that will be conducted, in the way of cross-examining witnesses, as, say, a friend of the committee, so to speak?

Mr. HAWLEY. That would depend upon what the committee would decide. Undoubtedly the committee will be glad to have any suggestions that anyone may make.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I should think so. We ought to have full information upon the question.

Mr. McFADDEN. Is there in contemplation an investigation of the operations of the Federal Farm Board in connection with the agricultural study?

Mr. HAWLEY. That might be included, but I have not considered the question sufficiently to make a definite answer.

Mr. McFADDEN. Is it not a big factor in the economic situation with respect to agriculture?

Mr. HAWLEY. It is.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is it the purpose of this resolution to satisfy in part the gentlemen from Kansas and other places who stayed away from the Republican caucus the other night?

Mr. HAWLEY. I have already answered that question. It is for the purpose of obtaining the information the committee needs to reach a conclusion as to what ought to be done, based on information, additional to that it now possesses and some information that can be obtained only under a resolution giving the committee the powers provided in the resolution.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I just want to inquire what business it is of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to inquire into the internal affairs of the Republican Party?

Mr. BLANTON. It is of interest to the people of the country to know that 20 stalwart Republicans refuse to attend a Republican caucus.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. In other words, these gentlemen are interfering where they do not belong.

Mr. BLANTON. We will take care of that.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. And we will take care of this side for a while.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; for a little while longer.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman or his committee had given any consideration as

to the general nature of the investigations that are to be made with respect to agricultural products particularly?

Mr. HAWLEY. They are specially named in the resolution.

Mr. BURTNESS. I know they are, but I am wondering whether or not the gentleman is in a position to give us any general idea as to the nature of the investigation that could be made with reference to agricultural products.

Mr. HAWLEY. My opinion is that the committee would consider the agricultural situation in all seriousness and make diligent investigation of the problems involved in it.

Mr. BURTNESS. I have every confidence that it will.

Mr. DYER. It would probably give four-fifths of its time to agriculture, in accordance with the action of this Congress in giving four-fifths of its attention to agricultural questions.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think the intention is to make diligent inquiry of all of the problems.

Mr. GIBSON. We have a serious problem in relation to maple sugar in connection with the tariff.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not know whether maple sugar is an agricultural product or not. If it is, we will investigate that.

Mr. GIBSON. It is an agricultural product.

Mr. HAWLEY. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as stated by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] this resolution was reported this morning unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, but until 10 o'clock this morning no Democrat had an opportunity to read the provisions of the resolution. That, of course, is pleasing to the Republican side, because they do not want Democrats to have any information as to the kind of skullduggery they propose to perform until they are ready to do it. [Laughter.]

This resolution, in my judgment, is advisable if it is carried out in good faith, and the presumption is that it will be carried out in good faith. It empowers the Ways and Means Committee to make an investigation, through a subcommittee or the whole committee, of the economic conditions pertaining to oil, manganese, asbestos, lumber, and agricultural products. However, the real reason for this resolution is not apparent upon its face. It ought to be entitled, a resolution to save the face of the Speaker and the Republican organization of the House on account of the manner in which they have dealt with the oil situation.

That is what this resolution is. It never was intended for getting information upon which to base legislation. But they desired the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GARBER] and other Members from oil-producing States to be able to go back and tell their constituents that the best they could do was to get a committee appointed to gather information. From that information they hoped to bring in legislation in the Seventy-second Congress giving relief for the oil industry and thereby control their votes in the organization of the House in December. [Applause.]

I always like to tell the truth about things. That is exactly what this resolution is for. It is for the purpose of protecting the organization of the Republican Party of this House, and for no other purpose.

Mr. Speaker, more than 60 days ago Mr. HAWLEY, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, was appealed to to give an opportunity to consider the question of levying a tariff on oil. You never could even get him to call the committee together. In fact, according to press reports, he gave out the statement that there would be no committee meeting for the purpose of considering a tariff on oil. The pressure became so great that the Speaker intervened and commanded an opportunity for the oil people to be heard. After the independent oil people were heard, they made a case so strong that the so-called free traders on the Democratic side, as they have been erroneously termed, were in favor of a duty on oil. I venture the assertion that out of 10 Members on the minority side, 9 of them would have voted for a duty on oil, but you Republicans on the committee would not do it. You claim to be protectionists, and yet you failed to vote for a duty on oil, Mr. HAWLEY. Now you are coming in and asking for this investigation

Mr. Speaker, the case is complete. As far as levying a tariff on oil from Venezuela is concerned, the case has been made. Every Republican on that committee knows that a case has been made and that there should be a duty on oil. But what happened? As soon as some of these New England people found out that there was a real consideration for a duty on oil, that the Speaker of the House had become alarmed and was looking at the setting sun in the west, they immediately arose in the east, and said: "We have some votes, and while we are regular you must give us a chance to be regular." Nick looked over the field, and when he glanced at New England with that large number of votes and down in Kansas with 6 or 7 and in Oklahoma with 1, he said, "Hold it up, gentlemen. Stop. I have made a mistake."

If you will recall that morning after the passage in his office, he was so excited, so agitated, that he could not even put the questions before the House on the various subjects. [Laughter and applause.]

Ah, sir, how does that vary from what it was six years ago! Remember that scene of that mighty Speaker, sitting on the stand, when he issued the ultimatum to those western people, when he took them by the nape of the neck and the seat of the pants and threw them out of committees, not only threw them off of committees but demoted them to the point of humiliation. He was monarch of the forest, a lion shaking his mane to the world, "We are pure Republicans; we will have none of you." [Laughter and applause.]

Now we have him at this day, when he has looked over the scene and he has seen the diminishing opportunity he has to keep his crown; he is like a 4-month-old puppy, whining, saying, "For God's sake, don't give me any more lashes. I will be good from now on." [Laughter and applause.]

Take it as you will, there can be no doubt that this resolution was brought in as a partisan matter, hoping to make it a partisan resolution, and I say that advisedly. I challenge any Republican to deny it. I will prove it. But when it came into committee a Democrat moved that it be reported. The Democrats made it unanimous. After the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee had caucused and had their little conference and fixed this thing up, they said: "Maybe we can get the Democrats to oppose it, and that will save us." But when we got in there and we learned the situation, we determined not to let them get by with it. So we unanimously reported this to this House for its consideration. [Applause and laughter.]

Whether or not you will get anything out of it, I do not know. It will depend upon the energy, the forcefulness, the desire, and effort to go into the oil question; $50,000 will not pay the expenses of the oil investigation. Production, transportation, refining, marketing must all be investigated. Not only that, Mr. HAWLEY, but I am putting it into the RECORD now, sir. I want to know whether you are going to ask Uncle Andy to come before the committee and explain the holding companies in the oil industry?

Mr. HAWLEY. I have no objection. I suppose all organizations importing oil into this country will be subpœnaed to appear and give any testimony the committee may desire, and I suppose that will include all oil companies, including the one in which the gentleman says Mr. Mellon is interested.

Mr. GARNER. I want to suggest to you, sir, so that the RECORD may show it now, that the first two witnesses to summon and to bring their books should be Andrew W. Mellon and Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., so we may have something concerning this oil business that will be of some value. I want to know about the old companies. I want to know whether there is a price control of oil in this country. I think a great many people believe there is in this country an oil industry controlling the price to the ultimate consumer. To ascertain these facts you must summons these men who control the industry, and I undertake to

say that Mr. Mellon and Mr. Rockefeller come nearer controlling it than any other two men, and they can come nearer giving us information on which to ascertain what is necessary with reference to it than any other two men in the country.

I am thoroughly convinced of two things about oil from the limited investigation I have made. First, that you ought not to permit these four companies which control oil in this country to bring cheap oil from abroad and put it in competition with the independent oil people. [Applause.] Of this I am convinced.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GARNER. Second, I am thoroughly convinced that as an economic problem the marketing of oil, of gasoline, and of lubricating oil in this country ought to be severed from the production, transportation, and refining of oil. Of those two things I am convinced from the limited investigation I have made. If you will do that, if you will give the independents a fair opportunity to produce oil and compete with these old-line companies, who control the market in this country, you will be doing something worth while for them. Then if you will tell the four old-line companies to sell their filling stations, and not permit the people who produce, transport, and refine oil to retail the refined products, you will go a long way toward putting oil, gasoline, and lubricating oil in this country in competition. Those two things I know ought to be done now.

I am going to vote for this resolution. I realize it is in your behalf, Mr. Speaker, and I want to do something at least to make you happy before the end of the session. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an effort to placate the Representatives from the oil States. It will deceive no one in the Middle West. It will give the recalcitrant Members a chance to get back on the reservation.

Congress adjourns on the 4th day of March, 1931. The leaders have deceived those interested in the oil industry, towing them along until the very closing days of the session, into the belief that favorable action would be taken in behalf of an embargo or a tariff on oil. Those more intimately familiar with the situation were not deceived. The four big companies who import 82 per cent of the oil have a strangle hold on the situation and, of course, are opposed to any legislation in favor of the independent oil producers.

AN ISSUE IN 1928 CAMPAIGN

Representing the administration, Senator CURTIS, then the nominee of his party for Vice President, during the campaign last year committed the administration to a policy of protection on oil. On September 27, 1928, Senator CURTIS, in Oklahoma, advocated a tariff in the following language, as shown by the following published quotation from his speech:

> Our Democratic friends favor a competitive tariff. That will not help a single farmer in this country, not a workingman in this country, not a single oil producer, not a manufacturer of goods. The Republicans are opposed to a competitive tariff and favor a protective tariff.
>
> In the last two revenue bills I proposed a duty on oil. You, in Oklahoma, I see, have requested the limitation of oil production. I took a market report and found that last year we imported 77,000,000 barrels of oil into this country. I suggest that we shut out those 77,000,000 barrels, and you would not have to shut down production here.

We strenuously insist upon faith being kept and that this campaign pledge be carried out.

I introduced a bill providing for a tariff of $1 per barrel on oil and 50 per cent ad valorem duty on refined products. I supported the embargo bill, which was a temporary measure, limiting the importation of crude oil to 16,000,000 barrels for three years; but the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, after holding hearings for a number of days, and having all the facts available before the committee, passed a resolution declining to take up for consideration either the tariff bill or the embargo bill. This, of course, defeated the legislation for this session of Congress.

In the meantime, 67 cents per barrel is offered for oil in the mid-continent field. There is a market at this time for only a small percentage of the oil produced. Everyone knows that the oil interests have been betrayed. The steering committee of the Senate has refused to give consideration to the bill reported to the Senate. Everyone knows that consideration could be secured for this legislation if it were favorably recommended by the President. By special message he has urged the enactment of much legislation during this session of Congress, but Congress has not been urged to enact this legislation, which is of vital importance to the oil industry of the country. The independent producers have no chance against the Big Four.

The oil situation has been investigated and reported upon by the Tariff Commission. All the facts have been placed before the Ways and Means Committee. They want more time to appease the wrath of western Members and have fallen upon this plan to pass a resolution to make an investigation. Let the resolution pass. It will deceive no one. It will serve as an excuse to defeat any legislation at the present session. In the meantime the Big Four will complete their strangulation of the independent producers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Ways and Means Committee has reported two resolutions. One you have before you. It provides for an investigation by the members of the committee of conditions in these industries. The other one is for a further investigation by the Tariff Commission particularly upon refined products of oil, which was not included in their first investigation, the report to be made by the 1st of next December. I certainly hope that both of these resolutions will be adopted, because I am confident, in the first place, that the report of the Tariff Commission will furnish an absolute basis for tariff legislation in the oil industry. With reference to the resolution now before us, I am confident that if the members of the Ways and Means Committee will go out into the oil country they will come back with a story which will confirm our viewpoint as to the legislation.

Now, reference has been made to these resolutions as placating certain Members of the House. I know nothing about that, but I know that these resolutions are in no way what we asked for. But, for the reasons stated, I hope they will be adopted.

In the few minutes I have, just let me say a word or two about this oil situation. The great oil industry is prostrate in a dozen States in this Union, from West Virginia to the State of California. And what has the industry been asking at this session?

It has only asked that there be applied to importations a measure of the same limitation which the industry itself has applied to domestic production.

I say there is no industry in this country which has done so much in the last two years to meet its problem without governmental aid as the oil industry.

The statement is made that if you limit importations of oil or place a tariff upon oil, this will increase the price of fuel oil. I have no time to discuss this, but I say that this is a strange argument to be coming from protection States.

It is said it will increase the price of gasoline. I say the figures disprove this. Over a course of years it is shown that the price of crude oil would go down 50 per cent, while at the same time the price of gasoline would go up.

I give my good friends credit for sincerity, but I say to them that in my judgment the independent oil industry of this country is now in process of strangulation, and within a comparatively short time, unless something is done, a comparatively few big oil companies will have control of the oil properties of this country, and when they have this control

then we will see what price will be paid by the consumers of this country for fuel oil and gasoline.

We have made no sectional appeal. I want to say that without any rancor we have simply resisted, and I may say resented, a sectional application of the policy of protection to which we have given our support, and I am sure that when our good friends upon the Republican side know all the facts, there will be no question about the result. When they know all the facts I am sure they will not repudiate the policy of protection when we are in distress, a policy of which they have been the beneficiaries for many years with our help.

Now in the moment of closing let me say, so there may be no misunderstanding, to my good friend from Texas JACK GARNER—and I am sorry he is not here—let him be under no misapprehension. As fond as I am of my friend from Texas I have no intention whatever of helping secure for him a certain automobile which he has had his eyes on for some time—none whatever. [Laughter and applause.]

During the years I have been here I have seen too much lip service by my friends on the Democratic side in behalf of the policy of protection when the issue was not before us for vote and such little support of it when it was before us for vote to be fooled by any protestations of support of the policy of protection that may be made from the Democratic side of the House. I have been appealing to you Republicans as a Republican and registering my position in every possible way so that there may be no misunderstanding about it.

I am appealing to my Republican friends in the House for the same sort of protection for our country when we are in distress that we have readily granted in the past to them when their industries came here seeking protection. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would not want the impression to go out to the country that the Democratic Party has become a high-protection party. There are some of us who are still against high protection, who are still against a protective tariff on oil. There are still some of us who oppose this resolution because we know it is the forerunner of a high-protective duty on oil, which will inure to the benefit of the four or more companies at which it is directed; and after a protective tariff, then you are going to outprotection protection and put on an embargo, and there are still some Democrats left who will vote against the resolution and vote against a high-protective tariff even if it is on oil. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNER] who has just taken his seat, I want to say that there are Democratic Members of this body who are in favor of a tariff on oil and I am one of them.

Now in reply to my colleague from Kansas who said, "I have seen too much lip service by my friends on the Democratic side in behalf of the policy of protection, and so forth." I resent that statement and do not propose to let it pass unchallenged. The delegations in Congress from the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, both Democrats and Republicans, have worked unceasingly for the past six or eight weeks to get some legislation to relieve the independent oil producers. I am willing to leave it to the men who were here from Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas representing the independent producers whether or not we Democrats from those States did our part, and further, Mr. Speaker, with final adjournment confronting us by noon day after to-morrow, I should feel I were derelict if I did not in these closing hours of the session again voice my protest against the utter disregard of the distressing plight of the independent oil producers and refining companies of our country that has been manifested by the administration and the leaders of the majority party.

The unwillingness to do absolutely anything toward alleviating the actually startling situation in which the independent oil industry of the country finds itself is another indication of the vacillating course the party in power has pursued as to all proposals in the interest of business recovery and in extending relief in one form or another to those who have been reduced to a state of sheer want through drought conditions and widespread unemployment.

I have exhausted every means at my disposal to secure legislation that would keep foreign oil from our shores. Failing this, I was determined to prevent as far as I could the use of taxpayers' money to buy oil of foreign production for use by our Federal agencies. I, therefore, first succeeded in amending the appropriation for the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation to prevent the purchase of fuel oil of any kind of foreign production, either at home or in our possessions, where domestic oil is available, providing the cost of our oil does not unreasonably exceed the cost of foreign-produced oil. I next directed my efforts to get a similar restriction placed on the naval appropriation bill. The Navy is by far the largest Federal user of fuel oil. I met with considerable opposition but in the end succeeded in having included in the bill, which the President approved on Saturday, a provision which reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available, any provision in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, for the purchase of any kind of fuel oil of foreign production for issue, delivery, or sale to ships at points either in the United States or its possessions where oil of the production of the United States or its possessions may be procurable, notwithstanding that oil of the production of the United States or its possessions may cost more than oil of foreign production, if such excess of cost, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, which shall be conclusive, be not unreasonable, but nothing herein shall apply to fuel oil on hand or on order on July 1, 1931.

I am fully cognizant of the fact that nothing short of an embargo on the importation of foreign oil will appreciably aid in the solution of the domestic oil problem, but my amendments at least are tantamount to committing the Government to the embargo principle in so far as they apply to the use of oil by its own agencies. And let me say right here that these amendments are not mere gestures. I shall make it my business when Congress convenes in regular session next December to ascertain to what extent, if any, foreign oil has been bought in preference to domestic oil solely on account of a price difference, and what that difference has been, and what factors have contributed thereto. It may be possible to lay down foreign oil along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts and possibly at points in our possessions at a lower cost than the domestic product because of cheaper production costs and lower transportation charges. These factors should be discounted under my amendments. The only factors that should enter into the determination of the reasonableness of the prices quoted for domestic oil should be those that contribute to the difference between the delivery price quoted for domestic oil at different points in the United States and its possessions. If the spirit of my amendments is complied with, the effect no doubt will be an increase in our budget for oil consumed by Federal agencies. What of that? We look to such a result and that was taken into account by myself and those with whom I negotiated in order to have my amendments adopted, and I desire to say here that I am ready and willing to vote larger appropriations to meet the additional cost.

I can not conceive of any branch of the United States Government, and especially the United States Navy and Merchant Fleet, purchasing fuel oil from a foreign source. Even though it may be purchased at a less cost, patriotism alone should forbid it. If it were impossible for the Navy and the merchant fleet to procure fuel oil of American production, it would be a different story; but we have millions of barrels of home-produced oil on the Atlantic coast, on the Gulf coast, and on the Pacific coast. There can be no reasonable excuse for not purchasing this oil from our people to whom the Navy, the Merchant Fleet Corporation, and our Government itself must look for support.

The Navy Department would prefer not to be hampered by my amendment. It has been contended that it might deny the purchase of fuel oil on the East coast, due to the fact that the major producers in their refining processes make use of considerable quantities of Mexican and South American crude oils, which become mingled with American crude, and it would be impossible for the Navy, as a purchaser, to determine whether the fuel oil offered contains crude oils wholly of domestic or foreign production, or a mixture of both. The very purpose of my amendment is to make it impossible for the Navy and Merchant Fleet Corporation to purchase fuel oil produced in Mexico and South American countries by peon labor and brought into this country in competition with American labor. My object has been to compel these governmental activities to purchase fuel oil refined wholly from American crude. If such large companies, like the Standard, the Gulf, and the Dutch Shell, with their subsidiaries, want this business, and the records show that these concerns furnish practically all of the fuel oil for the Navy and Fleet Corporation, let them refine American crude. If they will not do this, then let the Navy and the Fleet Corporation purchase it from companies that will.

The Navy and Shipping Board can require a certificate to accompany all bids for supplying fuel oil that they are based upon a product refined wholly from American crude. Congress can not directly compel American private concerns to purchase fuel oil refined wholly from American crude, but it can compel this Government, or its departments, to do so, and in the face of the existing condition of the independent oil industry of the United States, it is our duty to do it. That is the reason for my amendments to the appropriation measures for the Navy and the Merchant Fleet Corporation.

The independent oil producers and refining companies are to-day almost bankrupt because of unfair treatment by their Government. Practically every industry in this country, except the oil industry, received ample protection in the tariff measure that was passed last year, and it is unquestionably a fact that no industry or business appearing before the Ways and Means Committee during the hearings on that measure made a stronger or better case for a tariff than the independent oil industry; but notwithstanding that fact, for some inexplicable reason or motive it was denied any protection. Because of that neglect on the part of the Government, thousands of men and business concerns formerly large income-tax payers, to-day scarcely can pay state and local taxes assessed against their properties.

We were told prior to the passage of the measure increasing the potential borrowing limit on adjusted service certificates that we would close the fiscal year with a deficit of something like half a billion dollars. A considerable portion of this amount is owing to the substantial decline in revenues derived from income taxes. The condition of the oil industry in this country in a large degree is responsible for the financial predicament in which the Government finds itself. Former heavy income-tax contributors to the Federal Government are to-day either bankrupts or bordering on that state.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. The trouble is not confined to the oil operators; it extends to the farmers as well. Thousands of farmers leased their lands to operators at a remunerative rate, which provided them with ready money to meet their obligations, and to-day they are deprived of this income because the lessees either were compelled to cancel their leases or continue them at substantially reduced rates.

To what extent farm acreage throughout the entire Nation was leased, I am unable to state. In my own State of Kansas alone there were approximately 12,600,000 acres under lease which, before this oil situation arose, brought to Kansas farmers $10,500,000 of lease money and, in addition to this, I am told that they were getting from lease bonuses and from royalties, over $5,000,000 per annum, or a total annual income of over $15,000,000. Within the past eight months this source of income practically has been wiped out.

A few days ago I obtained data showing the situation in the five counties of the eighth congressional district of Kansas, which I have the honor to represent. They show that there are 3,230,080 acres of land in that district, of which 1,806,139 acres were under lease. Of that area approximately 80 per cent was leased for $1 per acre, or a total of $1,444,911. The remaining 20 per cent was leased for 50 cents and upwards per acre, or for about $180,614, thus making a total of $1,625,614 paid annually to the farmers in those five counties. Many of these leases have been canceled, and on many more leases still in effect the price has been reduced materially. The oil lease to the farmer is a serious matter in view of poor crops and low prices for such crops as he is able to produce, together with increased taxes, and the cancellation of his lease leaves him nothing with which to meet his obligations. Here is a copy of a letter written by one of these farmers of my own county to an oil man of Wichita, Kans., when informed that his lease money would be reduced to 50 cents per acre. This is what he said:

> I regret most exceedingly to hear that you are compelled to reduce your rentals on your oil lease on my land, for these oil leases have sure been a godsend to those of us tax-ridden farmers * * *, but we are used to taking orders; you know we can only have what the elements and that "Hooverized" Farm Board will permit us to have, then we must submit to being taxed blind by a bunch of "dead beat" nontaxpayers, then we must pay the other fellow's price for things we must buy. This, it seems is the penalty we must pay for the privilege of being farmers; so, if 50 cents per acre is all you can pay on your lease, we will accept it—because we have to—and say we like it. But right here I want to compliment, congratulate, and thank all you oil men for having given the farmers of Sedgwick County far more relief than they will ever get from Washington, and many thanks for what you have already paid me.

I am personally acquainted with the author of this letter. He is a fine citizen. While he has expressed his feelings in a somewhat caustic manner, one can not blame him. This letter, Mr. Speaker, is indicative of the feeling of a great many farmers who believe they have received a raw deal; and they have. These farmers have been told that the so-called farm relief or farm marketing act would put them on an equal basis with other industries; that the tariff measure passed would relieve their situation. They have been given both, and about the only relief they have received has been to relieve them of what they had, by hard knocks, been able to save up, and that has been precious little during the last 8 or 10 years. One place where there might have been something done to help the farmer, along with others, was to have put a tariff on oil, but the powerful interests would not permit it, so about all the farmer can do now is to express his opinion concerning those who have made so many promises, and wait for a chance to express himself more forcibly, which I prophesy he will do in the election of 1932.

I shall now refer to another group who have been affected adversely by the plight of the independent oil producers and whose future is not promising under the administration's do-nothing policy. It is estimated that over 100,000 oil-field workers in the mid-continent field alone are jobless, and that in the United States over 1,000,000 men in the various oil fields are unemployed. This, of course, does not mean the oil-field workers alone, but includes thousands of employees of the independent refining companies. It is said that the average daily wage of these workers, skilled and otherwise, was from $5 to $18 per day. This was sufficient to support a family very nicely; but, as has been stated, thousands of these workers have had their daily wage reduced, and thousands more have been let out and receive not a penny to sustain life, but are in the bread lines. I received, a few days ago, a telegram from the commander of the Salvation Army of Wichita, Kans., as follows:

> Convinced with our knowledge of present conditions that much help can come through passing of Garber-Capper oil relief bills. It is imperative that this happens. Present and future status of those engaged in all industry in Wichita and vicinity hanging in balance. Something must be done now in this crisis. We are

feeding more than 570 families, average 5 to 6 to family. A great number formerly employees in oil industry.

SALVATION ARMY OF WICHITA,
GEORGE HUNT, *Commanding.*

These men, only a few months ago, were receiving living wages and providing for themselves and families. It is the first time in the history of Kansas that there have been bread lines. This condition is not confined alone to the actual workers in this industry but reaches much further. When these men are thrown out of employment they naturally cease to be consumers and buyers of the necessities of life, such as food, clothing, and so forth, and their effacement as buyers is reflected in business of many kinds. Clerks in stores in numerous instances have had their salaries reduced or have been forced to quit because the business would not justify continuing their employment. It is an endless chain. There is no need further to dwell upon its many ramifications. I have received reliable information that a machine company in the city of Wichita, which furnishes a great part of the oil-field machinery in the mid-continent district, including Kansas and Oklahoma, has had its output of machinery cut 75 per cent in that district alone. Because of this, they have had to lay off men of all classes, laboring men and skilled high-salaried men. A number of the small competitors of this larger concern have been compelled to shut down entirely and let out all of their men. And what of the banks? How long may we expect them to survive? Because of this condition in the mid-continent fields many banks already have been forced to close their doors.

Let us turn to the lumber business. In the hearings on the embargo measure before the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Ortmeyer, of Wichita, Kans., stated that ordinarily in the mid-continent oil fields over 250,000,000 feet of lumber were consumed in a year, and the records show that this consumption has dropped off more than 50 per cent in the past six months. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that business of all kinds in the mid-continent field practically is paralyzed, all on account of the independent oil industry being put out of business. And, in the face of all this, what encouragement does the administration offer? The leaders of the political party in power here in Washington do not seem to be interested enough to do anything or even to permit anything to be done.

Soon after Congress convened in December I began receiving letters and telegrams asking me to do everything possible for a tariff on oil. My reply to these messages was that I have been at all times in favor of a tariff on oil and would have voted for it when the present tariff act was passed if given a chance. I have stated that, from a talk had with the leaders of the House, it was very evident that no oil tariff legislation would be considered at this session, and that unless the President could be persuaded to take a hand in this matter that there would be no oil measure even considered. I suggested that it would be well for the independent oil producers and their friends to urge the President to seek means that would enable him to meet the existing emergency; that, in my opinion, Congress would grant his request; and that this seemed to be the only way by which the present leaders of Congress, or the party in power, could be prevailed upon to act. My suggestion was severely criticized by some for bringing the President into the picture. There is not a single word or syllable in that suggestion that I wish to retract. And why should I? What I predicted has come to pass. To those who have been here in Washington for the past six weeks, pleading for protection for the independent oil producers, the President and the leaders of the majority party have given a sympathetic hearing, but nothing more.

In my opinion, a measure providing for a tariff of $1 per barrel would have passed both Houses of Congress by an overwhelming majority; but the committee having charge of such legislation refused to report such a measure. That committee also refused to report the Capper-Garber measure to limit the importation of oil to 16,000,000 barrels. Under the rules governing the House of Representatives the leaders of the party in power have absolute control of all legislation and are empowered to say just what legislation can be considered, as well as what can not be considered. They have decreed that oil tariff legislation should not be considered.

While I realize, as I have indicated before, that the two amendments that have been adopted, which were offered by me, providing that the United States Merchant Fleet Corporation and the United States Navy shall use fuel oil of American production, will not appreciably relieve the American oil producers, they appear to be the full measure of relief that may be looked for at this time. It is not much, but it is all we have gotten.

The New England interests have never been timid in their demands for the highest tariff obtainable on all produced in that section, and certain Congressmen from Western States have at all times assisted them in getting it. But when the time comes to reciprocate, as it did a few days ago, to provide a tariff on oil, or even to support a measure to limit the importation of oil for a year or so, they unhesitatingly said they could not go along as it would increase the cost of fuel oil and gasoline to New England users. Then some of the western supporters of the New England tariff sounded a warning note to the effect that there is another day coming. Yes, there is; but I am afraid before that day is reached it will be too late to help the independent oil industry. For one, I am anxious to see it settled at once, even though it means an extra session of Congress. That is the only reason that can be given for not settling this question within the next two months, instead of letting it drag until next winter. A great industry is prostrate; thousands of investors are facing bankruptcy. Now is the time to bring about the relief sought, not next winter, when Congress convenes in regular session.

Who is it that is afraid of an extra session of Congress? I notice that whenever it has been necessary to call an extra session to pass a tariff measure, such as the Smoot-Hawley measure, there has been but little or no complaint from the New England interests. Why not have one now, if the time be too short before adjournment, to enact a law for the protection of the independent oil producers?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am opposed to this resolution. The Ways and Means Committee proposes during the summer recess to investigate the economic conditions in the oil, coal, lumber, manganese, asbestos, and agricultural industries. Now, we all know that an entire summer could be consumed in investigating any one of these fields. If this resolution said what it meant, it would cut out all the enumerated subjects mentioned and put in just one—apple sauce. [Laughter.]

This resolution carries an appropriation of $50,000 to defray the expenses of the committee in securing information on these various subjects. So far as the oil industry is concerned, every bit of information which they can obtain or will obtain and a great deal more is now available and they can have it for the asking. In fact, we think they already have it on oil from the hearings that were held last summer and this session on the embargo bill. Mr. GARNER and the Democratic membership have made and will continue to make political capital out of the failure of the committee to report out the oil embargo bill. I am wondering how many of these gentlemen on the other side of the House, who are now so loud in favor of helping the oil interests, would have voted for the tariff bill if it had contained adequate protection on crude oil? The only justification that I can see for the committee's refusal to report this bill is so that this body might have credit for making some of the blunders that have been made and not leave them all to the other end of the Capitol or the other end of the Avenue.

I have been a Republican and a protectionist all my life, and I have said truthfully that the Democrats want protection for the things produced in their districts and everything produced elsewhere to come in duty free; but I have found to my sorrow that certain gentlemen of my own party take exactly the same illogical position.

In fairness, however, I do not believe that the full and complete blame for failure to report the embargo bill should be placed on the Ways and Means Committee; a portion must be shared by the independent oil interests.

Among the independents there are two schools of thought in reference to the policy of proration of oil production. One group believes that the policy of proration is unsound, is a mere pretext for price fixing, and is the weapon used by the so-called Big Four to further crush the independent interests. The other school of thought believes firmly in proration and feels that if the same should be now abandoned it would mean bankruptcy of the independent oil concerns, both great and small. Suits have been brought, and some are now pending, attacking the legality of proration. Legislation is proposed in the State of Oklahoma to prevent proration. The governor of our State has appointed an oil committee, which said committee split and made a divided report on this matter. The lie has been passed, and prominent gentlemen are at each other's throats.

The purpose and justification of the embargo bill was to compel the importers to prorate their importations to the same extent as the domestic producer is now prorating his production either because of legal requirements or voluntary agreement.

It would seem quite obvious that the passage of the embargo bill would mean the continuation of the policy of the domestic proration. While on the other hand, the failure to pass the embargo legislation would have a very marked tendency to add strength to the cause of the opponents of proration.

In this situation I believe it is a fair and justifiable inference that this lack of harmony and unity over proration tremendously weakened the whole hearted, bona fide support in good faith of the entire independent oil interests in their pressing their cause before the committee to a favorable outcome.

The embargo bill died in the Ways and Means Committee. It died before it was born, but its early demise was hastened, if not caused, by the bitter quarrel existing between its parents over the question of proration. If it was a boy, it would mean the continuation of proration; if it was a girl, the abandonment of proration. If it was neither, it would leave the warring factions of the independent oil industry where it found them, without arming the one group or disarming the other.

In closing I want to repeat here in part the statement which I made before the Ways and Means Committee during the hearings on the bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1931.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. WILLIS C. HAWLEY (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. When the hearing was interrupted last night by the roll call in the House, Congressman O'CONNOR, of Oklahoma, had been called to the stand. If the gentleman is here and ready to proceed, we shall be glad to hear him at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES O'CONNOR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am glad of this opportunity to appear here, because I represent the first district and my home, the city of Tulsa (which is in one of the 10 counties in my district), the headquarters from which the operations of the mid-continent field are largely managed and financed, that being the great oil city of the mid-continent field.

The oil business grew to be one of the major industries of the country, without any governmental help whatever. The country is full of big businesses, of which we are proud, which have developed from their infancies into great world industries behind the wall of the protective tariff, in which my party used to believe.

The only thing that we are asking here is that the oil business receive the same consideration as other great industries. The thing that astonishes me is the fact that men who call themselves protectionists and whose section of the country has been built by and because of a protective tariff have come around to the point where they are now protectionists only for their particular industry or their part of the country.

The management of these great industries further think, after they have been built up because the American people have paid a higher price for their tariff protected output, in order that they could maintain a high wage standard, and develop the great American market—I say, they now think that, because they are so big, have had all the benefits of the policy of protection—they owe nothing in return and should be free to go to the uttermost parts of the world for their raw material, wherever they can buy it the cheapest. They do not want to buy the American raw material if it costs more; and crude oil is raw material.

Now, I am not supporting this embargo bill just because I was the father of the idea. I am the man who laid this baby on the doorstep of a tariff meeting (in Tulsa last fall held by the people who are here urging this legislation), and, it not being a legitimate child, it received a rather cold reception at their hands, but now, in spite of its parentage, they have adopted it because it is a promising child. We are here asking for this bill because it is the only thing we can get under the circumstances, and, in my opinion, it is the only thing that can do us any immediate good.

It is very easy, gentleman, especially if you are opposed to a proposition, to defeat it by making it very involved, by spreading it too widely, by making it widely complicated and involved. Regardless of how much merit there is in the many controverted claims, and there is merit in all of them, there is merit in the argument with respect to employment, etc., that has been brought up here. But I want to put my thumb right on the one thing that this embargo will do, and that is undisputed and unanswerable.

Suppose, this morning, instead of appearing here as a Congressman addressing you gentlemen as members of the distinguished Ways and Means Committee I appeared as a salesman offering to sell 100,000,000 barrels of crude oil to you as prospective buyers of crude oil. That is exactly the situation. You gentlemen are buying the oil for the American consumer. Here is another salesman selling crude oil. I am selling the American oil and I am selling it at the same price as the other fellow. I am asking that you buy your own people's oil for our own people—oil that is being now held back in our wells. The opposition salesman wants you to buy the oil that comes into this country from abroad. To whom are you going to give the purchase order?

I do not think that the embargo will do nearly all that the men who are in favor of it expect it to do. In my opinion, it will not affect at all the price of gasoline. But if it will do this much, if it will sell 100,000,000 barrels of American oil, in round numbers, now in the wells ready to run to the American people, that the importers' salesman is now selling to them, that will help a great deal. The importers say that that is only 10 per cent, and such a little bit that it does not amount to anything. But 10 per cent often means the difference between profit and loss in a great industry.

Ten per cent more oxygen will save the pneumonia patient. We are asking you to put the pulmotor on this industry that is practically strangled and suffocating by proration aggravated to the extent of our importations.

Let me give you one illustration. Not due to proration, but due to the lack of storage, the Prairie quit buying oil down there. We had 300,000 small wells in this country that were producing 500,000 barrels a day; say a barrel and a half each. Those wells are on the pump. When you stop pumping them, those wells go dry, just as a cow goes dry when you stop milking her.

The only difference is, the cow may become fresh again, but these wells will never flow again. Such a waste and loss is an economic crime.

I am not one of those who believe in trying to catch the millennium by putting legislative salt on its tail. But I say to you gentlemen that these eastern people who are opposed to this proposition do not realize the extent of the great market that we are furnishing for their goods. I will ask Mr. Hastings and Mr. Galloway, if they will, for a moment, to unfold this picture of the skyline of Tulsa, so that you gentlemen may see it.

Your first reaction when looking at that picture is, "Why, those people do not need any help."

That city was built on the oil business. But I am telling you that every brick that you see there, every bit of steel, everything that went into those buildings was purchased somewhere outside of Oklahoma.

What are these buildings for? Why is this building (the Exchange Bank) in which I have my office, there? It is there because people are in business down there, and making their living there, and those people consume food and use clothing and shoes and buy automobiles and use all the things that are produced by you people. The people on the Atlantic coast who are so afraid that you are going to have a rise in your price of fuel oil should realize that we are furnishing you a pretty good market for the products which you produce.

I think it will raise temporarily the price of fuel oil on the east coast, but keen domestic competition and use of tankers on the Mississippi will soon overcome that.

Gentlemen, I am not one of those who blames a company for being big. Oil is a big-company business. A lot of these independent companies are big companies. But here is the situation. There are companies who own the acreage in foreign fields. I am glad that some American companies own some of that acreage. I wish they would go everywhere and I wish the American Government would back up American business, instead of trying to interfere with American business. But here is the proposition. They can produce oil cheaper there than they can here. They can make more money by selling us oil that they produce there, than here. But these follows here at home do not have any foreign oil. They are prorating and holding back their oil.

I think if the intelligence departments of these large companies could just see that it was a whole lot better to make a voluntary gentleman's proration agreement covering importations, and carry

it out, there would not be any need of coming here to Congress to ask for an embargo on foreign oil in order to compel them by law to do what we are already doing at home and thus make our proration here effective.

I do not know how much the Government can do to help business. I think the statesmanship in industry (if any there be) is going to restore prosperity. It's their job. But you can not restore prosperity if you are going to leave great industries like the oil industries prostrate. The statesmanship that is going to restore industry has got to come from industry, from those who know industry and its problems.

If there was some magic way by which the Government could get out of business and stay out of business, and the people who are charged with the leadership of industry could be trusted not to be selfish, greedy, and shortsighted, depression would soon cease and stability and prosperity return to bless us.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1921, I made on this floor one of the first speeches in favor of an importation tax on crude oil, realizing that if the independent producers were not given some kind of protection that sooner or later the very condition that exists at the present time throughout the Nation would be brought about. At that time the so-called war contracts were still being filled and the Shipping Board was paying from $1.25 to $1.80 per barrel for low-grade crude, and the Navy was taking oil on contracts made during the war at an average cost of $2.73 per barrel. It was about this time that a congested condition began to appear in the United States, occasioned by an overproduction of low-grade oil and, if my memory serves me correctly, it would have been possible for the Government to buy all of the oil desired from the smackover field in Arkansas at a price of 60 cents per barrel. I was of the opinion then, as now, that the independent producers were entitled to receive the same kind of protection as other legitimate industries and that the oil companies who were the beneficiaries of these Government contracts by making a profit from $1.05 a barrel to $2.13 should be made to pay a sufficient importation duty to protect producers in the United States. As a part of my remarks made on that date I respectfully wish to call the attention of the House to what was said on that occasion, as it is apparent that the same financial interests that opposed such legislation at that time are now doing everything in their power to prevent the independent producers from being protected against a flow of cheap oil from foreign countries.

The speech of July 18, 1921, is as follows:

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, if I am correctly informed, the independent oil producers of the United States at this time are practically bankrupt. This situation has been brought about by the rapid decline in price of fuel oil and certain of its by-products. If the independent producers and refiners are forced to continue selling their products at a price below the cost of production it will be only a matter of time until their properties will have to pass into the hands of others. Should the Standard Oil Co., or their subsidiaries, acquire possession of these properties it means the creation of a complete monopoly on petroleum, and in my judgment the citizens of this country would then be compelled to pay the highest prices ever charged for gasoline and other by-products of oil.

To-day the independent producers of oil are the only competitors of these large oil corporations. They are pioneers that open up and develop practically all of the oil fields of this country. This competition is absolutely necessary to protect the Nation and its many industries, for if the time ever comes when a group of oil companies are able to gain complete control over the oil industry, then every citizen of the Nation will be forced to directly or indirectly contribute to the monopoly.

It has been stated on this floor that the Standard Oil Co. and its subsidiaries are opposing the placing of an importation tax on oil. On the 24th day of June I introduced resolutions directed to the Secretary of the Navy and the chairman of the Shipping Board, requesting all available information relative to contracts made for the purchase of fuel oil from July 1, 1920, to May 1, 1921. I have here a reply to each of these resolutions, which contains information that shows that the Standard Oil and other large companies have made profits of many millions out of these contracts, and, because of the low price of Mexican fuel, I estimate that these companies will make an additional $30,000,000 of profit on the oil yet to be delivered on these uncompleted contracts.

I wish to bring to your attention a letter I have received from the Shipping Board, which shows that 17,550,000 barrels of fuel oil are yet to be delivered at prices ranging from $1.25 (buyer paying taxes amounting to approximately 47 cents) to $1.80 per barrel.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, July 8, 1921.

Hon. JAMES V. McCLINTIC,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCLINTIC: As per request contained in your letter of the 2d instant, I give you below in round figures the amount of fuel oil yet to be delivered under the contracts covered by the statement which I forwarded to you with my letter of June 30, 1921:

	Barrels
Atlantic Refining Co	2,300,000
Atlantic Lobos Oil Co	250,000
Atlantic Gulf Oil Corporation	10,000,000
Gulf Refining Co	----------
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	4,000,000
Midwest Refining Co	1,000,000

I trust that this gives you the desired information.

Very truly yours,

J. C. O'LAUGHLIN,
Assistant to the Chairman.

I also wish to direct your attention to the contracts made by the United States Navy for the purchase of fuel oil.

* * * * * * *

At this time Mexican fuel oil, including the export tax and transportation charges, costs approximately 82 cents per barrel to land the same in the United States. According to the recapitulation relating to contracts with the Navy, the average cost per barrel is $2.73. The average cost to the Shipping Board is approximately $1.65 per barrel. At this figure the Standard Oil and other large companies will take from the Government a great many millions of dollars that they have a legal right to take—yet they can not escape the brand of being profiteers. The smaller independent oil companies in the United States are not in a position to compete for this class of business; yet they are in a position to bring about a sufficient amount of competition to give some protection to small consumers of gasoline and other by-products of oil.

It is very evident to my mind that a few large companies and subsidiaries can put into effect a monopoly on Mexican fuel oil, and the contracts here given speak for themselves. It is fair to estimate that only about 50 per cent of the contracts with the Navy and Shipping Board has been completed. If this is true and an import tax of 35 cents per barrel on crude oil is levied, then the oil companies holding uncompleted contracts will be compelled to pay a tax of approximately $8,000,000 on the amount of oil yet to be delivered.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Chandler, called attention to the fact that the Standard Oil Co. has contracted for 50,000 barrels of Mexican crude oil daily for a period of two and one-half years, and a tax of 35 cents per barrel would bring into the Treasury a sum exceeding $13,000,000.

Inasmuch as these contracts are in effect, the tax will have to be paid by the oil companies. In other words, they will have deducted from their profits the amount of import tax which is proposed in this bill should the same become a law. I can readily understand why this opposition has appeared, and I am of the opinion that the item will be stricken from the bill.

The Democratic Party has declared itself in favor of a tariff for revenue only. The Government has already paid many millions of profit to these large oil companies and will continue to do so until these contracts are completed. I have shown how this tax will increase the revenue of the Nation and at the same time cause certain contract holders who are making enormous profits to return a small portion as a contribution toward the maintenance of the Government; therefore I intend to vote for the perfecting amendment introduced by my colleague [Mr. Carter], the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman is in favor of this tax upon oil?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I am, for the reason that I have named.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Can the gentleman tell me if the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee who framed this bill were sincerely in favor of giving this tax. Why did they not tie it with the other hundreds of provisions of the bill instead of having a separate vote on it? Can the gentleman answer me?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I realize if the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee really wanted to help this situation in Oklahoma they would have tied it up in their caucus and it would not have been subject to discussion at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution now pending has some merit in it. But I do believe that a great deal of politics is in this resolution. I want to ask why, recognizing that the economic conditions of the coun-

try are so bad in so many sections, why we do not extend it further and investigate some of the industries, and especially some of the monopolies that control food and the necessities of life. I think there is no question that we are coming to a time, and are very near that time just now, when there must be some legislation in the interest of the common man or the masses of our citizens, laborers, farmers, and small business men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this resolution which has shrunk from a bill to get tariff on oil to a resolution of investigation is like a 50-cent shirt bought from a mail-order house—it has shrunk dreadfully on the first washing. I am interested in conserving the oil industry. I do not represent the independent oil producers, neither do I represent the Big Four. All I am after is to conserve the $12,000,000,000 industry. But I hope the Ways and Means Committee will investigate some manner in which they can save us from bankruptcy while they are making this investigation of oil. [Laughter.)

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to obtaining information sought under this resolution. I am opposed to the proposed embargo on oil. I am against all embargoes. They are unsound and undemocratic. It is my information an embargo on oils, including gasoline, would result in an increase of 5 or 6 cents per gallon to the consumers of gasoline. Assuming this is correct, it is estimated this would entail an increase in cost of gasoline of from six to ten million dollars to Georgia per annum. In Georgia there is now a tax of 6 cents for State funds that help in highway construction in that State. It is too high, regardless of what purpose it goes for. I am not willing that the people of Georgia be further taxed on the gasoline they use. With the State tax of 6 cents per gallon and then a Federal tax of 6 cents, an embargo, it would mean a total tax of 12 cents per gallon.

It will affect the whole country about like it does Georgia, and the consuming public will be taxed hundreds of millions of dollars each year that will inure to the benefit of the big oil monopolies. These big monopolies control prices of the crude oil. Crude oil sells at a low price, but motor oil, fuel oil, and gasoline are high in price. That would continue to be the case if an embargo is put on oil. The monopolies will control the price of the crude oil and will get the benefit of the tariff or embargo. It will not benefit the independent small well owner. The public, as usual, will pay the bill and bear the burden, while the oil trusts will gather in hundreds of millions of dollars meant to benefit the small well owners in the oil fields if an embargo is put on oils.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this proposed resolution to allow the Ways and Means Committee to waste $50,000 in junketing all over the world is a ridiculous farce, and merely an attempt on the part of this administration to again "pass the buck," and thus try to escape their duty and responsibility to the independent oil operators of the United States.

This resolution was not drawn up until to-day. It has never yet been printed. It has never yet been introduced in the House of Representatives. Not all of the members of the Ways and Means Committee know anything about it. None of the other 410 Members of this House, except the Speaker, knew that it was in existence, or that it would be called up. It is now called up under suspension of the rules, when all of the rules of the House are thrown to the winds out of the window, and it has to be passed just as the typewritten copy came out of the pocket of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], and it can not be amended in the slightest particular. We can not even dot an "i" or cross a "t."

The people of Kansas, and the people of all of the rest of the United States, are tired of "passing the buck." Wasting this $50,000 of the people's money may appease and satisfy the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH], but it is not going to satisfy the people of Kansas. They have just gotten over the shock of the President wasting $500,000 passing the buck in a foolish, useless, valueless, ridiculous Wickersham investigation.

It is yet fresh in their memory that his predecessor, President Coolidge, wasted $400,000 in passing the buck on the coal investigation. Their report has not been read by any person in the United States, and it never will be read. It was a useless waste of $400,000, pure and simple.

On January 15, 1931, there was held in this city a convention of delegates from all oil-producing States, who were appointed to such conference by the governors of those States, and that convention was ably addressed by Mr. Wirt Franklin, of Oklahoma City, who was acting for the Independent Oil Operators of the United States. By consent of this House, I printed his comprehensive address in the RECORD, and you will find it on pages 2284 to 2288, inclusive, of the daily RECORD for January 15, 1931. The United States Senate deemed it of such value and importance that it, too, printed this same address in the RECORD.

Many of those leading delegates of that conference appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and testified in detail concerning the necessity for an immediate embargo against foreign petroleum produced in South America and Mexico by peon labor and shipped into the United States by Mr. Mellon and his big oil monopolies.

Many of the members of the Ways and Means Committee appeared before that convention and promised these delegates to this governors' conference that they would grant them needed relief.

After wasting this $50,000 junketing all over the world this summer the Ways and Means Committee will not be possessed of a single important fact about this necessity for an embargo, or at least a substantial tariff, on petroleum than they know already at this time.

But not being adverse to taking these pleasurable junket trips, very naturally we find that without waiting to print their resolution, and without waiting to introduce it, and without waiting to study it and understand it, and without waiting to take it up in its regular order, the Ways and Means Committee reported the typewritten copy unanimously, and we find all of the committeemen favoring the junket and announcing that they will vote for the resolution. Hence there is no chance whatever to defeat it. But I intend to vote against it. I have heretofore voted against all junkets. I have never yet been on one during my 13 years of service here, and I intend to vote against all junkets in the future. This is a waste of $50,000. If our minority leader [Mr. GARNER] could conduct this investigation, it would be worth the money, for he would force Mr. Mellon to answer questions and he would obtain valuable information regarding foreign oil monopolies. But he will not be allowed to have his way about the matter. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], as chairman of the committee, will say what is to be done and what is not to be done, and the whole proceedings will be farcical and the $50,000 wasted. I have done my best to stop it. That is all I can do.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, all of the debate in relation to the adoption of this resolution has centered around oil, with the exception of the remarks just made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. I call the attention of the House to the important provisions included in the resolution applicable to other products than oil. By reading the resolution it will be seen that the commission asks to be empowered to investigate in order to secure information as a basis for legislation relative to coal, lumber, manganese, asbestos, and agricultural products. That would include grain, butter, poultry, and every other agricultural product. The people interested in these other products have been before the Committee on Ways and Means with exactly as plausible a story as have the oil people. If we are to investigate for anyone, certainly they are entitled to the same consideration from Congress as the oil people. I urge the House to realize that in asking for a continuation of the

labors of the Ways and Means Committee during the summer we are not limiting our investigation to oil but to every industry that appeared before the Ways and Means Committee asking for relief. Members from all sections of the country, it seems to me, should unite with us in an effort to pass this resolution and secure the information, in view of expected legislation during another session.

Mr. BLANTON. Are you going to abolish the Tariff Commission?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oregon to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 226, noes 25.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker, however impossible it may be to get them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. As many as favor taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twelve gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

COST OF PRODUCTION OF CRUDE PETROLEUM, ETC.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 386, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 386

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed, under the authority conferred by section 332 (g) of the tariff act of 1930, to investigate the differences in the cost of production of the following domestic articles and of any like or similar foreign articles: Crude petroleum, fuel oil, gasoline, and lubricating oils.

The investigation made under this resolution shall be made as if such investigation were an investigation authorized under section 336 of the tariff act of 1930, except that the cost of production of foreign articles shall be ascertained only for foreign articles exported, directly or indirectly, from countries from which there was exported, directly or indirectly, to the United States during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1930, inclusive, more than 2,000,000 barrels in the aggregate of crude petroleum, fuel oil, gasoline, and lubricating oils, and except that the Tariff Commission shall report the results of its investigation to the President and to the House of Representatives not later than the beginning of the next regular session of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what powers are conferred by this resolution that were not conferred upon the gentleman's own committee in the investigation just authorized by the House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair intends now to recognize Members to call up bills of three classes: First, Senate bills which have been recommended by the appropriate committee of the House; second, Senate bills where a similar House bill favorably and properly reported by the committee is on the calendar; third, House bills with Senate amendments, where the request is to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the Speaker whether his enumeration includes private bills?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating an address which I delivered at the recent merchant marine conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me by the House, I am taking occasion to include in the RECORD the following address delivered by me on January 21, 1931, before the Fourth National Conference on the Merchant Marine:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the conference, not only the American merchant marine, but the merchant marine of every country, is feeling severely the effect of the world-wide economic depression and resulting alarming decline in foreign trade. As a consequence, shipping interests the world over have suffered enormous losses and ocean freight rates have been abnormally low.

But American ships, notwithstanding such depression, continue to carry a substantial part of our foreign commerce.

Before the World War our American merchant marine was probably at its lowest ebb. It only carried 9.4 per cent in value of the foreign commerce of the United States. Official reports of the United States Shipping Board for the calendar year 1929 show that the vessels of the United States carried 40 per cent of all this country's foreign trade and 38 per cent of ocean-borne cargoes, an increase of approximately 400 per cent in 15 years.

During that period and throughout the year 1930 most conspicuous progress has been made in the modernization of American vessels engaged in foreign trade.

It is also interesting to note that in 1913 the total gross tonnage of American vessels employed in the foreign trade was only about 1,000,000 tons, whereas to-day over 5,602,493 tons are engaged in the transportation of foreign commerce.

Of course, that is only a part of the picture, because we have a finer fleet engaged in coastwise commerce than the Nation has ever had before, a fleet which is available, even to a very large extent, for trans-Atlantic service when its services might be needed.

There is documented under the flag of the United States nearly one-fourth of the world tonnage. Of course, it is not to be understood that all of such tonnage is equally modern; but, by and large, the development of the American merchant marine under Government aid provided by the Jones-White Act and other legislation has shown conspicuous advancement.

The United States Shipping Board, which, through the Merchant Fleet Corporation, has so extensively operated Government-owned vessels over established trade routes, has disposed of practically all of the Government lines on the Pacific coast and nearly all on the Atlantic coast, and only continues to operate upon a substantial scale in the Gulf of Mexico.

THE MID-YEAR STATUS

On June 30, 1930, official figures showed that 74 per cent of American vessels and 72 per cent of the tonnage was owned by private American interests, and of the 466 ships in the hands of the Government only 184 were in active operation, with the remainder subject to disposition by sale or otherwise.

And so while we hear a great deal about the competition on the part of the Government with the privately owned merchant marine of the United States, when we analyze it we find after all that there is very little of it; that what the Government has been trying to do and accomplishing is to put in the hands of private interests not only a substantial number of excellent ships but to encourage them to build finer and better ships, and the Government to give such aid as it might in furtherance of that program.

Since 1924 the Shipping Board has decreased appropriations necessary for its operation from $50,000,000 annually to $5,950,000, or a reduction of $44,050,000.

And in this connection I should like to say that the American people should at all times be fully advised that while this Government has entered upon a program of mail aid costing, as indicated by the Assistant Postmaster General a moment ago, $22,500,000 up to this time, yet through that process it has been saving $44,000,000 a year that used to be expended in Government operation. [Applause.]

It has done more, because through that it has enabled private industry not only engaged in shipping but in the shipyards of this Nation, as indicated also in previous speeches, to start on a program, an auxiliary program of shipbuilding, that promises—if we have the coherence of those interested in shipping and the avoidance of the strife and dissension that sometimes is engendered and developed—that promises, I say, to make America again the master of the seas.

A great deal of credit is due the United States Shipping Board and Fleet Corporation for the way it has conducted Government operation of Shipping Board vessels, managed the affairs of that mammoth institution, and promoted the policies of the American merchant marine. It is probably true that it has made mistakes and pursued policies with which many fair-minded and capable Americans differ, but it has encountered many difficulties and problems for which it was not responsible in the administration of the Shipping Board and its affairs, and I think it ought to be said that the board has discharged its duties and responsibilities with great loyalty and capacity and has rendered splendid service to the American people. [Applause.]

CITATION OF SEVERE CRITICISM

You have heard a great deal from official sources and other sources severely criticizing the Shipping Board for its disposition of American ships at rates that appear to be to many absurdly low, contrasted with the cost of those vessels, but it must be remembered that the costs of those vessels were war costs, not current costs of replacement; that those vessels were war-built vessels; we did not have the time to construct them under all lines which would have been most agreeable and satisfactory to the trade; but we were building those vessels to transport supplies and troops to win the World War, and we did an excellent job of it; and I want to say for the Shipping Board that in disposing of those vessels and disposing of them to the best advantage of which it was

capable so that those who purchased them might be able to continue to operate them it was only carrying out the policies which Congress had declared in the merchant marine act of 1920. Where it has done that fairly and to the best of its ability and judgment, it does not lie in the mouths of anyone to criticize it. It may be that some confronted with that situation think that they might have handled it to better advantage in one form or another or gotten more money here or there, but they were not confronted with the actual conditions in disposing of those ships then. The very fact that to-day you have got tied up in various parts of the Nation an enormous number of ships which the board did not wish to sacrifice, and which now to-day it has to scrap, indicates that probably if the board had been free and untrammeled and unhampered by so much citicism it could have disposed of them to the American public to much better advantage and with far greater return to the American people.

Several investigations of the board have been made under congressional direction from time to time, those authorized by the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-eighth Congresses being of the most exhaustive character.

Senator COPELAND referred to the 13 volumes of 6,000 pages. That was just one of these investigations that covered about everything conceivable.

The result of such investigations, as appeared in the reports of the committees conducting the same, was that the management of the affairs of the Shipping Board was a creditable one.

I do not think that it can be too often repeated that the American merchant marine, built by the Government, resulted in far greater returns to the American people than the entire cost of that immense fleet.

THE PUBLIC'S OPINION

I do not think that the people of the United States should be educated up to the thought—the erroneous thought—that this great fleet, that cost over $3,000,000,000, was just a lot of junk and useless material. It has paid for itself and returned, in my opinion, nearly twice the original cost. The Shipping Board records reflect that up to 1920 they earned about $500,000,000 net on their operations at the then current high costs of transportation rates. The President of the United States when he was Secretary of Commerce testified before the Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives that the act of the Shipping Board in placing at the disposal of the grain-growing interests of the United States in 1926, 100 or more ships to move the grain of the United States raised the price of grain from $1 a bushel in the United States to $1.65 and netted $650,000,000 to the American people more than they would have otherwise gotten had it not been for the availability of American ships when foreign ships were not available. The decline in freight rates which has been occasioned by the presence of the American merchant marine in normal times has saved from a billion to a billion and a half dollars to the American people; and we can not estimate what these services have meant to the American people in promoting the development of their foreign trade, which until the past year has grown so enormously and by leaps and bounds.

Had the merchant marine not demonstrated its value, it not only could not have been continued but the Government aids which have been granted could never have been secured.

OUTLINE OF PRIMAL IMPORTANCE

And I want to assure you, gentlemen, that these matters of Government aid received the greatest scrutiny and the greatest consideration an ! the greatest amount of debate before they were ever translated into legislation. It has required years of effort to secure them; and if you gentlemen want to preserve them you had better keep a united front, eliminate your dissensions, and fight for only one thing—the upbuilding and maintenance of your merchant marine—in justice to all.

This historical summary, showing the remarkable growth and progress of our merchant marine in the last 16 years, is, of course, interesting and most absorbing. But it should not obscure the fact that the primary purpose of Congress was to develop a merchant marine sufficiently large, modern, and well balanced to carry the greater portion of our commerce and to serve as a naval and military auxiliary whenever needed.

Congress further sought in the merchant marine act of 1928, the so-called Jones-White Act, to provide for an equitable distribution of the ocean-mail contracts, so as to adequately serve not only the Atlantic and Pacific coast ports but those of the Gulf of Mexico and so recorded in the act of 1928. Although the foreign commerce of the Gulf is second in volume and value and is only outranked by that of the North Atlantic, yet the percentage of mail contracts awarded the Gulf and now in operation is only a little in excess of 7 per cent. If there is taken into consideration mail aids which do not go into effect for one or two years yet, then the percentage has been somewhat increased, but not commensurate with the provisions of law authorizing such aids.

One of the reasons, probably, for this situation is to be found in the resistance which has been experienced by the Shipping Board in carrying out its policy of preference, under the law, in the sale of established trade routes to communities, or those locally interested in such communities, with the assurance of an ocean-mail contract commensurate with the needs of the service, its development, and the law controlling the awards.

I want to say in this connection that the ocean-mail aid was not designed simply to build up great passenger services on the ocean. It was designed just as much to sustain and build up a cargo service for the United States, and all are eligible for that aid. But the primary purpose of building up those services was not to serve even ports; it was to serve the great areas of the United States through which ports serving them the commerce moved; and to assure and insure the perpetuation and preservation of the shipping services which the United States Shipping Board had built up, so that those communities at all times would have those outlets for their products and have their steamship lines and steamship communication that they could utilize and not be compelled in the competitive system of trade even throughout the United States, in the effort to obtain a fair share of foreign trade, to be hampered with additional burdens of rail transportation across the United States over long distances when ports were at their door or very near there which they could utilize if only the proper steamship service were furnished them.

"LANGUISHING" LEGISLATION

The additional legislation which has been recommended to carry into effect the policies of the Shipping Board remains languishing in the Senate of the United States with apparently little or no prospect of further consideration there, unless immediate steps be taken by those interested in the preservation of an American merchant marine to do all in their power to secure consideration and legislative action upon the pending measures.

As most of you gentlemen know who have been identified with the merchant marine, the Shipping Board some time ago construed the merchant marine act of 1920 and the Jones-White Act of 1928 to authorize a preference in the sale of the Shipping Board's services to local interests and even to local operators; and also that comprehended within the spirit of the laws, if not strictly within the letter, the award of mail contracts to such services, and such policy was pursued and carried out by the Shipping Board and the Post Office Department for quite a long time, until in the Gulf there developed a condition which challenged that construction and brought about a ruling of the Comptroller General which muddied the waters and has prevented to a very large extent the further disposition of the American trade routes operated by the Shipping Board to private interests until that situation is cleared up. In order to clear it the provision was adopted in the White bill, now pending in the Senate, that that preference should be recognized. It passed the House practically without opposition, but it has languished in the Senate all the past session and now still languishes there. If it still continues to languish and does not pass the Senate during this Congress it will have to be reintroduced in the next Congress, and no one knows what its ultimate fate will be.

If discord and antagonism, selfishness or greed, evidence themselves in the working out of the policies and application of the aids which Congress has provided, it can be confidently assured that insurmountable difficulties will arise in not only obtaining any additional aid but in preserving those which have been provided.

The interests of the Gulf and the great territory which it serves in the South, Southwest, and Mississippi Valley area of the United States require the same assurance of permanent and dependable service under the American flag which has been accorded the Pacific and the North Atlantic ports; and if such consideration is denied or so obstructed by other interests as to defeat the purpose and spirit of the merchant marine act of 1920, and that of 1928, it is altogether probable that the South, Mississippi Valley, and southwestern areas of the United States and their representatives will feel that their interests are not being recognized; and the benefit of their support will be lost in the furtherance of any program of Government aid which results in not only discrimination but the deprivation of services which it was understood would be established and continued upon a permanent basis with ultimate ownership and control in the communities and areas served by such steamship lines and trade routes.

CONSTRUCTIVE OPPORTUNITY

A real opportunity exists to build up an American merchant marine second to none, of which the United States can well be proud; but that opportunity can not be seized if strife and dissension develop among American shipping interests and those who are supposed to be friends of the American merchant marine. Can't anyone see how suicidal it is to allow such a situation to develop or grow? It disgusts those who want to help and furnishes destructive arguments and material to those who are doing all they can to prevent the United States from regaining its former prestige on the seas and becoming once more a nation dependent upon no other for the transportation of its commerce.

Of course, foreign interests will rejoice and encourage strife, dissension, and discontent among you as long as you permit it; and every time you do you lose much ground and set the American merchant marine backward another long way. Bear this in mind, too: The commerce of the United States is not going to give foreign shipping interests Government aid to any extent or under any form that it can prevent. It will not furnish foreign shipping interests or foreign flags ammunition to injure or destroy our own fleet. This Nation is trying to build up a strictly American merchant marine with an individual loyalty, and upon no other basis can you justify Federal aid.

You are confronted to-day with a most serious economic situation, in that we have lost over one-fourth of our foreign trade in one year, nearly two billion and three-quarters of a billion dollars. That can't be permitted to continue. It is partly due to world depression, but also largely to the development of the keenest foreign competition. Every effort must be made to keep and expand our foreign markets, to carry more of our exports and imports in American-flag ships. Live up to the high ideals of

America in your relations with the American public and world at large and show that you are worthy of the aid which the Government has given you, and remember always that in shipping, as in everything else, united we stand, divided we fall. I thank you. [Applause.]

FORT GRISWOLD, CONN.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 4248, authorizing the Secretary of War to convey the Fort Griswold tract to the State of Connecticut, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Connecticut, for the purposes of a public park and historic memorial, the tract of land owned by the United States known as the Fort Griswold tract, situated on the east shore of New London Harbor, in the State of Connecticut, and bounded northerly by the Fort Griswold monument reservation and by the land of various private parties, easterly and southerly by the land of various private parties, and westerly by New London Harbor and by the land of various private parties; reserving to the United States, however, the right to resume possession and occupy said tract or any portion thereof whenever in the judgment of the President an emergency exists that requires the use and appropriation of the same for the public defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ADDITION TO WEST POINT MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 5732, to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in Orange County, N. Y., for use as an addition to the West Point Military Reservation, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us whether or not the matter of the property along the river for aviation purposes has been straightened out?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Yes; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], from that district, will put a letter into the RECORD which covers the matter.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. So that it is satisfactory to the War Department and to everybody concerned?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. So that there will be an opportunity for an aviation field along the river.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. There is a satisfactory agreement between the people representing the people of Highland Falls and the War Department. Mr. FISH will put a letter into the RECORD, of which I have a copy.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I want it made clear to me. Members from New York have been communicated with with reference to this proposition. The first plan was to take some fifteen or sixteen thousand acres.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. And then the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] complained about taking 2,000 acres out of the city of Highland Falls.

That property was principally the assets of Mr. Morgan, Mr. Saterlee, and others, who are large taxpayers.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. That has been settled.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is that property going into the military reserve?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. It is going in, but the War Department is not going to take it for five years.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. In other words, there will not be an opportunity for an aviation field for five years?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Yes. They expect to get a lease from these gentlemen until such time as the 5-year option has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. On the assurance of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] that this bill, as it is finally worked out, is satisfactory to the people who wanted complete facilities given at West Point, I shall not object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, it is all right for the gentleman and his committee to arrange with our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] to adjust these matters, but the Government from time to time must take land. Are we establishing any precedent by this arrangement, whereby the Government will be hampered in the future from taking necessary land?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. I do not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman knows there has been some little encouragement, however unwarranted, offered our good colleague the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. KAHN] in her effort to try to move West Point to the west coast. It has gone even so far that some Californians have begun to believe that cadets are going to be marching down the streets of that city on the west coast very soon.

If the gentleman is going to spend all this money for this additional land for West Point, why does he not be fair with the gentlewoman from California, and with California itself, by telling them there is no chance on God's earth for West Point ever to be moved out on the west coast?

Mrs. KAHN. We believe there is a chance.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. If this bill goes through, there is no chance of West Point being moved.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to be fair. When the War Department appropriation bill comes up if there is any excessive charge for rentals for this aviation field, I am going to oppose it. It is quite all right to satisfy these people so that the land will be subject to local taxation for five years, but if as a result of that there is going to be any excessive charge for leases, we are going to fight it out on the merits when it comes before us.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. And if that thing occurs the chairman of the committee will be with the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I expect that.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Can we ascertain now what the agreement is as to the price of this property?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. No; because the War Department is authorized to buy or to condemn.

Mr. SABATH. You want to acquire it by condemnation?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Either buy it or condemn it.

Mr. SABATH. If you are as successful there as they have been here, it will cost us many, many million dollars more than it is worth.

Mr. SNELL. The land is not worth as much in our State as it is here in Washington.

Mr. GREEN. Reserving the right to object, if there is such a conflict as to the value of the land, in my State we will give you any amount of land you want for either the Naval Academy or West Point.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman include the Everglades National Park?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Regular order.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Knowing the chairman of the committee as well as I do, I know that it was not on his encouragement that the governor of our State acted when he was ready to take over West Point and assure the people of Illinois they were going to bring West Point to our State. Of course, we have wonderful sites for it but I do not believe the governor of our State had any assurance from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] that West Point would be moved.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. I have had no communication with the governor of the gentleman's State about it.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or

otherwise, approximately 17,000 acres of land in Orange County, N. Y., as an addition to the West Point Military Reservation; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated an amount not to exceed $1,500,000 for payment for the title to such land and the necessary expenses incident to its purchase.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"'That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional land in the vicinity of, and for use by, the United States Military Academy, in connection with the present military reservation at West Point, N. Y., such land being 15,135 acres, more or less, and including land surrounding Popolopen Lake, land bordering on the River Hudson, and other interlocking plots of land, all located in Orange County, N. Y.; and the sum of $1,500,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which sum shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall adversely affect the existing water supply, its sources, or pipe lines of the town of Highlands, N. Y.

"'SEC. 2. The Secretary of War shall, by due advertisements in such manner as he deems best and calculated to give the widest necessary publicity, call for offers of land for use in connection with said West Point, N. Y., and if after negotiation he is able to buy said land or any part or parcel or tract thereof, and at such price or prices as he shall deem to be the fair and reasonable market value of the land, then he is authorized to purchase said land for said purpose at such prices; and if any of said offers of land are at prices deemed by the Secretary of War to be above the reasonable market value of such parcel or tract of land, and if after the negotiation the Secretary of War is unable to purchase the same at fair and reasonable prices as herein defined, then in such case the Secretary of War is authorized to request the Attorney General of the United States to institute condemnation proceedings for the acquiring of such tracts or parcels of land as may be necessary for such purpose.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to incorporate in connection therewith a letter from the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. For several weeks past Mr. JAMES, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and myself, in cooperation with Supervisor Carrol A. Parry, of the town of Highlands, Mr. Jacob L. Hicks, and Mr. Kopold, have been trying to work out with the military authorities a compromise bill which would permit the proper expansion of the Military Academy at West Point, but would at the same time protect the vital interests of the taxpayers and people living in the town of Highlands, school district No. 2, and the village of Highlands Falls. Thanks to the earnest efforts of Mr. JAMES and the spokesmen of the town, village, and school district a compromise has been reached which is agreeable to the consolidated boards representing the people in that community.

The people in the vicinity of the Military Academy at West Point do not desire and never have attempted to stand in the way of the acquisition of all the property that is essential for the proper development of the greatest military academy in the world. The people in my district are proud of the splendid record of the Military Academy and its graduates for efficiency and patriotic service to the Nation, both in war and peace. For more than 125 years the graduates of the Military Academy at West Point have served our Republic with valor and distinction in all our wars and given to the country the services of some of our most eminent engineers to help develop our waterways, rivers, and harbors, and even the Panama Canal. It is well to remember when critics offer puny and ill-considered bills to change the location of the Military Academy at West Point, either to the West or the South, that there are approximately $40,000,000 of Government funds invested in buildings at West Point, and back of that, and of even more significance, are the great traditions connected with that historic site from the days of the Revolutionary War. I say to those Members of Congress who have spoken of a possible removal of the Military Academy from West Point that there is just as much chance of moving the Capitol and White House from the city of Washington.

The United States Military Academy belongs to the Nation and the American people cherish its traditions and the glorious names of its graduates, which include Presidents, statesmen, distinguished engineers, and such military leaders as U. S. Grant, William Tecumseh Sherman, George H. Thomas, Philip Sheridan, Robert E. Lee, T. J. (Stonewall) Jackson, Jefferson Davis, Joseph Wheeler, and John J. Pershing.

In accordance with the permission already granted I desire to insert the letter signed by the Secretary of War and addressed to the consolidated boards in the town of Highlands, giving satisfactory assurance of the use of water without charge to the village of Highland Falls and the hamlet of Fort Montgomery, and that no land would be acquired east of the main highway between Highland Falls and Fort Montgomery until July 1, 1932, provided the bill is enacted into law.

FEBRUARY 28, 1931.

To the BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
Village of Highland Falls, N. Y.

TOWN BOARD,
Town of Highlands, N. Y.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Union Free School District No. 2, Town of Highlands, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: It has been brought to the attention of the War Department that the municipal interests which you represent are apprehensive that under the provisions of a bill now pending in Congress, H. R. 14811, S. 5732, certain lands in the town of Highlands, N. Y., which now bear a considerable portion of the assessed taxes of your respective municipalities will be taken by the United States Government, thus depriving said municipalities of the taxes upon the same.

You are advised that should the measure above referred to be enacted into law, the War Department will not, under the authority therein contained, acquire title to any lands or property east of United States Highway Route 9W as it now lies in said town of Highlands and village of Highland Falls, N. Y., within a period of five years from July 1, 1932.

Immediately after July 1, 1932, the War Department will, in so far as it has legal authority, take all necessary steps to acquire the land upon which the water supply and system of the village of Highland Falls is located, including the purchase, at a price mutually agreeable, of the interest therein which said village now owns in the watershed from which this supply is obtained. When the watershed is acquired the War Department will guarantee to said village of Highland Falls the right to the use of the water up to the capacity of the said village of Highland Falls' present watershed without charge.

The War Department will also permit the settlement known as Fort Montgomery in the said town of Highlands to tap the West Point pipe line free of charge to supply the necessary water for all domestic purposes, provided that such connection with the pipe line will be made in a manner which will not impair the water supply to West Point.

This statement is made to you for the purpose of obtaining your consent to the bill now pending and will not be binding on either party if said bill fails to be passed by the present Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,
Secretary of War.

The above letter from the Secretary of War is sufficient guaranty that the provisions of the bill will be scrupulously carried out in every detail. I have implicit faith that the War Department will exert every means in its power to see that both the letter and the spirit of the bill are put into effect. I have the personal assurance of Mr. JAMES of Michigan, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and sponsor of the bill, that he will cooperate and insist on the complete fulfillment of every provision of the bill.

It is a matter of personal gratification that a compromise bill has been agreed on that will permit the War Department to buy additional land adjoining the Military Academy at West Point in order to provide an adequate water supply that will take care of the needs of the institution for years to come. It is hoped and expected that the proposed expansion of the military reservation will provide sufficient ground to establish an artillery target range, also for 1-pounders and machine guns, and a much-needed rifle range, the present one being utterly inadequate for the present requirements of the cadets.

The people of the town of Highlands and the village of Highland Falls have made real financial sacrifices in order not to jeopardize the expansion, efficiency, and development of the United States Military Academy and are entitled to

the gratitude and thanks of the Government and of the American people. Let no one in the future ever say that the people of the town of Highlands objected to or opposed the expansion of the Military Academy, which, under the provisions of this bill, is permitted to acquire nine-tenths of all the land in the town.

ATTENDANCE OF REGULAR ARMY AT OLYMPIC GAMES

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say he proposes to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. JAMES] for two bills, after which he will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 5715) to authorize the attendance of personnel and animals of the Regular Army as participants in the Tenth Olympic Games.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, S. 5715, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to direct the training and attendance of personnel and animals of the Regular Army as participants in the Tenth Olympic Games: *Provided*, That all expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation in the Tenth Olympic Games, including the use of such supplies, material, and equipment as in the opinion of the Secretary of War may be necessary, may be charged to the appropriations for the support of the Army: *Provided further*, That applicable allowances which are or may be fixed by law or regulations for participation in other military activities shall not be exceeded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two. Will the Army take horses to the Olympic games to use them for polo?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. No, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the Army participate in polo games at the Olympic games?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. No, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. What will be the cost of representation?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. It will not increase the Army appropriation bill at all.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask one question which I think will help the bill. Is the gentleman sure that this bill providing these expenses will not disqualify the participants as amateurs?

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. It will not. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement to that effect.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1931.

Hon. W. FRANK JAMES,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: Referring to Senate bill S. 5715, which if passed will authorize the expenditure of appropriations for the support of the Army, to allow personnel and animals of the Regular Army to participate in the tenth Olympiad to be held at Los Angeles, Calif., in the summer of 1932.

It is not the intention of the War Department to transport polo teams under the authority contained in the proposed bill nor is it expected that foreign armies will participate in any polo events connected with the Olympic games.

On the floor of the House yesterday Mr. LAGUARDIA asked if the passage of the proposed bill would destroy the amateur status of Army participants. It will not. Under the regulations drawn up by the International Equestrian Federation, of which the United States Cavalry is a member, an officer in active service is classed as an amateur for participation in the equestrian or modern pentathlon events of the Olympic games.

Yours very truly,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,
Secretary of War.

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. JAMES, CHAIRMAN MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Olympic Games are held every four years.

The next will be held in 1932 at Los Angeles, Calif.

Athletes from most of the nations of the world participate in these games.

There are two classes of events in the games for which the participants come almost exclusively from the various armies of the world.

These are: (a) The riding events; (b) the modern pentathlon.

Teams from not less than 10 armies of the world will participate in the above events in 1932.

The United States is the host nation and the American Army, in the eyes of the world, the host for the riding events and, to a lesser extent, for the modern pentathlon. This, however, will entail no expenditure of public funds.

There are three riding events. Two of them are designed to be a thorough test of the endurance, courage, and skillfulness of both riders and horses. The third is one designed to show the skillfulness of the rider and horses from a purely training standpoint.

The first two require the same riders and horses to participate in an endurance phase, but always under careful veterinary supervision. A phase showing the ability of rider and horses to gallop across difficult country, a phase showing the ability of both to negotiate most difficult obstacles of all types, and a final phase showing the training of man and horse.

This class of event is greatly encouraged among the various armies of the world, in order to develop in their young officers courage, skillfulness, hardiness, and quickness of thought, which are such prized qualities in the military man, and, in addition, to train their horses in the endurance and skillfulness which should be possessed by officers' chargers.

This type of international contest is held annually in Europe and was made a part of the Olympic Games because of their training and military value.

The other event in which, as a rule, only military personnel compete, is the above-mentioned modern pentathlon.

This is a modern counterpart of a similar event which was in the original Olympic games, and was intended to demonstrate the endurance, resourcefulness, and ability of a military courier.

The modern event consists of long-distance cross-country running, swimming, fencing, pistol shooting, and cross-country riding, all of which must be done by the same individual.

As a rule only persons with military training are sufficiently skilled in all of these things to successfully compete in the modern pentathlon.

The War Department wishes to enter teams in each of the three riding events, and the modern pentathlon.

The bill before the House seeks to authorize the use of public funds for training and sending military personnel and horses to Los Angeles.

Any amount expended will come from current appropriations and will not require additional funds.

A total of about 15 young officers will participate as principals and alternates in the riding events and eight or ten in the modern pentathlon.

Participation in these events requires long and careful training but this can be done without detriment to the officers' military duties.

Enlisted men are entitled to participate in both classes of events and will be given an opportunity to compete.

For training prior to the events, candidates with their horses must be assembled at some central place, such as Fort Riley, Kans., and final successful candidates must be sent to Los Angeles, and then to their homes.

The total cost involved will not exceed $15,000.

The number of officers involved, 25; enlisted men, 20; and horses, 30.

Polo will not be participated in by Army personnel.

The passage of this bill will in no way effect the amateur status of any military personnel. Their status is distinctly laid down in Olympic regulations.

American teams have participated in the last four Olympic games on private funds, but under those circumstances proper preparation could not be made for participation, and American teams have not been particularly successful.

The games being held in the United States make it most desirable that the best possible preparation be made.

The passage of this bill will allow such to be done.

The participants in the games will be at Los Angeles for approximately one month.

No more than normal expense will be required from War Department appropriations for participation in the games.

GUY V. HENRY,
Major General, United States Army, Chief of Cavalry.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 28, 1931.*

Hon. FRANK JAMES,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAMES: You have asked me the following questions:

(a) Will the Army take horses to the Olympic games that are usable for polo?

(b) Will the Army participate in any polo games at the Olympic games?

(c) Will the cost of representation exceed $15,000?

I can answer to each of the three above-mentioned questions "no."

Yours very truly,

GUY V. HENRY,
Major General, United States Army,
Chief of Cavalry.

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

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF DISABLED NURSES

Mr. JAMES of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 6231, to amend the act approved June 20, 1930, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement of disabled nurses of the Army and the Navy."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain his bill and show exactly what new drains it will place upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. McSWAIN. I do not think it will involve the expenditure of any additional money over and above what Congress intended when it passed the act last year.

Mr. BLANTON. Which is how much?

Mr. McSWAIN. Well, the expenditure under the act of last year, my recollection is, would involve an average of about $1,500 a year for the first few years.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the total expenditure?

Mr. McSWAIN. Only $1,500 by way of retirement.

Mr. BLANTON. One thousand five hundred dollars each to so many nurses?

Mr. McSWAIN. This is to retire nurses in the Army and the Navy who are disabled in line of duty.

Mr. BLANTON. And the total additional expense, over and above what is expended now, is about how much annually?

Mr. McSWAIN. It will involve for the first few years about $1,500 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman mean $1,500 apiece?

Mr. McSWAIN. No; that is the total. This will involve $450 additional for the first year, under the construction of the Comptroller General.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the passage of this bill just means $450 to be taken out of the Treasury?

Mr. McSWAIN. No; that much additional over and above that which would be expended under the act passed last year.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to know how much more money is going to be taken out by reason of the passage of this bill and which otherwise would stay in the Treasury.

Mr. McSWAIN. Four hundred and fifty dollars for the first year, and after that we can not tell how much. It will depend on the number of nurses who retire.

Mr. COLLINS. All nurses are retired at a stipulated base amount. Then the superintendents have added, when they are retired, $2,500 per annum to this base retirement allowance.

Mr. McSWAIN. There is one superintendent in each corps.

Mr. COLLINS. I understand. Then assistant superintendents have added to the base amount that they receive when retired $1,500 a year, and the chief nurses have added annually when retired $600 to their base retirement pay.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, it will cost into the thousands?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Let me be sure the gentleman understands. This is a letter I have just received from the Surgeon General of the Army, General Ireland, in which he says there is now no application for retirement by any superintendent or chief nurse in the Army, and only one chief nurse in the Navy.

Mr. BLANTON. About how many nurses will this bill affect?

Mr. McSWAIN. I can tell the gentleman exactly It will affect 140 all told in the next generation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservatien of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 20, 1930, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement of disabled nurses of the Army and Navy," shall be construed, from its effective date, as authorizing the pay of members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps retired thereunder to be computed upon the basis of the entire amount of the active-service pay received by each, respectively, at the time of her transfer to the retired list, including in the cases of superintendents of Nurse Corps, assistant superintendents, directors, assistant directors, and chief nurses the money allowance prescribed as part of their compensation by section 13 of the act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 631).

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

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO THE SECOND DIVISION, AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 233, to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Second Division, American Expeditionary Forces, a similar House resolution being on the Speaker's desk, No. 467.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Senate joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to grant permission to the Second Division Memorial Association, American Expeditionary Forces, through Maj. Gen. J. G. Harbord, United States Army, retired, president, or his successors in office, for the erection as a gift to the people of the United States on public grounds in the District of Columbia, a memorial to the Second Division: *Provided*, That the design and location for the memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts: *Provided further*, That such monument shall be erected under the supervision of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital and that the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of said monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution as originally written proposed that this monument be erected somewhere along B Street, now Constitution Avenue. Has that provision been stricken from the resolution?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That provision has been stricken from the resolution, so that the design and the location will be left entirely to the approval of the Fine Arts Commission.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

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

A similar House resolution was laid on the table.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend, as a part of my remarks upon this resolution, a statement of the services of the Second Division, appearing in the report of the Committee on the Library.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this resolution grants to the Second Division Memorial Association, American Expeditionary Forces, through Maj. Gen. J. G. Harbord, United States Army retired, the president of the association and one of its battle commanders, permission to erect here at the Nation's Capital, as a gift to the people of the United States, a memorial to that great Regular Army division. That division contained the Marine brigade of immortal fame for the capture of Belleau Wood, and took part in every major offensive of the American Army in France. Through its ranks including replacements, went almost 70,000 men, of these 4,419 were killed in battle and 20,657 wounded. For the information of the House I in-

clude in these remarks the brief but excellent and comprehensive statement of the service, the achievements, and the battle record of the Second Division contained in the report to this House of the bill by the Committee on the Library:

No division of the expeditionary forces in the Great War has recorded more remarkable achievements than those of the Second Division. Its formal organization as a division was effected by War Department order of December, 1917. It existed semiofficially for several months before that, but its units were scattered and its unity was not yet an actuality. The Fifth Marines reached France in June, 1917; the Ninth and Twenty-third Infantry and Fifth Machine Gun Battalion in September; the Sixth Marines, Second Engineers, Division Trains, and Sixth Machine Gun Battalion in October; the Twelfth, Fifteenth, and Seventeenth Field Artillery in December, 1917, and January, 1918; the Fourth Machine Gun Battalion in January, 1918.

No division could have been organized with better units. The Ninth and Twenty-third Infantries were two of the old line regiments of our Army with fine records almost covering the period of our existence as a Nation. The War of 1812, Mexico, the War of Secession, the Philippines, Santiago, and China are written on their regimental colors, and their history is that of the early struggles of our country, the winning of the West, the war with Spain, the Boxer trouble, and many encounters with the wily Tagalo and savage Mohammedan Moro. The Marines, a selected body of men, with their proud boast of "First to fight," and a record in their country's battles "from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli," brought a wealth of tradition and esprit and mingling their forest-green with the olive drab became as "army" as the Army itself. The artillery and auxiliary units more recently organized under the national defense act brought to the division the vigor and dash of youth, as marked in organizations and peoples as it ever is in individuals. Indeed, America's whole participation in the World War was that of a young Nation with the energy and drive that distinguishes youth from age.

To all these units the volunteers and the selective conscription had brought great numbers of eager youngsters from every phase of American life. No duty could be named—technical, mechanical, military, or civil—for which some expert could not be found. Officers who had spent their lives preparing to lead men in battle, the finest types of American regular soldiers and marines, engineers from the great enterprises of industrial life, linguists, artists, athletes, artisans, physicians, authors, lawyers, captains of finance, experts and organizers of all phases of active business life by hundreds caught the step and marched under the Indian head and star.

In January, 1918, all elements of the division were assembled near Bourmont, in the western foothills of the Vosges, and began a most intensive training for the ordeal before them. The German offensive of March, 1918, made it necessary for them to continue their training in actual service, and, on March 16–26, the Second Division took over the Toulon and Troyon sectors between Verdun and St. Mihiel. Aside from training received under fire, it had three more brief breathing spells which were devoted to instruction, near Robert Espagne, May 14 to 20; Gisors and Chaumont-en-Vexin, May 21 to 29; Columbey-les-Belles, August 18 to September 1, 1918.

From the cold official records of the American Expeditionary Forces the story of its achievements from March 26, 1918, may be paraphrased as follows:

Verdun sector, March 15–May 13, 1918: Division occupied Toulon and Troyon sectors in conjunction with French. A German raid in force was made against the Ninth Infantry on April 13, 1918. This was the largest demonstration made against American troops up to this time. The Ninth Infantry took some prisoners and inflicted heavy casualties on the Germans.

Aisne-Marne defensive (west of Chateau-Thierry), May 31–June 5, 1918: The division moved by camion to area northeast of Meaux and took up a position across the Paris-Metz highway west of Chateau-Thierry on June 1, 1918. The German advance on Paris was stopped and the enemy thrown back during this operation, which lasted until June 6, 1918.

Chateau-Thierry sector, June 6–July 9, 1918: Almost continuous fighting marked the Second Division's stay in this sector. During this time the Belleau Wood and the villages of Boureseches and Vaux were captured. Casualties were heavy, but the American Army demonstrated its ability to successfully meet in battle the best of German troops.

Aisne-Marne offensive (Soissons), July 18–19, 1918: Attached as part of the Twentieth Army Corps (French Tenth Army) near Soissons on the western side of the salient the Germans had pushed down to the Marne. Captured Beaurepaire Farm, Vaucastille, Vierzy, and advanced to Tigny.

Marbache sector, August 12–16, 1918: Quiet sector on Moselle River. No action except for numerous patrols.

St. Mihiel offensive, September 12–16, 1918: Went into the line near Limey, night of September 9–10, 1918; attacked with First American Army September 12, 1918; captured Thiaucourt, Xammes, and Jaulny and advanced to the vicinity of Rembercourt. Relieved September 16, 1918. Took many prisoners; losses slight.

Meuse-Argonne offensive (Champagne), October 1–10, 1918: Moved from Mairy-sur-Marne to Suippes Souain area. Went into front line under Twenty-first Corps (French) October 1, 1918, near Somme-Py. Cleaned up Essen trench. Jumped off October 3, 1918, and advanced to Medeah Ferme, Blanc Mont Ridge Road. Captured the strong enemy position of Blanc Mont and town of St. Etienne. Losses severe. Relieved by Thirty-sixth Division, United States, October 10, 1918, and moved to rest area near Somme Suippes.

Meuse-Argonne offensive, November 1–11, 1918: Marched to First American Army area October 22–25, 1918. Relieved Forty-second Division in line near Landres-et-St. Georges, night of October 30–31. Attacked November 1, 1918, advanced to corps objective. Captured Landres-et-St. Georges, St. George, Landreville, and Bayonville; continued the advance for several days; captured Fosse, Nouart, Letanne, and Beaumont. Crossed the Meuse the night of November 10–11, 1918, and was fighting east of river when the armistice went into effect.

Three hundred and nineteen officers and 9,972 men who were present with the division on March 15, 1918, were still present for duty on November 11, 1918.

Remained in the Beaumont-Pouilly area refitting until November 17, 1918.

March to the Rhine: Marched at 5 a. m. on November 17, 1918; crossed the American front line, advanced through Belgium and Luxemburg, and entered Germany December 1, 1918. Reached the Rhine in the vicinity of Remagen and crossed this river December 13, 1918. Occupied area No. 2 of the American sector of the Coblenz Bridgehead and established headquarters at Heddesdorf.

Accomplishments in the field: Kilometers advanced against opposition, 62. Prisoners captured: Officers, 288; men, 11,738; total, 12,026. Material captured: Heavy artillery, 74; light artillery, 269; trench mortars, 58; machine guns, 1,350 (many machine guns captured at St. Mihiel were not counted and are not figured in this total); antitank guns, 8; rifles, 1,000 (not counted except in the St. Mihiel offensive).

Decorations awarded: Medals of honor, 7; distinguished-service crosses, 675; distinguished-service medals, officers, 10; Belgian crosses, officers, 6; Legion of Honor (French), officers, 17; medaille militaire (French), men, 42; croix de guerre (French), 2,740; croce di guera (Italian), 15; Knight of Order of Crown of Italy, officer, 1; citations for distinguished gallantry, 795.

Such is the curt official record—its brief entry on the page of history. To write that entry cost the Second Division 4,419 killed, and 20,657 wounded; 35,343 replacements were sent to the Second Division—over 5,000 more than were sent to any other of the many fine American divisions. It lost 157 prisoners to the enemy. It spent 66 days in an "active sector," a period equaled only by the older First Division, which has 93 such days to its credit. Its service in "quiet sectors," 71 days, was equaled or exceeded by five other American divisions. But one other of our divisions, the Seventy-seventh, equaled the number of kilometers, 62, which it advanced against the opposition of the enemy.

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFICIAL MAIL MATTER

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 357) classifying certain official mail matter.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 357) classifying certain official mail matter having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

A. D. SANDERS,
CLYDE KELLY,
JAMES M. MEAD,
Managers on the part of the House.

L. C. PHIPPS,
G. H. MOSES,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

Conference was had on House Joint Resolution 357. The Senate conferees receded from their amendment and the bill is restored as it passed the House. The bill as it now stands permits Members of Congress to send to their own address official matters without limitation as to weight, exactly the same as is provided under present law for public documents.

A. D. SANDERS,
CLYDE KELLY,
JAMES M. MEAD,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 5624) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., and a point opposite thereto in Union County, Ky., now on the Speaker's table, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., and a point opposite thereto in Union County, Ky., authorized to be built by the act of Congress entitled "An act authorizing J. L. Rowan, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.," approved May 1, 1928, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved June 20, 1929, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

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

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE BOEUF RIVER, LA.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6132) granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Richland Parish, La., or the State Highway Commission of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Boeuf River at or near Buckner, Richland Parish, La., and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, a similar House bill being on the calendar.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the police jury of Richland Parish, La., or the State Highway Commission of Louisiana, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across Boeuf River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Buckner, within the parish of Richland, in the State of Louisiana, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PIPE-LINE BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6161) granting the consent of Congress to Missouri Valley Pipe Line Co. of Iowa to construct, maintain, and operate a pipe-line bridge across the Missouri River, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, a similar House bill being on the calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Missouri Valley Pipe Line Co. of Iowa, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a pipe-line bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River from a point in either Dakota or Dixon Counties in the State of Nebraska to a point in either Union or Clay Counties in the State of South Dakota, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation: *Provided*, That the work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That in approving the plans for said pipe-line bridge such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War may deem necessary to protect the present and future interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Missouri Valley Pipe Line Co. of Iowa, its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is fully authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

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

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what this is?

Mr. DENISON. This is a Senate bill on the Speaker's table, with a similar House bill on the calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON. I understood that; but is it a private toll bridge or railroad bridge?

Mr. STAFFORD. It provides for a pipe line across the Missouri River. Under reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propound an inquiry, as this is the first time in this Congress I have known of a bill providing an authorization to build a pipe line across a river. Is it necessary to obtain the consent of Congress to merely extend a pipe line under a stream that does not interfere with navigation?

Mr. DENISON. It is.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman know in how many instances Congress has been called upon to grant special privileges of this character?

Mr. DENISON. I can not state the number of instances, but we have done this before.

Mr. BURTNESS. And, if the gentleman will yield, of course, it may also be in the form of a trestle running across the river.

Mr. DENISON. Yes; the bill does not state how it is to be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6165) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Little Calumet River, on Cottage Grove Avenue near One hundred and fifty-eighth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the line of Cottage Grove Avenue extended, on the section line between sections 14 and 15, township 36 north, range 14 east, and just south of the east and west quarter lines through sections 14 and 15, Thornton township, in said county and State, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

Passed the Senate February 17 (calendar day, February 26), 1931.

Attest:

Secretary.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, where is this bridge to go?

Mr. DENISON. Across the Little Calumet River, but I do not remember just where.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that it is in my district. It is across the Little Calumet River. The roadway in Halsted Street has been closed for the past year.

Mr. SABATH. Will it not affect plans that are now in preparation as to certain improvements?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. No; this is a navigable stream, and it has to have the approval of the War Department.

Mr. SABATH. For whom is this bridge?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. It is for Cook County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ELEVEN POINTS RIVER, OREGON COUNTY, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6181) to legalize a bridge across the Eleven Points River at or near Thomasville, Oregon County, Mo.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge constructed across the Eleven Points River at or near Thomasville, in the county of Oregon and State of Missouri, is hereby declared to be a lawful structure, and the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Missouri State Highway Commission, its successors and assigns, to maintain and operate said bridge in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE JAMES RIVER AT GALENA, STONE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6182) to legalize a bridge across the James River at Galena, Stone County, Mo.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge constructed across the James River at Galena, in the county of Stone and the State of Missouri, is hereby declared to be a lawful structure, and the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Missouri State Highway Commission, its successors and assigns, to maintain and operate said bridge in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE WHITE RIVER, STONE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6183) to legalize a bridge across the White River approximately 11 miles south of Reed Springs, Stone County, Mo.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge constructed across the White River, approximately 11 miles south of Reed Springs, Stone County, Mo., is hereby declared to be a lawful structure, and the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Missouri State Highway Commission, its successors and assigns, to maintain and operate said bridge in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS WHITE RIVER, TANEY COUNTY, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill, S. 6184, to legalize a bridge across the White River at Forsyth, Taney County, Mo.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, are all these bridges toll bridges?

Mr. DENISON. If the gentleman will look at the title it will give him the information. This is to legalize a bridge across White River, Mo. It is to legalize a bridge that has been already built. The bridge is there, but they want to legalize it so that they can maintain and operate it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, what evidence was presented before the committee indicating that there is any lack of merit in legalizing the building of the bridge? Does the gentleman tell me that a corporation has a right to build a bridge and then come to Congress and have it legalized?

Mr. DENISON. This is simply to legalize a public bridge.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it a free bridge?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I should object to legalizing any private toll bridge.

Mr. DENISON. I do not think that has ever been done.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge constructed across the White River at Forsyth, in the County of Taney, State of Missouri, is hereby declared to be a lawful structure, and the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Missouri State Highway Commission, its successors and assigns, to maintain and operate said bridge in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT WELDON SPRINGS, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 6185, granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Weldon Springs, Mo.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State Highway Commission of Missouri to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Weldon Springs, Mo., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The authority hereby granted shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge be commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of approval hereof.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE WHITE RIVER, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6186) granting the consent of Congress to the Missouri State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the White River at Branson, Taney County, Mo., and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Missouri State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the White River at Branson, in the County of Taney, and State of Missouri, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The authority hereby granted shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge be commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of approval hereof.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO WEST VIRGINIA TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN BRIDGES

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6190) authorizing the State of West Virginia by and through the State Bridge Commission of West Virginia, or the successors of said commission, to acquire, purchase, construct, improve, maintain, and operate bridges across the streams and rivers within said State and/or across boundary line streams or rivers of said State, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think some explanation should be made of this bill as it is out of the ordinary.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill which has passed the Senate and is now on the Speaker's table. The House Committee has considered and favorably reported a similar bill which is on the calendar. It authorizes the

State of West Virginia in pursuance of a law which has been passed by the unanimous vote of both branches of the legislature of that State and approved by the governor to take over every toll bridge in the State and make it a free bridge.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope other States will do likewise.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and more adequately provide for military and other purposes, and to secure to the public the use of the herein-described bridges free of tolls as promptly as possible, the State of West Virginia, by and through the State Bridge Commission of West Virginia, or the successors of said commission, be and it is hereby authorized to acquire, purchase, rebuild, improve, maintain, and operate any or all of the following bridges and approaches thereto, at points suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with, and upon the approval of, the plans and location of said bridges as provided in an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the limitations herein provided, to wit:

A bridge across the Shenandoah River at or near Harpers Ferry; a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Harpers Ferry; a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Shepherdstown; a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Berkeley; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Chester; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Newell; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Weirton; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Middle Ferry; two groups of bridges across the Ohio River at or near Wheeling, each group consisting of a bridge from the city of Wheeling, W. Va., to an island in the Ohio River, constituting territory of the State of West Virginia, and a connecting bridge from said island to a point in Ohio; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Benwood; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near St. Marys; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Williamstown; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Parkersburg; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mason City; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Point Pleasant; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Huntington; a bridge across the Big Sandy River at or near Kenova; a bridge across the Tug Fork River at or near Fort Gay; a bridge across the Tug Fork River at or near Kermit; a bridge across the Tug Fork River at or near Williamson; a bridge across the New River at or near Hinton; a bridge across the New River at or near Prince; a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near Kanawha Falls; a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near Chelyan.

SEC. 2. Subject to the aforesaid conditions and limitations the State of West Virginia, by and through the State bridge commission or the successors of said commission, shall be, and it is hereby, authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation any private property, rights, or interests relating to bridges under construction or authorized to be constructed at any or all of the following locations and to construct or rebuild said bridges, to wit: A bridge across the Ohio River at or near Sistersville; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg; a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville; a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Star City; a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near Point Pleasant.

The times for commencing and completing the construction of new bridges authorized by this section shall expire two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 3. There is hereby conferred upon the State of West Virginia and the West Virginia Bridge Commission, or the successors of said commission, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, rebuilding, and/or operation of any and/or all such bridges and their approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 4. The State of West Virginia, by and through the West Virginia Bridge Commission, or the successors of said commission, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over any and/or all such bridges, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 5. The State of West Virginia, by and through the State Bridge Commission of West Virginia, or its successors, may unite or group all or such of said intrastate bridges into one or more separate projects for financing purposes as in its judgment shall be deemed practicable, and may also unite or group for financing purposes in any one issue of bonds such interstate bridges as the West Virginia Bridge Commission shall determine to be competitive, but no particular project or group shall be so united that any such project or group will include both interstate and intrastate bridges. If tolls are charged for the use of a bridge or bridges in a project, the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge or bridges embraced in the particular project shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund not to exceed an amount sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge or all of the bridges included in the particular project and their approaches under economical management, and not to exceed an amount sufficient, in addition to the foregoing, to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the aggregate cost of the bridge or all of the bridges embraced in the particular project, and their approaches, including reasonable interests and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not exceeding 25 years from the date of approval of this act. The tolls derived from the bridge or bridges embraced in any particular project may be continued and paid into the appropriate sinking fund until all such costs of the bridges embraced in the particular project shall have been amortized. In any event tolls may be charged on the basis aforesaid for transit over the bridge or bridges in each project for which revenue bonds of said State are issued, and such tolls may be continued and adjusted at such rates as may be necessary to pay such bonds with interest thereon and any lawful premium for the retirement thereof before maturity, subject only to the power of the Secretary of War or other authorized Federal authority to regulate such rates.

SEC. 6. The failure of the State of West Virginia, by and through the State Bridge Commission of West Virginia, to acquire, purchase, construct, improve, maintain, and operate any one or more of the foregoing bridges, or to unite or group any one or more for financing purchases, shall in no wise affect its authority or powers hereby granted to acquire, purchase, construct, improve, maintain, and operate such bridge or bridges as it may deem expedient, and any one of the bridges herein authorized may be purchased, acquired, or constructed as a single project without uniting such bridge in a joint project with other bridges authorized herein.

SEC. 7. When a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of any bridge or bridges in any particular project or group or sufficient to pay the principal and interest on bonds issued for the purpose of financing such particular bridge or bridges or project or group shall have been provided to the extent hereinbefore required, the bridge or bridges included in any such project or group shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. All tolls shall be uniform as between individuals and as between vehicles of the same class as to each bridge, but different rates of toll may be charged for the use of different bridges in any group of bridges included in a single project for financing purposes.

SEC. 8. The powers conferred by this act are supplementary and additional to all other authority and powers heretofore granted by law for the construction of the hereinbefore named bridges, but all acts or parts of acts heretofore enacted authorizing the construction of the hereinbefore named bridges which are in conflict with the terms of this act be, and the same are, hereby repealed in so far as such conflict exists. Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing tolls to be charged for the use of any one or more of the hereinbefore named bridges except as hereinabove provided, and nothing herein shall be construed so as to prohibit the State of West Virginia from paying all or any part of the costs of the acquisition, purchase, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of any one or more of such bridges or their approaches, and any and all bonds issued for such purposes, from any funds of the State which may now or hereafter be made available for that purpose.

SEC. 9. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER, AUGUSTA, GA.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6220) granting the consent of Congress to the Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga., and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Augusta, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Co., its successors and assigns; and any party to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such party.

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 6232) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Fayette and Washington, Pa., either jointly or severally, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Fayette City, Pa., and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Fayette, Pa., or its board of county commissioners, their successors or assigns, and/or to the county of Washington, Pa., or its board of county commissioners, their successor or assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Monongahela River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, at or near Fayette City, Pa., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 25 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches, under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditure for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

D. S. PRENTISS AND OTHERS

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6266) authorizing D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the town of New Boston, Ill., which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the town of New Boston, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Illinois, the State of Iowa, any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interest in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements. If the bridge is not taken over by the States as provided in section 4 after the amortization of the senior securities, the net revenue in excess of 8 per cent of the cost of the structure as provided in section 6 shall form a sinking fund, which shall be applied in reducing the cost of making the structure a free bridge to the States or adjacent counties desiring to take it over, maintain, and operate it.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the States or public agencies, or political subdivisions thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including a reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

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

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns; and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, are hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bills 2859, 4671, 4687, 4690, 6140, 6018, and 6045 be indefinitely postponed, similar House bills having been enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16111) to amend sections 1 and 7 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object simply to call attention to what these amendments are. This is the $28,000,000,000 authorization of bonds by the Treasury Department. It passed the House and an effort was made in the House to strike out the section that was stricken out in the Senate. It will be recalled that there was a roll call on the bill and that 150 gentlemen voted to strike out that section. The bill went to the Senate and that section was stricken out. The gentleman from Oregon is now trying to comply with what the minority wanted at that time.

Mr. HAWLEY. I might take some exception to the gentleman's speech, but I shall not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive, page 1, and lines 1 to 9, inclusive, page 2.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 1 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended."

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

COMMISSIONERS OF LINCOLN PARK

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5781) granting to the Commissioners of Lincoln Park the right to erect a breakwater in the navigable waters of Lake Michigan, and transferring jurisdiction over certain navigable waters of Lake Michigan to the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in consideration of the acceptance of this act by the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois, subject to all the provisions, conditions, requirements, and limitations hereof, consent, permission, and authority are hereby granted to said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park to exercise complete jurisdiction over the navigable waters of Lake Michigan which lie within the following-described boundaries:

Beginning at a point at the intersection of the existing bulkhead along Lake Shore Drive in Chicago, Ill., with the existing pier which is parallel to and north of Ohio Street extended and south of Ontario Street extended, thence easterly along said pier to a point in a line parallel to and 350 feet easterly of said bulkhead along the Lake Shore Drive, thence northwesterly along said last-described line to a point in a curve of 200 feet radius and tangent both to said last-described line and to a line 350 feet southerly from the southerly side of and parallel to the shore arm extension breakwater extending into Lake Michigan from a point near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive, thence along said curve to a point in said line last described, thence easterly along said line to a point in a line at right angles with said shore arm extension breakwater at the eastern extremity thereof, thence northward along said last-described line to said shore arm extension breakwater, thence westward along said shore arm extension breakwater to the shore line.

The rights herein granted shall include the right to destroy the navigability of the above-described waters altogether, and to perform any other acts which said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park would be entitled to perform if the above-described waters were nonnavigable.

SEC. 2. Said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park are also hereby granted the right to erect an additional breakwater to connect the said shore arm extension breakwater near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive with the shore line.

SEC. 3. From and after the taking effect of this act said the commissioners of Lincoln Park shall assume possession of the said shore arm extension breakwater near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive and shall thereafter be liable forever for its care and custody, and said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park shall maintain the said breakwater in good order and thorough effective condition for its purpose of the inclosure and protection of Chicago Harbor.

SEC. 4. Said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park shall signify its acceptance of this act by written notice to the Secretary of War within 60 days after the passage of this act, and this act shall become effective immediately upon its acceptance by said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park. In the event of nonacceptance within 60 days this act shall become null and void.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is this about?

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is a breakwater in the inner harbor which is largely out of repair and which the Lincoln Park commissioners need for the World's Fair. It will cost about a quarter of a million dollars. They propose to take it over. It will not curtail the harbor where shipping is had. Instead of that it will add to the harbor where pleasure yachts are anchored.

Mr. SABATH. Is this to extend the lagoon there?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. They also expect to build a breakwater of their own, which will involve a very large expenditure. It is one of the great improvements of Chicago, and is desired by everybody there.

Mr. SABATH. But I want to know how far you are going and what you desire to do?

Mr. DEMPSEY. There are three things that are done: First, we turn over to the commissioners of Lincoln Park for future maintenance the Oak Street Breakwater. Second, we give the commissioners of Lincoln Park the right to fill in a strip of land 350 feet in width along the lake shore and on the south side of the Oak Street Breakwater. Third, we give them the right to construct an extension of the Oak Street Breakwater to the shore.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Fifteen years ago, perhaps, there was a bill passed by the House granting to the United States Steel Corporation the right to fill in the lake at Gary, subject to the consent of the State of Indiana. That bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which Mr. Mann was chairman. I was fortunate enough at that time to be a member of that committee. That bill was predicated upon the idea that the State of Indiana had exclusive jurisdiction, subject only to the rights of navigation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. When I read the bill that is reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors I found that there was no provision made that those privileges should be extended to the consent of the State of Illinois, but that the National Government assumes jurisdiction over that which is largely local, and where it only has the right to legislate because it is over navigable waters.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No. There is no necessity of reciting what the jurisdiction or what the local rights of the two parties are. We have the breakwater there. We have constructed it and maintained it. The primary purpose of it is to enable them to take over this breakwater, to extend it, and to fill in some land. It will add to the harbor. It will add in every way.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I am not taking issue at all on the merits of it. I am only taking issue as to the authority of the National Government to assume jurisdiction over that which is largely State, because the title to the land under the waters of Lake Michigan at Chicago is in the State of Illinois.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now, as to that we can not cede what we do not have. If we attempt to cede what we do not have, that part of the act will be futile and void.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the conclusion to which I came as far as this act was concerned, and knowing the high standard the gentleman has as a lawyer I wish to get his views on that point.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. May I say this improvement is to be done by the Lincoln Park Commissioners, which is a municipality created by the statutes of the State of Illinois, a public municipality, and that the Legislature of the State of Illinois has passed complete laws covering the matter of

riparian rights and other rights on the shore of Lake Michigan.

Mr. STAFFORD. That covers the point. Otherwise there would be no authority in the National Government.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is there anything provided in this bill which will permit the Capone or Thompson combine in Chicago to still get more water from Lake Michigan?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not for the present.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, they are not interested in water. They are interested in something stronger than water.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ISLE ROYALE NATIONAL PARK, MICH.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, because of an emergency I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 17005) to provide for the establishment of the Isle Royale National Park, in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, is this a Senate bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is a House bill. The emergency is that the bill does not become fully effective unless these lands are ceded to the United States. The Legislature of Michigan is now in session. It will not be in session again for two years.

Mr. GARNER. Let me understand the situation. I want to know exactly what the situation is. I understood the Speaker was going to call up certain bills in certain classes. Does this bill come within the rule that the Speaker laid down or is this an emergency matter? I just want to know so that the membership may understand that they may appeal to the Speaker on emergency matters as well as on regular matters which he has called up.

The SPEAKER. A matter which is a real emergency, but not an imaginary emergency. For a real emergency the Chair will recognize Members.

Mr. GARNER. The Speaker has examined this bill and recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, that it is a real emergency, although it is not a Senate bill or a House bill, where a Senate bill of similar nature has been passed? The Speaker thinks it is of sufficient emergency that he should recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]?

The SPEAKER. The Chair was informed that the bill was of very great emergency, and that if brought up in this way would, in all probability, pass the Senate. On a mere assertion of emergency, the Chair does not always recognize.

Mr. CRAMTON. A companion bill has been favorably reported in the Senate and I am hopeful of getting action there to-night.

Mr. GARNER. In view of the statement heretofore made, the Speaker should be sure that there is an emergency when he takes up a House bill, and it should not be taken up unless there is every assurance that the bill is going to be passed by the Senate; otherwise it is useless to consider it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have great hope that it will be passed.

Mr. GARNER. One man in the Senate can defeat any piece of legislation now until we adjourn.

Mr. CRAMTON. I know of no opposition to it.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HOLADAY. Does this apply to any other park except the park in the gentleman's home State?

Mr. CRAMTON. It does not. My interest in Isle Royale as a possible national park was first aroused by the late Stephen T. Mather, first Director of the National Park Service. He was my friend and one of the greatest privileges of my long service in Congress was the opportunity given me to work with him from 1920 until his ill health forced his resignation as head of the Park Service. He was a man of the highest ideals, great enthusiasm, generously contributing many thousand dollars annually of his own money in park acquisition and development but always handling Government funds with wise economy. I came to be very close to him in his work and his friendship, and the close contact with his ideals and his enthusiasm are among the richest memories of my life here. No one knew better the scenic values of the United States than he, and no one has done as much as he to raise high the national-park standard. In the several years preceding his retirement we discussed together almost every important problem of the service, every important proposed development.

Among these was the creation of the Isle Royale National Park. It was the one outstanding new national-park project in his interest, and for it he was most enthusiastic. He visited the area in 1925 and brought back with him the most wonderful moose pictures I have ever seen, as well as pictures of the unusual scenery. He said then the name Isle Royale surely did justice to the island, for he had "never visited a more kingly bit of natural wonderland than this."

In his report upon this bill the Director of the National Park Service, Mr. Albright, says:

> The area was carefully inspected in 1925 by former Director Mather of the National Park Service, who gave it his unqualified approval. He was much impressed and very enthusiastic over the possibilities.

So impressed was I by his enthusiasm for and interest in the project that I feel creation of the Isle Royale National Park will be another monument to his zeal, foresight, and devotion in the preservation of these outstanding areas for perpetual use and enjoyment by the people of the Nation.

Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, president of the National Geographic Society, has expressed approval of this area as a national-park project.

As the attached report of Director Albright indicates, the area is indorsed as a national-park project by noted and disinterested experts who have studied it.

The January issue of Outdoor America contains an interesting descriptive article by Dr. Frank R. Oastler, of New York, indorsing Isle Royale as fully up to national-park standards. The Izaak Walton League of America have written me of their special interest "in the preservation of the Isle Royale region."

Recently the Herald, of Duluth, Minn., carried this editorial statement:

A GREAT NATIONAL PARK

> Representative CRAMTON, of Michigan, has introduced a bill in Congress to make Isle Royale a national park when the lands to be included are acquired by the Government. He did this in cooperation with Representative JAMES, whose district includes the island.
>
> Anybody who has seen Isle Royale, which isn't an island but a noble archipelago, will agree that if this bill goes through and becomes effective the island will constitute one of the Nation's greatest park assets.
>
> There is no grander or lovelier scenery in the world than this picturesque island with its brood of lesser islands and its scenic fiords and wild wooded heights. It is also one of the greatest wild-game sanctuaries in the country, with more moose than can be found anywhere. It is a wonderful place to visit, or to choose as a vacation spot or site for a summer home, and if the Government takes it over and lets the world know about it, it will quickly become one of the Nation's favorite resorts.
>
> Congress should by all means pass this bill, thus adding at small expense what will be one of the greatest treasures in the Nation's collection of national parks.

The Detroit News, which has given much attention to this project for a number of years, recently said editorially of this bill:

> In one respect those resources are unique. Because of the low temperature of the waters of Lake Superior, Isle Royale is unlike any other spot in the United States except other islands in Lake Superior. It is in some ways typical of land to be found much farther north, in Canada. It possesses flora of the sub-Arctic region, growing alongside plants native to Michigan. It is rich

region for the scientist not only because of its situation but also because the island remains practically unspoiled by the activities of man.

If adopted by Congress, the Cramton bill would awaken a wider interest in the importance of Isle Royale as a national possession. It would give a more definite invitation to generous property owners to deed their holdings to the Government as a gift to the Nation; and while the measure specifically provides that the United States shall make no purchase of property, it might encourage the raising of private funds to buy such parts of the island as perhaps can be obtained in no other way. The island is royal not in name alone; it is regal in its unique qualities and is worthy to stand untamed and unspoiled with the Yellowstone and the Yosemite as one of our finest national possessions.

During the administration of President Coolidge, Federal homestead lands totaling over 9,000 acres on the island were withdrawn from entry or sale by Executive order, pending the outcome of a land-acquisition program on the island. At the same time a similar order was issued by Michigan withdrawing 2,100 acres of State-owned land. In addition to this the Island Copper Co., of New York, through its chairman of the board, Thomas F. Cole, stands ready to deed to the Government, without cost, its holdings of some 45,000 acres, provided the island is made a national park. This leaves approximately 76,000 acres still in private hands, of which 72,000 acres are controlled by one corporation.

The Park Service has repeatedly stated that it can not afford to establish any national parks unless the Government secures title to practically all of the lands within the contemplated boundaries of the park, for its experience in attempting to secure private holdings after the establishment of a park site have been most unfortunate and expensive.

Isle Royale needs nothing to become a national park except an angel, some one or some group who will purchase most of the remaining land in private hands and present it to the Government. The National Park Service will do the rest.

The bill involves no expense to the Federal Treasury for acquisition of the lands. The expense for development will not be large since expensive and extensive roads would never be appropriate for development.

It is near a large population and will in time to come attract and charm many visitors.

The proposed park area lies in the congressional district of my colleague [Mr. JAMES], with whom I consulted before introducing the bill and who is much interested in this proposed recognition of some outstanding scenery in his district. As a matter of fact, the visitor who travels through my colleague's district in the upper peninsula of Michigan en route to Isle Royale will find much wonderful scenery for his enjoyment.

The following report of the National Park Service gives much interesting information about this area as a park project:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, February 19, 1931.

Reference is made to letter dated February 11, from the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives, inclosing for report a copy of H. R. 17005, Seventy-first Congress, third session, entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of the Isle Royale National Park, in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes."

Isle Royale is the largest island in Lake Superior, located just inside the international boundary about 25 miles north and west of Keweenaw Point in Michigan. It lies in Keweenaw County of that State. It is approximately 44 miles long, with an average width of 5 miles. Its area is estimated at approximately 205 square miles. Twelve square miles of this are composed of inland lakes, 24 in number, leaving 193 square miles, or approximately 123,520 acres net, of land area. To this may be added about 2,000 acres on the immediately surrounding smaller islands which should be included in the project. It is accessible by boat from about May 1 to November 15. For the remainder of the year it is icebound. During the open season boats from Duluth, Minn., Houghton, Mich., and Port Arthur, Ontario, provide transportation. A good many people now fly over the island. It has no telegraph or telephone connections with the mainland. The last census indicated only 23 registered voters, mostly trappers, fishermen, or miners, who live scattered throughout the area. It is used on a very small scale for summer-resort purposes, a small lodge being available at Rock Harbor on the eastern end.

The topography of the island is quite broken, and can perhaps be best described as a moss and forest covered mass of gigantic rocks, the result of a volcanic upheaval. It has the appearance of being almost entirely in its primeval state, for, due to the rugged formation, lumbermen have left its tree growth alone. The island is said to have burned over in the remote past, and evidence of such fires can be seen in places. However, in such instances nature has restored conditions well. There are many marvelous beauty spots in their primitive condition, thus offering perfect examples of nature's textbooks for the study of scientist and student. Especially is this the case on the smaller islands surrounding the main Isle Royale. The exquisite, rugged beauty of the cliffs of the shore lines, indented with countless small bays and mouths of trout streams that may be enjoyed by sailing along the narrow, deep fiords or channels, constitutes a particularly fascinating contribution to the scenic offerings of the park.

Due to the peculiar combinations of inland lakes and forested terrain, these factors may be held accountable for the preservation and increase of the wild life of the island. Without this sheltering cover of balsam, spruce, beech, birch, poplar, and pine, Isle Royale to-day doubtless would not be the home of moose, woodland caribou, beaver, deer, and other wild life. It is considered no exaggeration to estimate 2,000 moose and 400 woodland caribou on the island, the latter an animal not encountered elsewhere within the confines of the mainland of the United States. Moose may now be seen with little effort by any visitor. This in itself will present an unusually fine wild-life spectacle. Botanists report a wealth of flora, equaling in season the finest flower displays of the other national parks. The flora and fauna of the island, said to be entirely foreign to the neighboring shores of the lake and to be sub-Arctic in character due to the perpetually cold waters by which Isle Royale is surrounded, have long been the object of scientific curiosity. The waters of the island and the surrounding lake abound with fish, so that the sport of fishing would be one of the outstanding attractions of the park. The island group is considered the greatest breeding grounds for the herring gull in the Great Lakes. The proposed park thus offers large opportunities for study and enjoyment to the lover of bird, animal, and fish life under most favorable conditions.

Another most interesting feature of the island is the archæological remains. In two remote sections, one on the northern shore and the other in the south Siskiwit Bay district, extensive mining operations of ancient days have been uncovered. How far back into our history these go has not yet been definitely determined. On the old Minong workings, near McCargoes Cove, great piles of stone hammers, crude large stone steps leading to the water's edge, and other stone implements have been uncovered. Whether these represent the operations of ancient white man or began with their Indian antecedents is unknown. However, there are remains of literally thousands of open-pit mines from which, in aboriginal times, the early inhabitants of these regions obtained practically all of the copper that was used in aboriginal America. From here and the adjacent mainland, where all of this copper was obtained, it found its way by the trade routes into other parts of North America, and all of the copper, so far as can be determined, which has been found in mounds in the South and elsewhere, was originally obtained from this immediate vicinity. Here, at and near the head of McCargoes Cove, therefore, may be said on good authority to be the real seat of this great ancient mining industry.

It is therefore evident that from a scenic, recreational, scientific, and educational standpoint here is presented one of the outstanding opportunities for the establishment of a great island national park unique of its kind in the system and measuring up to the high standards that have been prescribed for such establishment. Its type of scenery, utterly distinct from anything now found in our national-park system, its primitiveness, its unusual wild life and interesting flora, its evidences of possible prehistoric occupation, all combine to make Isle Royale and its neighboring islands of national-park caliber.

It is this very unusualness which will also present unusual problems for development, if and when created as a national park. Complete protection, of course, is the prime object aimed at. The island appears peculiarly adapted for the building of a simple system of horse and hiking trails from one end of the island to the other, following ridges or partly at lower elevations near the shores with other trails, crossing over and connecting the longer parallel trails. From these pathways unending and everchanging scenes of marvelous beauty would be unfolded, without disturbing the wilderness character of the area, or the wild life. Such development of the inner section of the park would be paralleled by the boat routes through the channels surrounding the island.

The matter of establishing this national park was first seriously brought to the attention of the department in 1924 through the interest of Michigan conservation associations which were actively pushing the matter and exerting themselves toward securing the private holdings on the island in order that they could be offered to the Federal Government. The area was carefully inspected in 1925 by former Director Mather of the National Park Service, who gave it his unqualified approval. He was much impressed and very enthusiastic over the possibilities. It has been visited and reported on by other outstanding men of authority, notably this past summer by Harlan P. Kelsey, of Salem, Mass., a botanist and conservationist, as collaborator for the service, and Dr. Frank R. Oastler, of New York City, outstanding in conservation circles and a member of the advisory board on educational problems in national parks, both of whom were high in their praise of the area from a scenic and scientific standpoint.

The area was also studied in 1930 by Senator Walcott, chairman of the Special Committee on the Conservation of Wild Life Resources of the United States Senate, and other members of that committee. In all discussions of the possible creation of this park, the department and the service, while being favorable to the project, have taken the stand that the only condition under which the project would be acceptable under established policies would be that all the area required should be conveyed to the Federal Government without cost, as was the policy approved by Congress for the establishment of the three proposed southern Appalachian parks.

It may be pertinent to observe at this point that, while all except 9,121 acres of the island, which are public land, are in private or State ownership, the head of one of the large copper companies owning considerable acreage on the island has indicated that some 21,000 acres of their holdings would be turned over to the park project without cost, in the event of the establishment of the park, and that this gift may be increased to 45,000 acres. The Conservation Commission of the State of Michigan stands ready to deed 2,240 acres of land under its jurisdiction toward the project. Altogether commitments have been made to turn over approximately 56,000 acres of the total required for the park, leaving the rest still to be acquired by local authorities.

Under the provisions of H. R. 17005, the actual establishment of this national park is based upon the condition that the land deemed necessary be turned over to the United States without cost of acquisition.

* * * * * * *

With these changes made I heartily recommend that this bill be given favorable consideration and enacted into law.

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, *Director.*

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when title to all alienated lands within such area of Isle Royale in Lake Superior, Keweenaw County, Mich., as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior in the exercise of his judgment and discretion as necessary or desirable for national-park purposes, shall have been vested in the United States, said area shall be, and is hereby, established dedicated, and set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, and shall be known as the Isle Royale National Park: *Provided,* That the United States shall not purchase by appropriation of public moneys any land within the aforesaid area, but such lands shall be secured by the United States only by public or private donation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion and upon submission of evidence of title satisfactory to him, to accept on behalf of the United States title to any lands located on said islands offered to the United States, without cost, as may be deemed by him necessary or desirable for national-park purposes.

SEC. 3. The administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 26, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended: *Provided,* That the provisions of the act approved June 10, 1920, known as the Federal water power act, shall not apply to this park.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, in line 3, strike out the words "such area of," and after "Michigan" in line 5, insert the words "and immediately surrounding islands."

On page 2, in line 4, strike out the word "land" and insert the word "lands."

In line 17, strike out the figures "26" and insert the figures "25."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems very strange to me that only a few days ago my State desired a bill passed very similar in nature to this. We purported to give to the Federal Government 1,300,000 acres of land in the southern portion of Florida for a national park.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I am not going to object to your bill unless you force me to do so. When we offered to give that land we found on the other side of the aisle a legion coming up to protect the Federal Treasury and to prevent the Everglades National Park from being established. Now, then, we find the gentleman from Michigan coming in with all of the lions and lambs lying down together, and they are all communing together to help him to pass his park bill. I am going to see if gentlemen on the other side of the aisle [Republican], who were so zealous to stop the bill for the State of Florida, when we wanted to establish our national park—I am going to see if those gentlemen now are going to object to the passage of this bill to establish a national park in the State of Michigan. I am not going to object. I am willing for the gentleman to have his park. Why not couple with your request, that our bill be also passed. I hope the Democrats will not object but will let objectors come from over there on your own side. But it does seem strange that when we want our national park there is so much objection. When we wanted our bill passed to reimburse our fruit-fly sufferers, a legion objected on the other side of the aisle. It is all right with you, on the other side of the aisle, when the park is to be established in Republican territory, or when reimbursement claims come from your own section of the country. "Consistency, thou art a jewel." Why are you not consistent. Why not also pass our Everglades Park bill? [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to state the emergent character of this legislation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly. The bill provides that the park shall not come into being until all the lands involved are donated to the United States. The Legislature of Michigan is now in session; there is a movement in the State toward the acquisition of those lands, and the legislature will not meet again, in the ordinary course of events, for two years.

Mr. GREEN. Our legislature had already passed a bill to donate the land.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman that I favored the bill for a park in the State of Florida and would have been glad to have a chance to vote for it. More than that, the lady from Florida [Mrs. OWEN] has assured me that she does not object to what the gentleman suggests as a discrimination.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if she does not object I do not, either.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 1, in line 9, after the word "States," insert: "And exclusive jurisdiction over the same shall have been ceded by the State of Michigan to the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill 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.

COLONIAL NATIONAL MONUMENT IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 5616, to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the creation of the colonial national monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1930. I would like to say in explanation that the other day we passed the companion House bill. I did not then know the Senate bill had already passed the Senate, but since it had passed the Senate and is pending here, I am now asking to have the Senate bill passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the creation of the colonial national monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1930, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, which shall not exceed the sum of $2,000,000, to be available for all expenses incident to the examination and establishment of the said colonial national monument and for the acquisition of lands and/or lands and improvements needed for the completion of the monument, including the securing of options and other incidental expenses. The area of the Yorktown battlefield, authorized for inclusion in said monument, is hereby extended to not to exceed 4,500 acres, and all Government-owned lands within the boundaries of said monument as established by presidential proclamation, except those determined by the Secretary of the Interior as not necessary in carrying out the objects of said monument, are hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction and control of the National Park Service."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the House bill was brought before the House for consideration the other day under unanimous consent, I interrogated the mover of the motion with two explicit

questions as to the amount of additional money that would be required in case the limit of appropriation was lifted. The appropriation up to that time for this purpose was limited to $500,000. I tried my best, in my feeble way, to obtain information as to what additional burden would be placed upon the National Government by the authorization to purchase the additional acreage. No such information could be furnished me. I thought at that time it was ordinary farm property. I came to find out shortly afterwards, that very same day, that we were imposing an obligation upon the National Government of $1,500,000 to purchase additional land of 2,000 acres or thereabouts—land for this Colonial National Park.

I do not think it is dealing fairly or frankly with the membership of the House, when a million and a half dollar proposition is involved, for the sponsor of that legislation not to be acquainted with the merits of the proposition, so that in answer to a direct inquiry he can advise the House as to the added obligation. I have been criticized in this House for being economical and if I had known this project was going to entail an obligation of $1,500,000, threefold the original proposition, I would most certainly have objected. [Applause.]

Now, we have before us the proposal for the first time that the authorization of appropriation shall be increased from $500,000 to $2,000,000. We are also confronted with the situation that if we do not place this limitation on, it may go to three or four or five million dollars. I should have had, and this House should have had, the information when the original House bill was under consideration, so that we could have exerted our right to block this extravagant appropriation of $1,500,000 for public-park purposes, when the taxpayers in these piping times of peace will be obliged to pay the additional amount.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. I object.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. SABATH. I withhold it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], while he no doubt had it definitely in mind that he wanted that information, it is my recollection that he did not ask the direct question as to the amount of money. He did ask about the acreage.

Mr. STAFFORD. I asked twice about the additional amount of money caused by this additional authorization and got no reply.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is not fair to my colleague from Michigan, who made the request, to insist upon that. The situation is this: The bill passed the House a year ago with no limitation as to the amount of money or the acreage. The Senate put in a limitation of $500,000 and of 2,500 acres, and this was accepted in conference. At that time we could have secured in conference an agreement on this amount of $2,000,000, but we felt that the interest of the Treasury would be conserved by not hanging up that large stated sum, so we accepted the limitation of $500,000.

Again this year the Committee on the Public Lands reported out the bill removing any limitation as to money and providing 4,500 acres as to acreage. The Senate in their bill have insisted upon putting in this limitation of $2,000,000, which I believe is more than will ever be spent, and it is not, in my judgment, the most economical proposition to have it stated in the bill; but they passed it in this form and I am trying to pass the Senate bill here.

I will say to the gentleman that the acquisition of lands in this monument is limited to the Yorktown Battlefield almost entirely. Jamestown Island the State of Virginia is endeavoring to buy and giving to the Government. Anything acquired in Williamsburg will be presented to us. The parkway, 20 miles long, to connect these three historic shrines is not costing us over $43,000; but in the Yorktown Battlefield, one of the most momentous, historical places in America, it is necessary that the lands acquired be adequate.

Now, it so happens that in this increase of 2,000 acres, 1,400 acres, as I understand it, is the watershed of Newport News, and about 600 acres of increase is all that is involved in possible purchase, and the bulk of this was bought a few years ago by a land-development company. They started to put up a large hotel property, and they laid out a great golf course, and as you go over this sacred, historic shrine you find bunkers named for General Lafayette and General Washington, and so forth. This is one of the things we want to prevent. The people who bought this land have given an option to parties interested to sell it to the United States at the price they gave for it several years ago, and without any charge for interest or taxes.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. SABATH. How long ago was it that this development started?

Mr. CRAMTON. Several years ago, and within the last few months offers have been made by certain parties, and we are assured that we can acquire the option. If the option expires, I am afraid that the United States will be later charged much more for these lands which are essential.

Mr. SABATH. Are they essential or are the people who started it finding themselves embarrassed by having an extensive lot of land on their hands and are now trying to get the Government to relieve them from the dilemma in which they find themselves?

Mr. CRAMTON. We are permitted to take over the option, and if we do not take that option we will have to pay much more for the land in the future.

Mr. SABATH. Much more than the price was two years ago?

Mr. CRAMTON. We are offered the land through the exercise of that option at what it cost without interest. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] is cognizant of these facts, as the matter is in his district.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Virginia has investigated this matter and regards this as a reasonable sum?

Mr. BLAND. This applies to the Moore House and the land immediately adjoining it——

Mr. CRAMTON. The reference is to the option which has been given on the lands involved in the hotel development scheme?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. It is all under option?

Mr. CRAMTON. Several hundred acres.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. The following is the report of the Director of the National Park Service upon my original House bill, which proposed to entirely remove the money limit.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, January 14, 1931.

Memorandum for the Secretary.

Reference is made to the request under date of January 13, 1931, from the chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives, for a report on H. R. 15984, entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled, 'An act to provide for the creation of the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes,' approved July 3, 1930."

The bill would remove the limitation of $500,000 on appropriations to be made for the establishment of the Colonial National Monument; would increase from 2,500 to 4,500 acres the amount of land of the Yorktown battlefield which may be included in the monument, and would transfer to the Department of the Interior such tracts of Government-owned land as are necessary for completion of the monument.

At the outset let me say that no more funds will be requested during the present session of Congress, but ultimately, and perhaps next year, further increments of money will be needed and this legislation would open the way for the submission of estimates at the proper time. As a matter of fact, if this bill is enacted into law, it will give the Colonial National Monument the legal status originally approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

When the original bill for the creation of the Colonial National Monument was before the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriation Committees of Congress, we had no data as to the value of lands that would be required for monument purposes. As a result of work done during the past summer we now have a fairly accurate line on land values, and it appears that at least $1,500,000 in addition to the original $500,000 will be required for acquisition of lands to complete the project. While we recognize the desirability of having a limitation in law placed on expenditures for a new project, we feel it important in this case not to have an amount stated in the bill because of its influence

on the value of land. We know by experience that as soon as an amount is stated, the owners have a tendency to fix the value of their land in accordance with the amount authorized. We would prefer to leave it to the Bureau of the Budget and Congress to determine the amounts which may be estimated for under this authority and abide by their decision as to whether we are proceeding in an orderly and businesslike fashion.

A study of the Yorktown battlefield, parts of which are to be included in the Colonial National Monument, indicates that it will not be possible to protect all the principal points of this historic spot under the limitation of 2,500 acres—which the Colonial Monument act authorizes to be acquired. However, if this is raised from 2,500 to 4,500 we will be able to adequately protect and preserve for all time all historic points which should be properly a part of the monument. It is not proposed to acquire by purchase all of the additional 2,000 acres. Approximately 1,000 acres within the limits of the monument as defined by the proclamation belong to the city of Newport News, being a part of the watershed protecting the municipal water supply. As the objects of the city and the National Park Service will be along the same lines, to preserve and protect the area, it is not contemplated to buy the city's lands and it is believed that the city will grant certain rights of way and a landscape easement by donation or at small cost.

Several tracts of land now under the jurisdiction of other departments should form a part of the Colonial National Monument. These are the peace monument at Yorktown, administered by the War Department; the monument on Jamestown Island, administered by the Treasury Department; and two or three small parcels in the Navy mine depot and the Navy fuel station. The transfer to the department of such areas as are essential is provided by proclamation of the President and this proposed legislation is merely confirmatory of such action.

I believe that H. R. 15984 is a most desirable bill, and it is necessary if the Colonial National Monument is to be complete. Therefore, I recommend that it be enacted into law.

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, *Director.*

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we might take a recess in a very few minutes, as we are to have an evening session.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman permit me to say that I do not think that anybody has yet been recognized on this side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia.

INCREASE OF PAY OF MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 543) to increase the pay of mail carriers in the village delivery service.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been favorably reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and they recommended that an amendment reducing the maximum to village carriers of $100. I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill and disagree to the Senate amendment so that the bill will pass.

There are 954 of these village letter carriers, and the pay they now receive is from $1,150 to $1,350 a year. The bill as it passed the Senate gives them $1,250 to $1,500. The carriers who do the same work as these letter carriers get $1,700 to $2,100.

As I say, there are now 954 of these village letter carriers throughout the United States.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. They came to us and requested an increase of $150 a year.

At the time we increased the salaries in 1928 we gave the employees an increase of $300 a year, but we practically left these men out. Now we have reduced their request from $150 to $50 a year, and for that amount I think they ought to have it and that this bill ought to pass.

Mr. CRISP. I thank my friend, and I hope the House will take the same fair and equitable view.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. We have done something for all of the letter carriers both in the first and second class offices, and those in the village delivery service at this session of Congress. We have granted them a 44-hour week service, with the privilege of an allowance for service on Saturday afternoon if they are compelled to serve at that time. As I read this bill it provides in some instances for automatic promotions which will result in $200 promotion on June 1.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Oh, $50 is the highest increase, if you take it all along the line. The village carriers besides are not coming in on the 44-hour a week proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not? It applies to all letter carriers.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Not to the village carriers.

Mr. CRISP. My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], I am sure, is fair. These village carriers do exactly the same work as the city carriers, with this additional hardship. The village carriers are in places of less than 5,000 population, and many times they have to do their work through a mud street because they are not paved. The maximum pay they receive is $1,350, while the maximum pay a city carrier receives is $2,100. The Senate bill increases the maximum to $1,550. I hope my friend will not object. There are 954 of these village carriers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that it increased it only to $1,450.

Mr. CRISP. As the Senate passed the bill the other day the maximum was made $1,550. The Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads has reported it favorably, with a recommendation reducing the maximum to $1,440. In view of the lateness of the session and the possibility of its not getting through, and in view of the modesty of the salary asked, I am going to ask the House to disagree to the House amendment and agree to the Senate bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How many hours a day do these carriers work? Is it not a fact that they have only one train a day in some of these small towns, and these people work a few hours a day and have another job on the side?

Mr. CRISP. I would not think so, but I confess I can not answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose that inadvertently the gentleman stated that it was proposed to increase these men's pay up to $1,550?

Mr. CRISP. That is the Senate bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the House bill is $1,440. As I read the bill, I gained the impression that there would be an increase of $200 on July 1.

Mr. CRISP. I do not think there is anything in that.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. These village carriers, especially in the small towns, in the wintertime have especially hard work to perform.

Mr. STAFFORD. What are their hours of employment?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Some of them start very early in the morning.

Mr. SABATH. And sometimes they have half a dozen letters to deliver in a day.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Oh, that is a silly remark.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentlemen from the rural districts helped us to get the postal salary increase bill through and we ought at least to reciprocate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection. Let the bill be passed with the House amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. That the pay of carriers in the village delivery service under such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be from $1,250 to $1,550 per annum. The pay of substitute letter carriers in the village delivery service shall be at the rate of 60 cents per hour."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the figures "1925," insert: "(U. S. C., title 39, sec. 106)."

Page 1, line 10, strike out section 10 and insert: "Carriers in the village delivery service shall be graded, with salaries for each grade, as follows: First grade, $1,250; second grade, $1,350; third

grade, $1,450. That in the readjustment of salaries for letter carriers in the village delivery service to conform to the grades herein provided, village letter carriers who are now receiving $1,150 per annum shall be placed in grade 1, those who are now receiving $1,250 per annum shall be placed in grade 2, and those who are now receiving $1,350 per annum shall be placed in grade 3. In determining the aggregate period of service upon which promotions are to be based, all time served as letter carrier in the village delivery service is to be included: *Provided*, That hereafter substitute letter carriers in the village delivery service when appointed regular carriers shall have credit for actual time served on a basis of 1 year for each 306 days of 8 hours served as substitute, and appointed to the grade to which such carrier would have progressed had his original appointment as substitute been to grade 1: *Provided further*, That letter carriers in the village delivery service shall be promoted successively after one year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the third grade. All promotions shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following one year's satisfactory service in the grade."

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

The Senate amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 23, 37, 72, 77, 81, and 100 to the bill (H. R. 17163) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments to said bill numbered 14, 25, 36, 44, 45, 46, 59, 66, 79, and 82 and agrees to a further conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The message also announced that Mr. JONES, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. HALE, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. MCKELLAR had been appointed to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know for what purpose the Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG], but it is after 6 o'clock. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] to that fact and to the further fact that at 8 o'clock to-night there is to be a session of the House for the consideration of certain bills which the Speaker has announced he will recognize for consideration. I just want to know how long we are going on this afternoon.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will permit the one recognition, I agree with him that after this bill is considered I shall move to take a recess.

Mr. GARNER. I do not know what measure it is which the gentleman is calling up, but I shall not object.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF GRAIN ELEVATORS AND GRAIN FIRMS

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303), with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303), with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the joint resolution and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the joint resolution by title and read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"*Provided*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized to waive production of the original orders for cars, but that no claim shall be allowed and paid unless claimant shall file, under oath, a declaration based on personal knowledge showing his ownership of the wheat on which he claims interest and insurance; that the wheat was not held for any person, company, or association under any agreement, written, oral, or implied; that the wheat was not being held for seed, and that every reasonable effort was made to obtain cars each week for shipment of the grain in the elevator: *And provided further*, That no claim shall be allowed which has heretofore been adjudicated by any court nor where claimant actually profited by the delay nor where claimant filed a claim for such interest and insurance in any case prior to 1922."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. KENNEDY, of New York, for the balance of the session on account of illness.

SILVER NEEDS STABILIZATION

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech I made on silver, with certain extracts and tables which accompanied my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, in any discussion of the reasons for the present world-wide depression the break in the price of silver must be included among the contributing causes.

Not since the time of William Jennings Bryan has the silver question received so great attention as it has during the past year. Until recently the financial leaders, the economists, and those in the United States Congress, with few exceptions, have looked on silver as a commodity and let it go at that. "There is an overproduction," they said; "let the silver producers curtail the same as the farmers who are confronted with a wheat surplus."

SILVER—THE IMPORTANCE OF SILVER IN THE PRODUCTION OF ARGENTIFEROUS ORES

By Charles White Merrill

Silver is unique among the metals in that but two-fifths of its production is derived from ores more valuable for silver than for other metals therein contained. Thus, price is of less weight in controlling silver production than is price in the production of other metals. The relations of silver revenue to total ore revenue in the production of argentiferous ores accordingly is not only of importance to the silver industry but is a factor of considerable consequence to the production of gold, copper, lead, and zinc.

The recent decline in silver price to levels never before recorded, therefore, has provoked much inquiry as to the extent to which silver is a by-product of other metal production, the extent to which its by-product nature will tend to maintain its production in spite of price, and the extent to which the production of other metals may be affected by the price of silver.

This study brought out the following salient features:

1. Over one-half of the world's production of silver is from ores that derive less than 40 per cent of their recoverable value from silver. Almost one-third is from ores carrying not more than 20 per cent of their value in the form of silver.

2. One-third of the world's silver production is from ores that derive over 70 per cent of their value from silver.

3. Over one-half of the world's silver production may be considered by-product silver.

4. Over one-quarter of the world's silver production may be considered derived from "straight-silver" ores, as that proportion is produced from ores depending on silver for over 80 per cent of their recoverable value.

5. Ores valued at less than $10 per ton, of which silver at 50 cents an ounce contributed over 50 per cent of the value, produce one-fifth of the world's silver.

6. Eighty per cent of United States silver is produced as a by-product, but in Mexico 46 per cent of the silver production is from "straight-silver" ores.

7. Revenue derived from by-product silver in low-silver ores is a more important factor in the profits of metal mines than is apparent by contrasting the values of the metals in the ore.

8. Silver-bearing ores which produce 91 per cent of the world's silver also produce 85 per cent of the world's gold, 69 per cent of the lead, 66 per cent of the copper, and 46 per cent of the zinc.

9. Ores in which silver is the principal source of revenue provide 49 per cent of the world's silver; those in which lead is the principal source of revenue, 24 per cent of the world's silver; copper, 14 per cent; zinc, 7 per cent; gold, 5 per cent; and tin, 1 per cent.

I wish to bring to your attention, fellow Members of Congress, certain facts which I hope will cause you to assume a different attitude respecting this important question. Because of the present situation of silver and its world-wide

effect on hundreds of millions of people the attention of the world is challenged. This problem has been discussed in newspapers and magazines and recently most extensively by financiers and economists in publications put out by the banks of this and foreign lands. Doubt is expressed on every hand as to the ability of the gold reserves to supply the needs of the world. Silver has its place in the monetary world and it is believed that it is most desirable, that it is in fact essential, for the general welfare of the world that more stable relations between silver and gold be established.

In a recent conference by the writer with Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, in an effort to gain his support in the calling of an international conference on silver, Mr. Mellon stated that although in recent years silver has been looked upon as a commodity it is doubtful, he said, if it would ever cease to function as money in many countries of the world. He agreed that fully 750,000,000 people located in the countries of India, Indo-China, and China, not to mention the Latin Americas, are suffering from an economic depression caused at least to a degree by the decline to new low points in the price of silver.

There are numerous reasons advanced for the present world-wide depression and similarly for that of silver. Silver, the circulating money of more than half of the people of the world, is demoralized.

The so-called silver nations—

Said John F. Sinclair, in the Washington Star—

are fighting for their economic life—all of them—India, China, Mexico, and several countries of South America.

Silver has fought gold for supremacy for 2,000 years. It has fought a gallant but hopeless struggle. Only in the last hundred years has it finally lost out.

During the World War silver had a new lease on life—it climbed into the heights again and in 1917–18 it sold for $1.38 an ounce. For a number of years before this the price was kept at approximately 60 cents per ounce. It fluctuated very little from that point. Then something happened—a decline set in. In 1928 silver was worth 58 cents per ounce. In 1929, 53 cents per ounce, in 1930 it was worth from 45 cents in January to 32.6 in December and at present is selling at 27.5 cents. What is the result? The nations which pay their imports in silver find that the depreciated silver has enabled them to buy less goods than ever before. Foreign trade has dried up. American exports to and imports from silver-using countries decreased, during the first 11 months of 1930, as follows:

	Exports (per cent)	Imports (per cent)
South America	37	32
Mexico	13	33
India	19	30
China	27	36

No wonder Prof. Charles J. Bullock, of Harvard University, characterized the collapse of silver as "a world calamity."

This question is asked the world over, What has caused silver to drop to its lowest value in all history? It is not overproduction.

The following table is taken from information given by Handy and Harman:

Consumption of silver by India and China

	China, including coinage of Chinese Mints	India
	Fine ounces	*Fine ounces*
1924	41,700,000	108,200,000
1925	59,400,000	106,700,000
1926	73,900,000	91,600,000
1927	85,000,000	90,000,000
1928	124,000,000	89,000,000
1929	136,700,000	81,800,000
	520,700,000	567,300,000
6-year average for China		86,783,333
6-year average for India		94,550,000
6-year average for both China and India		181,333,333

The above figures, showing consumption, include resales of silver by Governments, which supplies, so far as available, are shown below.

Statement of silver derived from Government sales

	1929	1928	1927	1926	1925	1924	Total
Debasement of British coins	10,000,000	5,500,000	1,200,000	700,000	7,000,000	2,000,000	26,400,000
Demonetized coins						18,000,000	18,000,000
French	10,000,000	19,000,000	8,000,000				37,000,000
Belgian		13,000,000					13,000,000
Indo-China [1]	12,000,000						12,000,000
Sales by Indian Government	35,000,000	22,500,000	9,200,000				[2] 66,700,000
	67,000,000	60,000,000	18,400,000	700,000	7,000,000	20,000,000	173,100,000

[1] Mr. Kann estimates sales by Indo-China in 1929 at 50,000,000 ounces. (See p. 7.)

[2] The National City Bank of New York estimates the amount sold by India since 1926 at 82,500,000 fine ounces (see p. 14 of its Economic Review, etc., of January, 1931) Mr. Kann at 85,000,000 ounces (see p. 7, supra).

Estimates of world production of silver

(In fine ounces)

	By Director of U. S. Mint	By Handy & Harman	By American Bureau of Metal Statistics
1924	239,484,703	239,100,000	238,779,157
1925	245,213,993	245,100,000	241,697,187
1926	253,795,166	253,600,000	253,049,173
1927	253,981,085	251,200,000	253,121,265
1928	257,925,154	257,200,000	254,869,163
1929	[1] 261,715,021	[1] 260,900,000	[1] 261,265,718
Total 6 years	1,512,115,122	1,507,100,000	1,502,781,663
Average 6 years	252,019,187	251,183,333	250,463,611

[1] Subject to revision.

Industrial consumption of silver (as given by the report of the Director of the United States Mint, June 30, 1930, p. 251)

1928	60,757,062
1929	57,584,812

New York Handy & Harman silver price

	High	Low	Average
1924	72.125	62.750	66.781
1925	72.875	66.500	69.065
1926	68.625	51.500	62.107
1927	60.000	53.625	56.370
1928	63.625	56.500	58.176
1929	57.500	46.500	52.993
1930—January	46.875	43.250	45.000
February	44.000	40.875	43.193
March	43.125	39.625	41.654
April	42.875	41.625	42.428
May	42.500	37.250	40.736
June	36.625	33.250	34.595
July	35.375	33.500	34.346
August	36.375	34.250	35.192
September	37.000	35.500	36.315
October	36.125	35.500	35.846
November	36.500	35.125	35.908
December	34.875	30.750	32.635
1930	46.875	30.750	38.154
1931, Jan. 9			28.500

No, there has been no overproduction of silver. But there has been an oversupply of silver on the world market for the past five years.

The whole trouble, states Mr. Francis H. Brownell, was obviously caused by the enormous sales of government-owned silver, which was more than eighteen times the total increase in production for the entire three years 1927, 1928, and 1929 over that of 1926. If silver owned by governments had been held and not offered for resale the increase in production would have been a negligible factor.

Relative to sales of government silver Mr. Kann, a prominent Shanghai authority, says, in substance:

The sale by governments had a doubly harmful consequence: First, because large extra quantities of silver were thrown on the market, irrespective of whether, when, and where these were wanted; and second, the harmful psychological effect caused by the uncertainty, or rather the certainty, of more coming in the near future. This has been a huge black cloud overshadowing the silver market like the Angel of Death.

The movement was initiated by Great Britain in 1920. At that time the British pound sterling had lost in value. The wounds caused by a most frightful war were still wide open. The ministry had to hunt for means wherewith to balance the country's budget and in searching for funds, struck upon the idea of melting Great Britain's silver coinage (then 0.925 fine) and reminting the same, but with a basic fineness of only 0.500. Large quantities of extra silver thus obtained and were then disposed of in 1921 and 1922. But the sale of further supplies from the same source continued from year to year, unheralded and uncontrolled. In 1929 alone about 10,000,000 ounces were being supplied to an unwilling market.

The example of England was promptly followed by Germany and Poland.

In 1919 and 1920 France became a large seller of silver, a considerable portion of which, derived from melted 5-franc pieces, was shipped to Shanghai. During her severe monetary troubles, extending until 1928, France abstained from minting silver coins, but instead circulated in the country 1 and 2 franc pieces made from brass and aluminum.

The example of these countries was promptly followed by most of their neighbors, notably Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy, all of which have figured as sellers of silver at the most inopportune time.

During the latter part of 1929, Indo-China sold large quantities of silver, derived from demonetized piaster coins, in preparation of her adoption of the gold bullion standard in the spring of 1930. The quantity disposed of in 1929 may be estimated at as high as 50,000,000 ounces. As the sale was carried out just when the silver slide had set in, a veritable avalanche developed, causing panic on the world's silver market.

The greatest adversary to silver's stability, however, was and still is British India. At the close of 1926 it was definitely resolved to change from the then existing gold exchange standard to a gold bullion standard and to dispose of large quantities of silver, derived from demonetized rupee coin. The total amount for sale was not fixed by law and was made dependent upon the quantities of rupee coins reverting to the Treasury for circulation.

The Indian farming classes, constituting the great bulk of the population, have always kept their savings in the form of silver. Individual family savings are not of sufficient volume (it is said that the income of more than three-fourths of India's population of over 300,000,000 averages only about $36 per person per annum in United States currency, or, say, $180 per annum for a family of five) to be made in gold, although this also is hoarded wherever possible. It is this hoarding or saving by the people of India and China that through past centuries has absorbed, and still absorbs, the new mine production of silver not used for coined money or in the arts. The total amount of silver so held as hoards is variously estimated at from 5,000,000,000 to 8,000,000,000 of ounces. These people have followed this practice from time immemorial. For 4,000 years they have seen governments rise and wane and disappear. Their experience with coins has been that, in the long run, they have become worth no more than their silver content and they have come to prefer the form of fine or standard silver as having ultimately a more uniform and permanent value than coins at their par or face value. The recent political disturbance in India may have accented this traditional feeling.

Then, too, the Indian peasant values silver for itself. The greater quantity he can get for a given amount of produce or money, the better bargain he believes he has made. The silver rupee contains at the present time a quantity of fine silver about equal to one-third of the amount of fine silver that that rupee can buy in the market. It is customary in India for a bride to receive a dowry largely in silver. This is often in the form of bracelets and anklets. A father having, say, 100 rupees can, by exchanging the rupees and buying silver, make about three times the showing in actual silver that he would make if he gave the original rupees, and a correspondingly greater impression. The tendency to turn in the coined silver rupees, and in lieu thereof to obtain fine silver in an amount exceeding that contained in the coins, has been going on in India since the price of silver began to decline shortly after the war and the silver content of the rupee fell below the amount of fine silver that coin would buy. A silver rupee is brought in and exchanged (theoretically, at least) for a paper rupee, which, being tied both to gold and to the English monetary system at a fixed rate, enables the original owner of the silver rupee to buy, on a gold basis, a much greater volume of actual silver than he had when he held the original silver rupee. As the fall in the price of silver continues, this tendency becomes accented, since each fall in the price enables the owner of a silver coin to buy an increasing amount of pure, uncoined silver. Obviously, this exchange would not go to the extent of a tendering of all the silver rupees now coined in India and taking fine silver in exchange. In doing current business a certain amount of rupee or silver coins is necessary, and probably always will be under any monetary system. The exchange is only of those rupees which are not necessary for circulation as current money, but which would be kept as savings—that is, hoarded—and were so hoarded when the silver content equaled substantially the amount of fine silver the coin would buy. The total exchange, therefore, will probably be limited to that amount of coined silver rupees not necessary for current monetary purposes.

The existence of such an excess stock came about during the war, when Great Britain bought heavily of supplies from India and also employed many Indian troops and civil employees. As all of Great Britain's energies were turned to munitions, shipments from Great Britain to India were at a low ebb, and the abnormal balance of exchange in favor of India required payment in hard money—either gold or silver—since doubt existed as to the possible ultimate redemption of paper money. Silver consequently rapidly rose in value during the war and reached a high price, the peak being above the melting point of many coinages. To fill the demand, which was very much in excess of current mine supply, Great Britain obtained from the United States about 200,000,000 ounces of silver which had previously been in its vaults, which were immediately coined into the form of rupees and used to pay for Indian troops and supplies. The result is that, at the end of the war, an extremely abnormal stock of rupees had been coined and placed in circulation, and when, after the war, demand ceased, the price of silver began to fall, the excess stock of rupees which had been placed in circulation began, through the working of the tendency above described, to come back into the Indian Government's possession and fine silver to be purchased in lieu thereof. That Government also had left on hand a considerable amount of silver not yet coined.

This total stock of excess silver thus coming into the possession of the Indian Government has been estimated at from 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 ounces of fine silver, and it is this amount which the Indian Government must either keep in its vault as a reserve against a future emergency of similar nature (as does the United States, which holds in its Treasury over 400,000,000 ounces of silver coined in the form of dollars), or it may sell the silver in order to buy the gold to maintain its reserves under the present gold bullion standard. It was this latter course that was recommended by the Royal Commission in 1926 and which is now the law in India.

As above stated, one of the means of maintaining the gold reserve back of the paper rupee issue is through the sale from time to time of the surplus silver in its possession. The Indian Government built a refinery, where the alloys are taken out, and the silver contents made available for the market as fine silver. Looking back over the last three years, it seems probable that the Indian Government has raised annually somewhere between $10,000,000 and $20,000,000 (£2,000,000–£4,000,000) for this purpose through the sale of silver. This seems a small sum for a government to be concerned about, but it must be remembered that the balance of trade (excess of exports over imports) is in favor of India. (See Annual Statement of Seaborne Trade of British India with the British Empire and Foreign Countries, published by the commercial intelligence department of the Indian Government.) As India, however, is primarily an agricultural country, there may be periods of time in any year when the balance of trade is against it. Then, when the harvests move, the former deficit for that year is made up and substantially surpassed for the year as a whole. The balance of trade in India's favor, as a whole, strengthens the gold reserves.

If the Indian Government wishes to raise, say, $12,000,000 (£2,400,000) per annum to protect its reserves, and the price of silver is 50 cents per ounce, it can accomplish its end by the sale of 24,000,000 ounces; but if the price of silver is only 30 cents, it must sell 40,000,000 ounces, and the sale of this greater amount would still further reduce the price, making it necessary to sell an increasing amount to realize a given amount of money. As the fall in silver price tends still further to accent the exchange of silver rupees above described, a vicious circle is created.

A preliminary estimate was suggestive of an approximate quantity of 240,000,000 ounces of bar silver (nearly one year's world production) to be disposed of whenever the authorities thought fit. The total amount of melted silver sold up to now by the Indian Treasury is about 85,000,000 ounces. This figure in itself is large, but the chief danger is in the undefined future policy as to time and quantity of further silver stocks being disposed of. "Due to the fact that most of the other sources of surplus silver will give out in the near

future," states Mr. Kann, "there would be better prospects ahead for the white metal if it were not for the genuine threat emanating from India."

Irving Trust Co., of New York, in its Mid-Month Review of Business for December 17, 1930, says:

No banker or merchant can fail to feel the challenge offered by the irrationality of idle factories here or in Europe at a time when a considerable fraction of the human race, able and willing to work, is living at the verge of starvation. At the same time there are gluts of many commodities. What can be done about it? Is there nothing in the science of economics which can cope with a distribution problem of such large dimensions?

The problem of silver: Perhaps silver gives a clue. Half the world's population still uses silver as its money metal—India, China, Mexico * * * and other countries. In China silver has been used as the store of value for nearly 4,000 years. In India lifetime savings take the form of silver jewelry, bangles, table utensils, cult objects and statuary, bullion and coins, hidden in the rafters or buried in the ground. Myriads of people want metallic wealth, which 'neither moth nor rust doth corrupt'—not paper money that becomes sodden by the wet from thatched roofs or makes good provender for rats and insects (and fire). It is a serious matter to disturb folkways of such long standing. Yet the Government of India in 1926 imposed upon the people legislation * * * providing that India should adopt a gold bullion standard in place of the previous gold exchange standard, and gradually sell on the open market the excess stocks of silver, consisting of several hundred million ounces, then held in the Indian Treasury; the proceeds of these sales would serve to augment the treasury's gold holdings, which were to be increased gradually until the requirements necessary to the operation of a free gold standard should be accumulated. In line with this legislation, the Indian Treasury has disposed of large amounts of silver, and in March, 1930, imposed an import duty of 4 annas (between 9 and 10 cents) on the white metal.

At the time that the royal commission issued its recommendation, silver was selling at about 65 cents an ounce. A rapid fall in the price followed, and in December, 1926, the price averaged 53½ cents. Punctuated by occasional rallies, the trend has since been downward, and on the 16th of the present month quotations reached 31½ cents, the lowest level in the history of the world. Because Indians and Chinese, from time immemorial, have been accustomed to invest their savings in silver—the amount of such accumulated savings, in India alone, being conservatively estimated at 7,000,000,000 ounces—the extent of the social upheaval can hardly be imagined. Inasmuch as China is on a silver basis, her purchasing power in terms of imports has been melting away, and thus American sales to China have woefully declined. In addition, the Chinese are suffering from a world-wide decline in the gold prices of the commodities which they export. It seems safe to infer that the silver catastrophe has been a major factor in the unrest in India and the economic crisis in China. If so, the full effects of the situation have not yet been witnessed.

"Debasement of silver currencies in Europe: In addition to the events just described, Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria, Holland, Italy, Mexico, and some other countries have debased their silver coinage since the war, so that considerable supplies of the metal have been dumped from these sources upon a market that has now become demoralized. For the past five years silver production has been almost static at about 250,000,000 ounces per annum. Gold, too, has been produced in recent years in fairly constant quantities, or about an annual average of 19,350,000 ounces. * * * Bearing in mind the fact that the major portion of the silver now produced is a by-product of mining carried on chiefly for some other metal or metals, and the further fact that for the past five years the total silver output has been relatively constant, although the price has fallen some 50 per cent, it is evident that the economic law of supply and demand has been fundamentally disturbed by legislation.

"A suggested remedy: The facts clearly indicate the nature of the relief which is needed, and it is to be hoped that neither short-sighted nationalistic prejudices nor mere doctrinaire notions about bimetallism will stand in the way of the type of legislative action that is urgently necessary if the western nations are not going to push the Orient into an even deeper abyss of misery. The purchase of a few million ounces of silver annually by the treasuries of the leading commercial occidental nations for the purpose of augmenting the depleted silver content of their silver coins, or of using silver instead of paper for currency of small denominations, would exert an immediately beneficial effect. Some agreement, also, to proceed more cautiously in foisting the gold standard upon nations who are not yet ready for it would lessen the real concern that was expressed in the interim report of the gold delegation of the financial committee of the League of Nations lest gold supplies within a few years may be insufficient to support the growing volume of credit that is based on gold. These measures would help to preserve the value of the immense silver hoards in India and China and save the 700,000,000 of inhabitants from utter catastrophe. The historical defects of bimetallism in certain western currencies are well known and no one wishes to see them occur agafn. But we can still remain on the gold standard and use to advantage larger amounts of silver in our currencies. As far as the Orient is concerned, silver has been their standard of value from time immemorial. In the western countries for many centuries silver was of predominant importance until some 70 years ago the relative advantages of the gold standard became apparent to the United States and to other European countries. Thus here silver has become a commodity rather than primarily money, whereas in the minds of half the human race it still remains money first and commodity only secondarily. To forget this would be a serious psychological and political blunder. But mere altruism need not be the motive for trying to better the present silver situation. In helping our eastern neighbors we would be helping ourselves. Silver prices for many years have fluctuated slightly in advance of commodity prices. Thus, in preventing a debacle in the price of silver we would set in motion forces that would uphold general commodity prices and augment and stabilize international commerce. By broadening the monetary use of silver, here and in Europe, we would greatly strengthen the gold standard and insure its relative stability and permanence."

I believe with Mr. Francis H. Brownell in the statements he has made in two information pamphlets published January 14 and 16, 1930, that the crux of the question is—

Is it possible for the Indian Government, under its present laws, (1) to realize yearly the amount of money which it needs at times to preserve its reserves, and (2) over a period of years to sell its entire excess silver stock—without selling an amount of silver each year, which will seriously disturb the market and cause a decline in price?

Let us consider from the statistics of the last three years—1928, 1929, and 1930—whether there was a demand for Government silver in excess of new mine production sufficient to take care of India's needs. The following table sets forth the essential facts:

	1928	1929	1930
	Ounces	*Ounces*	*Ounces*
New mine production	257, 200, 000	260, 900, 000	243, 700, 000
Sales by Governments of silver formerly used as money [1]	60, 000, 000	67, 000, 000	71, 500, 000
Total silver sold	317, 200, 000	327, 900, 000	315, 200, 000
Deduct consumption of India and China	213, 000, 000	218, 500, 000	217, 500, 000
Balance	104, 200, 000	109, 400, 000	97, 700, 000
Deduct used for industrial purposes	[2] 60, 750, 000	[2] 57, 500, 000	[2] 50, 000, 000
Balance that must have been absorbed by Governments other than India and China	43, 450, 000	51, 900, 000	[3] 47, 700, 000

[1] There is every reason to believe more was sold. These figures are only what is known to have been sold.

NOTE.—All figures are from Handy & Harman's Reviews for the respective years except figures from Report of director of mint, June, 1930, marked (2), and figurefor 1930 (3) which is an estimate of the author, believed to be conservative.

The following essential facts are apparent from a consideration of the above table:

(1) That new mine production in no one of these three years was sufficient to meet the demands of India and China plus the demand for silver for industrial purposes.

(2) Hence it follows that sales of government-owned silver by India would be needed to supply the demand of those governments which are still annually buying silver for subsidiary or other coinage purposes. In no one of these three years did the amount so purchased fall below 40,000,000 ounces. In 1929 it amounted to over 51,000,000 ounces. The average can safely be set at more than 40,000,000 ounces per annum. The probability is that this amount was exceeded in the year 1930, which we have estimated at this low figure for the purpose of conservatism.

Now, this buying by governments can be controlled if the governments are sympathetic. They do not have to buy at any given time, and they obviously should prefer to buy at times when they could make the best bargains.

Suppose the governments selling silver, particularly India, had, during the three years 1928, 1929, and 1930, let it be publicly known that no silver would be sold below some announced level of price, say, 24d. in London or, roughly, 50 cents in New York, and if contemporaneously those nations buying over 40,000,000 ounces each year for subsidiary coinage had bought only when the price of silver fell below such announced level, we can reasonably deduce that three results would have been obtained:

1. The purchasing nations would have bought their silver when the price fell below the 24d. level and thus would have made a good bargain.

2. The dealers in silver would have resumed their former practice of also buying when the price fell below the 24d. level, knowing that the agriculturist and other demand for silver would in due season arise and that meanwhile governments would not be selling.

3. The effect would have been to stabilize the price, since buying would have come in at the low levels in sufficient quantity to carry over an otherwise dull period.

(4) As the production of new mined silver fell short of supplying the requirements of India, China, and the arts, it seems certain that the market requirements in excess of new-mine production would have compelled a price which would have yielded the amount of money India needed to obtain through sale of a lesser number of ounces of silver than she actually sold each year.

The sale of government-owned silver formerly used as money, being in the future largely, if not entirely, in the hands of India, can easily be held for sale at the proper levels of the market. The law appears not to compel the sale of silver the moment the gold

reserve falls below a certain level. A wise discretion is vested in the Government on this point.

Allusion has been made heretofore to the excess stock estimated at 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 ounces of silver largely in coined rupees, which the Indian Government has and which the Royal Commission's report of 1926 contemplated selling in order ultimately to acquire a sufficient gold reserve for the new gold monetary system. What the total excess stock of coined rupees will finally prove to be can not yet be determined with any degree of accuracy, but all the figures so far available seem to indicate that it does not reach a total of more than 400,000,000 ounces of silver in addition to the silver which has already been sold, and is probably much less than that amount. On the basis of the experience of the three years 1928 to 1930, inclusive, India might reasonably expect to sell about 35,000,000 ounces per year of this stock without injuriously affecting the market, and thus, in a period of, say, 10 to 12 years, would be able, without unnecessarily disturbing the market, to work off the entire excess stock gradually.

This, of course, assumes no relevant change of importance in present world monetary systems. It is interesting to note that much in the Royal Commission's report originally contemplated that the sale of this excess stock over a period of 10 or more years would not greatly disturb the market or price. While it is now evident that this can not be done without cooperation on the part of other governments, it is still entirely feasible if the necessary cooperation is furnished.

It seems probable that the volume of mine production of silver, especially from silver mines proper, is beginning to fall, with the prevailing lower price. There is nothing in the present situation leading one to assume that mine production of silver will exceed in 1931 what it was in 1930—less than 245,000,000 ounces. On the contrary, there is every present reason to believe that production of silver in 1931 will be an amount below that of 1930. As mine production falls, assuming demand in India and China to remain constant, it becomes obvious that the Indian Government would be able to sell a still greater amount of its excess stock of silver.

It thus seems that it is for the interest of India to strongly cooperate with the governments in stabilizing the market price of silver—certainly so long as the production of new mine silver does not exceed such an amount per annum as will prevent India's selling the necessary amount of silver to protect her reserves.

It is also obvious that if the price of silver could be stabilized at some given level and at the same time the Indian Government could thereby achieve a sale necessary to raise its requirement for reserve purposes, the great mass of the Indian people would be greatly benefited, in that the market value of their hoardings would not be diminished and in that any individual hoarder finding it necessary to sell a part of his savings would be enabled to realize a very much greater price.

The Indian Government has at all times, as is evidenced from the speeches of its finance minister and debates in Parliament etc., been solicitous, so far as it could, to preserve the price of silver, since the lower the price, the greater the burden placed upon it, for the reasons above outlined. In short, it is solely because of the necessity at times of raising funds with which to protect its gold reserve that the Indian Government is compelled to sell, and it apparently, on the whole, has done so only to the extent necessary for this purpose. That its Government is desirous of cooperation is best evidenced by the statement of Sir George Schuster, finance minister, who said, in his budget speech in March, 1930:

"I am prepared, on behalf of the Government of India as important producers, to say that if the other interests concerned show any desire to consider the possibility of joint action for the regulating of sales in order to meet the present situation, the Government of India would willingly cooperate." (See Handy & Harman's Review for 1930, p. 12.)

Perhaps no step of cooperation on the part of the leading nations of the world toward united action in curing the present business depression could be more easily and readily taken than the action proposed in regard to silver. Since it would improve trade with nearly one-half the human race, such cooperation must necessarily have a tremendously inspiring effect on all nations as being the forerunner of further informal or formal cooperation in solving the other problems which now confront international trade. It would not only tend to restore and help the foreign export trade with India, China, Mexico, and other silver-using countries (even though on some form of the gold standard), but would have a far-reaching beneficial effect upon the general world situation.

	Ounces
India	94,500,000
China	123,000,000
	217,500,000

(See their Review of Silver Market for 1930, pp. 14 and 20.)

(b) The United States Mint (report of Director, June 30, 1930) estimates world industrial consumption of silver as:

	Ounces
1928	60,757,062
1929	57,584,812
The average of the two years is	59,170,937

(c) For annual production, see the table on page 16. While the peak has been as high as over 261,000,000 ounces in 1929, curtailment of by-product production and the fall in price have greatly lessened this amount. Preliminary estimates are that 1931 will not exceed a production of over 245,000,000 ounces, more likely less. It is hardly probable that the production of 1929 will be again attained, even should the production of copper, lead, and zinc again rise to the same high level, for the reason that the apex of production of some of the largest silver mines in Mexico has already been reached and within another two years will begin to decline rapidly.

It is necessary that India should agree to the plan, as that is the country most likely to sell government-owned silver in the near future. Japan and China should also be consulted and tied in to the arrangement, and probably also Spain, which is perhaps the most potential seller of silver. Other governments are not so important, as they are not likely to be sellers of silver.

The arrangement between the governments need not be formal in its nature. It can be informal—a gentleman's agreement—but the governments should each publicly announce its policy in terms easy of comprehension. It should last for a sufficient time for a fair trial.

The immediate effect would be to remove from the market the present threat of sales by governments. This alone would greatly improve the price level. The fall in the price of silver was not due to current overproduction, but to the sales of silver formerly used as money by different governments. (See pp. 4 to 7.)

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

(a) Consumption[1] by India and China has averaged during the 6-year period 1924–1929, 181,333,000 ounces per annum, with a peak of 218,000,000 ounces in 1929. (See appendix, p. 15.) Handy & Harman estimate consumption for 1930—

Under the heading, Improving World Trade Conditions by Informally Stabilizing Silver, he further says:

Stabilizing the price of silver, at no fixed ratio to gold, involves three elements:

First, and most important, an informal understanding between the United States, England including India, France including Indo-China, and as many other governments as possible, that no sale will be made, for a stated period, say three years, or until further notice, of any silver now or hereafter owned by each government, at less than some fixed price, say, for example, 50 cents per ounce.

Second, an understanding that those governments will purchase the amount of silver they are now authorized by law to purchase for subsidiary coinage, whenever the price of silver in the open market is below the figure to be agreed upon as above.

Third, as compensation for agreeing as provided in "first," and to prevent too rapid a rise—an understanding that the governments, and particularly India, may sell government-owned silver whenever the price is more than, say, 5 cents above the figure agreed upon as above.

From the foregoing (a), (b), and (c) we may reasonably and conservatively predict mine production and consumption of silver per annum for the next three years, as follows:

	Ounces	Ounces
Annual production, not over, and probably less than		250,000,000
Consumption of India and China, say	180,000,000	
World industrial consumption, say	50,000,000	
		230,000,000
Leaving for subsidiary coinage and other nations' monetary uses		20,000,000

The above estimate is believed ultraconservative. The consumption of India and China will probably be more than the estimate; production will probably be less (materially so in 1931), even though the price be 50 cents per ounce.

BUYING

The United States, Japan, many of the European and most Latin American and other countries are still using silver for subsidiary coinage. Legislative authorizations for continuing purchases for this purpose are in existence. The exact limits are not known, but conservative approximations run from 20,000,000 to 50,000,000 ounces per annum.

If, then, by informal arrangement, these governments should begin buying, within present legislative authority, silver for subsidiary coinage whenever the price falls below some agreed-upon figure—say, 50 cents per ounce—there is every reason to believe that the price of silver would come back to at least such price, provided further Government sales below the agreed-upon figure are stopped for some publicly known period. By this is not meant that the governments, in purchasing for subsidiary coinage, should necessarily pay 50 cents per ounce. They would simply pay the market price prevailing, but they would begin buying for subsidiary coinage purposes whenever silver fell below, and would (unless necessary) cease buying whenever silver reached the 50-cent level.

Many of those intimately connected with the silver market are of the belief that the mere authoritative announcement by India and other principal governments, of intention to refrain from further sales of government-owned silver (below the agreed-upon figure) would, in itself, in a short time bring silver back

[1] The ultimate consumption of India and China is in the hoarding by the people as savings. This amount has no necessary relation to the amount used as coined money—in fact, is in the main distinct therefrom.

to a level of 50 cents per ounce. The basis of this belief is the fact that, notwithstanding an annual production of more than 250,000,000 ounces in the years 1926, 1927, and 1928, the price of silver did not fall below 51.5 cents per ounce until 1929, when India made its greatest sale (35,000,000 ounces) of any year. (See tables in appendix.) In 1929 also occurred the large sale by Indo-China of an unknown but probably even greater amount than sold by India. (See pages 7 and 15.)

A study of the above statistics indicates that a buying power of over 20,000,000 ounces per annum by governments for subsidiary coinage purposes is sufficient, if properly used, to stabilize the price above some fixed level, say, 50 cents per ounce, provided no further sales are made by governments below a level slightly, (say 5 cents per ounce) higher, and that there will be, at times, a demand above that higher figure which will permit governments to sell substantial amounts.

I am in full sympathy with Senator PITTMAN'S proposal for the calling of an international conference. I think the suggestion an excellent one, and for weeks have put my full force behind it because I believe it is sound, practical, and to the point.

I direct it to the attention of the President, and sincerely hope he may call an international conference at the earliest practical date to work out some such plan as is outlined above, and there is no doubt in my mind that it would be an event of world-wide importance.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wanted to ask if the order only provides for the consideration of Senate bills unobjected to, on the Private Calendar to-night?

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked the parliamentarian to prepare a statement with regard to just what was covered in the arrangements for to-night. The Chair thinks that the orderly and fair way of complying with the resolution agreed to on February 26, 1931, would be to begin at the star and call each Senate bill on the Private Calendar and each Senate bill on the Speaker's table, where a similar House bill is on the Private Calendar, in their numerical order, in which both classes of bills appear on the Private Calendar. When that has been completed, the Chair should then recognize Members to ask unanimous consent to take Senate bills from the Speaker's table, where similar House bills are on the Private Calendar, before the star.

The Speaker will not be in the Chair tonight, but designates the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] to act in his stead.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 357. Joint resolution classifying certain official mail matter;

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of participation by the United States in the Conference on the Limitation of the Manufacture of Narcotic Drugs to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 27, 1931; and

H. J. Res. 524. Joint resolution to provide an appropriation for payment to the widow of Henry Allen Cooper, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 471. An act providing for Saturday half holidays for certain Government employees;

S. 550. An act to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1496. An act for the relief of Edith Barber;

S. 3404. An act to authorize the city of Fernandina, Fla., under certain conditions to dispose of a portion of the Amelia Island Lighthouse Reservation;

S. 4022. An act to regulate the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display, and maintenance of outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising within the District of Columbia;

S. 4030. An act to provide books for the adult blind;

S. 5139. An act to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational education and civilian rehabilitation to Porto Rico;

S. 5743. An act to authorize 24-hour quarantine inspection service in certain ports of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 5904. An act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 524. Joint resolution to provide an appropriation for payment to the widow of Henry Allen Cooper, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

RECESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired, at 8 o'clock p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SNELL].

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a unanimous-consent request that on to-morrow, after the business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of, the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. OLDFIELD], may be permitted to address the House for five minutes. I assure the present Speaker that this meets with the approval of the Speaker of the House, because I mentioned it to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. OLDFIELD], may be permitted to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to bills of the following titles:

S. 543. An act to increase the pay of mail carriers in the village delivery service; and

S. 5732. An act to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in Orange County, N. Y., for use as an addition to the West Point Military Reservation.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10658) entitled "An act to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174, ch. 21, title 26)."

STATEMENT OF THE INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with an extension of my remarks on Indian affairs, I may include some material from the Indian Rights Association and also from officials of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein material from the Indian Rights Association and from officials of the Government. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks by the inclusion of material from the Indian Rights Association of Philadelphia, I present a statement on the progress of Indian affairs prepared by M. K. Sniffen, secretary of that organization.

The Indian Rights Association was formed nearly 50 years ago, and has followed a constructive policy of cooperation as well as of criticism. I believe this report of Mr. Sniffen is valuable to students of Indian affairs. It is as follows:

PROGRESS IN INDIAN AFFAIRS

By M. K. Sniffen, secretary Indian Rights Association

Charles J. Rhoads, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and J. Henry Scattergood, associate commissioner, have been in charge of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for 20 months. In attempting to evaluate what they have accomplished during that time it is proper to bear in mind what they inherited when they assumed charge on July 1, 1929.

The report of the Meriam survey, conducted by the Institute for Government Research, which has been accepted by practically all careful thinkers as a judicial, comprehensive, and sane study of the Indian situation as a whole, may be taken as a base.

That report confirmed what former Secretary Work said about "the poverty of the Indian Service," and recommended that for at least a limited period the Federal appropriations should be increased 100 per cent to bring the service to something approaching modern standards for welfare work. Other outstanding defects were (1) the attempt to feed the children at the boarding schools on an average per capita of 11 cents a day; (2) a service personnel largely substandard in equipment and insufficient in numbers to do the work called for—low pay, long hours, isolation, and poor living conditions, making it difficult to attract and hold high-grade employees; (3) the poverty and unadjustment of the Indians, many of whom are very poor.

When Messrs. Rhoads and Scattergood entered upon their duties they concentrated on the most urgent matters facing them, and these were the points indicated above. At the time the Meriam report was issued the total appropriation for the Indian Service was $14,991,485 for the year 1928. Following the publication of that report, in answer to appeals from friends of the Indians, there was an increase of about $3,000,000 the next year. The act for the year beginning July 1, 1931, carries $28,184,596 for the Indian Service (of which $24,914,496 is from the Federal Treasury and $3,270,100 from tribal funds), close to the amount recommended. This is a tribute to the effective presentation of the needs to the Budget and to Congress by Messrs. Rhoads and Scattergood, who had the hearty support of the President and the Secretary of the Interior. It is now possible to provide 37.8 cents a day for subsistence for each Indian pupil, assuring an ample diet, sufficient in quantity and quality, as against the former allowance of 11 cents per capita plus what was raised by those schools having gardens. The clothing allowance for each pupil is now $40 as against $22.

Additional funds made it possible to secure an increased and more competent personnel to inaugurate a reorganization program, with the following results:

EDUCATION

In August, 1930, Dr. W. Carson Ryan, jr., formerly professor of education at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, and one of the leading authorities on education in the United States, was appointed director of Indian education. Under his supervision that work is being brought up to a plane equal to approved State standards. Higher qualifications are demanded for all academic teachers, in accordance with present-day standards, which include a college degree for principals, along with teaching experience. The compensation now offered is more on a par with that paid in the educational world at large. Inducements are offered to old school employees who may not be up to the new standard to better prepare themselves for the present requirements by giving them educational leave with pay to attend summer schools.

The obsolete "uniform course of study" has been discarded, as the present grade of teachers are capable of forming their own course of study suitable to the needs of their pupils, or adopting any other course now in existence. Suitable textbooks are being supplied to the schools under expert guidance.

It is the aim to provide an opportunity for every Indian child to secure a practical education, with especial emphasis placed on vocational work in the higher grades, so that they will be properly prepared to earn their living after leaving school, whether on the reservation or in competition with the whites. The vocational instruction is being reorganized under Supervisor James Arentsen, who made such a success of similar work in the public schools of Tennessee.

The newly organized guidance and placement division will supplement the work of the schools by becoming familiar with the qualifications of the students before they leave school and securing employment for them where it is available. In addition, this division will keep in touch with these students after they accept jobs and encourage them to "hold on." Heretofore these young people were "dropped cold" when they went home from the schools, just at the time a continuation of interest was so essential. It is not surprising that many of them in the past became discouraged for lack of such friendly interest and returned to the reservation—"back to the blanket"—because there was little or no work to be had.

Another marked improvement is abolishing the positions of girls' matron and disciplinarian (for boys) and substituting therefor "advisers" of a high grade, with the training and ability to understand boys and girls and to sympathize with them in a real friendly manner. These advisers are constantly associated with the students in the formative period of their lives, and the importance of securing those of the proper type is obvious.

The drudgery heretofore imposed on the Indian pupils under the guise of "vocational work"—scrubbing floors and the like—has been reduced to the minimum through additional school employees provided for in the increased school appropriation.

The number of home economics teachers has been increased to better prepare the girls for what is to follow when they leave school and go to the reservation or to towns and cities.

Scout troops for boys and girls are being organized in the boarding schools in cooperation with the Boy Scouts of America, under Stanley Harris, and the Girl Scouts, by Miss Twohy, regional director in the Southwest, both organizations maintaining their representatives. This plan includes summer camps, which have won high favor among the present troops. The teaching of these two institutions stresses self-reliance, respect for the rights of others, and obedience to law; and the spread of such principles should go far toward developing a satisfactory form of student government and minimize the need for any severe discipline from the school authorities.

As fast as funds will allow the buildings are being put in a good state of repair and better quarters for employees are provided to make them more comfortable and contented, especially in the isolated points.

There are 217 schools maintained by the Government for Indians—20 nonreservation boarding schools, 52 reservation boarding schools, 13 sanatorium boarding schools, and 132 day schools. There are 28,600 children attending these schools; 5,000 are in mission and other private schools, while 38,000 attend the public schools. It is estimated that 9,000 Indian children are not in school, chiefly because of remoteness of their homes.

Closer cooperation is being developed between State and Federal Governments to encourage a greater number of Indian children to attend the district public schools wherever they can be made available, on such terms of immediate and continuing financial assistance by the Federal Government as will be just to the States and the communities where they reside.

Provision is now made by which promising students at Indian schools can be assisted to obtain a college education.

Referring to additions to the personnel that are contemplated, Doctor Ryan said:

"The following types of positions will be emphasized: (1) Vocational directors in the three fields of trade and industrial education, agricultural and home economics; (2) school principals who are qualified by training and experience for an educational program that will include practical arts and other activities in addition to the ordinary classroom work; (3) teachers of native art; (4) vocational counselors and school social workers who will help to bridge the gap between school and home and school and work; (5) boys' and girls' advisers familiar with modern methods of handling boys and girls and developing responsibility; (6) more adequate dormitory supervisors; (7) properly qualified directors of health and physical education; (8) institutional workers who will be better practical teachers of Indian boys and girls as well as more economical administrators of Government funds."

The reorganization of the educational work is not only dealing with the present situation but planning for the future, looking ahead for the next 15 years. It includes a study of the home environment of the pupils and development of a broad, practical, comprehensive program that means "education for life."

HEALTH WORK

Dr. M. C. Guthrie, of the Public Health Service, continues in charge of the medical activities for the Indians. Under his direction the personnel of this division has been greatly strengthened by the following additions since July 1, 1929: 1 assistant to the chief medical director, in charge of hospital administration; 2 assistant supervisors of nurses (for work in the field from the office of the district medical directors); 10 full-time school and agency physicians; 6 part-time school and agency physicians; 6 traveling dentists; 34 field nurses; 63 hospital nurses; and approximately 100 others employees engaged in health activities.

The appropriation for "Conservation of health among Indians" for the fiscal year is $3,138,000, an increase over that of the previous year of $480,000. For the year beginning July 1, 1931, the amount is $4,475,000, plus $75,000 for clinical survey of tuberculosis, trachoma, venereal, and other diseases.

Six new hospitals are to be constructed from the 1931 health appropriation: San Xavier Sanatorium, Arizona; Pipestone Hospital, Minnesota (to replace an old one); Walker River Hospital, Nevada; Winnebago Hospital, Nebraska (a replacement); Seger Hospital in Oklahoma, to be located at Clinton, Okla.; Toma Hospital in Wisconsin (to replace an obsolete plant).

A new hospital was constructed at Colorado River Agency, Ariz., during 1930. The hospital at Fort Totten, N. Dak., was reconstructed and enlarged, and is about ready to open. A new hospital was constructed and is in operation at Flandreau School, South Dakota. The capacity of the Kiowa Hospital in Oklahoma was increased to 100 beds by an addition and is now in operation. New hospitals are under construction at Fort Belknap and Tongue River in Montana; Turtle Mountain, N. Dak.; Pawnee, Okla.; Pine Ridge, S. Dak.; and Hayward, Wis. These latter institutions will be completed and put in operation before June 30, 1931.

Further increases in personnel, particularly field nurses, with some increase in hospital personnel, are planned for the year beginning July 1, 1931. There will then be available $375,000 for the construction of a 100-bed sanatorium at Albuquerque, N. Mex. (including equipment and employees' quarters); $375,000 for two sanatoriums at Pierre, S. Dak., of 100-bed capacity, and employees' quarters; and $75,000 for a 30-bed hospital at Ignacio, Colo.

There are now 144 full-time physicians, including 15 specialists in eye, ear, nose, and throat work. Supplementing this staff of physicians are more than 350 hospital and field nurses. The new entrance pay of physicians is $2,900, for hospital nurses $1,800, and for field nurses $2,000.

Commissioner Rhoads reports that "during the past year more than 38,000 Indians received hospital treatment in Government institutions, while a few years ago it was practically impossible to persuade many Indians to accept hospitalization even though desperately ill."

Good progress has been made in developing active cooperation with State officials in matters of health and welfare work for Indians, especially in California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Montana. A bill is now pending in the Montana Legislature to make Indian Service physicians deputy State health officers.

PERSONNEL

No matter how sound any reorganization plan may be, without the right kind of personnel to carry it through failure is inevitable. The serious effort that is being made by the present administration to secure a qualified personnel for important "key" positions in the Indian Service is indicated in the following recent additions:

Dr. W. Carson Ryan, jr., director of education: Formerly professor of education at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, an educator of national reputation, and a member of the Meriam survey staff.

Miss Mary Stewart, assistant director of education: Formerly dean of women and teacher, University of Montana, and director of junior guidance and placement in the United States Department of Labor.

J. H. Holst, supervisor of secondary education: Formerly with the State College of Montana.

Dr. Erl A. Bates, advisor in Indian extension work: Professor of anthropology, Cornell University, long-time student of Indian affairs, and author of The Bates Plan for Backward Races. (Loaned by Cornell for one year.)

Mrs. Jane Bartlett Bates, advisor in Indian extension work: Child Guidance School, Cornell University; graduate of Chicago University; student under Jane Addams; home-economics teacher; home demonstration agent; and holder of the Rockefeller fellowship at the Merrill Palmer School, Detroit, Mich.

A. C. Cooley, director of agricultural extension and industry: Formerly director of extension for the State of New Mexico and later head of the reclamation extension service, United States Department of Agriculture.

Mrs. Henrietta K. Burton, supervisor of home economics extension: Formerly head of the home economics department, State of Arkansas.

James Arentsen, supervisor of industrial education: Former director of vocational education, State of Tennessee.

Robert T. Lansdale, personnel officer: Formerly with University of Michigan; graduate of Oberlin College and New York School of Social Work; master's degree from Columbia University; secretary of the Montclair (N. J.) Council of Social Agencies.

Dr. William H. Bryan, director of hospital administration: Formerly with the United States Department of Health.

Maj. William S. Post, director of irrigation: Formerly with the United States Geological Survey; consultant and supervisor of construction in water-development projects in California and extensive irrigation and engineering work for the State of California and in private practice.

Others could be mentioned, but these names are sufficiently suggestive of the type of men and women being sought for the Indian Service.

It is noted that the Indian Service has a personnel of over 5,000, operating on 200 jurisdictions, scattered over 26 States, and in attempting to bring it up to a high state of efficiency it is no small task to study the individuals and evaluate their past work. When changes are made for the betterment of the service following such a study, the administration can avoid "putting round pegs in square holes," or doing injustice to anyone concerned.

During the past 18 months a number of superintendents and others have left the service largely through the operation of the new retirement act, and the aim has been to replace them with the best possible material obtainable, through promotion, or "new blood," under civil-service requirements. The turnover is probably upward of 25 per cent.

EXTENSION WORK

To improve the economic conditions among the Indians there has been created a division of agricultural extension and industry, the aim of which is to assist them in utilizing to the fullest extent the natural resources on the reservations, and to have it "tie in" with the various activities of the service—health, education, etc.

The director of this division is A. C. Cooley, with headquarters at Salt Lake City, Utah. To assist him there is a supervisor of home-demonstration work, with 5 home-demonstration agents and home agents; a supervisor of extension work, with 18 full-time extension agents and 5 cooperating extension agents; a well-equipped supervisor of livestock, in addition to 300 farmers and stockmen and dairymen in connection with school farms and dairies and reservation work.

The extension work includes making a special study of each of the 200 Indian reservations and the development of a specific farm and home program for the benefit of the inhabitants thereof. It also includes cooperation of the State and county agricultural extension forces and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Closely allied to this program is the—

GUIDANCE-PLACEMENT WORK

Placement centers have already been established in Minneapolis, Minn.; Kansas City, Mo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Los Angeles, Calif.; Berkeley, Calif.; and others are in contemplation as funds permit. Each center is in charge of a trained worker, who makes contacts in towns and cities, and with Indians at schools and on reservations in his or her district. Part of the duty of these placement officers is vocational guidance and follow-up work to see that Indians become adjusted to their new environment. In this field of endeavor every effort is being made to secure the cooperation of local welfare groups to develop on a proper basis the social side of these Indian migrants.

While the placement and guidance work is under the division of education, it aims to help any able-bodied Indian to secure employment according to his ability.

DECENTRALIZATION

By putting more responsibility upon superintendents and others in the field, decentralization of the activities of the Indian Service is taking place, in the field and in the Indian Office.

Every year thousands of routine matters came from the field to the bureau calling for nothing but a formal approval—useless time-killing work at both ends of the line. In most of these minor matters, not involving a question of policy, superintendents are authorized to act upon their own responsibility. They are under heavy financial bond, and are more competent to deal with matters involved than are clerks in the Washington office several thousand miles away.

The voluminous correspondence of a purely routine nature is now being handled through the heads of divisions, who actually write the letters and are authorized to sign them, where they do not involve matters of policy. This relieves the commissioners of the necessity for signing, in a mechanical manner—for it is physically impossible for them to read such papers—the hundreds of letters that heretofore were brought to their desks for this formality.

Routine correspondence and reports from the field are being reduced to the lowest possible minimum. Circular 2725, sent to superintendents on December 1, 1930, reduces the number of reports on minor matters in the field, requiring them semiannually instead of monthly. Other routine reports heretofore sent to Washington can be deposited in the local agency records. This obviates much unnecessary work in the field and will tend to avoid an accumulation at the Indian Bureau of records that are of little value.

One of the most prolific sources of complaint and discontent to Indians—and "grief" to superintendents—has been the individual Indian moneys, derived from leases, land sales, etc., and placed to the credit of individuals at the respective agencies. When an Indian wished to draw any of this money he signed a formal application stating the amount and the purpose for which it was to be used. This was sent to the Washington office, with the superintendent's recommendation, for formal approval and its return to the agency was usually a matter of weeks. Meanwhile the Indian who wanted his own money went through a period of "watchful waiting" and frequent inquiry at the agency about word from Washington. He could not understand the delay, and irritation was inevitable, with consequent annoyance to his superintendent, whose hands were tied until the formal approval was received.

The method of handling these funds has been radically changed by Circular 2725. Authority is therein granted superintendents to make payments, not exceeding $500, to the Indian depositors practically "on demand," or according to the custom of modern savings banks. As a majority of the 90 agencies—and the 20 nonreservation boarding schools—carry individual Indian moneys—upward of 80,000 accounts—the effect of Circular 2725 will be far-reaching.

Superintendents are also authorized by Circular 2725 to lease Indian tribal land for farming, grazing, and business purposes, where the annual rental does not exceed $1,000, without the necessity of submitting such leases to the Indian Office for approval.

Superintendents are authorized by circular 2725 to contract for sales of timber of a stumpage value not exceeding $100, subject to the recommendation of a special forest officer.

There is now a special commissioner to Indians of the Southwest—former Governor of New Mexico, H. J. Hagerman—with headquarters at Santa Fe, N. Mex., who has general supervision over the work in the States of New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Utah. Mr. Hagerman acts as a coordinator of general policies in the Southwest so that progress may be balanced and that no one jurisdiction may be favored at the expense of the whole. While plans are in the making he assembles the details and presents to the Washington office a proposal for final consideration. He is not supposed to be responsible for local details of operation, which are the duty of the individual superintendents. Governor Hagerman has been in charge of special negotiations in land exchanges and other problems involving the joint interests of several agencies.

Due to insufficient funds in the past many buildings at the schools and agencies deteriorated; and since they are being repaired and modernized in addition to new building operations, a well-qualified architect was obtained from the Supervising Architect's Office of the Treasury Department to direct the work. The construction staff has been increased to five competent persons, which should mean greater efficiency in this necessary work.

To bring about these results of far-reaching effect much intensive study of the whole field was necessary by Messrs. Rhoads and Scattergood. They have aimed that all changes shall mean real improvement in method and personnel. Perhaps more rapid progress would have been made had it been possible to create a division of planning and development, or a general staff of trained assistants. But the trend of events has been largely along the lines recommended by the Meriam group.

There is, however, much to be accomplished before the task is finished, and the commissioners are fully aware of that fact. There has been so much to do that it was a question of what should be done first, and they concentrated on health, education, and economics—things of vital importance to all. If one considers that these 340,541 Indians live in 200 reservations or communities scattered over 26 States (mostly west of the Mississippi River), speak 60 distinct languages, have little or nothing in common, are affected by numerous separate treaties and laws, it will be evident that the Indian question is extensive and complex. Hardly two reservations are alike, and must be treated as separate units. Each tribe has its own culture. In readjusting the Indians to changed conditions the time element is an important consideration. It is unreasonable to expect them in a generation to reach a point for which the white man required centuries.

Among the things needed are a reorganization of the Indian Bureau at Washington, which is "in the making," and developing an efficient supervisory service.

Good progress has been made, and it is hoped that the commissioners will not grow weary in well-doing but will continue in their reconstruction work until the entire Indian Service is brought to the standard set forth in the Meriam report and put on such a permanent basis that public opinion will never allow it to backslide.

M. K. SNIFFEN,
Secretary Indian Rights Association.

GEORGIA A. MUIRHEAD

The Clerk called the first Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 3831, for the relief of Georgia A. Muirhead, a similar House bill (H. R. 10614) being on the Calendar.

There being no objection, the bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Georgia A. Muirhead, postmaster at Hemingford, Nebr., in the sum of $264.42, representing the amount of postal funds lost by reason of the failure of the First National Bank of Hemingford, Nebr., and shown on final audit of her accounts as postmaster to be due the United States.

SEC. 2. The surety on the bond of the said Georgia A. Muirhead as postmaster is relieved of any liability on account of such loss.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 10614) was laid on the table.

CAPT. CHRISTIAN DAMSON

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 1244, for the relief of Capt. Christian Damson, a similar House bill (H. R. 12289) being on the Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as with this bill and as to others of similar purport, where the accident occurred after the enactment of the employees' compensation act of 1916, I am going to offer amendments similar in purport to the following:

In the administration of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, as amended, the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized, notwithstanding the lapse of time, to examine and consider the claim of Capt. Christian Damson, who is alleged to have suffered injury while employed on or about August 17, 1918, in line of duty: *Provided*, That no benefits thereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The purpose of this proposed substitute is to leave it to the Employees' Compensation Commission to determine in fact whether the injury arose out of the service rather than, under the phraseology of the Senate and House bills, to indicate the determination.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. Does not the gentleman think that this bill ought to be amended by striking out everything after the word "duty," on page 2, and just leave to the commission the right to adjudicate the question of liability, and so forth?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the purpose of my amendment. I do not know whether the gentleman heard me read the amendment which I intend to propose.

Mr. COLLINS. I did not.

Mr. STAFFORD. If this is acceptable to the author of the bill and those interested, I have no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is entirely acceptable to the author of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill (S. 1244), as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Capt. Christian Damson, a civilian employee of the War Department, who was injured on the steamship *Cudahy*, a vessel of the Army Transport Service, on or about August 17, 1918.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"In the administration of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized, notwithstanding the lapse of time, to examine and consider the claim of Capt. Christian Damson, who is alleged to have suffered injury while employed on or about August 17, 1918, in line of duty: *Provided*, That no benefits thereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 12289) was laid on the table.

LILLIAN G. FROST

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 4345, for the relief of Lillian G. Frost.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object. This is similar, in purport, to many bills providing for a year's salary.

CORPORATION C. P. JENSEN

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 4612, for the relief of the Corporation C. P. Jensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of the Corporation C. P. Jensen for services rendered to the United States on October 12, 1926, by the steamship *Anneberg*, its officers and crew, in connection with the rescue from a sea peril of two United States prohibition agents and their disabled motor boat off the coast of Florida, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim not to exceed the sum of $500. There is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay said claim.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. L. TODD

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 5215, for the relief of H. L. Todd, a similar House bill, H. R. 13094, being on the calendar.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is to pay for certain services of enlisted men who acted as chauffeurs. The chauffeurs were enlisted men in the Army. Is that so?

Mr. WELCH of California. During the 1928 holiday rush in the San Francisco post office Postmaster Todd borrowed a number of trucks from the War Department, and in the interest of expedition and economy retained the services of a number of furloughed soldiers. Unconscious of department rules, he was afterwards notified, or at least his bondsmen were, that he would have to pay this money out of his own pocket, regardless of the fact that the Government was the beneficiary of the services of these expert men. The Postmaster General has recommended the payment of this claim.

Mr. COLLINS. I have been protesting in the past against the use of enlisted men in the Army as chauffeurs.

Mr. WELCH of California. If the gentleman will permit me, this has nothing to do with the retaining of chauffeurs.

Mr. COLLINS. The report says so. The report says enlisted men of the Army were used as chauffeurs on trucks loaned by the War Department to the city post office.

Mr. WELCH of California. The gentleman should make a distinction between a chauffeur and a truck driver. These were men who drove big 5 and 10 ton trucks.

Mr. COLLINS. I am telling the gentleman what the committee report recites. I want the facts. These three men were actually enlisted men in the Army who were employed to drive trucks for the post office, and the postmaster paid them, and the General Accounting Office held that he improperly paid them, and now the postmaster asks relief.

Mr. WELCH of California. Had they been discharged soldiers or civilians it would have been all right. He was unconscious of the rule of the department and he hired them by reason of the fact that he knew them to be experts.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, this postmaster was an old postmaster of the city of San Francisco, with a book of the rules and regulations and the law on his table. For years he could find out in 15 minutes from an inspection of that book—and he probably knew about it—because the Post Office Department says that he violated the law and that he did not have the authority to employ the soldiers.

Another thing: These soldiers were still in the Army. They got their pay check every month from the Government. Under the regulations of the Army if they received money from another Government institution to which they were not entitled, it could have been deducted from their pay each month. That is a method that they have devised.

Only the other day I had a prominent man here from my district. He served gallantly, was a fine officer, and a dozen years after the war he got a notice from the War Department that on some little trip they had overpaid him 40 cents and they wanted him to send it back to them. Why did they not take this out of the soldier's pay check?

Mr. WELCH of California. The gentleman refers to the postmaster at San Francisco as an old man in the service. May I correct the gentleman? Mr. Todd is not an old man in the service of the Government. He has only been postmaster of San Francisco for two years.

Mr. BLANTON. That is long enough to learn something about these rules and regulations. How much salary did he get; $12,000?

Mr. WELCH of California. Something like $8,000 or $9,000.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman knows that soldiers are being used every day as domestic servants in certain households and he knows this is improper and wrong.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and they are required to wash the children's clothes in the back yard.

Mr. WELCH of California. I think gentlemen are going to extremes in this particular case. I will repeat again it was in the interest of economy that he borrowed the trucks and hired the soldiers.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say this, although the gentleman did not accomplish anything for them, my friend undertook to do something for the low-paid Government employees. He started out all right, but did not accomplish anything—the big high-paid officers got all the money, but because he tried to do something for the poorly paid Government employees I am not going to object to his bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to credit the account of H. L. Todd, postmaster at San Francisco, Calif., in the sum of $1,935.90, and to certify such credit to the General Accounting Office. Such sum represents the amount disbursed to enlisted men of the United States Army for services as chauffeurs on trucks loaned by the War Department to the post office at San Francisco in December, 1928.

SEC. 2. The surety on the bond of the said H. L. Todd, as postmaster at San Francisco, Calif., is hereby relieved of any liability on account of such disbursement.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARMERS' GRAIN CO., OF OMAHA, NEBR.

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 899, authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to refund to the Farmers' Grain Co., of Omaha, Nebr., income taxes illegally paid to the United States Treasurer.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I reserve the objection; but I say to the gentleman that there have been at least 10 bills on the Private Calendar arising out of discovered mistake in the amount of tax paid after the time under the statute of limitations has elapsed, and to each and every one of those 10 bills I have objected. I take this position: If the Government is going to refund taxes where there have been innocent mistakes made, then there should be some general legislation. Personally I have had two cases come to my attention from my own district where they have been denied refunds even though there is no question about there having been erroneous computations. The Committee on Ways and Means in particular ought to devise some general plan where a mistake has been made which is discovered after the statute of limitations has run, for refunding, rather than to single out for preferential treatment individual cases.

Mr. SEARS. I do not think there is anything preferential in this at all.

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

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The Secretary of the Treasury reports that "the department looks with disfavor on the enactment of special legislation designed to give relief from the operation of the statute of limitations, and that he is therefore unable to give his approval to the bill. What I would call to the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin is that this is one bill which in this present extravagant Congress the Bureau of the Budget says does not conflict with the President's financial policy, and it is approved by the Budget. In view of the fact that our friend from Nebraska [Mr. SEARS] is going out, I hope the gentleman will let the bill go through.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have to be consistent with the position I have taken on other bills.

Mr. SEARS. This amount was paid and the whole matter was in the hands of the department. As soon as the department said it was, then the statute would run. There is no question about the merits of the case.

Mr. STAFFORD. There should be some general legislation listing this character of claims so that the department can pay them.

Mr. SEARS. I should be very glad to help pass a special law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am trying to bring this to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection further?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The facts are I filed for this creamery, which I have known since its organization, a bill precisely like this, and filed it in the House. It was taken before a subcommittee of the Committee on Claims, Mr. DOXEY being the member. We had a hearing of two or three hours. We took testimony, and the bill was up for consideration by the Committee on Claims when this bill came over from the Senate, and it would have been passed by the Committee of the House, but to expedite matters I withdrew, or rather did not press, my bill, thinking that as it had been recommended by the Senate and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Claims, Senator HOWELL, that there would be no question about it. They were unable to arrive at this for a number of years, because the determination of whether there had been an overpayment was delayed, as there were no other corporations discovered where they could make their complaints. If Mr. DOXEY is present he will verify this statement, because I conducted through him and with him the hearings.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not question the merits of many of these tax-refund cases; but if we are going to lift the statute of limitations, I say we should lift it on all of them.

Mr. SLOAN. I suggest this point, that, of course, the gentleman has the keeping not only of his own conscience but of the conscience of the House, and I suggest his objection should be made, not on an arbitrary position but on the judgment a reasonable man would take of a bill of this character, where there is no question about the right of recovery. The gentleman would not set up his consistency against the judgment of the House, would he?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

FAIRMOUNT CREAMERY CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3620, for the relief of the Fairmount Creamery Co. at Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEBANON EQUITY EXCHANGE OF LEBANON, NEBR.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4018, for the relief of Lebanon Equity Exchange of Lebanon, Nebr.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

THE ATLANTIC & PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 5105, for the relief of certain settlers and claimants within the limits of the grant of land to the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad Co. in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I object.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. This bill was sent up by the Secretary of the Interior. Each year in the administration of the land laws there are certain peculiar cases calling for equity, which the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior call to the attention of Congress These are called omnibus bills. This is simply an omnibus bill sent up to correct certain cases which call for equity and which can not be corrected without legislation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. A bill of this kind should not be on the Consent Calendar. Ninety per cent of the bills on this calendar have no business here. The Members of Congress have been getting away with murder with these bills. They are appropriations and demands upon the Treasury. It is going to give some of you a dose of your own medicine.

Mr. COLTON. This could not go on the Consent Calendar. We tried to get it on the Consent Calendar but they will not permit it. The parliamentarian holds that this is a private bill, does not appropriate any money, does not appropriate any property, and there is no general legislation contained in it, and therefore it can not go on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. This is legislation in which no particular Member of Congress is interested, but it covers cases which the Commissioner of the General Land Office finds he can not allow.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman say there is no appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No appropriation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, in one particular, I notice that in line 8, page 2, you authorize the railroad company to get lieu lands of equal quantity. It is customary for such bills to read "lands of equal value."

Mr. COLTON. I have no objection to that, but where it is necessary, as it would be in this case, to send out officials of the General Land Office to determine the value of the lands it costs more than to give them an equal area, because the valuable lands are gone anyway. What land there is left is largely of small value.

Mr. STAFFORD. This would not permit the railroad company to receive heavily forested lands in lieu of these lands which these old settlers appropriated?

Mr. COLTON. Oh, no. Absolutely not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not press the objection.

There being no objection the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Co., successor in interest to the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad Co., may, when requested by the Secretary of the Interior so to do, deed to the United States any part or all of sections 9, 15, and 23, township 2 north, range 4 west, New Mexico principal meridian, the title to which was derived by said railroad company through the act of Congress of July 27, 1866 (14 Stat. L. 292), in aid of the construction of said railroad, any portion of which sections is and has been occupied by any settler or claimant, by themselves or their predecessors in interest, for a period of not less than 40 years next before the passage of this act, and shall then be entitled to select in lieu thereof and to have patented other sections of vacant, unreserved, nonmineral public land of equal quantity in said State as may be agreed upon with the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall as soon as may be after the passage of this act cause inquiry to be made of all lands so held by settlers or claimants, and shall cause the holdings to be surveyed, and on receiving such deed shall at once, without cost to the claimants, cause patents to issue to each such claimant for his or her holdings: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 160 acres shall be patented to any one person: *And provided further*, That any fractions of any such sections of land remaining after the issuance of patents to the settlers or claimants as aforesaid shall be subject to entry or other disposition the same as other public lands of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue patent upon stock-raising homestead entry, Buffalo, Wyo., No. 025831, made by James Scott on April 7, 1926, for the south half of the southeast quarter and southeast quarter of the southwest quarter, section 13, southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 23, and north half of the northwest quarter, and southwest quarter of the northwest quarter, section 24, township 41 north, range 88 west, sixth principal meridian, in support of which final proof was submitted on October 15, 1929.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

AUGUSTA CORNOG

The clerk called the next bill, S. 5467, to amend an act for the relief of Augusta Cornog, approved May 29, 1928, a similar House bill (H. R. 11594) being on the House calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman know whether this lady is drawing compensation or not?

Mr. IRWIN. She is in a hospital.

Mr. COLLINS. Is she drawing compensation?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes. This merely——

Mr. COLLINS. I know; it merely gives her $2,000.

Mr. IRWIN. Oh, no. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It merely transfers her from one hospital to another, without any compensation whatever. It is merely a transfer, which is agreed to by the department.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman just read half of the bill. The bill provides—

The Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $2,000 to Augusta Cornog—

And so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I wish to say to the gentleman I did not have time to examine the original act on yesterday when I examined this bill, but I take it, upon careful reading the proposed amendment, that all that is intended by the language referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] was to rewrite the original act?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not take it that the claimant would be entitled to an additional $2,000.

Mr. IRWIN. No. The amount of money involved is the same as in the original bill.

Mr. COLLINS. I will ask the gentleman again, Is this lady drawing a monthly amount as compensation for having contracted tuberculosis?

Mr. IRWIN. No, sir. In the last session Congress did pass a bill giving her $2,000, and this is merely giving them permission to transfer her from a Veterans' Bureau hospital to another hospital in the South.

Mr. COLLINS. Then is this an additional $2,000?

Mr. IRWIN. No, sir, it is not. It is simply the old bill giving her $2,000, and this is simply a transfer, giving the department the right to transfer her from one hospital to another.

Mr. SABATH. Is legislation needed for the purpose of transferring a patient from one hospital to another?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. I have an idea this bill, if enacted, will allow her an additional $2,000.

Mr. IRWIN. I will say to the gentleman if he does not feel satisfied, we will be glad to amend the bill, because I know the bill is intended to make a transfer from one hospital to the other, and that is all. That is to amend the original bill which was passed a year ago, so as to give them permission to transfer her from one hospital to another.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose the gentleman would have no objection to the following provision:

Provided, That in the construction of this act no additional payment shall be made to that heretofore made.

Mr. IRWIN. That is perfectly satisfactory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act for the relief of Augusta Cornog, approved May 29, 1928, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows: After the semicolon following the word "hospital," strike out the following words: "and that said Augusta Cornog shall be admitted to such Army hospital as may be directed by the Surgeon General of the United States Army for necessary care and treatment" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and that said Augusta Cornog shall be removed from Fitzsimons General Hospital, an Army hospital at Denver, Colo., and that the Director of the Veterans' Bureau be required to admit her to the United States veterans' hospital at Oteen, N. C., for necessary care and treatment," so that the same will read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $2,000 to Augusta Cornog, a former employee of the United States Public Health Service, who contracted tuberculosis while employed at the Atlanta Veterans' Bureau hospital; and that said Augusta Cornog shall be removed from Fitzsimons General Hospital, an Army hospital at Denver, Colo., and that the Director of the Veterans' Bureau be required to admit her to the United States veterans' hospital at Oteen, N. C., for necessary care and treatment."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. It is the concensus of opinion that there is no need of the amendment which I suggested. The bill only provides for the reenactment of existing laws, with the privilege of transferring her to the Veterans' Bureau hospital instead of an Army hospital.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In letting this bill pass it is understood from the chairman of the committee and from the author of the bill that when this bill is passed and is construed by the department, they are not to pay another sum other than the $2,000 originally agreed to by the first bill?

Mr. IRWIN. No; they are not to pay her any additional at all.

Mr. BLANTON. It is just a matter of transfer?

Mr. IRWIN. It is just a matter of transfer.

Mr. BLANTON. With that understanding, there is no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. That is the understanding.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the chairman of this committee write a letter to the commission to that effect, so as to make it clear that no additional payment is carried in the bill.

Mr. IRWIN. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. There is nobody going to make any claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 11594, was laid on the table.

THOMAS G. HAYES

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 4509, for the relief of Thomas G. Hayes, a similar House bill, H. R. 12398, being on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of Thomas G. Hayes, formerly private, Company A, One hundred and forty-second Machine Gun Battalion, Camp Beauregard, Alexandria, La., as reimbursement for money he failed to receive which was contained in registered letter No. 15158, which letter was mailed to him by Miss E. Hoffman, New Orleans, La., on April 26, 1918, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim not to exceed $40. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $40, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay said claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 12398, was laid on the table.

MILDRED N. O'LONE

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 5193, for the relief of Mildred N. O'Lone, a similar House bill H. R. 14507, being on the calendar.

There being no objection, the bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of Mildred N. O'Lone for blood furnished June 17, 1930, for transfusion to Clarence Judd, a patient in a Government hospital, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim an amount not in excess of $25. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of such claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 14507) was laid on the table.

GEORGE C. MANSFIELD CO.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 5475, for the relief of George C. Mansfield Co. and George D. Mansfield, a similar House bill (H. R. 1887) being on the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill involves a claim of $126,000, and I do not believe it ought to pass at this time and in this atmosphere.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This bill provides that the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction of this claim and shall determine its merits.

Mr. BLANTON. But at present this claimant has no legal claim at all against the United States that could be enforced, unless we would grant a special gratuity to permit it to go back to the Court of Claims, and it does involve $126,000 to come out of the Treasury.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. They have a moral claim. The bill passed the Senate unanimously; the House subcommittee held extensive hearings on the bill and reported it out. The testimony produced indicates that this company suffered an actual loss by reason of the unfair and arbitrary action of a Government agency. The Senate amendment to the House bill covers the amendment which I suggested to the Subcommittee of the Committee on Claims providing that it shall only carry the actual loss suffered without interest.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Wisconsin is usually such a careful and dependable watchdog of the Public Treasury that he does not generally allow these $126,000 bills to be passed under unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will suspend to receive a message from the Senate?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, are we to be slammed off our feet in this way? Are we going to be forced to split up our argument just because a message, through our friend, comes from the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair asked the gentleman if he would suspend.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want my paragraph split up in that way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman refuses to suspend, that is all right.

Mr. BLANTON. I do refuse to suspend until I get through this sentence.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill just under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to the bill just under consideration. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill involves $126,000.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object; but I wanted to give the gentleman from Wisconsin a chance to speak on the bill. But as it involves $126,000 I can not allow it to pass without due consideration. I object.

MRS. THOMAS DOYLE

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 4716, for the relief of Mrs. Thomas Doyle, a similar House bill, H. R. 12960, being on the calendar.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice this bill is for the relief of Mrs. Thomas Doyle and then there is another bill for the relief of John T. Doyle.

Mr. LEAVITT. John T. Doyle is the son of Mrs. Thomas Doyle.

Mr. SABATH. What is this about? Are they husband and wife?

Mr. LEAVITT. No. Mrs. Thomas Doyle is the mother of John Doyle. She is a half Indian and John T. Doyle is a quarter Indian. They are not living on the Crow Reservation; they are living in Wyoming, and they are constituents of Senator Kendrick. He has told me personally that he knows them and that both of them are entirely competent to carry on their own business. This bill allows them to sell the lands they have and use the money just as any other competent person would be allowed to do.

Mr. SABATH. They are half Indians?

Mr. LEAVITT. One is half Indian and the other is quarter Indian.

Mr. SABATH. And they are now restricted under the law?

Mr. LEAVITT. They have sold all of their surplus land and now they have certain restricted homesteads. It requires an act of Congress to allow them to dispose of them.

There being no objection, the bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Thomas Doyle, Crow allottee No. 1657, for land allotted to her under the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 751), and designated as homestead.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 12960, was laid on the table.

JOHN T. DOYLE

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 4715, for the relief of John T. Doyle, a similar House bill (H. R. 12959) being on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue a patent in fee to John T. Doyle, Crow allottee No. 1660, for land allotted to him under the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 751), and designated as homestead.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CHARLES PARSHALL

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 612, for the relief of Charles Parshall, Fort Peck Indian allottee, of the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REBECCA GREEN

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 3206, for the relief of Rebecca Green.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Rebecca Green, postmaster at Barbourville, Knox County, Ky., in the sum of $597.56 due to the United States on account of postal funds embezzled by Frederick Custer Miller, former assistant postmaster at Barbourville, Ky., in the year 1927.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN BABA

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 2106, for the relief of John Baba, a similar House bill (H. R. 8993) being on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to settle and adjust the claim of John Baba for additional compensation for work performed under contract of June 20, 1928, for the making of certain repairs to floors, doors, etc., in several buildings at Schuylkill Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., and to allow said claim in the sum of not to exceed $335. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $335, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER H. BRIGHT

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 4726, for the relief of Alexander H. Bright, a similar House bill (H. R. 13086) being on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle, adjust, and certify to Congress the claim of Alexander H. Bright in the sum of $573.50 in full settlement for damages to his Moth airplane by an Army airplane at Boston, Mass., on November 16, 1929.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ROSE FEFFERMAN, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 1382, for the relief of Rose Fefferman, as administratrix of the estate of Adolph Fefferman, deceased, and the United Mercantile Distributing Co., a partnership, a similar House bill (H. R. 9003) being on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to examine and settle the claim of Rose Fefferman, as administratrix of the estate of Adolph Fefferman, deceased, and the United Mercantile Distributing Co., a partnership, for $1,900.80, arising out of an auction sale held November 23, 1922, of certain mittens, and for $412.99 arising out of an auction sale held on December 12, 1922, of certain knives and spoons, and to deduct therefrom $1,440.90, due the United States by the estate of Adolph Fefferman, deceased and the United Mercantile Distributing Co., as damages for breach of an auction sale on May 10, 1923, of certain blankets, and there is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated not to exceed $872.89 for payment of such sum as may be allowed by the Comptroller General of the United States in full settlement of all claims of Rose Fefferman, administratrix, and the United Mercantile Distributing Co. against the United States on account of said auction sales.

Passed the Senate January 26 (calendar day, February 10), 1931.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PIONEER STEAMSHIP CO.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 896, to pay the Pioneer Steamship Co. the sum of $3,100.50, money paid as duty for repairs in foreign ports.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Pioneer Steamship Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $3,100.50 for money paid as duty upon certain repairs in foreign ports.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. H. PRICE

The Clerk read the next title to the Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 6072, for the relief of C. H. Price.

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, this bill should be amended, but that would probably result in its defeat, so the gentleman should furnish a statement to the commission making no claim for compensation prior to the date of the award. I suggest that he agree to do this.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is similar to the bill considered the first of the evening, when I stated that I would offer a substitute providing that in the administration of the employees compensation act we waive the statute of limitations and further provide that no benefit thereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

I may say that I observe from the procedure in the Senate on Saturday that whenever a Senate bill with a House amendment comes up it invariably goes through without reference to committee. If the gentleman will accept the amendment I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of C. H. Price, who suffered injuries to his eyes while he was serving as foreman in the drainage work for the Public Health Service in Lauderdale County, Ala., in 1918 and 1919, and is now practically blind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, as amended, the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized, notwithstanding the lapse of time, to examine and consider the claim of C. H. Price, who was alleged to have suffered injury to his eyes while in the performance of duty as foreman in the drainage work of the Public Health Service in Lauderdale County, Ala., in 1918 and 1919: *Provided*, That no benefits thereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I arise in opposition to the amendment. As I understand the bill it is to place under the Compensation Commission a person injured prior to the passage of the act.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; subsequently.

Mr. ALMON. The compensation act was passed in 1916.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I rose to call the attention of the House to a matter—not to object to this bill—but in the first session of this Congress a bill introduced by me passed the House without any objection, to grant a man who had a wife and six children recognition under the employers' compensation act. He lost his right hand in an accident at the Naval Academy six months prior to the time the compensation act went into effect.

That bill has been pending before the Senate Committee, and I was told to-day that the reason the bill was not reported by the Senate Committee was that the Senate Committee reports no bill to place a man or woman under the compensation act.

Now, I know myself that one bill which I introduced in the Seventieth Congress passed the House and the Senate, and was signed by the President, thereby placing that person under the compensation act. I know of a dozen other bills of the same character. I am not going to take it out on this person because the Senate has not acted favorably on my bill, but I want to say that this is not the first time in this session where bills have passed similar to bills I have introduced and there has been objection made to the bills I have introduced. I serve notice now. I propose to defend my constituents' interests in the next Congress, and my bills will be passed or others of a similar nature will not.

Mr. VESTAL. If the gentleman will yield I might say that just a week ago the House objected to a bill of mine, where a man was injured where he was only three months behind in filing his claim with the Compensation Commission, and the compensation act had been on the statute books for two or three years.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I say to the gentleman that his bill should have been passed.

Mr. VESTAL. I think so myself.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I withdraw the reservation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

DAISY O. DAVIS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 182, for the relief of Daisy O. Davis.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a similar one to the bill just passed, where the accident occurred after the enactment of the employees' compensation act. I have prepared a similar amendment to the one just offered, and if that is acceptable to the author of the bill, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Daisy O. Davis, a former employee in the Treasury Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That in the administration of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, as amended, the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized, notwithstanding the lapse of time, to examine and consider the claim of Daisy O. Davis, who was alleged to have suffered injuries while employed on or about September 12, 1923, in the Treasury Department: *Provided*, That no benefits thereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DR. COOPER NICHOLSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4274, for the relief of Dr. Cooper Nicholson.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a similar bill, where the accident occurred subsequent to the enactment of the compensation act of 1916. I have prepared a similar amendment, and with the understanding that it be agreed to I have no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Dr. Cooper Nicholson, who suffered an injury to his left eye while in charge of Main Hospital No. 1, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., during the World War.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That in the administration of the employees compensation act of September 7, 1916, as amended, the Employees Compensation Commission is hereby authorized, notwithstanding the lapse of time, to examine and consider the claim of Dr. Cooper Nicholson, who is alleged to have suffered an injury to his left eye while in charge of Main Hospital No. 1, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., during the World War: *Provided*, That no benefits thereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object merely to call attention to the fact that here is another bill sent over from the Senate in a matter of compensation under the employees compensation act.

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

THOMAS BIRD

The clerk called the next bill, S. 4676, for the relief of the estate of Thomas Bird, deceased.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LESLIE W. MORSE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 5199, for the relief of Leslie W. Morse.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some information about this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. It appropriates $20.

Mr. SABATH. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of Leslie W. Morse, formerly private, Company A, One hundred and fortieth Regiment United States Infantry, as reimbursement for money contained in registered letter No. 337, which letter was mailed to him by his father, Fred Morse, De Sota, Kans., on April 20, 1918, receipted for by the proper Army agency and never delivered to the addressee, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim not to exceed $20. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20, or so much as may be necessary, to pay this claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

SEWARD CITY MILLS (INC.)

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4675, for the relief of the Seward City Mills (Inc.).

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Is there any one here who can give me any information about this?

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill sent down by the Comptroller General admitting that there was a mistake and misunderstanding in the contract. The Comptroller General recommends that the bill be paid.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. And the gentleman is personally acquainted with some of the facts in the case?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes. It is a just bill.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That satisfies me.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of the Seward City Mills (Inc.), for a balance alleged to be due under the contract 1–I–Ind–1660, dated September 7, 1928, for the delivery of flour to the Indian Service, and to allow in full and final settlement for said claim the sum of not to exceed $830.82. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $830.82, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for payment of the claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WHITE B. MILLER

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 4105, for the relief of the estate of White B. Miller, a similar House bill, H. R. 15535, being on the House Calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object. This bill appropriates $25,000.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I am sure the gentleman would not object if he understood the conditions.

Mr. BLANTON. There are two bad reports against this bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I would like to give the gentleman the facts. The facts are that Mr. Miller was not a regularly employed United States Assistant Attorney General. He was employed in special cases. The first employment was made in a lot of tax cases in 1925. He was employed in the Big Four Savannah cases, and also included the trial of tax cases which are listed in a letter which I have here. The gentleman can see the list of cases.

Mr. COLLINS. How much was involved?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. In those cases various sums were involved. He prosecuted one of those cases to the Supreme Court of the United States and recovered $500,000.

Mr. COLLINS. And the fee is only $25,000?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. He was paid in those cases. A year afterwards, in 1926, he was employed at that time to look into these tax cases in which there was over $2,000,000 involved. On April 24, 1926, the Attorney General sent a contract to Mr. Miller to sign, in which it was provided—

Your compensation will be decided by the Attorney General upon the conclusion of your services.

Mr. Miller refused to accept that; and on April 24, 1926, Attorney General Sargent changed that wording to read—

You will be allowed reasonable compensation at the close of your services.

There was over $2,000,000 involved in those cases.

Mr. COLLINS. And he is asking for a fee of only $25,000?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. He is only asking a fee of $25,000, and it has been approved by the Attorney General.

Mr. COLLINS. That seems to me to be a reasonable fee.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The fact of it was he expected a $50,000 fee, and that had been approved by the department under Mr. Sargent, Attorney General; but in the change of administration they agreed to give him a fee of $25,000 and asked the Bureau of the Budget to put it in the appropriation bill. They thought it could not be handled in that way and asked for special legislation. On the other side of these tax cases was Chief Justice Hughes's firm. Mr. Miller saved the Government $1,080,000.

Mr. BLANTON. I call attention to one fact that the gentleman has not mentioned. This is from the report of Attorney General Mitchell. He says:

> At the time of Mr. Miller's appointment in the Cannon cases he was already receiving the maximum of $10,000 a year as a special assistant to the Attorney General for conducting the Hare cases at Savannah, Ga.

Now, if he were already drawing $10,000, which is the same salary that the gentleman draws, and which I draw, and which I drew during the first 12 years I was here, during which time I gave every moment of my time to the Government, vacations and otherwise, he does not deserve an extra $25,000 for looking after these cases.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I am sorry, but I must object. If this special attorney were going to try a case involving $25,000 down in Tennessee, he would ask for a week to try the case. He would ask the court to give him four hours to argue the case before the jury. He would not call it up here toward midnight after a hard day's work, with a few Congressmen here, all tired out, and ask it to be passed in a moment. That is not the way to try a case involving $25,000 attorney's fee. I want to know the Government's side of this case. I am a friend of the gentleman and his colleague. We belong to the same party. I would like to grant him a favor if I could, but I have never yet objected to a bill because, forsooth, it happened to be a Republican bill or a Democrat bill. I have objected to bad bills. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold the objection, but I intend ultimately to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 5039, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain land to the city of Asheville, N. C., for park and street purposes, a similar bill (H. R. 14946) being on the House Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, as I understand this bill, the gentleman is seeking to give to the city of Asheville a former post-office site and building that was erected thereon, on the basis that the city originally donated the tract; and in further justification for the contribution back to the city, the city also donated the land for the new site?

Mr. PRITCHARD. The citizens did by public subscription. They raised the money to give it to the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, the new site is worth almost twice the value of the old site?

Mr. PRITCHARD. The building and land combined; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is because of the fact that the citizens donated the new site, as well as donated the old site, which I think is a liberal set-off, that I do not press the objection.

Mr. SABATH. Your people seem to be very liberal, and I think the bill should be passed.

Mr. PRITCHARD. We just want this for the purpose of entertaining our friends when they come to our city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Asheville, N. C., the land in said city known as the old post-office site, together with the building thereon, to be used exclusively for public park and street purposes. If the city of Asheville fails to use such land for the purposes herein provided, or attempts to alienate such land, title thereto shall revert to the United States.
>
> SEC. 2. It shall be expressly stipulated in such deed that notwithstanding the transfer of title, the United States shall be permitted to occupy, without payment of rent to said city, the building now located on such post-office site until such time as the new post-office building now under construction in said city shall be completed and made available for use.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINES, GULF REFINING CO.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 5297, to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products, a similar House bill (H. R. 15010) being on the House Calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I object.

Mr. KELLY. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, but this bill would permit Mr. Mellon's big monopoly to put a pipe line under the Capitol. I object to that.

Mr. KELLY. If the gentleman will let me say a word, this bill will result in the expenditure of a considerable amount of private funds, instead of contributions from the Treasury. It is a fair provision, which can injure no one.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If the gentleman is not going to object, I shall.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

R. B. MILLER

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 3088, for the relief of R. B. Miller.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. SHAFFER of Virginia. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold the objection.

Mr. SHAFFER of Virginia. In this case this man shipped a certain amount of manganese from Bland County, Va., to Reading, Pa. The Director General of Railroads, who was Solicitor General, states in his report that Mr. Miller has an equitable claim, and that if he had filed this equitable claim in time in all probability it would have been allowed. You have been suspending the statute of limitations all night, and I see no reason why the statute of limitations should be imposed in this case.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read the report, this man Miller filed a claim with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission held that the rate was reasonable on the commodity rate. Now he wants to have a new adjudication of the manganese that was shipped during the war. The damages are only conjectural, and if we allow this bill to pass there will be any number of bills of similar import.

Mr. SHAFFER of Virginia. The Solicitor General says this is an unreasonable charge, and he said in this report that if the charge to Harrisburg, Pa., was reasonable, then this charge was unreasonable and that he is entitled to a refund of $2,400.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me read this:

> The legally published rates on the balance of Mr. Miller's shipments during Federal control to Harrisburg, Pa., and Graham, Va., were not class rates and it does not appear that they were unreasonable rates.

That is what I base my opinion on. I object.

UPSON-WALTON CO.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 13, for the relief of the Upson-Walton Co., a similar House bill, H. R. 15327, being on the calendar.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MOONEY. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. MOONEY. As a matter of fact, this bill is to protect a company that did some work for the Shipping Board, on which they lost money. The Shipping Board at one time entered into an agreement to pay and then refused because the company with which they had a subcontract failed. It gives them the right to sue in the Court of Claims and appropriates no money for them at all. It is to make up money that was actually lost by this company.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CICERO A. HILLIARD

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 2481, for the relief of Cicero A. Hilliard.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill similar to those heretofore considered, where the accident occurred subsequent to the passage of the employees' compensation act. I have prepared an amendment waiving the statute of limitations, and, if that is acceptable to the author of the bill, I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. VESTAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. VESTAL. Is this another one of those bills that goes back?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not retroactive. No bills are being considered in the House where the accident occurred prior to the enactment of the employees' compensation act, in 1916. This injury occurred in 1925, but he failed to file a claim within the one year prescribed by that act.

Mr. VESTAL. I can not quite understand why the House is permitting this sort of bill to pass when other bills were objected to, where the injury occurred only three years ago.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I shall object in order to make the policy uniform. I will reserve the objection and state that it is manifestly unfair for the conscientious objectors to object to the consideration of bills introduced by Members of the House on certain grounds, because they come within a class, and the very next day allow Senate bills in the same class to pass.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will certainly not level that charge against me, because I have not in one instance objected to any bill that came within the purview of the employees' compensation act, where the accident occurred after the enactment of that act. We have passed five bills to-night of similar purport, and if the gentleman objects to this bill then he is doing a manifest wrong to this claim and giving preferential consideration to those other bills. I did not object to the bill of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BACHMANN. The gentleman from Indiana is right. I objected to his bill the other night, the same kind of a bill. I objected because the report did not show how long afterwards he brought it to the attention of the commission.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mrs. OWEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. A gentleman on the gentlewoman's side called for the regular order, and I can not yield.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who demanded the regular order did not rise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] rose and demanded the regular order.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for the regular order.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection and reserve the right to object.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] what he has to say with respect to the bill.

Mr. VESTAL. What I desire to say is that it seems to me—and I do not want to object to the bill, because I have never objected to a bill on the floor of this House in my life; but I do not understand how it comes about that bills of this character are not objected to when the sort of bill I brought in here the other night was objected to, where the party was seeking this same remedy. He was injured only three years ago and he just missed by a month or so of filing his claim before the statute of limitations applied.

Mr. BACHMANN. I want to say that the gentleman from Indiana is absolutely right. The only trouble was that the report in his case did not show how long it was before he asked for the benefits of the employees' compensation law, and if any of the Senate bills are going through to-night I think it is right that the gentleman should have his bill go through. It is the only bill of the kind I know of that was objected to, and unless we can turn back to it I am going to object to all Employees' Compensation Commission bills that come from the Senate that are in the same category. We ought to treat every Member fairly.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. BACHMANN. But his bill is in the same category.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have passed five of these bills to-night. Is the gentleman going to start now to level this character of objection to the bills?

Mr. BACHMANN. There was only one such bill, and I objected to it with the understanding we had between the committee on this side and the committee on the other side, and it is not fair to take advantage of some Member of the House.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will not the gentleman permit the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. OWEN] to explain the bill?

Mr. MONTAGUE. She is the patron of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield? Tell us something about this understanding the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BACHMANN. The gentleman heard it the other night.

Mrs. OWEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mrs. OWEN. Does the gentleman realize the purpose of this bill?

Mr. BACHMANN. I do.

Mrs. OWEN. The purpose is to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act to this claimant, although he failed to file the claim within the year as provided by law.

Mr. BACHMANN. Why did he not file his claim within the year?

Mrs. OWEN. This is a man over 80 years old, employed by the Government at a paltry wage. The man did not realize it was necessary to make more than a verbal complaint. This is exactly the same type of bill, five of which have been passed this evening. Would there be any equity in barring out the claim of this old man?

Mr. BACHMANN. I will say to the gentlewoman from Florida that I am glad to let the bill go by and not object to it, but I am calling the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that this is a Senate bill, and the gentleman from Indiana had a bill of the same kind where the gentleman involved is 78 or 79 years old and the bill is on all fours with this bill. He had his injury in 1927 and he was an employee of this House. There is no difference between that bill and the pending bill. I objected to the other bill the other night.

Mrs. OWEN. Will the gentleman point out what possible service it would be to this old gentleman to bar out this other man who has a claim against the Government?

Mr. BACHMANN. I will say to the gentlewoman from Florida that the only thing I am seeking to do is to give every Member the same right with respect to these matters and not prefer a Senate bill over a similar House bill.

Mr. PARKS. Because an injustice was done to another man, does the gentleman want to do an injustice to this claimant?

Mr. BACHMANN. No; but I want unanimous consent a little later to return to that bill.

Mr. PARKS. All right; the gentleman will get it.

Mrs. OWEN. I shall certainly not object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I will not object provided the House, before we pass the objection stage on this bill, will permit the gentleman from Indiana to go back and have his bill considered. It is on all fours with this bill, and I do not think it is proper to refuse to pass a House bill if we are going to pass a similar Senate bill in another case.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 12659).

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order has been demanded. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Nevada to ask unanimous consent to return to a bill, and the Chair will ask the gentleman whether the bill he refers to is back of the star.

Mr. ARENTZ. It is back of the star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If it is back of the star, the Chair is not in position to recognize the gentleman to make the request, in view of the statement made by the Speaker and the arrangement under which we are operating to-night.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the Chair explain again what is the rule that we are working under, and whether or not we have a right to go back of the star?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Chair read for the information of the House the statement of the Speaker in regard to procedure:

> The Chair will make this statement in order to clarify the procedure to-night. The Chair thinks that the orderly and fair way of complying with the resolution agreed to on February 26 would be to begin at the star and call each bill on the Private Calendar, and each Senate bill on the Speaker's table, where a similar House bill is on the Private Calendar, in their numerical order, in which both classes of bills appear on the Private Calendar. When that has been completed the Chair will then recognize Members to ask unanimous consent to take Senate bills from the Speaker's table where similar House bills are on the Private Calendar before the star.

Therefore the present occupant of the chair feels that he should not recognize the request to return to bills on the calendar before the star.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

FRED N. DUNHAM

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 3839, for the relief of Fred N. Dunham.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object. I will reserve the objection.

Mr. PARKS. I call for the regular order. Why should we have 30 minutes' debate when these bills are brought up when a Member knows that he is going to object, and block everybody who have bills ahead. That is the only reason I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKS. I ask for the regular order from now on.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

TO AMEND SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 25, 1927

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. J. Res. 56, to amend section 2 of the act of February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. L., pt. 2, p. 336).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. I object.

ROSCOE M'KINLEY MEADOWS

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. I object.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. COLLINS. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If my good friend will examine the bill, I think he will find it eminently just. Here is a man, a chaplain in the Navy, who sustained a 45 per cent injury. He was held to be a regular officer by the Comptroller General, and later the Navy held him to be a provisional officer, so he was caught both ways. He was a regular officer in the Navy or an emergency officer, or vice versa.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. In other words, under the ruling he was not eligible either as a regular or an emergency officer, and, of course, having served for over two years during the war as an officer of the Navy, subjecting himself to all of the risks, dangers, travails, and hardships of the service, he should be entitled to the benefits either as a regular officer or as an emergency officer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. I object.

DANIEL S. SCHAFFER CO. (INC.)

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1249, for the relief of Daniel S. Schaffer Co. (Inc.).

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This was a claim originally for over $33,000. The Senate passed it for $17,765, showing that there was that much inequity in it to start with. I object.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. GAMBRILL. This account was presented, it is true, for about $33,000, but in the auditing made by the Navy they disallowed certain items and reduced the amount to $17,765. Everything has been done in the orderly, customary way. The accounts have been audited by the Navy Department, the bill has been passed by the Senate, and has been favorably reported by the Committee on Claims. Everything has been done that could be done in order to put this bill in proper shape for consideration by this House. The only items allowed by the Navy Department were the excess labor costs which they were compelled to pay by reason of the act of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is based on a claim that runs back to 1917. If it could be taken up in an orderly way and discussed and argued in a proper way, we could likely reach some proper agreement, but to be brought here and disposed of in an instant is not proper on a $33,000 bill that has been already reduced to $17,765. I therefore object.

CAPT. JACOB M. PEARCE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 5779, for the relief of Capt. Jacob M. Pearce, United States Marine Corps.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I object.

Mr. COLLINS. I object.

Mr. BRIGGS. On what grounds do the gentlemen state that they object?

Mr. COLLINS. Because it rearranges the entire personnel of the Navy. I object.

COUNTY OF SOLANO, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3184, to permit the county of Solano in the State of California to lay, construct, install, and maintain sewer outlets over and across the Navy longitudinal dike and accretions thereto, in Mare Island Straits, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to permit the county of Solano in

the State of California to lay, construct, install, and maintain such sewer outlet or outlets as circumstances demand without detriment to naval interests, over and across the Navy longitudinal dike and accretions thereto, in Mare Island Straits, upon conditions and plans to be previously approved by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That the permission given pursuant to this act shall not pass any right or title in said dike or the accretions thereto and shall be revocable by the Secretary of the Navy when, in his judgment, the maintenance of said sewer outlets is inimical to or endangers the interests of the naval service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

JAMES H. ROACHE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 181, for the relief of James H. Roache.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, because there is an unfavorable report upon this bill. I would inquire whether these improvements were made by this claimant when he knew that he did not have any right to the land.

Mr. DRANE. No; he did not know. He spent all of the money he had on the property. He went on it in good faith. The Government put him on it in good faith, and he spent his money there doing everything that was necessary. After his money was spent the Government found that it had put him on in error and asked him to leave, and he had to leave, and he lost his money.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay James H. Roache, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $944.50 as reimbursement in full for expenses and losses incurred in connection with improvements made by him on the land embraced in his homestead entry 021325 for the southeast quarter northeast quarter section 4, township 35 south, range 26 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida, after said entry had been allowed on May 10, 1927, and prior to receipt of notice on or about June 27, 1927, that said allowed entry had been held for cancellation owing to fact the identical land was patented to the State of Florida August 31, 1903.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CLAUDE J. CHURCH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 401, for the relief of Claude J. Church.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Claude J. Church, a citizen and resident of Monroe, La., the sum of $300 as compensation for injuries received by him when struck by a mass of ice and snow falling on him from the roof of the Federal building at Monroe, La., when in the act of entering the said building.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I rise simply for the purpose of asking some Member from Louisiana to tell the Members of this House how often they have ice and snow in Louisiana so thick that it falls off a Federal building and strikes the head of a pedestrian. As long as there is no Member from Louisiana present who can enlighten the House I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BENJAMIN BRAZNELL

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 457, for the relief of Benjamin Braznell.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a tax bill, and I have been objecting to this class of bills.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I would not object to it for that reason alone.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. I am different from the gentleman from Missouri. I try to be consistent.

I would like to have some explanation of this bill.

Mr. KELLY. I will say that this measure has been before Congress for a number of years and favorable committee reports have repeatedly been made. The Treasury Department has admitted that there is a just claim, but that by a technicality as to the filing of the claim for refund it is impossible to pay this amount which is properly due the estate involved.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is similar to the other bills, Mr. Speaker, and I object.

AMOS D. CARVER ET AL.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 1367, for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill appropriates $35,000, and I object.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. This bill sets forth a claim that has already been passed upon by the Court of Claims, in which claimants were awarded $175,000. The United States Supreme Court handed down a decision to the effect that the Court of Claims had no jurisdiction. The Senate committee has passed this claim; the Senate has passed the bill; the House committee has reported it. The claimants are willing to accept $35,000. They already had a judgment on the merits by the Court of Claims for $175,000. The Government will save money by the passage of this bill. I think the gentleman, in view of the fact that the claimants are willing to accept this reduction, should withdraw his objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chief Justice has made such an eloquent oration in behalf of his bill that I turn it over to the Republican administration and call attention to the fact that it appropriates $35,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask whether the Speaker thinks there is a quorum present.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I only make the point of order because there is no use having this session to-night. What is the use of having the Senate pass bills when one man can object to them over here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. BLACK. Does the Speaker desire me to withdraw the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not the Chair thinks there is a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks there is a quorum.

STILLWELL BROS. (INC.)

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 1671, for the relief of Stillwell Bros. (Inc.).

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, a bill on all fours with this was objected to a minute ago by the gentleman from Texas, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GAMBRILL]. This is to pay a subcontractor.

Mr. MILLER. Is that any reason for objecting to this claim?

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, we like to be consistent.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not fool with them when they are that small.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the facts in this case, some years back we passed as an item in the naval appropriation bill authorization to the Navy Department to settle claims with principal contractors where there was loss occasioned by higher costs during the war.

Mr. MILLER. Yes; but it did not apply to subcontractors.

Mr. STAFFORD. It did not apply to subcontractors. This is a case where a subcontractor, under a principal contractor of the Navy Department, suffered a loss?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has served a long time on the Committee on Naval Affairs. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to how many similar cases there are of claims of subcontractors who would be entitled to relief if this bill were passed?

Mr. MILLER. At the time the act was passed granting relief to principal contractors there were many claims of subcontractors. I was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee at that time, and we thought the best thing to do would be to pass a bill giving relief to the principal contractors, but let the subcontractors either submit to an audit of their claims or come to Congress with a private bill. That is the principle we followed. This claim has been audited and has been reduced from $27,000 to $5,900.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House as to how many such claims exist, similar in their nature to this claim?

Mr. MILLER. No; I can not. I do not have that information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has Congress heretofore passed any bills of this character?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes. They have given relief to subcontractors.

Mr. SABATH. When we were not looking; yes. This would set up a dangerous precedent, and I object, Mr. Speaker.

THOMAS F. MYERS

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 5321, for the relief of Thomas F. Myers.

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, merely for the purpose of asking a question. This gentleman was on a sidewalk and a private automobile which had been commandeered by a policeman struck him.

Is it the idea of the chairman of the committee that the District is liable?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will say that I know something about the case. The bill was introduced by the chairman of the District Committee in the Senate. The automobile which struck the pedestrian on the sidewalk was in charge of an employee of the District of Columbia. The injury occurred in 1926 and the man lost his leg.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This bill merely permits the commissioners to adjudicate this claim. If the gentleman were to give his idea about the merits of it, it might induce the commissioners to do something that they otherwise might not decide to do. I would suggest that we merely pass the bill and leave it to the commissioners in their own discretion.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is what the commissioners ask may be done rather than to permit the man to have another day in court.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Mississippi asked the gentleman from Virginia to express his views as to the merits of the case.

Mr. COLLINS. I heartily thank the gentleman from Texas for his voluntary suggestions to me; however, I know what I am after.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Texas is desirous of helping out a little bit this time.

Mr. BLANTON. The commissioners are so used to following WALTON MOORE, and this House usually does the same thing, and I suggest that we do not object to the bill but allow it to go through.

Mr. SABATH. They can not follow a better man than the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. COLLINS. The thought I have is this: Here was a citizen on the sidewalk and the automobile which struck him was a private automobile.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But in charge of the Government's officer and, to all intents and purposes, a Government vehicle for the time being. That is the situation, and the statute says that in such a case as that the District is liable to a suit, that statute having been passed in 1930.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume the gentleman would have no objection to a clause providing that no interest shall be allowed on the amount of the award.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The only thing is that might prejudice it. I will give the gentleman my word of honor that I will communicate with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and say that was the intent at the time this bill was passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that assurance I shall not press the amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is it proper for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] to sit beside the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman believe the bill is on all fours with the bill that was objected to by the Democratic objector the other night, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL].

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman from Wisconsin is mistaken. I did not object to that bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I thought the gentleman, Mr. COLLINS, and the gentleman, Mr. BACHMANN, both took the floor and indicated that they had an agreement to object to those compensation bills.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. This is not a bill of that sort.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It is on the same principle.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It is to waive the statute of limitations. The claim has not been filed and prosecuted under the law which was in effect providing for giving an injured person an opportunity to have his day in court. If the man were in court to-day—and he was in court once—the District Commissioners would have the right to waive the statute of limitations.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I shall not press my objection, but I hope that before this Congress adjourns the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] may bring his meritorious bill up, and I may say at this time that I shall not object this evening if the gentlewoman from Florida will ask unanimous consent to return to the bill to which I objected.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, to hear, determine, and settle, under the act approved February 11, 1929, as amended by the act of June 5, 1930, entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," the claim of Thomas F. Myers against the District of Columbia on account of injury sustained by him on September 8, 1926.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CICERO A. HILLIARD

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement just made by my colleague, that he withdraws his objection to Private Calendar bill No. 1126, Senate bill 2481, I ask unanimous consent that we return to that bill.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HAZEL L. FAUBER, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 3230, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States

to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Hazel L. Fauber, as administratrix, C. T. A., under the last will and testament of William Harrison Fauber, deceased, against the United States, for the use or manufacture of inventions of William Harrison Fauber, deceased, a similar House bill, H. R. 9364, being on the calendar.

There being no objection, the bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding the lapse of time or the statute of limitations to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment under the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., ch. 423, p. 851), as amended July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. L., ch. 114, pp. 704, 705; U. S. C., title 35, sec. 68), on the claim of Hazel L. Fauber, as administratrix, C. T. A., under the last will and testament of William Harrison Fauber, deceased, or her successor, as the legal representative of the estate of said decedent, for the use of or the manufacture by or for the United States without license of the owner thereof or the lawful right to use or manufacture the same, of certain inventions of said William Harrison Fauber, deceased, described in or covered by Letters Patent Nos. 971029, 1024682, and 1121006, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on September 27, 1910, April 30, 1912, and December 15, 1914, respectively.

SEC. 2. That from any decision in any suit prosecuted under the authority of this act an appeal may be taken by either party as is provided for by law in other cases.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 9364) was laid on the table.

J. D. STEWART

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 3144, for the relief of J. D. Stewart.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill that is similar to the one objected to by the gentleman from West Virginia and it is also similar to the bill which was presented by Mr. VESTAL, of Indiana, some time previously. It would be my suggestion to the House that we consider all three of these bills at this time, because they are all alike, and settle them at this time, and stop the wrangling which has been going on, and which I think, has crowded out three meritorious bills, because the parties did not file within one year under the compensation law.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this unanimous-consent request will be granted.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. OWEN] ought to be allowed to call up her bill and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] ought to be allowed to call up his bill and that they all should be considered.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is it not possible for the House of Representatives by unanimous consent to do anything to-night that it desires to do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Under the ruling of the Speaker before the House adjourned this afternoon it was understood we would not go back of the star until after all the Senate bills had been considered.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I submit this unanimous-consent request at this time, that this bill, being similar to the one that the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. OWEN] introduced, that we return to her bill and pass that bill, and then pass the pending bill, with the understanding that after the calendar has been finished, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] will be allowed to call up his bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, that would be a violation of the understanding, I submit, that we had when we went into this session and to preserve the rules of the House the present occupant of the chair should not entertain the request.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It would not be a violation of the rules, because we have frequently returned to bills ahead of the star after the calendar had been finished at the evening session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After we have finished the other bills, the Chair would be willing to entertain such a request.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I submitted my request in a spirit of harmony, because all three of the bills are similar and all of them are meritorious.

Mr. BACHMANN. I think that is what should be done and when we reach the end of the calendar, I will agree to that request.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I am not asking now to go back of the star, but to consider the bill of the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. OWEN], with the understanding that after the calendar has been finished, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] can submit his request to go back at that time.

Mr. BACHMANN. Reserving the right to object, I have no objection if the gentleman will make his request at the conclusion of the calendar so that all three bills can be taken up at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks that would be all right.

Mr. BACHMANN. With that understanding, I shall renew my request after the calendar is called.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOWARD DIMICK

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 5195, for the relief of Howard Dimick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Howard Dimick for refund of the amount paid by him for the purchase of a motor vessel *V–13604* sold by the Prohibition Service but not delivered to him, and to allow said claim in an amount not exceeding $910. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $910, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of this claim.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. MORRIS WHITE

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 5198, for the relief of T. Morris White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of T. Morris White as reimbursement for balance of money not previously refunded of the amount of $152.49 erroneously paid to the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital for 586½ cubic yards of ashes and cinders retained for the use of the contracting officer as provided by contract PBP–13, dated June 23, 1926, and covered into the Treasury of the United States, along with other money received from said contractor as "Miscellaneous receipts, proceeds of Government property," and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim not to exceed $69.81. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $69.81, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay this claim.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DRY DOCK & REPAIR CO. (INC.)

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 5200, for the relief of the National Dry Dock & Repair Co. (Inc.).

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, what is this bill about?

Mr. BLANTON. Two hundred and four dollars.

Mr. SABATH. What is it for?

Mr. BLANTON. The Comptroller General recommends that this bill be enacted, and whenever he recommends a bill, that is all I want to know.

Mr. SABATH. And the gentleman approves it?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman from Texas approves it, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of the National Dry Dock & Repair Co. (Inc.) for damages resulting from the action of the Government in can-

celing a proposal accepted March 11, 1930, for certain repair work to the steamer *Pickering*, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim the sum of not to exceed $204. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $204, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for payment of the claim.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, these are relief bills that we are considering, and I want to say that the business revival has brought relief to many of my constituents. In Amsterdam, N. Y., the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Mills, which have been operating only two days a week, started a week ago Monday to run five days a week. The Chalmers Knitting Mills Co., one of the largest users of cotton in my territory, started last Monday and notified the employees that they would run from midnight Sunday nights to midnight Saturday nights on a 24-hour schedule for at least eight months. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I mention these facts to show that there is at least a ray of the sunshine of prosperity gleaming through the clouds of depression. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in the discussions as to the causes of this period of depression which has seriously affected agricultural and industrial prosperity the critics have all laid great stress upon the evil effects of the present tariff law known as the Hawley-Smoot bill. Democratic orators have made the welkin ring with their vociferous denunciations of this tariff law, and without offering the slightest evidence point to it as the primary cause of the business depression.

The fact that our exports have decreased very considerably is not conclusive evidence that retaliatory tariffs by foreign countries have shut out our merchandise. The whole world is involved in this depression, and the purchasing power of foreign nations has shrunk in the same ratio as it has in this country.

We have had five periods of depression and unemployment during the last 50 years, and this is the first really severe one that has occurred during a Republican administration. During our past periods of depression, however, the rest of the world was in fairly good shape and our recovery was not long delayed.

Agriculture was hard hit by the drought last year and farmers who depended upon cotton and grain for their income were in many sections of the country left almost destitute. A fairly normal crop of both wheat and corn was harvested in spite of abnormal weather conditions, but unfortunately the world supply increased tremendously and the price obtained by our farm folks was in many instances below the cost of production. Russia alone increased her wheat production 475,000,000 bushels in 1930. Evidence given by witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee during the Russian embargo hearings clearly demonstrates that the United States has lost her foreign market for export wheat. Russia can produce her wheat for 17 cents per bushel. This certainly demonstrates that we must produce only for our own consumption, and if necessary raise our tariff on wheat to a point where forced labor production in Russia shall not drive our farmers to the wall.

The statement that the present tariff is unconscionably high is without foundation of fact. The public is fed up on declarations of this character, which are issued purely as political propaganda. Two-thirds of our imports from foreign countries are admitted free of duty. One-third are on the dutiable list. In the writing of the Hawley-Smoot bill only one-third of the rates on dutiable commodities were changed, and they were not all raises by any means.

WHAT IS REAL PROTECTION?

In the national Republican platform of 1908 you will find the following:

> In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

This last sentence in this statement is the meat in the coconut, and just so long as we base the allocation of rates, or their change by the Tariff Commission, on a basis of the difference in production costs here and abroad, with no consideration of the "reasonable profit to American industries," then we are departing from our fundamental policy of a protective tariff and subscribing to the doctrine of a competitive tariff.

FOREIGN COSTS VERSUS INVOICE AVERAGES

Where cost of production in foreign countries is not ascertainable as described in section 336 (h) (4) the Tariff Commission is now availing itself of section 336 (e) (2), which permits the use of the weighted average of invoice prices as evidence of such costs. This method has been used in the majority of the cases recently decided, and their report shows that the duties on five commodities—wood flour, pigskin leather, hats, bonnets, and hoods of straw, and so forth, and maple sugar and maple sirup—were all reduced and that one—woven-wire fencing—was raised. The importation of these products in 1929 amounted to $3,400,000, and the reduced duties will mean a saving to the importers and a loss to the Treasury of $500,000 on that basis.

It may be interesting to those of you who are vitally interested in a protective tariff to read what the American Tariff League suggested at an interview with the Tariff Commission. An extract from their statement follows:

USE OF FOREIGN INVOICE PRICES IN LIEU OF COSTS

> In a majority of the commission's flexible tariff reports thus far submitted the recommended changes in duty are made not on the basis of the difference between foreign and domestic costs but on the basis of the difference between the invoice prices of imports and domestic costs of production. This, we told the commission, was not in our opinion a fulfillment of the protective principle in the tariff law, nor in many cases would it be fair to the American producer to base a duty on the difference between his cost and the foreigner's invoice price in view of the fact that the latter would ordinarily include the foreigner's cost plus a share of his selling expenses and profits, and in some cases might also include foreign income or profits taxes.
>
> On this basis we urged upon the commission that flexible tariff rate adjustments be made on the basis of the difference between foreign and domestic costs as the law contemplated, and that in case where the expense and difficulty of securing actual foreign costs were prohibitive, that the commission arrive at a constructive foreign cost on the basis of the difference between foreign and domestic wages, costs of raw materials, and investment charges (all of which are available or readily ascertainable in the foreign country), instead of using foreign invoice prices as the equivalent of foreign costs. In this latter connection we referred particularly to the commission's recent findings in the wood-flour investigation. In these the commission considered the average invoice value of imported wood flour of $13.79 a ton, as the equivalent of the foreign cost of production, and on this basis recommended a decrease in the wood-flour duty from 33⅓ to 25 per cent. For purposes of illustrating our viewpoint we pointed out that if the average foreign selling price of $13.79 included, say, only a 10 per cent margin for foreign selling expenses, profits, and similar items, that the 33⅓ per cent duty would have been within 1 per cent of equalizing the foreign and domestic costs, thereby indicating no reason for a decrease in the duty.
>
> In order to make clear to the commission our viewpoint on the equalization of foreign and domestic costs we referred to the declared intention of the tariff law to protect American industry and labor—an intention also clearly indicated in the provisions under which the commission operates. In view of this and also of the provision in the law giving the commission the legal power to demand cost data from the American producer under oath (which authority does not extend to the foreigner), we proposed that in the administration of the flexible tariff provision the commission should place the burden of the proceedings on the foreign producer or importer; that in cases where the commission could not readily ascertain foreign costs that the foreign producer or importer should be required to furnish accurate foreign costs. His failure to do so should be construed as an unwillingness on his part to cooperate with the commission and should operate to deny to him the right to object to the foreign cost as determined or construed by the commission.
>
> After permitting us to present our views, the commissioners discussed our suggestions, but with no indication that they would be considered, at least for the present. Chairman Fletcher advised us that the commission had resolved upon its present rules of procedure after due consideration and that no change in these would be made for the time being. Further in this connection, the chairman advised us that a resolution adopted by the National Council of American Importers and Traders requesting the commission to return to the former policy of making available a preliminary statement of information had been denied by the commission.

In view, therefore, of this very definite indication of the commission's intention to pursue its present policy, we earnestly renew our suggestion to our members concerned with flexible tariff investigations that they be prepared to furnish the commission with the most complete evidence of foreign costs available to them. Chairman FLETCHER advised us that the commission has in contemplation a considerable enlargement in its foreign staff, with headquarters in Brussels, but until the commission itself shall undertake by some such means the collection of adequate foreign cost data it is our opinion that the present procedure places the burden in flexible-tariff investigations largely on the domestic producer. Believing this, we emphasize it to our members, and for their assistance in meeting this problem we have prepared a suggested schedule of information which we believe should, if possible, be submitted to the commission in order to avoid flexible-tariff adjustments made on the basis of incomplete or inaccurate data. A copy of this schedule is inclosed, and we invite your suggestions and criticisms of it.

TARIFF FOR ALL

If the policy of protective tariff can not be applied with equal advantage to all commodities—where foreign competition destroys market values, regardless of its percentage of domestic production—then there is something basically wrong with the policy. In my opinion, it can and should be applied all along the line, and no American producer, whether he supplies industrial products, agricultural products, or products of the mine and the oil well, should be denied its advantage. I regret that the oil producers did not come to Congress during the consideration of the tariff by the Ways and Means Committee. Later on they presented their case and no fairer, no stronger case for tariff protection has been before the Congress in years.

While the importations are only 11 per cent of domestic production, the advantage of cheap production and cheap transportation are all in favor of the importing companies. The cry was raised that the price of gasoline would be raised to the consumer, but the evidence submitted at the hearings demonstrated that there was no relation between the price of gasoline and the price of crude oil even at the eastern seaboard, where transportation rates were lowest.

PROPHECY UNFULFILLED

When the tariff bill was under consideration we heard the Democratic spellbinders shout from the housetops the declaration that the duty on sugar would cost the people of this country $100,000,000 a year; that the duty on cement would cost the farmer and the builder millions more; that boots and shoes would cost more; blankets would advance in price and clothing prices would go up. But none of these dismal predictions have come to pass. All these commodities are cheaper to-day than when the tariff bill was passed. The Democratic prophets are without honor save in their own bailiwicks.

The house of Raskob, Shouse & Co. scattered their propaganda concerning the cost of the tariff bill to the American people to the four corners of this Nation. One billion dollars, they declared, would be the burden placed on our consumers. In 1922 a Democratic spokesman, the Hon. Norman W. Davis, made the statement that the "burden on the tax-burdened masses would be $6,000,000,000 due to the Fordney-McCumber bill," and now my Democratic friends are quoting an economist who, they say, is an authority on the tariff as contending that—

If only one-half of the legalized tariff allowances are added to the merchandise sold in our general stores, the cost to consumers is $10,000,000,000 annually, as computed by experienced Federal statisticians.

The logical deduction is that if it was all added, the cost to consumers would be twice that amount, or $20,000,000,000, but either statement falls far short of being the truth.

ADDED-COSTS THEORY IS A DUD

If you will examine the hearings on the Hawley-Smoot bill held in 1929, I feel certain that you will not find any evidence that any commodity which had a protective rate in the Fordney-McCumber bill in 1922 had increased in price to the consumers during that period of seven years. On the other hand, many commodities had fallen in price, due to rapidly increasing imports, and the American producers appeared in behalf of a higher rate of protection. All the Democratic attacks upon the tariff costs to consumers are based upon the theory that the rate of duty is added to the retail price of the merchandise. As a matter of fact, this condition has never prevailed and they know it, and they also know that such a premise is incorrect and can not be substantiated by facts. But it is so easy to say that a 20 per cent ad valorem duty on imported shoes makes a $5 shoe made in America cost $6 to the consumer that they can not refrain from this illogical, unsound method of computation. The ease with which the result may be arrived at especially appeals to my Democratic friends from the "hookworm" territory.

WHERE ARE THE DEMOCRATS ON THE TARIFF QUESTION?

Traditionally against the policy for many years, fighting it tooth and nail at every opportunity, they were converted to the policy almost overnight by Mr. John J. Raskob, who succeeded in having 90 per cent of the Democratic candidates for Congress in 1928 declare for the protective tariff plank in the Houston platform.

During the revision of the tariff following this election, no Democrat lost or was denied an opportunity to present his case in behalf of his constituents where an adjustment of rates seemed necessary. Outstanding Democrats declared that the protective tariff was here to stay, and they were desirous that its benefits be extended to their constituents where foreign competition was gradually encroaching upon the home market.

But once the tariff bill became a law, then the barrage of calumny and vituperation broke loose. On the platform, in the press, and over the radio we read and listened to such nonsensical phrases as "unconscionably high rates," "subservience to big business," "the Grundy tariff," "a robber tariff," "vicious legislation to repay campaign contributors," and a host of other vindictive and false accusations that are not supported by facts, but what does a free trader care for facts? He is the same gentleman who, in his platform of 1892, said, "We denounce the McKinley tariff law as the culminating atrocity of class legislation." He is the same glib-tongued gentleman who in the 1904 platform said:

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few.

It is the same gentleman who, in his 1924 platform, said that "the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act is the most unjust, unscientific, and dishonest tariff-tax measure ever enacted in our history."

At least one outstanding Democrat must have changed his mind for my good friend and committee colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] introduced at this session the old Fordney-McCumber bill with some minor changes, including the substitution of the Hawley-Smoot agricultural rates for those in the old law. His action is another example of the fairness and consistency which are marked characteristics in the legislative activities of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

BACKSLIDING RASKOBITES

It is quite evident that a considerable percentage of the 90 per cent that might well be termed Raskobites are backsliders and have made an earnest endeavor to rally the sadly depleted forces of the Jeffersonian Democracy, and to this effort the 10 per cent of Simon-pures who turned a deaf ear to the siren call of John J. and Al are extending a helping hand.

My Democratic friends, why do you not get together on this vital economic policy? Many of your most brilliant members have subscribed to its merits. Your constituents are and have been benefited by the tariff over a long period of years. When the Republicans write a tariff bill we listen to your supplications—and sometimes they are in the nature of demands—and in a spirit of fairness we accede to those demands, even though we know you will vote against the bill on final passage.

Your chief argument during a campaign is that it is an economic and not a political problem, and yet in and out of Congress you play politics with this important policy at every opportunity.

How are you Democrats going to be able to look the world squarely in the eye when you are explaining your attitude on this question? You have been against it; you have declared for it; some of you have supported it half-heartedly; and some of you have passed by on the other side, and a woefully small contingent of willful men announce very faintly that they are still free traders. What a predicament you are in!

Come on out in the open; do not let your prejudice override your judgment, but be fair enough to support legislation that your constituents have benefited by and that has materially improved our living conditions.

WHY BLAME THE TARIFF?

That we have passed through a period of serious depression no sensible person will deny, but to hold the tariff responsible for such conditions is manifestly unfair. We are looking forward to a gradual recovery with a renewal of industrial and agricultural activities, and the tariff law will aid rather than prevent such recovery. It is the first time in more than 50 years that the Democrats have had an opportunity to spread propaganda relating to unemployment under a Republican administration, and they have certainly worked overtime.

1930 NOT A TOTAL LOSS

In the Magazine of Wall Street, Theodore Knappen reviews things, and finds that while conditions are bad enough, 1930 has not by any means been a total loss; for example, he points out that the brunt of the business depression fell on the steel, construction, and automobile industries. But even so, these industries were better off than in 1920.

Similarly, the total volume of manufactures in America in 1930 was far above the total for 1920. There was only a slight drop in electric power output from 1929. The gasoline consumption for 1930 was the largest in American history. Department store sales in 1930 equaled those of 1929 in volume and were only slightly below them in value. Chain-store sales increased in volume and fell off in value only fractionally.

Nor is that all. Savings banks deposits gained during 1930. The aggregate of interest and dividend payments on securities was considerably ahead of that of 1929. Capital issues of domestic securities were larger than in any previous years except 1928 and 1929.

The country is in better health than we supposed. This is not to say that there has not been much suffering. But it does mean that the country is on a sound basis for a healthy revival.

LABOR INDORSES TARIFF

During the hearings held previous to the tariff revision the American Federation of Labor expressed itself in no uncertain terms as favoring the policy of protective tariff. Mr. Matthew Woll appeared as a representative of the International Allied Printing Trades Association, and stated that—

He would be glad to join with any other group to get full and adequate protection, which has been the principle of American labor.

Later on in the hearings he stated:

I favor protecting every industry, whether it be agriculture or otherwise, against foreign competition.

Never before has organized labor been represented by as many witnesses at tariff hearings, and their attitude has been one of exact fairness in the application of the protective-tariff policy. The title of the bill is as follows: "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes," and with these worthy objectives no real American will disagree.

THREE TARIFF POLICIES

There are three definable tariff positions: A tariff for revenue only, allocating duties so low as to give the foreign manufacturer an appreciable advantage in our markets and increase importations to displace American-made goods. Second, a competitive tariff, which lays duties that will exactly equalize the cost of production here and abroad and give the foreign producer an equal chance to supply the needs of our people. Third, a protective tariff that will allocate such duties as will keep the American market for the American producer, permit the payment of decent wages, and maintain the American standard of living.

This is the policy that has been instrumental in making us the greatest of all nations, and if the Hawley-Smoot bill had not been enacted into law we should have seen our markets flooded with foreign merchandise and the existing depression would have been far more disastrous in its results.

Our people are very soon going to awaken to the fact that the policy of real protection to American industry has been sidetracked for a makeshift policy of competitive tariff. When they come to a full realization of the evils that may result we shall hear from them in no uncertain terms, and their message will be a demand to return to the protective policy.

C. O. SMITH

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 5201, for the relief of C. O. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of C. O. Smith for loss or damages sustained on account of the Government's destruction of 2,800 pounds of seed cotton owned by him and which remained unharvested from a 7-acre tract of land leased to the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, for experimental plots for cultural control investigations in re pink bollworm of cotton, under lease No. Ae-992, dated November 12, 1929, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim not to exceed the sum of $168. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $168, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay said claim.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COOS HEAD RIVER MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 3360, authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the University of Oregon certain lands forming a part of the Coos Head River and Harbor Reservation.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the University of Oregon, State of Oregon, subject to the conditions hereinafter specified, the following described part of the Coos Head River and Harbor Reservation situated on the south shore of the entrance to Coos Bay in Coos County, Ore.:

All of lot 2, the westerly 750 feet of lot 3, all of lot 1 except the west 300 feet thereof, and all of the southwest quarter northwest quarter, except the west 300 feet thereof, all in section 2, township 26 south, range 14 west, Willamette meridian, in the county of Coos, Ore.; excepting therefrom the parcels of land released to the Treasury Department by letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, dated April 24, 1913, and more particularly described as follows: Site for station buildings beginning at a point north 41° 30′ west 1,307 feet from the southeast corner northwest quarter of section 2, township 26 south, range 14 west, Willamette meridian, thence north 33° 15′ west 400 feet; thence west 33° 15′ south 400 feet; thence south 33° 15′ east 400 feet; thence east 33° 15′ minutes north 400 feet to the point of beginning, and containing 3.673 acres; also a site for lifeboat house commencing at a point 775 feet north 33° 15 minutes west from the starting point of site and the station grounds; thence running west 33° 15′ south 150 feet; thence south 33° 15′ east 225 feet; thence east 33° 15′ north 150 feet; thence north 33° 15 minutes west 225 feet to the point of beginning, and containing 0.774 of an acre.

SEC. 2. The lands herein authorized to be conveyed shall be used by the University of Oregon solely for scientific and educational purposes, subject, however, to the right of the United States, in case of war or other emergency, to assume control of, hold, use, and occupy said lands or any part thereof for any and all military, naval, or other governmental purposes, and subject at all times to the rights of the United States, stated in section 4 hereof. The deed executed by the Secretary of War under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall contain the express condition that if the University of Oregon shall at any time attempt to alienate said lands that same shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant the use of the Coos Head Military Reservation, in the State of Oregon, to the cities of Marshfield and North Bend, Oreg., both being municipal corporations, for

park purposes," approved August 21, 1916, and of any permit granted by the Secretary of War under such act, shall not apply to the lands herein authorized to be conveyed, after the date of such conveyance, nor shall such act or permit apply to the unconveyed part of lot 3 after the date of this act.

SEC. 4. The lands herein authorized to be conveyed to the University of Oregon shall at all times be subject to the right of the United States to occupy and use such part thereof as are now or may hereafter be needed for jetty site or sites, for rights of way for tramways from the unconveyed part of lot 3 to such jetty site or sites, and for ingress and egress by persons engaged in river and harbor work; and the United States shall at all times have prior right to three-fourths of the natural flow of streams draining lots 2 and 3.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES WILLIAMSON

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 4435, for the relief of James Williamson and those claiming under or through him.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been waiting all through the third session of the Seventy-third Congress for the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] to take the floor and picture the bread lines and the soup kitchens under Democratic administration. I have been wanting to take him to New York and show him the bread line; not in single file but in phalanxes, in legions, to show him the bread line and the soup lines—not under Democratic administration but under high protection Republican administration. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, we are not paying any attention to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] because he has just been to a banquet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue to James Williamson, in trust for those claiming under or through him, the patent of the United States for lots 5, 6, and 7, section 14; lots 7, 8, and 9, section 23; and lots 1, 2, and 3, section 24, all in township 30 south, range 38 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida, without mineral reservation, the same to be in lieu of the patent which issued to James Williamson in trust for those claiming under or through him, on April 3, 1930, under the act of December 22, 1928, containing a reservation of coal and all other minerals.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JAMES W. NUGENT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 35, for the relief of James W. Nugent.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers James W. Nugent, late of Troop F, First Regiment United States Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said troop and regiment on July 29, 1903: *Provided*, That no pension, back pay, or allowances shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 9 after the word "pension" insert the word "bounty," and in line 10, strike out the word "accrue" and insert "to be held to have accrued."

The committee amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JESSE J. BRITTON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 155, for the relief of Jesse J. Britton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers, their widows, and dependent relatives Jesse J. Britton, who served in Troop H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said organization on September 22, 1900: *Provided*, That no back pay, pension, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

IRENE STRAUSS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1918, for the relief of Irene Strauss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Irene Strauss, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government, for the death of her husband, Arthur B. Strauss, resulting from injuries sustained when he was struck by a United States mail truck in San Francisco, Calif., on September 26, 1927: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JAMES M. BOOTH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3050, for the relief of James M. Booth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, to James M. Booth, dependent father of Stancil Hume Booth, the sum of $1,500 on account of the death of his son, Stancil Hume Booth, who was killed while on duty at Fort Screven, Chatham County, Ga., on April 9, 1929, by coming in contact with an electric wire on a pole in the Government reservation at Fort Screven, Tybee Island, Chatham County, Ga., which pole and electric-lighting system was the property of the United States Government and under its control.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WALTER J. BRYSON PAVING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4434, for the relief of Walter J. Bryson Paving Co.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

G. ELIAS & BRO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4334, for the relief of G. Elias & Bro. (Inc.).

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object. This bill appropriates $20,000 and the Postmaster General reports that it is not just; that these airplanes were refused acceptance. The bill is disapproved by the department. Therefore I object.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I want to say what the facts are with regard to this bill. By examining the papers it will be seen that Paul Henderson, son-in-law of the late Martin B. Madden, was the Second Assistant Postmaster General of the United States. He gave an order for five airplanes and those five airplanes were tested by a committee. A favorable report was made by the test committee upon all of these airplanes. Four of them were paid for. This particular airplane only was not paid for. Then the matter was investigated by the expert of the department. We have his report here. It says that this airplane had all the tests and was fully up to the standard and should have been accepted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.
Mr. BLANTON. Here is what the Postmaster General said.
Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; but the Postmaster General——
Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman ought to know it.
Mr. DEMPSEY. I know exactly what he said.
Mr. BLANTON. He is your Postmaster General.
Mr. DEMPSEY. Wait a minute.
Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from New York has no confidence in him.
Mr. BLANTON. Is not Walter M. Brown your Postmaster General? Let me call attention to what he says. If you are not going to let the House know what the Postmaster General says there is no use of going any further.
Mr. DEMPSEY. But that is not what he says to-day.
Mr. BLANTON. I am not surprised. He may change his mind a dozen times a day.
Mr. DEMPSEY. He has changed his mind. He sent a representative before the Senate committee, and the representative before the Senate committee testified that this claim was a just claim.
Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman want us to consider his remarks? Let me tell the Members what the Postmaster General said.
Mr. DEMPSEY. But that is past history. That is not what he is saying to-day.
Mr. BLANTON. He says this airplane was the fifth on the list.
Mr. DEMPSEY. He says also that it was a good airplane and that it met all of the tests.
Mr. BLANTON. But it was turned down.
Mr. DEMPSEY. No; he sent his representative before the Senate committee, and they say——
Mr. BLANTON. I will say this to the gentleman: The gentleman has rendered such signal service to the United States Government and his people on waterways, and I have such a high regard for his splendid work in that particular, that if his Republican administration will let $20,000 be paid to a Democrat when the Postmaster General, a Republican, says that it is not just, why, take it out of the Treasury and pay it. I am willing that he should have it.
Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say this: I have had 16 years of service here, and this is the first private claim I have ever had.
Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ELIZABETH B. DAYTON

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 5839, for the relief of Elizabeth B. Dayton, a similar House bill (H. R. 13735) being on the House Calendar.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
Mr. STAFFORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

W. W. PAYNE

The Clerk called the next bill on the calendar, S. 43, for the relief of W. W. Payne.
There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to George Snyder or his assigns, upon his executing and filing a satisfaction of the judgment hereinafter referred to, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of the judgment recovered by him in the United States District Court for the District of Montana against W. W. Payne for acts committed by the said Payne as and while acting as superintendent of the Glacier National Park and by direction of the Director of National Parks, not to exceed the sum of $1,800; and should the amount necessary to satisfy such judgment be less than $1,800, then to pay the difference to the said W. W. Payne.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the figure "$1,800," strike out the balance of line 2, all of line 3, and line 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.
The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
A similar House bill was laid on the table.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, owing to so much confusion, I did not hear Calendar 1219 called. I would like to ask if it was called.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was called and objected to.
Mr. GIFFORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to return to Calendar 1219.
Mr. WOOD. I object.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Clerk will call the next bill.

MRS. HERMAN M. WARR

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 5353, for the relief of Mrs. Herman M. Warr, a similar House bill, H. R. 15229, being on the House Calendar.
Mr. BACHMANN. I object.
Mr. RUTHERFORD. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?
Mr. BACHMANN. I will withhold the objection.
Mr. RUTHERFORD. This is a very meritorious case. This man had been in the employ of the Prohibition Unit. He was a disabled World War veteran and he could not qualify regularly for civil service on account of his disability. This man was killed in a prohibition raid and he left seven little children, the oldest 9 years of age. This bill has the recommendation of the department if the gentleman will read it. All departments have recommended it.
Mr. BACHMANN. Why did he not file a claim with the Compensation Commission?
Mr. RUTHERFORD. The man is dead. This bill only gives his widow the benefit of the Employees' Compensation Commission with the amount fixed in the bill as the maximum.
Mr. BACHMANN. Why did she not file a claim within the time limit of one year?
Mr. RUTHERFORD. She did not know anything about it. The man was just killed last August—August, 1930.
Mr. BACHMANN. She still has time then. Why did she not take it up with the Employees' Compensation Commission? What is the need of the legislation?
Mr. IRWIN. The need of the legislation is that in order to compute compensation you have to state the salary. This man was on a per diem basis.
Mr. BACHMANN. This case is not on all fours with the other cases then?
Mr. IRWIN. No; it is not.
Mr. BACHMANN. This action must be taken?
Mr. IRWIN. Yes. This action must be taken.
Mr. BACHMANN. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. SABATH. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order is demanded.
Mr. RUTHERFORD. I will tell the gentleman the reason. At the time this man was killed he had just got out of the service, and, strictly speaking, they could not recognize him as a civilian employee at that time.
Mr. SABATH. So, he was not in the employ, but you provide, nevertheless, $150 a month?
Mr. RUTHERFORD. No. They only get two-thirds of that. He had only been out a few days.
Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. SABATH. I yield.
Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is this not the case where a man was temporarily employed and taken in a raid by a Federal prohibition agent, and therefore he did not come under the United States Employees' Commission, although he was performing his duty as a Government agent?
Mr. RUTHERFORD. That is the case exactly.
Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I hope my colleague will withdraw his objection. The Claims Committee carefully considered the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission shall be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to extend to Mrs. Herman M. Warr, widow of Herman M. Warr, a former employee of the Bureau of Prohibition, the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for

employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, and the pay of the said Herman M. Warr, at the time of his death, shall be deemed to have been at the rate of $150 per month.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: At the end of line 12, strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR J. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 2615, for the relief of Arthur J. Robinson, a similar House bill, H. R. 7695, being on the House Calendar.

Mr. BLACK. Reserving the right to object, what is this bill about?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. It is simply to correct a military record.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws or any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Army Arthur J. Robinson shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged as an unassigned recruit, United States Army, on January 18, 1903: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

JOHN DONAHUE

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 351, for the relief of John Donahue.

There being no objection, the bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws or any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Navy John Donahue shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the United States Navy on March 19, 1903: *Provided*, That no pension, pay, or bounty shall be held to have accrued by reason of this act prior to its passage.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

G. ELIAS & BRO. (INC.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Mississippi has satisfied himself that he was under a misapprehension in objecting to No. 1206 on the calendar and that he withdraws his objection.

Mr. COLLINS. I have no objection to returning to the bill, but the gentleman is misquoting me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to returning to this bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object. Let us proceed with the calendar.

JOHN E. ROSS

The clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 1640, for the relief of John E. Ross.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. This is a case in which this man received no notice that his property was taken. The statute of limitations passed, and the Navy Department permitted others to go on and take his oysters. He was damaged to a greater extent than that allowed by the committee. A similar claim, wherein a party had the right to go before the Court of Claims, with a less acreage, resulted in a judgment of $14,000 in that case. That man had only 98 acres while this man had 235 acres. There was no opportunity given, and through the action of the Navy Department he was deprived of his property and no relief at all was given him.

Mr. STAFFORD. When did this claim arise?

Mr. BLAND. The Government took the property in 1918 or 1919, and notified parties to come before a special board, but in this particular case they gave no notice to this man and he had no knowledge that his property was taken until after the statute of limitations had expired. If that had not been so he would have gone into the Court of Claims.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I may say that when this claim was considered by the full Claims Committee a question arose with reference to it, particularly with reference to one or two members, and Judge Box, the chairman of the subcommittee, who had given it very careful consideration, got further evidence, and then after a second hearing, which lasted an hour and a half, the committee favorably reported the bill.

Mr. BLAND. There was a question about the acreage, and in order to satisfy the committee we got an abstract of title from the Commonwealth down to the time the property passed into the hands of this man.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct. We considered that at the second hearing before the Claims Committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any attorney interested in this case?

Mr. BLAND. I think so, but I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will have no objection to the usual attorney's fee clause?

Mr. BLAND. I shall be compelled to accept it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has such wonderful persuasive powers with the Senators from his State that there will be no question about getting the bill through the Senate.

There being no objection the bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to John E. Ross, of Williamsburg, Va., the sum of $15,350 as compensation for his oyster grounds, for oysters on said grounds, and for his dwelling house, and damage to his oyster business as a result of the Federal Government taking over said property and area for a Navy mine depot.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: In line 9, after the word "depot," strike out the period, insert a colon and add the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PUBLIC SERVICE COORDINATED TRANSPORT OF NEWARK, N. J.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 2035, for the relief of the Public Service Coordinated Transport of Newark, N. J.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object. This bill appropriates $122,442.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. This is a claim that has been approved by the Comptroller General of the United States, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. BLANTON. That is right, but it ought not to pass here.

Mr. ACKERMAN. It is a war claims bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but it ought not to pass in that sum without any consideration at all.

Mr. ACKERMAN. There has been a large amount of consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. It is too large a sum to pass here at this hour and without consideration.

Mr. ACKERMAN. If the gentleman pleases, there has been a large amount of consideration, and a large amount has been deducted from the original claim.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; $15,000.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thirty thousand dollars, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry. I am a good friend of the gentleman and a good friend of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], who is interested in it. I hate to object, but it ought not to pass. There ought to be a policy that bills of this character ought not to pass under unanimous consent. We are getting careless. We are getting to be a tremendous Congress, $4,000,000,000, $5,000,000,000, and $6,000,000,000. I object.

WALTER HARRELL ALLEN

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 3951, for the relief of Walter Harrell Allen.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND MARINE CORPS TO ACCEPT DECORATIONS, ORDERS, AND MEDALS

The Clerk called the next Senate bill, S. 4800, to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to accept such decorations, orders, and medals as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PRINCETON CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 4907, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Princeton Club of Philadelphia the bowl and ladle formerly in use on the U. S. S. *Princeton.*

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say that in view of the invasions of the private clubs of Philadelphia just a few nights ago, I can not imagine what club in Philadelphia, whether it is the Princeton Club or not, has any use for a bowl with a ladle. Without the ladle, the bowl might be useful for ornamental purposes in which to plant flowers, but after the drastic action by the authorities in that city of brotherly love, in the private clubs there, I can not see the purpose of this bill. If the gentleman from New Jersey, who years ago was interested in ladles and little glasses that used to tinkle, would withdraw the ladle part and let the bowl go through, it would be all right.

Mr. FORT. The gentleman has not noticed that it is for preservation and exhibition as a souvenir of the past.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. As an antique?

Mr. FORT. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I withdraw the objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Princeton Club of Philadelphia, for preservation and exhibition, the bowl and ladle formerly in use on the U. S. S. *Princeton: Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of such bowl and ladle.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFF DAVIS CAPERTON AND LUCY VIRGINIA CAPERTON

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 1793, for the relief of Jeff Davis Caperton and Lucy Virginia Caperton.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BACHMANN. I reserve it.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. The gentleman understands that this only extends the statute of limitations in this case.

Mr. BACHMANN. I do; and I will say to the gentleman that this is the same kind of bill that the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. OWEN] tried to get through, and if the gentleman will include this bill in the motion at the end of the calendar, I shall have no objection to all of them going through at that time.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. The gentleman means bill of a similar character?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

LESTER L. WILSON

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 2068, for the relief of Lester L. Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester L. Wilson, of Tigard, Oreg., the sum of $144 for loss of personal effects in the sinking of the United States concrete ship *Captain French*, the said Lester L. Wilson having been a seaman on the *Captain French*, and reimbursement for his loss of personal effects as aforesaid having been refused by the War Department because of his alleged failure to sign shipping articles prior to the voyage.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. G. MASON

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 5516, for the relief of E. G. Mason.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $200 to E. G. Mason, of Mercedes, Tex., which sum was paid by him April 6, 1928, to the United States by reason of the forfeiture of the bail bond of Valentin Trevino, who was later taken into custody by said Mason, at his own expense, and surrendered to the United States marshal, entered a plea of guilty, and sentenced to serve a term in jail.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANISLAUS SIEMEK

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 1412, for the relief of Stanislaus Siemek.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I have difficulty in bringing my mind to a conviction that this man has any claim against the Government. I know he made a claim of $15,000 many years after the accident. When the officers of the Government called upon him he was still plying his trade at a butcher's block and seemed able to do the work he had done before.

Mr. PALMISANO. The bill was filed by my predecessor in 1924. It is true the officers did make an investigation and found him working, but it was also true that he had been under the doctor's care since 1922. There is a doctor's bill of $800 for services rendered not only by the present doctor but by his father for injuries received.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman acquainted with this claimant?

Mr. PALMISANO. I have met him since I have been here. He is crippled and can not stand up for any length of time.

Mr. STAFFORD. When a person files such a preposterous claim as this for $15,000 it raises a suspicion as to the bona fides of the claim. Then he makes a concession for this small amount, and it inclines one to believe that there is not much merit in the claim, especially in view of the fact that he accepted compensation for the injury to his automobile at the time of the accident.

Mr. PALMISANO. The bill of 1924 was introduced at $15,000, and naturally I followed the same procedure—whether it was done at the claimant's suggestion or by the Member of Congress who preceded me I can not say. Since this bill has been reported this claimant is willing to accept this amount because of his present condition.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $3,500 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Stanislaus Siemek, of Baltimore, Md., in full compensation for injuries, permanent and otherwise, resulting from a driver of a United States Army truck negligently running into and upon Stanislaus Siemek while his automobile was parked on the north side of Foster Avenue, between Lakewood and Glover, on the 18th day of May, 1922, at which time the said Stanislaus Siemek was inspecting the engine of his parked automobile, and said injuries resulting from no fault of the said Stanislaus Siemek: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL REAL ESTATE & STORAGE CO.

The Clerk read the title of the next Senate bill on the Private Calendar, S. 4727, for the relief of the Federal Real Estate & Storage Co.

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, this bill comes to my attention so recently that I have not had an opportunity to read it. It was put on the calendar very recently. I desire more information than I have been given in the report.

Mr. THATCHER. This bill only gives the claimant company the right to go into court to determine its rights, waiving the statute of limitations, because of the fact that for a number of years negotiations were had between the company and the War Department on the points at issue. Major Somervell, the resident United States engineer, entered into an agreement to settle the matter, but long delay was occasioned through the action of War Department officials, and the agreement was not finally approved by the Secretary of War.

When Colonel Grant, Director of Public Buildings and Grounds, got into the matter further delay was occasioned. The claimant asks only for the right to go into the Court of Claims to have the claims determined and reported to Congress. This company ought not to suffer because of its efforts to reach an agreement without the necessity of litigation. Agreement was reached between the company and the United States resident engineer and reduced to writing and signed by the company, but it was not approved formally by the Secretary of War.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this claim a modern claim?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; it arises out of the closing of a road.

Mr. McKEOWN. I think I can tell the gentleman what happened.

Mr. STAFFORD. When did it happen?

Mr. McKEOWN. When they built this water conduit on the Conduit Road. This man's property was out there. I have no interest in it except this: The man seemed to be outraged by the conduct of an officer of the engineer's bureau, and I went out there. They had shut off his road into his residence. They went out there and arbitrarily built some buildings and shut him off and shoved him to the other side.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean that he did not have any rights under existing law to recover damages under those conditions?

Mr. McKEOWN. He could recover damages in any court, if he did not have the Government to deal with, but he could not sue the Government without the permission of the Government, and that is all he is asking.

Mr. COLLINS. Why should the Government be expected to pay? The District of Columbia closed this road or street.

Mr. THATCHER. That is only one phase of it. There is the running of all this silt through his property. If the gentleman will read the agreement made by Major Somervell he will see that there was an agreement touching these matters, and Major Somervell recognized the justice of these claims.

Mr. COLLINS. Is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in favor of the bill?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Then I withdraw the reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to hear and determine and report to Congress the claims of the Federal Real Estate & Storage Co., as owners of lands lying partly in Montgomery County, Md., and partly in the District of Columbia, arising out of the taking and closing of the Little Falls Road, leading from the Conduit Road to the aforesaid lands of the Federal Real Estate & Storage Co., by the building of the Delecarli filtration plant and other buildings in connection therewith, and for the closing of a road substituted therefor by the agreement of the United States district engineer and the Federal Real Estate & Storage Co., any statute of limitations to the contrary notwithstanding.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SERVICE COORDINATED TRANSPORT, OF NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Private Calendar No. 1248, S. 2035, for the relief of the Public Service Coordinated Transport, of Newark, N. J.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1248. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. This is the claim for several thousand dollars?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Twenty-two thousand dollars.

Mr. SABATH. It is a rather large claim to take up at this stage.

Mr. LEHLBACH. This has the recommendation of the Comptroller General, who found himself unable to approve the payment sought to be made by the War Department, which everybody acknowledged was due, because it was not executed with the formality required by law. The Comptroller General drew this bill.

Mr. SABATH. I know; but it is rather strange that the committee is obliged to reduce the claim that the Comptroller General recommends by $30,000. It it does that, the chances are that it should be reduced by $100,000 more.

Mr. LEHLBACH. They have a perfect right to do that.

Mr. SABATH. It just shows how reckless he is in his recommendations.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I hope the gentleman will not object to this.

Mr. SABATH. If I thought it was a just and valid claim I would not object. I do not think it is a valid claim. I object.

GEORGE B. M'LEOD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 6254, for the relief of United States Marshal George B. McLeod.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a claim to pay a court reporter for some stenographic work done on the order of the Department of Justice in reporting evidence in a case which the district attorney was investigating in the southern district of Georgia. The Comptroller General disallowed the payment because of some provision in an appropriation bill that provides that no man can be paid two salaries they amount to over $2,000 a year. This man was drawing $1,800 a year as a court reporter.

Mr. SABATH. He was United States marshal?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No. The money was paid to a court reporter by the marshal and disallowed in the marshal's account. The gentleman understands that all of the secretaries to the Federal judges act as court reporters and get fees for it, but they held this as compensation, and therefore they disallowed the United States marshal's account. If the gentleman will notice, the Attorney General says that under the circumstances in the case he has no objection to the passage of the bill. They could not approve it because of that law, but it is all right for Congress to pay it, because the services are rendered and that they were worth what they cost. They were let on competitive bids by order of the Department of Justice.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman thinks it is all right?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Absolutely.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a case where there is no question that the services were rendered.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Attorney General himself says that it appears the service is authorized, and so far as known they were of the value stated.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of George B. McLeod, United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia, in the amount of $577.50, being the amount paid by him to J. W. Talbert for stenographic service in reporting the testimony of James J. McGrath in the matter of the United States against Sonia Goldberg and others in February, 1929.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MACON, DUBLIN & SAVANNAH RAILROAD CO.

The Clerk called the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 2614, for the relief of the Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad Co., a similar House bill, H. R. 9397, being on the House Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I ask the author of this bill to make some explanation of it.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on the Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad Co., in 1917, during the war, the tariff rate was based on Macon, Ga., because at that time Camp Wheeler, a point 6 miles beyond Macon, at Swift Creek, was not in the tariff schedule. When freight was shipped from all points to this camp, the freight rate being based on Macon, Ga., this little railroad never got one cent for its hauling and its switching. At that time the Auditor for the War Department was supreme. This is an absolutely bona fide claim. As you will notice, the comptroller says it is just and should be paid. This is simply to have it referred to the accounting office for certification and then for a report to be made to Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was rather impressed by the statement made by the Comptroller General that the claim was rejected by the Auditor for the War Department, in accord with the well-known rule as to reopening such matters, and there was no fraud, error of computation, or newly discovered evidence.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why should we reopen it if it was once adjudicated?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The Auditor for the War Department at that time was final, and therefore these people could not proceed. The comptroller held to the contrary, and while they were awaiting the decision of the Comptroller General the statute of limitations intervened.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman be willing to have this claim allowed without interest?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Surely.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not press the objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad Co. against the United States in relation to the transportation of Government property by way of Macon to Camp Wheeler, both in the State of Georgia, in the year 1917, be, and the same hereby is, referred to the General Accounting Office for settlement, and for certification of any amount due to the Congress, pursuant to section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (23 Stat. 254).

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 1, line 9, after the word "Congress," insert the words "without interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUTTE ANGLERS' CLUB

The Clerk read the next Senate bill on the calendar, S. 4696, granting to the Butte Anglers' Club, of Butte, Mont., a patent to lot 1, section 5, township 2 south, range 9 west, and a patent to the Northern Pacific Railway Co. of lot 2 in said section 5.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted, subject to vested existing rights, to the Butte Anglers' Club, of Butte, Mont., lot 1 of section 5, township 2 south, range 9 west, and to the Northern Pacific Railway Co. lot 2 in said section, upon its filing with the Secretary of the Interior a duly certified copy of a conveyance of the said land to the said Butte Anglers' Club. In each case the patent, in evidence of the grant herein made, shall provide that the land conveyed shall revert to the United States if and when after two years from the date thereof the premises cease to be used for the propagation of game fish and that any and all mineral of any kind or character within the granted lands reserved to the United States.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment? There are one or two matters which gentlemen say are emergencies, and there are one or two bills to which objections have been withdrawn, and the Chair would like to recognize them if the gentleman will withhold his point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold it. I would like to say that we have now got down on the Private Calendar to the consideration of Senate bills reported as late as February 19. There are hundreds of House bills reported prior to February 19 which have not been considered at all. We have done very heavy work to-night. I have no objection to withholding the point of no quorum for the purpose stated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WOLVERTON] for one matter which the gentleman claims is an emergency.

S. A. LONG

Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112), which is an emergency.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the bequest made to the Government of the United States by S. A. Long, late of Shinnston, W. Va., in his last will and testament, dated August 27, 1927, and recorded in book 14,

page 308, of the records of the county court of Harrison County, W. Va., be declined by the Government of the United States and that the estate of the said S. A. Long be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of said last will and testament.

Mr. BRIGGS. Reserving the right to object, what is the emergency?

Mr. BACHMANN. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BACHMANN. This is not my bill, but I can give the gentleman the facts. An old gentleman out there died, and he had had some trouble with his family, and he made a will in which he made a bequest of $5,000 to the United States Government. There is one heir, a daughter, in destitute circumstances. This is an emergency matter because if it is not passed at this Congress the money will go to the United States.

Mr. BRIGGS. I do not press the objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. ELIAS & BRO. (INC.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 1206 on the calendar, S. 4334, for the relief of G. Elias & Bro. (Inc.). I understand the objection has been withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the explanation of the bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The bill is one for the purchase price of an airplane. Five airplanes were constructed under a contract with Paul Henderson, Second Assistant Postmaster General, the son-in-law of Martin Madden. All of the airplanes were tested and all of them were found to conform to the specifications.

Mr. STAFFORD. Except one, for which a claim is now being made.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No. This airplane itself was found by the testing committee to conform to the specifications.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then why did they not accept the plane?

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is no explanation of why they did not accept it, because the testing committee approved it, the expert of the department at the present time has approved it, and the representative of the Post Office Department before the Senate committee has testified that there was a contract, that the plane was tested and there was no fault found with it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to the other four planes, the Government had the use of them and accepted them?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the instant case the Government refused to accept the plane. The Government had it in its possession against its protest for six months, but the Government did not accept it, and returned it to the claimant and he accepted it in return.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; the claimant did not accept its return.

Mr. STAFFORD. What was done with the plane, as the Government did not use it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The claimant was obliged to remove it, because the Government insisted that he remove it.

Mr. STAFFORD. And you are now asking the Government to pay for something it did not receive?

Mr. DEMPSEY. We have the report of the testing committee; we have the report of the Senate committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Who has the plane?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The plane has been held ready for the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. The plane is no longer of any use to the Government?

Mr. DEMPSEY. But it is the Government's fault that it has not used it; it is not the fault of the claimant at all. This claimant will receive not to exceed one-half of what this plane actually cost him under a contract that, if he would manufacture a certain kind of plane, it would be accepted. The chairman of the committee will tell the gentleman that his committee has unanimously approved of this bill, after a most patient and careful investigation, and the Senate committee has likewise unanimously approved it, after a most patient and careful examination. The House committee says that a very grave injustice has been done this man. He is ill and he is liable to become a bankrupt, all because the Government has failed to live up to a proper, honest, and legitimate contract.

Mr. IRWIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois. The trouble I have had with this bill is that the Government has not the property.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The claimant is ready to deliver it. It is the fault of the Government that it has not the possession of the property, and it is not our fault.

Mr. IRWIN. This man furnished the Government with this plane. They were to put one of their own engines in it, and because it did not work properly they did not take this plane, but that was not the fault of the man who built this plane, but it was because of the engine placed in this plane.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the amount in the Senate bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Twenty thousand dollars, and it cost him $50,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the plane go to the Government if this bill is passed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is there any wording in the bill to that effect?

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the bill does not contain such language, I am perfectly willing to have it placed in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then amend the bill to that effect, and with that understanding I shall not object.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to G. Elias & Bro. (Inc.), of Buffalo, N. Y., the sum of $35,000, in full compensation for one air mail plane type M–1, delivered to the Post Office Department by said company on June 9, 1925, said air mail plane having been constructed by the aforesaid company in compliance with written and verbal instructions issued by the official in charge of the air mail service of said department during the month of October, 1924.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was the understanding the amount was to be $20,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right; and that was the House bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I offer an amendment, Mr. Speaker, reducing the amount to $20,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Insert at the end of the bill the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. M. WILLIAMSON ET AL.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 831, a bill which was considered a few evenings ago and objected to by the gentleman from Texas, who has withdrawn his objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. COLLINS. I object, Mr. Speaker. The bill is back of the star.

ROSCOE M'KINLEY MEADOWS

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 1134 on the Private Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ESTATE OF WHITE B. MILLER

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 1113 on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

R. P. BIDDLE

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2047) for the relief of R. P. Biddle, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that request is not in order.

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes; it is. This is a House bill that has passed the Senate with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is it a Private Calendar bill?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

The Clerk reported the bill by title, and read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$1,320" and insert "$423.56."

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, what is the number on the Private Calendar? If it is behind the star, it is not in order.

Mr. BACHMANN. The star has nothing to do with this bill. It has passed the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. That does not make any difference. The order of business to-night is to call the Private Calendar and to consider bills on the Private Calendar after the star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I make a point of order against consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman objects, that is all that is necessary.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I make the point of order it is not in order to consider the request to-night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BACHMANN. This bill has already passed the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But it is not on the Private Calendar.

Mr. BACHMANN. It is a private bill.

GROVER CLEVELAND BALLARD

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up the bill (S. 6233) for the relief of Grover Cleveland Ballard. The bill has passed the Senate and is now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $246.75 to reimburse Grover Cleveland Ballard, an ex-service man of the World War, for money expended for medical and surgical services in reamputating his leg, which was shot off below the knee in battle during the World War.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recollect this bill, this man had the privilege of the services of the Government surgeon, but declined them and then went to a special private service and now asks to be reimbursed for the expenses of this private service when he had refused the public service.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say that this young man's leg was shot off in the Argonne fight during the World War. At the same time he was badly burned with mustard gas and laid there for nearly 24 hours. When his leg was amputated he came home. Later he had to have the leg amputated again. He went to the Government bureau hospital and while he was coming out from under the ether they went off and left him and he fell out of bed.

Later it was necessary to have the leg amputated the third time. He consulted the bureau hospital physicians and they did not recommend it, but it was found that he had to have it done and so he went to a private physician, the best he could find, and had it amputated the third time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been sitting here three hours, waiting for my bill to come up. The House stopped just before it reached my bill. I can not see any reason why we should jump ahead into the end of the calendar that we have not reached, and unless there is some good reason I shall object.

Mr. RANKIN. I was not trying to get ahead of anybody.

Mr. STAFFORD. We want to make some progress. We do not want to take up bills out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to this bill?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I shall object. There was an agreement that we should stop at 11 o'clock. We have been here since 11 o'clock this morning, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HOSPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN FORCES

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, the President, in the exercise of his veto power, has returned to the House with his disapproval my bill, H. R. 6997, conferring the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes to those persons who served in the Quartermaster Corps or under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition on vessels owned by the United States and engaged in the transportation of troops, supplies, ammunition, or materials of war and who were discharged for disability incurred in this service.

In the veto message it was stated that the Secretary of the Interior had furnished figures indicating that this act would confer these benefits upon approximately 7,000 former employees of the Transport Service who are now living. As a matter of fact there are very few such former employees who would be compelled to avail themselves of the benefits of this act were it made law. The act itself specifically limits those affected by it to former Transport Service employees who served on board vessels owned by the Federal Government and who were discharged honorably for disabilities incurred in line of duty. The number who received these discharges is not large and there are but a negligible indigent few who would take advantage of this legislation.

These men, though technically civilian employees of the Government, were under stringent military discipline and served in uniform. They made up the gun crews of the transports upon which they served. When troops were landed from their ships these seamen manned the ships' boats carrying the landing forces and were under hostile gunfire from both the Spanish and the Philippine insurrectionists. They were exposed to the same hazards as were the troops they were carrying and they suffered casualties

under fire. I am appending to these remarks a copy of a disability discharge issued to one of the men who would be affected by this act and I am also appending a copy of a pass issued to a transport seaman in the Philippines in 1900 permitting him to be absent from his ship during evening hours.

Railroads and other private industries make provision for their employees who serve them faithfully and those who are disabled in the performance of their duties. The Federal Government has enacted laws safeguarding the employees of the railroads and practically every State in the Union has enacted workmen's compensation laws compelling private employers to care for disabled employees. Progress demands humanitarian legislation. Should the Federal Government, on one hand, force private employers to care for their employees and on the other overlook the services rendered by a patriotic group of men who were disabled in the service of their country? Such an attitude is not consistent.

The cost of this legislation would be comparatively little. The indigent few who will take advantage of such an act as this should be assured of medical treatment or a home, and these few unfortunate men, disabled in the service of their Government, would not displace former soldiers needing hospital care. Our Government is generous and it is only fair and just that these old men, friendless and alone, disabled by hostile gunfire or by accident while serving their country in time of emergency and discharged because of these disabilities, should be given the aid of a grateful nation, even though this aid may come too late for most of them.

The veto of a measure such as this upon erroneous information furnished him by his departmental advisers has subjected the President to the criticism that he has done a very petty act. The cost in dollars and cents to the Government, if this legislation were approved and not vetoed, would be practically nothing, but the harshness of the veto, its departure from recognized governmental policy and humanity's dictates entails a cost in heartburning and a sense of injustice toward men who served their country well. This cost can not be estimated. There remain only a few, not 7,000 as stated in the message, who wore the uniform of their country at its behest; who served exactly as soldiers served in war; who were under fire; who did their duty well; who received honorable discharges from the military authorities of the United States; and who, injured and discharged for disabilities actually received in line of duty, are denied the poor privilege of hospitalization made necessary by their injuries received in the service of their country. It is a sad travesty upon the present-day attitude of a great and wealthy nation.

U. S. ARMY TRANSPORT "HANCOCK,"
ENGINEER'S DEPARTMENT,
January 4, 1900.

Permission to be absent from the ship from 6 p. m. to 12 p. m. is hereby granted N. McCall.

I. I. MURPHY,
Chief Engineer.

Approved.

J. J. BRADLEY,
Captain and Assistant Quartermaster,
Transport Quartermaster.

DISCHARGE

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ARMY TRANSPORT SERVICE,
U. S. ARMY TRANSPORT "SHERMAN,"
February 16, 1900.

Name: F. Kuhl; rating, seaman.
Proficiency: Very good.
Conduct: Very good.
Reasons for discharge: Hurt in the service.
Time of service: From May 22, 1899, to August 25, 1899.
Port of entry: San Francisco, Calif.
Port of discharge: San Francisco, Calif.

C. H. GRANT, *Master.*

Approved.

JAMES C. READ,
Captain and Assistant Quartermaster,
United States Volunteers,
Transport Quartermaster.

EXTRACTS FROM SHIPPING ARTICLES

It is also agreed that the crew shall mutually assist each other in the working of the ship, shall handle cargo and trim coal if required by the master, and shall purchase and wear the prescribed uniform.

It is also mutually agreed and understood that any return of this ship to a port in the United States within the time which the contract covers shall not operate as a discharge.

It is also mutually agreed and understood that those of the crew who shall serve the full term of shipment shall be furnished with transportation and board money from the port in the United States where discharged to the port where shipped, but all those who are discharged for cause, or at their own request, are not entitled to transportation or board money.

It is also mutually agreed that in case of emergency or of necessity the crew, or such members of the crew as may be needed, shall serve such period of time beyond the term of shipment as the emergency or necessity shall demand, at the same rate of pay as expressed in shipping articles, and a failure to so serve shall carry with it a forfeiture of transportation and board money.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATIONS OF RAILROADS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to a plan of consolidation of railroads into a limited number of systems, to be compelled or unduly influenced by Federal statute or agencies of the United States Government. The grounds for opposition are stated in part 5 below. However, I might not object to individual plans of consolidation having merit.

2. THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS ARE IMPOTENT

Section 5 (4), (5) of the interstate commerce act (U. S. C., title 49, ch. 1), among other things, requires the Interstate Commerce Commission to prepare and adopt a plan for the consolidation of the railway properties of the United States into a limited number of systems. Additional provisions of that section are to the effect that the commission shall agree upon a tentative plan of consolidation, publish that plan, hold public hearings on it, and then adopt and publish a plan of consolidation. All of that has been accomplished. A tentative plan was agreed upon and published on August 3, 1921, proposing 19 consolidated railroad systems. (63 I. C. C. 455.) Later, on December 9, 1929, the commission adopted and published a plan proposing 21 consolidated railroad systems (159 I. C. C. 522).

Attention is directed to the following provisions of paragraph 4 of section 5:

> The several systems shall be so arranged that the cost of transportation as between competitive systems and as related to the values of the properties through which the service is rendered shall be the same, so far as practicable, so that these systems can employ uniform rates in the movement of competitive traffic and under efficient management earn substantially the same rate of return upon the value of their respective railway properties.

The quoted provisions are impracticable in that such uniform results evidently can not be attained through any sound plan of consolidation. The stockholders of the companies paying regular dividends above 5 per cent obviously will not voluntarily accept consolidations which will reduce the value of their securities, and it is doubtful that the stockholders of the weaker railroad companies, in times of speculation based on proposed consolidations or mergers, would sell their securities at a reasonable price. Inflation would be inevitable if the statutory provisions could be enforced. The results sought, in the quoted provisions of the statute, can not be attained through suggested consolidations, which is the full force of this innocuous legislation. Such results, if attainable, could be attained only by means of compulsory consolidation of railroad systems which probably can not be imposed under our present Constitution.

The railroad consolidation theory has been advocated continuously since the passage of the transportation act, reflecting the instigation theory, which was approved on February 29, 1920. However, very little of substance has developed from the expression of that theory in the statute.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its letter of February 4, 1925, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce recommended repeal of that part of section 5 of the interstate commerce act, which required the commission to adopt a plan for the consolidation of all the railroad properties into a limited number of systems.

The commission's report of December 9, 1929, in which it adopted and published the plan of consolidation, seems to reflect the action of a tribunal compelled by statute to perform an unpleasant duty. The concurring opinions of individual members of the commission, which in substance were

expressions of dissent, provide a good foundation for that impression. The commission, at page 79 of its latest annual report to Congress on December 1, 1930, informed Congress that the commission had requested that it be relieved of the duty of formulating a plan of consolidation, and that upon failing to obtain that relief it adopted and published the plan of December 9, 1929.

The plan of consolidation was adopted and published about 15 months ago. It can not be enforced through compulsion. Absence of effort to consolidate railroad systems in accordance with the plan is noticeable. The proposal of the four trunk line systems in northeastern territory is not in harmony with the commission's plan.

3. THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE CONSOLIDATION PROBLEM

No application for consolidation is pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The so-called four trunk line system plan has not been submitted to that tribunal.

An important question at hand now is: Is the consolidation problem definitely before the Congress or the Interstate Commerce Commission now?

The subject is before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce for consideration in S. 668, and before the House Committee on Interstate Commerce in H. R. 3208. The main purpose of S 668 is "to authorize voluntary railroad unifications, but only to the extent that they promote the public interest." H. R. 3208 is of similar purport.

More than 10 bills on the subject have been introduced in the Senate and House since the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, 1923–24. The problem at present is centered in the two bills—S. 668 and H. R. 3208. This history of futile attempts at statutory railroad consolidation is not encouraging for advocates of the statutory theory.

It appears that the Interstate Commerce Commission has passed the problem to Congress. The commission, at pages 79–80 in its annual report to the Congress on December 1, 1930, referred to its request that it be relieved from the statutory requirement that it formulate and publish a plan for railroad consolidations; also, that failing to obtain such relief it had adopted and published a plan on December 19, 1929. The commission also said:

> Nothing has been undertaken before us by any of the carriers under section 5 (6) looking to carrying out the plan. Whatever has been accomplished has been as heretofore under paragraph (2), as is more fully explained elsewhere in this report.

Paragraph (6) of section 5 of the interstate commerce act contemplates the filing of applications by carriers with the commission for authority to consolidate in conformity with the plan of consolidation adopted and published by the commission.

Paragraph (2) of section 5 of the interstate commerce act authorizes the commission to approve the acquisition of control of one carrier by another carrier by means of leasing, purchase of capital stock, or by means other than consolidation.

The annual report of the commission of December 1, 1930, carries the consolidation provisions of section 5 (4), (5), (6) before both Houses of the Congress with a strong suggestion that those provisions are unsound and impracticable legislation.

4. GROUNDS URGED IN SUPPORT OF THE THEORY OF CONSOLIDATION

Support of weak lines: The principal reason urged by advocates of consolidation is that consolidation of railroad systems that are strong in financial resources and earning power with railroad systems that are weak in financial resources and earning power will sustain or shelter the weak system and provide better service to the public served by the weak system. That end can not be attained unless the stockholders of the strong companies voluntarily accept an arbitrary reduction of the value of their securities. Will they permit their earnings to be absorbed by the weak system without obtaining any offset? I can not put myself in the place of stockholders of either the strong system or the weak system and develop the charitable bequest needed by the weak system.

The boards of directors of strong railroad corporations occupy positions of trust in which the directors can not dissipate the property or income of such corporations by assuming the burdens of weak railroad corporations without obtaining offsetting benefits. And if the weak system had such benefits it would not be weak. The established business policy of the strong railroad systems is to divest themselves of unprofitable branch lines which is the antithesis of this panacea advocated by consolidationists. Action of the Pennsylvania system and the Boston & Maine to divest themselves of unprofitable branch lines is well known.

The Railroad Commission of Louisiana, by its order, attempted to compel a corporation to continue operation of a railroad when that operation resulted in a loss of more than $1,500 per month. The corporation resisted on the grounds that the order, if enforced, would deprive it of its property without due process of law, in violation of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States, in Brooks-Scanlon Co. *v.* R. R. Commission (251 U. S. 396), sustained that contention of the corporation and said:

> A carrier can not be compelled to carry on even a branch of business at a loss.

Railroad Comm. *v.* Eastern Tex. R. R. (264 U. S. 79), and Colorado *v.* United States (271 U. S. 153), are to the same effect.

The Government can not compel any railroad system to assume and conduct the unprofitable operation of another railroad system nor in the absence of exceptional circumstances can it require any large system to continue operation of an unprofitable component. The fourteenth amendment and sound business practice stand against the weak system doctrine of the advocates of consolidation.

Other reasons, urged in support of the consolidation theory, are (1) fair return can be obtained at uniform rates; (2) better adjustment of rates; (3) adequate and efficient transportation facilities and service for all communities; (4) limited number of more strong and stable railroad systems; (5) rehabilitation or improvement of railroad credit; (6) more economical and convenient financing; (7) sustained earning capacity, better assurance of regular returns to investors, and improved railroad credit; (8) solution of terminal problems; (9) economy in construction, maintenance, and operation; (10) shorter hauls and choice of routes and better grades by railroad management; (11) discontinuance of duplicate service; (12) improved car service; (13) solid trains and heavier car loading; and (14) discontinuance of back hauls and interchange at certain junction points.

It is noticeable that no strong or cogent reasons are urged in support of this great departure from past practice. In fact, those 14 reasons are mere remarks which do not invite lengthy discussion.

It has been conceded by the most active advocates of consolidation that consolidation will effect little, if any, reduction of railroad operating expenses. Mr. Alfred P. Thom, of the Committee of Railroad Executives, at the hearing on S. 2224 (1925), page 67, said:

> I would not be frank with the committee if I did not state that a good deal of expert opinion among railroad people is to the effect that the idea of economy can be overestimated as a cause for consolidation. There is a difference of opinion among men on that subject.

5. GROUNDS FOR OPPOSITION TO RAILROAD CONSOLIDATIONS

Various grounds for opposition to railroad consolidations may be summarized as follows: (1) No substantial benefits will accrue to the shipping public from consolidation; (2) the advocates of consolidation have failed to present persuasive reasons for that drastic change; (3) the consolidation theory is war-time doctrine, which is not supported by present conditions; (4) strong grounds for belief that best results to shipping public in operating efficiency, service, and rates are obtained from smaller railroad systems, whose executives can maintain personal contact with shippers and keep informed of their competitive problems, needs, and prospects; (5) great consolidated systems, if financially successful, will be powerful, arrogant, and indifferent to needs of shippers; (6) wholesale consolidation of railroads would

result in uneconomical and unwieldy operation; (7) consolidations will result in inflation of securities, prodigality of expenditures, and huge profits of promoters, and the resulting greater burden will be placed on the neck or back of the shipper; (8) the shipping public has not advocated consolidation, and the consolidation sentiment is artificial and emanates from a small group in financial circles that seek profits from sales or exchanges of securities; (9) no car shortage has been experienced in five years and the war-time conditions that prompted suggestions of consolidation have disappeared; and (10) no feasible or practicable plan of consolidating railroads into a limited number of systems can be developed or imposed by the Government. The whole scheme is illusory.

6. WHAT IS THE SOUND POSITION TO TAKE IN DEALING WITH THE PROBLEM OF RAILROAD CONSOLIDATION?

It should be borne in mind that two plans of statutory treatment of the railroad consolidation problem are before Congress at the present time.

First, the consolidation of all railroad property in the United States into a limited number of systems under a general plan promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is the present statutory plan, as reflected in section 5 of the interstate commerce act, and the implied means of enforcement is denial, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of any application for consolidation that is not in harmony with that plan. Of course, consolidations effected without obtaining the approval of the commission may incur prosecution for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. This, in substance and effect, is a statutory strait-jacket in so far as small meritorious consolidations, not in conformity with the general impracticable plan, may be involved.

Second, voluntary consolidations, as initiated by parties or railroad companies, to be approved by the commission if and when the merits of the case and the public interest command such approval. This sound and elastic plan of voluntary consolidations can not be developed and applied unless and until the provisions of section 5, which compelled the commission to promulgate the 21-system plan, are repealed. The commission, in its letter of February 4, 1925, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, advocated repeal of those provisions of section 5 and amendment of that section so that the statute would admit of these smaller meritorious consolidations.

In the commission's letter of February 4, 1925, we have the mature judgment of the tribunal that dealt with this complex problem during a period of several years, and it seems that when that problem is solved the satisfactory solution will be in harmony with the recommendations of the commission in that letter.

There are several important reasons for withholding support of a statutory plan of railroad consolidation which contemplates creation of a limited number or certain number of railroad systems by any agency of the Government. Several of those reasons are stated in the following paragraphs.

Impracticability: Adverting to the provisions of section 5 of the interstate commerce act, which are reproduced on page 1 above. Our railroads were constructed for the purpose of serving, and being supported, by our agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and forests, and by our selling and distributing activities. The railroads, like other business enterprises, have distinctive characteristics. It is impossible to assemble groups of railroads that, when consolidated, will conform with the provisions of section 5, which I refer to. It is impossible to incorporate into a Federal statute satisfactory specifications for all bridges or tunnels to be constructed in this country. Neither consolidation of railroads nor building of bridges are proper subjects for statutory strait-jackets.

Lack of foundation: Consolidation of railroads should be prompted by circumstances and conditions arising from operation of individual railroad enterprises. When the Government undertakes to impose consolidations, by force of statute, it will waste the time of its agencies in attempting to consolidate certain business enterprises which will not and can not be consolidated. I venture the suggestion that there is no reasonable expectation that as much as 20 per cent of the railroad values, reflected in the commission's 21-system plan, can be consolidated in conformity with that plan.

Weak railway lines: The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States stand in the path of gaining support for financially weak railroad lines through consolidations.

Larger systems not advantageous: The representatives of the traffic departments of large shipping enterprises prefer to deal with the smaller railroad systems having executives who are informed of, and in contact with, local conditions. Those representatives fear indifference of executives of the proposed large railroad systems and that their rate and service problems will be delegated to subordinates in those large systems who will not make decisions and who will not have authority to act. It should be borne in mind that the shipping public did not propose any of these consolidated systems.

Elusive features: It should be borne in mind, in considering any statutory plan of consolidation, that the Government may be unable to compel complete performance of any plan of consolidation which one of its agencies approves. It may require from 1 to 20 years to work out a given plan of railroad consolidation. The United States Government has very little power or authority in connection with the consolidation of railroads. Its officials or commissions can approve a proposed plan, and the only effect that approval has is to protect those who participate in the consolidation from prosecution for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The consolidators may bring forward a plan of consolidation in writing which, if carried out, would merge or consolidate many strong and financially weak lines. At the time the consolidators present their plan to the commission they may not have discussed the matter with the management of many of the corporations named in the plan. Undoubtedly they have not then bought all of the capital stock of many of the corporations involved. The plan is merely an expression of hope. If and when the plan is approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission the consolidators start to buy or acquire the capital stocks of the corporations to be consolidated and that effort may continue for several years. The corporations that they acquire control of can be consolidated. Those that they can not buy control of, either by reason of the owner's price being too high or the consolidators' offer being too low, can not be included in the consolidation. The substance is that the Government may authorize a certain consolidation, involving the merging of certain weak lines with strong lines, and at the end of two years or five years find that the consolidators had consolidated only the choice properties and left out the weak lines because they could not buy them at a satisfactory price. And in such case the Government can not unscramble that part of the consolidation which is accomplished nor compel the consolidators to buy and take in the weak lines at a price which they do not elect to pay.

Commission's recommendations sound: I referred to the fact that the commission, in its letter of February 4, 1925, recommended amendment of section 5 of the interstate commerce act, which, if made, would have relieved it of the duty of promulgating the 21-system plan of consolidation which it published on December 9, 1929.

Subparagraph (a) of section 5 (6) of the interstate commerce act provides that when any voluntary consolidations are proposed, by application to the commission, the plan must be in harmony with and in furtherance of the complete plan of consolidation. The complete plan of consolidation is the 21-system plan published by the commission on December 9, 1929. Whenever a relatively small plan of consolidation is laid before the commission now it must conform with the 21-system strait-jacket or the commission must amend or change the strait-jacket.

If the recommendations in the commission's letter of February 4, 1925, were adopted and passed by the Congress, then the strait-jacket of the 21 large systems would be removed,

and appropriate consolidations, more especially smaller consolidations dictated by sound business principles, could be proposed and approved. In fact, the reasons suggested by the advocates of consolidation lend stronger support to the smaller and more elastic voluntary consolidations than to the commission's prescribed 21-system plan.

7. THE FOUR TRUNK LINE SYSTEM PLAN

Referring to the proposed four trunk line system described in the speech of Representative PARKER in the House of Representatives on January 8, 1931.

That plan has not been submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission by means of formal petition or application, the only means of obtaining action on that plan by that tribunal. I do not understand that the Congress, or any of its committees, contemplate taking definite action on the 4-system plan. I can discuss that plan here as an interesting phase of the railroad-consolidation problem, but I can not deal with it as a matter presented formally under conditions calling for definite action by any agency of the Government.

Certain statistics present the four proposed systems in the following light:

	Total operated mileage	Per cent	Total investment in road and equipment	Per cent	Net railway operating income	Per cent
Pennsylvania R. R	16,548.64	100.0	$3,333,223,624	100.0	$205,687,215	100.0
New York Central	12,920.96	78.1	2,487,589,546	74.6	128,915,290	62.7
Chesapeake & Ohio	12,554.07	75.9	1,990,300,739	59.7	113,219,377	55.0
Baltimore & Ohio	11,156.16	67.4	1,970,976,938	59.1	89,948,511	43.8

The proposed systems show substantial variation in mileage to be operated, in investment and in net railway operating income. However, I doubt that such variation should condemn, or that uniformity of those items should commend any given plan of consolidation. For example, the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. is well able to compete with the Pennsylvania Railroad system, and to give efficient service to its patrons although a comparison would develop a material difference of mileage, investment, and income of those two railroad systems. In fact the Lackawanna undoubtedly can furnish better service and more effective competition when being operated in its present independent position than when merged with any one of its large competitors.

The four trunk line plan reflects important departures from the 21-system plan promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission (159 I. C. C. 522) on December 9, 1929. For example, the following important carriers are assigned to different railroad systems in those two plans:

Carrier	Commission plan	Four Trunk Line plan
Lehigh & Hudson River	System No. 2, New Haven	Baltimore & Ohio.
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R.	System No. 6, Chesapeake & Ohio.	New York Central.
Lehigh Valley R. R	System No. 7, Wabash-Seaboard.	Chesapeake & Ohio.
Wheeling & Lake Erie R. R	do	Do.
Wabash System	do	Pennsylvania R. R.
Norfolk & Western	do	Do.
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton Ry	do	Do.

It seems to me that the shipping public served by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad and the Lehigh Valley Railroad should and will resist the incorporation of those two strong lines, which are efficiently operated and which furnish valuable competitive service, into huge railroad systems in which "absentee landlord methods" will seriously impair present efficient service and valuable competition.

The Reading Co. lines should not be merged in the Baltimore & Ohio system, as is proposed in the 4-trunk-line plan, but should be kept free of domination by any large railroad system, in order that those lines will provide a competitive route into Philadelphia for any competitor of the large railway systems developed during the next 50 years.

The Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey owns acres of valuable lands on the western shore of upper New York Bay. This land is suited to use for railroad and steamship terminal facilities at one of the most congested harbors in the world. The Central Railroad of New Jersey should be kept an independent terminal line, available for the use of large railroad systems which in the future may seek entrance to New York Harbor. Further, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, as such independent terminal carrier, should be the operator of one or more belt-line railroads which necessarily must be constructed on the New Jersey shore in the near future to afford terminal and switching service for all of the railroad systems operating in that district.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A NATIONAL PROGRAM OF EROSION STREAM FLOW INVESTIGATIONS ON FOREST AND RANGE LANDS

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I have to-day introduced a bill intended to provide for a national program of erosion stream flow investigations on forest and range lands. It is to add a new section to the McNary-McSweeney Act, reading as follows:

SEC. 11. That for such experiments, tests, and investigations, at the forest experiment stations or elsewhere, as may be necessary to determine the rôle or function of forest, chaparral, grass, or other natural vegetative cover characteristic of forests or ranges or wild land, under varying conditions of growth, soil, topography, precipitation, utilization, and other factors, and the form in which such cover will be most effective in the regulation of stream flow and the delivery of the maximum amounts of usable water, the prevention of destructive floods, the control of erosion, and the maintenance of soil productivity on the watersheds of the Mississippi and Colorado Rivers and other streams subject to destructive floods or important for navigation or for supplies of water in irrigation, municipal use, power, or other use; to determine the functions and most effective use of such cover in preventing the formation and movement of dunes or other wind erosion, and the effects of forest upon climate and rainfall; and for such other investigations as may be necessary for the control of erosion and the regulation of stream flow on forest and range lands, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not more than $500,000.

The necessity of enacting this measure has become apparent to the various forestry, farm, and civic organizations which have turned the attention of careful study upon a national problem of the first importance. These organizations include such nationally known bodies as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Society of American Foresters, the American Forestry Association, and the National Grange. Other groups have come to this same conclusion. It is my purpose in introducing this measure at this time to present it for study and consideration by the Members of Congress and all those interested during the months before Congress convenes in December, and to again introduce it in the next session to be pressed for enactment.

Water is becoming the most important and the most valuable crop of forest and also of range lands in many parts of the country, even exceeding timber and forage. This is true in a number of portions of the arid West, where the availability of water is the most important factor in the foundation of the existing economic structure and prosperity. It is particularly true, for example, in southern California and the great interior valleys of California, where the entire present and future agricultural and urban development is dependent upon water from forest and range lands. The severe droughts of the past year have also shown the importance of the water crop from forest lands for municipal purposes, power, and so forth, in many parts of the humid East. It is becoming increasingly urgent, therefore, to obtain the knowledge which will permit the management of forest and range lands with full recognition of their function of water production.

A second reason for such a program is to ascertain the extent to which we can and should depend upon forest and range lands for the amelioration of destructive floods. An outstanding example of flood damage is that of the Mississippi in 1927, which caused a loss of $300,000,000 and took 214 lives. Flood damages in California total many millions of dollars annually and affect agricultural lands, urban development, roads, reservoirs, and so forth. Destructive floods, however, in streams of all sizes where some or large

parts of the drainage area is or should be in forest or range lands, are common to practically every part of the United States. We should have the knowledge which will make possible the management of such forest and range lands in full recognition of their possible function in the prevention of destructive floods.

A third consideration is the number and magnitude of public and private programs throughout the United States for flood control, irrigation, the improvement of navigation, municipal water supplies, and for power, which are being planned largely or wholly without regard for the possible relation of forest or range cover to stream flow and erosion. Outstanding again is the Mississippi, where flood control and navigation programs total approximately $350,000,000. The silt carried by the Colorado River totals 137,000 acre-feet annually and its control is being disregarded in the developmental plans for the Boulder Dam. Stream flow and erosion problems of first magnitude are involved in the Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Elephant Butte Reservoirs in Arizona and New Mexico, and numerous other projects which have already been completed.

The need for research is to determine the place or function of the vegetative cover in stream flow regulation and erosion control. It is first of all to determine the value of such cover, and, second, to determine the extent to which the forest may be cut and removed and forage plants used by grazing without interfering seriously with the influence on stream flow and erosion. It is to determine under what conditions the maximum amount of usable water is delivered. It is conceivable and, in fact, probable that under widely different conditions of soil, topography, precipitation, and the character and density of forest and range cover that their influences may vary within rather wide limits. This necessitates the consideration of requirements for the United States as a whole, and is one of the reasons for a national program.

Obviously facts of the character indicated are of concern to very diversified groups, both public and private, including agriculture and the domestic livestock industry, the forest industries, navigation and power interests, municipalities, States, and the Federal Government.

AGREEMENTS AND COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES (CONSTITUTION, ART. I, SEC. 10)

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the subject of congressional consent to agreements and compacts between States, I am including Acts of Congress Authorizing or Ratifying Agreements Between States, prepared at my request by Mr. McClenon and Mr. Gilbert, members of the legislative service staff, showing 55 such agreements or compacts up to date.

The matter referred to above is as follows:

ACTS OF CONGRESS AUTHORIZING OR RATIFYING AGREEMENTS BETWEEN STATES

Joint resolution of May 12, 1820 (3 Stat. 609, V). Kentucky and Tennessee, February 2, 1820. Boundary line; agreement ratified.

Act of June 28, 1834 (4 Stat. 708–711). New York and New Jersey, September 16, 1833. Boundary line, execution of process, etc.; agreement ratified.

Act of February 15, 1848 (9 Stat. 211, ch. 10). Missouri and Arkansas. Boundary line confirmed.

Act of January 3, 1855 (10 Stat. 602, ch. 20). Massachusetts and New York, May 14 and July 21, 1853. Cession of district of Boston Corner by Massachusetts to New York ratified.

Act of February 9, 1859 (11 Stat. 382, ch. 28). Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Attorney General directed to assent to agreement between States in adjustment of boundary dispute before Supreme Court.

Joint resolution of February 21, 1861 (12 Stat. 250, No. 9). Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Joint action for removal of "raft" from Red River; assent to acts of State legislatures relating to, past or future.

Joint resolution of March 10, 1866 (14 Stat. 350, No. 12). Virginia and West Virginia. Cession of Berkeley and Jefferson Counties to West Virginia recognized and approved.

Act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 481–483). Virginia and Maryland. Boundary line; agreement approving award of arbitrators January 16, 1877, ratified.

Act of April 7, 1880 (21 Stat. 72, ch. 49). New York and Vermont, November 27, 1876, and March 20, 1879. Boundary line; agreement ratified.

Act of February 26, 1881 (21 Stat. 351–352). New York and Connecticut, December 8, 1879. Boundary line; agreement ratified.

Act of October 12, 1888 (25 Stat. 553, ch. 1094). Connecticut and Rhode Island, May 4 and 5, 1887. Boundary line; establishment ratified.

Act of August 19, 1890 (26 Stat. 329–333). New York and Pennsylvania, March 26, 1886. Boundary line; establishment ratified.

Act of July 24, 1897 (30 Stat. 214, ch. 12). South Dakota and Nebraska, June 3 and 7, 1897. Boundary line; compact ratified.

Joint resolution of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1465, No. 19). Tennessee and Virginia, January 28 and February 9, 1901. Boundary line; agreement ratified.

Act of March 1, 1905 (33 Stat. 820, ch. 1295). South Dakota and Nebraska. Boundary line; compact approved.

Act of January 24, 1907 (34 Stat. 858–861). New Jersey and Delaware, March 21, 1905. Jurisdiction over Delaware River, process, etc.; agreement ratified.

Joint resolution of January 26, 1909 (35 Stat. 1160, No. 4). Mississippi and Louisiana. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction; agreement authorized.

Joint resolution of January 26, 1909 (35 Stat. 1161, No. 5). Mississippi and Arkansas. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction; agreement authorized.

Joint resolution of February 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1163, No. 7). Tennessee and Arkansas. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction; agreement authorized.

Joint resolution of June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 881, No. 31). Missouri and Kansas. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction; agreement authorized.

Joint resolution of June 10, 1910 (36 Stat. 881, No. 32). Oregon and Washington. Boundary line; agreement authorized.

Joint resolution of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. 882, No. 34). Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. Criminal jurisdiction on Lake Michigan; agreement authorized.

Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, ch. 186, sec. 1). General consent to agreements between States for conservation of forests.

Act of October 3, 1914 (38 Stat. 727, ch. 315). Massachusetts and Connecticut, March 19, 1908, and June 6, 1913. Boundary line; establishment ratified.

Act of August 8, 1917 (40 Stat. 266, sec. 5). Minnesota and North and South Dakota authorized to make agreements for improvement of navigation and control of floods on boundary waters and tributaries.

Act of April 8, 1918 (40 Stat. 515, ch. 47). Oregon and Washington, 1915. Protection of fish in Columbia River, etc.; agreement ratified. (Oregon, Laws 1915, ch. 188, sec. 20.)

Act of September 13, 1918 (40 Stat. 959). Wisconsin and Minnesota. March 26 and April 9, 1917. Mutual cessions of territory ratified.

Act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 158, ch. 11). New York and New Jersey. Construction of tunnel under Hudson River; agreements authorized. (See New Jersey Laws, 1918, chs. 49, 50; New York Laws, 1919, ch. 70, and General Laws 1919, ch. 178.)

Joint resolution of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1447, ch. 176). North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Nebraska. Jurisdiction over boundary waters; agreements authorized.

Joint resolution of June 30, 1921 (42 Stat. 104, ch. 38). Pennsylvania and Delaware. Boundary line; reestablishment ratified.

Act of August 19, 1921 (42 Stat. 171, ch. 72). Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Apportionment of waters of Colorado River and its tributaries. Agreement to be made by January 1, 1923, subject to approval by legislature of each State concerned and by Congress.

Joint resolution of August 23, 1921 (42 Stat. 174–180). New York and New Jersey, April 30, 1921. Creation of "Port of New York Authority," for comprehensive development of port of New York (supplement to agreement of 1834, noted above). Agreement ratified.

Joint resolution of July 1, 1922 (42 Stat. 822–826). New York and New Jersey, 1922. Supplemental agreement, embodying comprehensive plan for development of port of New York, ratified.

Joint resolution of September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1058). Kansas and Missouri, March 18 and April 15, 1921. Development of waterworks plants at Kansas City; agreement ratified.

Act of January 10, 1925 (43 Stat. 731–738). New York and Connecticut, January 3, 1911, and March 15, 1912. Boundary line; agreement ratified.

Act of January 29, 1925 (43 Stat. 796–798). Colorado and New Mexico, November 27, 1922. Distribution of waters of La Plata River; compact ratified.

Act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1268, ch. 534). Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana. Apportionment of water supply of Columbia River and its tributaries. Agreement to be made by January 1, 1927, subject to approval by legislature of each State and by Congress.

Act of March 8, 1926 (44 Stat. 195–201). Colorado and Nebraska, April 27, 1923. Apportionment of waters of South Platte River; agreement ratified.

Act of April 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 247, ch. 129). Extension of time for agreement under act of March 4, 1925, above, to December 1, 1927.

Act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 831, ch. 754). Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, and Oregon. Apportionment of waters of Snake River; agreement authorized, subject to ratification by Congress.

Act of February 26, 1927 (44 Stat. 1247, ch. 216). South Dakota and Wyoming. Apportionment of waters of Belle Fourche and Cheyenne Rivers; agreements authorized, subject to ratification by Congress.

Joint resolution of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1403, ch. 382). Provisions of act of March 4, 1925, above, extended to December 31, 1930.

Joint resolution of February 16, 1928 (45 Stat. 120–128). New York and Vermont, May 11, 1927. Bridge across Lake Champlain; agreement ratified.

Joint resolution of March 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 300–303). Wisconsin and Michigan, December 1, 1927. Bridge across Menominee River; already executed agreement authorized.

Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1058–1066). Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Various agreements as to Colorado River authorized; compact of November 24, 1922, under act of August 19, 1921, above, ratified.

Joint resolution of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1444, c. 448). Oklahoma and Texas. Titles to land transferred between States; negotiations by governors authorized.

Act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1502, c. 520). Colorado and New Mexico. Water supply of Rio Grande, San Juan, and Las Animas Rivers and tributaries; negotiations authorized.

Act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1502, c. 521). New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. Water supply of Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian Rivers and tributaries; negotiations authorized.

Act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1503, c. 522). New Mexico and Oklahoma. Water supply of Cimarron River and tributaries; negotiations authorized.

Act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1517, c. 537). New Mexico and Arizona. Water supply of Gila and San Francisco Rivers and tributaries; negotiations authorized.

Act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1517, c. 538). Colorado, Oklahoma, and Kansas. Water supply of Arkansas River and tributaries; negotiations authorized.

Act of April 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 154, c. 130). Oklahoma and Texas. Bridges over Red River. Past and future agreements approved.

[The act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 224, c. 194) authorizes "the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina," and a city and county in Georgia, to construct a bridge over the Savannah River; this would presumably not involve a formal agreement between the States as such.]

Act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 767–773). Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas, March 9, April 19, and May 22, 1929. Use of waters of Rio Grande above Fort Quitman, Tex.; compact ratified.

Act of January 19, 1931 (Pub., No. 568, 71st Cong.). Idaho and Wyoming. Boundary line; compacts authorized.

NOTE.—S. 2890, authorizing compacts between Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming for division of the waters of the Columbia River, passed the Senate April 1, 1930, and was reported in the House May 14. Various bills authorizing other compacts have been introduced and are now pending, but none of them have apparently been reported out of committee yet.

I am informed of only two Federal cases involving the construction of the constitutional provision—Article I, section 10—relating to agreements between States since the case of Sterns *v.* Minnesota (179 U. S. 223).

In Virginia *v.* West Virginia (220 U. S. 1, 26) the Supreme Court upheld an agreement between West Virginia and what was recognized by Congress as the State of Virginia; this agreement had been ratified by Congress and upheld by the Supreme Court in Virginia *v.* West Virginia (11 Wall. 39).

In North Carolina *v.* Tennessee (235 U. S. 1, 15) the Supreme Court held that an agreement between the two States to survey and mark the boundary line, which had been left uncertain by the original cession from North Carolina to the United States, was not such an agreement as required the consent of Congress.

In view of the fact that in the future Congress will almost certainly be called upon to assent to or ratify an increasing number of compacts or agreements between States, I have thought the above references would be helpful to Members of the House.

REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS' HOSTILITY TO VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, many of us, especially the veterans themselves, find it impossible to understand the hostility of Republican administrations to legislation liberalizing the Government's treatment of World War veterans. Almost every proposal for the benefit of former service men is met with steely, stony-faced opposition at the White House.

There have been three Republican Presidents since the World War and all of them have vetoed legislation passed in the interest of the veterans.

In 1922 President Harding vetoed the so-called bonus bill. The House of Representatives repassed the bill over his veto, but it was killed in the Senate for lack of the necessary two-thirds vote.

In 1924 President Coolidge vetoed the present adjusted compensation act, accompanying his veto with a message in which he severely criticized the veterans; but Congress overrode the veto and it became a law.

Last year President Hoover vetoed the bill adjusting the compensation of disabled veterans, although a substitute measure was finally passed.

Now, President Hoover vetoes the veterans' loan bill, a bill under which veterans who need it will be able to borrow not money which really belongs to the Government but borrow against their own claims, against a debt the Government has confessed it owes them, up to 50 per cent of the value of the certificates the Government has already issued to them acknowledging its debt to them. Personally I have favored paying these claims in cash, but under the circumstances, due to the influence of the administration and of big financial interests with a majority in this Congress, we were unable to even get a vote on that proposal. So we had to agree to this bill or nothing. It is better than nothing, because it lowers the interest rate the veterans' must pay and increases the amount they may borrow. But the President opposed doing even that, although in his letter to Senator SMOOT, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, expressing his opposition to the loan bill, he admitted that the Government owes to the service men "a special obligation beyond that to any other groups of citizens."

On one occasion in President Coolidge's administration, when General Hines and the legislative representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled Veterans agreed on a bill for the relief of disabled veterans estimated to cost about $39,000,000, the administration forced a reduction in the fund for this purpose to $9,000,000, although General Hines and the representatives of the veterans' organizations were in entire agreement that $39,000,000 was the minimum amount with which the necessary care could be given the disabled men.

Every time a proposal is brought forward to deal liberally and fairly with the former service men in the matter of their claims growing out of this "special obligation" we are told from the other end of the Avenue that the Treasury can not afford it, that the country can not stand it. Once when a veterans' bill was pending Secretary Mellon estimated there would be a Treasury deficit of $300,000,000. Instead, there was a surplus of $600,000,000. He was wrong $900,000,000. Notwithstanding such predictions, when Congress, responding to the demands of justice and the needs of the veterans, has passed legislation in the interest of the service men, it has failed to bring the dire results predicted by Mr. Mellon, either to the Treasury, to the bond market, or to business.

Always, when Congress proposes to do justice by the men who rallied to the colors during the World War, the word comes from the White House that the country can not afford it. Yet somewhere in the recesses of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon is always able to find enough money to meet other demands. It has been possible to return $3,000,000,000 in tax refunds and credits to huge corporation and other income-tax payers, although this money was collected more than a decade ago in war-profits taxes. It has been possible to find money with which to guarantee a return to the railroads, to subsidize great shipping interests, and even to cancel billions of dollars of debts owed to us by foreign governments. It was even possible to reduce income-tax rates when the stock-market panic broke, and that helped save the hides of a lot of stock gamblers. It seems that it is only when bills are pending seeking to do justice to the service men that the Treasury Department becomes panicky, and grows alarmed about Treasury deficits and about what may happen to the security market.

It is a matter of record that every act that has been passed for the purpose of discharging the obligation we owe to the men who offered themselves on their country's altar has been passed over the bitter opposition of the last three Republican Presidents and the Secretary of the Treasury who has served under them.

POEM ENTITLED "WILL ROGERS"

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem composed by Ignatius I. Murphy, of Hays, Kans., as a tribute to the noted humorist, lecturer, and humanitarian, Will Rogers.

WILL ROGERS

Kindly wit, philosopher, friend,
He won a Nation's heart,
And when grim mis'ry clutched the land,
Nobly he bore his part.

The pioneer blood in his veins,
Descendant of the braves,
From humble walks he rose to fame,
Winning his country's praise.

No tarnish dims his honest name,
No envy seeks his crown,
Alone, unsought, he gained the heights
Of merited renown.

Far more than jester's cap and bells
Are his by one accord,
A man 'mongst men, we hail him all,
He touched the common chord.

A SHIPPER'S VIEWS ON INLAND WATERWAYS

Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS. Mr. Speaker, there is no section of this country more vitally concerned with the problem of transportation than the upper Mississippi Valley, and those who have given careful study to this problem are convinced that relief can come only through cheaper forms of transportation. Missouri is especially impressed with the importance of a solution for this problem—just now when she realizes that she is to lose three seats in the next Congress. Representation in Congress is based on population. Population depends upon the success of industry and agriculture. Along with Missouri each State in the valley west of the Mississippi River will see its representation reduced in the next Congress. March 4, this group of six States will lose 17 seats in this House, while States which have enjoyed the benefits of cheap water transportation will greatly increase their representation in the next House; and it is certainly a matter of concern to the whole country that this great agricultural interior should be given an opportunity to develop.

Our loss of representation in Congress is clearly the result of the failure of industry to develop in the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys, and industry can not develop where the freight rates do not permit it to compete with industry in other sections of the country.

Hostility has developed toward river improvement in certain railway sections. I am sympathetic with the railways, and I am convinced that the development of industry in the upper Mississippi Valley will be a great benefit to the railways of that section.

The Monsanto Chemical Works is a most important industry in my district. Among the raw materials which they use are large quantities of sulphur which come from Texas. I find that the rail rate on sulphur from the Texas mines to their St. Louis plant is substantially twice as great as the water rate on sulphur from the Texas mines to Boston while the distance from Texas to Boston is twice as great as the distance from Texas to St. Louis. When the Mississippi River and the Texas-Louisiana Intracoastal Canal are completed so that barges can be loaded with sulphur at the mines and unloaded in this chemical plant in St. Louis, these rail rates will be tremendously reduced. The result will be a great stimulus to this chemical industry in St. Louis, and what applies to the chemical industry applies to practically all the other industries of St. Louis. The growth and development of these industries will increase the population of St. Louis, will give more jobs to men, will bring more business and prosperity, and in all of this the railways will share.

Mr. John F. Queeny, chairman of the board, Monsanto Chemical Works, one of the most prominent citizens of St. Louis and one of our most successful business men, has dictated a statement entitled "A Shipper's Views on the Development of Inland Waterways." This statement contains so much sound, forceful argument, that I feel it will be useful to the House and the country, and I am, therefore, presenting it to you. His statement is as follows:

As a shipper of substantial tonnage, and since it is the shipper who pays the freight bills, I have been very much interested in the recent discussions and criticisms coming from railroad officials regarding the development of our inland waterways.

Much is said about subsidizing the efforts to restore transportation on our inland rivers. I look upon this subsidizing as a proper function of our Government, particularly during this experimental period, or what might be considered the reestablishment of navigation on our inland rivers. So far as the Federal Barge Line is concerned, it must not be forgotten that this is purely a demonstration on a small scale, and under the law must be disposed of by the Government just as soon as the experiment is completed.

Transportation and commerce have been protected and subsidized since the dawn of civilization. Ancient Rome subsidized highways and ancient Venice subsidized its commerce on the high seas in the protection from pirates, and the greatness of both these cities was due to the growth of their commerce because of these subsidies.

Up to the present day the highways of commerce are subsidized with the taxes of the people, including the taxpayers in the Mississippi Valley, paying for battleships to protect coastal and foreign commerce; for the Panama Canal; for lighthouses on the coasts; with Consular Service in foreign countries. These forms of subsidies are common to all civilized nations and all civilized nations subsidize and develop their inland rivers.

With all of these subsidies for protection and development of water transportation on the high seas and coastwise, why should the farmer, the workman, the manufacturer, and all of the taxpayers in the interior, who pay their share of taxes for lighthouses and other deep-water transportation subsidies, be denied like protection and support for navigation on our inland water highways?

That the rivers are natural highways of commerce is recognized the world over, and that our Nation should allow these badly needed natural resources to go to waste, is unthinkable.

Commerce and transportation (and without either one you can not have the other) are subsidized in all directions; the lighting of our air routes, the State and Federal aid to hard roads, and the subsidies to navigation on the Great Lakes, the coastal routes, and the high seas, the cost on the people of the Interstate Commerce Commission with its large expenditures supported by taxation and charged under the law to see to it that the railroads operate profitably. I am informed that some thirty odd millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money has been spent to date to valuate the railroad property and the job is not yet completed.

As shippers we shall always be dependent upon the railroads, and we realize that the railroads must prosper and that we will as shippers in the long run make up any losses the railroads suffer in increases in our freight bills. But as interested students of transportation we shippers in the interior realize that the development of railroads will not be injured but will profit ultimately in the interchange of commerce with the rivers, just as the railroads have had their intensive development wherever commerce enjoyed the use of water transportation, for example, in places like the Rhine Valley, the Pittsburgh district, the Great Lakes territory, and coast-wise territory. Intensive development of railroads does not take place in desert territory.

Because ditches can be dug more economically with machinery than with pick and shovel, would you destroy the machinery? Because raw material can be transported by river more economically than by rail, would you destroy the river? No. We must, here in the interior, have both with the interchange of traffic between the rail carriers and the river carriers on joint through rates and through bills of lading; in other words, coordinated river and rail transportation.

In my opinion, the solution of the railroads' difficulties is not the antagonism of economical competition but rather constructive thought and action along the lines of corrections in the transportation act, particularly any injustices in the transportation act such as, perhaps, the recapture clause affecting the credit of the railroads, a correction in the act permitting the natural consolidations of railroads, or in any other reasonable manner aiding the railroads. To such constructive offers the railroads will have our hearty support.

I agree with Mr. Queeny that there is nothing revolutionary about the improvement of our rivers at public expense. As a matter of fact, a river is a highway just as much as a hard road is a highway; and when the river is improved any citizen who has a towboat, a packet boat, or a pleasure boat can go upon this public highway with as much freedom as any man who owns a pleasure car or any other kind of a motor vehicle can go upon our highways. We have long since abolished toll roads. There is even opposition in this House to toll bridges, and I do not believe that the American people are at all disposed to go back to toll highways or that they want to impose tolls upon the traffic which is to navigate our great, free, water highways.

In times of war and peace our water highways have been free and open for commerce and for the national defense.

It has never been the policy of our Government to permit any individual, firm, or corporation to have a monopoly on these greater water highways. They are capable of rendering the public a great service. They can only be developed at public expense and their improvement should not be delayed. I fully agree with Mr. Queeny that there is nothing unusual or extraordinary about the public improvement of these great free highways.

BY THEIR FRUITS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Associated Press dispatches to the country carry the headlines that the Seventy-first Congress is dying, and from the country comes back the reply, "Let it die."

Never within the memory of any man now living has a Congress approached its end so little lamented and so universally execrated.

During the term of this Congress more men have been bankrupted, more men have been deprived of employment, more men have been dispossessed of their homes, more men have gone to prison, more men have been consigned to suicide graves, more women have wept, and more children have gone hungry than under the administration of any previous peace-time Congress in the Nation's history.

We have had more bank failures during the life of this Congress and at the same time a greater concentration of wealth in the hands of a few than in any like period in the annals of this or of any other country. Over a thousand banks—practically all of them in the agricultural districts—have failed in the last year alone, while the number of millionaires reported by the Treasury Department has doubled and the number of corporations receiving incomes in excess of $5,000,000 per annum has increased from 187 to 229 since this Congress convened.

This Congress found wheels of industry turning and leaves them silent. It found men employed and leaves them selling apples on the street. It found standard stocks and bonds above par and leaves the invested reserves of every country bank depleted with defaulted coupons. It found a prosperous commerce and leaves export and import channels clogged by insuperable tariffs. It found every table supplied and leaves bread lines, soup houses, and food riots.

For the first time in the history of the Republic a peace-time Congress has spent $10,000,000,000. For the first time since the war the United States Treasury reports a deficit. For the first time State legislatures are appealing to the Federal Government for relief. For the first time the governors of the States are calling a conference to consider the problem of domestic distress. For the first time wheat is being burned as fuel. For the first time American women are working in the fields. For the first time American progress falters.

Wheat is cheap and bread is dear. Livestock is low and meat is high. Shoes are taxed and diamonds are free. In the cities, car loadings are down; construction is at a standstill; factory employment is dropping and sales volumes shrink steadily. In the country, reserves are exhausted, production is declining, taxes are delinquent, interest on farm mortgages is defaulting. And everywhere the clock of material progress has been set back.

This Congress has failed in every major purpose. It has failed to solve the farm problem. It has failed to relieve unemployment. It has failed to redeem bonus certificates. It has failed to liberalize its own rules. It has failed to abolish lame-duck sessions. It has failed to provide for veterans and their widows and orphans. It has failed to settle the World Court controversy. It has failed to give the Nation the benefit of Muscle Shoals. It has failed to reform the tariff. It has failed to redeem promises made by both political parties in the last campaign. And it has failed utterly to achieve adequately any objective for which it was convened.

But, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has failed still more signally. It has failed to rise to an opportunity for service the equal of which was never presented to any legislative body of ancient or modern times—the adjustment of production and consumption, the equitable distribution of the economic output of the Nation.

The Secretary of Agriculture reports that the granaries of the Nation are bursting with surplus food products, while the President of the United States announces that 6,000,000 children are undernourished. In every community there is acute need of manufactured commodities. And the industrial plants which produce those commodities are idle for lack of patronage.

On every hand are untilled fields, while men clamor for bread. In every city are idle manufactories, while families are denied necessities which they produce. And everywhere are armies of unemployed eager to toil in field and factory, ready to produce every luxury which would contribute to the happiness of mankind. Only one thing is lacking—a legislative and economic adjustment which would provide for every man both labor and remuneration and for every family the requirements and luxuries of life without stint.

America is a land of fertile farms, with husbandmen ready to bring to every table their choicest products. America is a land of high-powered factories and skilled artisans ready to manufacture every commodity a household could consume. Why should any man lack employment? Why should any family want for the products of modern civilization? It is only necessary to adjust this vast mechanism; to correlate our plants, our labor, our production, our markets, our consumption, our finance, our management, to supply employment and luxury for all. We have the farms and the farmers to feed every citizen. We have the textiles and the mills to clothe every family. We have the machinery and the mechanics to manufacture radios and automobiles for every household. All that we need is the statesmanship which will give men opportunity to work, provide their families with purchasing power, offer industry a market, and the market a clientele.

This Congress has failed to provide that statesmanship. This Congress has not only failed to remedy pressing economic conditions but it has contributed to the fundamental causes which produced them. Legislation has been enacted giving industries, classes, and sections undue advantages at the expense of other industries, classes, and sections. Laws granting special privileges, laws subsidizing favored beneficiaries, laws monopolizing natural resources, laws legalizing predatory tariffs, laws levying discriminatory taxes, and laws exploiting the people for the benefit of the few have served to perpetuate these inequalities, to further reduce incomes, to further limit buying power, and to correspondingly decrease the markets of other industries and congest national commerce.

For the difficulty is not overproduction, as some would have us believe. If legitimate needs were supplied, there would be no surplus. The trouble is not overproduction but underconsumption. There is no commodity on the shelves of our merchants or in the warehouses of our jobbers; there is no service dispensed by our artisans or supplied by our professional men, that the country would not consume in record time if purchasing power was raised to normal by supplying an outlet for its own labor, an investment for its own capital, and a market for its own products. The problem reduced to its simplest terms is: How can we by legislation insure for our producers equality of opportunity for production and marketing which will give them purchasing power in proportion to their services to society.

This problem is especially applicable to agriculture. Congress has enacted laws affecting the wage scales of labor entering into commodities which the farmer must buy. Congress has enacted laws guaranteeing fixed incomes on capital invested in public-service corporations which the farmer must patronize. Congress has enacted laws permitting manufacturers to increase prices which the farmer must pay. And Congress has enacted laws which shift the burden of taxation from capital and industry to the farmer, until farm costs have increased and farm incomes have declined to a point where farm legislation is imperative.

This Congress was under peculiar obligation to provide such legislation. Twice the McNary-Haugen bill had been

passed by both House and Senate and twice the President had vetoed it. Twice the united farm organizations of the Nation had been refused legislation, previously accorded industry, transportation, labor, and finance. Both political parties had pledged themselves in the last campaign to return agriculture to a place of economic equality with other industries, and the President called an extra session for that specific purpose. The Nation confidently expected the farm problem to be solved by this Congress.

How inadequately the Seventy-first Congress discharged that solemn obligation is now apparent to the most partisan. It has failed by every test. It has not controlled the surplus. It has not prevented overproduction. It has not effectuated the tariff. It has not stabilized the market. It has not given agriculture equality with other industries. And it has not brought the farmer a fair price for his products, a fair wage for his labor, or a fair return on his investment. Since the bill became a law the price of farm products has fallen $3,000,000,000. When this Congress was elected wheat was selling for $1.44 a bushel and bread was 10 cents a loaf. To-day wheat is 35 cents a bushel on the farm and bread is still 10 cents a loaf in the city. And wheat is selling in Germany and France to-day for $1.50 a bushel. Since this Congress convened eggs have fallen from 38 cents a dozen to 8 cents a dozen at the farm; prime steers, which were then quoted at $15.50, are now selling at $7 or lower; and hogs which brought $11.40 at that time are now being marketed at $6.50, while farm machinery and other necessities of production which the farmer must buy are still selling at war-time prices. Under the administration of the agricultural marketing act the standard of living on the American farm has declined to the irreducible minimum, and agriculture's lack of purchasing power has precipitated one of the greatest panics in the economic history of the Nation.

How hopelessly the act has failed is further indicated by the futile campaign to secure reduction of acreage. The attempt to restrict production is not only a confession of failure but it is wholly impracticable. The farmer has certain fixed charges which must be met. Taxes, interest, and maintenance must be paid and can not be postponed for even one crop season. To expect individual farmers of the Nation to voluntarily effect a reduction approaches absurdity. In fact, reports from the crop estimates of my own State, instead of showing a reduction, reflect a substantial increase—not because the farmers of Missouri are out of sympathy or unwilling to cooperate but because they have no choice in the matter. They have bills to meet, mouths to be fed, families to be cared for, and they can not care for them by permitting their fields to lie fallow.

The farm bill has failed. The Congress which enacted it has failed. Agriculture is prostrate; commerce is stagnate, and 7,000,000 unemployed men are walking the streets—many of them dependent on charity—

Begging for bread—in a plentiful land!
Begging for bread—with a trade in his hand!
Sound as a dollar, in heart and in head,
Ready for work, and yet—begging for bread?

Begging for bread—but not begging alone;
Now are they swollen to numbers unknown,
Who weary the highways with heart-breaking tread,
And swarm through our city streets—begging for bread.

Begging for bread—with such stores on our hands
We could feed the unfed of all habited lands;
Food rotted to order—starvation widespread—
Organized waste—millions—begging for bread!

"The Congress is dying."

Let it die.

IT IS THE VETERANS IN NEED WHO ARE BORROWING ON THEIR ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in order to defeat the legislation providing for a 50 per cent loan to holders of adjusted-compensation certificates, many statements were made by prominent Government officials that the veterans as a whole who would borrow from the Government were not actually in need. Other statements issued solely for the purpose of preventing the passage of the bill related to how it would affect the Treasury, others predicting an assault upon business that would retard a return to normal.

Two years ago I introduced a bill providing that the money then in the Treasury to the credit of the adjusted-compensation fund be loaned to the veterans at a low rate of interest. Mr. Mellon in a lengthy letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee vigorously opposed my bill, as he did all legislation that would permit the veterans to borrow on their certificates.

Let us see what has happened. Veterans all over the country are making applications for loans, the number in my own city, St. Louis, I understand, exceeding those in other cities of a like size. Our unemployment situation finds 10 per cent of our citizens out of work.

What do the veterans say they need the money for? Representatives of prominent newspapers in St. Louis went among the veterans and asked for information along this line. On the first day they found one man who said he was employed. On the second day they found two employed seeking loans. The balance, thousands, were out of a job, married, their dependents without the necessities of life, some sick and in need of medical care, others about to be evicted from their living apartments for nonpayment of rent. The money received by these veterans immediately, as I predicted, goes into circulation.

I personally requested the representatives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Washington to go among the veterans making applications for loans at the Washington office and interview the men to see how many were receiving loans who did not need the money. This morning I received the report from Maj. Edwin S. Bettelheim, jr., chairman of the national legislative committee. And what did he report? He told me he understood there has been some discussion as to just whether or not the recent bonus bill is really acting as a relief measure for needy veterans or whether it is being used by all veterans as an opportunity to get some money.

He took occasion on Saturday morning and again on Monday morning to interview approximately 150 men in the line, telling them that he was not connected with the Government in any way and not attempting to pry into their personal affairs but was interested in knowing just why they were applying for the loan on their bonus. He told them that he did not desire their names but just their reasons.

He found less than one-half of 1 per cent had never borrowed before. He found the men in line, many without overcoats and many in shabby clothes. One or two had their wives or children with them. A goodly percentage were from out of town and had been living on charity here in Washington awaiting the final passage of the bill. Quite a number had been disappointed in their appeal for compensation and their disability allowances. Quite a number of them admitted that they were dependent for food on the Veterans of Foreign Wars soup kitchen conducted at Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

Some of the reasons given him by these men for their place in line were taken down and listed as follows:

The first man needed the loan very badly for his wife and child in New Jersey.

Next man, out of work.

Been waiting on the list for entry to Walter Reed Hospital for three months; finally had to go into Emergency Hospital.

The next four men gave the reply—

Out of work.
To pay back installments on his home in Virginia.
Refused to give any reason.
Wife and child destitute.

The next one was a woman in line submitting the application of her husband who was home desperately ill and no funds coming into the family.

Child's face injured and in hospital. Is only borrowing part of the loan.
Mother in Gallinger Hospital.
Out of work.

Four more men out of work.

Man threatened with dispossession of himself and family of four out of two rooms unless back rent was paid or assured by the end of the month.

Two men from New Jersey had come here expecting work on Government construction and were going home again with the hope of using this money to tide them over until they got a job.

Secondhand Ford on which back payments were due liable to be taken from him.

And so the list of reasons go on. A number of them wanted to pay mortgages on their homes down here in near-by Virginia; others used it to pay miscellaneous bills.

He only found one man who admitted that he was not really in need, but he said he could use the money. He failed to see any automobile salesmen that were spoken of, and every man that he saw but one or two looked and dressed as though this loan would be a real relief to them.

In his office here he has made out blanks for a large number of men, most all of whom he knew were in need of money because they have previously extended loans and relief to them.

Mr. Speaker, we have not made a mistake. We have helped the veterans who needed help—the men who helped their country when the country needed their assistance.

The people of my city are not complaining about the adoption of this legislation.

Every dollar of this money will be used in such a way that business, little and big, will benefit thereby. Placing money in circulation helps business. Increase the buying power of the people of the United States as we have done in this instance and business conditions will surely improve.

The city boys will spend their money to help themselves and their families, live as Americans should live, while the boys from the country will be able to borrow money that will enable them to care for their needs and purchase seed to make a crop.

So far as the country as a whole is concerned, this legislation, which I started two years ago, as the RECORD will show, long before others ever thought of suggesting such a proposition, will be far more beneficial than any legislation passed by Congress during the past two years.

COMMUNISM

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, several days ago an organization known as "American Civil Liberties Union" sent a communication to the Members of the House of Representatives urging the defeat of the program advocated by a committee of the House which investigated communist activities in this country. This is the same organization that has been assisting in the communist movement for several years. Roger N. Baldwin, a director and who appears to be its managing head, appeared before our committee, of which my good friend and colleague, the Hon. HAMILTON FISH, Jr., of New York, was chairman, declined to take an oath, saying he did not believe in God, and denied he was a communist, but finally admitted that he was a former member of the I. W. W. Mr. Baldwin also testified that Mr. W. Z. Foster, one of the leaders of the communist movement, and candidate for President on the communist ticket in 1924 and 1928, is affiliated with the American Civil Liberties Union.

This same organization has been active in furnishing bonds and providing for the defense of certain known communists who have been charged with inciting riots and other criminal offenses. It rallied to the defense of the communists who were indicted as a result of the strike and riots at Gastonia, N. C., and the defendants when released on bond left the country and are now in Russia. Through the activity of the American Civil Liberties Union these men were released and went unpunished and the ends of justice defeated.

Mr. Baldwin also testified that he is a member of the board that has charge of the "Garland fund"; that he has helped to finance the Daily Worker, the official communist newspaper in the United States; that he has assisted in financing the International Labor Defense, another communist organization; that he helped finance the communist strike at Passaic, N. J., to the extent of $15,000; that in the 1926 communist strike of the Lady Garment Workers Union $100,000 was loaned; and that he has also assisted in the financing of a number of foreign-language papers controlled by the communists.

In fact, there can be no question but that the American Civil Liberties Union under the guise of "free speech" and "civil liberty" is assisting the Communist Party, an organization whose membership is almost wholly composed of aliens and controlled by an alien government, in the spreading of its propaganda and the carrying out of its program for the overthrow of the Government of the United States and the establishment of a soviet form of government in its place.

This attack against the committee of the House of Representatives appointed to investigate communist activities has been very ably answered by an editorial which appeared in the Wheeling Daily News, of Wheeling, W. Va., in its issue of Friday, February 20, 1931, which follows:

THE COMMUNISTIC PROPAGANDA

The American Civil Liberties Union has vigorously opposed the activities of the House of Representatives committee which has been investigating communism in the United States. The union charges that the committee, headed by Representative FISH, has promoted a spirit of intolerance and repression in this country, caused an increasing number of attacks on peaceful assemblage and scores of unjustified arrests and prosecutions, and has revealed a lack of any conception of America's traditional civil liberty.

The union adds that revolutions are not produced by propaganda but by unbearable conditions; that the way to fight communism is to mend capitalism.

There is a distinct difference between depriving American citizens of their civil liberties and investigating the activities of foreign propagandists in the country whose avowed purpose is to destroy the Government. The latter is what the Fish committee has been doing. Able Members of the House of Representatives have been appointed to this committee, and they have taken their duties seriously and intelligently. They have brought to light many facts about communists in the United States which are startling to the American public.

There have been no hysterical attacks upon the reds. Having made their investigation, members of the committee have introduced measures in Congress to deal with this menace to American institutions.

Nor has communism sprung up in the United States as a revolt against capitalism as the American Civil Liberties Union contends. It is a movement led from without the country. It is directed by the officials in Moscow. It is essentially an attack by foreign peoples on our institutions and Government. Certainly Congress should investigate these communistic activities and pass the measures necessary to prevent them.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE CEMENT PLANT

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE], among other things, discussed the State cement plant, owned and operated by the State of South Dakota, at Rapid City, and endeavored to show that it has been operated by the State at a loss. To make his point, he indulged in considerable juggling of figures.

I opposed the construction of the plant at the time it was voted upon by the people of our State, but, once established, I felt that it was entitled all the support we could give it, and in the main it has had this in a surprising degree.

No better cement is manufactured anywhere than comes from this mill. It has freed the State from the strangle hold of the cement trust and has without question given to our people a cheaper and better product than they would otherwise have had. Its management has been singularly free from politics, both under Republican and Democratic administrations. It has been operated strictly as a business institution and as such has been a success. There is every reason to believe that the capital cost and interest will within a reasonable time be returned to the State, leaving the plant as net profit, to say nothing of the saving to our people in the lower price of cement not only from the State mill but from outside competing mills which have been obliged to meet State competition in competitive territory.

That I might have authoritative information, I wrote Hon. George Philip, of Rapid City, S. Dak., chairman of the State cement commission and asked him to reply to the speech of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. This has been effectively and authoritatively done and I take the

liberty of quoting therefrom at some length. I commend the facts contained in the excerpt to the perusal of my friend from the Keystone State.

This is with reference to the speech of Congressman COYLE, appearing at page 5326 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of February 18, 1931. Mr. COYLE seems to oppose the "State in business" idea. With his view, I, in principle, agree. That, however, does not alter the fact that South Dakota is in the cement business, and it is the duty of the people of this State to make its business a success in so far as it can fairly and legitimately be made so. Neither does it alter the fact that public men, whether they be Congressmen from the cement producing section of Pennsylvania, or just humble, nonsalaried cement commissioners from South Dakota, should try to give correct information in regard to the business.

I am neither an auditor nor a bookkeeper, and, as a consequence, I am not able to juggle the figures to the confusion of anyone. I just have the viewpoint of the everyday Scotchman that if I have earned money which I have not spent, and for which I am not indebted, the money is mine. The same should be true of a cement plant, even though State owned.

The constitutional amendment for the cement business, adopted in 1918 (against which I voted, by the way), allowed the State to engage in the production and sale of cement. A commission of high-grade men was appointed by Governor MCMASTER, and they built a very good 2,000-barrel plant, and production commenced in the closing days of 1924. A bond issue for $2,000,000 was floated on a difficult market, and consequently the terms were not as favorable as they would be to-day. It cost the entire sum of $2,000,000 to build the plant, and the legislature of 1925 appropriated $275,000 to put the plant in operation. This was soon paid back from the earnings of the plant. Since that time there has been paid back from the earnings of the plant to the State treasurer for the credit of the cement plant interest and sinking fund, the sum of $800,000, the last payment of $50,000 having been made in December, 1930. Up to June 30, 1930, the end of the fiscal year, the amount so paid back was $750,000. All this was from earnings of the plant not needed in its operation, and it must be remembered that the plant, by reason of improvements, additions, and replacements is more valuable and up-to-the-minute to-day than when it commenced operations; and in that time, except for the above-mentioned sum of $275,000, which was promptly paid back, the State has not been called upon to put up a dime to finance the operation of the plant. It at all times keeps on hand, and has now, an adequate cash balance from its own earnings to carry on production and improvements.

Mr. COYLE said that there are other employees of the State who work for the cement plant, but who are not carried on the pay roll. In this he is entirely in error. With the exception of the State treasurer, in whose office certain cement-plant funds are carried—and they require no addition to the required force in that office—there is no other State officer who works for the cement plant in any way who is not on the pay roll of the plant. Even the State auditor, whose duty it is to audit the plant twice a year, presents his bill for that service to, and has it paid by the plant.

Mr. COYLE mentions "curious bookkeeping." To me all bookkeeping is more or less "curious," but the system employed at the State plant seems as simple as any, because it has nothing to conceal, not even the amount of a taxable income. The State auditor calculated, and proved to my satisfaction, that, after depreciation and before interest, the profit of the plant from January 1, 1930, to June 30, 1930, inclusive, was $90,560.70.

The books of the plant show that the plant is being depreciated on exactly the same basis as privately owned cement plants, and as approved by the Government. This charge is regularly made.

Our biennial report for June, 1930, correctly shows in the trial balance an item of $750,000 returned to the cement-plant interest and sinking fund. It also shows cash and current assets of $491,872.41, a total of $1,241,872.41. The total interest for this period is $513,500. It seems to me that no one but a very expert bookkeeper can show a loss.

Mr. COYLE mentions loss from taxes. South Dakota had no cement plant, and to this day would have had none unless it erected one of its own. Consequently, that loss is pure fiction. We might as well calculate the loss of taxes on our ocean shipping when we have neither shipping nor ocean.

Mr. COYLE's figures are wrong, and those who agree with him, and with me, that the State should not be in business can take very small comfort from the record of the South Dakota Cement Plant.

Waiving all discussion as to the possible reduction of price of cement to the ultimate consumer, the South Dakota plant is paying for itself.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION FOR PORTO RICO

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill (S. 5139) to extend the benefits of the Smith-Hughes Act and the civilian rehabilitation act to Porto Rico is of the highest importance to the welfare of our fellow citizens of Porto Rico. When this bill was before the Committee on Education, of which I have the honor to be chairman, there appeared before us Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Governor of Porto Rico; Resident Commissioner, FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA; Senator Santiago Iglesias, of Porto Rico; and other distinguished persons interested in the educational affairs of Porto Rico.

The people of the United States of America have a profound admiration and a genuine affection for their fellow citizens of Porto Rico, and the fact that this bill was passed by the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote is evidence of the fine feeling that exists between the people of continental United States and the people of our beautiful island possession of the south.

The evidence before our committee demonstrates clearly and convincingly that Governor Roosevelt has approached the problems of Porto Rico in a very sympathetic and practical manner. I think it is well within the facts to say that Governor Roosevelt of Porto Rico has taken the time to visit the farms of the island, both large and small, to ascertain the real needs of the children of school age and the parents of these children. It seems there are over 500,000 children of school age with facilities to take care of little more than half of this number. Under the leadership of the governor and other prominent citizens of Porto Rico, modern schoolhouses have been built and are being built by the children interested in vocational work. Also the necessary furniture to put into these buildings has been made by the children as a part of their vocational school work. There is a farm in connection with every school, the products of which are used to feed the children. There is a garden in connection with every little home, which helps to sustain the family life. All this work is being done under trained supervision so that the children of Porto Rico, at least so far as facilities are available, will receive practical training in vocational work. If this work is continued over a period of time it will be sure to raise the standards of living throughout the island and soon produce a generation of highly trained and skilled workmen for the island.

We must not lose sight of the fact that Porto Rico has over 600 industries, employing nearly 20,000 persons, of whom 16,000 are wage earners, having a total capital of more than $84,000,000. It is highly important that the school children of the island should have a thorough course in vocational education in order that present industries may be made more efficient; also that new industries may be developed to give employment to our citizens.

The people of Porto Rico are to be commended for the courage and energy with which they have met and overcome the calamities which nature has inflicted. The cyclone that swept the island in 1928 left ruin and devastation in its wake. The people have shown a spirit of determination worthy of the best traditions of any race on earth. Homes have been rebuilt, new schools have been established, and every effort is now being made to put the island on a sound economic basis.

It is needless to enlarge upon the value of civilian rehabilitation because the result obtained in this country has convinced those familiar with the facts that the legislation is practical and wise. There are many people in Porto Rico who are prevented from carrying on a gainful occupation because of physical defects, congenital or acquired by accident, injury, or disease. It is safe to assume that a very large percentage of these people will, under this act, be retrained and prepared to become self-supporting, self-respecting citizens.

I feel certain that at the end of two years the work carried on under this act will be so resultful and highly beneficial in every particular that the work will be continued by Porto Rico with the assistance of Federal aid from the United States Government.

WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH THE ECONOMIC CONDITION IN THE UNITED STATES? IS THERE A REMEDY THAT WILL CURE IT?

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, every thinking man and woman in the United States has frequently, no doubt, asked himself or herself this ques-

tion: What is the matter with the economic condition in this country, and is there a remedy that will cure it?

It is my opinion that there are several causes for the present disturbed conditions in the United States, and I shall mention a few of them that have contributed to the present condition.

Of course everyone knows that the drought situation in nearly 20 States has been a very great disturbing cause in those sections, but the drought alone was not the only thing that had to be contended with even in those States. I doubt if anyone has ever seen in the history of this great Republic the economic distress that prevails in the United States now.

It is estimated that we have at least 5,000,000 men who are out of employment. If that be true, and each laborer represents a family of 5, and that would be about the average, then we have at least 25,000,000 people who are suffering on account of the present conditions.

As long as the stock and bond market and dealing in futures is carried on as it is now, we may expect a calamity, distress, and unrest in business at any time. Just a few months ago we retired at night thinking everything was in a normal and healthy condition financially, and the next morning read in the paper that the bottom had fallen out of the stock market at New York, and multiplied thousands of people had lost all they had invested in stocks and bonds. In other words, they had gotten to the point that they were not financially able to stay in the market and protect the stock they had bought before, and consequently lost everything they possessed. Of course everyone knows it was "shaking out the shorts," or a case of the big fish eating the little ones. This should not be allowed to prevail in a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Ninety-five per cent of the business of the world is done on confidence, and happenings like the one just above referred to destroys the confidence of the people, and instead of investing their money they hide it away in some lock box or private place and thus take it out of circulation. What we need now is a restoration of confidence.

No one can foretell now what might happen at any moment with reference to the financial condition of the country when it is handled as it is now by these stock exchanges, and dealing in futures as is now permitted.

Another thing that has contributed very much to the destruction of confidence is the banking laws that are now in force. We have seen more banks fail in the United States in the last year than possibly ever failed in that period of time before in the history of our Government. In my opinion that was largely caused by reason of the looseness of our laws with reference to banking.

These are some of the causes that have produced a lack of confidence, but they are not the greatest cause. It is my opinion that the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act passed by this Congress has had more to do with the destroying of confidence and disturbance of business conditions in this country than either or all of the causes above mentioned.

The tariff schedules fixed in this bill are very much higher than ever proposed in any other tariff law in the United States. The schedule of tariff that was prevailing in 1922 was the highest we had ever had up to that time, but its high rates were nothing to compare with the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

This act has some good provisions in it. The schedules with reference to agriculture will be helpful where they are effective. The trouble is that not more than 25 per cent of the rates fixed on agriculture will be effective and beneficial.

The call of a special session of Congress was for the purpose only of aiding agriculture and to amend the tariff act as it affected agriculture. But the truth was, when the floodgate was open for tariff legislation the whole tariff bill was rewritten with rates kited on everything so high that the consuming public could not buy.

When the last presidential campaign was on the people were told by the party then in power, and now in power, that everything was prosperous and that we should not disturb the prevailing conditions, but just as soon as they were reinstated in power then this legislation followed that has brought on this disturbed condition that we now have to face.

A careful study of that legislation will convince, I think, any reasonable mind that the legislation was intended to be beneficial to the manufacturer more than to any other class; and the rates of tariff fixed in this bill have, instead of helping the manufacturer, kicked back on him and hurt him and brought about the distressed times we are having now.

Here is the condition that now prevails. Here is the factory that is running day and night producing one of the necessities of life. The price on that commodity produced is raised, we will say, 25 per cent to 50 per cent, and will cost the consumer that much more. The purchaser has just so much money to spend, and if the purchasing power of his dollar is decreased he must necessarily decrease the amount of his purchasing or, in other words, when he has spent that which he has then he must quit.

The manufacturing establishments in the United States that thought they would be benefited by this tariff act have gone on and manufactured a heavy stock of the production that they manufacture and have their total capital invested in manufactured products much of which is on hand and no market for, either in the United States or elsewhere. What is the result that follows? The factory must either close down entirely or cut its time to one or two days in the week, and that puts laborers out of employment and puts them to seeking employment elsewhere, and when he goes there for employment it is the same in other places. The same condition prevails throughout the entire United States.

When this high wall of tariff was built around the United States for the purpose of putting out competition from other nations, they passed legislation to retaliate against it, and in many instances have made it so high that it has destroyed the export trade the United States has always enjoyed heretofore. We have had reciprocal trade relations with other nations and our export trade has now been practically cut off.

There is one provision in the Smoot-Hawley bill that is enough in itself to cause the destroying of confidence as now prevails in the United States, and that is the flexible provision in this tariff act. This flexible provision provides that the President of the United States may raise or lower tariff rates 50 per cent. This is a dangerous power to rest in the hands of a single individual however honest he may be. It is not people rule, and is not in accordance with the principle of a free government. The tariff is a tax. It has been well said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. The business world can see from this one provision the danger that might arise at any moment. It places an arbitrary power in the hands of one individual where he could make or break any corporation in the United States. He could raise or lower the tariff to a point that would be the destruction of business. The business world knowing the provision is in the tariff act and fearing its consequences are afraid to invest and afraid of the conditions that might follow from it.

A study of the uses of this power in the past will show that it is dangerous. Just a few days ago it was announced in the press that under this provision of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act an announcement had been made of a small reduction in the tariff on straw hats and an increased tariff placed on wire fences that the farmers of the country have to use.

Now, let us discuss for a few moments how this condition that we have spoken of above could be remedied. Legislation can play an important part in the restoration of business conditions.

First of all, our banking laws should be remedied as suggested above. The Smoot-Hawley tariff bill should be repealed and will have to be either repealed or modified before we have normal conditions in the United States.

The present distressed condition has taught us at least one great lesson, and that is that if any nation is to be

prosperous and to have normal conditions prevail whereby all the people can be taken care of and provided with a living that we must take care of agriculture.

It is a known fact to everyone who has studied the agricultural marketing act that it does not go far enough to provide the relief that was intended to be provided, and it will never be effective as it should be unless it is amended and unless a different policy of administration is adopted in enforcing this agricultural marketing act.

We all know that so far as cotton is concerned the act has proven ineffectual. The bill could be amended so as to fix and maintain a stabilized market for the price of this great commodity which is one of the greatest money crops raised here. The price to-day is so low that it does not equal the cost of production let alone giving a reasonable profit to the farmer for his labor and a reasonable interest on his investment.

I have an amendment pending before the Agricultural Committee of this Congress which if passed would make it effective on this great commodity. Everyone knows that if we are going to control and stabilize the price of cotton that we must control the bulk of it. The taking of a million bales of cotton off the market where we have 14,000,000 bales would have about as much effect as taking one bucket of water out of a well.

I hope when the next Congress meets we will be able to amend this agricultural marketing act and make it effective.

If you will take the number of acres of land in the United States and divide it equally between every person in the United States you will find that there would be a fraction over 15 acres of land for every person in the Union. Any person who has enough strength and energy to work can take 15 acres of land and by proper cultivation and care make enough to provide a living for that one individual. This would give to a family of five 75 acres of land.

The Lord never intended that anyone should starve, nor will they if they have a mind to work. Of course, it is not expected that everyone will engage in farming, for it is just as necessary that we have industries and people following various vocations and avocations of life because they furnish a market for the surplus of production of agriculture, and each should go hand in hand and be fairly treated.

One of the things most needed in the United States and in each of our States is economical government. If the Government of the United States were run economically, as it should be, it could be run on half the expense it is now costing. That is also true in each State. We should not only preach the Monroe doctrine but practice it. To have no entangling alliances with other nations. As far as lies within us, we should be at peace with all the nations of the earth and have reciprocal trade relations so we would have a foreign market for all our surplus products in the United States.

One of the causes for the low price of cotton is the discrimination against us by other nations which have heretofore been able to sell their manufactured products in the United States who have been shut out by a high-tariff wall, and they are going to other countries that produce cotton and selling them their products and, in turn, buying their cotton and establishing trade relations with them that have heretofore been enjoyed by the United States, and thus deprives us of selling our surplus products abroad.

It is time the people were thinking along this line before we wreck every hope that we have of continued prosperity.

RESTRICTION OF CANADIAN IMMIGRATION A NEW POLICY

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. J. Res. 500) by virtue of the provisions of section 2 thereof proposes an entirely new policy of restricting immigration to this country from our great friendly neighbor to the north of us, the Dominion of Canada. In the guise of unemployment relief it seeks to shut the door to the Canadian immigrant who under our present laws can freely enter, by providing that only 10 per cent of last year's total of Canadian immigrants may be admitted. In my opinion this is neither wise nor just. It is not wise because it is a complete reversal of a policy of over a hundred years of unbroken international friendship and mutual cooperation and friendliness between two great nations that has won the admiration of the world. Canada and the United States touch each other along 3,000 miles of unprotected border where for generations the peoples of both countries have traveled back and forth with scarcely a thought that they were traversing the boundary of nations foreign to each other. During that long period of time no untoward incident has happened to mar that record of free and happy intercourse, and no harm has come to the economic, political, or social interests on either side of the border.

Now we propose to begin the building of a wall, not, indeed, a wall of bricks and mortar but nevertheless a wall. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this resolution is unhappily enacted into law it will breed distrust and suspicion where none exists now; it will make for friction between the two nations and inevitably result in incidents that will endanger if they do not interrupt the long years of friendly intercourse of the past. What have we to fear from a continuance of the present unrestricted Canadian immigration? Some say it is necessary to relieve unemployment. That is not so and the advocates of this resolution know it. The fact of the matter is there is no ground for fear of any kind.

What is the matter with the type of immigrant coming from Canada that the advocates of this legislation are so impatient to put them under the ban? For my part I know of no complaint against the Canadian in the part of New England from which I come, and I dare say other Members of Congress from that section will gladly testify to the same effect. The distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], a member of the committee, says in his minority report opposing this resolution that in his own State are many splendid citizens who came from Canada. I, too, can say that in my State of Rhode Island there are many thousands of such citizens who came there from the Province of Quebec and are numbered among the leaders of our political, social, and business life. Their coming has enriched Rhode Island in an immeasurable degree. The State would be, indeed, the loser in every way had they not been permitted to come in the generous numbers which they did in the last half century. In the mass they are sober, industrious, thrifty, and hard-working members of the communities in which they live, and in addition they are loyal and devoted citizens of this great country which gave them their opportunity. In the last war their sons were early at the front fighting gloriously for the flag, and in no instance was there any doubt of their loyalty and allegiance. As individuals they have forged to the front in the professions, business, and public life. They have furnished political leaders to both of the great parties, and, in the past, Rhode Island has had two representatives of the race of French Canadians, governor of the State, and one now represents our State in the other Chamber of this great Congress, Hon. FELIX HEBERT, the junior Senator from Rhode Island. In the face of these facts I can not bring myself to believe that this country will suffer in any way by continuing to permit these people to freely come among us and participate in the privileges and responsibilities of American citizenship.

I shall vote against this resolution because of this unjust, unwise, and unfair discrimination against our friends from Canada, and I shall vote against it also because it makes impossible the reuniting of families, which, in my opinion, is unsocial and inhuman to the last degree. This same section 2 of the resolution absolutely shuts the door of hope to thousands of separated members of families, wives, aged mothers and fathers, and little children. This very phase of the legislation has evoked the solemn protest of scores of religious, charitable, and social-welfare societies who have an intimate knowledge of the cruelty and inhumanity that results from this separation of husbands from wives and parents from little children. There is no sound reason for excluding these people, as practically all of them are either too young or too old to become competitors in the labor market for the jobs of American workmen. For years and years they have been hopefully waiting for the day when once again they would be reunited to the sepa-

rated members of their families. What a disappointment the passage of this bill will be for them! If there were something real and tangible to be gained for American labor by the passage of this legislation, this might excuse, though it could not justify, such inhumanity; but no such benefit will be derived. On the contrary, because these dependents must be supported by the breadwinner of the family living here, millions of dollars are sent over annually to these foreign countries and will continue to be sent for an indefinite time in the future, thus taking large sums of money permanently out of the country which if these dependents were permitted to enter would flow into the domestic channels of trade.

The sponsors of this resolution offer it as a partial remedy at least for unemployment, but, Mr. Speaker, unemployment was not caused by immigration nor will it be removed or mitigated by the passage of such legislation as here proposed. Unemployment is a by-product of the maladjustment of our economic system and the sooner we stop fooling ourselves in the belief that we can eradicate it by such makeshift legislation as this the sooner shall we approach a real solution of the problem. Let us stop running after false gods in our anxiety to find a job for every man and above all let us not be guilty of heartless and cruel inhumanity in our haste to cure the ills from which we suffer. I do not believe this legislation is really intended to help American labor in this emergency, but is part and parcel of a carefully planned and concerted movement having for its ulterior object the exclusion of all immigration from this country. Of course, such a policy can not be openly advocated now with any hope of success and consequently the promoters of it seek to mask their purpose behind a pretext and, of course, the pretext most readily at hand and most likely at the moment to win support from every quarter, is the relief of unemployment. By this pretext organized labor, it would appear, has been enlisted in the fight on the side of the exclusionists. I am indeed sorry to find labor asking for this legislation because I do not find that the laboring people generally in my district, which is highly industrialized, approves of this type of legislation. On the contrary I have no hesitancy in saying that it is the overwhelming opinion of the people of Rhode Island, and particularly the people of the district which I have the honor to represent, that immigration legislation such as that now before us to-day is unworthy of the approval of the Congress of the United States and ought not to be enacted into law.

IMMIGRATION BILL SHOULD BE AMENDED

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I regard the measure now before the House of Representatives with mixed and contradictory emotions.

I believe it is necessary to put further temporary restrictions upon immigration as a matter of justice to American workingmen who are altogether too numerous for the jobs that are available in these parlous times and who should not have their chances of securing employment jeopardized by an influx of laborers from foreign lands. I believe also that it is not fair to the foreigners that this high tide of immigration should continue because when they come they do not find the paradise of prosperity their imaginations had pictured but a dead sea of disappointment.

I find, therefore, that I am in perfect accord with the main purposes of this bill but I do protest that it is not as considerate as it should be of the ties of family. I believe that our immigration laws should recognize the sanctity of the home and the sacredness of family ties and should make most liberal provision for the reuniting of families.

Every argument of kindliness and humaneness protests against families being kept asunder. While the life of the pending bill is limited to two years and while it recognizes the preferences that heretofore have existed in favor of relatives, it so reduces the quotas that in my judgment it will operate to shut out some immigrants who might well be allowed to join their relatives in this country. To keep these relatives separated for two years is to my mind a gross injustice.

I had expected to offer some amendments to take care of this situation. Preliminary canvasses had convinced me the amendments would be adopted, but the promoters of the bill were taking no chances on amendments. They suddenly decided to railroad the bill through under whip and spur, and when it was brought to the floor the privilege of offering amendments was denied. I think one of the most disgraceful scenes I have ever witnessed in Congress is the speed with which this bill is being rushed through to passage, with all privileges of amendments cut off. The bill must be voted up or down. Members of the House can "take it or leave it." They can not improve it with amendments.

The bill has yet to run the gauntlet of the Senate. It may fail there or it may be amended in that body so that it will be unobjectionable from the standpoint of uniting families, but if it passes the Senate and is signed by the President, I will make it my business to introduce on the opening day of the next Congress an amendment which I shall hope to see adopted. That amendment will add at the close of section 4 of the bill the following:

> In addition to authority to issue visas otherwise provided in this act and in the immigration laws now in force the Secretary of State in his discretion may cause visas to be issued, not to exceed 200 in any one calendar month, to provide for the reuniting of relatives in exceptional cases where great hardship would result if this authority were not exercised.

This amendment, or at least its substance, has the approval of such men as Reid Lewis, director of foreign language information service, ex-Congressman Nathan D. Perlman, representing the American Jewish Congress, and other authorities on immigration who appeared before the congressional committees. It would vest in the Secretary of State a wise discretion which could be relied upon to correct glaring instances of inhumanity in the administration of our immigration laws.

THE ADJUSTED COMPENSATION LOAN BILL

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am the son of a soldier of the war of 1861 to 1865, and I have always pledged myself to be favorable to legislation to aid and assist any soldier, whether the War of the Rebellion, the Spanish-American War, or the World War.

Since I have been in Congress I have supported every measure that has ever come up to aid soldiers, and my record to-day is 100 per cent for the soldier.

I believe that if this country requires the youth of this Nation to join the Army and go to the front for the protection of the Union, it is the country's duty to support this man after the war is over.

I recall to-day my action in Congress during the eight years that I have been a Member of Congress.

I had only been here a few months when I was called upon to consider the most important measure that has ever been offered in behalf of the soldier of the World War and that was the war risk insurance act which was passed. This was the adjusted compensation act for the veterans and their dependents and I supported this bill with my vote.

It passed the House of Representatives and the President of the United States saw fit to veto it and I was one of those who believed it a just bill and voted to pass the law over the President's veto.

Again, in 1924, 1925, and 1926, acts to clarify and liberalize the compensation insurance pertaining to the veterans of the World War were passed and I also voted for them because I believed it was necessary to clarify the act in order to give the soldiers the necessary relief.

Bills to build hospitals and make other minor adjustments to the compensation law were brought forward at different times. These, I always supported.

In the Seventy-first Congress we passed the American Legion hospital bill. At this time, I made a speech upon the floor of the House in favor of it. This speech is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 16, 1929, and I quote one paragraph of that speech:

It has been my purpose at all times to vote for all bills that would be beneficial to the sick and those unable to make a living for themselves. I believe that the Government should provide adequate hospital housing facilities for the care of the disabled veterans, and I favor this measure known as H. R. 234, authorizing an appropriation to provide additional hospital, domiciliary, and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization under the World War veterans' act of 1928, as amended, and for other purposes.

Learning through my congressional experience in dealing with the soldiers in my district, I found that there were many cases of actual hardship and distress that could not be covered by the war risk compensation act through technical reasons and consequently last summer I sponsored and supported the legislation to give to the soldiers of the World War a pension for disabilities not of service origin.

A few days ago I supported the measure to authorize loans to the soldiers holding adjusted compensation, believing that as the Government had assumed this obligation with the soldier that it was no more than just to make a part payment on that loan at this time when there is so much distress abroad in our land.

My friends, those of us who are in Congress and who are favorable to helping the soldier can do no better than to pass legislation to aid the sick and needy, and I believe that this country should be generous in its gifts to the soldier and should act in a way that will impress upon the younger generation that the Government is willing and ready to stand by the boy who follows the flag. I am sure if this is done and a future war should come, we would have no difficulty in raising an army for the protection of the Nation.

FURTHER FOOD RELIEF EXPEDITIONS—MICHIGAN TO ARKANSAS

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks of some days ago commenting upon the wonderful work done by the people of Benton Harbor and Covert in sending food to drought-stricken Arkansas, I just want to mention some other communities of my district which have likewise answered the call of want and were not willing to be outdone by their neighbors in spreading good cheer and sharing their bountiful stores of provisions with others less fortunate.

From the communities of Eau Claire and Baroda, of Berrien County, Mich., four truck loads of provisions consisting of 250 loaves of bread, beans, flour, rice, sugar, bacon, potatoes, cabbage, turnips, carrots, canned goods, clothing, and so forth, were taken to Earle, Ark. In addition to the provisions supplied, the students of the Eau Claire school raised about $25 to be added to the milk fund for hungry Arkansas kiddies.

On Sunday, February 22, three truck loads of food started for Paragould, Ark., from Hartford, Van Buren County, Mich. Contributions were also made to this caravan from the townships of Bangor, Lawrence, Keeler, and Watervliet. Hartford did not label its venture as "charity" or "relief," but the Caravan bore the banner, "Hartford, Mich., the garden spot of the world, direct to Arkansas." Editorial comment upon the movement is so fitting that I can not refrain from quoting it:

"Peace on earth, good will to men" has held full and undisputed sway in Hartford this week. What a noble, inspiring spectacle was afforded by the hundreds who trekked in and out of the town hall, bringing their offerings of food for a people made hungry by the caprice of nature. * * * Paragould is welcome. The pleasure is all Hartford's.

The fourth food relief expedition to Arkansas from Berrien and Van Buren Counties left from Watervliet and was joined by trucks from New Troy, Keeler, and Sawyer, with Piggott, Ark., as their destination. With this expedition these two counties have now put approximately 60 tons of goods into Arkansas, approximately a thousand dollars in cash, and the communities of South Haven in Van Buren County, Lake Township in Berrien County, and other places are planning like expeditions.

The spirit of giving has been so contagious and these good people have derived so much pleasure out of their generosity and the helping of the less fortunate, that, in addition to all the provisions and money sent direct to Arkansas, these two counties have also oversubscribed their Red Cross quotas to the extent of several hundred dollars each.

Again I say there is a "right way" and a "wrong way," and the gratitude of those who received can not possibly exceed the happiness of those who gave.

THE CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER CHARLES J. MOOS

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, the astounding farce goes on. It would be a comedy if it were not so tragic. I doubt if anywhere in the annals of our Government there will be found a more sordid trail than the story of the post-office leases. There seems to be no length to which they will not go to keep it covered up and to prevent the facts from reaching the public. There must be good reasons. And there are.

I do not wish to keep this matter agitated before this House, but there are facts that the Congress and the public are entitled to have. The best way to end this appalling situation is to expose it in all its hidden baseness. Why are the facts denied the Congress? Why does a high official, when he does condescend to report to Congress, deliberately misrepresent the facts?

The leasing situation is thoroughly bad and represents a most ugly chapter of governmental failure. It is indeed an unlovely picture to see men high in the Government and in party councils not only shield and protect but participate in a huge fraud upon the Government.

Enough facts have finally been dug out and in spite of most sinister obstacles have been made public so as to convince all that there is a thoroughly inexcusable and deplorable situation existing.

Yet a Cabinet officer undertakes to tell Congress and the country that all is well, that there is nothing wrong with a condition that has been and is robbing the people of millions of dollars a year in fraudulent post-office rentals based on fictitious values. The Post Office Department has been so conducted that professional leasing rings got a monopoly on the business of building and renting parcel-post substations and post-office garages. They are enabled and permitted to rob the public of untold millions, certainly well over a hundred million dollars, at least, in inflated bonds on these stations.

This iniquitous scheme seemed to have had its start with a lease at St. Paul, where the Post Office Department leased a building put up for it by promoters without bid or competition of any sort. There is good reason to believe that the building never cost $200,000 and the land was appraised at $50,000. Yet the Post Office Department agreed to pay $120,000 a year for 20 years and the promoters unloaded on the public, under the misrepresentation that they were Government bonds, or guaranteed by the Government, over a million dollars in bonds, and were preparing to unload another $800,000 issue in addition when the investigation got started.

A Federal grand jury at St. Paul reported evidence of fraud, graft, and corruption, in the whole transaction and requested an investigation by the Department of Justice. A Federal court later awarded a total damage on the St. Paul station in condemnation as compensation for the land, building, and value of the lease of $334,000.

Right in the midst of the condemnation case, mind you, gentlemen, while the case was being tried in St. Paul, Postmaster General Brown sent a prepared statement to be read to Congress stating that the St. Paul property was worth $677,000, although his own department files at the very time showed that post office appraisers had established a value of $405,000.

Later he said it was worth $800,000. During the final determination of the case in Federal Court at St. Paul, while the Government was doing its best to acquire the property at a reasonable price, the Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Arch Coleman, suddenly appears at St. Paul without warning or notice to the Federal district attorney and lo and behold! appears in court as the first and star witness against the Government. He goes to St. Paul, mind you, gentlemen of the House, at Government expense, to be the chief wit-

ness on behalf of one of the most notorious of these professional post-office leaseholders and bond promoters against the Government. The Post Office Department was supposed to be the client, the district attorney the client's lawyer. What would any of you lawyers think if your client in a lawsuit were, without consulting you, to appear as the chief witness voluntarily on the other side of the case?

How long would you believe in his sincerity and his fitness to be head of a great superbusiness dealing in hundreds of millions of dollars such as the Post Office Department.

My main reason for voting against the Government operation of Muscle Shoals was my complete disgust and distrust of Government operation and management of its business enterprises as demonstrated by the Post Office Department. This year we will have the largest postal deficit we ever had. It will run to the astounding sum of $150,000,000. I have become so thoroughly imbued with a lack of confidence of politically controlled governmental management of business enterprises that I feel that the worst thing we can do is to extend that policy. I believe, however, that for the protection of the public interests, that the people should retain public ownership of our natural resources, such as water power, but under proper and adequate supervision and regulation have them efficiently operated by private interests.

For instance, do you suppose a board of directors would long retain as one of its corporation an executive officer who told the board that official information he had gathered for them and in his files about the corporation's affairs was no concern of the board of directors and that he refused to make the information available to the board because it was not "compatible to the corporation's interest" for the board of directors to know about the corporation's affairs.

Yet that is just what Postmaster General Brown has done. He refused a committee of Congress access to his official files about matters which Congress was then legislating. He also refused to make public the result of an investigation of the postmaster at St. Paul on charges which I preferred as to participation in the notorious lease there and improper use of his official position to advance his own private insurance business. One of our cardinal principles is to keep the Government from unfairly competing with private business. It should also extend to Government officials.

This postmaster, Charles J. Moos, uses his public office to force people dealing on a large scale with the post office to give his insurance firm their business. He does the same thing with the postal employees. This is the crudest, rottenest kind of unfair competition with private business. Yet Postmaster General Brown exonerates and protects Mr. Moos in this abuse of a public office.

My charges are dismissed by Postmaster General Brown and Mr. Coleman as being "trivial." Let us see whether you would consider them trivial. I recite them:

1. That Postmaster Moos spent but a small part of the day at the post office or in postal work and the vast majority of his time at his office at the William B. Joyce & Co. and in the soliciting of his private insurance business. The postmaster has rarely ever been in the post office regularly during the business hours of the day.

2. That he had a private telephone installed from his office in the William B. Joyce & Co. to the post office, which could be connected to the switch board of the post office. When calls were made for the postmaster over the phone the fact was not given out that he was not in the post office, but the call was simply switched through to William B. Joyce & Co., and those calling thought they were talking to him at the post office, thus concealing the fact that he was in reality engaging in his private business during the working hours of the day.

3. That he circularized the postal employees by letter for their insurance business. Copy of the letter was made part of the file.

4. That he had full knowledge of the making of the noncancelable lease on the St. Paul commercial post office station which since has become the object of a nation-wide scandal. Although Mr. Moos was not postmaster when the original negotiations were made by the Post Office Department to lease the quarters for the St. Paul commercial postal station, as this was done under a previous administration, Mr. Moos did become postmaster before the building was completed, and it was under his administration that the post office department moved into the new building and that the lease was signed. This was done in spite of the fact that there was a protest from substantial business men of St. Paul before the post office department moved into the new building against the terms of the lease which was being negotiated. The assistant postmaster at St. Paul, Mr. O. H. Negaard, protested repeatedly in detail and in writing to Postmaster Moos against making the original lease which was for 20 years and cancelable, noncancelable in 1925. Under the original lease the Government could vacate the property at any time on 90 days' notice, and the postmaster at St. Paul refused to pay any attention to the advice of his assistant postmaster and the lease was quietly rewritten with the cancellation clause dropped out. To comply with the law which prohibited the remaking of leases unless there was a substantial benefit to the Government, $775 per year was dropped from the rental. This, however, was fictitious consideration for the Government, inasmuch as the lease originally called for $120,775 per year. This small amount of $775 can only be considered as colorful and an attempt to evade the law. During the negotiations it was agreed that if the lease was rewritten without the cancellation clause that there would be a very much more substantial reduction in the rent, but this provision was left out when the lease was negotiated finally.

5. That Postmaster Moos directly profited from the making of the lease noncancelable. After the lease was negotiated Mr. Moos went to Chicago, presumably on official business, as he went at Government expense, visited the office of the owner of the station, Mr. Jacob Kulp, where he solicited the insurance on the leased building. At this conference it was agreed that he was to get the insurance and later this was confirmed by letter with a list of expirations, which his firm, the Wm. B. Joyce & Co., wrote in an amount exceeding $1,000,000 coverage, as follows: $500,000, fire; $330,000, tornado; $250,000, explosion; $120,000, rental, plate glass, elevator, and public-liability insurance.

This is all the more significant in view of the fact that there is a question whether the building ever cost $200,000, and in any event a Federal court in condemnation action last year gave an award of, as total compensation for the value of the land, building, and the value of the lease itself, as $334,000. Mr. Moos interposed no objections during the negotiations to the making of the lease noncancelable and apparently was rewarded by having the insurance transferred to his firm.

6. That a similar transaction took place in regard to a leased post-office garage at St. Paul. A garage for the Post Office Department under lease by people who had their own insurance connections contained a cancelation clause; Mr. Moos was instrumental in having the lease canceled and negotiations for a new garage undertaken. The new garage was built and when the owners got a noncancelable lease their insurance was switched to Mr. Moos's insurance firm.

7. That Mr. Moos had the Post Office Department trucks pick up the parcel-post packages of a number of business concerns and take the same to the post office. This was done for a few favorite firms who were good customers of Moos's insurance agency, but is not done generally.

8. That post-office employees were permitted and encouraged to solicit their fellow workers for insurance for the Wm. B. Joyce & Co. agency, the Moos insurance firm. That those employees who did not switch their insurance business, or boost the insurance firm of the postmaster, were denied promotions and were given the more undesirable assignments, and those employees who were most active in writing and soliciting business for the postmaster were given the best assignments and were promoted.

9. That Mr. Moos forced the owners of subpostal stations in St. Paul to place their insurance in his firm before they could get leases with the Post Office Department.

10. Mr. Moos was not in the insurance business when he became postmaster, but some time afterward used his position as postmaster to get into the insurance business.

11. That Mr. Moos demoted a number of department heads at the St. Paul post office because they refused to circulate petitions demanding his reappointment. They refused to boost his private insurance business and some of them were opposed to the making of the lease noncancelable and told investigators about the lease and the postmaster's connection with it.

12. That Mr. Moos organized and used the post-office band to promote his insurance business.

13. That he used official post-office bulletins to promote his insurance business.

14. That Postmaster Moos is also the president of a building and loan association and that he permitted and encouraged postal employees to solicit their fellow employees to purchase stock in his building and loan association.

15. That an agent of the Foshay Co., which is now bankrupt and in the hands of the receivers, was allowed to solicit post-office employees during working hours. A number of post-office employees lost heavily in the collapse of the Foshay Co.

Since the expiration of Moos's term, a year ago in January, no examination has been called for the selection of a postmaster and Mr. Moos has not been designated as acting postmaster nor has he been appointed postmaster. I have repeatedly requested a civil-service examination for the selection of an eligible list for the appointment of a new postmaster or have insisted that if the administration is going to retain Mr. Moos, that he be regularly appointed and his name sent to the Senate, where an opportunity would be given to protest against his appointment and all of the facts officially presented on both sides.

I have charged the administration with knowing full well that Mr. Moos will never be confirmed and that they have therefore withheld submitting his name to the Senate for that reason, for as soon as he were rejected he would have to leave the office and his successor would have to be appointed.

Gentlemen of the House, do you consider these charges as trivial? How much reliance can you place in officials who report to you that they are? Yet Assistant Postmaster General Coleman told a committee of this House that Mr. Moos was being retained because my charges were trivial. But you will note that Mr. Moos's name has not been sent to the Senate where the charges would have a fair and impartial hearing, although his term expired over 13 months ago. Mr. Coleman told the committee recently that Mr. Brown intended to reappoint Mr. Moos as postmaster at St. Paul. But time has gone on and nothing is done. If the department intends to reappoint Mr. Moos, why do they not do so?

Mr. Moos is standing on his Post Office Department whitewash and the statement that a grand jury exonerated him. I should think that the less he said about the grand jury the better. As a matter of fact, he really protests too much and too soon, for he is defending himself against charges which have not yet been made. Why? Something on his mind? He had not been charged with any criminal act that would warrant grand jury action. My charges were as to gross impropriety in office. He jumps up and seeks to vindicate himself by hiding behind a grand jury report. Up until the time that he made his suspiciously too vigorous defense, at least in advance of accusations, no one realized that he had even been called by the grand jury.

But talking about the grand jury it might be well to point out that the first grand jury indicted no one, but made a general charge of graft, fraud, and corruption in the St. Paul lease. Incidently that grand jury did not know that Mr. Moos had obtained over $1,000,000 worth of insurance coverage on the St. Paul commercial post office, nor did they know how and under what circumstances he obtained it. There are other things not known then that are known now, however. The grand jury at St. Paul, behind which he seeks to hide, recommended a complete investigation and second grand jury action, as it had insufficient evidence or time to indict anyone.

The second grand jury, which was to receive the report of a Department of Justice investigation, was suddenly halted and the case never presented. Had it been we would have had some most enlightening exposures. I charge that the second grand jury was called off as a result of a conspiracy and collusion in the Post Office and Justice Departments.

Here is a partial trail of sickening corruption. Post-office inspectors exchanged files with the Department of Justice investigators at the outset of the investigation, and much of the evidence disappeared. An agent of the Department of Justice, who is investigating the case and who gets too hot on the trail, leaves the service about that time. The assistant Federal district attorney at St. Paul is dismissed suddenly and without warning on the eve of presenting the case to the grand jury. The new Federal district attorney, as fine and square a Government prosecutor as ever lived, shortly after his taking office is high pressured into signing a whitewashing report by a high official from Washington of the Department of Justice upon misrepresentation to him about the report. Later when he fearlessly and courageously fought the Government's case against most insidious opposition of high governmental officials, he is harassed, shadowed, investigated, and an attempt made by Government agents to discredit him.

By orders of high officials the criminal case is deliberately withheld from the grand jury until the statute of limitations has barred presentation and then the file closed with the report that it is now too late to further pursue the matter.

When by sheer persistence the matter is finally forced out in the open, it is found that the incriminating books of one of these professional lease holders have been destroyed. Two hundred thousand dollars in bonds issued against this leased property have never been accounted for. The records that would indicate to whom they were sold or given and to whom the interest payments were made have disappeared. No one has appeared to redeem these bonds. Why? Had a proper investigation been made honestly in the first place the whereabouts and why abouts of these bonds would have been known.

Yet we are told that there is nothing wrong about the lease situation, and that my charges against Postmaster Moos are trivial. Well, I shall not let the matter rest there. The facts, and all of the facts, are going to be made known to Congress and the public.

So far everyone connected with trying to expose these leasing deals has been gotten out of the way. Vicious campaigns have been made against my reelection to Congress ever since I started this exposure. These campaigns have been well financed, highly organized, and though other issues have been raised as camouflage, the real cause was my activity in pursuing the post-office lease matters. I have known what was behind the opposition, but I am determined to leave no stone unturned until the whole miserable business is cleaned up. Sometime I may tell the House some of the personal indignities to which I have been subjected since I started this demand for a clean-up. But until it is wiped out I shall confine myself to the official records in the matter. You shall have the whole truth regardless of who or how many it hits, or how high up they are.

RETIREMENT OF REPUBLICAN CONGRESSMEN FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Illinois that has furnished illustrious men to the Nation, beginning with Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, and since his time the majority of the Illinois delegation have been faithful to the Republican cause.

During the last campaign we were confronted with a condition that caused four of our best Members to be retired from Congress. These men have been faithful servants to the Government of the United States and, as they retire from their seats in Congress, it is fitting that they should be properly mentioned.

EVERETT DENISON, one of our leading Members, was elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress and reelected to each succeeding Congress until the Seventy-second Congress. While he has been defeated at the polls, he still has the respect of the majority of the citizens of his district and no doubt, in time, if it is his desire, he will be returned. Mr. DENISON has, during his term of Congress, been recognized upon the floor of the House as a man of great ability. He is a good constitutional lawyer, has passed many bills on the floor of this House for the benefit of the Nation, and as he retires to-day it is the Congress that is the loser.

The next in time of service is our venerable Congressman from Chicago. We, of the Illinois delegation, have always respected him on account of his kindness to each of us. He has always taken a great interest in every Member of the Illinois delegation and during the latter years of our most respected citizen of high standing in Congress, he was his most personal friend, the late Martin B. Madden. Mr. SPROUL retires from Congress at a good ripe age; but upon his retirement, he takes the highest respect from every Member of this House to his home, and we wish him many pleasant and happy days in the future.

ALBERT MICHAELSON, who was defeated in the primary, has been a Member of this House for 10 years. He has been a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, has taken great interest in the promotion of inland waterways, and his influence upon the floor and in the committee has been of such a nature that his loss will be felt not only by his committee but by the Members of Congress.

EDWARD M. IRWIN, who has been in Congress but a short while—six years—has had a remarkable success and advancement in the House of Representatives. His influence, his hard work, and his friendliness with his colleagues have brought him to the chairmanship of one of the important committees of the House and his loss as chairman of the Claims Committee will be felt by every Member in the House who has had the opportunity to go before his committee; and at this juncture, I would like to read an editorial from the Alton Telegraph, the principal paper in his district, which appeared on February 18:

Congressman EDWARD M. IRWIN, near the close of his present term of office, and with a certainty that he will be superseded for at least two years, has put through Congress a bill providing post-

office buildings for both Wood River and East Alton. Defeated in his aspirations for reelection the Congressman has not lost his enthusiasm to maintain a reputation as a worker for his district. In his career in Congress he has been one of the most useful of Congressmen.

While he has refrained from making any exhibition of his speechmaking powers, and frankly he would tell anyone he was no speechmaker, he was proud of the fact that he knew how to work and wanted to do it. In his career as Congressman he has been of great assistance to a large number of his constituents. It is undoubtedly true that he has done more correspondence with and for his constituents than any other Congressman the district has known. He has performed countless personal services for people back home who needed special services from him at the National Capital. His time will expire March 4, and no matter how good his successor is, it is more than could be expected that the people could have from any other person such devoted self-sacrificing service as Doctor IRWIN has given the twenty-second district. That would be too much luck for anyone to expect. He has set a high mark in service for those who may follow him to emulate. Wood River and East Alton will have special reason for uniting in the opinions here expressed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my thought that the retirement of these four Republicans is much regretted not only by the Republican side of this House but by the Democratic side, because they are four men who have been instrumental in bringing about satisfactory legislation to the entire House.

WHAT PROHIBITION HAS DONE TO THE AMERICAN HOME

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in his campaign speech at Elizabethton, Tenn., October 7, 1928, President Hoover said:

The purpose of the eighteenth amendment is to protect the American home. I wish it to succeed.

One of the leading prohibition advocates in the United States is Canon William Sheafe Chase, head of the International Reform Association, a professional prohibition organization. Canon Chase was one of the contestants for the $25,000 prize offered by William C. Durant, automobile manufacturer, for the best plan to enforce prohibition. In his paper submitted in that contest, as reprinted on pages 121 and 122 of Mr. Durant's book entitled "Law Observance," Canon Chase said:

Liquors may be manufactured in the dwelling or obtained in any other way, and the same rule applies as to disposing of them.

The only limitation to the home saloon is that liquors are not sold within its walls in the presence of Federal officers unless they are bribed or are trespassers. That limitation is easily evaded by the ordinary bootlegger.

Here we have the compromise that drove the saloon from the public places, where children were protected by being barred from their doors, into the private homes, where the children must live.

The children could not go to the saloon but the Volstead Act takes the saloon to the children.

Here in the home the adult members of the family and "bona fide" guests sit with children at the family table, sip these constitutionally protected liquors, damn the Constitution, curse the law, and villify the enforcement officers. Children here are led into lives of crime.

SERIOUS THREAT TO LAW AND ORDER

The National Commission on Law Enforcement and Observance, comprised of 11 outstanding American citizens to study and report on the prohibition question, devoted many pages of its recent report to the effect of home manufacture of intoxicants on the lives of children and its general effect on law and order. On page 22 of the House reprint of its report the commission said:

To the serious effects of this attitude of disregard of the declared policy of the national prohibition act must be added the bad effect on children and employees of what they see constantly in the conduct of otherwise law-abiding persons.

Such things as the effect on youth of the making of liquor in homes, in disregard of the policy, if not the express provisions of the law; the effect on the families of workers of selling in homes, which obtains in many localities; and the effect on working people of the conspicuously newly acquired wealth of their neighbors who have engaged in bootlegging are disquieting. The widespread and scarcely or not at all concealed contempt for the policy of the national prohibition act and the effects of that contempt must be weighed against the advantage of the diminution (apparently lessening) of the amount in circulation.

On pages 32 and 33 of the commission's report are its findings and conclusions with respect to the manufacture of beer, wine, and distilled liquors in the homes. After presenting facts to show the frequency of such manufacture the commission says:

But there is more to be considered than the difficulties of detection without invasions of homes and violation of constitutional guaranties. The bad effects of such operations, on the verge of or in violation of law, carried on in the home are self-evident. Adults living in such an atmosphere of evasion of law and law-breaking and children brought up in it are an obstruction to the present enforcement of the law and a serious threat to law and order in the future.

The difficulties presented by home production differ from those arising in other phases of the general situation in that they involve the arousing of resentment through invasion of the home and interference with home life. Necessity seems to compel the abandonment of efforts for effective enforcement at this point, but it must be recognized that this is done at the price of nullification to that extent. Law here bows to actualities * * *.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A SALOON

In a campaign speech delivered October 26, 1928, Charles Evans Hughes, now Chief Justice of the United States, but then a private citizen, said:

What is meant by a saloon? I suppose we should have a scientific definition of a saloon. You don't alter the fact by changing the name. To-day we have the speakeasy, and that is a part of the conditions of which complaint is well made.

* * * * * * *

HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF HOMES A POTENTIAL WINERY, BREWERY, OR DISTILLERY

Hon. Amos W. W. Woodcock, Director of the Prohibition Bureau of the United States Department of Justice, appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives December 8, 1930, in connection with the appropriations for the enforcement of prohibition. He was interrogated as follows by Representative GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM:

Mr. TINKHAM. What is your interpretation of that part of section 29 of the Volstead Act? [Reading:]

"The penalties provided in this act against the manufacture of liquor without a permit shall not apply to a person for manufacturing nonintoxicating cider and fruit juices exclusively for use in his home."

Mr. WOODCOCK. The courts have interpreted that, and I, of course, accept the interpretation of the courts.

Mr. TINKHAM. Their interpretation is what?

Mr. WOODCOCK. Well, I tried the Hill case, and the court in the Hill case said that "nonintoxicating" meant nonintoxicating in fact. If a person made—in that case it was both wine and cider, or fruit juices and cider—for exclusive use in his home, why the burden was upon the Government to prove that they were intoxicating in fact. Then the same conclusion was reached by the Circuit Court of Appeals in the Isner case.

Mr. TINKHAM. How can the consumption of alcoholic liquor be regulated by your department with this provision in the Volstead Act, as interpreted by the court?

Mr. WOODCOCK. How can it be regulated?

Mr. TINKHAM. How can the consumption of alcoholic liquor be regulated?

Mr. WOODCOCK. I say, all we are attempting to do is to stop the commerce in intoxicating liquor. I do not think that section has very much bearing upon it one way or the other.

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, that section permits the making of wine and home-brew for home consumption, does it not?

Mr. WOODCOCK. No, sir; not wine; nonintoxicating fruit juices is the language.

Mr. TINKHAM. Yes; nonintoxicating. Grape juice is nonintoxicating at first, is it not?

Mr. WOODCOCK. I think so.

Mr. TINKHAM. It would permit the making of nonintoxicating grape juice in the home and home-brew, which subsequently, of course, becomes intoxicating?

Mr. WOODCOCK. Not home-brew, Mr. TINKHAM. The saving exception is in favor of nonintoxicating fruit juices and cider.

Mr. TINKHAM. If you permit those to be made in the home, nonintoxicating fruit juices and cider, and if you can not get a search warrant without a sale being made, why is not the production of alcoholic liquor possible as a practical matter in every home in this country?

Mr. WOODCOCK. I think it is of that particularly limited class of alcoholic liquors.

Mr. TINKHAM. So, really, we might say, in a large way—not perhaps what we might call a fanciful way—every home, under the law, can become a winery, or a brewery, or a distillery?

Mr. WOODCOCK. No; I do not admit anything like that, because the exception is not in the phrase containing breweries.

Mr. TINKHAM. But you can not raid a home where home-brew is made unless there is a sale. Certainly every home, to a practical degree, can become a brewery.

Mr. WOODCOCK. That is the law that Congress has passed.

Mr. TINKHAM. That is true. I am not asking you to criticize the law. I am asking you about the results of the law.

Mr. WOODCOCK. I think the prosecution of a person for making home brew, with no commercial aspect, is not impossible, of course, but it is very difficult.

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, the fact is, that with the right under the Volstead Act to make fruit juices and cider plus the fact that a

house can not be searched unless there is a sale, every home in this country may produce as much alcoholic liquor for home consumption as is desired, and there is no other result that can possibly be reached under the law.

GOVERNMENT AID IN HOME WINE MAKING

The Federal Farm Board has lent to the California grape growers, according to a letter by Edgar Markham, assistant to the President, written to me under date of January 21, 1931, a total of $19,187,622.07, of which $2,555,330 was a direct loan to Fruit Industries (Ltd.), whose principal business is manufacturing concentrates for the production of champagne and wine in the homes. More than 80,000 cars of California grapes are shipped annually, largely for home wine-making purposes, and the Government is subsidizing this industry with huge loans.

QUANTITY OF LIQUOR MANUFACTURED IN THE HOME AS COMPARED WITH PREPROHIBITION PRODUCTION

It is impossible to determine with accuracy the amount of whisky, gin, wine, beer, and cider manufactured in the homes of the people under prohibition conditions. It is known that great quantities of household commodities are converted into alcohol in the homes.

We have an official estimate of the amount of illegal liquor produced in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, by Amos W. W. Woodcock, director of the United States Prohibition Bureau of the Department of Justice. It is to be expected that Mr. Woodcock would be extremely conservative in estimating the quantity of unlawful liquor made in the United States since it is his duty as chief prohibition enforcement officer to suppress entirely the production of all unlawful alcoholic beverage. Mr. Woodcock's estimates of the quantity made are much below the estimates of unofficial investigators and research men. Since, however, Mr. Woodcock's estimates are official, and were published under the authority of the Bureau of Prohibition of the Department of Justice, they will be used here to show the probable extent of home manufacture of various kinds of alcoholic drinks.

WINE

Under section 29 of the national prohibition law, as interpreted by the courts and the Prohibition Bureau, it is entirely lawful to manufacture 12 to 20 per cent wine in the home for home use. The following tables from Mr. Woodcock's survey show the amount of wine consumed in the United States for five years before prohibition and the amount he finds made in the United States during the last five prohibition years:

Before prohibition

	Gallons
1915	32,911,909
1916	47,587,145
1917	42,723,376
1918	51,598,024
1919	54,272,656
Total	229,293,090

After prohibition

1925	137,225,550
1926	126,165,400
1927	143,573,400
1928	153,614,400
1929	118,320,300
Total	678,320,050

It is stated by Mr. Woodcock in his survey that the wines made since prohibition contain an average of 12 per cent of alcohol. It will be seen from the foregoing tables that almost exactly three times as much wine of 12 per cent alcoholic content has been made during the last five years of prohibition as were consumed during the five years preceding the adoption of the national prohibition law. It is admitted that most of this wine is made in the homes, and it is also admitted that under the anomalous provision of section 29 of the national prohibition act this manufacture is not unlawful.

BEER

There is also a very large quantity of home brew made in the homes of the people. Mr. Woodcock estimates that there were 683,032,000 gallons of home brew of 3.4 per cent of alcohol made in the United States in 1930. Although the home brew contains but 3.4 per cent of alcohol, as against 12 per cent of alcohol in home made wines, its manufacture is unlawful under the national prohibition act. Mr. Woodcock estimated the amount of absolute alcohol in the 1930 production of home brew at 23,223,088 gallons.

In 1919 there were 669 breweries operating in the United States manufacturing 2.75 per cent beer. These 669 breweries produced 852,977,018 gallons of beer. The beer manufactured in all the operating breweries of the United States contained very little more absolute alcohol than the home-brew Mr. Woodcock found made in the homes in 1930, after 10 full years of Federal and State prohibition enforcement.

WHISKY, GIN, DISTILLED LIQUORS

Mr. Woodcock's survey shows the following quantities of 100-proof whisky, gin, or other distilled spirits made unlawfully in the United States in 1930:

	Gallons
From corn sugar	45,900,000
From cane and beet sugar	10,000,000
From molasses and grain	4,000,000
From diverted alcohol	9,929,218
Smuggled liquor	3,557,500
Total	72,486,718
Spirits legally withdrawn, 1919	82,118,111

It will be seen from these tables that in 1930, after 10 years of National and State prohibition, Mr. Woodcock found that the unlawful production and smuggling in of distilled liquors was only 9,631,393 gallons short of the legal withdrawals of 1919, the last wet year.

TAXES, CRIME, ETC.

Accepting Mr. Woodcock's survey at its face value it shows that three times as much wine is being manufactured under prohibition as before prohibition; that the beer manufactured in 1930 contained almost precisely the amount of alcohol as the beer manufactured in 669 operating breweries in 1919, and that the production and smuggling of unlawful whisky, gin, and other distilled spirits in 1930 was only 9,631,393 gallons short of the legal withdrawals of 1919.

In 1919 the Federal Government collected $365,211,252.26 in revenues on distilled liquors and $117,839,602.21 on fermented liquors, or $483,050,854.47 on both distilled and fermented liquors.

These figures prove that all that prohibition has done is to divert the manufacture of liquor from a lawful, regulated, controlled industry into an unlawful, unregulated, and uncontrolled industry, and to transfer the manufacture from Government-supervised wineries, distilleries, and breweries into the homes of the American people.

They further prove that the Federal Government has lost, on the basis of 1919 production and withdrawals, $483,030,854.47 in revenues each of the 10 prohibition years, or $4,830,308,744.70 in all.

In other words, the revenues the Government might have collected on the lawful alcoholic beverage industry have gone as profits into the pockets of violators of the national prohibition law, and these profits have financed the greatest criminal ring in the history of the Republic.

As the distinguished champion of prohibition, Canon Chase, well said, "Prohibition has taken the saloon to the children in the homes, and the children are here led into crime."

The folly of an institution that has driven the manufacture of liquor into the homes of the people and criminalized the children of the country is the answer that prohibition echoes back to Mr. Hoover who said that "The eighteenth amendment was intended for the protection of the American home."

APPALLING EXTENT OF UNLAWFUL DISTILLING

Another index to the extent of unlawful distilling in the United States under the operation of the national prohibition law is found in the number of unlawful distilleries, stills, and parts of stills captured by the Federal prohibition officers during the 10 years of the law. A compilation of this unlawful apparatus is made by the prohibition bureau every year. These reports, taken from the official records,

show the following number of stills, parts of stills, and illicit distillers reported captured by the Federal prohibition agents alone:

1920	32,862
1921	95,993
1922	110,150
1923	158,132
1924	158,976
1925	172,537
1926	161,979
1927	208,673
1928	261,661
1929	247,242
1930	285,891
Total	1,893,496

The foregoing figures show a steady and enormous growth of unlawful distilling in the United States during the entire prohibition era. They also show that no matter how many stills and parts of stills the Federal Government captures in any one year that there is always a greater number awaiting capture the succeeding year.

In 1926 former Federal Prohibition Administrator Gen. Lincoln C. Andrews testified before a subcommittee of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee that in his opinion the Federal officers did not capture more than 1 out of each 10 stills in operation.

If General Andrews's estimate was correct—and no official of the Government was in better position to make an estimate—then it is apparent that not less than 18,934,960 unlawful distilleries, stills, and parts of stills have been in use during the 10 years of the prohibition law.

General Andrews testified that a great number of stills were in operation in the homes of the people. It is very difficult for the officers to capture stills in the homes, for the reason that no warrant may be issued for the search of any dwelling house except upon proof of unlawful sale of liquor. To get such proof is often very difficult, for the prohibition agent must gain entrance to the dwelling and make a purchase of liquor before he can swear out a search warrant.

In the course of the hearings former United States Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, undertook to elicit from some of the professional prohibitionists who appeared as witnesses what the effect of this widespread manufacture of liquor must have upon the women and the little children in the home. One of the witnesses thus interrogated was Mrs. Ella A. Boole, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

On page 1086 of the record of the hearings of the subcommittee appears the examination of Mrs. Boole by Senator Reed:

Senator REED. * * * Do you know that the prohibition department seized last year (1925) 172,600 stills?

Mrs. BOOLE. I have heard it.

Senator REED. Well, that is the official record.

Mrs. BOOLE. Yes.

Senator REED. Now, I am not arguing with you in regard to what we may desire, because I understand that you desire that everybody should stop the use of liquor altogether, and there may not be a very great difference of opinion as to the desirability of that if it can be accomplished, but I am dealing with the condition as it is. Do you know of any condition prior to prohibition where there was any such number of stills as I have named, running in private homes, the most of them? You will agree with me that that was not true then, will you not?

Mrs. BOOLE. Yes; that was not true.

Senator REED. * * * Do you think it makes for the moral advancement of the family to have liquor manufactured in the home?

Mrs. BOOLE. Why, of course it does not, Senator Reed.

Senator REED. Do not you think it is a very detrimental thing to the little children to see liquor manufactured in the home?

Mrs. BOOLE. Yes; but Senator——

Senator REED. * * * If it is true that in 172,600 homes the prohibition officers have found stills, and nearly all of them in the homes, of a great majority of them, and that they have probably not gotten more than 1 out of 10 that exists, which would mean 1,720,600 stills, nearly all of them in the home, do you not think that is absolutely a terrible condition?

Mrs. BOOLE. Yes; but I think——

Senator REED. Well, if that is true, it is a terrible condition, is it not?

Mrs. BOOLE. It is a terrible condition. * * *

Mrs. Boole, in explanatory testimony, denied that all the stills were making liquor in the presence of little children. She said that it was her experience that in most of the homes where stills were operating there are no children, and that as much of the liquor was manufactured at night the children would not be present.

Senator Reed pressed her for an answer to his interrogatory as to whether it was better to have the liquor manufactured in the homes, in the presence of the women and the children, or outside of the homes, but she declined to answer.

The National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement in its recent report to the President and Congress states that there has been more sustained effort to enforce the prohibition law than any other law on the statute books. But in spite of this fact the violations of the law, as shown by the records, have increased year by year. The commission, on page 140 of its original report, says:

> The statute [prohibition] has been in force for a decade with large majorities in Congress pledged to give effect to it and militant organizations pushing to that end. There has been more sustained pressure to enforce this law than on the whole has been true of any other Federal statute, although this pressure in the last four or five years has met with increasing resistance as the sentiment against prohibition has developed. No other Federal law has had such elaborate State and Federal enforcing machinery behind it. That a main source of difficulty is in the attitude of at least a very large number of respectable citizens in all communities and a majority of the citizens in most of our large cities and in several States is made more clear when the enforcement of the national prohibition act is compared with the enforcement of the laws as to narcotics.
>
> * * * * * * *

The sustained pressure of the Federal Government to enforce the national prohibition law resulted, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, in the following results, as shown by the annual report of the Federal Prohibition Commissioner:

Number of persons arrested for violation of law	83,222
Number of persons convicted	54,085

The report shows that the penalties assessed against 54,085 persons convicted of violation of the national prohibition laws amounted to 14,172 years of imprisonment and fines of $6,678,732, and that in addition thereto property valued at $29,238,077.48 was seized, of which $20,202,278.69 was destroyed.

But the tragic thing about it is that the Federal Government alone, so say nothing of what the State governments are doing, is imprisoning more than 1,000 persons every week in an attempt to enforce the prohibition law. Speaking on this phase of prohibition in the National House of Representatives on February 7, 1930, the Hon. JAMES M. BECK, former Solicitor General of the United States and now one of the most brilliant Members of Congress, said:

> It was Edmund Burke who said that he did not know how to frame an indictment against all the people, but he might have gone further and said that you can not indict a substantial portion of the people. The fact that after 10 years of enforcement, with the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars and a ghastly sacrifice of many lives, the prohibition law is still largely unenforced damns it beyond any defense.

MATERIALS USED IN MAKING MOONSHINE WHISKY

For six months of 1930 the Federal Prohibition Bureau at Washington kept a record of the materials captured with stills. These materials are used by the moonshiners for making whisky and alcohol. The following is the record as shown by the report of the Prohibition Commissioner:

	Quantity	Equivalent in alcohol
Molasses	223,706 gallons	159,790 gallons.
Cane, beet sugar	714,013 pounds	89,251.62 gallons.
Corn sugar	162,431 pounds	116,243.10 gallons.
Grain	536,256 pounds	38,304 gallons.
Molasses mash	98,000 gallons	15,680 gallons.
Sugar mash	14,946,307.68 gallons	2,391,409.20 gallons.

In addition to these materials for distilling, the Federal agents seized 201,414.13 gallons of denatured alcohol and

alcoholic preparations from which it was intended to make moonshine whisky.

The yield in proof gallons of alcohol—which means 100-proof whisky or gin—from the materials captured with the stills would have been 3,179,199.32 for the 6-month period of 1930.

If the same proportions of materials was captured during the succeeding six months they would have yielded 6,358,398.64 gallons of moonshine whisky of 100 proof, for the year.

On the basis of 1 still in 10 captured, the yield of alcohol from illicit distilling would have been 63,583,986 gallons. This is quite close to the amount of moonshine Mr. Woodcock estimated was produced from the same materials in 1930.

DEMORALIZING EFFECT OF PROHIBITION ON HOME LIFE IN THE COAL-MINING DISTRICTS

Mr. James J. Forrester, research expert for the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, in an article in Current History, for March, 1931, presents a graphic picture of the deadly demoralizing effect of prohibition upon the home life of the people in the coal-mining regions. Here is his portraiture of the conditions, based upon his personal investigations for the Wickersham Commission:

All evidence tends to show a highly demoralizing effect of prohibition upon certain large elements of our foreign population. This is nowhere more apparent than in the large coal-mining areas, where the overwhelming and undisputed testimony is that continuous, open, and flagrant violations of the law exists among the workers. They make and drink the vilest liquors in their homes, almost without exception, and there is free indulgence on the part of women as well as men, and by boys and girls.

Places where liquor can be had are more numerous than before prohibition, and there is practically no effort to conceal them. This condition in the anthracite regions shows not only a lack of observance of the prohibition law, but has developed a general contempt for all law among all classes of the foreign born except the Lithuanians. The testimony of physicians who come in contact with the conditions, is, with few exceptions, that not only is intemperence increasing, but loathsome diseases, and that there is wholesale disregard of sexual morality.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DESPERATE CONDITIONS IN COAL-MINING REGIONS BY REV. FATHER FRANCIS KASACSUN, A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN OF LUCERNE COUNTY, PA.

Compare the picture of the pathetic and distressing conditions found by Mr. Forrester in the coal-mining regions in 1930 with the conditions described by the Rev. Father Francis Kasacsun, of Lucerne County, Pa., before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate April 10, 1926. He testified under oath:

You can find stills in practically every other home. They make it, they drink it, they sell it. Anywhere from $1.50 to $2.50 a quart. The private families that make it sell it. In some cases they sell it to the saloonkeeper.

The stills are copper kettles with a whole lot of coils, and the women folks take care of that. The men are at work, and the women folks take care of it. Drink it themselves, and in many cases the children drink.

Never (before prohibition) in my occupation as a Catholic clergyman have I found children drinking hard liquors. I have never found that the youth, anywhere from 14 to 18 or 19, that drank hard liquors. And now you see children drink. You can see them drunk. I have seen them drunk myself. There were a few children last year found drunk in the schools of the towns, and had bottles of it in their pockets. Last year there was a girl around 14 in the town arrested drunk. About two weeks ago there was a boy in another small suburban town that was caught drunk on the street. The school-teachers have been complaining about children coming to school under the influence of liquor. Before, the men, as I said, drank. Now the women are drinking and the children are drinking.

I go into the homes at least twice a year. I visit the homes. Many times I find mothers around 45 and 50 years of age drunk, so drunk that they can not stand on their feet; and the youngsters anywhere from 6 to 7 years of age have to do their own cooking because the mothers are drunk.

I have also found some grass widows making moonshine and selling it, and also inviting people into their homes, selling the whisky, treating them, and selling themselves at the same time.

So that there is an increase in immorality in the private homes.

You will find that the flask habit is on the increase and that very much immorality is going on amongst the youngsters, due to prohibition.

WOMEN AND YOUNG PEOPLE DRINK MORE THAN EVER

On the subject of drinking among women and young people of both sexes Mr. Forrester says:

The estimated number of speak-easies is three times the number of saloons before prohibition, and in some large centers of population the proportion is even greater. No reliable estimate is obtainable from the investigations as to the number of people who are drinking, as compared with those who drank before prohibition, but there is abundant evidence showing the increase in the classes of those who are drinking, and in the character of drinking. Many women who did not drink intoxicating liquors before prohibition are now indulging in them and young persons of both sexes are drinking far more than formerly. From the wide disregard of the law, and the ease with which liquor is obtainable, it would appear that in general only those are not drinking who do not wish to drink.

* * * * * * *

HOME MANUFACTURE OF LIQUOR FOR SALE

On the manufacture of liquor in homes for commercial purposes Mr. Forrester says:

A fourth and prolific source of supply is the home manufacturer, who may also be said to include the individual and independent moonshiner type of former days, whose tribe has increased manyfold during the decade of prohibition. The basement of his house, a garage, a barn, sometimes an abandoned or temporarily untenated dwelling, is the scene of his operations, both in the cities and in the country.

The distilling apparatus is easy to obtain, the materials abundant, and the process simple. He uses redistilled commercial alcohol, corn sugar, corn meal, fruit, fruit and vegetable parings, raisins, and various kinds of cereals. The most commonly used ingredient is corn sugar, the production of which has increased far beyond the apparent demand of legitimate commerce during the past five or six years. He sells direct to the local trade, to speak-easies, "beer flats," "blind pigs," and other places handling small quantities with quick turnovers.

Investigation shows that the country adjacent to most cities and large towns is honeycombed with illicit stills, many of them of large capacity. * * * It is these that supply the great army of bootleggers and speak-easies. * * * The liquors are not so good as those imported, and the cost to the consumer is less, but there are "millions in it" for the makers, the bootleggers, and the retailers. The demand is heavy; the danger of arrest is comparatively small and of successful prosecution still smaller.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. VIOLA M. ANGLIN

Mrs. Viola M. Anglin, chief deputy probation officer of the magistrates courts of New York City, testified before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate April 10, 1926:

The probation officers under my supervision, and there are 16 of them, tell me that in each of their districts—I mean in each one of their probation districts—you can find from 100 to 150, and in some of them 200, stills. * * * The children can not help but know that stills are running in the houses, and they can not help but know that their own parents, the people to whom they must look for guidance and everything, are disregarding the law and laughing at it.

THE EFFECT OF PROHIBITION ON TEMPERANCE

The most generally accepted indices of the effect of prohibition on temperance are arrests for drunkenness and deaths from alcoholism and a comparison of these statistics with those of other countries that do not have prohibition or have liquor-control systems restricting the sale of intoxicants.

Another index are the polls of the greater colleges and universities of the country conducted by the students themselves through their publications. The students ask themselves whether they drink, get drunk, and whether they are in favor of the enforcement of the prohibition law, its repeal, or its amendment to legalize light alcoholic beverages. These results of these polls are interesting and important. Early in the year 1930 polls were taken at 18 of the largest colleges and universities of the United States, including all of the highest rank.

CITY OF WASHINGTON

Arrests for drunkenness in the city of Washington, the National Capital, ought to be a fair index of the effect of prohibition on temperance. The police department of Washington has been keeping a record of arrests for drunkenness since 1913, when the Sheppard law was adopted making drunkenness an offense punishable by fine. Captain Edwards, in charge of police statistics, says that there has been no change in the policy of the police department in making arrests since the adoption of that law. Anybody found drunk and disorderly on the streets has been arrested since the date of its adoption.

If there is any American city where prohibition ought to be effective it is Washington. The city is under control of the Federal Government. Every police officer is a Federal

officer. In addition to the police force there is a large staff of Federal prohibition agents operating in Washington.

The effect of prohibition on temperance in Washington is fairly reflected in the arrests for drunkenness for six years preceding the adoption of the national prohibition law and for the last six years under the operation of the law. The population of Washington in 1920 was 437,571 and in 1930 it was 486,869, an increase of only 49,396—an average increase of less than 5,000 a year.

Arrests for drunkenness

Before prohibition:		After prohibition:	
1914	8,837	1925	10,571
1915	9,751	1926	12,907
1916	9,394	1927	13,375
1917	9,648	1928	13,796
1918	6,896	1929	13,942
1919	6,793	1930	14,409
Total	51,321	Total	79,000
Yearly average	8,553	Yearly average	13,166

With an increase in population of only 49,398 in 10 years from 1920 to 1930 the arrests for drunkenness in the model city of Washington were 1,832 more than twice as many as in 1919, the last year before prohibition.

WASHINGTON AND LONDON

It is interesting to compare arrests for drunkenness in Washington, the American National Capital, under all the prohibition enforcement the Federal Government can give it, with London, the English Capital. The approximate population of London is 10,000,000 as compared with 486,869 for Washington.

	Arrests for drunkenness, Washington	Convictions for drunkenness, London
1914	8,837	65,448
1928	13,796	33,641

This startling record shows that while Washington, under the national prohibition act, was growing steadily more drunken the city of greater London, under a wise liquor regulatory system, was reducing its convictions for drunkenness by approximately 66 per cent.

On the basis of population there are about 10 arrests for drunkenness in the model city of Washington, under the operation of the "noble experiment" to one in London.

Increase in arrests for drunkenness in Washington, from 1914 to 1928	4,959
Decrease in convictions for drunkenness in London, from 1914 to 1928	41,847

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS IN PHILADELPHIA, AS COMPARED WITH CONVICTIONS FOR DRUNKENNESS IN ENGLAND AND WALES, 1928

1928

Philadelphia, 1,950,561 population	60,395
England and Wales, 40,000,000 population	55,642
Excess of Philadelphia over England-Wales	4,753

Here we have the almost unbelievable record that the arrests for drunkenness in the city of Philadelphia, with only 2,000,000 population, exceed the convictions for drunkenness in England and Wales, with a combined population of 40,000,000, by 4,753. But if that appears to be startling, we find that the arrests in the city of Chicago for drunkenness in 1928 exceeded the convictions for drunkenness in England and Wales in the same year by 19,260. There were 74,802 arrests for drunkenness in the city of Chicago, and only 55,642 in all of England and Wales.

NEW YORK

The city of New York is universally condemned by prohibitionists as being the most wide-open city in America with respect to the sale of liquor. It is estimated that its speak-easies pay millions of dollars a year in graft for the privilege of unmolested operation. But when the prohibitionists want to prove that America is very sober under national prohibition they quote the statistics of arrests for drunkenness in New York City only, and use these statistics to prove that European cities are sodden with drunkenness.

On the basis of arrests for drunkenness, New York is the most sober of all the large American cities. The arrests for drunkenness in New York in 1928, with its nearly 7,000,000 of population, were only 13,353. This was several hundred fewer arrests for drunkenness than in the city of Washington, with only one-fourteenth the population of New York. But New York City is the only major American city the prohibitionist can compare favorably with London, Paris, or other European capitals in the matter of arrests for drunkenness.

DEATHS FROM ALCOHOL COMPARED WITH DEATHS FROM OTHER DISEASES

The professional prohibitionists—that is, the prohibitionists who make their living out of prohibition politics and propaganda—have created the impression that alcohol is the great destroyer of human life. Before the adoption of the prohibition law they made the claim that alcohol was killing more than 100,000 people every year. The truth is that deaths from alcoholism have always been very small. In 1919, which was the last year before national prohibition, there were only 1,367 deaths from alcoholism in the entire registration area of the United States.

There is an average of 1,250,000 deaths in the United States every year. But alcohol has always been a negligible factor in death-rate statistics. In fact, the death rates from alcohol are so insignificant that they have never been carried in the Statistical Abstract of the United States.

Deaths from alcohol (United States census reports)

1910	2,909
1911	2,875
1912	3,183
1913	3,744
1914	3,257
1915	2,945
1916	4,161
1917	3,907
1918	2,193
1919	1,367
1920	900
1921	1,611
1922	2,467
1923	3,148
1924	3,155
1925	3,694
1926	4,109
1927	4,372
1928	4,627
1929	4,339

Deaths from other causes

	1927	1928
Heart disease	211,796	237,349
Cerebral diseases	91,001	99,624
Cancer	103,578	109,770
Tuberculosis	87,567	90,659
Pneumonia	87,230	112,195
Nephritis	100,163	108,813
Total	681,335	758,413
Total deaths	1,236,949	1,378,675

The foregoing statistical record from the reports of the United States Census Bureau show that heart disease, cancer, cerebral diseases, tuberculosis, pneumonia, and nephritis cause more than one-half of all the deaths in the United States. The staggering total of deaths from these causes was 681,335 in 1927 and 758,413 in 1928, or 1,439,748 in two years.

Compare these 1,439,748 deaths in two years with the insignificant total of 1,367 deaths from alcohol in 1919—the year before the National Government embarked upon the "noble experiment."

COMPARISON OF MONEY SPENT TO SAVE LIVES FROM ALCOHOL AND FROM OTHER DISEASES

Notwithstanding the fact that the deaths from alcohol in the entire registration area of the United States amounted to only 1,367 in 1919, the Federal Government embarked upon the costly experiment of prohibition to save that number of lives.

From year to year it has increased appropriations for Federal enforcement until the aggregate appropriations for the prohibition and industrial alcohol bureaus, the Coast Guard, customs, and expenses of administration of the law through the Federal courts amounts in round numbers to $50,000,000 a year.

Now, as shown by the records of the Internal Revenue Department, the Federal Government is losing $483,040,854.47 a year in revenue taxes. Adding the direct cost of enforcement to the loss in taxes we have $533,040,854.47 as the cost to the Federal Government alone of the attempt to enforce prohibition.

We find from the records of the Census Bureau that notwithstanding this enormous cost the deaths from alcohol in 1929 were more than three times the number of deaths from the same cause in 1919, before the Federal Government began the "experiment."

So the Federal Government, while spending and losing $533,040,854.47 to save a mere handful of lives, has played the game so badly that the deaths from alcohol trebled during the years that prohibition has been in effect.

While the Government has spent and lost this enormous sum, aggregating nearly $5,000,000,000 in 10 years, what is it spending to save the lives of the 1,250,000 who die from other causes every year—many of them preventable.

The records show that it is spending for all public-health activities only about $10,000,000.

How many of the 1,439,748 deaths from heart disease, cancer, and the other four diseases that are really destructive of human life might the Federal Government have saved if it had used the $1,066,081,708.84 that it frittered away on a worse than useless effort to enforce the prohibition law, which, if fully successful, would have saved only a few lives, if it had expended this money in scientific research and aid to save the victims of heart disease, cancer, tuberculosis, diseases of the brain, kidneys, and respiratory organs?

ENGLAND'S MARVELOUS STRIDES TOWARD TEMPERANCE

The reduction in convictions for drunkenness in England from 188,887 in 1913 to 55,642 in 1928—a reduction of 70.5 per cent—has been brought about by strict regulation of the liquor trade in the matter of hours of sale and in the reduction of the number of places of sale. Added to these is a high rate of taxation.

These restrictions have resulted in a reduction in the sale of spirits from 31,790,000 gallons in 1913 to 12,881,000 in 1928, or a per capita reduction from 0.7 of a gallon in 1913 to 0.29 of a gallon in 1928.

There was a reduction in the consumption of beer from 35,250,000 barrels in 1913 to 20,819,000 barrels in 1928, or a per capita reduction from 27.76 gallons in 1913 to 16.96 gallons in 1928. There was a very slight increase in the consumption of wine from 0.25 of a gallon in 1913 to 0.375 of a gallon in 1928.

During the last two years this downward trend has continued, but the exact statistics are not available.

EFFECT ON PRISON POPULATION

In 1913 there were 18,989 persons in all the prisons in England. That was at the rate of 50.3 prisoners per 100,000 of population. In 1926, the last year for which statistics are available, there were only 9,508 convicts in all the prisons in England, or only 24.3 prisoners per 100,000 of population. During the period of this liquor-control system which brought about wonderful results in the reduction of the number of convictions for drunkenness there was also such a remarkable decline in the number of prisoners in the penal institution that England has been able to sell 27 jails.

PRISON POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The principal claims made for prohibition, in advance of its adoption as a national policy, was that it would empty the jails, eradicate crime, and convert the United States into a real millennium. These claims were perhaps never better stated than by the Rev. William A. Sunday, who preached the funeral sermon of John Barleycorn when the eighteenth amendment was ratified. He said:

> The reign of tears is over. The slums will soon be only a memory. We will turn our prisons into factories and our jails into storehouses and corncribs. Men will walk upright now; women will smile and the children will laugh. Hell will be forever for rent.

How completely this forecast of prisons and jails turned into factories, storehouses, and corncribs failed, is shown by the records of the Census Bureau on prison population.

On January 1, 1910, there were 68,735 prisoners in all the State and Federal prisons and reformatories. On January 1, 1927, this number had increased to 96,126. The prison population per 100,000 of population had increased from 74.7 to 85.

There are at present more than 9,000 prisoners in the State penitentiaries of Illinois alone, almost as many as in England.

United States prisoners per 100,000 of population, 1927	85
England, prisoners per 100,000 of population, 1927	24.3

ILLINOIS PRISON POPULATION INCREASED MORE DURING PROHIBITION DECADE THAN IN THE PREVIOUS 60 YEARS

Rodney H. Brandon, director of the Department of Public Safety of the State of Illinois, under date of August 29, 1930, issued a press release containing the gist of a report that he had made to the governor on that date.

He said:

> During the 1920–1930 decade the increase in the State's penal population was 131.25 per cent, and was greater than the total increase for the 60 years previous to 1920. The increase in 1930, as compared with 1929, was 11.74 per cent. Should this rate continue the prison population will be more than trebled by 1940.

He said further:

> During the decade which ended June 30, 1930, the population of Illinois charitable and penal institutions increased 50.85 per cent. In the same period the population of the State increased 17.65 per cent. The increase in the institutional population was three times the increase of the State's population.

Forty new buildings were on that date under construction for housing the victims that were being poured into the prisons and charitable institutions of that State.

SOME CONDITIONS IN MISSOURI

The Governor of Missouri, Hon. Henry S. Caulfield, was quoted in a newspaper interview February 10, 1931, as saying that there had been an increase of 500 in the prison population of Missouri's already overcrowded penitentiary during the first two years of his term. He added:

> I can't explain the increase in crime which puts prisoners in such numbers into the prison.

The Federal prohibition enforcement department made for the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement a report on the conditions of enforcement in all the States. In response to a Senate resolution the reports of 32 of these States were submitted to the Senate. One of these States was Missouri. The investigator for the Federal prohibition bureau reported:

That in St. Louis, the chief city of Missouri, there were stills in 20 to 25 per cent of the homes in certain largely populated sections of the city.

The report drew a picture of drinking among young people with the effect that morals had been reduced below par.

CHICAGO

Col. Robert Isham Randolph, president of the Chicago Association of Commerce, as spokesman for the Chicago Business Men's Committee for the Prevention and Punishment of Crime, reported last week that more than $2,000,000 a week in profits on the beer racket in Chicago are available for bribery and corruption.

He stated that there were 20,000 beer joints in Chicago, selling 100,000 barrels of beer each week, and that the standard price to the retailers was $55 a barrel, of which $52 a barrel was profit. Deliveries are made in trucks protected by armed guards. It was estimated by Colonel Randolph that 2,000 gunmen, armed guards, collectors, fixers, and custodians of brothels, gambling houses, and handbooks were engaged in the manufacture and wholesale distribution.

He concluded his report as follows:

Hoodlum gangs to-day in Chicago have corrupted the law-enforcement agencies to a degree that is tragic; they murder, rob, and bribe with apparent immunity. And the cornerstone of the power is the sale of beer—not whisky.

DRINKING IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A great deal of opinion has been voiced as to whether there is drinking in colleges and universities and whether the drinking is more or less than it was before the adoption of the national prohibition law. This discussion last year led the students of 18 of the large colleges and universities to poll themselves, through their university publications, as to whether they drink or get drunk or whether they favor the enforcement, modification, or repeal of the national prohibition law.

The result of the poll was printed in the record of the hearings of the Judiciary Committee of the National House of Representatives on the prohibition bills, page 1229. The result was as follows:

	Yes	No
Do you ever drink	19,593	10,210
Do you ever get drunk	4,781	9,417
Percentage who drink	66	
Percentage who get drunk	34	

For enforcement of prohibition	4,699
For modification of dry law	12,299
For repeal of prohibition law	7,722
Percentage for repeal or modification	81

Included in this poll were Amherst, Assumption, Brown, Colgate, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Lafayette, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Purdue, Pittsburgh, Princeton, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Williams, New York University, Yale, and Rutgers.

CONCLUSION

I have endeavored, in all fairness, to picture the prohibition situation as it really exists. The statistics and quotations can not be questioned. In my opinion, so long as the raw material is available it is apparent real prohibition will never exist in this or any other country.

How long will it be before the people responsible for existing conditions will admit their mistake and lend their efforts toward the enactment of legislation—National and State—that will bring a return of real temperance in this great country of ours?

THE DANGERS OF COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, communism, like some malignant growth, has fastened itself upon the United States, and unless some action is taken to eradicate it, may become a cancer that will destroy the very heart of our beloved Government. The surest cure for communism, I believe, is the complete understanding on the part of the public of its objectives and practices. The communistic doctrine when stripped of its verbiage is innately abhorrent to any red-blooded American. The danger lies in apathy, lack of understanding, and a failure to realize the fatality of allowing such a cancerous growth to go on without careful treatment.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, let me take your time to-day to review the subject of communism, to trace its history from the beginning, to show its spread through Russia, thence to the United States, and to reveal through the testimony of the communists themselves the real objectives of this movement.

COMMUNISM DEFINED

Communists openly pledge allegiance to the red flag of Soviet Russia and the forcible overthrow by bloody revolution of all other governments. The following definition of communism is given in the report of the congressional committee for the investigation of communistic propaganda:

A world-wide political organization advocating: (1) Hatred of God and all forms of religion; (2) destruction of private property, and inheritance; (3) absolute social and racial equality; promotion of class hatred; (4) revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed, and civil war; (5) destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and trial by jury; (6) the ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world union of soviet socialist republics with the capital at Moscow.

The patent and cardinal point for Americans to remember is that the main object of the communists in the United States is to forcibly overthrow our Government, destroy our system of private property, and put in its place a soviet or communistic government. Sovietism and communism are essentially synonymous terms.

HISTORY OF COMMUNISM

Communism and its half-brother, socialism, was first introduced in its embryo form in 1848 by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. They published the Manifesto of the Communist Party, which presented the following as its basic thought:

The history of all human society, past and present, has been the history of class struggles; incessant warfare between the exploited and the exploiter, between oppressed classes and ruling classes at various stages in the evolution of society; the struggle has now reached a stage of development when the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can not free itself from the dominion of the exploiting and ruling class (the bourgeoisie) without at one and the same time and forever ridding society of exploitation, oppression, and class struggles.

Communists scorn to hide their views and aims. They openly declare that their purpose can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the whole extant social order. Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a communist revolution. Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Proletarians of all lands, unite.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

To properly understand the development of this movement we must go back to the First International Association of Workers, which was formed at London in September, 1864, largely as a result of the manifesto to which I have just referred. While Karl Marx was largely responsible for this First International, after six years he withdrew his support from it because the anarchists were becoming too powerful within the organization, and he was bitterly opposed to them. As a result this First International Association survived only nine years. It must be said to Marx's credit that he preferred to tear down his own handiwork rather than see the anarchist element get control.

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

The so-called Second International, which was organized in Paris in 1889, followed very closely after the teachings of Marx, and to this day remains the guiding hand of world socialism. Before Marx's death in 1883 he found in Nicolai Lenin a very fervent and radical worker. Lenin later repudiated the Second International and became the leader of the radical wing of the socialists.

FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Probably no other event or series of events is so much misunderstood by the general public as the events beginning with the abdication of the Czar of Russia and the ultimate control of Russia by the communists, bolshevists, or soviets. Many are of the opinion that the communists were responsible for the overthrow of the Czar. On the contrary, the Communist Party, as we now know it, or its leaders, had very little, if anything, to do with the overthrow of the Government. Czar Nicholas II abdicated and the reigns of government were taken over by the liberal wing of the Duma, the representative body of Russia, whose members were elected by the people. Prince Lvov was the leader of this liberal group, and it is to be remembered that the United States was the first nation to recognize the provisional government of Russia, which was organized on the same democratic principles as our own. This all occurred in March, 1917.

While all this was going on in Russia it should also be borne in mind that the World War was in progress. At this same time Lenin was in exile in Switzerland and Trotsky was living in the Bronx, New York. Kerensky was at the head of the Russian provisional government, which functioned as a representative democracy for eight months,

at the end of which period it was overthrown by the communists.

No matter how justifiable a revolution against the czar's régime, no credit can be claimed by the communists in order to secure sympathy from liberals throughout the world.

Communism made very little growth in Russia until the revolutions took place and the czar's government was overthrown. With the formation of the provisional government political amnesty was declared and all exiles were allowed to return to Russia. Lenin, who was then in exile in Switzerland; Stalin, who was an exile in Siberia; and Trotsky, who was an exile in the Bronx, New York, immediately took steps to return to Russia. Trotsky, who had been delivering orations throughout New York and in Philadelphia made his farewell speech just before sailing for Russia in which he is reported to have said:

> I want you people to organize and keep on organizing in America in order that you may be able to overthrow this dirty, rotten Government of the United States. I am going back to Russia to overthrow the government there and stop this war with Germany.

The German Army's general staff knew that it would be greatly to the advantage of the central powers if revolution could be stirred up among the Russian troops. It was with the aid of the German general staff officers that Lenin and 30 other revolutionists were sent through hostile German territory in a sealed car into Russia.

On November 7, 1917, just a little more than a year before the armistice was signed, just a few months before very many American troops were beginning to arrive in France, and at probably the most critical period during the World War, Lenin and about 30,000 communists, taking advantage of the simplicity of the peasants of Russia, promising to give them land and wealth and promising the almost exhausted army a separate peace with Germany at once, staged a revolution that placed 150,000,000 Russian people under communistic, or soviet rule. Kerensky was driven into exile and most of the members of the former government were executed. Lenin and his followers had made an unsuccessful uprising in St. Petersburg in July, 1917, and as a result had to flee to Finland for protection. As the Germans became more successful against the Russian Army, however, the difficulties of the new provisional, or socialistic government, increased and dissatisfaction grew among the troops until finally revolution took place and Lenin took control. It should be kept in mind that the provisional government under Kerensky was a typical socialistic government.

Probably the most interesting and instructive point to the average citizen of the United States who believes in representative government is the fact that at the regular elections in Russia in 1917, there was a communistic party and members of this party ran for offices in the national legislature against the representatives of the Kerensky party. However, in view of the fact that the communists failed to elect a majority of the members of the national assembly it was dissolved by Lenin, the dictator. The first act, therefore, of the official communist or Soviet Government in Russia was to do away with representative form of government. To Americans, this should be a very enlightening point.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Third International or what might more properly be called the Communist International was organized by Lenin at Moscow in March, 1919. This International was an outgrowth of the radical wing of the Second International, of which Lenin was the leader. Conferences were held in Switzerland in 1915 and 1916 by the radical group of the Second International. The Third International pretends to be the headquarter association representing the advanced workers in every nation of the world and it no doubt has a great influence among workers in many nations.

The communists or Third International, known in Russia as the "Comintern," had its first international meeting in Moscow in March, 1919. Radicals from all over the world came to the meeting and since that time this Communist International has been the central medium of instigating class warfare and social revolution in all countries, in order to establish a World Soviet Union with the capital of the world at Moscow.

The government of Russia which is known as the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (U. S. S. R.), is an autocratic, self-constituted dictatorship by a small group of self-perpetuated revolutionists. Lenin was the founder and the first dictator. Joseph Stalin, the secretary general of the communists' party, is now the actual dictator. While the Communist Party as such has less than 2,000,000 members in Russia out of a total population of 150,000,000, yet it entirely controls the Soviet Government which has charge of Russia, and the Communist International, which is the fountainhead of communism throughout the entire world.

To any person who believes in representative government it is enlightening to learn that the Russian Communist Party is the only legal party in Russia. All other parties are outlawed.

We find in Russia three great distinct yet interrelated organizations. First, the Russian communistic party; second, the Soviet Government, and third, the Communist International. While each of these pretends to be a separate organization there is an interlocking directorate that really places all of the control in the hands of the dictator and his advisers. The central committee of the Russian Communist Party, of course, dominates the Soviet Government through its subcommittee of 10 members known as the "Politbureau," whose members as a rule hold all the important offices in the Soviet Government as well as in the Communist or Third International. It should be kept in mind that these officers are self-perpetuating in nature.

The principal function of the various organizations, in addition to governing Russia, is to carry out a propaganda campaign for communism throughout the entire world and to stir up revolution and class hatred in every country that can possibly be reached.

The legislative power of the Soviet Government is vested in the Congress of Soviets, which meets every two years and selects a Central Executive Committee to represent it during the intermission. The Central Executive Committee in turn selects a smaller group known as the presidium. This latter group is the real legislative authority and appoints the local commissars and judges of the government. The presidium is closely affiliated with the politbureau and usually many of its members are the same. Stalin and Mollotoff hold offices in both of these organizations.

I do not intend to take any more time to-day in discussing the development of the Communist Party in Russia. I should like to have time to discuss the economic policy of the communist Government or its so-called 5-year program. To-day, however, I want to take what time is left to discuss the growth of communism in America and to show the cooperation and assistance, leadership and direction that is coming from Soviet Russia to aid and develop the communists of the United States.

THE GROWTH OF COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

At a meeting of the American commission of the Third International, which was held in Moscow in the month of May, 1929, the following speech was delivered by Stalin, the dictator. This speech was suppressed from general publication, as are many of the speeches, orders, and publications of the soviet or communistic Government of Russia.

Stalin stated:

> I consider that the Communist Party of the United States is one of the few Communist Parties to which history has given decisive tasks from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement. The revolutionary crisis has not yet reached the United States, but we already have knowledge of numerous facts which suggest that it is approaching.
>
> It is necessary that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting the moment of crisis fully equipped to take the direction of future class wars in the United States. You must prepare for that, comrades, with all your strength and by every means; you must constantly improve and bolshevize the American Communist Party. You must forge real revolutionary cadres and leaders of the proletariat who will be capable of leading the millions of American workers toward the revolutionary class wars.

Molotoz, at present a member of the presidium and president of the Council of Commissars, in a report that he made

on the growth of communism and the "revolutionary thrust," made the following statement:

The Comintern has given particular attention to the situation in the Communist Party of the United States.

A special delegation of the executive committee of the Comintern was sent to the last congress of this party (Communist Party of the United States. Afterwards, for several weeks, there sat at Moscow a commission of the presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International which specially studied the situation in the Communist Party of the United States. The presidium of the executive committee of the Communist Party radically renewed the direction of the American Communist Party and created within it the conditions of a real Bolshevist development of the party and of a reinforcement of its authority among the working masses.

The Communist Party of the United States was first organized in Chicago in September, 1919.

Shortly after the party was organized the Government, acting at that time under the provision of war-time legislation, was able to drive this obnoxious growth underground. In 1921 the "Workers Party of America" was formed as a camouflage for the real Communist Party and continued to work under this name until 1924, when, as a result of the repeal of war measures and consequent discontinuance of Government activities on the part of the Department of Justice, the original Communist Party was again permitted to reappear in its old form. Each year these communists have become more bold, until at present they flaunt their revolutionary activities throughout the country, openly encourage class warfare, class hatred, and instill in the minds of the youths of foreign-born and of foreign people a disgust and hatred for the American Government, its institutions and traditions.

Unfortunately, at the present time the Department of Justice has no power, no authority, no funds from Congress to investigate communistic propaganda or activities or suppress the same. I sincerely hope that the Members of this Congress will give serious consideration to the evidence that has been submitted to us by the investigation committee and that at the next session of Congress we will be able to put into effect some healthy remedies for the situation that now exists.

It is extremely interesting to know that when the Communist Party was organized in America a Japanese (Sen Katayana) was chosen as president of the American section of the Third International, and from 1919 until just recently he has represented America at Moscow. This Japanese has had a very interesting and checkered career. He was born in Japan in 1859, and was driven out of his own country in 1916. He found refuge in the United States, where he immediately became a leader in the radical wing of the Socialist Party, which later became affiliated with the Communist or Third International. Recently Katayana was taken to Moscow and employed as an advisor on all Oriental matters. William W. Weinstein is the present head of the American section of the Communist International, although Mr. William Z. Foster has been the active candidate for the President of the United States at the last two elections on the communist ticket.

Surprising as it may seem, many States—Missouri among them—allowed the Communist Party to have its name printed on our regular election ballots.

At the present time the Communist Party of the United States is thoroughly and highly organized nationally and locally and is extremely active. Great encouragement and direction of all local activities is constantly received from Moscow. The effort to communize the foreign-born element in our population has met with greater success than any other effort of the communists. A great effort has been made to get members from the colored race in America, but fortunately, with the exception of those in large population centers, very little progress along this line has been made. The majority of the communists can neither read nor write the English language, and they are reached through the communistic foreign-language press of this country. It is astonishing to learn of the circulation these papers have in the industrial centers of the United States.

Some of the basic principles of the Communist Party in America can best be gathered from the testimony of various communistic leaders. Following is some testimony given before the congressional committee by Mr. Foster, who was twice candidate for President of the United States of the Communist Party:

Mr. FOSTER. Our party considers religion to be the opium of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices amongst the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. To be a member of the Communist Party, do you have to be an atheist?

Mr. FOSTER. In order to be—there is no formal requirement to this effect. Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples or religious ideas; but a worker who will join the Communist Party, who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party, must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs, and, if he still has any lingerings when he joins the party, he will soon get rid of them. But religion—that is, atheism—is not laid down as a formal requirement for membership in the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been to Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Eight or nine times.

The CHAIRMAN. You are familiar, then, with the workings of the Communist Party in Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. Reasonably.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, can members of the Communist Party in Russia be married in the church and maintain religious beliefs of that nature, and practice them?

Mr. FOSTER. My opinion is that a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union who would be married in a church would not be of any value to the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Could he maintain his membership in the party?

Mr. FOSTER. He would not.

The CHAIRMAN. He would be put out of the party?

Mr. FOSTER. Eventually, if not for that specific act.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it not be the same in this country?

Mr. FOSTER. As I stated before, workers who would be so imbued with religious superstitions that they would be married in a church would be of no value to the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. And the same thing would happen to them in this country that happens to them in Russia?

Mr. FOSTER Of course.

The CHAIRMAN. What you advocate is a change of our republican form of government and the substituting of the soviet form of government?

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated that a number of times.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if I understand you, the workers in this country look upon the Soviet Union as their country; is that right?

Mr. FOSTER. The more advanced workers do.

The CHAIRMAN. Look upon the Soviet Union as their country?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They look upon the soviet flag as their flag?

Mr. FOSTER. The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag and that is the red flag.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you owe allegiance to the American flag; does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?

Mr. FOSTER. The workers, the revolutionary workers, in all the capitalist countries are an oppressed class who are held in subjection by their respective capitalist governments and their attitude toward these governments is the abolition of these governments and the establishment of soviet governments.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, they do not claim any allegiance, then, to the American flag in this country?

Mr. FOSTER. That is, you mean the support of capitalism in America—no.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean if they had to choose between the red flag and the American flag, I take it from you that you would choose the red flag; is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated my answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Could not you answer a little more definitely and specifically whether they owe any allegiance to the American flag?

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated my answer.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to force you to answer if it embarrasses you, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not embarrass me at all. I stated very clearly the red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood that.

Mr. FOSTER. And all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that answers the question.

Now listen to the acceptance speech of W. Z. Foster when he accepted the candidacy to run for President of the United States on the communist ticket. This speech was made on May 25, 1928. He spoke as follows:

Our party, different from the Socialist Party, creates no illusions amongst the workers that they can vote their way to emancipation, that they can capture the ready-made machinery of the State and utilize it for the emancipation of the working class. On the contrary, we must utilize this campaign to carry on wide-

spread and energetic propaganda to teach the workers that the capitalist class would never allow the working class peacefully to take control of the State. That is their strong right arm and they will fight violently to the end to retain it. The working class must shatter the capitalist state. It must build a new state, a new government, a workers and farmers' government, the soviet government of the United States. No communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a communist heads a government in the United States, and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises, that government will not be a capitalistic government, but a soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Communist Press has a paid circulation of approximately 350,000 in the United States; exclusive of hundreds of shop papers and local publications.

The Daily Worker is published in New York and is a national official organ of the communistic party, and is the only paper that is printed in English. It has a daily circulation of 35,000 and goes into 1,118 American cities and towns.

The following testimony of Mr. Louis Bebrits, editor and chief of the Uj Elore, a revolutionary communist daily printed in Hungarian in New York City given before the congressional committee is both interesting and alarming to an American reading it.

Mr. BEBRITS. I am always fighting against capitalism and seeking to overthrow capitalism and to get a soviet government.

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes; and you would go to the extent of using force and violence the same as they did in Russia when the Russian provisional government was overthrown and the communist took control?

Mr. BEBRITS. I can not imagine a revolution without the same methods as the Russian workers and farmers used.

To a nation whose fundamental philosophy is based on a belief in God, the following testimony of Mr. M. J. Olgin, editor of the Morning Freiheit, is indeed shocking:

Mr. OLGIN. I agree perfectly with what Marx said about religion; that religion is the opium for the people.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe in abolition of all religion?

Mr. OLGIN. I believe in enlightening all the people so they may stop believing what don't exist. * * *

Mr. BACHMANN. Since 1922 you owe no allegiance to the American flag?

Mr. OLGIN. Since 1922 I am a communist, and that is a revolutionist.

Mr. BACHMANN. You are fighting to displace the American flag; is that not true?

Mr. OLGIN. I am fighting under the red flag to displace American capitalism by a government of workers and farmers.

Later Mr. Olgin said:

I know of no changes in history that have ever been accomplished without violence and struggles.

To the citizens of America who have long believed in private property, the freedom of opportunity for all, and the sacredness of the American home, the following testimony of Mr. Bebrits, editor of the Uj Elore, is indeed interesting:

Mr. ESLICK. If your idea of the new state would come into being at once, a change from our form of government to the soviet form of government, would you pay the landowner and the merchant and the other property owner anything for his holdings?

Mr. BEBRITS. The landowner, the property owner, will not get anything. I hold it that property owning, in my opinion, is the result of robbing generations of the people.

Mr. ESLICK. You would take away lands, merchandise, banking?

Mr. BEBRITS. Yes.

Mr. ESLICK. All of these forms of industry?

Mr. BEBRITS. Yes.

Mr. ESLICK. You would make no compensation whatever to the owners?

Mr. BEBRITS. No.

Mr. ESLICK. But suppose the capitalist class and individual corporations refused to give it up, then how would you take it away from them except by force?

Mr. BEBRITS. All revolutions are working with force.

Mr. ESLICK. And you would go to the extent of killing him in order to take his property, would you not, if it became necessary?

Mr. BEBRITS. I guess he will be wiser than to say he will stand and get killed.

To organized labor in the United States there should indeed go a great deal of credit for the tremendous forward drive that America has made in the last 50 years. American labor has truly formed the advance guard of our rapid drive in advancing civilization. The improvements in the standards of living in America has come about largely because of the cooperation which has existed between American labor and American industries.

Organized labor should be given tremendous credit for having withstood the onslaughts of communism and socialism that has been directed against it from Moscow. The people of America can never adequately express their appreciation to organized labor for the very brave and decided stand these organizations have always taken against communism.

In 1919 Mr. William Z. Foster, the present head of the Communist Party in America, was an active worker in the American Federation of Labor. No doubt, he was largely responsible for the great Youngstown steel strike which took place at that time. Mr. Foster was also an officer in the Industrial Workers of the World organization in America. As soon as his activities were understood by the labor officials he was immediately put out of the organization. This is the whole idea of the communist Government in dealing with labor. Their idea is to bore from within. Throughout the entire United States the soviet or communist Government has tried to organize unions within unions and has tried to stir up strikes and hatred within our labor organizations.

The farsighted and wise leadership of Samuel Gompers, and now the wise leadership of Mr. Green, have gradually made it possible to eliminate from the American Federation of Labor such cancerous growths in their organization. Probably no other organization in America, including the Department of Justice, has done more to hold the front-line trenches against communism in behalf of Americanism than has the loyal American labor leaders and the rank and file of the American Federation of Labor and of the other great labor organizations of this country. So effective has been the work of these labor leaders that the Communist Party has now had to change its types of propaganda to a certain extent. However, it is to be regretted that in certain important unions of the federation such as the garment, needle, textile, and mining trades, the communists have succeeded in almost breaking up the organizations.

The action of organized labor in dealing with the communists should be a grand and noble example for the industrial leaders of this country to follow. As one of the members on the investigation committee, Mr. HAMILTON FISH, said:

Our economic organization is on trial, and our industrial leaders must link their arms in the arms of our labor leaders if we are to successfully combat this growing evil of communism.

THE WORK OF THE COMMUNISTS AMONG THE YOUTH OF AMERICA

To me the most dangerous and insidious propaganda that is now being practiced by the communists is that among the youth of America. As Hon. JOHN NELSON, my good friend and colleague, a member of the investigation committee, said:

America can have no more vicious or dangerous enemy than he who seeks to implant in the minds of impressionable youth the seeds of class hatred, anti-Americanism, and revolution. In the world of practical affairs, to American-born men and women, with minds toughened by contact with an imperfect world, the philosophies of the communist make but little appeal; but youth, with its energy and idealism, lacking the experience and judgment to weigh and discriminate, is often distressingly warped and deluded in its formative years by the trickery of this propaganda.

Communistic propaganda activities among the youth of America are carried on through two organizations, the Pioneers of America and the Young Communistic League. Membership in the Young Pioneers of America is made up of children from 8 to 15 years of age. At the latter age they graduate into the Young Communistic League, with which organization they are affiliated until they reach the age of 23, when they become eligible for membership in the Communist Party proper.

Modeling after the noble organization of Boy Scouts of America, and yet despising that organization, the communists have their own organization, Young Pioneers. In this organization the children, largely foreign born, are taught contempt for law, government, and religion. In-

structions containing detailed information are issued to the leaders having this work in charge. Schools are held in our cities where teachers or leaders of these Young Pioneers are trained. You parents who have boys who are members of the Boy Scouts of America and who are acquainted with the loyalty of these young members and the pledge that they take listen to the oath that all pioneers must take upon joining that organization:

I pledge allegiance to the workers' red flag and the cause for which it stands. One aim throughout our lives—freedom for the working classes.

The Young Pioneers are taught that the workers and their children all over the world have but one fatherland, the soviet fatherland, but one flag, and that the red flag, symbolizing the red blood of the workers of the world.

To this organization of young boys and girls, and the organization, the Young Communist League, is often given the job of passing out treasonable literature. The communists realize that if the grown-ups gave out the literature they would be either arrested or subject to mob violence, but they know by having the youngsters give out this literature they will not be molested.

One of the most important features of work done by the communists among the young people is the conducting of schools for foreign-born children. The primary purpose of such schools is to teach the principles of communism and prevent the Americanization of the children of these foreign-born people. Summer camps are also maintained for the children. In 1925 there were just two of such camps in the United States, but in 1930 they were increased to more than 20.

During attendance at these camps the children are educated in the principles of communism, they are taught antireligious ideas, and are also taught to hate and hold in contempt all American institutions and all religion. They are taught further to render no allegiance to the American flag, the Stars and Stripes, and it is never displayed at any of their camps to-day. On the contrary, they are taught to reverence the red flag of communism and world revolution and to properly pledge allegiance to it. Communist schools and communist camps serve no other purpose than to prejudice the children of America and to try in every way that they know how to overthrow our present Government.

Again, I say the work of the communists among the young people of America is the most pernicious and dangerous of all the propaganda that they are now carrying on. If America is to stand by and give the Communist Government, a foreign government operating from Moscow, free access to the plastic minds of the children of America in its attempt to sow the seeds of anarchy, revolution, and class hatred, we are unconsciously aiding the most pernicious enemy of civilization in its conquest to overthrow organized government in the world.

There is an irrepressible conflict between Russian communism and a belief in God. The Communist International and the Soviet Government have declared war on religion. They have done everything to mock, descry, and outlaw religion. They have torn down shrines, desecrated temples and burial grounds, turned churches into clubs, and have murdered priests and clergy by the thousands. Communists openly claim that no one but an atheist can be a true communist.

The recommendations made to this Congress by the congressional committee appointed to investigate communistic propaganda are:

First. Instruction of our consular officers abroad to be very strict in the selection of immigrants and the issuing of visas.

Second. Authorization and appropriations to enable the Department of Justice to resume the work which was carried on previous to 1924, that of following up radical activities in the United States and cooperating with the various States in the same kind of work and reporting the same to the Congress.

Third. Additional appropriations to enable the Department of Labor immediately and continuously to deport all undesirable and illegally entered aliens whose deportation is indicated under our existing statutes.

Fourth. Amending of our present immigration laws so as to make it possible for us to more fully rid ourselves of criminal aliens, including all of those convicted under the anarchy and criminal syndicalism laws of the Federal States.

Fifth. Amendments to our postal regulations giving authority to the post-office officials to more strictly supervise the publication and transmission through the United States mails of radical publications which have as their object the overthrow of our Government.

Sixth. The encouragement and support of organized labor.

It has, indeed, been truthfully stated that America's best defense against the "red shirt" of the communist and the "black shirt" of the fascists is the "blue shirt" of the American workingman. In our fight against communism we can have no more effective ally than the 5,000,000 patriotic citizens comprising the American Federation of Labor and our other labor organizations.

AMTORG CORPORATION

I am going to take a minute or two to tell you something about Amtorg. I do not want to take up the economic situation at this time because of lack of time.

Russian trade in this country is conducted through an agency called the Amtorg Trading Corporation. It is incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. All of the stock of the corporation stands of record in the name of Peter A. Bogdanov, chairman of the board of directors, as trustee for the Bank of Foreign Trade of the Soviet Union. This bank is owned by the State Bank of Russia, and the State Bank of Russia is owned by the Soviet Government. Not a share of stock of this corporation is owned by an American. Every official of Amtorg with but one exception is a citizen of Soviet Russia.

The business of Amtorg Trading Corporation is conducted largely on a credit basis, with only $2,000,000 invested capital, and the commerce to America from Russia is equal to about one-third of the amount of its purchases in the United States. From 60 to 65 per cent of its business must of necessity be on a credit basis. The Soviet Government claims that in 1929 Russia sold us over $30,000,000 in commerce and we exported to Russia over $107,000,000 in commerce.

When called before our committee a number of the officials of Amtorg denied they were communists, but nearly all of them were communists in Russia. Before coming here some of them held very high positions with the Communist Party or the Soviet Government. They severed their communist relationships to come to the United States.

The biography of Peter A. Bogdanov, chairman of the board of directors of Amtorg, shows he began his career as a revolutionist when only 18 years of age and while yet a student. He was arrested in 1902 and served a prison sentence. In 1905 he was elected a member of the Bolshvik executive committee of the Russian Socialist-Democratic Labor Party and a member of the underground organization in the army. Later he went to Moscow and became active in the underground subversive organization as a member of the Communist Party.

In the beginning of the communist revolution he was president of the revolutionary committee of Gomel City. In 1919 he was appointed president of the council for the military industry and in 1921 president of the supreme economic council. During the year 1923 he was appointed chief of the supreme administration of the military industry and president of the committee for war minister orders.

He is now the highest official of Amtorg. Admitted to this country as a temporary visitor for the purpose of overseeing the affairs of this trading corporation, it will be interesting to note how long the Government of the United States will permit him to remain here.

The investigation of the committee discloses that Mr. Delgassa, vice president of the Amtorg, resigned and gave as his reason that he would not sign a statement of perjury, as would be the case if he made a statement to the effect that he was not a communist. He further stated that Amtorg was filled with communists, and after his resigna-

tion he was afraid to go on the streets because under the Russian courts and the order of the secret police this man had been sentenced to be shot and forfeit all of his property for having testified against communism.

We hear a great deal about the so-called 5-year economic program of Soviet Russia. To understand this we must analyze the action of the government toward the landowners of Russia, particularly the Kulaks, or more successful peasant farmers. Any farmer who owned more than two cows and two horses was considered wealthy and his property was largely confiscated by the Red Army.

The Soviet Government has gradually taken over most of the land in Russia, and is operating at the present time farms ranging in size from 185,000 to 500,000 acres. The labor on these farms as well as in the lumber camps is composed largely of forced, convict, and conscript labor.

G. T. Grinko, vice chairman of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics State planning commission, who is credited in a large part with being the author of this plan, in his recent book entitled "The Five Year Plan of the Soviet Union," in the first chapter, under Planned Economy and Perspectives, defines the 5-year plan, its purposes, and objects:

"The 5-year plan is a program for the further extension and consolidation of the great October revolution. Nor should the great international significance of the plan be underestimated. For the first time in history a vast country, with inexhaustible natural resources and a population of 150,000,000 free people, faces the world with an elaborate plan for upbuilding a socialist economy and culture—a socialist society. We fully share the view expressed in the editorial of the Pravda of August 29, 1929: "The 5-year plan is an important part of the offensive of the proletariat of the world against capitalism; it is a plan tending to undermine capitalist stabilization; it is a great plan of world revolution."

Its hope of accomplishment is thus defined:

"The great task set by the 5-year plan for the development of the productive forces of the Soviet Union through rapid industrialization and steady strengthening of the socialist elements in national economy is that of attaining and surpassing the technical and economic level of the advanced capitalist countries, thus assuring the triumph of the socialist system in its historic contest with capitalism."

The following statement is taken from the book written by the author of the 5-year plan (Prospects of Industrial Development):

These, to sum up, are the major statistical barometers of industrial development in the Soviet Union: 22,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric current, 140,000,000 tons of coal, 40,000,000 tons of crude oil, 17,000,000 tons of cast iron, 8,000,000 tons of chemical fertilizers, nearly 150,000 tractors, and nearly 250,000 automobiles, 2,000,000,000 rubles' worth of industrial machinery, and more than a billion rubles' worth of agricultural implements will be produced in the last year of this 5-year period.

The unfortunate situation in regard to the Russian 5-year plan is that the actual execution of this plan is being carried on under the direction of foreign engineers and experts, many of whom are Americans. The testimony presented to the committee indicates that the largest line of credit extended the Soviet Government in the purchase and installation of machinery comes from American industry. It is almost impossible to believe that certain American industries are willing to go to the extent of financing a Government that is carrying out a plan to destroy not only American industry but industry throughout the world.

The 5-year program will have a particularly striking effect on agriculture. From 1924 until 1929 Russia exported very little wheat. By the end of the first year of the 5-year program Russia exported 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, largely from the Government owned and operated farms. Mr. Gutchikoff, president of the Russian Grain Trust, states that in 1931 acreage will be increased 150 per cent and that the trust will export more than 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. This means the ultimate destruction of the world market for American wheat.

If I had time, I could give similar figures for cotton, fruit, cattle, tobacco, beet sugar, oil, manganese, and particularly lumber and pulpwood.

I wish to quote here a conclusion arrived at by the congressional investigating committee in regard to the 5-year program:

Conclusions as to the 5-year plan: Boiled down to a reasonable conclusion, if the 5-year plan succeeds, the Soviet Union is to become a great money making machine that it may finance communism and world revolution. To undersell the rest of the world in agricultural and industrial products is a part of the scheme to create unrest, ripening into revolution.

This activity would affect us ultimately in the destruction of our grain and cotton markets; especially is this true of wheat and cotton produced by peasant labor on Government-owned and controlled land, practically without cost, and with which American labor can not compete. The same would be true in the industrial world. Russian products have already practically destroyed the manganese industry with us. It seemingly threatens our lumber and wood-pulp industries, as well as the anthracite coal and oil markets, and the proof strongly indicates that convict and impressed labor are used especially in producing lumber and pulpwood.

Taken in connection with the acts and avowed purposes of the Soviet Union, the 5-year plan is not intended alone to benefit the home union and government and to improve the condition of the Russian people. It goes much further. Its purpose is not to build up but to tear down and destroy.

Pravda, the communist organ, of August 29, 1929, fully defines its purpose:

"It is a plan tending to undermine capitalist stabilization. It is a great plan of world revolution."

In closing, let me repeat that the most effective and remedial measures that can be taken against this obnoxious growth in our body politic is the understanding by the general public of their principles and practices. These principles and practices are innately abhorrent to the liberty loving and orderly minded American. It is self-evident that the communists have only one object in view, not to obtain control of the Government through peaceful and legal political methods of a political party, but to establish by force and violence a dictatorship to function under the supervision of the Communist International at Moscow. Let us take effective measures against this "enemy within our lines."

THE TRAGIC YEAR—COUNTRY SUSTAINED ECONOMIC LOSS IN 1930 APPROXIMATING ONE-THIRD THE TOTAL NATIONAL WEALTH—SLUMP IN FARM PRICES AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION UNPRECEDENTED IN NATION'S HISTORY—ENORMOUS INCREASE IN BANK AND BUSINESS FAILURES

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, for a year and a half, ever since the autumn of 1929, this country has been in the depths of the most serious economic depression in its history. It is generally admitted that the year 1930 brought to American industry, including agriculture, and to the American people as a whole the most serious distress ever experienced during any period of peace in the history of the Republic. Economic values shrunk to such a degree that the losses involved probably equaled or exceeded one-third the total national wealth, estimated at something like $350,000,000,000, a shrinkage greater than the total wealth of any of several European nations.

ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITY

As to the degree of responsibility for this economic disaster resting upon the political party now in power, the people may be left to determine for themselves. This disaster has reduced many among our agricultural population to such extremes of want that the cry for bread has swollen to a chorus, has filled our industrial cities with bread lines and soup houses, has paralyzed industry, and reduced our national income so seriously that we are confronted with a deficit in the Federal Treasury it now appears will amount to several hundred million dollars.

Whatever the degree of responsibility of the Hoover administration for the crisis which came upon the country following the stock-market panic of 1929, that administration can not point with truth or certainty to a constructive effort on its own part which in any degree lessened the seriousness of the situation, or in any substantial degree alleviated the misery from which a people have been suffering. This notwithstanding the fact that this great depression settled upon the country during the administration of a President who was advertised in the campaign preceding his election as the best-equipped man ever offered for the Presidency by any political party, as being indeed a veritable worker of economic miracles who would lead the country along the high road of prosperity and happiness until we reached that Utopian state in which the poorhouse would become only a memory.

In years gone by the Republican Party has always posed as the party of prosperity, as the only party fit to or with the capacity to govern; we were told that Republican policies were a guarantee of good times and that it was only under Democratic administrations that panics could occur. President Hoover lent himself to this fiction. Indeed, no candidate of his party ever went quite as far as did he during the presidential campaign of 1928, when he attributed all of good the people had enjoyed for nearly a decade to the policies and leadership of the Republican Party and, in effect, gave his guarantee that if the people would but elevate him to the Presidency and continue his party in power they would ere long reach that goal when poverty would be banished from the land. He talked glibly of the increased use of telephones, automobiles, of bathtubs, and so forth, and advertisements printed in the newspapers of the country by the campaign committee of his party promised to put a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage.

Implying that Republican policies under his immediate predecessors, Presidents Harding and Coolidge, had wrought an economic miracle, Candidate Hoover said in a speech delivered at Newark, N. J., September 17, 1928, of 5,000,000 men alleged to have been out of work when President Harding was inaugurated and Mr. Hoover became Secretary of Commerce that not only had these men been restored to employment but that—

> We had produced a fundamental program which made this restored employment secure on foundations of prosperity.

He said this result was not an "accident" and was not "achieved by luck" but was due to the "sound governmental policies and wise leadership" of the Republican Party, and added:

> Continuous employment and prosperity depend upon the continuance of these policies.

A little earlier, in his speech of acceptance at Palo Alto, Calif., on August 11 of the same year, Mr. Hoover held out the hope of the eradication of poverty and the elimination of the poorhouse as the goal to which these policies were eventually to lead. He said:

> The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not yet reached the goal, but, given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, we shall soon, with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from the land.

PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Before calling into review the distressing and calamitous occurrences of the last year and a half it should be said that the claim that the prosperity which the people of this country enjoyed between 1921 and 1928, for which Mr. Hoover claimed all of the credit for his party, was due to those policies was a false claim, as may be easily shown. The country and the world had but recently returned to the ordinary pursuits of peace time. For more than four years the greatest nations of the earth had been engaged at the business of mutual destruction. With the return of peace, restoration was begun. This country had loaned to European countries something like $15,000,000,000. This gave great impetus to our trade. These loans financed foreign purchases of the products of our farms and factories.

For our own part, for four years our energies had been devoted to the production of food and other essentials for waging war. Road, railroad, and building construction were practically suspended. With the coming of peace, these things took on an impetus unparalleled in the industrial history of any country. Automobile production reached an unprecedented figure. Instalment buying was encouraged, and workers mortgaged their earnings for months ahead. These things brought about the prosperity of which Candidate Hoover talked, and not any "unparalleled service" by the Republican Party, as he claimed. But the balloon had gone too high; it ran out of gas; the crash had to come. It did come and it brought with it such a train not merely of agricultural and industrial disaster but of human hunger and woe that for long, long years to come the year 1930 will be referred to as the tragic year—the year during which a proud and prosperous people reached the bottom of the abyss of distress.

SHRINKAGE IN VALUES

I have said that economic losses sustained during the 1930 panic year equaled about one-third the total national wealth of the country. In 1928 the national wealth of the United States was estimated at slightly in excess of $350,000,000,000.

From the peak of the inflation, in September, 1929, to December, 1930, the shrinkage in security values was not less than $80,000,000,000. The Wall Street Journal fixed the total value of all securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange at $136,409,448,062 in September, 1929, and in December, 1930, at $96,404,684,348, a shrinkage of slightly in excess of $40,000,000,000. It is estimated that the value of all securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange is about half the value of all securities outstanding. Possibly it is a little less than one-half the total. If the securities shrinkage on the New York Stock Exchange alone was in excess of $40,000,000,000, then the total shrinkage for all securities, listed and unlisted, was not less than $80,000,000,000.

It may be said that some of this was a "paper loss." Unquestionably some of it was. But much of it was actual. Certainly it was real to those who bought securities at peak prices and were sold out by their brokers because they could not produce the money with which to protect their markets. When those stocks changed hands at peak prices, somebody was obligated to pay for them. Probably some are still held by their purchasers, but it will be a long time before they will be able to sell those securities at the high prices which they paid for them. Even admitting that much of this tremendous shrinkage was a "paper loss," $80,000,000,000 is a very huge sum, and such allowance can be made and still leave a very staggering real loss which security holders must absorb.

INDUSTRIAL CURTAILMENT

The Census Bureau reported the value of the output of manufacturing plants in the United States during 1929 at somewhat more than $69,000,000,000, or in round figures, $70,000,000,000. The industrial curtailment during 1930 was very marked. Probably it is too conservative to say that the curtailment was 20 per cent. But employing that low figure, the reduction in industrial output under 1929 was $14,000,000,000, and the tremendous unemployment throughout the year would indicate that the reduction was probably considerably more than that. This decreased industrial production was a very heavy loss, felt not only by the industrial enterprises themselves but by every stockholder, every employee who was laid off or had his working time reduced, by every producer of raw materials, every jobber, every commission merchant or retailer who handled the products of these plants and shared in the profits ordinarily derived from handling these products from the farm, field, or mine from which the raw material came to the ultimate consumer who purchased the finished product.

UNEMPLOYMENT

It is easily demonstrable that the loss due to unemployment among wage earners was well in excess of $10,000,000,000. In its issue of October 15, 1930, Standard Trade and Securities said that the reduction is potential purchasing power "caused not only by actual unemployment but the further loss due to subnormal number of working hours and wage cuts," exclusive of agricultural and Government workers, was $8,853,000,000. This figure was based on an unemployment estimate of only 3,742,000. Since that time it has been shown that the number of unemployed is probably double that figure. On January 7 of this year, Col. Arthur Woods, chairman of the President's Emergency Committee for Employment, fixed the number of wage earners without any job at from four to five millions, while on January 27 of this year President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, placed the number of wage earners totally unemployed at 5,700,000, with also a large increase in the number of part-time workers. This number of unemployed in January was estimated by President Green as being 2,300,000 greater than the number completely without work one year before. The January survey of the American Federa-

tion of Labor showed 27 per cent of the skilled workers affiliated with that organization to be "totally unemployed."

In a statement issued synonymous with the unemployment report, President Green condemned the Federal administration for its failure to comprehend the seriousness of the situation and its "inexcusable delay" in starting a national work project. Only the kindly hand of charity was preventing thousands upon thousands actually dying of starvation.

The average wage of wage earners in the United States is $1,200 per year. Applying this figure to only 5,000,000 totally unemployed, as admitted by Colonel Woods, the wage loss for one year from unemployment is $6,000,000,000. If we take the larger figure of President Green, even with no allowance whatever for unemployment among office workers and farm hands, the loss in pay rolls is easily $10,000,000,000. More probably it is fifteen billions.

VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS

Serious and long-continued as the distress of agriculture has been, it will doubtless be surprising to some to know that farm crops in the United States is 1930 had a value of $2,400,000,000 less than the value of the same crops produced in 1929. The figures are reported by R. G. Dun & Co. and are therefore reliable, particularly as they are backed up by figures obtained from the Department of Agriculture only a few days ago.

This terrific shrinkage in farm-crop value—amounting to about $400 per farm family—was not due to decreased acreage or to decreased production but almost solely was occasioned by lower prices for the farm products.

In 1929 the total wheat production of the United States was 806,508,000 bushels, with a value fixed by the Department of Agriculture at $840,921,000. In 1930, according to the same authority, wheat production totaled 850,965,000 bushels, with a value of only $517,407,000. Thus, although production was increased by nearly 45,000,000 bushels, the value of the crop fell by $227,000,000.

In 1929 the cotton crop amounted to 14,919,000 bales, valued by the Department of Agriculture at $1,225,000,000. In 1930 the cotton crop amounted to 14,243,000 bales, with a value of only $674,044,000. While production decreased nearly 700,000 bales, or about 5 per cent, the value of the crop decreased more than $550,000,000, or more than 40 per cent.

In 1929 the corn crop was 2,622,000,000 bushels, valued at $2,042,000,000, or close to 80 cents per bushel. In 1930 the production fell to 2,081,000,000 bushels, while the value of the crop dropped to $1,378,874,000, or to but slightly more than 65 cents per bushel.

In 1930 the production of oats, rye, and white potatoes exceeded the production of the preceding year, yet, despite this fact, the value of all farm crops in 1930 was nearly two and one-half billion dollars less in 1930 than in 1929, or an average of $400 per farm family. This is almost half the total average annual net income per farm family. This happened in the face of the promises of the Hoover administration to solve the farm problem and place agriculture on a parity with other industries.

What were some of the Hoover administration promises?

In its national platform of 1928 the Republican Party said:

> The Republican Party pledges itself to the development and enactment of measures which will place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries to insure its prosperity and success.

If the Hoover administration has placed agriculture on an economic equality with other industries, it is the equality of distress, and has been brought about by bringing other industries down to a level with agriculture rather than elevating agriculture to a level with industry in the prosperity it enjoyed prior to the tragic year 1930.

In his speech of acceptance at Palo Alto, Mr. Hoover said that the problem of agriculture was the "most urgent economic problem" confronting the country and that "we have pledged ourselves to find a solution." He dedicated his abilities to "secure prosperity and contentment in that industry where I and my forefathers were born."

What did the Hoover administration do? It passed the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, and it passed the act under which the Federal Farm Board was created with what the President, when he appointed the members of the board, characterized as "responsibility, authority, and resources such as have never before been conferred by our Government in assistance to any industry." This board was appointed in July, 1929, and since that time Congress has given it $500,000,000 without hint or hindrance as to what it should do with it or how it should be expended, saying only that it use the money to solve the problem of the farmer and end his distress.

What have been the results? Despite this huge sum of money placed at the disposal of a board endowed with unprecedented authority, the farm crops of 1930 were worth less by nearly two and a half billion dollars than those of 1929. From January, 1930, to January, 1931, the index of the general level of farm prices as reported by the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics dropped 40 points, to the lowest level since 1912, the last year of the Taft administration. Wagon prices for wheat in the Middle West dropped perilously close to a half dollar per bushel, and during the last winter the Associated Press carried the news that in Iowa wheat was actually used for fuel because it was cheaper than coal, while in Chicago oats brought less than the price of sawdust. Despite its unlimited authority and the expenditure of this huge sum of money the Farm Board which President Hoover appointed to diagnose and cure the ills of agriculture has been able to recommend nothing to the farmers except that they curtail the acreage devoted to production. On one occasion one of the members of the board suggested that farmers transfer 5 per cent of their acreage to reforestation, probably on the assumption that if they would wait 30 years for the trees to mature they could be converted into sawdust and sold at a better price than oats would command.

SLUMP IN FOREIGN TRADE

Another heavy loss sustained by the country during the tragic year 1930 was in its foreign trade. The total volume of this trade fell off, as compared with 1929, by $2,737,780,000, or approximately two and three-quarters billion dollars. Exports declined during the year by $1,399,788,000 and imports by $1,337,992,000. The decrease was more than 25 per cent. In January of this year there was a further slump of $287,000,000 in our foreign trade.

Mr. Hoover himself furnished a yardstick with which to measure the value of foreign trade to our people, and its effect not only on business but upon the American home. In his speech at Newark, N. J., on September 17, 1928, he said:

> More than 2,000,000 families in the United States earn their living to-day producing goods for export and another million families earn their living in the manufacture of raw materials which we import in exchange for our goods.

He pointed with pride to the circumstances during the years between 1921 and 1928, years in which he presided over the Department of Commerce and was hailed as a great trade expert, that American exports had increased by a billion dollars. He said that this increase had "brought a living to a half million families," and, generally speaking, meant higher standards of living and higher wages to American workers.

In one year of his presidency the total volume of foreign trade declined by two and three-quarter billion dollars. If 3,000,000 families earned their living in our foreign trade in 1928, as he pointed out, then when that trade fell off more than 25 per cent in 1930, more than 25 per cent of those 3,000,000 families were deprived of that means of earning their livelihood.

The greatest single factor contributing to this disastrous loss of trade must be conceded to be the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, which President Hoover signed, in great haste, with what amounted to an apology, that it was better to end the existing uncertainty by signing a bad bill than to keep the country in suspense as to the sort of a tariff bill that would finally be enacted.

As a result of that act scores of countries which have been friendly customers passed retaliatory tariffs. Trade began to dwindle months before the tariff act was finally approved, because the world had long known that the act itself would not be very different from that which the House had passed, a bill carrying the highest tariff rates in our history, many of them practically embargoes. It is interesting to note, however, that of the two and three-quarter billion dollar falling off in foreign trade in 1930, one and three-quarter billions of the loss occurred during the second half of the year, after the Hawley-Smoot Act had gone into effect.

While this act, which has had this blighting effect on international commerce and has thrown millions of American workers out of jobs, was approved apologetically by the President, other spokesmen of his party hailed it as a benefaction to mankind and proclaimed it a worker of economic miracles. In the Senate, on the eve of the vote by which the bill was passed by that body, Senator WATSON, of Indiana, Republican leader in the Senate, voiced this optimistic prophecy:

> It is my prediction, deliberately made on the floor of the United States Senate, that after the passage of this bill this afternoon the skies will clear, and within a comparatively brief time the sun again will shine and bring prosperous conditions and happy days back to the people of the United States.

That prediction was made last June. The answer is written in the faces of those who stand in the bread lines and haunt the soup kitchens in every industrial center in America; it is found in the unemployment figures of the president of the American Federation of Labor and of the chairman of the President's own commission on employment. It is reflected in lowered security values, decreased industrial output, in the number of corporations and individuals showing, not merely reduced earnings but actual losses. In fact, one wag has suggested that the only man who has been able to make any profits of late is the fellow who manufactures red ink. Unless conditions improve soon, he may be under the necessity of consuming a large part of his own product.

BANK AND BUSINESS FAILURES

For banking institutions and business houses generally, 1930 was indeed a tragic year.

R. G. Dun & Co. reports that for 1930 the number of bank failures in the United States was 934, and their liabilities amounted to $908,157,788, as compared with 437 failures during 1929, with liabilities amounting to $218,796,582. The number of failures more than doubled, while the liabilities involved almost quadrupled. The Federal Reserve Board gives the number of failures during 1930 as in excess of 1,300. The discrepancy is accounted for by the fact that in one case the number of mere suspensions is not included but only actual failures. I have used the smaller figures as reported by R. G. Dun & Co.

The same agency reports that during 1930 the number of commercial or business house failures was 26,355, with liabilities aggregating $668,283,000, as compared with 22,909 failures with liabilities totaling $483,250,000 during 1929.

The Republican Party wrote these words into its platform back in 1904:

> A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity.

It is interesting to note here for the benefit of those, if any, who still cling to this Republican fiction that the number of bank failures during one year of the Hoover administration, 1930, exceeded by 188 the number of all the banks failing during all of the eight years of the two administrations of Woodrow Wilson, and that the liabilities of the defunct banks were almost four times as great. From 1913 to 1920, inclusive, eight years of the two last Democratic administrations, the total number of banks failing was 746 and the amount of liabilities involved $226,484,447.

OTHER FIGURES

There are other figures, but they merely serve to increase the evidence of the enormity of the shock which our economic structure has sustained. For instance, R. G. Dun & Co. reports that during 1930 the total amount of bank clearings fell below the 1929 figures by $174,000,000,000. Gross railroad earnings during the year fell below those of 1929 by $964,000,000, while net earnings of first-class railroads fell off by $389,594,000. Building permits in only 37 States fell below those for the same States in 1929 by $1,250,000,000. During 1930—and all figures I am giving are from R. G. Dun & Co.—pig-iron output decreased under 1929 by 10,800,000 tons; steel output fell off 14,660,000 tons; cotton consumption at home decreased 1,726,000 bales and exports of cotton by 1,922,000 bales; while the value of wheat exports decreased $23,000,000.

The foregoing is the record of what has occurred; a record of cold figures and indisputable facts. But, in the minds of many, the severest indictment yet brought against the Hoover administration is its callousness; its failure to even try to do anything; its ostrichlike attitude of refusing to see or hear; its failure to recognize conditions as they did exist. In fact, the charge is warranted that the administration either willfully misrepresented the real condition or was woefully ignorant of the facts. Neither can we forget that during most of the crisis, if the administration has felt any concern at all, it has been for the great, selfish money interests rather than for the masses of the people.

We recall that in November, 1929, when the great stock-market panic broke on Wall Street, Mr. Hoover and Mr. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, rushed forward with a proposal for a decrease in the income-tax rate, for the obvious purpose of "pegging" the stock market and stopping the break in prices. This suggestion came, not when it would do the small investors, or even the small speculators, any good, but after the savings of thousands had been wiped out. The market was then "pegged" and the big gamblers were able to buy in the dumped stocks at prices which were but a fraction of their former quotations. We know that every time a proposition has been made to meet the adjusted-compensation claims of the World War veterans, or to liberalize treatment of them, their widows, and orphaned children, we are told that the Treasury can not afford it, and that it would be disastrous to the bond market. Yet somewhere in the recesses of the Treasury Mr. Mellon has been able to find enough money to pay out $3,000,000,000 in tax refunds and credits, although 83 per cent of the money so refunded was collected by the Woodrow Wilson administration more than a decade ago, and was collected in excess profits, much of it from war profiteers, for the sole purpose of paying the expenses of winning the war. And the end of these refund payments is not even yet in sight.

FALSE OPTIMISM

We recall, apropos the disposition in high places to deny that conditions were anything like as bad as they have since been proven to be, how in January and February of last year frequent statements were issued from the White House to the effect that the worst was over, that the pendulum was swinging in the right direction, that the upturn had occurred, and that prosperity was only 60 days around the corner. On January 21, 1930, a White House statement said that—

> The tide of employment all over the country has changed in the right direction.

The same day Secretary of Labor Davis said that employment was definitely on the upward trend. He insisted that the number of unemployed was not more than half as great as back in 1921, and never did he admit the number out of work to be in excess of 3,000,000. He predicted a great deal of business in 1930, and that the year should see us well on the way to complete recovery from the depression of the last few months of 1929. Secretary of Commerce Lamont joined the Pollyanna chorus and predicted a record year for 1930 in construction and maintenance work. Yet six months later the chairman of the President's own committee on employment admitted the number then out of work to be almost double the highest figure Secretary Davis ever conceded, while instead of the record year in construction which Secretary Lamont foresaw, Dun & Co. report a falling off of a billion and a quarter dollars in the amount

of building permits in only 37 States. If the other 11 were added the decrease would likely be more than a billion and a half.

The attitude of the administration toward the whole situation is well illustrated by the remarks of the President himself, made to a committee of visitors calling at the White House on June 4, 1930, to urge a speeding up of public works as an aid to the unemployed and an example to private industry, that the idle might be put to work, and a little coal be stored in the bin and flour in the pantry against the hard days of the winter to follow. This committee consisted of a distinguished number of bishops, manufacturers, bankers, and so forth. One of its number was Hon. Amos Pinchot, brother of Pennsylvania's Governor. Writing months afterwards, in the issue of the Nation of January 14, 1930, of how the committee's suggestions were received by President Hoover, Mr. Pinchot said:

THREE WEEKS TOO LATE

We were listened to with the scant patience and restrained exasperation of a man who knew every angle of the situation far better than we who had presumed to advise him. Whereupon he launched into a clear, forcible, and convincing speech, in which he proved to us that we were wrong in every point. Unemployment, he said, was being shamefully exaggerated. Its peak had been reached and passed. The tide had turned. The Census and Labor Departments reports and other information to which, as he reminded us, he had better access than we, would presently show that things were quite different from what we feared. Yes; we were now to drift peacefully, if slowly, back to good times. With calm confidence he spoke of the results that were being gained through the conference he had called of great business leaders and of their fine response to his appeal not to curtail the volume of their activities. He showed us, in authoritative style, that every agency of both the Federal and State governments was working at top capacity to relieve the situation. "Gentlemen," he said, "you have come three weeks too late."

Yet, six months later, Colonel Woods, the President's own representative, found the number of unemployed to be almost double the number admitted by the administration at the time the President was saying unemployment was being "shamefully exaggerated." If he had said it had been "grossly underestimated," he would have been nearer the truth.

Undoubtedly the President believed what he said, for it is a matter of record that instead of the Government taking the lead at that time in speeding up public works it lagged behind. Congress was then in session. It adjourned on July 3, 1930, after making appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1. It is a matter of record that not only did neither the President nor his Budget Bureau recommend any increased expenditures for public works to take up the slack in employment but that appropriations which were made by the Republican Congress on the recommendation of the Republican President for public construction were actually almost $26,000,000 less than made for similar purposes during the last preceding year. It was not until winter came, not until the bread lines had lengthened to distressing proportions, not until the wolf of hunger was at the door of millions of homes that the President or anybody identified with his administration came forward with a suggestion that a single extra dollar be expended on a Federal construction program.

The administration's failure to realize the seriousness of the unemployment situation during 1930 was as complete as its failure to appreciate the seriousness of the suffering of men, women, and children in the drought area, covering 21 States, in January of this year, when John Barton Payne told a Senate committee the four million and odd dollars then available for relief work was ample and that to make an appeal for additional funds would make the Red Cross a laughing stock. Yet within a week Mr. Payne joined President Hoover, who is also president of the Red Cross, in appealing to the country for $10,000,000 additional relief funds.

ECONOMIC LOSSES IN 1930

I append hereto figures on the shrinkage in security values, losses in bank and commercial failures, decreased railroad earnings, and so forth, which give an idea of the economic shock sustained by the country during 1930:

Shrinkage in security values from peak in September, 1929, to December, 1930	$80,000,000,000
Loss in wages of unemployed during 1930 not less than	$10,000,000,000
20 per cent decrease in value of manufactures (under 1929)	$14,000,000,000
Decrease in foreign trade under 1929	$2,737,780,000
Failure of 934 banks in 1930, with total liabilities of	$908,157,788
Failure of 26,355 commercial houses, with total liabilities of	$668,283,842
Decrease in bank clearings under 1929	$174,000,000,000
Decrease in gross railroad earnings under 1929	$964,000,000
Decrease in value of farm crops under 1929	$2,400,000,000
Decrease in building permits (37 States)	$1,250,000,000
Decrease in freight-car loadings, cars	7,000,000
Decrease in pig-iron output (tons)	10,800,000
Decrease in steel output (tons)	14,660,000
Decrease in cotton consumption (bales)	1,726,000
Decrease in cotton exports (bales)	1,922,000
Decrease in value of wheat exports	$23,408,000

THE POSTAL SERVICE AND THE SURVEY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service is not only a great business but in its multiplied operations and scope of service rendered it is without doubt the biggest distinctive business in the world. It is owned and operated by the people, and no service, either public or private, comes in more regular or intimate contact with them. Every phase and feature of our common endeavors depends largely on the certainty of its processes, and the business man at his desk awaits the arrival of the letter carrier to begin his daily tasks.

The service rendered by the post office during the passing years has been deserving of high commendation, due to its plan of operation and the ability and loyalty of the great army of postal workers, totaling well above the 300,000 mark. There is no other institution, either public or private, where the patron receives greater returns for his dollar, and postage rates in the United States are the cheapest in the world. Dating back more than 20 years, postal operations have undergone a constant process of refinement in a steady and persistent effort to cut out lost motion, take up the slack, and eliminate every operation that could be eliminated, and dispense with every possible postal employee whose services could otherwise be absorbed, until at the close of the administration of former Postmaster General New it was conceded by all competent observers that in this regard postal progress had reached the saturation point. The volume of production performed per unit of postal workers had practically doubled during this period, and this fact was further evidenced with a greatly increased amount of service rendered by a lesser number of employees in various branches of the service. Less men were doing more work than ever before.

In fact, the limit had been reached in attempting to further refine and torture the Postal Service to a lower operating cost basis without doing injury to the service and denying postal patrons the character of service to which they were entitled. Nevertheless, with the advent of the present Postmaster General, Walter F. Brown, on March 6, 1929, it soon became apparent that the profit policy was to be the moving purpose in postal operations and that no effort would be spared and no opening discarded to force the postal budget to balance. Postmaster General Brown on repeated occasions declared that the Post Office Department should be operated on a self-sustaining basis and indicated that its whole plan and purpose of postal administration was to achieve its objective with little regard to the effect of this policy on service efficiency. Addressing the Bronx Board of Trade at a gathering held in New York City April 3, 1930, Postmaster General Brown said:

As I stated at the outset, the business of the Post Office Department is essentially that of a public utility. Like any other properly managed public utility, it should conduct its operations without financial loss; that is to say, its rates of charge to the public should be adjusted so as to provide an income sufficient in the aggregate to pay the cost of all of its services. There is no more logic and justification in asking the Government to transport your private mail for less than cost than there would be in asking an electric-light company to light your house or a telephone company to furnish you with long-distance service for less than cost.

There is no warrant in postal history or in the legislative action of Congress to justify this statement by Postmaster General Brown that the post office must be run on a profit or self-sustaining basis. On the contrary, the supreme aim of the post office is to render service, whether this service results in a bookkeeping postal deficit or not, and postage rates have time and again been fixed on the general concept of rendering the greatest service to the American people, and at a level far below the cost of handling such mail matter. Postmaster General Brown, in a frantic purpose to prove a postal profit, has stopped at nothing to attain this end, as subsequent developments have shown. In this same address he gives further evidence of a retrenchment policy, declaring:

As far as we can, we are endeavoring to cut down operating costs. We are surveying the organization and administration of all the larger post offices with a view to introducing labor-saving machinery and eliminating unnecessary operations and personnel.

During the past year or more Postmaster General Brown has been busy in carrying out this plan, which he refers to as "eliminating unnecessary operations and personnel." The service has been searched and ransacked in an effort to find places where consolidations could be effected, service reduced to lower limits or wiped out entirely, and added duties assigned to already overworked employees. A survey conducted by post-office inspectors in response to the orders of the department was made in some 19 of the larger offices and a revised system of rendering service to patrons, based primarily on a reduction in service both in regularity and frequency, with less men and less collections and dispatch of mail, was established. The result of these surveys in the larger offices was made the basis of a general plan to be more widely observed and postmasters were instructed accordingly.

With this object in mind, a communication addressed to postmasters and embracing a long series of instructions was, on June 5, 1930, issued from the office of the First Assistant Postmaster General. The opening statement of this communication reads:

With a view to securing uniform service in all large offices, the following instructions have been issued for your guidance, and you are directed to proceed immediately in making a survey of your office.

The plan outlined in these instructions is, in the main, the one which has been followed by postmasters and inspectors cooperating with them at offices where surveys have been made or are now under way.

In the long list of instructions to postmasters that this communication from the department contained the prime object is a reduction of service in regularity and frequency for the purpose of reducing the postal working force and in the end operate the Postal Service at a lower money cost. Just this is what has happened, and this is the chief achievement to be credited to the survey. Time was, and that not so long ago, when as many as 6 and 8 deliveries of mail were accorded patrons in busy and active commercial centers. This has been stopped. Quoting further from this department communication of June 5, we find under the caption "City Delivery Service" the following:

Under ordinary conditions not more than four delivery trips are justified in the business sections. Additional deliveries are not to be scheduled unless the volume of mail to be handled is so great that it can not be disposed of under a 4-delivery-trip schedule. The point is that four trips provide ample service to the patrons; additional trips are to be made only where necessary to facilitate the work in the post office. Make special report for the consideration and approval of this office in all cases where it appears to be necessary to provide more than four delivery trips.

The establishment of 3-trip routes is to be confined to strictly business territory where train schedules do not justify four trips and to mixed business and residential routes where the nature of the business justifies two morning deliveries. In the matter of setting up 3-trip delivery routes it should be understood that small neighborhood business houses, such as grocery stores, drug stores, etc., are not the character of business houses which appear to be entitled to more than two deliveries a day. No residence or apartment house, irrespective of size, requires more than two deliveries a day to meet the needs of the patrons. It is far more economical to provide for auxiliary service to assist the carriers on heavy residential routes on days when a large mail is to be handled than it is to make a useless trip on 4 or 5 days of the week.

The schedules of all carriers, particularly those assigned to 2-trip routes, should be arranged so they will return to the station from their morning trips by 11.30 a. m., in order that collections can be dispatched to meet the interstation schedule in the middle of the day. In some cities, to provide sufficient time for this exchange of mail between stations throughout the city, making it possible for all local mail collected in the morning to be delivered in the afternoon, it will be necessary to swing the carriers for 1 hour and 45 minutes to 2 hours between the morning and the afternoon trips. Quite a large area can be covered with interstation service if the delivery carriers return with collections at 11.30 a. m. and do not report for the afternoon trip until 1.15 or 1.30 p. m. It is essential that this interstation exchange of mail in the middle of the day be maintained if good local service is rendered the patrons. It is therefore necessary to insist that station superintendents and others who are in charge of the carriers see that the work is properly arranged to insure their return to the station on schedule time.

This revised system of rendering service to postal patrons predicated upon the surveys ordered by Postmaster General Brown and based in part on the above-quoted instructions has now been in operation long enough for us to pass judgment on its general practicability and wisdom. What effect has it had on service efficiency? What effect has it had on the maintenance of good service? What has it, then, done toward aggravating the present serious unemployment problem? What has been its effects on service enthusiasm and morale? Let us hear what the Postmaster General thinks about it.

In referring to this subject under the caption "Reorganization of Post Offices," Postmaster General Brown, in his annual report recently made public, refers to this matter in the following terms:

Surveys are being made by post-office inspectors at the largest post offices. They are now in progress at New York and Chicago and will be extended to other large cities.

Post offices have been organized on a business basis, the responsibilities of supervisors have been more clearly defined, simplified methods of distribution and new and approved methods of accounting have been adopted, the collection and delivery and other services have been made uniform, the distribution of mails has been centralized, night work has been reduced to a minimum consistent with public needs, and merit has been rewarded and inefficiency appropriately dealt with.

The reports of the results obtained at 17 offices where the survey work has been practically completed indicate that an estimated annual saving of $1,500,000 will be effected when the surplus man power developed can be absorbed through the filling of vacancies occurring in the service. No regular employees have lost their positions as a result of these surveys.

The evidence at hand and from many sources does not at all bear out this approving interpretation of either plan or purpose of the survey or the results that have attended its operation. Its chief result has been a reduction of service to postal patrons in an attempt to further tighten up a system that had already been refined to the saturation point. Service has been reduced in the delivery, collection, and dispatch of mail, and complaints as to the injury this reduction has caused have been intense and widespread. This is evidenced by highly critical editorial comment appearing in the press nation-wide and by sharp complaint emanating from postal patrons who have been compelled to suffer a reduction in the character of service to which they have been accustomed. True enough, Postmaster General Brown declares that "no regular employees have lost their positions as a result of these surveys." This statement is misleading and conceals the actual facts in the case. As a result of this widespread reduction in service a great army of substitute clerks and letter carriers have had their prospect of promotion set back so far as to make the outlook in this regard appear hopeless, while their wages have declined almost to the vanishing point because the work that hitherto fell to their lot is now being performed by the regular employees whose former positions have been absorbed in this survey and are now postal employees without definite assignments. A conservative estimate would fix the total of postal employees who in practical effect have lost their jobs at more than 5,000.

Let us examine this whole proposition, which has so little to commend it from a standpoint of sound public policy. To-day and during the past year the subject of unemployment has been our most menacing problem. The evils and

woe that attend the workers thrown into involuntary idleness confront us everywhere, awaiting our keenest concern and sympathy and challenging our resourcefulness as a people. What, may I inquire, does it profit a big department of the Government to institute and observe a policy which, aside from many other fatal defects, results chiefly in adding to the army of the unemployed?

ANTHROPOLOGY AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE—MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CAN LEND A HAND

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Arthur MacDonald, a distinguished anthropologist and author of a number of scientific works of great value, is endeavoring to collect certain data respecting Members of Congress which he believes may prove to be of some historic as well as scientific importance.

His work is purely voluntary and disinterested. To accomplish any degree of success he must have the cooperation of the individual Members of the House and Senate. He urges them to get in touch with him and submit to certain anthropological measurements. These are few and simple, being height; weight; chest girth; arm reach; hand grasp; length, width, and height of head, of face, and nose, and a few physiological measurements.

Doctor MacDonald informs me that he will be glad to make appointments at the convenience of the Member if communicated with at his address, No. 314 East Capitol Street.

Twenty-four specialists of Johns Hopkins University have consented to examine gratis every Member of Congress who takes the physical anthropological measurements of Doctor MacDonald.

The medical examinations are supplementary to Doctor MacDonald's measurements, and may prove of value in discovering latent physical weaknesses or defects.

Incipient tendencies, not yet noticed, if discovered early by the specialist usually can be remedied, but if undetected they may become serious, if not fatal. Each specialist makes a full report to Doctor MacDonald, and the Member examined can have a copy. The one fundamental idea is to keep well, and every hour spent in these examinations may add many years to the Member's life and also spare him from much pain, suffering, and sickness. This will enable him to be still more efficient in his public service. The examination by different specialists is fundamental. The problem is to have the normal decadence of life extended equally to all the vital organs, for the chain is never stronger than its weakest link. Synchronicity is the secret of long life.

HON. ELBERT S. BRIGHAM

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Hon. ELBERT S. BRIGHAM, who for the past six years has represented the people of the first congressional district of Vermont, goes out of office to-day. He retires voluntarily to accept a responsible position with one of the great life insurance companies of the country. It is a privilege and a pleasure to pay him a deserved tribute.

Mr. BRIGHAM was educated in the high school of the town where he now resides, in Middlebury College, and holds an honorary degree from the University of Vermont. He has filled many positions of trust by election and appointment attesting the confidence of his fellow citizens.

Farming early engaged his attention, and he made such a success of it that he was appointed commissioner of agriculture of Vermont. He served 11 years in this position. His cooperation and help brought agriculture to a comparatively profitable condition in his State.

He was elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress by a splendid majority; reelected to the Seventieth and to the Seventy-first Congresses by majorities that gave indication of the appreciation of his constituents of his faithful and efficient service in their behalf.

It has been a privilege to work with Mr. BRIGHAM in behalf of the people of Vermont. Our relations have been characterized by the utmost cordiality, and in him I have had the utmost confidence and respect for his ability. He has approached problems of legislation with an open mind, has given them careful study, and has arrived at independent conclusions with the best interests of his constituents always in mind. We have not been in agreement at all times, but I have entertained the utmost respect for his opinions. We have never allowed differences of views to mar the harmony of our relations or to interfere in the least degree with attainment of our objectives.

In Congress Mr. BRIGHAM has won and held the respect and confidence of his colleagues. His friends have increased in an ever-widening circle. They join with me in expressing regret at the termination of his service and in extending to him our best wishes for success in the future.

Mr. BRIGHAM wound up his work in Washington by securing the passage of a law that bears his name providing for a tax on oleomargarine. This act means much for the dairying interests not only of his own State but of all the country. It will help to stabilize and bring a greater measure of prosperity to a great industry. The successful passage of this measure required the ability of a statesman, and ELBERT S. BRIGHAM measured up to the needs of the hour.

I feel a sense of personal loss in the severance of the happy official and personal relations of the past six years.

TABLE OF WOOD FROM HISTORICAL SERVICE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, during an earlier session of the Congress just closing two comrades, veterans of the Spanish War, brought to Washington and presented to me as the floor leader of the House a table of unusual construction. For a long time it stood in my office just off the floor of the House, where it was examined by many Members, and photographs taken of it by some of the news services. It stands now in my private office. The two Spanish War veterans who were responsible for this unique gift were Mr. Royal B. Lovelace and Mr. Harry Livingston Relf. Comrade Relf did most of the work of collecting the material, while Comrade Lovelace did the actual work of construction.

The top of the table, about 3 feet square, is a map of the United States with outlying Territories and possessions. It is made of wood of different colors gathered from every State in the Union, Hawaii, Alaska, the Philippines, and Panama Canal Zone. Each piece of wood, cut to scale, represents the State, Territory, or possession in which the wood grew.

In addition to all the States, Territories, and possessions being represented a considerable number of pieces of wood from historical sources are also inlaid in the top of the table. These historical pieces are from trees, houses, and other structures, such as the house where Lincoln was born, home of John Sevier, oldest schoolhouse in Oklahoma, courthouse where Jackson held court, the tree where "D. Boone cill'd a bar," the original White House, the oldest house in South Carolina, where George Washington was a guest, a Spanish ship sunk by Dewey, house of Admiral Farragut, the Charter Oak at Hartford, a fence post on "Teddy Roosevelt's ranch" in the Dakotas, the Lincoln home at Springfield, Ill., and a number of other historical sources. Documentary evidence from the governor of the State or other official in each case is presented in an affidavit, or otherwise, to prove the authenticity of the origin of each piece of wood. On the whole, it is a most unique and interesting piece of furniture.

The table is largely the handiwork of Mr. Lovelace, requiring the leisure time of a number of years while he was a patient in the Mountain Branch of the National Soldiers' Home, at Johnson City, Tenn. The reasons assigned for presenting the table to me were not only that I am floor leader of the House but because the table was made at a soldiers' home located in the very county in which I was born. I appreciate the gift, and sincerely thank my two good comrades, the donors, for thus honoring me.

HON. RICHARD N. ELLIOTT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the trials and tribulations which often come to a Member of Congress can be appreciated only by a fellow Member. We are frequently misunderstood as we work together for what we conceive to be the public good. But in our arduous service, aside from the

self-satisfaction which devotion to duty affords, there is one compensation which always cheers and comforts us and it is, perhaps, the most pleasing compensation we can possibly derive from our legislative careers. I refer to the friendship and companionship of those with whom we labor.

For the last 10 years it has been my privilege to serve on a committee, and in more recent years on three commissions, with the Hon. RICHARD N. ELLIOTT, of Indiana. The association with him has been both helpful and delightful and I am happy to number him among my cherished friends. We have not always agreed on public questions—what two of us have? But his record has been consistently one of honest purpose, fair dealing, industrious effort, courageous advocacy, and conscientious conviction. These sterling traits of statesmanship have characterized his service and they have been delightfully seasoned with that affable personality which has endeared him to us all, not in cold formality as the gentleman from Indiana, but as DICK ELLIOTT, our friend.

His has been the leading spirit in much and important legislation, legislation happily devoted to the pursuits of peace, and he has won for himself thereby an enduring place in the annals of congressional accomplishment.

As he goes to new labors for which his talent and training peculiarly fit him, let me indulge the hope that he may find both the work and the workers as pleasing and congenial as he has made himself in his dealings with men and measures here. I feel sure that I speak the sentiment of us all in saying that our very best wishes and affectionate regard will always attend him.

BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF IRA L. REEVES

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit Ira L. Reeves, formerly a major in the Regular Army and a colonel in the emergency forces, to appear before a retiring board for reexamination and, if found entitled thereto, to authorize his appointment and retirement as a major of infantry. This bill was reached on the Consent Calendar February 25, 1931, and was objected to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

It is only fair to a distinguished officer and a patriotic citizen to place in the RECORD a few observations as to the merits of this bill. Colonel Reeves holds the unique distinction of having been retired as a captain for wounds received in the Philippine campaign; of being restored to active duty in the World War; of being promoted to grade of colonel in recognition of his services; of having been gassed in France, and then being refused retirement although still suffering from the original wounds, and in addition the disability of permanent ill effects from gas poisoning.

Colonel Reeves has served in every military emergency with which the United States has been confronted during his lifetime; has made important contributions to the military education of the colleges of the country; has served in several administrative capacities in the War Department, and has been decorated by his own country and by France.

He began his military service as a private in the Missouri National Guard, then enlisted in the Regular Army, and rose to the rank of first lieutenant during the Spanish-American War; was recommended for his promotion for "untiring energy and bravery that could not be excelled during five days of marching and fighting." He then went to the Philippines with his command, participated in many engagements, and was wounded in action. He then performed light duties until 1902, when he was retired for disabilities caused by his wounds, with the rank of captain.

During the intervening years to the World War he served as professor of military science and tactics at Purdue University; organized the "Indian Territory Volunteer Militia" which became the National Guard of Oklahoma when that State was admitted to the Union; served as military instructor at Miami Military Institute in Ohio and at the University of Vermont; and as president of Norwich University. During the Mexican border service he served as colonel of the First Vermont Infantry and took that regiment to the border; was at the head of the Vermont State Committee of Public Safety during the period immediately preceding the outbreak of the World War and at the commencement of the war was ordered to Washington, where he, with other specially selected officers under his direction, made a survey of the personnel and office methods of all War Department bureaus in Washington. This comprehensive survey resulted in many fundamental reorganization recommendations which were put into effect by the Secretary of War.

Desiring active service he was restored to the active list and given choice of a commission of brigadier general or as a colonel overseas. He chose the latter and arrived in France to participate in the drive in the Metz sector. He was gassed and sent to a hospital. After a partial recovery he was assigned to the command of a regiment, but was soon assigned to organize the American Expeditionary Forces University at Beaune Cote d'Or. This institution, serving the men of the American Expeditionary Forces, offered over 300 courses with over 500 instructors and had a student attendance of nearly 18,000, and was then the largest residential educational institution in the world.

Upon returning to the United States in July, 1919, Colonel Reeves at once engaged in important bureau duties at Washington. He was made a member of the War Credits Board and of the War Department Claims Board. The work in hand involved the liquidation of approximately $4,000,000,000 worth of contract liabilities of the War Department.

Following the armistice he was awarded the distinguished service medal of the United States and made a chevalier of the Legion of Honor of France. He has been awarded practically all the medals of his country for faithful service in her cause.

In November, 1919, Colonel Reeves applied for retirement. The medical officers of the board are said to have been unanimous in recommending it, but the line officers of the board were reluctant to retire him on the ground that his services were too valuable to be dispensed with. He then resigned, feeling that civil life offered opportunities not offered in the service. He soon found that his health would not stand the strain of civil activities, owing to his wounds and the effects of gas. It would seem only fair and reasonable that he should be given an opportunity to show that at the time he resigned he was incapacitated for active service. That is all this bill proposes. He asks no back pay allowances; he asks no increase in rank; he asks nothing that the Congress of the United States may not, in perfect justice to itself and to the Nation, thankfully grant.

Yet under the present rules governing the consideration of the Private Calendar one man is able to block such meritorious legislation. This situation is deplorable. Members of the committees give careful consideration to the bills, spend days in close consideration, only to find their work and efforts wasted because a single Member, after what must be only a superficial examination, can block enactment by an objection. Here we see bureauracy operating in all its nakedness. A department opposed to the passage of a measure only has to enlist the sympathetic support of one Member, and its purpose is accomplished. I am in favor of an amendment of the rules that will end such a situation.

My personal experience in dealing with a problem in which the people of my State are vitally interested leads me to the conclusion that we should further amend the rules so that the members of a committee may control its deliberations and direct its action. These two amendments will be helpful in securing consideration of meritorious proposals.

THE JOHN J. PERSHING NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 17207, a bill providing for the creation of the John J. Pershing National Military Park, near Laclede, Linn County, Mo., the birthplace of General Pershing. It directs the Secretary of War to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such lands near Laclede as may be suitable for the memorial objects of the act. It authorizes an appropriation of $250,000 for the purchase, landscaping, and beautification of

the park, and the Secretary of War is charged with the maintenance and administration of the park. I shall earnestly advocate the enactment of this bill.

The second congressional district of Missouri, which I have the honor to represent, has given to the world several men who exerted a potential and enduring influence on the world's history, among whom was Gen. John J. Pershing, who was born in Linn County and who won deathless fame as commander in chief of our military forces in the World War, the most sanguinary conflict that has ever scourged the earth since the first page of human history was written.

Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, provost marshal general of the United States Army during the World War, and who probably did more than any other individual to create, organize, train, and equip our armies, was born in Grundy County, in my district, and within about 50 miles of the birthplace of General Pershing. It is significant that these two men who had so much to do with our military operations during the World War were both Missourians and both born in the second congressional district of that State.

Samuel L. Clemens, otherwise known as Mark Twain, was born in the little village of Florida, in Monroe County, in the second Missouri district. He was not only America's greatest humorist but he was a profund philosopher who established a new school of literature, scaling the mountain heights of human nature and sounding all the depths and shoals of human emotions.

Sol Smith Russell, the great comedian of the last generation, who moved millions to laughter and to tears, first saw the light of day in Brunswick, Chariton County, Mo., in my district.

This great district has produced numerous other men who attained enviable distinction in State and national affairs, and who made worth-while contributions to the forces that promote the public weal.

But in appraising the eminent men given to the world by the second Missouri congressional district, by all recognized standards by which true greatness is measured, Gen. John J. Pershing stands preeminent. Providence decreed that he should play a conspicuous part in the never-ending and all-embracing drama of human events.

General Pershing has lived in an heroic age. He has a large part in some of the most important events of all time. He led to battle millions of brave men in the most colossal and destructive war that has ever ravished nations and decimated humanity since the beginning of time.

Under his skillful direction the American Army tipped the scales of destiny, turned the tide of battle, and applied a force without which victory would have inevitably perched on the banners of the Central Powers.

General Pershing was no accident. He won his rank by a mastery and wise application of military tactics, by a comprehensive knowledge of the principles of successful warfare that have come down to us from the long line of war lords that in the sweep of history have led great armies with banners to victory. He not only thoroughly understood the science and art of war, but his inherent military aptitude enabled him not only to visualize conditions but to initiate and carry to a successful conclusion vast military movements.

No student of military science will ever rate him as having only mediocre ability. He was not an opportunist. In directing the movements of his mighty army his farseeing vision swept from sector to sector, extended far behind the lines of the enemy, and, by sound judgment and sober reasoning, aided by an unexplainable military intuition, he formed comprehensive plans that required weeks or months to effectuate; and having once determined his objective, he industriously and, may I say, relentlessly exerted every possible force and influence to accomplish his well-considered aims.

Indubitably General Pershing was gifted with a high order of military genius—not the brilliant dash and seemingly reckless strategy of Napoleon nor the initiative of Marlborough at Schellenberg, Blenheim, Ramillies, and in the immortal Flanders campaign, which in skill and resolution has no equal in the annals of war, and which to the end of the world will be the subject of study and admiration of military men.

General Pershing lacked the intrepidity of Phil Sheridan, the sturdy strategy of Robert E. Lee, the reckless daring of Prince Rupert at Naseby, Turenne's marvelous mastery of army maneuvers, and Von Moltke's sagacity and consummate preeminence in the science of war. But it can be truthfully said that General Pershing combined many of the qualities of many of these war lords and, considering changed conditions, is entitled to rank high among those military leaders whose genius have often changed the history of the world and the course of human events.

General Pershing led a great army at a time when warfare had been modernized and when the age-old strategy that had won victory and undying fame for generals in the past had become inefficient and obsolete. In modern warfare the personal equation and the spectacular elements are largely eliminated and there is but little, if any, opportunity or necessity for individual initiative and pageantry, which formed a large part of the military activities in the past.

Obviously, man power will always be the most important single factor in military conflicts because of the intelligence, initiative, and resourcefulness of the individual soldiers, but in modern wars chemicals, machinery, and other man-made instrumentalities are becoming increasingly important, and ordinarily the best organized, best equipped, and best operated military machine wins.

General Pershing, engaged in modern warfare, wisely adopted modern methods, modern agencies, and modern instrumentalities, all of which had a tendency to obscure real military genius as understood by the average man, but which in fact require a very high order of military genius to operate efficiently.

If General Pershing had been at the head of a great army in any of the historic wars in the past, I am convinced that he would have displayed to an eminent degree many of the types of military genius appropriate in those periods. In other words, General Pershing as ably exemplified the particular type of military genius suitable for the period in which he lived as did the war lords in the past utilize the strategic or military formulas and systems best suited for the time in which they lived.

Though hedged about by entirely different conditions which necessarily limited his initiative, he nevertheless demonstrated a high order of military genius. Confronted by the superb armies of the Central Powers, the best organized, best equipped, and most efficient fighting machine that the world has ever known, General Pershing displayed the same dogged determination, resourcefulness, and initiative that General Grant exhibited while he was hammering his way to Richmond; the same sound judgment and inflexible will manifested by Wellington in his peninsular campaign and when his English squares stood the shock of the charge by the imperial guard at Waterloo.

It is fitting, therefore, that our beloved Republic, even in the lifetime of General Pershing, create a national military park in his honor and commemorative of his outstanding military genius and in recognition of the service he has rendered to the land that gave him birth. And it will be especially appropriate to locate this memorial park near his birthplace in Linn County, Mo. I believe I may well indulge the hope that this proposal will be adopted and this memorial park established near Laclede, Mo. I am sure the American people will approve such action.

AGRICULTURAL LOSSES

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, losses sustained by agriculture in this country during 1930 amounted to several billion dollars. In the value of crops alone it amounted to nearly two and a half billion dollars. In addition the value of livestock sold from the farms and ranches was approximately $225,000,000 less in 1930 than in 1929, making the total shrinkage in crop and livestock values in one year more than $2,600,000,000.

Some say that these losses were due in large part to the devastating drought of last summer, which affected 21 States. The record does not justify such a conclusion, not-

withstanding the ruin which the drought occasioned. The fact is that, excepting corn and cotton, there was larger production in the other staple crops in 1930 than in 1929, yet they brought smaller returns to those who produced them.

In 1930 wheat production amounted to 850,965,000 bushels, valued, according to figures from the Department of Agriculture, at $517,407,000. In 1929 the wheat crop totaled 806,508,000 bushels, valued at $840,921,000. Thus while the 1930 wheat crop was nearly 45,000,000 bushels larger than that produced in 1929, its value was $323,000,000 less.

In 1929 the corn crop amounted to 2,622,000,000 bushels, valued at $2,042,000,000. In 1930 the corn crop was 2,081,000,000 bushels, valued at $1,378,874,000. Thus while production fell off about 540,000,000 bushels, the value of the crop dropped $670,000,000.

The size of the corn crop decreased about 20 per cent, but the value of the crop was approximately one-third less. One would think such a substantial reduction in production would make for a higher price for the product, yet whereas the average value of the 1929 crop was about 77 cents per bushel, the substantially smaller crop of 1930 was worth only about 67 cents per bushel. There is something fundamentally wrong with a situation in which the law of supply and demand is so completely set at variance.

Cotton production in 1929 amounted to 14,919,000 bales, valued at $1,225,000,000. The 1930 cotton crop was 14,243,000 bales, valued at only $674,000,000. Thus, while production dropped only 676,000 bales, the value of the crop decreased $551,000,000. While production fell about 5 per cent under 1929, the value of the crop dropped about 40 per cent.

In 1930 the oat crop exceeded the production of 1929 by 160,000,000 bushels, but the value of the crop fell from $538,445,000 in 1929 to $453,976,000 in 1930, a decrease of $84,469,000.

Production of rye in 1930 exceeded that of 1929 by 15,000,000 bushels, but the value of the crop fell from $35,371,000 in 1929 to $20,895,000 in 1930, a decrease of $14,476,000.

White potato production in 1930 was a little more than 6,000,000 bushels greater than in the preceding year, but the value of the crop fell from $469,701,000 in 1929 to $326,457,000 in 1930, a drop of $143,244,000.

For 1929 the Department of Agriculture reported the total of the 75 principal crops grown in the United States at $8,675,270,000. For 1930 it reported the value of the same crops at $6,274,427,000. This is a decrease of $2,400,743,000, or more than 25 per cent. How long can American agriculture survive such a terrific loss?

The Department of Agriculture's index figure, computed on the price of all farm products, dropped 40 points from January, 1929, to January, 1930, and February reports show it still dropping. Based on a pre-war average of prices of farm products, the index figure stood at 134 points in January, 1929. In January of this year it was at 94, the lowest level of farm prices since 1912, the last year of the Taft administration.

These facts reflect the complete failure of the Hoover administration to redeem its pledge to solve the problem of agriculture. In 1929 the President prevented the enactment of a farm bill favored by the farmers' organizations, and in lieu of that caused the enactment of the law under which the Federal Farm Board was created. He appointed the members of the Farm Board in July, 1929. The board had what he said was "responsibility, authority, and resources such as have never before been conferred by our Government in assistance to any industry." In urging Congress to enact the Farm Board bill, President Hoover said it was a "proposal for the steady upbuilding of agriculture onto firm foundation of equality with other industry and would remove the agricultural problem from politics and place it in the realm of business."

Congress gave the Farm Board $500,000,000 to do for agriculture what President Hoover said the proposal was intended to do, but in the first crop year after the President's plan was put into effect, the value of the farm products dropped more than $2,600,000,000.

If this is the steady upbuilding of agriculture onto a firm foundation, then it is time for the agriculturist to pray that the "upbuilding" cease at once.

STABILIZING THE BUYING POWER OF MONEY

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call your attention to a bill reintroduced at the opening of the extra session in 1929. I refer to my H. R. 112, the only bill now before Congress having for its object the stabilization of the commodity price level and so of the buying power of money.

This subject has been so fully discussed during the past decade that further argument for dollar stability should be unnecessary. The public is finally, and again painfully, becoming aware that our so-called standard of value—fixed in its weight and varying, therefore, in its essential quality, buying power—is a standard in name only. A true standard would prevent change in the average buying power of money, just as our standards of weight and length prevent change in the weight of the pound weight and in the length of the yardstick.

My bill would not stabilize the prices of individual commodities nor in any way conflict with the law of supply and demand. Indeed, it would broaden the scope of that law by bringing within its reach the price of gold, which has heretofore been price fixed. I say the price of gold has been fixed, not its valure. Though the gold unit purports to be a standard of valure, its own valure constantly fluctuates, its price alone remaining stable. And this is simply because it is measured in terms of itself. It is always worth a hundred cents—a hundred-hundredths of itself. What a standard with which to measure valures!

The valure of the gold dollar is its average buying power, and tested by buying power it is seen to be less reliable in its essential quality than a rubber tapeline. Certainly no tapeline in actual use ever shrank in its length as our dollar shrank in its buying power 1915 to May, 1920, nor stretched in length as our gold dollar stretched in buying power during the deflation period. The gold unit of 25.8 grains was nominally the standard of valure 1915 to May, 1920, when the price level rose to two and one-half times its pre-war stage. As compared with the gold dollar of 1915, the gold dollar of May, 1920, was a 40 per cent dollar; and as compared with the gold dollar of May, 1920, the gold dollar of July, 1921, was a 170 per cent dollar.

In 1922 the Federal reserve authorities virtually abandoned the gold standard by making the commodity price level the ultimate criterion of valure. From that time up to the middle of 1929 they prevented any marked inflation or depression of the dollar's buying power, employing as their guide the index of commodity prices. When the price level tried to rise they halted it by contraction of credit and other means. When the price level tried to decline they increased the supply of money in circulation. The price level itself, therefore, virtually served as the valure standard by which the buying power of the yardstick of price, the gold dollar, was partially stabilized; as nearly stabilized, perhaps, as it could have been without the weight regulation of the unit, which must be a main feature of real stabilization of the dollar.

That the heads of the Federal reserve felt that they were doing, after 1922, all they reasonably could do through the means at their command to prevent rise or fall of the price level, appears in the testimony of Benjamin Strong, governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York at the hearings on H. R. 7895 before our Committee on Banking and Currency April 6, 1926. Congressman WILLIAMSON asked whether—

> The Federal Reserve Board could stabilize the price level to a greater extent than they have in the past by giving greater expansion to market operations and restriction or extension of credit facilities.

Governor Strong replied:

> I personally think that the administration of the Federal reserve system, since the reaction of 1921, has been just as nearly directed as human wisdom could direct it toward that very object.

Later, in reply to a question by Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, Governor Strong agreed that after four years of a fairly stable index number there would remain no evidence of inflation

of commodity prices. This was equivalent to saying that there would exist no evidence of depreciation of the valure of the dollar and consequently no justification for further so-called deflation. Mr. Strong was not only governor of the great Federal Reserve Bank of New York, but also chairman of the market committee, which handled the open market transactions of the New York banks. He was probably the most influential man in the whole system. Had he lived it seems likely that the present disastrous depression would have been checked as soon as it started. He died late in 1928, and the slump of the price level began in July, 1929. By December, 1930, the price level had gone down nearly 20 per cent, raising the buying power of money, and with it the burden of debts and taxes about 25 per cent.

Had our bill been in effect even during the past two years the world-wide scramble for gold, which was one of the causes of the sharp rise in its valure, which in turn was the direct cause of the price slump, would not have affected our domestic markets. For we would have been cut loose from the fixed-weight gold unit. As gold rose in the world market less and less of it would have been needed to hold our price level at its initial stage. Meanwhile the weight of the uncoined bullion dollar in which our currency would have been redeemable would have grown gradually smaller and the stock of gold in the United States Treasury would have divided into more and more dollars as gold advanced in value.

As to the producers of goods the prices of which depend largely on the foreign markets, they would have at least this consolation. The burden of their debts would not be going up while their incomes were going down. Had our dollar been stabilized, it would have taken no more goods and labor to pay their debts and taxes than the same payments would have taken before the European depression began. The small price in foreign money they now realize from the sale of their exports would divide into more American dollars, for our dollars would not as now be unjustly inflated.

The plan embodied in this bill is the oldest of the proposals to stabilize the buying power of money. It is older by 15 years than that of Irving Fisher and by more than 25 years than that of Keynes. It was first published in 1896 by Dana J. Tinnes, now of Grand Forks, N. Dak., whose work along monetary lines is known to well-informed economists in this country and to a considerable extent abroad. It is my belief that the Tinnes plan is not open to any of the valid objections against the two proposals to which I have referred, the Fisher plan embodied in the Goldsborough bill, H. R. 402, of 1925, and the "managed currency" scheme of J. Maynard Keynes, of England. Since these two have received very wide publicity, I will in a few sentences summarize them for comparison with the scheme I sponsor.

While my bill is expected to produce real stability by blocking tendencies toward change in the price level as soon as detected, neither Keynes nor Fisher aims at anything more than approximate stability. They would both stop redeeming currency in fixed weights of gold, but would have a variable buying price and selling price for gold, the two prices about 1 per cent apart. Raising this "pair of prices" is equivalent to reducing the weight of gold represented by the money unit; and lowering them is equivalent to increasing the weight of the gold unit. This double price for gold would, of itself, make actual stabilization impossible. For in order for the currency and the gold unit to remain of the same valure they must be freely interchangeable on equal terms both ways.

Keynes would have the gold prices revised every Thursday morning, with occasional stabilizing changes in the bank discount rate. But he would leave the control of the commodity price level where it now is, in the hands of private interests. For his "managed currency" would be managed by the Bank of England. Fisher would have his plan administered by the United States Treasury and would have the fixing of the pair of prices properly automatic. But, unfortunately, his adjustments are plainly inadequate, being made but six times a year and each limited to 1 per cent. Also his brassage charge would affect foreign exchange rates, hindering the import of gold.

The main feature of the plan contained in my bill is the daily adjustment of the weight of the uncoined bullion dollar in which all currency would be redeemable. Whenever gold tends to cheapen, as shown by a rising tendency of the price level, a trifle more gold is added to the bullion dollar to check the rise. And whenever gold tends to grow dearer, as it is now doing, the bullion dollar is reduced in weight, thus blocking the depression of the price level. Anyone who knows that more gold would buy more goods, thus lowering prices, and that less gold would buy less goods, thus raising the price level, must see that tendencies toward change in the price level can be counteracted by proper corrective change in the gold weight of the measure of price, the dollar. Such change in the gold weight of the dollar does not involve any reminting of coins, for the gold would not be in coins, but in bars marked with their weight. Therefore weight adjustments would be no more than slight alterations of the mint rate—the rate at which currency would be redeemed in gold at the Treasury. Assisting the main stabilization process would be the purchase and sale of United States bonds. Bonds would be sold when price inflation is threatened, thus withdrawing currency from the market. Bonds would be bought on the open market when price depression threatens, thus increasing the supply of money in circulation.

To illustrate the plan, take the present monetary situation. Suppose that when our price level began to decline, a lowering of the mint rate had immediately begun, the dollar gradually growing smaller and smaller. If it be true that less gold will buy less goods, the buying power of the dollar could not have continued increasing while its weight was decreasing. Suppose that at the same time the United States Treasury had begun buying bonds on the market, paying for them in currency, and thus increasing the supply of money in circulation, would not this have aided the stabilization process by making the weight adjustments less necessary? Could the slump of the price level have continued a year and a half while the dollar in which price is measured was growing lighter and while the supply of money in circulation was being prevented from shrinking? This would not be change but prevention of change. The bullion dollar would be continuously changing in its gold weight to prevent change in its only essential quality—buying power. And blocking change in the gold unit, from which all our currency derives its value, would at the same time stabilize that currency, and with it all credit extended and all contracts written in terms of that currency.

Passage of this bill will not invite but should greatly lessen speculation in gold, or, what is the same thing, in gold valure. One can now gamble in gold when monetary conditions are unsettled by investing in safe, secured notes, mortgages, bonds, bank certificates of deposit, bank or Government currency, and so forth. For the valure of all of these rise and fall with the valure of the fixed-weight gold dollar. This may not be generally recognized as speculating in gold, but it is by far the most common method.

With this bill in force, this most attractive and seemingly innocent method would be barred. The valure of all such obligations would be stabilized by being payable in dollars having always the same average buying power.

One can also now speculate in gold either by storing the actual metal or by depositing it in the United States Treasury in exchange for gold certificates, which can be put into immediate use earning interest. With our bill in force such deposits would be paid for in Treasury notes redeemable not in a fixed weight of gold but in the weight shown by the mint rate current when the gold is withdrawn.

It has been argued that with this bill in effect one could profit by depositing gold when the bullion dollar was light and withdrawing it when the dollar became heavier. But the dollar would be light only if gold were dear and would be heavier only if gold were cheap. Just how one could profit by depositing a given number of dollars' worth of gold and later withdrawing the same number of dollars' worth of gold remains to be explained.

A reversal of this process would be somewhat more promising. But this would involve actual storage of the metal, with loss of interest during the time stored, plus cost of

storage and fire and theft insurance. Considering that the daily adjustments would be very small and the carrying costly, this prospect does not look enticing. It could be profitable only in case of a great rise in the market valure of gold, and even then any profit made would not be at the expense of the Treasury. Also the provisions in the bill suspending the right to deposit when the valure of gold is declining and restricting large withdrawals when its valure is rising would make such speculation more difficult.

The fact that slumps in foreign exchange rates—deviations from par—affect the foreign trade of a country has led some to fear that stabilization by America alone would hurt our trade. If the imports of a country exceed her exports, visible and invisible, or if the credit of her traders is in question, her exchange will sell at a lower rate, putting both her importers and exporters at a disadvantage. Readjustments of mint pars can have no such effect. Dollar stabilization would make the changes in the valure of gold, now camouflaged by the fixed weights of the money units, visible in all comparisons between prices stated in stabilized and those stated in unstabilized units. And that is all.

Any man intelligent enough to see that at home he was not being wronged by corrections in the unit intended to prevent change in its value could also see that price changes quoted in the money of a foreign country—in so far as they were due to the steadiness of our dollar—could not harm him, for they would be changes in seeming only—in foreign price only and not in valure as measured in other goods or in the dollars in which he would receive payment.

Take the exporter of wheat as an example and see whether the shifts in sterling exchange due to stabilization by America alone would affect his foreign market.

If the valure of gold as measured in other commodities and the price of wheat in Liverpool both remain stationary, the price of wheat in dollars would also remain steady save for alterations due to other causes.

Were gold to depreciate on the British market—other market influences remaining unchanged—the Liverpool price of wheat as measured in British money would advance, while the price in dollars would remain stationary.

Were gold to appreciate there as compared with other commodities—other influences unchanged—the Liverpool price of wheat in British money would decline, while the price in dollars would hold stationary.

In other words, if not disturbed by influences acting directly on the supply-demand of wheat, its price would remain constant regardless of that part of the change in the relation of United States to British money due to dollar stabilization.

Price constancy, if it means stability in relation to gold only and not to commodities in general in the markets in which he buys and sells other things, can neither hurt nor help him unless it is the gold itself he wants.

Fixed valure relations between the money units of the various nations are not even desirable. Countries adopting sound economic and financial policies should not have the continuous prosperity they have so earned disturbed by unwise or reckless neighbors.

SKETCH OF THE BILL H. R. 112

It makes the gold unit variable in its weight in order that it may be made invariable in its essential quality, buying power. The weight regulation is vested in a monetary standard division of the Treasury Department. The division collects trade and price data, constructs the daily price index number, the market gage, and by its guidance adjusts the weight of the bullion dollar. It also assists the stabilization process by purchase of bonds when the price level tends to decline and sale of bonds when the price level tends to advance.

Price-level tendencies are measured at 2 a. m. daily and changes announced at once, before the markets and the mint open for the day, thus barring all chance of speculation on advance information of weight change. Metric weights are used. A bulletin showing all adjustments during the week with the data on which they were based is issued weekly to protect against error or fraud.

Gold coins and silver dollars are retired, the metal being minted into bars, each marked with its weight. Free coinage of gold is continued, gold bars being issued instead of coins. All paper currency except Federal reserve and national bank notes are replaced by a new issue of Treasury notes, for which a redemption fund is provided by consolidating all existing gold and silver funds. Redemption is in gold or, at the option of the applicant, in silver, not at a fixed ratio to gold but at its current market price.

Further details of the measurement of price-level tendencies and adjustment of the daily mint rate are given in the accompanying copy of the weekly bulletin.

MONETARY STANDARD BULLETIN

Week of.....193

Market gage schedule Commodities and markets	First adjustment, Monday						
	W	Q	QW	P	PQW	P	PQW
Cotton, middling, Galveston, lb	.0178	5.8823	.1047	.17	.0179	.19	.0199
Hogs, light butchers, Chi., cwt	.0274	7.6922	.21077	.13	.0274	.12	.0253
Milk, fluid, New York, cwt	.0184	.2793	.00514	.358	.0184	.360	.0185
Wheat, 2 dark spring, Mpls., bu	.0050	.641	.00321	.156	.0050	.158	.0051
Wheat, 2 hard win., Kas. City, bu	.0056	.6667	.00373	1.50	.0056	1.53	.0057
All other commodities	.9258				.9258		.9258
Market gage at close of day					1.		1.0003
Mint rate for following day					1.672*		1.673

Column W, relative trade importance of the various entries, shown in decimals. Q, physical quantity of each sold for $1 at the start. QW (W times Q) the weighted quantities which together make up the goods-dollar. P, current market prices. PQW, the goods-dollar components, priced. Their sum is the market gage for the day. All goods on the wholesale market to be listed; only a few farm products are here shown, all other goods—.9258 of the whole—being lumped together below. The initial mint rate, *1.672 grams (25.8 grains) is the present weight of the gold dollar. At 2 A. M. daily the current mint rate is multiplied by the newly-computed market gage to get the new mint rate, which is announced at once. Cols. P and PQW are revised daily, cols. W and QW quarterly, and the entire schedule yearly.

Market gage schedule—Continued. Daily adjustments Tuesday to Saturday, inclusive

Close of.....	Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday	
QW	P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW
.1047	.19	.0199	.19	.0199	.19	.0199	.17	.0178	.17	.0178
.21077	.12	.0253	.12	.0253	.12	.0253	.13	.0274	.13	.0274
.00514	3.58	.0184	3.58	.0184	3.58	.0184	3.58	.0184	3.58	.0184
.00321	1.54	.0049	1.55	.0050	1.52	.0049	1.51	.0048	1.49	.0048
.00373	1.48	.0055	1.49	.0056	1.45	.0054	1.45	.0054	1.43	.0053
All other goods		.9258		.9258		.9258		.9258		.9258
New market gage		.9998		1.		.9997		.9996		.9995
New mint rate		1.673		1.673		1.672		1.671		1.670

Note.—VALURE is rate of exchangeability for goods, as distinguished from the many other meanings of the ambiguous word, value.

HON. SCHUYLER MERRITT

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Hon. SCHUYLER MERRITT, of Connecticut, at the end of this session will be deeply regretted by all. He has been a warm personal friend since he first came to Congress, and I shall miss his genial companionship. No man is better equipped to help solve present-day problems than Mr. MERRITT, and we can ill afford to lose at this time men of his experience, judgment, and ability. To-day public life specially needs men of courage, and such a man is Mr. MERRITT. He also represents the highest type of a cultured gentleman. He is the kind and character of a man I am proud to call my friend. His retirement is not only a loss to his State but to the American Congress.

THIRD-CLASS POSTMASTERS' EQUIPMENT ALLOWANCE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 229 proposes to give to third-class postmasters who are required to own or rent post offices, fixtures, and equipment a yearly allowance equal to 8 per cent of their salaries. The allowance asked is modest, as the box rents received by the department from personally owned and rented equipment amount to 11.25 per cent of the salaries of the postmasters.

There are 10,956 postmasters of the third class. Of these 1,642 are in quarters leased by the department, where fixtures are furnished by the lessor. This leaves 9,314 offices at which the postmasters are required to purchase or rent the fixtures. The salaries of the third class range from $1,100 to $2,300, graded according to postal receipts.

This group of 9,314 postmasters are the only officers, agents, or employees of the Government compelled to provide the equipment necessary to conduct the Government's business. Fourth-class postmasters are granted an allowance for rent, fuel, light, and equipment. Postmasters of the first and second class are provided with necessary equipment, and some of the higher-salaried grades of third class are in leased quarters. Rural letter carriers get an equipment allowance. This group of third-class postmasters should be relieved of this discrimination and placed on an equality with other postmasters and postal employees.

Postmasters required to provide equipment are in most—if not all—States compelled to pay personal taxes on it. The Post Office Department fixes the amount of rental charged for boxes, the postmaster furnishes the boxes and collects the rentals, keeps the records, turns the box rentals in as postal revenues, pays taxes and insurance on his equipment, and receives no revenue from his investment.

These postmasters on account of the requirement to provide fixtures and equipment are taken advantage of by firms manufacturing post-office equipment. If they buy they are compelled to pay a very high price. If they rent they are compelled to pay exorbitant rentals. The lease contract postmasters renting equipment must sign stipulates that it shall be in effect so long as the lessee continues as postmaster. It provides that the lessee will pay for all freight, hauling, and erection charges in connection with installation. It also provides that at the expiration of his incumbency as postmaster he shall immediately, at his own expense, take down and crate and ship to the owner, freight charges prepaid.

If the postmaster buys he runs the risk of losing his position after a 4-year term, and then he has no market for his equipment unless his successor will purchase it from him. It may be readily seen that this provides a setting for complications unsatisfactory to both.

The following statement submitted by a postmaster in Utah is typical:

Since taking charge of this post office July 1, 1922, which pays an annual salary of $1,800, I have provided necessary equipment at a cost of about $1,700. During the seven and one-half years I have collected in box rents $3,012.52, all of which has been remitted to the department. I have been obliged to pay for all repairs, insurance, taxes, investment on equipment, etc.

H. R. 229 provides an equipment allowance equal to 8 per cent of the salaries of postmasters. In my case this would amount to $144 per annum, while the box-rent collections average $401.64 per annum. The department would still receive from this office $257.64 in box-rent collections in excess of the allowance on personally owned equipment.

The Post Office Department has no definite policy in leasing quarters at third-class post offices. There are 394 offices with salaries of $2,300, 664 with salaries of $2,200, and 835 with salaries of $2,100, a total of 1,893 offices. As there are only 1,642 offices in leased quarters, it is evident that a discrimination exists in granting leases.

Through a questionnaire sent to postmasters in offices not under lease by the National League of Third and Fourth Class Postmasters, a statement has been compiled which I ask to have printed as part of my remarks. The following is the summary:

Summary

Offices reporting	2,127
Average salary	$1,622.00
Total value of equipment owned and rented	1,346,569.00
Value of equipment average postmaster	633.00
Total box rents collected	388,159.15
Box rents, average per year	182.50

Box rents average 11.25 per cent of salaries.

Extending this to cover the 9,314 post offices in quarters not under lease we find that the value of the equipment owned and rented by the postmasters is $5,895,772, from which the box rents turned in to the department as postal revenues are $1,699,805. The Post Office Department estimates that this bill would cost about $1,200,000. The box rents more than cover this estimate.

In very many offices of the third class the fixtures are entirely inadequate. For this the postmaster can not be blamed. He is appointed for a 4-year term only, and, even if financially able, would not feel disposed to invest his own money for which he would receive no return. The majority of these postmasters are unable to buy suitable fixtures, so they must rent them. It is desirable—yes, necessary—to have adequately equipped post offices, but these can not be had under the present inequitable system. The enactment of this bill would enable more than 9,000 communities to have post offices of which they would not feel ashamed.

Equipment owned and rented by third-class postmasters in offices not under lease

State	Number of offices	Salaries	Value equipment owned	Rent paid per annum for equipment	Box rents collected
Alabama	32	$50,900.00	$13,446.00	$71.50	$4,339.58
Alaska	1	1,100.00	500.00		90.30
Arizona	8	12,400.00	4,850.00	10.80	1,572.20
Arkansas	22	34,300.00	9,215.00	432.80	3,621.84
California	42	72,400.00	19,000.00	954.52	11,411.01
Colorado	44	70,700.00	21,785.00	599.80	8,001.69
Connecticut	12	20,000.00	3,365.00	100.00	2,294.31
Delaware	5	7,200.00	1,250.00		691.71
Florida	32	48,000.00	18,495.00	486.30	6,076.58
Georgia	21	31,700.00	9,290.00	433.80	2,749.98
Hawaii	5	8,400.00	3,350.00	168.00	1,320.60
Idaho	17	29,100.00	9,670.00	177.00	3,314.72
Illinois	97	152,900.00	41,540.00	2,933.90	18,253.65
Indiana	125	202,900.00	44,240.00	2,358.60	18,890.67
Iowa	194	331,700.00	92,040.00	2,513.40	42,669.79
Kansas	94	154,400.00	48,424.00	970.40	16,885.13
Kentucky	31	49,300.00	11,200.00	391.10	3,975.63
Louisiana	25	39,800.00	11,757.00	647.20	4,741.53
Maine	36	59,600.00	17,545.00	370.40	6,678.27
Maryland	14	20,400.00	3,590.00	55.00	1,157.57
Massachusetts	28	44,700.00	14,385.00	108.00	5,686.75
Michigan	68	109,800.00	32,730.00	186.80	11,735.63
Minnesota	118	193,300.00	71,865.00	453.40	21,005.99
Mississippi	22	33,600.00	9,500.00	603.40	2,757.90
Missouri	66	105,500.00	28,258.00	1,556.20	9,945.69
Montana	23	37,100.00	16,913.00	257.25	5,867.21
Nebraska	89	144,000.00	48,105.00	1,284.40	16,966.01
Nevada	6	10,600.00	3,840.00		1,228.62
New Hampshire	10	14,400.00	5,425.00	453.36	1,079.02
New Jersey	38	66,000.00	14,260.00	518.50	8,930.57
New Mexico	8	13,000.00	5,000.00		1,306.60
New York	90	148,000.00	41,370.00	677.00	15,809.34
North Carolina	22	36,200.00	11,445.00	490.80	3,333.22
North Dakota	70	117,700.00	38,950.00	1,809.40	14,565.77
Ohio	57	88,600.00	27,091.00	155.38	9,896.19
Oklahoma	49	76,400.00	23,415.00	1,057.45	8,709.52
Oregon	28	45,900.00	17,470.00		6,064.48
Pennsylvania	93	147,100.00	40,390.00	1,563.20	16,633.78
Rhode Island	3	5,000.00	920.00		735.55
South Carolina	9	13,900.00	3,450.00	60.00	1,532.33
South Dakota	49	80,700.00	25,948.00	1,389.43	9,276.24
Tennessee	17	26,800.00	7,185.00	366.00	2,283.95
Texas	102	160,500.00	49,890.00	2,864.90	20,134.95
Utah	19	31,500.00	10,750.00	397.20	4,598.37
Vermont	16	26,300.00	7,650.00		2,072.05
Virginia	39	60,700.00	14,525.00	541.00	4,282.74

Equipment owned and rented by third-class postmasters in offices not under lease—Continued

State	Number of offices	Salaries	Value equipment owned	Rent paid per annum for equipment	Box rents collected
Washington	34	$56,200.00	$23,725.00	$275.20	$8,258.99
West Virginia	7	11,600.00	3,510.00		1,418.50
Wisconsin	82	136,600.00	40,075.00	1,224.30	11,523.53
Wyoming	8	12,900.00	4,310.00		1,782.90
Total	2,127	3,451,800.00	1,026,902.00	31,967.69	388,159.15

Summary

Offices reporting	2,127
Average salary	+$1,622.00
Total value of equipment owned and rented	1,346,569.00
Value of equipment average postmaster	+633.00
Box rents, average per year	182.50

Box rents average 11.25 per cent of salaries.
Proposed bill provides for 8 per cent of salaries.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, as retiring chairman of the Committee on Claims, having served in that capacity during the Seventy-first Congress, I am taking the liberty of enlightening the membership of the House in some degree as to the necessity of adopting some method whereby the work assigned to this committee may secure the consideration to which it is entitled.

In the Seventy-first Congress 1,700 bills were referred to this committee. By diligent attention to those claims our committee was able to consider about 50 per cent of them—and in this connection I will state that I am sure no committee in the House has worked harder than has the Committee on Claims during the past session in order to give serious consideration to the work before it. However, with the vast number of bills referred to this committee it is impossible to keep up with this work, and at the end of the session we find 750 bills remaining without any consideration, a majority of which will no doubt be reintroduced in the Seventy-second Congress.

Recognizing the situation, I introduced and had reported favorably in the last session a bill (H. R. 17168) which would give to the Comptroller General authority to settle claims against the Government for private-property damage up to $1,000, provided the claimant agreed to such settlement; if not, then such claims to be referred to the Court of Claims. But owing to the legislative jam in the short session just closed I was unable to have the bill considered. The bill also provided for personal-injury and death claims. The committee was ably assisted by the members of the Court of Claims and by the Attorney General, and feels certain that this bill would, if enacted into law, take care of from 50 to 60 per cent of the total claims referred to the Claims Committee. The committee would then be able to consider the 40 per cent remaining and at the same time do justice to the hundreds of claimants who have claims against the Government, some of them pending for years, who are certainly entitled to consideration, and which can never be considered if we continue in the future as we have in the past.

Now, just a word in reference to the rules governing the consideration of the Private Calendar. I think you will all agree with me when I say our present rule of unanimous consent, where one man who has given but a few moments' consideration to the merits of a bill can object to the passage of any bill, thereby defeating it after the committee has given it due consideration, should be changed. Many times bad humor and prejudice on the part of some Member will defeat a worthy and just claim, and I will "with charity for all and malice toward none" call your attention to some of the unparliamentary—yes, disgraceful—scenes enacted on the floor of this House the past few weeks when the Private Calendar was up for consideration. The rules should be changed, by all means.

I am merely giving my views as one who is deeply interested because of the experience I have had in such matters in giving claims against the Government a just and equitable consideration so that the hundreds of claimants to-day waiting patiently may have their claims brought to a determination. I am in hopes that in the next Congress my views and recommendations as set out in this statement may be given consideration, to the end that justice in full measure may be given to those who are entitled to receive justice.

INEQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMISSIONED OFFCERS OF THE NAVY

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this bill (S. 550) to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy is worthy of the most serious consideration of the House, and I am unqualifiedly in favor of its passage. For two years we have delayed this legislation, which meets with the approval of the major portion of the officer personnel in the Navy, with the approval of the Navy Department, and has the unqualified indorsement of the House Naval Affairs Committee. The bill is one which will result in a substantial saving to the Government.

This is not a radical measure. It is an attempt to smooth out inequalities of opportunity. It is a substitution of a policy known as "age in grade" for one of "service in grade." Whereas a youngster may enter the Naval Academy under the present personnel legislation and find, because he entered near the maximum age limit, that he will not have an opportunity for selection to the higher ranks in the Navy because the present law says he must retire at a certain age if he is not selected for the next higher rank; under the proposed law he is given a certain term of service in the grade in which to prove his worth for the next higher rank, without regard to his age. Surely we can not sacrifice trained officers because they happen to be one or two years older than others of their rank. Those one or two extra years may mean added judgment, more ability in making quick, clean-cut decisions.

The bill makes provision for those who were commissioned during the World War from the enlisted ranks or from civilian life. These officers have an opportunity to progress through professional examinations or to honorably retire from the Navy with all the monetary benefits of such retirement. In the case of those who held warrant officer rank to revert, if they so choose, to such rank.

I regret that during this Congress no progress has been made with this pay bill. It is not possible for the younger officers to hold their own with the pay accorded them. There has been no adjustment in many years, and I sincerely hope that the Naval Affairs Committee in the next Congress will give serious consideration to proposals to adjust their pay.

FLOOD CONTROL AND INLAND WATERWAYS NAVIGATION

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association held in St. Louis on November 24 and 25, 1930.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Mississippi Valley Association, it is an honor to be invited to address this distinguished body. This association is the only organization in America that I know of which is advocating a policy sufficiently broad in vision to provide for the best interests of the agricultural, industrial, and commercial groups composing the vast central portion of our country.

Prior to the great World War it was considered hardly respectable to be an advocate of inland-waterway improvements. There had been so much waste of public funds in that endeavor and so much loss in the construction of ill-considered projects that the people were skeptical of every new proposal for river development. The term "pork barrel" was a familiar epithet hurled at devoted advocates in Congress of waterway projects, and it was repeated by every crossroad weekly newspaper throughout the land. Proposals for a comprehensive national policy of control and utilization of the run-off waters of the country, and the use of its streams could not get a sympathetic hearing, although thoughtful men everywhere realized we were wasting one of our most valuable assets. The World War demonstrated the need for water transportation as a supplement to the railways, which alone were inadequate to meet the emergency. Some progress was made at that time and the Government barge line on the Mississippi was established, but after the crisis had passed the same indiffer-

ent and neglectful policy as to our waterways was resumed. No definite plan of national scope for improvement of our waterways as a whole has been adopted.

Then came the great flood of 1927, with its heavy loss of life and property. The calamity was of such proportions as to challenge the attention of the entire Nation. Much thought was given to the question of the control of our flood waters, but even then, when it came to the type of legislation to be enacted, the people most affected and who had suffered most from the ravages of uncontrolled stream flow preferred to accept a piecemeal and emergency plan of relief rather than to hold out firmly for the kind of legislation that would be an effective and comprehensive remedy. The final solution of the problem must be one which will serve the best interests of each section of the entire river basin.

A new session of Congress is now approaching and a demand comes from these same localities to save them from the dangers of the Jadwin plan of legislation passed at their behest. The approved project of flood control is one that nobody now wants in its entirety.

The first problem that confronts the Nation with respect to our waterways and their economic uses is that of a comprehensive public policy. We really have not any broad national plan that will fit the future development of our country. The man in Louisiana has one thought upon the matter; the man in Kansas and Nebraska another. What we need is a plan broad enough to take in all the affected areas—the 31 States within the great Mississippi Basin as well as all the other States indirectly interested, and with sufficient elasticity to include the future expansion of this great and growing country. That duty, I say, rests with Congress. Congress should say what the policy shall be, and place the responsibility for carrying it out upon the engineering profession. I for one am willing to go on record now and state that it is the duty of the National Government to control the entire flow of all interstate streams, from their source to the mouth, and to utilize the waters therein to the utmost for the benefit of agriculture, industry, navigation, and flood control. Such uses will constitute the highest economic good to the entire Nation. With this definite and comprehensive policy adopted by Congress, then the detailed plans of the various projects can be more intelligently and economically worked out by engineers. Individual projects should be considered with reference to how each will fit into the whole system.

It is true that Congress has placed some restrictions upon the engineers of the War Department in passing upon the advisability of adopting new projects. Now, the engineers are asked to report upon the commercial possibilities, the economic justification, the feasibility from an engineering standpoint, and the estimated cost of each new waterway project, as well as the extent of both the Federal and local interests therein. This is all very valuable information as far as it goes; it enables Congress to more easily come to a wise decision in passing new legislation. Projects wholly lacking in merit are no longer authorized. Ill-advised legislation is no longer considered. However, the engineers can not be expected to do justice to the individual project when we have no national policy, nor can they state how any single project, under present conditions, will affect all others.

This association has advocated the standardization of channels of the great central waterway system. Congress has attempted to do this, but only on the main traffic lines. There is still a great lack of uniformity in the various waterway projects. The main river channel depth for navigation has been placed, for the most part, at 9 feet with all the other river channels tributary varying in depth from 4 to 8 feet. It should be the aim of this association and of Congress to insist upon a uniform legal standard depth for the entire waterways system of the country at 9 feet, and work for that accomplishment as quickly as possible.

Originally river transportation was the chief means of commerce. It failed not because of railroad competition, as some may think, but because of the instability and uncertainty of its waterway channels. In the handling of slow moving, bulk commodities river transportation supplements, rather than competes with railroads. There is a distinct field in the country's traffic for each to fill. The uncertainty of our waterways is what has driven much of the commerce from the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Only this last season, after years of labor and much expense, most of the traffic on the river north of Memphis had to be abandoned or was tied up for want of water in the channel. We can not maintain a 9-foot channel unless we have the water to flow in it. The fundamental thought, advanced by Senator Newlands nearly two decades ago, in favor of source-stream control, is as sound to-day as it was then. The principles of waterway development, as he enunciated them, should yet be enacted into law by Congress. If we are to have permanent regulation and the full use of our waterways his idea must be adopted as the controlling and guiding influence.

In dealing with this question of waterways we should consider, I believe, each entire river system as a whole. The great waterway of the central portion of our country is the Mississippi-Missouri River system. Improvements on the main stream and each of its tributaries should be contemplated and made from the Gulf to the head of navigation on each—I mean the natural navigation. The Ohio River has already been partially taken care of, with its system of locks and dams, the completion of which was dedicated last year by the President. But additional works should be put in looking to the control of stream flow in flood time. The upper Mississippi and the Chicago-Illinois diversions are practically all provided for now. The biggest unit still to be developed and completed is the upper Missouri River, as far at least as Fort Benton, Mont. No less a depth than a 9-foot channel should be considered throughout all the stretches of this main river. Let us standardize completely our waterway improvements. When we have adopted a plan of uniform depth throughout the length of our main waterways, we must next maintain this depth of channel throughout the entire year, both in low water and in flood times. This of necessity will require source stream control in the upper reaches of the river. The importance of controlling the flow of our streams at or near the source has not been fully appreciated heretofore by those living in the lower valley; in addition to its effect upon floods it is absolutely essential in the improvement and development of navigation. Without exception all of our rivers flow more swiftly at their source. The gradient per mile is much steeper, and in consequence the siltage and erosion of soil into the stream is very heavy. Slow up this run-off water at or near its source and it will lessen or completely eliminate all erosion and siltage. This in itself will be a wonderful saving in the maintenance of a navigable channel in the lower Mississippi River. There is now being spent each year for dredging the channel between Cairo and New Orleans, for the purpose of maintaining a sufficient depth for navigation, the sum of approximately one and one-half million dollars. This large sum can be greatly reduced by source stream control. In addition, the river banks will become fixed and stabilized on the lower reaches of the river. When we remember that erosion each year removes twenty times as much plant food from the soil as is used in the growing of crops in the United States we can begin to realize how important this one item alone is in the national economy. We have lost from wastings and erosions in our country more than 17,000,000 acres of land which we can not reclaim.

The abandoned farms of the Appalachian region are mute evidences of this wastage of a great national resource. The McCook Conference of Governors held last January said: "Soil erosion is recognized as the greatest waste of the heritage of the Nation." Unless water is stored during the floods on the upper Missouri and its tributaries as an aid to summer or low water flow, the general improvements now being made up to Kansas City and Sioux City will be of little value. The result, so far as navigation is concerned, will prove to be even less adequate than is the Ohio River navigation project. It has been demonstrated that the Pittsburgh dams and reservoirs, or some such supplemental storage system which will hold back flood peaks—the water to be released during dry weather to maintain navigation as water is needed—should be an essential part of a proper navigable channel on the Ohio. In a much greater degree are reservoirs and dams necessary on the upper Missouri.

Investigations into the drainage, precipitation, and run-off waters in this upper region have been made in my State of North Dakota. There is one reservoir site on the Missouri River above the city of Bismarck which is capable of storing 15,000,000 acre-feet of water. This will take care of about 40 per cent of the run-off waters of the Missouri River drainage basin. Detailed surveys have been made of this proposed reservoir site by Mr. R. E. Kennedy, State engineer. His plans and estimates are for the construction of a reservoir by means of a large earthen dam with a steel-concrete core. The dam proposed would be over 2 miles long, with a maximum height of 175 feet above the river bottom, and a spillway of 1,500 feet. The full capacity of the reservoir would be 30,000,000 acre-feet. The cost is estimated at $47,500,000, or $3.30 per acre-foot. Siltage of the river would be deposited in the lake thus formed at the upper end over a 60-mile area and would take 230 years to fill. The dimensions of this reservoir-lake would be approximately 140 by 1½ miles. It is believed that this improvement will affect the discharge of the Missouri River by reducing the flood flow at least 80 per cent at Bismarck and will increase the low-water flow at least 70 per cent at the same point. In other words, it will have the effect upon the river of giving it a stabilized flow throughout the year and will insure a constant uniform depth of channel below, which is absolutely necessary in the promotion of water navigation. It is very important to note the provision made for siltage, for the upper Missouri River carries 80 per cent of the total siltage of the Mississippi River system.

Engineers generally are agreed that the flood problem of the lower Mississippi River is the question of getting rid of approximately 20,000,000 acre-feet of excess water at the mouth of the Arkansas River. The 1927 flood contained only 16,000,000 acre-feet of water in excess of what the present adopted levee system, when completed, will be able to carry safely in the main river below the mouth of the Arkansas. The reasonable margin of safety above the 1927 flood should be provided for, which is 25 per cent over the 1927 basis. The main problem of the lower river, therefore, is how to take care of this 20,000,000 acre-feet of water more than the Mississippi River can safely handle below that point. Rather than turn the waters loose through fuze-plug channels or diversions, which will destroy vast areas of land and property in the Boeuf and Atchafalaya Basins, we ought to study first every other feasible plan which gives promise of taking care of this flood water in some better way. I am convinced this surplus water will all disappear if we develop the available reservoir sites on the upper tributaries. Such a program of reservoir control should be made a part of the adopted Jadwin plan by amending it. It will be less expensive in the long run to the Federal Government, and will at the same time repay in added benefits to the sections of country affected more than the original cost.

The Great Plains region is suffering severely from extremely high freight rates. The agricultural and industrial development of this section is held back by reason of prohibitory freight rates. As an illustration of the influence of transportation rates upon an industry I will cite the case of flax of which I am a large producer. North Dakota raises about one-half the total flax crop of the United States. We import some 20,000,000 bushels additional annually to supply the normal needs of the Nation. All of this could be easily supplied by the flax-growing States. Yet we find that for the last 20 years the Argentine farmer has been able to deliver his flax on either of our coasts cheaper than can the North Dakota farmer. In fact, the Argentinian has enjoyed an exclusive monopoly of that business by reason of cheap water transportation.

The American farmer, largely because of the freight differential, has been unable to reach the market of his country east of Buffalo, N. Y. With a developed inland waterways system the flax of Montana and North Dakota could reach the New York markets by an all-water route, and meet foreign competition on a favorable footing. This area produces 80 per cent of the basic raw materials of the country, such as wheat, corn, potatoes, butter, cotton, and livestock. It also contains vast mineral resources awaiting developments. These raw materials are bulk commodities and lend themselves readily to water transportation. With a properly developed waterway system the impetus to other industrial developments in the region would be so great that it would add materially to the railroad traffic. Thus, the revenues of the railroads would be increased rather than diminished thereby. It is a shortsighted policy which prompts railway executives to oppose development of river transportation, and I am happy to know that a changed attitude is now being shown by many of those interested in our railways.

I have tried to stress, as the central thought of my discourse, that there can be no safe, certain, and permanent river transportation until we have a controlled river channel. We must control the run-off waters of our rivers from the source to the mouth. Dangerous and destructive floods must be prevented if we are to have a prosperous and developed river commerce. The two activities must go hand in hand. Let the flood-control advocates recognize the fact that their interest lies with the navigation advocates. Do the job at once.

A great economic depression hangs over our land and the world to-day. Large numbers of men are unemployed. I believe it will be wise economy and the part of statesmanship to set these men at gainful work on public improvements. And, of these there is none which will yield a richer return nor more permanent benefits than the proper development of our inland waterways. Now, when industry is lagging, is the time to push this great public work. The program already adopted can be augmented and speeded up. Let us bend every effort toward its successful completion, not in 20 years, but in 5, so that we may profit from its establishment in our lifetime. I, for one, pledge myself to do my utmost to that end.

THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the greatest organizations of our Government, the United States Coast Guard. This is one of the earliest organizations of the Government, and until recently had practically no criticism against it whatsoever. In recent years, however, this organization has had imposed upon it the duty of undertaking to enforce the liquor laws in addition to other violations, and has been subject to attacks from some sources, which I do not think have been justified in any particular.

This organization is headed by one of the best men in public life, Rear Admiral F. C. Billard. I have come in close contact with this organization, and from the highest to the lowest it will compare favorably with any other governmental activity.

The life-saving branch of the service has stood out conspicuously in the past.

I feel that in the rescue of the fishermen adrift on the ice fields of Lake Erie February 7, 8, and 9 that the United States Coast Guard performed a service that reflects great credit upon that organization. This rescue is traditional of the Coast Guard and characteristic of the work which that valiant service performs. Editorials from various newspapers representing the larger cities throughout the United States have voiced the opinion that the service should receive national recognition for the very efficient rescue of 41 fishermen.

The work of effecting this particular rescue extended over a period of 48 hours. Receiving word that the men were adrift in very exposed and dangerous positions at 10 a. m. of February 7, the rescue was not completely effected until 9.45 a. m. of the following Monday morning, a period of 47 hours.

During this entire period the Coast Guard personnel in and about Buffalo were actively engaged in rescuing these men from their position of peril—this in the face of a blinding northeast blizzard, with the temperature at 18° and a strong northeast gale.

In effecting the rescue it became necessary for the Coast Guard to employ the services of airplanes. The service was also assisted by the local Buffalo interests in placing additional planes at the disposal of the service for use in locating the drifting men. Due to the intensity of the storm it was impossible for planes to take off until approximately 26 hours after the fishermen had first been reported adrift. This delayed the rescue of the fishermen for 24 hours. The matter of planes is mentioned to point out the humanitarian duties which they may be called upon to perform.

Due to the fact that the marooned fishermen had drifted several miles into the open lake, the exact whereabouts could not be determined by Coast Guard forces. The planes having finally located the missing men, the Coast Guard activities were immediately directed to the rescue. Approximately four hours after the men had been located Coast Guard personnel and craft had effected the rescue of the first boatload of fishermen. Great difficulty was experienced in accomplishing this rescue, due to the fact that it was necessary to haul small boats a distance of 7 miles over the broken ice fields and then cross open fissures which were full of heavy slush, which was almost impossible to penetrate. The marooned men were escorted ashore and the work of accomplishing the rescue of the remaining men continued through Sunday afternoon. As darkness set in Sunday night all but 3 of the last 20 survivors had been rescued. In order to accomplish this rescue it was necessary that Coast Guard personnel who were operating the rescue boats remain on the floating ice fields in order that their places in the boats might be taken by the fishermen. This self-sacrifice on the part of seven coast guardsmen who willingly sacrificed their own safety for that of the marooned fishermen is particularly commendable and truly representative of the traditions of this noble service. By strange irony of fate one of the coast guardsmen who surrendered his place in the rescue boat was the same man who two years ago was so severely criticized while in the performance of his sworn duty. I refer to Motor Machinist's Mate Glenn S. Jennings. Two years ago this young man, while in the performance of his duty in the suppression of smuggling along the Niagara frontier, in attempting to stop an automobile which was supposed to have been smuggling contraband, fired a shot at the tire of this automobile which ricocheted and hit the occupant of the car, Mr. Jacob Hanson. Now Jennings appears in another rôle. I call this to your attention to show the diversity of duties which the coast guardsman is called upon to perform.

With the approach of darkness Sunday night the weather conditions changed and the wind shifted to the northeast, which caused the ice floe to again separate and drift farther into the lake. The separation of the ice floe and the fact that it drifted farther up the lake caused a temporary suspension in the rescue operations. The three fishermen and the seven Coast Guard Men were therefore required to spend the night on the ice, although continual effort was made during the night to effect their rescue. With the coming of morning, planes were again chartered by the Coast Guard to locate these missing men. Personnel from adjoining Coast Guard stations—Cleveland, Erie, and Niagara Falls—were called in to reinforce the personnel which had been engaged for the preceding 36 hours, and who were fast becoming exhausted from their arduous labor. Upon the missing men being again located Monday morning, the rescue was speedily accomplished and the remaining fishermen and Coast Guard personnel rescued.

I call this accomplishment to your attention not that it is different in any way than a thousand other similar accomplishments which have been effected by the Coast Guard during the past few years but for the reason that at this particular time, when the Coast Guard is being criticized and censured while in the performance of its sworn duty, I

feel that the true and paramount duties of this excellent service should be called to your attention.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent decision the Commissioner of Internal Revenue held that palm oil, when used as a substantial ingredient of oleomargarine, can not be considered as artificial coloring matter within the act imposing 10 cents a pound tax on oleomargarine when artificially colored. This ruling has had a most serious effect in lowering the price of butter, and unless promptly remedied by making all yellow oleomargarines subject to the tax as proposed by the bill (H. R. 16836) now before us will prove disastrous to the dairy industry of this country.

Oleomargarine has practically no food value. The discussion here shows that it contains no vitamin A, which is essential to life and an important ingredient of butter. It has also been stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH], who is an eminent physician, that it takes 25 pounds of oleomargarine "to give you as much nutritive value as does 1 pound of wholesome butter made from cow's milk." If this is correct, the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine is a fraud upon the public and should be entirely prohibited. Canada has already done this, not only in the interest of the dairyman and farmer but in the interest of public health.

For a long time a tax on oleomargarine was opposed by the South, as large quantities of cottonseed oil and peanut oil were used in its manufacture. However, the use of peanut oil has fallen from 21,593,000 pounds in 1917 to 5,000,000 pounds in 1927, and the use of cottonseed oil is rapidly reaching the vanishing point. In place of using these comparatively wholesome oils, the manufacturers have resorted to the use of coconut and palm oils. Both of these are foreign oils and are produced under conditions which make them both cheap and unfit for human consumption.

The tariff protects butter against competition from foreign butter and animal products but does not effectively reach the substituted vegetable oils now used in oleomargarine. Imposing the tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleomargarine will help, but I would go further and prohibit its manufacture altogether. This is demanded both in the interest of childhood, to whom vitamin A is essential to health and growth, and the American farmer.

THE HOOVER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that the record of the Seventy-first Congress and of the first half of the Hoover administration is keenly disappointing to the people, who have been promised so much and for whom so little has been performed.

This administration and this Congress came into power two years ago with a number of definite commitments, but outstanding above all else was the pledge to do two things: To solve the problem of agriculture and to accomplish a "limited" revision of the tariff. Neither promise has been kept in good faith, whether for lack of vision and capacity or whether from unwillingness to keep faith with the people each of you may determine for yourself, just as each voter will determine that question when he or she comes to return a verdict on the Hoover administration in the election next year.

I do not believe it an exaggeration to say that as a candidate before the country a little more than two years ago Mr. Hoover was probably more profuse in his promises than any other candidate had ever been. There was little that was good that the country had enjoyed that Mr. Hoover did not attribute to the policies and the leadership of the political party with which he had at last decided to affiliate himself, and there was nothing he was not willing to promise, even an eventual Utopian state in which poverty and the poorhouse would be unknown.

Among other things, Mr. Hoover was induced to pledge, in the event of his election, to convene Congress in special session to do two things, namely, revise the tariff and produce a cure for the ailments from which agriculture had so long been suffering. At least President Hoover kept the promise to convene Congress in special session, and it was so convened in April, 1929, only a little more than a month after Mr. Hoover was inaugurated. He sent a message to Congress in which he made two specific recommendations, dealing with the farm problem and the tariff.

On the subject of agriculture, after picturing the plight into which that industry had fallen, he said:

> There being no disagreement as to the need of farm relief, the problem before us becomes one of method by which relief may be most successfully brought about.

He added that his administration was—

> Pledged to create an instrumentality that will investigate the causes, find sound remedies, and have the authority and resources to apply these remedies.

On the subject of the tariff, in the same message, President Hoover pointed out what he said was "the necessity for some limited changes in the schedules" of the existing tariff law. He wanted, mind you, only a "limited" revision, and the test of the necessity for revising a rate or a schedule was—

> Whether there has been a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years, and a consequent decrease of employment due to insurmountable competition in the products of that industry.

These were the pledges. It is appropriate to inquire how they have been kept. As for myself, it is my deliberate judgment that they have not been kept either in good faith with the people or in harmony with sound principles of good common sense. It is my opinion, too, that this verdict will be concurred in by an overwhelming majority of the people of the country.

AGRICULTURE

First, I shall discuss the pledge and the performance with respect to agriculture. You know, all of you, what happened. Congress was disposed to pass a farm bill containing the principle of the export debenture, which was a very simple proposition, in that it was nothing more nor less than an attempt to give agriculture at least some of the benefits of the tariff, benefits which have for so long been bestowed in a discriminatory way to other industries, such as the steel, the aluminum, the textile, and many other industries. Mr. Hoover rejected that plan, even though the Senate actually voted it into the bill. It became manifest that we must accept either the Hoover plan or get no plan at all. So we had to accept the Hoover plan, even though the export-debenture plan was approved by every important organization of farmers in the country and was, I have not the slightest doubt, the choice of a majority of the Members of this House as well as of the Senate. However, there is no use talking about that. We could not get the export-debenture plan, or any other plan except that of Mr. Hoover himself, and so his plan was adopted. Under it the Federal Farm Board was created, made up of members selected by the President himself. In announcing the appointment of this board, President Hoover himself said there had been lodged in the board—

> Responsibility, authority, and resources such as have never before been conferred by our Government in assistance to any industry.

Moreover, it was given the huge appropriation of $500,000,000 with which to do its job. Congress dealt generously with the board; it attached no string to a single dollar of the money. It asked only that the board do something to revive the farming industry. Well, what has happened?

I do not believe there is a man within the sound of my voice, or even in the whole length and breadth of the country, who will say that the board, by what it has done or what it has attempted to do, has justified the confidence which the President reposed in it. There is not a farmer, not an economist, not an individual who has taken the pains to inquire into the state of the farming industry who is not bitterly disappointed at what must be confessed to be the absolute failure of the Hoover board, the complete breakdown of the administration's plan for farm relief.

The Farm Board was created 20 months ago. To-day, notwithstanding the very extraordinary power conferred upon the Farm Board and the very huge sum of money placed at its disposal, the agricultural industry is in very

much worse condition than it was when the board was created. Let me quote you just a few lines from a statement appearing in the newspapers only the other day under the name of R. W. Dunlap, who is Assistant Secretary of Agriculture: He said:

The year 1930 was one of considerable disappointment not only to farmers but also to those engaged in many other industries. Agriculture suffered because the prices for agricultural products dropped to a much greater degree than the prices of products for which farmers must pay.

I would say that Mr. Dunlap, who is Secretary Hyde's right-hand man, was stating the case somewhat mildly when he said the year 1930 was one of "considerable disappointment" to the farmers. He might have said that it was a year of considerable anguish, even of downright disaster to a great many of them, without laying himself open to the accusation of having overstated the case.

Let me give you just two or three figures by way of illustrating just how "considerable" was the disappointment from which the farmers suffered last year.

In 1929, according to the Department of Agriculture's own figures, the total value of the principal farm crops produced in the United States was $8,675,000,000. At the end of the crop season of 1930, after the Farm Board had been operating with almost unlimited capital for nearly a year and a half, it was found by the same official authority that the value of the same crops was $6,274,000,000, or almost precisely $2,400,000,000 less than the value of the same crops in the preceding year. Also, from 1929 to 1930 the value of livestock sold off the farms and ranches of the country dropped a little more than $225,000,000. Add this to the $2,400,000,000 loss in the value of crops and we have a shrinkage of $2,625,000,000, which the farmers and stockmen, those engaged in the basic industry of the country, had to absorb in a single year, notwithstanding the profuse promises of the President to cure the farmer's ills and notwithstanding the grain exchange and other manipulations of the President's Farm Board. I am not so sure, either, but that we will have to add to this stupendous loss the $500,000,000 which was appropriated for the use of the Farm Board, for I am beginning to think that we might as well have tossed that money to the birds, so far as any beneficial effect on the agricultural industry is concerned.

This appalling, this ruinous loss in farm crop values can not be attributed to the score of either underproduction or overproduction, for there was not a material difference in the crop production of 1929 and 1930.

Wheat and cotton are two of our principal crops, and what we know as "money crops." In 1929 wheat production in the United States was 806,500,000 bushels, and it had a value of $840,921,000. In 1930 the crop amounted to 850,900,000 bushels, an increase of about 44,000,000 bushels; but it had a value of only $517,407,000, a decrease of $227,000,000.

In 1929 the cotton crop amounted to 14,919,000 bales, with a value of $1,225,000,000. In 1930 the crop was 14,243,000 bales, with a value of only $674,000,000, a decrease of more than $550,000,000.

How many years do you imagine that agriculture, our basic industry, can go on absorbing such losses and still exist? Is it any wonder that the columns of the newspapers of every county in the land are cluttered up with advertisements of farm sales under foreclosure?

From January, 1929, to January, 1930, the average price of farm products, as shown by the index figure of the Department of Agriculture, dropped 40 points to the lowest level since January, 1912. And it is still dropping.

In the face of these facts, these indisputable Government figures, can anyone maintain longer that the Hoover policy of farm relief and the Hoover Farm Board are not a flat failure?

THE TARIFF

I shall deal but briefly with the subject of the tariff.

As I have shown, President Hoover committed himself to a policy of "limited revision" of the tariff. That pledge was not kept, as nobody knows better than you gentlemen of the House. All of you know how, when the hearings were opened by the Ways and Means Committee, great swarms of greedy lobbyists thronged the corridors of the House Office Building and later the Senate Office Building, pot-bellied with greed and endowed with capacity to get what they were after. They got it. The Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate were surrounded by "men who knew what they wanted and how to go about getting it." They had made their contributions to the campaign chest of the Republican Party, and they were here to collect their dividends, and they collected.

Instead of a "limited revision" all of the schedules were opened up, and when the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill was finally passed it contained the highest level of rates ever written into an American tariff. It is true he signed it rather apologetically, but the President signed it nevertheless, and he never committed a greater error or helped to commit the country to a more ruinous policy.

The rates of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill add enormously to the burden of living costs of the American people. One economist who is an authority on the tariff contends—

If only one-half of the legalized tariff allowances are added to the merchandise sold in our general stores, the cost to consumers is $10,000,000,000 annually, as computed by experienced Federal statisticians. And one-half of this—

He adds—

is over and above the requirements of honest protection.

To realize that the tariff policy of the Hoover administration and of the Republican majority in this Congress is ruinous it is necessary to go no further than to the foreign-trade figures of the Department of Commerce.

During the calendar year 1930 our foreign trade fell below the trade for 1929 by $2,737,780,000. During the first seven months following the signing of the tariff bill by President Hoover our foreign trade fell off more than $2,000,000,000.

A well-known economist has said that "customs tariffs determine the extent and flow of international trade." Without a decent, fair, honest tariff policy we can not expect the friendship of the rest of the world, and without that friendship we can not hope to find a sufficient market for our export surpluses of grain and cotton, as well as of manufactured products.

It is no answer, as some of the opposition would have us believe, to say that the remainder of the world is also in the depths of a depression. If it is, the fault is more upon us than any other country. Not only have we done nothing by our tariff policy to help keep the rest of the industrial world out of chaos but we have actually contributed to it. Scores of countries have enacted retaliatory tariffs on the principle that if they may not sell to us they will not buy from us. Apply this principle locally. Let a merchant set himself up in business in the community of any of you. Let him buy nothing in that community; let him import carpenters, bricklayers, electricians to erect his store building; let him spend not a dollar among you except what he must pay in taxes, and how long do you suppose he would stay in business? If he does not buy in the community, he will not long sell in that community. And so it is with nations; if we will not buy anything, we can not sell anything.

Of the importance of this foreign trade, not only to our manufacturing industries, to our cotton and wheat growers, but to all of the people, I cite no less an authority than President Hoover himself. In 1928, when he was a candidate, he made the statement that our foreign trade meant a living for no fewer than 3,000,000 American—not individuals, mind you—but families. Well, our foreign trade fell off about 27 per cent in 1930, and it is still dropping. If 3,000,000 families were earning a living as a result of our foreign trade in 1928, when Mr. Hoover was a candidate and spoke so proudly of our foreign trade, then 27 per cent of those families were deprived of that means of earning their livelihood in 1930. That is part of the answer to your problem of unemployment. Our short-sighted, silly, selfish tariff policy, by its ruinous effect on foreign trade, accounts for the unemployment of the workers in more than 800,000 families, according to President Hoover's own yardstick.

I am not talking to you now about the policy of protection or of free trade or of a tariff for revenue. I am talking to you about the ruinous, dishonest policy of inflicting outrageous and unjustifiable tariff duties on commodities that are essential to the life and comfort of our people, and doing it in the name of protection.

For this policy Mr. Hoover and the Republican majority in Congress must assume the responsibility. For it they must answer to the people, as more than 50 of you discovered to your sorrow in the election of last November. They must answer, too, for the failure of the administration not merely to deal sympathetically with the problem of agriculture but to deal with it in any effective way.

On this record, on the record of the complete breakdown, the utter failure of the Hoover administration and this Congress to keep its pledges with reference to agriculture and the tariff, I say that the last two years have brought the most bitter disappointment to the people of this country of any short-sighted, stupid, silly, selfish policy ever followed by any party or President in any administration.

Upon your record you will be judged. Viewing that record, I and my colleagues look forward with confidence to the approach of another presidential election year, when the people will have opportunity to return their verdict, to render their judgment, and to once again wrest back power from the selfish interests which have seized and abused it.

TURPENTINE GUM AND ROSIN

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following statements made before the Committee on Agriculture February 17, 1931, the committee having under consideration Senate bill 2354:

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appear in support of this bill in a dual capacity, both as a representative of a number of constituents who produce turpentine gum and rosin and then as a witness to explain what turpentine gum is and its relation to agriculture.

I might say at the outset that in my earlier life all of my time was spent on the farm, where I was engaged in many types of farming. We grew cotton, corn, wheat, oats, potatoes, livestock, and ran what we called a "turpentine farm." We used the same labor in each and every operation. That is, I or other members of the family, for we did practically all of our own work, would be found plowing corn one day, chopping cotton the next, and "chipping" pines the third. Or we may plow cotton one day and dip rosin the next, depending somewhat on weather conditions, for quite often we would be able to work the turpentine farm when you could not work the cotton or corn farm, particularly after heavy rains when the land would be too wet to work cotton or corn, but you could chip pines or dip rosin. We used the same mules in plowing cotton and corn in hauling turpentine gum and rosin. We used the same labor in each operation. The work was all under the same management. It is just simply a different type of farm, but a farming operation nevertheless.

The difficulty, as I understand it, in this matter has been on the part of the Farm Board to determine whether turpentine gum is a farm crop or farm product, the contention being that if it is a farm product it should be placed in the same classification as any other farm product and the producers be entitled to share in the benefits of the agricultural marketing act. In my section it is the exception to find anyone who works a "turpentine farm" who does not also do other farm work; that is, a "turpentine farm" is simply a type of farming, or one of many agricultural operations carried on by a number of farmers in my district, as well as other parts of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here from one of the best and largest farmers in my district. I will read what he says: "There are many of us who have for years planted our pine seed"—that is, they plant pine seed like they plant cotton, corn, wheat, or other farm crop. Reading further, he says: "We set our pine plants," just like you set sweetpotatoes, tomatoes, pecan trees, fruit trees, or any other plant on the farm. There is no doubt but what an apple or peach orchard is a type of farming; there can be no doubt but what a pecan grove is a type of farming; then where can there be any doubt about planting and cultivating pine trees as being a type of farming? If so, then turpentine gum and rosin should certainly be classed as products of the farm, just as apples, peaches, pecans, or maple sugar. Listen to what this farmer goes on to say in his letter: "We have plowed the trees, hoed, protected them, and cared for these trees each year to the same extent and in the same manner that we would our other farm program."

So it is only a question of whether or not this turpentine gum and rosin should be included in the marketing act on the basis of other farm crops. Knowing the situation as I do, I can not see where there can be any doubt whatsoever.

Mr. FULMER. That is, the farming turpentine business is largely like the farming pecan business, and the pecan growers have organized and have come under operations of the board.

Mr. HARE. Yes; that is a good illustration. It is just like the tobacco business also. In my State a man may have 4 acres of tobacco and 50 acres of cotton in order that he might be able to organize his labor to the best advantage. And for that same reason he takes in or includes turpentine farming. He has so many acres or trees he will cut one year; so many he will work next year; and let these rest [illustrating], just like we let our land rest from time to time. In other words, there is diversification in it, and it is purely a farming operation. You can not get anything else out of it, and this type of farming should have been included in the original agricultural marketing act.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I have been limited to five minutes, I will ask to insert in the record some letters and telegrams I have received in behalf of this amendment.

ESTILL, S. C., *February 12, 1931.*

Hon. BUTLER B. HARE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The George amendment, classification gum turpentine and rosin farmers under Capper-Volstead, now in House Agricultural Committee, sponsored by LARSEN, of Georgia. Necessary you rush this out of committee for passage. This will be a great help to the people of your district. Thanking you for past favors,

W. L. RHODES.

ESTILL, S. C., *February 13, 1931.*

Hon. BUTLER B. HARE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Will greatly appreciate your help in getting George amendment, classifying gum turpentine and rosin from under Capper-Volstead Act, out of committee for passage this session. This is among the largest industries in our district. Employs thousands of people and is badly in need of help. Kindest regards.

M. H. O'NEAL.

YEMASSEE, S. C., *February 13, 1931.*

Hon. BUTLER B. HARE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Amendment by Senator GEORGE, gum turpentine and rosin farmers, Capper-Volstead Act, being sponsored by Congressman LARSEN. Amendment in Agricultural Committee. Please use best efforts to get this out at earliest possible moment.

C. E. BULLARD.

VARNVILLE, S. C., *February 15, 1931.*

Hon. B. B. HARE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARE: Mr. Irvin Post and others of the executive committee of the Gum Turpentine-Rosin Marketing Association, of Jacksonville, Fla., and Savannah, Ga., have been very insistent that I accompany them to Washington for a hearing before the House Agricultural Committee in re Senator GEORGE'S amendment classifying the gum turpentine-rosin farmers as being eligible under Capper-Volstead Act. I know you are familiar with the subject, and that it will be a pleasure to assist in every way possible to obtain the desired results for our cause.

There are many of us who for years have planted our pine seed; also set out our pine plants, and plowed, hoed, protected, and cared for these young trees each year the same as any other part of our farm program. Therefore there should be no question as to the product we get from our trees being eligible under Capper-Volstead or any other agricultural act. And the growers and producers thereof should be, and are in my opinion, entitled to the privileges enjoyed by other agricultural products. Why should we as tree growers and producers be denied the right to organize ourselves into a cooperative marketing association to handle and market the product we grow and produce on our farms? And why should not our Government under our agricultural and marketing acts extend to us the financial assistance needed to carry forward and accomplish this end the same as it does for other kindred agricultural products that are grown from the soil on our farms and produced on, in, or by the trees? I've got to stop—the subject is so interesting and the present situation so intensely vital to the industry until I will be writing you a long letter before I know it.

Thanking you in advance for all assistance in the matter and all courtesies shown our gum-spirits committee, I am,

Very truly yours,

T. H. TUTEN.

THE POWER TRUST

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks I want to insert a letter received today from a gentleman of the State of Massachusetts indicative of some of the splendid, high-type, calm, conservative, dignified gentlemen who support the Power Trust. The letter speaks for itself:

ATTLEBORO, MASS., *March 3, 1931.*

Congressman LAGUARDIA,
Washington, D. C.:

After listening to your effort at oratory last evening, which, by the way, sounded more like a squawky "red" soap-box spouter on the east side, from which you come and where the worse bunch of low-downs elect you.

I have lived 60 years and have yet to hear a complaint on the high cost of electricity or gas. We do the most of our cooking

with gas, and the bill last month was $1.19. Also, we have an electric refrigerator, sweeper, radio, toaster, etc., and the bill last month was $3.45. Can one ask more?

You spoke of cheap gas supplied by the Canadian Government and you say nothing of the big taxes that they do not pay that the United States companies do.

If you and that bunch of "red" western Senators would use your addled brains toward something that would aid business instead of trying to tear it down, you would have as many friends here as you now have in Russia and we would have had plenty of employment long ago. And by the way, I should like to know how much Russia pays you.

Your name shows what you are, a dirty foreigner, in a class with Capone, and those that can't be deported should be shot.

Hoping you will soon be in hades.

J. R. WALCOTT.

P. S.—It would be a fine business run by such politicians as we have now in Washington.

OLEOMARGARINE AND TURPENTINE

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed the oleomargarine bill carrying a provision declaring that certain naval-stores products shall be classed as farm products and as such entitled to all the benefits of the Federal Farm Board marketing act. This is a recognition that has long been sought by the turpentine producers and which many of us hope will be very beneficial to them.

On at least three former occasions I have expressed rather fully my reasons for actively supporting this legislation and I shall not now make an extended argument in support of the proposition, except to repeat the statement, that in my opinion the Farm Board has a better chance to make a real try out of its marketing plan with this product than with any other. I say this for the reasons heretofore urged in support of this recognition, and I now wish to urge the Federal Farm Board to grant to the turpentine producers all possible assistance authorized by law. The turpentine producers and their friends have made a hard fight to secure that which many thought them entitled to under the original act.

I was one of those who feared the original act was too doubtful in its terms and susceptible of a construction excluding gum-turpentine products. My fears were well founded, as was established by later developments. One of my criticisms of the original Farm Board marketing act was aimed at the indefinite terms of the bill. I felt and stated that too much was left open to several different constructions. I urged that the bill be couched in definite and unequivocal terms, so there could be no doubt about the legislative intent.

In fact, when the original bill was passed I had pending a bill with definite, certain language specifically including naval-stores products. I could not secure the approval of my bill or any of its provisions. Congress was determined to pass the original bill as reported and without amendment, and did so. I am glad this provision of my bill has been written into the law and hope still more of my plan will be enacted in the near future. I have heretofore said so much about my contract control of production and price marketing plan until I shall not now further discuss this proposal.

I do, though, want to say a few words concerning the splendid fight that has been waged to secure enactment of the proposal including gum turpentine as entitled to all the relief of the Federal Farm Board. Those of us in the House who favored the enactment of this proposal believed that our colleague, Mr. LARSEN, should introduce the measure for the relief of the turpentine producers. We came to this decision deliberately because of Mr. LARSEN'S position on the House Committee on Agriculture, and because of his ability as a legislator, coupled with his untiring determination to succeed when serving his people.

We were not at all mistaken in our decision. Having kept in close touch with the matter before the Farm Board, before the House Committee on Agriculture, on the floor of the House, and at all times, whether in private conference or in public legislative combat, I am in position to know and state of my own knowledge that no one ever rendered more faithful and efficient service in behalf of a measure than did Mr. LARSEN in behalf of this one.

It is my candid judgment that the measure would have met much greater difficulties and probably been defeated except for his splendid help.

Time and again I found the proposal getting past what appeared to be unsurmountable hurdles; all because of Mr. LARSEN'S splendid activity and the good work not only of Mr. LARSEN but also of his many friends here who were helping, even though some of them knew nothing about turpentine but simply wanted to help their friend Mr. LARSEN and had faith in the bill because he was its author.

Senator GEORGE introduced and passed the proposal in the Senate. It was well that he take the lead there, since he had argued the matter repeatedly before the Farm Board and was from the turpentine section of the greatest turpentine-producing State in the Nation.

After the bill passed the Senate, came to the House, and a favorable report was made by the House Committee on Agriculture certain manufacturing interest who had always been unfriendly to the bill became very active against the measure, and for a time it seemed that we were doomed to certain defeat. Congress was nearing adjournment, we had tried every parliamentary move to get the bill up for consideration, but were blocked. It seemed we could not move. We believed we could pass the bill if we could only get it up, and yet we were uneasy about the outcome even if a vote was taken. We knew that certain interest was waging an awful fight against the bill, and knew that only a small percentage of the Members represented turpentine sections.

We were seeing all our friends that we could possibly reach and yet the situation was most serious.

While the oleomargarine bill was being considered and debated in the House my colleague, Mr. EDWARDS, of Georgia, and I were discussing the seriousness of the turpentine situation and each expressed the wish that there was some way to tie the turpentine proposition to the oleomargarine bill so as to secure for the turpentine proposal the votes of the oleomargarine supporters. We knew, though, under the rules of the House the turpentine item could not be tacked onto the oleomargarine bill by amendment.

To make a long story short, the oleomargarine bill passed the House, went to the Senate, where the rules of procedure are more liberal. Senator GEORGE made the strategic move necessary to force the passage of the bill, and without which the bill would have failed of passage. He not only made the proper move at the right time and in the proper way, but also brought to bear his legal and legislative acumen in effectively forming and safeguarding a situation which would force the passage of the provisions of his bill.

After the amendment was secured by Senator GEORGE the fight ceased to be hard. The friends of the proposal were jubilant and many of the enemies of the turpentine bill were mad but found themselves bound to vote for it rather than defeat their pet oleomargarine bill. It was an amusing situation. Many of those who did not like turpentine were forced to swallow it when the dose was given with oleomargarine.

We were glad to secure the passage of the bill by any legitimate means. We were almost desperate. Our folks were suffering, wanted the bill passed, and believed it would help them.

Among the many who wired me to support the bill are the following:

W. V. Musgrove, Homerville, Ga.; H. Langdale, Valdosta, Ga.; Lakeland Turpentine Co., Lakeland, Ga.; A. J. Baldwin, Naylor, Ga.; Moody Bros., Surrency, Ga.; D. E. Coleman, Valdosta, Ga.; Alex K. Sessoms, Waycross, Ga.; A. H. Croom, Baxley, Ga.; L. M. Autrey, Valdosta, Ga.; B. A. Bennett, Millwood, Ga.; Pearson Turpentine Co., Pearson, Ga.; Paul M. Lang, Pearson, Ga.; F. A. Shaw, Willacoochee, Ga.; J. T. Paulk, Willacoochee, Ga.; B. G. Oberry, sr., Willacoochee, Ga.; Miles & Dunn, Baxley, Ga.; J. B. Lewis, Waycross, Ga.; E. D. Rivers, Lakeland, Ga.; G. W. Varn, Valdosta, Ga.; the Downing Co. (Inc.), Brunswick, Ga.; D. J. Henderson, Ocilla, Ga.; J. G. Henderson, Lakeland, Ga.; W. L. Miller, Lakeland, Ga.; R. L. Patten, Lakeland, Ga.; Reason Henderson, Lakeland, Ga.; R. Simpson, Lakeland, Ga.; W. W. Tur-

ner, Valdosta, Ga.; J. A. Bennett, Valdosta, Ga.; W. M. Prescott, Valdosta, Ga.; J. T. Holt, president Baxley Kiwanis Club, Baxley, Ga.; L. L. O'Quinn & Bros., Odum, Ga.; Georgia Forestry Association, T. G. Woolford, president, Atlanta, Ga.; Gum Turpentine Rosin Marketing Association, Jacksonville, Fla.; D. A. Sapp, Brunswick, Ga.; J. D. Odom & Co., Waverly, Ga.; J. H. Harvey & Co., Gardi, Ga.; Sasser & Co., Lake City, S. C.; Sapp & Reynolds, Bainbridge, Ga.; Appling Turpentine Co., Baxley, Ga.; Alcorn Naval Stores Co., Dexter, Ga.; Cadwell Naval Stores Co., Dexter, Ga.; Laurens Turpentine Co., Glenwood, Ga.; Carr & Howard, Kite, Ga.; Screven Turpentine Co., Sylvania, Ga.; Carolina Naval Stores Co., Dorchester, S. C.; McClellansville Turpentine Co., McClellansville, S. C.; Wiergate Naval Stores Co., Wiergate, Tex.; Pine Harbor Naval Stores Co., Eulonia, Ga.; Union Turpentine Co., Lake Park, Ga.; Odum Turpentine Co., Odum, Ga.; Coastal Turpentine Co., Uvalda, Ga.; Rosa Turpentine Co., Poplarville, Miss.; Eastman Gardiner Naval Stores Co., Laurel, Miss.; Altamaha Turpentine Co., Graham, Ga.; White Springs Naval Stores Co., White Springs, Fla.; Gem Naval Stores Co., Kirkland, Ga.; Sansavilla Turpentine Co., Mount Pleasant, Ga.; Better Rosin Corporation, Cogdell, Ga.; and Waynesville Naval Stores Co., Waynesville, Ga.

Among those who came to Washington and rendered most splendid and efficient service in behalf of the bill are the following:

T. J. Aycock, Jacksonville, Fla.; Julian Langner, Jacksonville, Fla.; James Fowler, Soperton, Ga.; Robert Newton, Hattiesburg, Miss.; Raymond L. Sullivan, Savannah, Ga.; M. O. Dunning, Savannah, Ga.; and A. K. Sessoms, Cogdell, Ga.

In conclusion let me say I sincerely trust the Federal Farm Board, by reason of this law, renders a real service to the turpentine producers. These producers are worthy of assistance, really need it, and will cooperate in every way possible in helping the board make here and now a real success.

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following with reference to the Five Civilized Tribes bill.

In order to explain the bill under discussion, which is much misunderstood, I am inserting the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all funds and other securities now held by or which may hereafter come under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior belonging to restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians of one-half or more Indian blood, including heirs born since March 4, 1906, shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of said Secretary until April 26, 1956, subject to expenditure in the meantime for the use and benefit of the individual Indians to whom such funds and securities belong, under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe: *Provided,* That where the entire interest in any tract of restricted and tax-exempt land belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes is acquired by inheritance, devise, gift, or purchase, with restricted funds, by or for restricted Indians, such land shall after April 26, 1931, remain restricted and tax exempt during the life of and as long as held by such restricted Indians, but not longer than April 26, 1956, unless the restrictions are removed in the meantime in the manner provided by law: *Provided further,* That such restricted and tax-exempt land, held by anyone, acquired as herein provided, shall not exceed 160 acres: *And provided further,* That all minerals, including oil and gas, produced on or after April 26, 1931, from said lands so acquired shall be subject to all State and Federal taxes as provided in section 3 of the act approved May 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 495).

SEC. 2. That the attorneys provided for under the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 312), shall have the right to appear and represent any restricted member of the Five Civilized Tribes before the county courts of any county in the State of Oklahoma, or before any appellate court thereof, in any matter in which said restricted Indians may have an interest, and no conveyance of any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir shall be valid unless approved in open court after notice in accordance with the rules of procedure in probate matters adopted by the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, and said probate attorneys shall have the right to appeal from the decision of any county court approving the sale of any interest in land to the district court of the district of which the county is a part.

As above stated, this bill contains two sections. The first part of the first section only deals with funds and other securities belonging to restricted Indians and makes sure that the restrictions on these funds and securities are continued on and after April 26, 1931, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, as at present. It does not give any preferential right to an heir born after March 4, 1906. The bill in no place does that.

The first proviso of section 1 permits an entire interest to be acquired in restricted and tax-exempt land by inheritance, devise, gift, or purchase with restricted funds, and places the restricted Indian exactly in the same position as a restricted allottee. He can not acquire more than 160 acres, and this is subject to the mineral tax as provided in section 3 of the act of May 10, 1928.

It will be observed that this section does not enlarge the restrictions, nor does it enlarge tax-exempt lands. It only continues restricted funds and securities as restricted, so that large sums may not be turned over to non-English speaking Indians who may improvidently expend them.

I am sure that no one who reads the bill will think for a moment that large sums of money should be turned over to these inexperienced Indians without any supervision.

The second section relates to probate procedure and permits the probate attorneys as a matter of right to go into the probate courts and represent restricted Indians, and this is done in accordance with the rules and procedure in probate matters adopted by the Supreme Court of Oklahoma. Surely no one can object to this provision. The section further gives the right of appeal to the district court.

I know of no county judge in my district who is not earnestly protecting the restricted Indians. Everybody knows there has been some criticism against some of the county judges, and, while I do not share in this criticism, this section of the bill gives the right of appeal in the event it is believed the Indians are overreached in the sale of their inherited lands.

We have provided for appealing most every other case for white people as well as the Indians, and surely no one can have any objection to an appeal in the sale of inherited lands.

Much of the discussion on the floor of the House when this bill was up for consideration was far afield and it clearly shows that there was a misconception of the provisions of the bill.

Let me repeat that the restrictions were extended by the act of May 10, 1928, and this bill does not further extend the restrictions nor does it enlarge the acreage of tax-exempt lands.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. BELL, 1893 TO 1903

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days we have all listened with genuine appreciation to many eloquent and richly deserved eulogies upon the life, character, and public services of our departed colleagues in this Chamber. In honoring them we honor ourselves and render a splendid service in patriotism and loyalty and encouragement to the youth of our country.

These formal memorial occasions are confined to those brothers who pass to the Great Beyond while in the active service here in Congress. Those many hundreds of ex-Members of Congress who reach the end of life's journey after retiring to private life have no congressional mention made of their departure or of their loyal and eminent services to our country. There are probably many more really great men to whom our States and our Nation actually owe a profound debt of sincere gratitude who die in private life than while in Congress.

Very few people have time to ever read more than occasionally a few headlines or matters in which they are especially interested in the hundred and fifty thousand words in the average daily issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Nevertheless it is absolutely the only place or document anywhere in our country where any mention of the life record of any Member can ever be preserved in any form readily accessible to the general public.

The bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the public library of every city in the United States and all the large libraries of the world will be a permanent record as long as this planet is inhabited by human beings.

It has always seemed to me that it would be eminently fitting if the Members of Congress from each State would occasionally insert in the RECORD a very brief and conservative statement of the services to our Nation of a few of the most eminent Members of Congress their States have produced and who passed to their reward as private citizens. It would cost comparatively nothing and would, I think, be encouraging and conducive to a more vigorous Americanism, as well as immensely gratifying to all their descendants and friends.

With that sentiment in mind I have taken the liberty of occasionally paying a deferential mark of admiration and respect to the memory of several of the greatest names and minds in our State's history, men who were really builders of Colorado and the entire West. My humble tributes appear in the RECORD of the dates as follows:

Senator Charles J. Hughes, February 12, 1911.
Senator Thomas M. Patterson, September 15, 1917.
Senator Henry M. Teller, February 13, 1923.
Senator John F. Shafroth, February 28, 1923.
Congressman William N. Vaile, February 20, 1929.
Territorial Delegate Hiram P. Bennet, February 16, 1931.

What memories those names conjure to the minds of all old-time Coloradans!

Senator Hughes and Congressman Vaile died while in Congress. The others passed to their reward in private life at their homes in Denver.

Colorado has been most exceedingly fortunate in the selection of all of her 5 Territorial Delegates, 18 United States Senators, and 24 Congressmen. Patterson was a Delegate, a Representative, and a Senator; Chilcott and Chaffee were each a Delegate and a Senator; and Shafroth was a Representative and a Senator. Our State has never been humilated or compelled to bow her head in shame for any of their actions, as some other States have at some time or other been compelled to do. Of the few of those 42 Coloradans who are left with us to-day, there are 2 octogenarians in vigorous health of whom both the Territory of Colorado and the Centennial State have been proud from their boyhood days—Senator Charles S. Thomas and Congressman John C. Bell.

Feeling that a few kindly greetings as we journey down the western slope of life are far better than waiting until they can not be appreciated, I was genuinely glad of an opportunity to express a few words of admiration of Senator Thomas in the RECORD of June 16, 1930, and under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I am pleased indeed to make a brief friendly reference to Judge Bell. He is the only former Member of either the Senate or House now living in my congressional district. He represented the western half of our State, that is now my district, for 10 years, from March 4, 1893, to March 4, 1903. I was delighted to join in a humble way in some of his nominations, which were practically always unanimous, and a part of that time I was supremely proud to be the chairman of his campaign committee, and I have never wavered a moment in my profound admiration of him for almost a half a century.

No man ever represented Colorado in Congress with more earnest and unselfish devotion. Through all our desperately trying frontier times and gyrations in politics and business he has always been the soul of honor. In his private life, in his practice of law, and on the bench and in Congress—in every office or position he has ever occupied—he has been a valiant champion of human rights. His heart has always beat for common humanity, for honesty, for fair dealing, and his entire life has been a noble example and inspiration to the youth of western Colorado.

He never sought publicity or played to the gallery. His record in Congress was not spectacular, but he was always a hard and indefatigable worker. In addition to diligently attending to the very large amount of detail office work, correspondence, and requests of all kinds that every Congressman has, he found time to prepare and forcibly deliver a great many wonderfully learned and exhaustive speeches on a great variety of subjects. His speeches appearing in the RECORD during that 10-year period are a veritable storehouse of information on those subjects.

It must be a very great gratification and satisfaction to Judge Bell, as it is to his thousands of friends, to realize that nearly all the measures that he fought for so long and so valiantly 35 years ago were either enacted during his service here or have been placed on the statute books since then.

The West will always owe him a sincere debt of gratitude for his very important aid in bringing about the enactment of the national irrigation and reclamation policy. While he, together with all the West, failed in their long and heroic fight to prevent the demonetization of silver, yet he was partially successful in his fight against the banking practice in vogue at that time and against the trusts and some of the tariff outrages. He was successful in his efforts regarding the national income tax and for an 8-hour day and a voluntary bankruptcy law.

His activities covered a wide range and all of them were honest and for the betterment of common humanity. In the light of over a third of a century he has nothing in his official career to regret. He has been a great public official in all his offices and lived a grand life. Colorado will always be proud of him. Our State in particular, and the West in general, are better for his long, vigorous, earnest, honest, and efficient career.

When the future historians of our State shall write the records of the men who made Colorado truly great, the name of John Calhoun Bell, scholar, able lawyer, profound judge, statesman, orator, faithful public servant, loyal son of Colorado, kind, unselfish, big-hearted, generous, genial gentleman, will be given a very prominent and most creditable page among our State's great builders.

In the recently published new edition of The Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774 to 1927, the brief sketch pertaining to Judge Bell is as follows:

Bell, John Calhoun, a Representative from Colorado; born near Sewanee, Franklin County, Tenn., December 11, 1851; attended public and private schools in Franklin County, Tenn.; studied law in Winchester, Tenn., and was admitted to the bar in 1874; moved to Colorado in 1874 and commenced practice in Saguache, Colo.; county attorney of Saguache County, Colo., from 1874 to 1876; resigned in May of the latter year; moved to Lake City, Colo., in 1876; clerk of Hinsdale County in 1876; mayor of Lake City in 1885; moved to Montrose, Montrose County, Colo., in 1886, and continued the practice of law; judge of the seventh judicial district of Colorado in 1888; elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-third and to the four succeeding Congresses (March 4, 1893–March 3, 1903); unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1902 to the Fifty-eighth Congress; member of the United States Industrial Commission in 1900 and 1901; resumed the practice of law in Montrose, Colo., judge of the Court of Appeals of Colorado 1913–1915; again resumed the practice of law, and is a resident of Montrose.

At my request, one of Judge Bell's daughters, Mrs. John L. Stivers, has prepared a short family biographical sketch, which I insert herewith, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. BELL, SECOND DISTRICT, COLORADO, 1893–1903

Just as the towering peaks of Colorado's western slope form a majestic background for much of her early years of struggle and accomplishment, just so has the rugged strength and ability of former Congressman John C. Bell left itself as an imperishable page in this section's early history of progress.

Being one of eight children, John Calhoun Bell was born of Rachel (Laxsom) and Harrison Bell on a Tennessee farm in the Sewanee section of the Cumberland Mountains, in the month of December, year 1851.

The parents of the lad were fine, honest, highly respected citizens. The father, aside from farm duties, found time to engage in the exchange of lands and horse trading, was an extensive planter, served as sheriff of Grundy County, and was long one of the leading men of his district.

From educational and cultural standpoints the youth came into the world at an inopportune time. The horrible war was but recently ended. Universities, for lack of funds, were closed, and the little log-cabin school, to which the boy had been sent early in life, shut its doors for the same reason. It was a sad time for parents, ambitious for the education of their children.

Finally, through the untiring efforts of the community and of two professors from Knoxville University, a little school was established at Boiling Forks, and we find later enrolled among its students the subject of this sketch.

Here the youth studied until his teens, distinguishing himself in numbers, literature, and civil government, and early showing the great nobility and loftiness of character which has always distinguished him.

With grade and high-school years now disposed of, the time for choosing a vocation was at hand. At first there was a wavering between law and medicine, but law finally won out, and the tall, lank, future Congressman made his way to Winchester, where he entered as student the law offices of Brennan, Hunt & Davis.

After serving here his allotted time, in April of 1874, the young man was issued a diploma in law from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and thus the hour had arrived for the choosing of a suitable location for the practice of his profession.

The South was as yet staggering under the blow of the war's defeat; the North had adjustments to make, which were slow in the making; to the East stretched the illimitable sea, thus leaving only the glorious and little explored West as the land of promise for ambitious youths during this period of reconstruction.

A few months as master of a school placed within the needy palm of the young attorney sufficient money to give him courage to leave the stamping ground of his youth and forever turn his face toward those regions of the West, whose history of hidden treasure read like the tale of gold-paved streets in some new Jerusalem.

The first step of the young man was at St. Louis, where, at the famous Planter's Hotel, he listened breathlessly to the tales of the unearthing of beds of gold near Denver, or Del Norte, or in any one of the many rich mineral districts in the heart of the Colorado Rockies.

As the train whistled into Denver the young attorney was all eyes and ears, listening to the hoof thud of the heavy teams bearing to smelters their new-found ores, watching excited miners in native garb, or outlaws with long, bristling mustaches taking in the possibilities of the future as all plied up and down the streets of the city, then a thriving, overgrown town, with a population of some eight thousand inhabitants.

A few days at the Shipiro Hotel convinced Bell that he must again move. Everyone was talking of Del Norte and its possibilities. There he would cast his lot. Once there he took up his abode at the Messler Hotel, entering into partnership with one Newton Love, who already had won some judicial distinctions in the Columbine State.

Here a few months and it was deemed wise to establish a branch law office at Saguache, to which place Mr. Bell went, immediately receiving the appointment of county attorney.

The year 1876 was the year destined to bring another change of location for the struggling attorney. This time he made his way to Lake City where, from the moment of his arrival, his success was phenomenal; and it was here that the friendship between the young attorney Bell and the heroic Otto Mears sprang up—a friendship which has grown stronger with the passing of the years.

Immediately his success was not only in his own locality but spread to neighboring sections. Honors and offices were heaped upon him in great numbers, he having been made county clerk, county attorney, and mayor in quick succession.

In 1885 he formed a law partnership with the Hon. Frank C. Gondy, and the head office was trasferred to Montrose, Colo. Again the attorney made rapid strides—his popularity, honesty, and marked ability fast making him one of the most prominent lawyers and figures of his State.

In the year 1888 he was elected to the office of judge of the seventh judicial district of the State of Colorado, an office which he held with great distinction until 1892.

During these years the judge became intensely interested in the agricultural possibilities of the Uncompahgre Valley and, like his father before him, took great pride in his holdings of land, which, under his careful supervision, were changed from seeming arid deserts to fields and orchards of unsurpassed beauty and promise.

During the years, too, the future Congressman had journeyed more than once back to the home of his childhood, bringing back on one of his return trips as wife Susan Abernethy, the sweetheart of his early years. To them were born two daughters, Susan and Ethel by name.

The year 1892 had arrived, and it proved to be the outstanding year of achievement in the life of Judge Bell, for it was at this time that the constituents of the second congressional district called him to represent their needs in the halls of the United States Congress at Washington.

Here, always a leader, always a friend of the great and the oppressed, always an advocate of everything splendid and progressive, he served not only his State but his Nation with distinction until the year 1902. It was a Republican year, and the Congressman and his little family again took up their residence in Montrose, he, forming at different intervals, varying partnerships, the last one being with John L. Stivers, a native of Iowa, an honor graduate of the law school of Yale University, who in later years was to become through marriage a member of the Bell family.

Upon his return, for many years Judge Bell was most active in the Democratic politics of his State, serving more than once as committeeman to the Democratic National Presidential Convention, and at one time serving for some years in the court of appeals in Denver, Colo.

As time went on he gradually became less and less active in the practice of law, increasing with the years his interest in the cattle industry of his section, and giving much time to the development of the hundreds of acres of land which he had so helped to reclaim while fighting for the great Uncompahgre relief project while in the Halls of Congress.

The achievements which Judge Bell has so helped to bring to the State of his choice, like the towering peaks about, shall ever be an imperishable part of Colorado's western slope history, but in the hearts of those who have known this noble man something finer, better, deeper, even more lasting than the annals of history shall linger with his memory.

In closing I quote from a short biography given by one of his admirers of a few years back—a tribute which is as true to-day of the Grand Old Man, as he is known in his own community, as it was when life was still new and fresh and challenging:

"Judge Bell as a man bears an enviable reputation for sincerity, hospitality, sociability, and integrity; a lover and practicer of the truth, with a soul of honor, incorruptible, and noble."

I also insert herewith a roll call of the longevity service record of Colorado's membership in Congress for 70 years, including the 15 years and 5 months that Colorado was a Territory, from February 28, 1861, when President Buchanan signed the bill creating the Territory of Colorado, to August 1, 1876, when President Grant signed the bill admitting our State into the Union, and from that date to March 4, 1931.

COLORADO'S MEMBERSHIP IN CONGRESS FOR 70 YEARS

Five Territorial Delegates in Congress: Hiram P. Bennet, 4 years; Allen A. Bradford, 4 years; George M. Chilcott, 2 years; Jerome B. Chaffee, 4 years; Thomas M. Patterson, 1 year.

Colorado's 18 United States Senators: Henry M. Teller, 29½ years; Edward O. Wolcott, 12 years; Lawrence C. Phipps, 12 years; Charles S. Thomas, 7 years; Nathaniel P. Hill, Thomas M. Bowen, Thomas M. Patterson, Simon Guggenheim, and John F. Shafroth each served 6 years.

Sixteen of our United States Senators have been elected and two appointed. Our present United States Senator, CHARLES W. WATERMAN, has now served four years of his present term. Jerome B. Chaffee, Charles J. Hughes, jr., Samuel D. Nicholson, and Rice W. Means each served about 1 year and 9 months. Horace A. W. Taber served 35 days. George M. Chilcott served by appointment 9 months, and Alva B. Adams served by appointment 18 months. On November 4, 1930, Hon. Edward P. Costigan was elected for a full term, to succeed Senator PHIPPS on March 4, 1931.

The terms of service of Colorado's 24 Representatives in Congress from August 1, 1876, to March 4, 1931, have been as follows:

EDWARD T. TAYLOR, 22 years; CHARLES B. TIMBERLAKE, 16 years; GUY U. HARDY, 12 years; John C. Bell, 10 years; John F. Shafroth, 9 years; William N. Vaile, 8½ years; James B. Belford, 7 years; Edward Keating, 6 years; Robert W. Bonynge, 5 years; George G. Symes, Hosea Townsend, Franklin E. Brooks, Herschel M. Hogg, John A. Martin, Atterson W. Rucker, and Benjamin C. Hilliard, each 4 years; Lafayette Pence, George W. Cook, Warren A. Haggott, George J. Kindel, Harry H. Seldomridge, and WILLIAM R. EATON, each 2 years; Thomas M. Patterson and S. Harrison White, each 1 year.

In addition to the above service all of the State's present delegation in the House—TAYLOR, TIMBERLAKE, HARDY, and EATON—are reelected to March 4, 1933.

HON. J. A. GARBER AND HON. JOSEPH C. SHAFFER

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say au revoir to my colleagues in the Virginia delegation, Hon. J. A. GARBER and Hon. JOSEPH C. SHAFFER.

Congressman GARBER of Virginia has left a deep impression upon the Congress which has just ended, and his friends are legion among the Members on both sides of the House. By reason of his energy, his activity, his ability, and his knowledge of the needs of the agricultural interests of Virginia, he has contributed a great deal to the welfare of the State of Virginia and the country as a whole in his service as a member of the important Committee on Agriculture in the Seventy-first Congress. His ability to make friends among the members of this important committee and in the House made him an unusually valuable member of the Virginia delegation, and that State has lost a valuable Representative peculiarly in a position to help her in her important agricultural problems in the loss of Congressman GARBER of Virginia. True to his constituents to the last, he continued to serve them earnestly, energetically, and ably until the Speaker's gavel fell on the morning of the 4th of March.

Of Congressman SHAFFER of Virginia I can say that it is not only my feeling but that of the Members of the House generally that he is a man in every sense of the term, and has served his State, his district, and his country loyally, efficiently, and intelligently in the Seventy-first Congress as a member of the Committees on Roads and Mines. These committees are peculiarly important to the citizens of Virginia and the district which he represented, and rarely have I seen a man more earnestly imbued with the desire to serve conscientiously and faithfully his constituents and his country than Congressman SHAFFER of Virginia. Being a man of deep convictions and sincerity of purpose, he approached problems of State and National importance with the utmost care and consideration. He is a strong mountain character of clean, high ideals, and it was in this attitude that he approached the solution of all problems affecting the people of Virginia and the country as a whole. Conscientious and careful to the extreme, when his mind was once made up it was impossible to swerve him from his convictions.

These two Congressmen have been a great asset to the State of Virginia, and their valuable services will be missed in the next Congress.

THE HILL *v.* PALMISANO CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for ignoring the contested-election case filed by John Philip Hill against me. I never had any doubt as to the outcome of the contest from the day I read the charges placed against me by Mr. Hill. The contestant in his petition made so many ridiculous assertions that he actually charged conspiracy between the Republican and Democratic election officials. The charges were so ridiculous that I immediately forwarded a copy of them to the State's attorney of Baltimore City and demanded that the contestant be cited before the grand jury so that the repeaters and conspirators would be sentenced to the penitentiary. Mr. Hill was before the grand jury, according to the Baltimore papers. The Department of Justice also investigated the alleged fraud, as was testified to by Morris D. Traub, an investigator from the Department of Justice. (See Record, p. 113.)

Notwithstanding the fact that the contestant appeared before the grand jury and the investigation made by the Department of Justice, no one was arrested or indicted; the conclusion was that the charges were not based on substantial evidence.

I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fourth precinct of the third ward. In this precinct I have resided for about 45 years. The testimony of one of the star witnesses of the contestant, one Max Steiner, would have the committee believe that I imported a considerable number of repeaters from Pennsylvania. Two of the repeaters Steiner stated he knew and one in particular being of the underworld character. Steiner refused to give the address of this man, thereby protecting him from prosecution. The committee discarded the testimony of Steiner.

I wish to further call your attention to the registered vote in this precinct in the 1928 and 1930 elections; also the number of votes cast in said elections, together with the votes received by the principal candidates, viz:

Registered, 1928		*Registered, 1930*	
Democrats	535	Democrats	[1] 460
Republicans	32	Republicans	[2] 49
Declined	13	Declined	15
	580		524
President Hoover	32	Mayor Broening	36
Senator Goldsborough	29	Mr. Hill	56
Mr. Hill	61	Governor Ritchie	433
Governor Smith	459	Palmisano	411
Senator Bruce	431		
Palmisano	416		

You will note that in the 1928 election only 87 per cent voted and in the 1930 election 96 per cent voted.

Notwithstanding the fact that in the fourth precinct of the third ward there was an increase of 17 Republicans registered in 1930, Mr. Hill received 5 votes less than in 1928 election. I received only 5 votes less than in 1928, although there was a decrease of 75 Democrats in the registration. My majority over Mr. Hill was 355 in both elections.

[1] Decreased 75. [2] Increased 17.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. YON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am opposed to any amendment that would cause the suspension of or lessening the effort in the training given the youth of our land either in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the citizens' military training camps. I am not one that would have the Government causing any oppression to the length of any extra expenditure of funds in the maintaining of our national defense, but when you observe that this Nation, with its 125,000,000 population and with its possessions or dependencies stretching one-half around the world, I feel that with our great wealth and possibilities that an army that consists of 12,000 officers—that is, an average of 12,000 officers—and something like 900 warrant officers and an enlisted men's strength of 118,750, with an additional 6,500 Philippine Scouts, making a total of 138,216 officers and men for our standing Army.

I say that we are the least military of all the nations of the earth, and especially as compared to wealth, breadth, and population. Of course, we have, in addition to our regular establishment, a well-organized National Guard, with a total strength of 185,000. This force is, of course, under the dual administration and direction of the State and National Governments and has been created from those that had service in the World War, an organized reserve force of 101,000, and the main source therefore of our possible defensive strength will come from that great body of our young men and boys that are being trained in reserve officers' and citizens' military training camps. I have observed the operation of these encampments. I have been to the camp open to the boys in the citizens' military training camp and to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. There happens to be a most delightfully located military post at Fort Barrancas, Pensacola, in my district, where this unusual opportunity is given the young men and boys of the country, and from my observation there I feel that the money that is appropriated for this splendid work is expended for the good of the national defense as well as to build up a splendid manhood for the future. What we propose to take care of in the future in this bill is the training of 127,000 reserve officers' trainees in the training corps and 37,500 for the citizens' military training camps.

AN INHUMAN BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following relative to the Jenkins resolution (H. J. Res. 473, now H. J. Res. 500).

The Brooklyn section of the National Council of Jewish Women have sent to me a copy of a resolution adopted by that organization expressing their disapproval of the Jenkins proposal, which I herewith set forth:

Whereas the present existing immigration laws have the effect already of separating residents from their wives and children living abroad, and said laws have been declared in many respects to be inhuman and have been so declared by the President of the United States; and

Whereas the Secretary of State of the United States has declared on December 18, 1930, before the Senate Committee on Immigration that even under the present laws he has succeeded in curtailing immigration to this country during the month of October, 1930, to 22 per cent of the quotas of immigration law classes and during the month of November, 1930, to 15 per cent of the quotas of immigration law classes, and such restriction was effected by his department upon the ground that the incoming aliens were likely to become public charges owing to the present economic conditions; and

Whereas the present existing laws, by virtue of the power conferred upon the Secretary of State as aforesaid, are more than sufficient to protect the residents of this country from invasion by foreign labor; and

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a measure which has for its object the further curtailment of immigration to 10 per cent of the present quotas, which will result in greater inhumanity by curtailing the opportunities of residents, whose wives and minor children reside abroad, to have those wives and children join their husbands and fathers in this country, and such further curtailment of immigration would

establish a dangerous precedent for this country to adopt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Brooklyn section, Council of Jewish Women, do hereby express their disapproval of the House Joint Resolution 473 (now H. J. Res. 500) now pending in Congress, which has for its object the further curtailment of immigration to this country upon the ground that the same is unnecessary, oppressive, barbarous, and inhuman; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators representing the State of New York and to the Congressmen representing this borough in Washington, and also to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in Congress.

Dated Brooklyn, N. Y., February 24, 1931.

A true copy.

HILDA L. WEINSTEIN,
Chairman on Legislation.

This measure provides for the suspension for two years of general immigration into the United States by cutting down quotas by 90 per cent. That is, immigration shall be reduced for the next two fiscal years, to wit, July 1, 1931, to June 30, 1933, from 150,000 per year to 15,000 per year.

I am strenuously opposed to this legislation because I have never yet in my experience as a Representative found an immigration measure of a temporary character that did not become permanent. In other words, I fear that when the two years have expired a bill will be offered and passed making the restriction permanent.

This legislation will be cruel and inhuman in its application, because it will involve the separation of families. Under the present statute aged fathers and mothers of citizens here and aged fathers and mothers and minor children of aliens legally here are given preference within the quotas. There are so many of them, however, awaiting visas at our American consulates in foreign countries that these preferential aliens practically exhaust the quotas. This is particularly true in countries like Italy, Poland, Russia, Rumania, and Lithuania. Now it is proposed to cut down the quotas to 10 per cent. This means cutting near relatives down to 10 per cent. In other words, this bill prevents the reunion of families.

The bill also disregards party pledges. The Republican national platform adopted June 14, 1928, reads as follows:

Where, however, the law works undue hardship by depriving the immigrant of the comfort and society of those bound by close family ties, such modification should be adopted as will afford relief.

Likewise, the Democratic national platform contains the following provision:

Laws which limit immigration must be preserved in full force and effect, but the provisions contained in these laws that separate husbands from wives and parents from infant children are inhuman and not essential to the purposes or the efficacy of such laws.

The separation of families is inhuman and barbarous and should not be countenanced, even under the guise of aiding unemployment. But this bill will not help in the economic depression. Aged parents and minor children, because of age or youth, can not take the places of American workmen, but, on the contrary, they would help in the unemployment situation; they would increase the army of consumers; 27,735 wives, children, and parents of residents born in southern and eastern Europe are registered as seeking admission. Under the present statutes it will take many years, because of repressive restrictions, for the wives, children, and parents of aliens legally here to come to this country. Under the instant bill, with the cutting down of quotas to 10 per cent, it might take hundreds of years.

The Department of Commerce conservatively estimates that aliens resident in the United States send to their near relatives abroad $247,000,000 a year, exclusive of currency sent by mail. Keeping the families apart only continues the need for the constant sending of this money abroad. This money could well be used in the United States, particularly under the prevailing economic conditions. There are, however, "none so blind as they who will not see." The proponents of this legislation are enthusiastically misguided. They can not see beyond the ends of their noses.

The law-abiding aliens in our midst ask for bread, and they are given a stone. A cruel ocean separates them from their loved ones, and this heartless measure will keep them asunder further. What a far cry it all is from the days when we, with open arms, received these very aliens who came to this country when we were making our greatest strides in railroading, shipping, manufacturing, electricity, telegraphy, and so forth. We forget our immeasurable debt to our aliens. We forget that our music is almost wholly German or Italian; that our paintings are borrowed from the French; that our literature comes from England and Russia; that our architecture is Roman, Gallic, Byzantine. Our kindergartens and universities are patterned upon German models; Paris dictates our style of dress. Even our cooking is most likely to be French; and if not French, then Italian or German.

I should like to take many of our alien-baiters to our Statue of Liberty on Bedloes Island, in New York Harbor, where they might see upon the wall of the statue the tablet on which is engraved these glowing words from a sonnet by Emma Lazarus:

Keep ancient lands your storied pomp!" cries she
With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me;
I lift up my lamp beside the glowing door!

LIEUT. GEN. EDGAR JADWIN

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, in the closing days of the session there has come to us the news of the death, in the Canal Zone, on the 2d of this month, of one of our Nation's ablest soldier-engineer officers, Lieut. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, retired, and former Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

General Jadwin's career has been a distinguished one. He was born at Honesdale, Pa., August 7, 1865, and was, therefore, something more than 65 years of age at the time of his death. He graduated in 1890 at the United States Military Academy at West Point and stood at the head of his class. Upon his graduation he was appointed as second lieutenant in the Engineer Corps of the Army, and served with that organization in varying capacities of ever-increasing authority and usefulness until finally, on August 7, 1929, he retired from active duty with the rank of major general, after having served a term as Chief of Engineers.

In 1907 he was sent to the Isthmus of Panama with the Army Corps contingent, and there, until the year 1911, he performed invaluable service in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal. He first served in the central, or Culebra, division of the Canal work, and afterwards as resident engineer of the Atlantic, or Gatun, division. In the last-named capacity he had immediate supervision, among other things, of the dredging operations of the approach channel extending from the open sea to Gatun Locks.

While he was engaged in the Panama Canal service it was my privilege to become acquainted with General (then Major) Jadwin during my own official connection with the great isthmian enterprise, and we became, and thenceforward remained, close friends. His reputation there, as always elsewhere, was that of a highly skilled and capable engineer and a man of unblemished integrity.

He had many other important assignments of duty during his long and useful career. He was widely famed because of his river and harbor work in the United States. He performed notable engineering and military service in Europe during the World War. He served as a member of the American mission to Poland in 1919. He was awarded the distinguished-service medal by the United States, was made a companion of the Order of the Bath by Great Britain, and commander of the Legion of Honor by France.

As Chief of Engineers he supervised the plan, which was adopted by Congress, for the control of floods in the Mississippi Valley. In 1929 he was appointed by President Hoover as chairman of the Interoceanic Canal Board, charged with the duty of making a survey of the proposed Nicaraguan canal, together with the survey touching the matter of increased facilities of the Panama Canal. While engaged in this work on the Isthmus death came to him.

His has been, indeed, a most active and successful life. The world is greatly advantaged because of his having

lived in it. His service added distinction to a branch of our Army organization long known for its worth and efficiency—the Engineer Corps. But rarely is one ready for the final summons, and death is usually tragically commonplace. However, in the sense that in a large and highly important way he had done his "bit" in the world, General Jadwin was prepared to go; and he fell into the last great sleep amid the lovely tropical scenes of his effective isthmian labors, and upon the very brink of the mighty waterway which his skilled hands had helped to fashion. Thus the work of his life was beautifully dramatized by the time, place, and manner of his departure. If this was decreed as the hour for his going, his family and friends must feel that he could not have left them in any way more fitting. The Nation mourns his loss, and our deepest sympathies go forth to his wife and children.

Most worthily has he wrought; his memory shall endure.

THE RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS, COVERING THE FIRST HALF OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am of the opinion that the record of the Seventy-first Congress, covering the first half of the administration of President Hoover, is greatly disappointing to a large majority of the American people.

When the Hoover administration came into power it found the country prosperous, our people happy and, for the most part, contented. At the half-way mark of that administration we find the country in the depths of the most serious depression of our economic existence—a depression that, had it occurred during a Democratic administration, would have been referred to as a plain panic. Agriculture has not been revived, as promised. On the other hand, its condition is far more critical than it was two years ago. Industry has been retarded; our foreign trade has been seriously diminished; millions of workers walk the highways and the streets searching for employment in order that they may earn an honest living, but are unable to find jobs at any wages. In fact the condition has been so grave during the last several months that millions of honest, faithful, and energetic workers who have never before known the meaning of the word "want" have been compelled to take their places in breadlines sustained by charity to avoid starvation.

Under whose administration have these distressing things occurred? They have occurred under the administration of a President who, when he was a candidate for the high office which he holds, was advertised to the country as a superman, one who was better qualified for the office to which he aspired than any other candidate for the Presidency ever offered by any political party. They have occurred under the administration of a President who as a candidate even promised that if we would elevate him to the office which he sought and make possible a continuation of the policies which had been followed by his immediate predecessors, and which he pledged himself to continue, we would finally reach that state where poorhouses would be eliminated and poverty be unknown.

It is my solemn judgment that no administration ever promised more than did that of the present or perform less. Although Mr. Hoover was hailed as a man capable of working miracles in economics and in statecraft because of his intimate knowledge of business affairs and his lifetime of travel in other countries, he has, I do not hesitate to say, failed more completely than any other President in the life of our Nation. He has not disclosed a capacity for leadership; too frequently he has not demonstrated that he possesses that courage which has characterized our really great Presidents; and more disappointing than all else, because it was therein we expected most, he has not displayed that far vision so necessary in a President if he is to deal successfully with the great problems which arise from time to time in our national life.

Certainly it can not be offered in extenuation of the failure of the Hoover administration that a hostile party was in control of the Congress, for in this House the administration majority was more than 100 and in the Senate the Republican majority was 17. If it be said that in the body at the other end of the Capitol a number of Senators in his own party, whom we denominate as progressives, did not give him cooperation and show him loyalty, I reply that that very fact is proof of one of the failures on the part of the President to which I have alluded—that is, his failure to demonstrate capacity for or exercise leadership. Had he been the great leader he was certified to be during the campaign preceding his election he would have been able to work in harmony with this element in the Senate, for with a single exception they gave him loyal and effective support during his campaign. In fact, it should be said that the most conspicuous among the progressive members of his party in the Senate who have broken with the President is the able Senator from Idaho, who, more than any other individual, helped to bring to Candidate Hoover that support so necessary for him to carry in the election the great agricultural States of the Middle West and the Northwest.

During his campaign in 1928, Mr. Hoover was induced by this same Senator to commit himself to a pledge to convene Congress, in the event of his election, in special session to deal with the farm problem, and to find a remedy for the ills of agriculture.

That promise, at least, Mr. Hoover kept, in so far as it related to the calling of the special session. He did call Congress in session in April, 1929, and it has been in session about three-fourths of the time since. He made two major pledges, one to solve the farm problem, and the other to give the country a "limited revision" of the tariff.

A farm bill was passed, but it was not the bill the farmers themselves, through their organizations, urged be passed, and a tariff bill was passed, but it was a bill revising the tariff by wholesale, and adding literally hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the cost of living of the American people.

The farm bodies, many leading economists, and undoubtedly a majority of the Members of Congress favored the passage of a farm bill containing the export-debenture principle. This was nothing more nor less than a device to make the tariff at least partially effective on farm products, and was projected because everybody had agreed that the farmer had been suffering from very serious and very unjust tariff discriminations under the existing law. The Senate even went so far as to write the export-debenture principle into the farm bill, but the President, using the great power of his office, forced it out. It became a question of adopting the President's plan of farm relief, or having no plan at all. So the President's plan was adopted. He selected the members of the Federal Farm Board to place his plan in operation, and Congress unstintingly voted it enormous sums of money, aggregating finally a half billion dollars, with which to endeavor to make its plan effective. It can not thus be pleaded that the Farm Board, of the President's own creation, lacked either the authority or the funds with which to do what he had pledged it would do. In fact, when he announced the appointment of the Farm Board he referred to it as a board having "responsibility, authority, and resources such as have never before been conferred by our Government in assistance to any industry."

What has been the result? What has this board accomplished? A few figures I shall give you answer the question far more eloquently than any words I can employ.

During 1930 the value of the principal farm crops produced in the United States was $2,400,000,000 less than the value of the same crops in 1929. To put it another way, the value of the same crops, of substantially equal production in both years, speaking as a whole in 1929 before the Hoover plan went into operation, was almost $2,500,000,000 greater than the value of the same crops raised under the first year of the Hoover plan.

In addition, the value of the livestock sold off the farms and ranches of the country in 1930, the first year under the Hoover plan, was approximately $225,000,000 less than the sum realized from the sale of the same kind of stock in 1929.

Add these together and we find that in 1930, under the Hoover plan, the crop growers and stock raisers took a loss

of more than $2,600,000,000, due entirely to a decrease in prices under the level of 1929.

In January of this year the Department of Agriculture reported that the index figure representing the average of all farm crop prices had dropped 40 points under the level of January, 1929, and had reached the lowest point since 1912, the last year of the Taft administration. And when this report was made the level of prices was still sinking, and is now substantially below the pre-war level.

These are terrific losses. There should and will be added to them when available figures showing losses the farmer sustained last year by reason of the continued shrinkage in the value of his land and buildings. What this will be I do not know, but I am sure it will be tragically high, and added to the current losses in crop and livestock values by reason of price decreases aggregates a sum that foredooms the ruin of the agricultural industry in America unless early and effective means of checking this downward trend are found. The average net income per farm family in the United States has recently approximated $800. Last year the decline in crop values under 1929 averaged $400 per farm family. Even a blind man may see that at this rate farm incomes will soon reach the vanishing point.

In the light of these facts can it be truthfully said that President Hoover has kept faith with the farmers and redeemed the pledge he made in his speech of acceptance at Palo Alto, Calif., August 11, 1928, when he said:

> The most urgent economic problem in our Nation to-day is in agriculture. It must be solved if we are to bring prosperity and contentment to one-third of our people directly and to all of our people indirectly. We have pledged ourselves to find a solution.

If agriculture is now on a "parity" with industry, then it is the parity of despair accomplished by bringing industry down to the level of despair which agriculture has occupied for so many years.

THE TARIFF

I believe that if anyone should have the hardihood to now arise and say that the Hoover administration has kept its promise to the farmers of America, that answer has been effectively disposed of. So I now turn to the tariff.

As I have said, when the President called Congress into special session in April, 1929, he pledged a "limited revision" and made the test of necessity for revision of a rate or schedule whether the industry affected was suffering from excessive imports and whether there was substantial unemployment among the workers in those industries. In short, tariff revision was to be so limited that it was only to be a step in eliminating that discrimination from the tariff under which agriculture was suffering and to assist those industries where import duties were so low that they were being injured by heavy imports.

Instead of this promised "limited" revision the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill was passed, containing the highest level of rates ever written into an American tariff bill. It does not help the farmer but injures him. His last condition is worse than his first. As for the consumer he must pay increased prices, due to the tariff, for practically all of the necessities of life. One well-known economist, an expert on the tariff, estimates that by reason of the rates in the Hawley-Smoot bill the consuming public is paying annually a tariff toll of $10,000,000,000, or virtually double the amount of protection that can be justified for the industries that are profiting from these high duties.

What has been the effect of the tariff? No man can say with exactness what industrial conditions would have been or what the volume of our foreign trade would have been had the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill not been passed. But we do know that forever the lie has been given to one of the false claims of the opposition. In one of its platforms—I believe it was that of 1904—the Republican Party said that prosperity always followed the enactment of a Republican tariff and hard times always came after the enactment of a Democratic tariff law.

Under the operations of the policy of which the opposition has heretofore been so boastful, the country has sustained the most severe economic shock in its history, a shock that would have been fatal to any other country not endowed with the wonderful resources which our country possesses, and not populated by a people with the resiliency, resourcefulness, and determination of the American people.

How much of the responsibility for the economic disaster of the last year and a half is due to the policies of the Hoover administration each may determine for himself. We may say in all fairness, however, that in the past the opposition has claimed a mortgage on prosperity and has attempted to make the American people believe that only under its policies could the country be prosperous. Nobody has been more emphatic in this claim than was President Hoover in 1928, when he talked of the increased use of the telephone, the automobile, the radio, and the bathtub as a Republican achievement. We know that he voiced especial pride in the fact that while he was Secretary of Commerce our exports of goods to foreign countries increased $1,000,000,000.

It can not be questioned that our present ruinous tariff policy has been responsible for much of the recent terrific slump in our foreign trade. For 1930 our foreign trade was $2,737,780,000 less than during 1929. During the first seven months of the operation of the Hawley-Smoot tariff our foreign trade decreased more than $2,000,000,000.

The effect of this loss of trade has been felt not only by the farmer who raises wheat and by the producer of manufactured goods which have been finding their way into the markets of the world but it has been felt in every home and at every fireside in the land. For proof of the truth of this statement I cite the high authority of the President himself. During the 1928 campaign, when he was speaking of our great foreign trade, Mr. Hoover made the statement that 3,000,000 American families made their living out of the production of goods we exported and out of the manufacture into finished products of the raw materials we exported in exchange for our imports. Our foreign trade fell off in 1930 under 1929 by 27 per cent. If 3,000,000 families gained their livelihood in 1928 as a direct result of this foreign trade, then when our foreign trade fell off 27 per cent last year 27 per cent of those families were thrown out of that means of employment. They went to join the bread lines and to occupy the soup houses that fill every industrial center in the land. And the ruinous effect of that decreased foreign trade was reflected in the lowered price on every bushel of wheat and of corn grown on the farms of America and every pound of cotton produced in our sunny but now well-nigh impoverished Southland.

That a country that will not buy can not long sell is an economic verity as true as the gospel itself. Since the Hoover administration's tariff policy became known scores of nations have passed retaliatory tariffs. South American countries that bought hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of goods from us annually, in the aggregate, are turning to the countries of Europe for many of the things that we formerly produced in our factories and on our farms. I am not now criticizing or even discussing the principle of protection. Under the system that has been built up in this country a protective tariff has become essential to our welfare. But it ought to be a fair tariff policy—one that will permit the even flow and friendly exchange of commodities; one that is as fair to the farmer who tills the field as it is to the magnate who harvests dividends from the toil of the workers in the steel and aluminum mills. It must not be the sort of a tariff policy that robs Peter to pay Paul, because under the American theory of government all men are equal before the law. A tariff law should not be permitted that violates that theory, that takes $10 from one pocket of the farmer's pants while it puts only $1 in the other.

I am not so biased a partisan as to say that this Congress does not have any accomplishments to its credit. I would give credit where it is deserved. It is true that the process was slow, but finally a building program was adopted which will place needed public buildings in many cities and help to stimulate industry and somewhat reduce the unemployment. This legislation came late, but it is at last a fact accomplished. There has been other legislation passed that ought

to have been passed. But many, far too many, things were neglected.

A bill was finally passed which will be helpful to that great army of men who served the country so well during the trying days of the World War. Congress passed the World War veterans' loan bill. It was not the sort of a bill many wanted. Many favored legislation providing for early cash settlement of the veterans' claims. Some opposed any sort of legislation, and conspicuous among these were the Secretary of the Treasury, certain large selfish financial interests, and even the President himself. Despite this opposition, notwithstanding the veto of the President, the loan bill was passed. Under it veterans may now borrow up to 50 per cent of the value of their certificates, and at 4½ per cent interest annually instead of 6 per cent.

I believe this legislation, which I voted for both as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and as a Member of the House, to be justified from any viewpoint from which we may look at it. Certainly no one can fail to justify it as a step in the direction of the discharge of that patriotic obligation we owe to the service men who offered their all on the altar of their country's liberty. Economically, I have no hesitancy in saying I believe it is sound legislation, the Treasury Department to the contrary notwithstanding. These loans place no additional financial obligation on the Government, for it is lending the veterans money it has already admitted it owes them. It is doing it at a rate of interest higher than the rate it is paying for such money as it may have to borrow.

If it continues to do this, actually the Government will make money out of the process. Just now there is a good deal of what we call "timid money" in the country. It is in hiding, because under the present state of things its possessors hesitate to make investments. This money is, therefore, idle and those who own it will be glad to lend it to the Government, for they know that to be a safe investment. So if the Government borrows this money at a low rate of interest, then turns around and lends it to the veterans, the money is brought out of hiding and is placed in circulation. This will stimulate all business. The veterans will use the money in many ways. Some will help pay off mortgages on their homes, some will use it to pay rent, to pay their grocery bills, to pay the tailor, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker. The money thus is released to the many channels of trade and all business will be stimulated. Sometimes the business balance is very delicate and a comparatively small thing will turn the balance either in the right or in the wrong direction. It can easily happen that the few hundred million dollars placed in circulation through these loans to veterans will be the turning point in the trend of business that will turn us out of depression in the direction of the high road of prosperity.

I might go on and refer to other things, such as the failure to settle the long-pending Muscle Shoals problem solely because of the President's veto, and many other things. But I shall not attempt to go further into detail, because I believe I have already directed attention to enough of the problems which were promised to be solved, but which have not been solved, to prove the truth of the indictment which I have brought against the Hoover administration. That indictment is that, promising more than, possibly, any other administration in our national history, it has kept fewer of those promises than any other administration we have ever had.

TIME LIMITS OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, section 4, clause 2, of the Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

The two years' term of Members of Congress ends on March 4 of every odd-numbered year. The session of Congress which assembles on the first Monday of December of the even-numbered years automatically comes to an end on the 4th day of March following. This so-called short session of Congress has a definite time limit. Many of the States limit the time that their legislatures can remain in session.

Three States have a limitation of 40 days.
One State has a limitation of 45 days.
Two States have a limitation of 50 days.
Eighteen States have a limitation of 60 days.
One State has a limitation of 61 days.
One State has a limitation of 70 days.
Two States have a limitation of 75 days.
Two States have a limitation of 90 days.
One State has a limitation of 100 days.
One State has a limitation of 157 days.

Sixteen States have no limitation on their legislative session.

The following table contains more specific information on the time limitation of legislative sessions of each of the States:

Limitation of legislative sessions of the various States

State	Governor's term begins	Legislature begins	Legislature meets	Limit
Alabama	January, 1931	January, 1931	Quadrennially	50 days.
Arizona	do	do	Biennially	60 days.
Arkansas	do	do	do	75 days.
California	do	do	do	None.
Colorado	do	do	do	Do.
Connecticut	do	do	do	157 days.
Delaware	January, 1933	do	do	60 days.
Florida	do	April, 1931	do	Do.
Georgia	July, 1931	June, 1931	do	Do.
Idaho	January, 1931	January, 1931	do	Do.
Illinois	January, 1933	do	do	None.
Indiana	do	do	do	61 days.
Iowa	January, 1931	do	do	100 days.
Kansas	do	do	do	50 days.
Kentucky	January, 1932	January, 1932	do	60 days.
Louisiana	May, 1932	May, 1932	do	Do.
Maine	January, 1931	January, 1931	do	None.
Maryland	do	do	do	90 days.
Massachusetts	January, 1930	do	Annually	None.
Michigan	January, 1931	do	Biennially	Do.
Minnesota	do	do	do	90 days.
Mississippi	January, 1932	January, 1932	do	None.
Missouri	do	do	do	70 days.
Montana	January, 1933	January, 1931	do	60 days.
Nebraska	January, 1931	do	do	None.
Nevada	do	do	do	60 days.
New Hampshire	do	do	do	None.
New Jersey	January, 1932	do	Annually	Do.
New Mexico	January, 1931	do	Biennially	60 days.
New York	do	do	Annually	None.
North Carolina	January, 1933	do	Biennially	Do.
North Dakota	January, 1931	do	do	60 days.
Ohio	do	do	do	None.
Oklahoma	do	do	do	60 days.
Oregon	do	do	do	40 days.
Pennsylvania	do	do	do	None.
Rhode Island	do	do	Annually	60 days.
South Carolina	do	do	do	40 days.
South Dakota	do	do	Biennially	60 days.
Tennessee	do	do	do	75 days.
Texas	do	do	do	60 days.
Utah	January, 1933	do	do	Do.
Vermont	January, 1931	do	do	None.
Virginia	January, 1934	January, 1932	do	60 days.
Washington	January, 1933	January, 1931	do	Do.
West Virginia	do	do	do	45 days.
Wisconsin	January, 1931	do	do	None.
Wyoming	do	do	do	40 days.

THE WORK OF THE WAKEFIELD NATIONAL MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me, I extend my remarks on the work of the Wakefield National Memorial Association.

The Wakefield National Memorial Association deserves the gratitude of the American people for its work in restoring the birthplace of General Washington, in caring for the graves of his ancestors, and in making those properties a national shrine.

The association commenced this work under the most trying circumstances. The Government owned a few acres of land on which had been erected a monument to mark the birthplace of Washington. Little else had been done. The bodies of Washington's ancestors lay in a neglected graveyard located in a field with no road or path leading to that sacred spot. The road which led to the monument area was a winding forest road so narrow in many places that two machines or even two horse-drawn vehicles could not pass, and it was so impassable in bad weather that cars traveling to and from Wakefield were sometimes unable to proceed.

In order to afford access to Wakefield the United States had built a wharf, which served no practical purpose, as the wharf was located about a mile from the monument. There was no improved walkway or road from the wharf to the site of the monument, and there was no way of covering the distance except on foot. The use of the wharf was circumscribed with official red tape, and this wharf was so little used that when it was carried away by ice about 1918 no effort was made to restore it.

Wakefield was so inaccessible to the general public that it was seldom visited. The graves of the Washingtons were overgrown with weeds and burrowed by ground hogs. These graves were located in a field and entirely surrounded by private property, so that such of the public as might desire to visit this cemetery could do so only by license of the owner or by committing a trespass.

This was the condition when Mrs. Harry Lee Rust, of Washington, D. C., organized the Wakefield National Memorial Association. Mrs. Rust and the noble band of patriotic women associated with her aroused the interest of the American people in the great need of making Wakefield a national shrine. They prosecuted their work under the most adverse circumstances. The difficulties which met them in their work at times seemed insuperable, but they never permitted themselves to become discouraged. Even though the health of Mrs. Rust, their leader, became imperiled by her tireless efforts, she and all of her noble workers continued their efforts until they overcame all obstacles and secured success, though there is still much to be done.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

The association has secured 367 acres of land which had been owned by General Washington's father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, including the site of the wooden house near Bridges Creek bought by John Washington in 1664, eight years after he came to Virginia, and occupied by John Washington and his descendants.

This acreage also includes the site of the house in which General Washington was born, and the association is building a house as nearly as possible like that which was then on this property. This house will be built of brick made by hand from clay taken from the Washington lands and burned on the place. There will be rebuilt also the ancient kitchen, and it will be similar to the original kitchen. The old garden, sloping from the house to the river, will be restored. This garden will be a replica of a Virginia colonial garden of that period, according to plans prepared by a landscape architect of both gardens and grounds, and necessary funds for the garden and grounds have been donated.

The acreage secured also includes the graveyard which contains the remains of General Washington's ancestors and near relatives. The original vault has been uncovered and reconstructed, and the remains which were found in the vault and were impossible to identify have been placed in a large casket within the rebuilt vault and arched over with brick. A monument will be erected in the graveyard in memory of John Washington; tablestones of colonial design will be inscribed to the descendants of John Washington, known to have been buried there; a brick wall of colonial design will inclose the graveyard; cedars will surround the inclosure, and a pathway bordered with cedars will connect the inclosure with the road.

The monument erected by the Government has been relocated at a more appropriate site, and the Government has contributed $30,000 for the relocation and improvement of this monument.

An improved highway has been built connecting Wakefield with the Kings Highway, which extends from Fredericksburg down the Northern Neck, and is close to the birthplace of James Madison, the birthplace of James Monroe, the birthplace of Washington, and Stratford, the birthplace of Richard Henry Lee and Gen. Robert E. Lee.

The purchase of these 367 acres of land was made possible through the generous contribution of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., who purchased 267 acres of land for the association at the price of $115,000 upon conditions which have been met.

The work of the association has been done in large part by volunteers and without any salaried officers until October, 1930, when a secretary was employed to expedite the work and prepare for the transfer of the properties to the United States in February, 1932.

The United States also appropriated $50,000 for the use of the association in restoring the birthplace. This was in addition to the $30,000 appropriated in connection with the monument.

There also stood on this property originally a log house, and it is hoped that if sufficient funds can be secured a similar structure will be erected to typify the earliest period of American life.

It is contemplated to build on the premises a lodge for the reception, hospitality and convenience of visitors. This is essential, as Wakefield is 35 miles from Fredericksburg, the nearest center of population, and 95 miles from Washington. The architect's plans for this structure have been completed, but that work can not proceed because of lack of funds.

It would be a splendid recognition of the worthy work which this association has done and a splendid act of patriotism for Americans to rally to the assistance of this association in such numbers and with such contributions as to enable the association to complete all of its plans before 1932 and to transfer the completed project to the United States in February, 1932, as a devoted recognition of the services of Washington, without whom the Nation would not exist.

It will be necessary to raise about $200,000 to finish this great work, and when finished it will be a lasting tribute to the Father of his Country and conclusive proof that one republic at least has shown itself grateful.

THE SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAY BILL

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of congratulation that the Saturday half-holiday bill has become law through the signature of President Hoover. The history of this legislation is of peculiar interest. There is one step in its progress that should not be lost sight of. This is plainly set forth in the two following letters:

MARCH 6, 1931.

Hon. ERNEST W. GIBSON,
United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Now that the tumult and the shouting is subsiding over the Saturday half-holiday bill for Government employees, I find in looking over the list of names of the great and near great who are credited with the responsibility of this legislation, no mention is made of the important part that you played in your capacity as chairman of the subcommittee which drew up the amended bill as it passed.

We are referring to the meeting held in the early part of April, 1930, by the subcommittee of the Civil Service Committee, consisting of yourself and Representatives ADDISON T. SMITH, of Idaho, and J. W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, who were directed to make a study of S. 471 (Jones bill) as it passed the Senate and other pending measures on this subject, together with the correspondence submitted by the various departments of the Government.

Before your honorable committee there was permitted to appear N. P. Alifas, of the machinists, who looked after the interest of the 8-hour group, and the undersigned, who sponsored the interest of the 7-hour group.

As a result of the discussions and deliberations the Jones bill was amended in the most liberal manner possible in the interest of all of the employees concerned, and I want to take this opportunity, and I feel confident that I am expressing the sentiment of Mr. Alifas when I state that not only do I appreciate the courtesies extended but also I am grateful for the final results that have been achieved.

In our opinion, this meeting was the crucial point in the parliamentary progress of this legislation. Your office and your committee should therefore receive proper recognition for the part they played, and I want to take this opportunity to assure you that it will be and has been my privilege to bring these salient facts to the attention of our members.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

C. L. ROSEMUND, *President.*

MARCH 7, 1931.

C. L. ROSEMUND,
President Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, Metal Trades Department, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROSEMUND: This will acknowledge and thank you for your kind letter of the 6th instant relative to the Saturday half-holiday bill for the benefit of Government employees.

I appreciate more than words can express the spirit that prompted your letter. It had not occurred to me to lay claim to any credit for the passage of this act, since I am always content with securing the enactment of meritorious legislation without thought of credit to anyone.

It may be well, however, to have the record show the facts. Senator JONES introduced the bill in the Senate (S. 471). I introduced a similar bill in the House (H. R. 712). The Senate bill received early favorable action and was duly referred to the Civil Service Committee of the House. After some consideration a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, was appointed to consider the half-holiday bills and bring them into harmony. A meeting of this subcommittee was held in my office, at which meeting you appeared as the representative of the 7-hour group, while Mr. N. P. Alifas looked after the interests of the 8-hour group. The Jones bill in amended form was reported to the House committee, amended and reported out, and Representative DALLINGER, of Massachusetts, was placed in charge of its passage.

It is only fair and just to say that the able way that you and Mr. Alifas presented your cases to the subcommittee made it possible to reach and agreement satisfactory to all interests concerned. Had it not been for the splendid spirit of cooperation on your part and that of Mr. Alifas and the loyal work of your respective groups, I doubt if the measure could have been enacted during the life of the Seventy-first Congress.

Permit me to congratulate you and your organization members on the outcome.

Again thanking you, and with personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. W. GIBSON.

AT LAST WE HAVE CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, a tremendous victory for orderly government in the Republic was won when this Congress recently frustrated all efforts to delay or block congressional reapportionment.

The Detroit News published on March 2, 1931, the following timely editorial, entitled:

AT LAST WE HAVE CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

Recent action of the Census Committee of the House of Representatives removing all obstacles to reapportionment of congressional seats is conclusive proof of the power of informed public opinion to have its way in this country. The truth plainly has been brought home to the politicians that the people of every section desire observance of the provisions of the Constitution, even though in specific local instances it results in loss of representation.

For persistent effort in bringing this movement for fair congressional representation to successful conclusion, great credit is due to Representatives ROBERT H. CLANCY and CLARENCE J. MCLEOD, of Detroit. In session after session they have been acknowledged leaders in every reapportionment fight in Congress, and on all other fitting occasions have helped in the creation of sentiment.

The measure finally prevails, not because of predominance of influence of those localities benefited by increased representation but by constraint of growing public sentiment that the mandates of the Constitution must be obeyed.

The overwhelming victory on February 27 of the friends of constitutional reapportionment in the House Census Committee must be a source of the greatest satisfaction not only to real friends of the Constitution but to those millions of Americans in the large cities and in the more rapidly growing States who have been unjustly disfranchised of representative government for the past 11 years.

The full membership of the committee was present the first time during this Congress, and by a decisive vote of 13 to 8 all bills to block or retard reapportionment were killed. This means that the automatic reapportionment as fixed by the law of 1929, passed in the first session of the present Congress, will go into effect March 4.

This vote means that probably never again will a movement to increase the size of the House beyond 435 Members ever gain considerable headway. It means that instead of reapportionment being made the football of Congress, as it has been on so many occasions during the country's growth, and especially during the past 11 years, the question will practically be taken out of politics.

For the aforesaid law of 1929 provides that when the census is taken every 10 years the figures shall be merely reported to the Secretary of Commerce and he shall automatically divide the population of the country by the 435 Members and allot the Congressmen to the various States by the principle of major factors.

This settlement means that the dangerous hostility between the rural and the city elements of the population, the hostility which has been rapidly growing since the advent of the eighteenth amendment and prohibition, will be considerably minimized because the automatic reapportionment will tend to prevent the mobilizing of these two great American armies of political and economic thought.

The victory means that a mandate has been issued by Congress to the many recalcitrant legislatures who have been hostile to reapportionment that they need not look for comfort to Congress now for any new laws setting aside the reapportionment of March, 1929.

When Congress reconvenes in December, 1931, many legislatures will have been redistricted. The foes of reapportionment can not hope to control both the House and the Senate for a determined Senate filibuster can kill an unjust bill, and it might safely be presumed that a presidential veto would meet an unjust reapportionment bill.

The most comforting aspect of the vote to-day to the friends of reapportionment was the clear indication that even the States which lose Congressmen under the reapportionment act of 1929 voted against delay or blocking the reapportionment. Men like Representatives NEWHALL, of Kentucky; SWICK, of Pennsylvania; and GREENWOOD, of Indiana, deserve the very highest praise for their patriotic votes in favor of reapportionment because strong elements in their States tried to influence these Members to vote against reapportionment because their States lost Congressmen and electoral votes through the reapportionment act of 1929.

As a member of the Census Committee and as a man who has fought throughout the years for reapportionment, I am particularly gratified that my city of Detroit will now get the 4 additional Congressmen, 4 additional electoral votes, and 8 additional delegates to the presidential conventions to which it has been entitled for so long a period.

Detroit is still disfranchised by the Michigan State Legislature out of 7 State senators and 19 State representatives. I sincerely hope that the State legislature will profit by the unselfishness and patriotism of many Congressmen and Senators who are willing to let the Constitution rule on reapportionment and that the Michigan State Legislature will now grant to Wayne County its rightful constitutional number of State senators and State representatives.

Moreover, the action of the House Census Committee to-day is a mandate to the Michigan State Legislature to immediately reapportion the congressional districts upon a fair and just basis.

CONGRESS AND THE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the time necessary for the proper consideration of the annual appropriation bills, most of the time of the present session has been devoted to relief measures made necessary by unemployment and a widespread drought. The total of Government expenditures authorized or actually made for these purposes is staggering in its magnitude, but justifiable in so far as substantial progress has been made in properly relieving distress. There have been differences on this floor, and sometimes the views of the House have differed from those of the Senate as to the best method of dealing with the existing conditions, but in fairness to all let it be said that, regardless of party, each individual has sincerely directed every effort toward securing the wisest and best means of relief within the proper scope of the Federal powers.

The amount authorized for relief measures of various types totals approximately $400,000,000, omitting advancements to the Farm Loan Board, and such sums as may turn out to be necessary to increase the loans under the service certificate act, to which reference will be made later.

The principal items making up the appropriations for relief are as follows:

Emergency construction act, including $80,000,000 for Federal-aid highways, $25,500,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control, and $10,500,000 for roads in national forests, national parks, etc	$116,000,000
Emergency construction items in first deficiency act for various departments	15,000,000
Federal-aid highways, additional amount appropriated at the present session, exclusive of the $80,000,000 special item, over the amount appropriated at the last session	42,000,000

Advances to the reclamation fund on account of decline in receipts to the fund resulting from the depression	$5,000,000
Drought relief, including loans for seed, feed, fertilizer, and other agricultural rehabilitation, including rural sanitation and medical supplies in drought areas	69,000,000
Increase in public-building appropriations at present session over like appropriations at last session for construction and sites, $16,000,000 and additional authorization for construction of new buildings, $100,000,000	116,000,000
Advances to the Shipping Board construction loan fund for making loans for the construction of merchant vessels in the American merchant marine	35,000,000
Total	398,000,000

There are a great many other smaller items scattered through the appropriation bills which bring the total well over the figure of $400,000,000 which I have indicated, and if we add to it the $250,000,000 appropriated for the Farm Board, the total amounts to over $650,000,000.

THE VETERANS' LOAN ACT

As is well known, I opposed the bonus loan bill in the form it was enacted because I believed, and still believe, that it was not necessary to go so far in order to relieve needy veterans, and that it was not best for other veterans or the rest of the country to induce veterans to borrow on their certificates under existing economic conditions. I was in favor of restricting the loans to those veterans who are in need, not because I begrudge a single dollar to the veterans but because I think that except in cases of actual present need it is best for them as a matter of insurance protection that they retain their bonus certificates unimpaired. I took the same position as I would if Congress had the power to increase the loaning value of insurance policies with private insurance companies. I would dissuade veterans from borrowing on their bonus certificates just as I would dissuade policyholders in private insurance companies from borrowing on their insurance policies, except when in actual need. Those who advocated this bill contended that only the veterans who are in dire need will borrow on their certificates in any event. If this contention is correct, then my proposal to limit it to those in need would have better served the purpose. However, a sufficient vote was given in both Houses to pass the bill over a presidential veto and it is now a law. We all hope that it will turn out to be a boon to veterans, rather than an inducement to them to sacrifice what amounts to the protection of a paid-up insurance policy of twice the amount that can now be borrowed upon it.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT

A bill of great importance in its relation to the relief of unemployment passed by Congress was one for the planning in advance of public works to meet unemployment cycles.

A bill abolishing in effect the present Federal employment service and substituting in each State an agency for this purpose was sent to the President by Congress, but did not receive his approval. The bill as passed provided for an employment service which would function through State employment bureaus. The President's refusal to sign the bill was apparently based upon the belief that more would be lost than gained by attempting to change systems in the midst of unemployment and industrial depression.

Another correlated bill, providing for the collection of more accurate statistics concerning employment conditions, was passed at the last session of Congress and has been in operation for some time. These bills were sponsored originally by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, Democrat, of New York, and it is a pleasure to give him the credit he deserves for urging them upon Congress. It is only fair to point out, however, that they could not have been passed in the House except by the aid of Republican votes, which were freely given.

MAINTAINING THE WAGE SCALE

The Congress has shown a lively interest in the welfare of Government employees and of labor in general by the passage of laws giving half holidays every week to postal employees, Saturday half holidays throughout the year to other Government employees, and requiring that prevailing wage rates in the vicinity where the work is done be paid by all contractors on Government-building projects. The latter law meets a situation which was rightfully criticized by labor leaders throughout the country. Under the old law it was possible for contractors on public buildings to import labor from other parts of the country and often pay them much less than the locally prevailing scale of wages.

PROHIBITION LAW AMENDMENT

One noteworthy event in prohibition legislation occurred during the session, and this was the uniting of both "wets" and "drys" on an amendment to the prohibition laws. The amendment was to the so-called Jones law and limited the penalties that may be imposed for slight infractions of the prohibition law. It has become a law by the President's approval.

NEW OLEOMARGARINE LAW

A bill of great interest to farmers which was passed at the recent session and has become a law by the President's signature is one that provides further regulation for the sale of oleomargarine in order to protect the public against deception by the sale of oleomargarine by unscrupulous dealers for butter.

WOMEN WIN NEW RIGHTS

Another important act of this Congress which was passed with the support of all the great women's organizations of the country is an amendment to the Cable Act, which was sponsored by Mr. CABLE himself. This amendment provides that no American woman can lose her American citizenship through marriage to an alien or residence abroad unless she herself renounces her allegiance to the United States.

PRESIDENT VETOES SHOALS BILL

A bill for the disposition of Muscle Shoals was passed by both the House and Senate, but a veto by the President was sustained in the Senate, and would doubtless have been sustained by a more decisive vote in the House. As pointed out quite clearly and forcibly in the President's veto message, this measure, if enacted into law, would have committed the country to a policy of Government operation of power plants and would have served as a precedent for similar operation of other public utilities.

As usual in a short session, a large part of the available time was necessarily given to consideration of the regular annual appropriation bills. Despite the press of relief work the usual care and scrutiny have been given them. They faithfully carry out a policy of economy in so far as it has been possible to do so without conflicting with the relief program. They are larger than ever before in many instances, but the increase may be justified so far as the additional sums are wisely and properly expended for necessary improvements and expansions and at the same time provide much-needed employment.

The present depression has been an unusual one, because for probably the first time in our history an industrial slump has been coincident with a great drought, which of itself would have been a national calamity. Nevertheless, the conditions have not approached in distress those which have existed contemporaneously in all the other countries of the world, or those which have existed in previous economic depressions in our own country. It should be remembered that periods of depression have recurred in this country somewhat regularly about every 10 years. Cycles of prosperity and depression have visited this country just as they have every other great commercial nation of the world and at practically the same intervals.

TARIFF PROTECTS WAGE STANDARDS

It is well to note in passing—and I think the credit for this may to a large extent be given to our sound protective-tariff policy—that this depression has to only a very limited degree been accompanied by a reduction of wages. The fact is that while many people may now be out of employment, those who are regularly employed are perhaps better off than ever. This state of affairs is well presented by the

following article in the Labor Banner of December 12, 1930, which I shall take the liberty of including as part of my remarks:

Industrial workers who have not been thrown out of employment by depression now command the highest "real wages" ever known in the United States.

REAL WAGES COUNT

"Real wages," not money wages, determine the financial condition of workers, it is claimed. When the number of dollars in the pay envelope is increased, there is no gain to the worker if prices of necessities also soar. The pay envelope contains money wages. But if the cost of living declines when money wages rise, then "real wages" also advance. Since 1921 money wages have increased and the trend of living costs have been downward. Real wages thus have been gaining for nine years. The trend of money wages and of living costs is shown in the following table:

Year	Gain in money wages or workers' earnings since 1921	Decrease from 1921 level of cost of living
	Per cent	*Per cent*
1930	12	8
1929	12	6
1928	11	6
1927	10	4
1926	9	3
1925	8	4
1924	7	6
1923	6	6
1922	3	8
1921	0	0

The gain in real wages in the last 12 months accounts in part for the fact that bank savings deposits this summer rose to the highest total in history. Workers still employed are in a position to buy more and save more than a year ago without reducing their living standards, if they choose. This partly offsets the lack of buying power on the part of 3,500,000 persons who are without employment. It also tends to modify the depression for the country as a whole.

COPYRIGHT BILL FAILS

Owing to the legislative jam in the Senate during the closing days of the session, a number of important measures which passed this House failed to be enacted into law. The most important of these was the so-called Vestal bill, which provided for a complete revision of the copyright laws and which if passed would have paved the way for the admission of the United States into what is sometimes called the International Copyright Union. This bill was of vast importance to the writers, playwrights, and composers of the entire country, and it is most unfortunate that it failed to pass owing to the peculiar rules of the Senate, which render 95 Senators entirely impotent to pass legislation if one individual Senator chooses to make them so.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

Another important bill which was lost in the Senate 1-man filibuster was that reducing all immigration quotas temporarily by 90 per cent to aid in relieving unemployment. The failure to pass this bill, however, is not so serious, because the State and Labor Departments are already limiting immigration almost to the zero point.

The failure to secure action in the Senate on the bill extending the life of the maternity law brings to a conclusion a long-drawn-out fight on this law by those who believe that the work done under it is entirely outside the scope of the Federal Government's powers and is an invasion of State rights.

The proposed constitutional amendment to eliminate the so-called "lame duck" session of Congress, the session which starts in December after a general election and continues until March 4, when the new Members take office, died in conference. This proposal was defeated in a previous Congress. In this Congress the House passed the so-called Norris resolution, which had already passed the Senate, as it had many times before; but the House inserted by a very decisive majority the so-called Longworth amendment fixing a limit to the length of the second session, which would have prevented Congress from staying in continuous session throughout the two years of its existence unless called in special session by the President. The failure of the Senate conferees to agree to the House amendment resulted in the defeat of the resolution. It is obvious that so long as the rules of the Senate make it possible for 1 Senator to prevent 95 Senators from passing any legislation without his consent, it will be necessary for the House to insist upon a fixed date for ending the last session of a Congress. Otherwise it would be necessary for Congress to remain in session until every bill favored by a Senator is enacted into law. The Treasury would probably be unable to stand indefinitely the strain that would be put upon it by such a program.

By the "lame duck" proposal, instigated and kept alive by an inane but catchy phrase, it is seriously proposed to amend the fundamental law of the land in order to remedy a situation brought about by the archaic rules of the Senate. It remains to be seen whether the rules of the Senate are regarded by the people of the country as more sacred than the Constitution upon which our Government and our liberties rest.

PRESENT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL BANKING SITUATION

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted to Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert the following:

Banking deals with money and the money value of things, and it is therefore in communities where there is much money and many valuable things that banking reaches its greatest magnitude. Needless to say that here in the United States, and in the era in which we are living, more banking is being done with real money and real things than was ever done anywhere in the world before.

Financial transactions, including those which overlap frontiers, are now carried on upon so great a scale that it is no easy task, even for bankers engaged in extensive transactions, to perceive the larger tendencies and estimate their probable results. Formerly we were accustomed to estimate conditions about us and consider these as determining whether business was likely to be good or bad. There is too much tendency to do that now and to ascribe to local or domestic conditions reasons for the state of trade or of credit at a particular moment.

Before the Federal reserve system was established in 1913 thousands of banks maintained their own gold reserves. After its establishment the member banks gave their gold reserves into the control of the Federal reserve banks and a vast central pool of credit was created under control of the Federal Reserve Board.

"Credit once brought into existence," some one has said, "is a natural fluid which can not be kept from flowing into the nearest channel available under the gravitational force of demand in the form of interest rates." The streams of credit which have flowed out of this central reservoir since its creation have brought changes and raised problems which were undreamed of in 1913. We have centralized the creation of credit and its uses.

The revolutionary character of the Federal reserve system was greatly magnified by the coming of the war in Europe in 1914. Historically, the central bank came into existence as a war instrumentality. The Bank of England was created in 1694 to establish a central pool of the nation's wealth upon which the government of William III could draw to defray the expenses of its wars upon the Continent, and since that date its resources have been primarily at the disposal of the British Government in its imperial and foreign enterprises. The central bank enables the Government to utilize, if it so desires, the entire credit power of the nation in enterprises abroad.

No doubt this was not in the mind of the Congress when it established the Federal reserve system. A status of peace seemed to be our normal condition, and it was the stabilization and equalizing of credit conditions in our domestic economy that was uppermost in the minds of the legislators.

From 1914 to 1917 our stimulated foreign trade gave us a large favorable trade balance which was offset by loans by private bankers to the Allies. After we entered the war the belligerent governments suspended shipments of gold. The allied governments asked and received credits from the United States Government sufficient to cover all debts, and

these credits were raised here by the floating of the Liberty and Victory loans.

I would invite your attention to the way the "stream of credit," which we are likening to a natural fluid, has flowed during the past 14 years, viewed, as it were, from some stationary point of observation which ignores minor eddies or whirlpools, the rate of the current here or there, or the depths or shallows at a particular point.

Beginning with 1917 we see it sweeping eastward across our political boundaries "under the gravitational force of demand in the form of interest rates" and under the impulsion of a foreign war. For four years and more the vast current flowed unchecked. These four years of war did their devastating work in Europe. Year by year on an ever-greater scale the warring states expended their stored-up wealth outside of Europe.

When the armistice came, and with it the reaction from war, all Europe was stunned and inert, but there existed an insistent demand for foodstuffs, goods, and commodities which had to be met. Europe presented a limitless consuming market, and the producing market was in the United States alone.

You will recall the enormous industrial energy with which America met this demand. And in order that the manufacturers, merchants, and workers might be paid without depending upon remittances from the foreign purchaser, the Government extended further loans to the allied states and, through the War Finance Corporation, advanced hundreds of millions of Government money to the banks so that the banks could continue to finance the producers.

Month after month this went on, with the credit inflation mounting far beyond that which would have been justified by the gold base, and during this period nobody inquired what the consequences would be if Europe could not settle its trade balance. Finally, in 1920, the Government became alarmed; it ceased making loans to the banks for the financing of exporters, called on the governments of Europe to settle their trade balance in gold, and induced the Federal Reserve Board to raise its rates.

Never was industrial activity on such an intensive and so vast a scale so suddenly and so completely reversed. From one end of the country to the other bank credits were frozen, factories closed, and not only foreign but domestic trade brought almost to a standstill. This condition lasted through 1921.

Returning to our metaphor of credit as a natural fluid, the scene from our stationary point of observation is now changed. The rushing stream that had been pouring across our territorial borders has dried up as quickly as it had sprung forth. Where before had been a broad and swift-flowing current there appeared sandy wastes through which could be discerned a few trickling streams flowing from one stagnant pool to another. Credit for domestic purposes was as unavailable as for foreign.

This sudden industrial stagnation in the United States was as unpleasant as it was unexpected, but it was felt far more acutely in Europe, which for a year had been living upon the importations from the United States.

There was only one way to have these importations begin again, and that was by paying for what had already been sent so that the banks in the United States could again have sufficient reserves to allow them to make new loans to exporters. The allied governments, therefore, had to remove the embargoes which they had maintained on the exportation of gold so that the European trade balance with America could be settled.

The recovery in the United States in 1922 coincided with the receipt of continued importations of gold on an immense scale. Gold continued to flow into the United States until, as you will recall, our gold stock in 1924 amounted to $4,000,000,000. It is on the basis of this gold cover that the great industrial activity of the past decade has been able to be carried on.

The influx of the gold refilled the great credit container of the Federal reserve system. Out of this container in 1922 innumerable small streams of credit began to flow throughout the United States. The sandy stretches and the stagnant pools disappeared and there was movement again everywhere.

If a governmental policy had been entered upon in 1922 of confining the use of Federal reserve credit to the needs of the domestic market and of foreign trade, business and financial conditions in the United States would have been stabilized upon a sound basis and the function of the Federal reserve system would have become more clearly defined.

If it were considered that the political and social structures in Europe might disintegrate without the aid of great loans from the United States, this would have been regarded as a political question which would have been given due consideration and regulated by legislation at Washington.

The belligerent states of Europe were entirely impoverished as a result of the war. Their industrial and financial potentialities were greatly and permanently lowered. Europe to-day is no better able to carry a foreign debt of $20,000,000,000 than the states of South America would be. But this view has not prevailed at Washington.

The great international banking interests of the East have persisted in the view that the war in Europe was only an incident, although a grievous one, in the history of that continent, that the thread of European life and activity could be taken up after the war and followed under substantially the same conditions that had prevailed before 1914.

Under this appraisal, the ultimate financial resources of the states of Europe remain as great as they ever were and assurances are given the American people that investments in Europe are a good risk. Yet the German Government has been able to pay reparation annuities only out of the receipts of loans from America, the allied states groan under the payment of installments on their debts to America, and are protesting that they can not pay these installments unless they first receive the money from Germany. Most of the states of Europe are nearly denuded of gold, which is the only measure of monetary wealth, and their resources and those of private citizens are necessarily limited by the amount of the gold. It is probably no exaggeration to say that substantially the only monetary wealth in Europe to-day is the credits which are continuously flowing there from New York.

Since 1922 the air has been filled with schemes and plans for utilizing Federal reserve credit in Europe. In 1924 the international bankers devised the Dawes plan, which created negotiable German reparation bonds in the sum of $4,000,000,000, the bulk of which were intended to be sold in the United States. The State and Treasury Departments of the United States Government actively participated in these negotiations, but they did not meet with the approval of President Coolidge and the bonds could not be offered on the American market.

Nevertheless an active propaganda here proclaimed the Dawes plan as a final settlement of the contentions in Europe, and with this propaganda as a basis the international bankers entered upon a policy of pouring the money of American investors into Europe through the purchase of governmental, municipal, and industrial bonds.

Notwithstanding the fact that political, financial, and economic disintegration has steadily increased in Europe with the passage of the years, the propaganda of prosperity in Europe has been kept alive in this country in order that the international bankers might continue in their lucrative trade of selling European bonds here. The Dawes plan has been revived in the Young plan of 1929, under which negotiable German reparation bonds in the sum total of $3,250,000,000 are available for sale upon the American market.

In a speech which I made here recently I included a table showing the loans which the international bankers have made abroad since 1919 and the banking houses which made them. The total of these loans is nearly $8,000,000,000. Add to this $9,000,000,000 in loans made prior to 1919, making a total of $17,000,000,000, which, together with the public debts of $12,000,000,000 that the European states owe the United States Government, makes a total debt of $29,000,000,000 owed by the foreigners to the people of the United States, and if the $3,000,000,000 in Young plan reparation

bonds were disposed of in this country the total would be raised to $32,000,000,000.

This practice of the bankers of extending loans by billions of dollars to Europe began during the war and has continued under the Dawes and Young plans. They have been doing substantially what the Dawes plan would have accomplished if it could have been put into operation in the United States.

These vast loans gave Europe a renewed purchasing power here, and the greatly stimulated trans-Atlantic trade was the basis of the feverish financial optimism which centered itself in the operations of the stock market which culminated in the crash of 1929.

During those five years we saw once more the great stream of credit flowing eastward across our borders. And again we saw it suddenly terminate in 1929 and the sandy wastes and stagnant pools reappear. This time there was no gold stock in Europe to be shipped westward to settle the foreign debt. The billions advanced by the international bankers have not been repaid.

Under the Young plan it was the intention to post the first tranche of the reparation bonds on the American market in 1929. If the bonds had been acceptable and the way opened for the floating of successive tranches, the improvement in Europe's purchasing power would have been immediate, trans-Atlantic trade would have immediately revived, and industrial depression in the United States would have been checked. There would have been no collapse of stocks in 1929. It would, however, merely have been postponed. Stagnation here would have supervened at a later date, when European purchases here had exhausted the credit, just as it supervened here in 1920 and again in 1929.

If the international bankers now resume the practice of selling European securities here at the rate of a billion dollars a year, we will have several years of exaggerated industrial activity like those which followed the Dawes plan, followed likewise by a sudden stagnation like that after 1929, supervening when the European credit has been expended here. The great stream of credit flowing eastward across our borders will be checked again and the sandy wastes and stagnant pools will reappear.

The longer this policy of the international bankers is followed the greater becomes the number of people throughout the country who hold foreign securities which the mounting debts of foreign governments make it less and less possible for them to repay, and the greater grows the proportion of the liquid wealth of the country which remains in the hands of the international bankers.

As an adjunct of this policy the eager support which the international bankers of New York have given to the Bank for International Settlements set up under the Young plan is entirely logical. It is in the nature of a central bank for Europe, through which the European States collectively may deal with financial centers outside of Europe. The receipts from the sale of more than $3,000,000,000 worth of Young plan reparation bonds outside of Europe were intended to fill its coffers with gold at an early date.

But there is no way in which gold from America can be made to flow into Europe through payment of balances because the balance of payments is so greatly in favor of the United States. The Stresemann policy, which I have discussed in the Congress, and which has guided every foreign office in Europe for years, is a plain notification to us that loans from the United States in billions is the sole basis upon which the European statesmen propose to reconstruct European affairs. Under the Stresemann policy many more billions were to have been received from America in the space of a few years than Europe had to pay to America on balance. This would have caused a flow of gold from America to Europe.

The gravity of this for us lies in the fact that the Stresemann policy had the wholehearted support of the international bankers of New York. That it is their desire that gold in large amounts shall flow from the United States to Europe is evidenced by their support of this policy, and now that the Stresemann policy has failed it is being urged in New York by the leading international bankers that we should release a portion of our gold for the reserves of depleted central banks in Europe.

The relations of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York with the banks of Europe have become as intimate in the matter of extensions of credit as if these European banks were members of the Federal reserve system. One can but wonder upon what theory of banking this practice is based.

No bank ever existed except under the protection of some sovereign authority and for the furtherance of the purposes of that sovereign power. Without such sovereign protection its treasures would be at the mercy of any band of marauders. The practices which the Federal reserve bank and the international bankers of New York are following would indicate an assumption that a political alliance or a superstate has been created under whose sovereign will the safety and security of these international banking transactions is guaranteed. If there were, in fact, a single sovereign power dominating the United States and the states of Europe, and a bank of international settlements were set up by this power, then the gold reserves of the central banks could be kept in the Bank for International Settlements where they would remain permanently; credits and debits of gold would be entered upon its books in the manner in which this is done for domestic banks by the Federal reserve system.

Inasmuch as the creators of the Bank for International Settlements assume that some sort of political status quo exists in the world sufficiently powerful to guarantee the safety of gold deposits in the Bank for International Settlements, and are inviting our Federal reserve system to intrust a part of its gold stock to the custody of that bank, prudence would move us to inquire what is the political authority or sovereign power under whose protection the bank will operate.

It is located within the territorial limits of the small neutral state of Switzerland and it is not pretended that it derives its security from Swiss protection. It rests upon the security of the treaties at The Hague which put the Young plan into operation about a year ago. The Hague conference was not characterized by harmony and good will. It was one of the stormiest and bitterest international conferences ever held. It can hardly be denied that the sole motive for agreement was the mutual financial benefit which might accrue if the bulk of the $3,000,000,000 worth of Young plan reparation bonds, there being created, could be disposed of in the United States. If the bonds can not be so disposed of in the United States, the motive which made the signing of The Hague treaties possible fails, and there is nothing to hold the parties to their agreements.

The centrifugal influences in Europe are dominant, as may be seen by studying the political relationships of any one state to the others. All are armed to the teeth, except those held in subjection by the treaty of Versailles.

Is there any interest which they may be said to have in common? There is one, and we may find it by examining the important international conferences there since the war.

The first important international conference after the treaty of Versailles was the London ultimatum of 1921. At this conference Germany assumed liability for the payment of $33,000,000,000 in negotiable reparation bonds—and, incidentally, pressure by the State Department here upon Germany had much to do with her signing of the treaty. Twelve billions of these bonds were to be commercialized immediately on the international market. It was the purpose to sell them outside of Europe, and the proceeds were to be divided between the allied governments.

The next important conference was that of Genoa in 1922, at which the presence of the United States was urged most insistently. The motive here was to facilitate the marketing of the reparation bonds outside of Europe, but the absence of the United States caused the main purpose of the conference to fail.

The next great international conference was the Dawes plan conference in London in 1924. This was for the fixing of the annuities which Germany should pay, but without reducing the total amount of her liabilities. The chief in-

terest was in finding out how large a sum could be obtained by issuing negotiable reparation bonds to be sold on the investment markets of the world. That treaty provided for the issuance of $4,000,000,000 worth of these bonds, the proceeds to be divided among the allied governments. Secretaries Hughes and Mellon were present in London at the negotiating of these agreements.

The Dawes plan bonds, however, could not be sold in the United States, partly because of the bad relations on either side of the Rhine and partly because the Coolidge administration would not permit it here. The Dawes plan, therefore, failed in its main purpose, as the London ultimatum had done.

It was after the Dawes plan was signed that the international bankers of New York began selling German municipal and industrial securities here upon an enormous scale, the loans mounting, as you will recall, to more than a billion and a half dollars. Germany out of her own resources had no means whatever of paying the Dawes plan annuities. She paid them, and it was intended that she should pay them, out of these receipts from America.

Notwithstanding the failure of these various treaty adjustments in Europe to accomplish their purpose, there was so much encouragement from the international bankers of New York, and at times from administrations in power in Washington, that this one motive of common action among the states of Europe remained alive. In France it got into domestic politics and in 1927 aided in keeping Poincaré in power.

The chief interest at the time of the meeting of the Council of the League of Nations at Geneva in 1928 was a plan "for the final settlement of German reparations." This plan was to fix not only the amount of the annuities Germany was to pay but the total number of years over which they were to be paid. By treaty settlements provision was made for the appointment of a committee of experts to draw up a plan, and it was desired that an American should be the chairman. This was the origin of the Young committee, which met in Paris in February, 1929, and substantially rewrote the Dawes plan, reducing the amount of the commercializable reparation bonds to $3,250,000,000.

This plan was made effective by The Hague treaty the next year. Under the London ultimatum and the Dawes plan Germany had held back when it came to issuing the commercialized bonds because the burden was too great for her to assume. At The Hague conference, however, she was assured of one-third of the receipts from their sale, and this assurance induced her to become a party to the treaty.

The Young plan bonds were offered here last July as "the German international 5½'s," but the venture was not successful. If the bonds can not be sold here on the scale intended, the entire Stresemann policy, as it is called—that is to say, the one policy which might unite the states of Europe in a common cause sufficiently strong to keep them at peace—fails and falls to the ground.

That, apparently, is what has happened in Europe. The defection of Italy leaves Britain and France in a close alliance to maintain the treaty of Versailles, with its reparation demands upon Germany, while in Germany there is a strong and growing purpose of radically revising the Young plan, and the Breuning Government holds on to power only by yielding more and more to this demand.

Tranquillity in Europe, therefore, seems more than dubious. These major conferences of which I have spoken have not been League of Nations conferences. The League of Nations is not a superauthority exercising sovereign power. It could not afford physical security to the Bank for International Settlements.

What, then, might be the fate of the gold stocks held in trust in the vaults of the Bank for International Settlements if this one motive of common action in Europe failed? If, as a result of a common policy in Europe, a continuous flow of gold and credits from America can not be secured, what is there to hold these states together in peace? There is nothing, unless they can bring themselves to a radical revision of the treaty of Versailles, which will eliminate the idea of German reparations to be commercialized outside of Europe, and which will undo the other injustices of that treaty.

It can not be said, then, that there is a stable status quo in Europe emanating either from comprehensive treaty agreements or from the creation of a supersovereign power; and there is no territory in Europe where the gold reserves of a world bank would not be exposed to the vicissitudes of international strife. The site of the present bank has been chosen in the general locality of the territory which for centuries has been known as the cockpit of Europe.

I stated above that political, financial, and economic disintegration since the war have been increasing in Europe. I know of no disinterested observer who denies this. The following conclusions were expressed in an article by the well-known observer, Frank Simonds, just the other day:

> In sum, the impression I gather from Geneva and from the public men of all European countries here assembled is this: With the exception of France, the condition in all continental countries has become such that the familiar issues and problems of the postwar era, problems political and military, have become actually side issues.
>
> Disintegration within the countries has become so general and gone so far that one of the most familiar judgments one meets is that capitalistic and democratic civilization is endangered, if not doomed, and that Europe is drifting toward a general catastrophe, still continuing to murmur the old words of nationalism.
>
> Or, to put it differently, there is a growing recognition that recovery from the World War has not yet even begun and that no one can now guess what the new Europe will be like, although more and more are convinced that it will be incredibly unlike the old.
>
> In any event, what seems in America to have remained an economic crisis has in Europe broadened into a political, social, and intellectual crisis. Informed people are no longer discussing the question of return of prosperity, but whether old Europe can survive this final catastrophe.

To continue indefinitely to make loans to a debtor who can not pay is not good business and is not good banking. These vast loans which I have listed have been made practically without security, for the scarcity of gold in Europe makes their settlement in the customary way impossible.

It would seem that our experience in 1920, when a vast credit inflation was carried to a most perilous degree because of the delay abroad in settling an immense trade balance, would be a sufficient warning against jeopardizing a great part of the Nation's wealth in advances to an insolvent debtor.

In 1920 payment in gold, though dangerously delayed, could be and was made in time. But if inflation here were again carried to a similar excess in expectation of settlement from abroad, the consequences would not result so happily if the foreign debtor failed or were unable to ship gold.

There is a strong tendency here to exaggerate the total amount of our foreign trade in proportion to our domestic trade and its relative importance. It ought not to be forgotten that our entire foreign trade is normally less than 10 per cent of our domestic trade. The vast free-trade markets, producing and consuming, within our continental limits constitute the greatest business empire the world ever saw.

It can hardly be controverted that to preserve the health, energy, and activity of this great domestic market and to protect it from stagnation by the proper management of its currency is of the first importance to the American people. To divert or tamper with the flow of credit needed in this market in order to create and strengthen producing markets abroad is a policy not in the interests of the American people.

It would seem to be a sound principle that loans abroad should be in proportion to the value of our normal foreign trade, and limited by that measure. This is all that the outside world has a right to ask and is all that was ever undertaken by any other nation.

If the world were filled with communities possessing great monetary wealth, the organization of giant industrial enterprises in the United States for the purpose of exporting their products on a vast scale might be a logical development.

But the world to-day is not filled with such communities, and it is precisely those communities which constitute the largest consuming markets for American export products that are without the means to pay for them. The extent to which foreign nations since the war have been consuming American-created products without the means to pay for them is measured by that enormous sum of $8,000,000,000 extended in foreign loans by private bankers to which I have referred.

There is a tendency, I may say here, to seek to discredit critics of the international banking policy which has prevailed here since the war, and to denounce their views as radical or unsafe. This criticism is wide of the mark when directed against efforts to guard and preserve the national wealth of the United States and to render the capital of its citizens secure under the protection of the laws of their own country. They are not to be confounded with any form of radicalism. In my own case I fear no comparison of motives with the motives of those who have dominated our foreign financial policy since the war and who have brought upon us successively the conditions of 1920 and 1930.

If it is admitted that what we have been doing is not good banking policy and is not based on business principles, it may be urged that the policy is justified on sentimental grounds. Here a subject of discussion is opened up which is outside the bounds of a discussion of banking and sound banking principles. We enter the realm of politics and international relations, of allied debts and reparations, and must discuss the question of whether, how far, and to what nations the financial assistance of our Government ought to be given.

This is in fact the field to which our inquiries ought to be turned not as bankers but as patriotic citizens. The unrestrained selling here of billions of dollars' worth of European securities by private bankers ought to come to a stop while the ideas of the Government and of the people are clarified on great fundamental questions which are essentially political in their nature. International rights and obligations ought to be fearlessly considered and definitely settled. Until this is done there are none who have the right to divert the credit of the Federal reserve system from domestic to foreign uses unchecked and on a scale which has twice imperiled the safety of the country, and which may imperil it in the future.

The Federal Reserve Board is not intended to be an autonomous body serving foreign banks, if it so chooses, precisely as it serves member banks in the United States. Nor should it expand credit without limit in order to facilitate the sale in this country of billions of dollars' worth of foreign securities. To relieve it of responsibility in this connection I recently introduced a resolution for the creation of a capital issues board to pass upon the issue of such securities.

The shifting foundations upon which our financial relations with the States of Europe now stand should be replaced by a stable base erected by political authority.

Efforts at treaty settlements between the states of Europe and the international bankers of New York like the Young plan, setting up a Bank for International Settlements at Basel intended to facilitate the transfer of credits and the shipment of gold from New York to Europe and to make possible the sale in the United States of German war reparation bonds to the amount of over $3,000,000,000, of which our State Department professes to remain entirely ignorant, ought to become a thing of the past.

This titanic flow and ebb of credit since the war has not been a matter of ordinary trade and commerce governed by the principles of political economy and of banking. It has been primarily political in its nature and has evidenced the desperate efforts of governments in Europe to regain the economic power they possessed before the war.

It has been the repercussion of these efforts upon our unregulated Federal reserve system that has disturbed our domestic conditions. The stream of credit was not properly regulated at the source; the great sluice gates of the dam were not properly guarded.

In conclusion, we have in the Federal reserve system an engine of stupendous power, whose destructive potentialities, perhaps, are as great as its constructive power. It is a governmental agency, and its action should be guided by definite governmental policy.

DRAINAGE DISTRICTS AND THE GLENN-SMITH BILL

Mr. MILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the administration refused to permit the House to consider and take some action on the Glenn-Smith bill, an act to provide for the aid of farmers in any State by the making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, and levee and drainage districts.

This bill on June 13, 1930, passed the United States Senate by a unanimous vote. It was then referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House of Representatives for consideration. This committee on December 20 made a unanimous report to the House favoring the passage of this bill. Later the Rules Committee of the House was asked for a rule for the consideration of the measure. This they failed to grant. Neither could the chairman of the committee secure recognition to suspend the rules of the House and pass the bill. I am of the opinion that had the House of Representatives been given an opportunity to vote upon this measure it would have passed it by a substantial majority, and its enactment would have brought direct relief to thousands of overtaxed farmers throughout the Nation.

The bill provided for the creation of a revolving fund out of which the outstanding obligations of drainage and levee districts might be purchased and refinanced. The loans were to be made only to the legally constituted authority which had issued the bonds or to its successors. This was not to be done until the Secretary of the Interior had made an examination of the engineering work of the successful operations thereof and found the lands designated as being benefited actually receiving a benefit to a reasonable degree.

The Secretary of the Interior was to have an appraisal made of the value of the taxable properties in each district that made application for a loan, and was empowered to make such compromises and reductions in the amount of the existing indebtedness as he deemed fair and reasonable. The loans were to be made for a period not exceeding 40 years, to be determined by the Secretary in each case, and were to bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, payable annually, with a proviso that during the first five years of the loan the interest may, in the discretion of the Secretary, accrue and be payable during the successive years of the loan in equal annual installments.

The loans were to be secured by the issuance and delivery to the Secretary of the Treasury by the legally constituted authority refunding bonds payable to the United States in the amount of the loan, the bonds being a lien on all the taxable property within the said districts.

This legislation was not in any form a gift to agriculture or to the farmers. It was merely a matter of extending credit so that these people might have a fair opportunity to work out their financial obligations and save their homes from being sold under a tax bill. There would have been no loss to the Federal Government if this legislation had been enacted.

By reason of falling prices of farm commodities, drought, and flood, the farmers in these districts are placed in financial straits because of the additional burdens in drainage taxes. If this bill had been enacted, it would have given them a breathing spell, and in time they could work out their problem, as the land in the confines of these districts is the most productive land to be found.

I am personally familiar with the conditions that now exist in my district and in northwest Missouri, where vast areas of lands are included in drainage districts and vast sums of money invested in such enterprises. The latest available information, which is not complete for all the counties in the northwest section of the State, shows as follows:

County	Land in drainage enterprises in 1929 (acres)	Drainage conditions in 1929			Land in occupied farms		Capital invested in enterprises
		Land unfit for crop for lack of drainage (acres)	Land drained fit for normal crop (acres)	Land partly drained, fit for partial crop (acres)	Total land (acres)	Land planted in 1929 (acres)	
Andrew	24,311	5,286	18,183	842	23,256	17,928	$509,800
Atchison	101,234	14,200	86,928	106	90,409	86,145	858,741
Daviess	38,066	3,611	7,000	27,455	35,900	24,500	815,000
Gentry	28,282	1,992	22,699	3,591	27,782	18,620	866,998
Harrison	22,423	5,200	8,700	8,523	22,100	10,790	445,750
Holt	47,306	9,944	35,169	2,193	47,159	41,079	676,910
Mercer	14,631	4,000	8,785	1,846	14,631	6,400	171,310
Nodaway	40,830	3,746	34,429	2,655	40,772	36,234	630,253
Ray	14,162	2,600	9,212	2,350	13,662	12,982	238,500
State	3,450,866	308,971	2,753,099	388,796	2,659,721	2,246,350	46,292,782

In the entire State of Missouri there are 3,450,866 acres of land in drainage districts, with a total investment of $46,292,782. This gives an idea of the amount paid each year by these overburdened taxpayers of the State in payments of principal, interest, and maintenance charges.

These enterprises have been organized not alone for selfish benefits but for improvement and protection of public health, flood control, and to reclaim valuable and productive lands.

If the administration had seen fit to enact this bill into law, it would have produced more direct benefits to the farmers than any law on our statute books. It would have allowed many families to retain their homes which will, unless some relief is provided, be sold under a tax lien.

"PRICE FIXING DANGEROUS TO RETAILER AND TO PUBLIC"

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that—

* * * Contracts between manufacturers and wholesale and retail merchants to control * * * the price for all sales by all dealers * * * eliminating all competition and fixing the amount the consumer must pay, amounts to a restraint of trade * * * invalid both at common law and under the * * * antitrust act.

The interests which demand the power to fix prices ask for a law to nullify this decision of the Supreme Court and to destroy the provisions of the antitrust law to which the decision refers. They claim that some retail dealers sell goods at a price which is too low and therefore they ask for a law which would enable producers of goods to prevent retailers from selling goods for less than the price dictated by producers.

To enact a law making it possible for producers of goods to fix a price below which retailers could not lawfully sell such goods would be unwise and wrong for many reasons, some of which will be stated.

The purpose of the antitrust laws and of the Supreme Court decision was to assure the people of the United States the benefit of competition. The bill being pushed by the interests desiring to fix prices would to a great extent prevent competition.

The right of competition means that anyone may offer to sell his goods at prices and on terms which he believes will cause them to be bought by those desiring to purchase such goods.

This principle, freedom of competition, has, in the past, generally saved the public from being forced to pay a price higher than necessary to provide a reasonable profit for the seller.

If we were to enact a law such as demanded by the interests desiring to have price fixing made lawful, almost everything required for the home would be sold at a price fixed by the producer. It would then be useless, and, in fact, foolish for a person, wishing to buy a common brand of goods, to go for them even a hundred yards beyond the store nearest his home. The buyer would know very well that he could not buy such goods at any store for a cent less than he would pay to the store nearest his residence.

The storekeeper, then, could not hope to attract customers residing outside his own little neighborhood, for he could not offer them a better price. In going even a few hundred yards beyond the store nearest his residence the buyer would merely be causing himself loss by wearing out shoe leather. Under such conditions the storekeeper would become a mere order taker for the producer. He must sell at the price ordered by the producer, and he must pay whatever the producer demands. In fact, the storekeeper would have little more freedom or discretion in selling his goods than if he were a mere agent for the producer, but the producer would not be responsible, either to the storekeeper or to the public, as he would be responsible for a person legally appointed by him as an agent to sell his goods.

When a producer sells his goods through his agents, who lose money in trying to sell, it is the producer's money that is lost and not the agent's money.

Under the proposed price fixing law, however, the price at which a producer's goods must be sold by the retailer could be controlled by the producer as surely and exactly as if the producer were selling through his own agents, for whom he would be responsible.

The producer of goods could say what price the retailer must charge, and yet such producer would not be risking the loss of any money in operating the store.

If a law were passed to allow producers to fix prices below which goods could not be sold by retailers, it would then be useless for a storekeeper to advertise for the purpose of increasing his business, for he could not offer any better price than other stores in the community. The producer having fixed or dictated the same price for all stores in the same community, one store could not advertise a price better than the other stores could offer to buyers. With price fixing fully in effect, about all that a store could say in an advertisement would be, "Come to our store; we have nicer show cases and more attractive clerks."

The general fixing of retail prices below which goods could not be sold would be harmful to retailers in another way, illustrated as follows: Suppose that a storekeeper had accustomed the public to buying a certain kind of soap, the retail price of which had been fixed by the maker at 10 cents a bar. The retailer when he began to sell the soap paid the maker 6½ cents a bar. After the storekeeper had, however, accustomed the public to buying that particular kind of soap, he would be compelled to carry the soap in stock to satisfy his customers. Then the soap maker, knowing that the storekeeper must have that particular kind of soap for his customers, would naturally say to himself, "I can now raise the price which the dealer must pay me for my soap," and raises the price the retailer must pay the maker to 9 cents a bar. In this way the soap maker would increase his profit while the storekeeper's profit would become smaller.

The producer would be the more tempted to increase the price charged to the storekeeper because of the fact also that practically the only advertising that would be done would be in magazines of nation-wide circulation. We must remember that there would be no reason for local advertising, for advertising of individual dealers, because the price fixed for all retailers would be the same.

If the producer of goods could fix a price to suit himself and the retailer could not lawfully sell such goods for less than the price fixed, the retailer would be injured in another way. He might be hard pressed for money and might desire to sell some of his goods at a sacrifice to get money to save himself from being forced out of business. We all know of storekeepers who during the present hard times have saved themselves from ruin by selling part of their goods for even less than cost. If, however, the law had allowed producers to fix prices which storekeepers could not reduce, the merchant in need of cash to pay his creditors could not have sold part of his stock at lower prices to get money to do so. Many merchants have large stocks of goods but no money. If they can get money by selling some goods at a sacrifice they can often save themselves from ruin, but they could not do so if the law were to permit price fixing.

"But," shout the advocates of price fixing, "what about chain stores; price fixing would stop their growth." The answer to that is that the proposed price fixing law would not prevent development of the chain system at all, but, on the contrary, would give the chain stores an advantage. It is one of the tricks of propagandists to yell loudly against something which they believe unpopular and then to ask the public to accept what they propose, although it could have no bearing at all upon the alleged evil against which the propagandists roar but, in fact, would probably make the trouble worse.

Whether you approve or disapprove of chain stores, let me assure you that the proposed law to authorize price fixing would not interfere with them in the least. The interests which demand a law to permit price fixing admit that under such law the buyers of large quantities of goods could lawfully and properly be given a price lower than that paid by buyers of smaller quantities. Any large chain system could buy from a producer quantities of goods many times larger and therefore at a lower price than could the man with one store. Because it would thus pay less, the chain store's percentage of profit would be greater.

Remember, too, we have been emphatically assured by those clamoring for the right to fix prices that there will always be some goods the retail prices of which will not be fixed by producers. If necessary, therefore, to attract more customers, the chain store would offer to sell for less than the usual price some of these goods the retail price of which would not be fixed. Then the customer being in the store to buy goods thus reduced in price, he would naturally buy whatever he might need of goods on which the prices had been fixed. Thus the chain store would do most of the business, and because of its large purchases would buy cheaper than could the small dealer goods upon which the same retail price would be fixed, and so the chain store would, of course, make a larger profit.

Let me point out another objection from the standpoint of both the storekeeper and the public. Suppose that Mr. Smith, a storekeeper, were to buy a large stock of goods upon which the producer would have fixed a retail price below which the goods could not be sold to the public. If later the cost of producing that class of goods were to become less, then Mr. Smith, the storekeeper, would not be able to sell his price-fixed goods. Other goods of the same class and of as good quality but produced later at a lower cost would be for sale at retail for less money, and because just as good and cheaper they, instead of the price-fixed goods, would be bought by the public. The dealer, then, who would have bought a large stock of certain price-fixed goods, when the cost of production would have been high, would suffer loss, because he could not reduce the fixed retail price of such goods in order to sell in competition with other goods of the same class.

The proposed price fixing law would injure the public by preventing competition. Without competition the producers of goods could fix prices that would be altogether unfair to the buyer.

At present, with competition, if a producer of goods tries to keep in force too high a price, some one offers to the public the same kind of goods at a lower price, and he gets the business.

If you do away with competition, the public can be charged whatever pleases the producer, who then practically becomes a monopolist. The consumer then could not help himself for the reason that the producer of goods could compel the retailer to keep up the high prices.

To make it lawful for producers to dictate retail prices which storekeepers could not reduce would greatly increase the cost of living and would put the retailers in the iron grasp of great producers.

Some retail dealers have been led to believe that, if given the power to fix unchangeable retail prices, the producers would be nice and kind to them and would not raise the prices which the retailers would be forced to pay producers. Let me warn such people to beware. Burns stated the case well when he said:

> But och, mankind is unco weak
> An little to be trusted;
> If self the wavering balance shake
> It's rarely right adjusted.

THE JONES-M'CORMACK SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAY BILL

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the bill known as the Jones-McCormack bill, Senator JONES having introduced it in the Senate and I in the House, granting a Saturday half holiday to Government employees, will, in my opinion, be most beneficial to the Government. It will enable the faithful employees to return to work on Monday morning better physically and mentally as a result of the rest they secure over the week-end.

In these days when leading business men, as well as those in charge of the great labor organizations, are advocating a 5-day week, it is but fair that we grant to the Federal employees a 5½-day week, especially when the great majority of those employed throughout the Nation are enjoying the Saturday half holidays granted by their employers.

In some of the large cities of the country, during certain periods of the year, the large department stores, as well as industries, provide a 5-day week during the summer months.

The Federal Employee, the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, has the following to say in its issue of March 1 relative to the law recently enacted:

SATURDAY HALF-DAY BILL BECOMES LAW

The Jones-McCormack Saturday half-holiday bill was passed by the House on March 2 and signed by President Hoover on March 3. The text of the congressional debate on the bill will be carried in full in next month's magazine.

In the brief debate which followed consideration of the bill in the House, where it was called up by Representative LEHLBACH, who moved suspension of the rules, no opposition was expressed other than by Representative WOOD, of Indiana, but on a viva voce vote the bill was passed without opposition. Senator JONES, of Washington, secured unanimous consent for acceptance of the House amendments to avoid delay by sending the bill to conference.

The national officers already have discussed with the Interior Department and congressional leaders the securing of an Executive order conferring the benefits of the short Saturday on field employees of permanent tenure in the Interior Department. That group was eliminated at the request of the Secretary of the Interior because of the many temporary and seasonal employees on its rolls.

Federal employees owe a very substantial debt of gratitude to Chairman LEHLBACH, of the Civil Service Committee, whose skillful generalship adds the Saturday half holiday law to an already long list of legislative accomplishments during his chairmanship of that committee, which position he leaves with the closing of this Congress. The national office presented Mr. LEHLBACH with the pen and holder used by the President in signing the act.

Great credit is also due Senator JONES and Representative MCCORMACK for their sponsorship of the measure. Representatives LAGUARDIA and DALLINGER also were indefatigable in their efforts to secure its passage.

The National Federation has addressed a communication to President Hoover expressing the heartfelt appreciation of organized Federal employees who are benefited by the Saturday half holiday law.

THE PLIGHT OF A GREAT INDUSTRY

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish at this time to discuss the plight of a gigantic industry, which in normal times and under ordinary conditions employs directly and indirectly almost a million men—an industry comparable in dignity and importance with the power industry in the United States. Its very magnitude and former prosperity has in its time of crisis prevented and impeded the correct understanding of its dilemma.

There was a time when an individual who had an oil well of a few thousands of barrels daily was considered a rich man. To-day one who has several such wells may be on the verge of bankruptcy, if he has large sums invested in them, from the fact that there is little or no market for his product; and when sold it is marketed below cost of production.

Those engaged in the petroleum industry have heroically attempted by proration and curtailment to overcome the difficulties which confronted their business, but because of vast importations of petroleum and its products from foreign

countries their efforts have been in vain and all their plans have been abortive in the face of this flood of foreign imports of oil and oil products.

Now they appeal to the only power which can give them aid, the Congress of the United States, and ask that a tariff be imposed on imports of petroleum and its products in order to protect their industry from the inroads of oil from countries where labor is cheap and where petroleum can be obtained for almost nothing. This, linked with cheap water transportatien, produces the most ruinous competition. Here is a just demand, and the Republican Party by reason of its age-old advocacy of the protective principle as a means of stabilization of industry should come at once to the rescue of a great industry in this emergency.

There is no discounting the difficulty of amending the tariff schedules now, but the dire necessity justifies even this heroic remedy. When New England's textile industry was in distress the West came to its rescue with an adequate tariff, and now we demand this very proper Republican remedy for the ills of the petroleum industry, particularly in the mid-continent field.

In lieu of a tariff we have asked a limited embargo, based on the degree of proration which we ourselves have imposed on the domestic industry. This would be of immense and speedy relief and should be yielded as an emergency measure.

When the tariff bill was before Congress I favored some degree of protection, as I believe all the Kansas delegation did; but there was no backing for it by the oil producers when it was before the House. A fine showing was made before the Finance Committee of the Senate, but not before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. If some degree of protection had been placed in the tariff bill then the President, who is sympathetic toward the oil industry, in conjunction with the Tariff Commission, could, under the flexible provision of the tariff act, raise the tariff so it would be an effective relief. This not having been done, the fight for the industry must be carried on until it is stabilized for the home market to meet the time when Russia will take our export market from us by dumping her oil, which belongs to the state and costs her nothing, for the destruction of the oil industry unless we retain by protection or embargo the market of our own country.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave this day granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the bill pending—in other words, the House joint resolution restricting immigration—I rise to say that I am in favor of this bill and hope that it will pass the Senate as it has passed the House. I was compelled to be absent from the floor of the House when the roll call on this legislation occurred. Had I been present, I would have voted with the 298 other Members of the House who voted "aye." See page 6744 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 2. As it is, I am paired for the bill with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. KEMP], and this sufficiently shows both his position and mine. I have already stated that if present I would have voted for the bill.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, distinguished chairman of the Immigration Committee, recently said:

> This bill is absolutely necessary. The Dominion of Canada has already suspended all immigration for two years, with the single exception of orphan boys who are sent by the churches from the cities of the British Isles to be put on farms and raised, just as 30 and more years ago New York sent its orphan boys out to the West to be adopted and raised and where later some of them became governors of States. Canada has suspended immigration for two years in this world emergency. Mexico has done nearly the same thing. In the last three or four days Canada has placed an embargo on soviet-made goods. Canada is for Canada. It is time for the United States to do something for the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is need for this bill. I believe that the country would like absolute suspension. I do not pretend to know that the whole country would like absolute suspension, but I am familiar with the State whose Congressman at large I have the honor to be. I think I know Illinois as well as any man who lives in it and I believe that this bill would be enacted into law if it were possible to have a state-wide vote upon the subject.

The best authorities prove that this bill will keep out 188,000 persons each year for two years, or, in round numbers, 376,000 immigrants from foreign lands. It will prevent this vast army from entering this country to take jobs needed by the millions of unemployed citizens here. In spite of this act of restriction, every alien legally in the country has his rights under the Constitution and is entitled to protection in that right. It should also be remembered that this bill is a suspension for two years only. Furthermore, it is exactly fair as between all the countries of the world.

I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration [Mr. JOHNSON], the able Representative from the State of Washington, that the need of restriction is vital and the danger of nonrestriction is colossal. I agree with him in his idea that in addition to the million who are always out of work through failure to contact the jobs—the misfits—there will be next winter at least 3,000,000 and perhaps 4,000,000 who will seek jobs which they can not find. I agree that we may care for 2,000,000 out of 5,000,000 by creating Government work, but in spite of everything we would have 2,000,000 on our hands.

These may be pessimistic statements, but, as Mr. JOHNSON points out, we must not fool ourselves, for, in fact, the soviet system points to worse conditions. Here in the United States the continued use of labor-saving machinery, the consolidation of business for the sake of economy, the farm situation, the export figures all are danger signs; so are the conditions of most of our State treasuries.

PAYMENT OF PREVAILING RATES OF WAGES ON FEDERAL BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to print, I desire to submit the following statement I made before the Labor Committee of the House on January 31, 1931, on H. R. 16619, introduced by me:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT L. BACON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that Mr. BACON, the author of the bill, desires to say a few words at this time. Mr. BACON.

Mr. BACON. I have no intention of delaying these proceedings, but because of the fact that I have been working on this whole problem since 1926 I should like to have permission to submit a brief statement at this point.

There is no need, I believe, for me to add any explanation of the terms of the bill as given by the Secretary of Labor.

This committee has, in three different Congresses, carefully considered the whole subject, during each of which it held public hearings. During the present Congress the last hearings were on two bills, one by Representative SPROUL and the other by myself, H. R. 9232 and H. R. 7995, respectively. In the Sixty-ninth Congress the Committee on Labor had before it my bill, H. R. 17069, which was reported unanimously on March 4, 1927. In the Seventieth Congress a unanimous report was made on H. R. 11141 after full hearings. This measure, which I also had the privilege of sponsoring, was bottomed on the plan of effecting the same desired results by limiting the employment on Federal projects to local citizen labor, with definite preferences. The aim of this bill was the same as the one introduced and considered in the Sixty-ninth Congress, but its amended form was due solely to the common desire to avoid constitutional objections which it was feared might be lodged against the previous measure.

The executive department also carefully considered the subject. On August 6, 1930, the matter was presented by me to the President in the form of a more or less full memorandum setting out the need and desirability of such a policy and making the suggestion that it might, perhaps, be made effective through administrative action. While this memorandum to the President suggested a variation in the details of the proposal, in substance it was essentially the same.

I think it is granted that there is no further need of extended hearings on the subject.

The translation of the present proposal into law would, in substance, assert that our Government is not willing to continue a partnership with contract practices that force it, unwillingly, to give aid and encouragement to the demoralization of standard local labor conditions. That simply is the gist of the whole proposal.

In line with our tremendously enlarged public building program the Government's position in this problem has been greatly accentuated. We have the condition to-day on many Federal construction projects where the terms "local labor" and "prevailing rates of wages" mean absolutely nothing; where local workmen are merely envious onlookers, off the reservation, simply because the Federal contractor concerned has been able to bring into the community a cheap, bootleg labor supply, with profit to himself

and, perhaps, also, I am ashamed to say, with profit to the Federal Government. We are witnessing Federal construction work going on, in the erection of post offices, customhouses, courthouses, hospitals, etc., where local labor is absolutely disregarded or where the prevailing rate of wages means nothing to the contractor; and we see certain Federal contractors dumping this cheap labor into an already demoralized labor market at the expense wholly of the local workman, his family, and his community. To permit the Federal Government to aid in the disruption of stable labor conditions is not fair or decent.

To the contractors this proposal will guarantee equality of opportunity in bidding. The competition between them will not be lessened, but it will be limited to the economy and efficiency of their managerial organizations. By removing the temptation to import cheap, bootleg, itinerant labor or to cut the prevailing wage rates, the advantage that unscrupulous contractors wield to-day of clubbing their way to the top of the list as low bidders, will be effectively eliminated.

I merely want to add one thing, namely, that, for the first time, we have got all these departments together on a bill. That, of itself, I would think, is a notable accomplishment. If the bill is amended in any way, their responsibility may cease immediately.

I believe that if we can go to the Speaker of the House and tell him that the administration and all the executive departments are behind this bill that we can bring this bill up on the floor under a suspension of the rules and pass it quickly. The session is rapidly drawing to a close, and I see no way of getting this bill through except by the procedure just suggested.

I hope the committee may see fit to report the bill favorably immediately, so that we may take it upon the floor next week. Its enactment into law would do much to quiet the discontent which increases to serious proportions especially during times of economic depression, times such as we are having to-day.

This bill may not be perfect in every respect, but I think the Secretary of Labor, when he says that 90 per cent of all cases will adjust themselves without controversy, is right; and I believe that Mr. Wetmore is correct when he says that he can enforce this provision 100 per cent without real controversy. Moreover, if, in any later Congress, defects appear, they can always be corrected by amendment of the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is a similar bill pending in the Senate?

Mr. BACON. A similar bill is pending in the Senate.

(The above bill, known as the Davis-Bacon bill, became a law with its signature by the President on March 3, 1931, being Public Law 798.)

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MASONIC NATIONAL MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me before the Twenty-first Annual Convention of the George Washington Masonic National Memorial Association:

I deem it a great honor, both as a Mason and as associate director of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, to have the privilege of addressing the Twenty-first Annual Convention of the George Washington Masonic National Memorial Association.

You are so familiar with the Masonic life and history of George Washington that nothing I could say upon that subject would be either new or, perhaps, interesting. However, I can not refrain from reflecting at this time upon a coincidence—one of many in the remarkable life of George Washington—which found the star of our mystic order rising in America almost at the very time that the future first President was born at Wakefield, in your own historic State.

It seems to me natural and inevitable that a man of Washington's character should have joined our great fraternity, for the ideals of Masonry, its conception of divine order and guidance, were, of course, his own.

That he was not yet 21 years old when he applied for admission at Fredericksburg, is a subject of considerable comment.

Yet George Washington matured early. He was a youth of great self-reliance and steadfast purpose. No doubt the brethren of the Fredericksburg Lodge knew him intimately and knew well his qualifications.

From the time that he was raised to the sublime degree of Master Mason, August 4, 1753, until his death, George Washington was the ideal Freemason.

During all those long and burdened years when this great man served humanity and established our Republic, he never deviated from the great lessons which he learned within the halls of our brethren.

When we consider George Washington's life in its fullness, can we think of any weakness, any deficiency, anything lacking in his manhood? Could anyone suggest a trait of character, a circumstance of life, which would have made him more perfect?

When we think of the young surveyor treading the pathless wilderness, we know that every thought and act was of noble purpose. When we think of him as a youthful soldier beyond the Alleghenies, we think of him as a man and a Mason. When we think of him as a farmer, as a member of the Virginia Assembly, as a member of the Continental Congress, as head of the Revolutionary forces, as President of the Constitutional Convention, yes, and as President of the United States, we think of him as a Mason, always bringing credit and honor upon our order.

I would like to mention one particular instance of Washington's love and veneration for Masonry, which was manifested during the Revolutionary War and which has always strongly impressed me.

In a regiment of the British Army there was a traveling lodge with a warrant from the Grand Lodge of Ireland.

After an engagement, in which the British were defeated, the private chest of the lodge, containing its jewels, furniture, and implements, fell into the hands of Washington's troops.

When Washington learned of this fact he ordered the chest to be returned to the lodge and the regiment under a guard of honor. The surprise and delight of the officers and men may be imagined when this noble tribute was paid them.

Accompanied by a guard of honor, with music playing a sacred march, the chest containing the constitution and implements of the craft, borne aloft like another Ark of the Covenant, equally by the Englishmen and Americans, through the lines of the regiment, who presented arms and colors, and hailed the glorious act by grateful cheering.

There is a well-founded tradition that George Washington and his Masonic brethren held military lodges during the old French War, and I am told there is a cave near Charles Town, W. Va., a short distance from Winchester, which to this day is called Washington's Masonic Cave.

All through the Revolution the influence of Freemasonry was strongly felt, both in the Halls of Congress and upon the battlefields.

If I were to recite the names of the soldiers and statesmen who figured high in the events leading up to and during the Revolutionary War, it would include a majority of the greatest men of that period. Such men, for instance, as Paul Revere, James Otis, Benjamin Franklin, John Hancock, Peyton Randolph, John Jay, Roger Sherman, Robert Livingston, and Robert Morris.

Also such warriors as Nathanael Greene, Ethan Allen, Anthony Wayne, William Moultrie, "Lighthorse" Harry Lee, Israel Putnam, John Stark, Francis Marion, John Sullivan, Lafayette, Baron von Steuben, and many others.

As men and Masons, we have much to learn concerning our own craft and our own exalted order from the life of George Washington. We can read into every act of his the influence of those lessons of Freemasonry which many of us sometimes are tempted to neglect. Should all of us achieve the same standards of manhood which George Washington achieved, we would then be as he was, ideal Masons.

This great memorial rising here upon this historic spot is a glorious tribute to a glorious brother. It is a fitting testimonial to the honor which George Washington has brought to Masonry. In all the world there is no such monument. True, there are mighty shafts and temples in honor of great men, but where is there such a testimonial to the character of any one man? This monument rising from this spot does not glorify Washington the soldier or Washington the President or Washington as a statesman; all these things are molded into the character of Washington the Mason. And it is inspiring to think that this magnificent Masonic memorial is a tribute from our brother Masons everywhere under the flag.

The George Washington Bicentennial Commission, established by act of Congress and which I have the honor to-day to represent as its associate director, is organizing throughout the world a mighty celebration in honor of the two hundredth anniversary of George Washington's birth.

This event will take place next year. In the preparation for this celebration we have had the finest historians and research experts in the United States at work. They have delved into every conceivable phase of George Washington's life. They have followed through every tradition and every legend, they have reread every history and every comment. Is it not worthy of note that in all this study, in all this delving into the most obscure places, not one thing has developed to dull the luster of George Washington's name?

I deem it one of the proudest moments of my life that I can meet here with you, my brethren, and add my humble devotion to yours in honor of that man who stands for all that is beautiful and noble in the order of Freemasonry.

REPORT TO MY CONSTITUENTS

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the close of each session of Congress since I have been a Member I have placed in the RECORD an account of my activities in order that my constituents might have an opportunity to judge my service. The people who honor a citizen by sending him to Washington as their Representative in Congress have a right to know his views on public questions. In campaigns I have voiced my sentiments frankly and in language that needed no further explanation to clarify.

I have served now in the Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, and Seventy-first Congresses. I have never missed a session of the House nor failed to be recorded on every roll call since I took my seat in the Sixty-ninth Congress. My record, therefore, is an open book.

The session just closed, known as the lame-duck session, affords an outstanding argument in support of the Norris resolution which seeks to place in office immediately follow-

ing the election the Representatives elect, as well as prevents those repudiated by their constituents from participating in the consideration of legislation thereafter. Lame ducks contributed toward the defeat of the Norris resolution, but it will be revived in the next session and I predict is passage.

Another important piece of legislation that failed to pass over the President's veto, due in no small degree to the vote of lame-duck Members, was the Muscle Shoals bill. This, an outstanding farm relief measure, because it would have resulted in cheap fertilizer, so much needed by the farmers, will also be revived in the next session and I likewise predict its passage.

The pocket veto by the President of the Wagner bill was a blow to the millions out of employment. It was sound legislation and should have become a law. In the next session this bill will be passed again and in time to give the Senate and House an opportunity to vote on the President's veto.

I read with interest the statement of the Republican leader, that genial gentleman from Connecticut, JOHN Q. TILSON, entitled "The tariff in the Election of 1930."

The tariff bill opposed by 1,000 of the leading economists of the country, a bill that placed an additional burden of over $1,000,000,000 on the people of this country, extending special benefits to the privileged class, which I opposed, was an issue in the last election. Mr. TILSON defends the tariff. In the final analysis the result of the election of 1930 should certainly be the deciding factor as to whether or not the people of this country approved of this nefarious bill.

In the Seventy-first Congress the Republicans had a majority over the Democrats of 100 Members. After the election in November, 1930, this majority dwindled to 2. That is the answer to the question, "The tariff in the Election of 1930."

The law creating the Federal Farm Board, which carried with it an appropriation of $500,000,000 of the people's money, has utterly failed so far to bring relief to the agriculture interests. I voted against this bill, feeling at the time it was not sound legislation.

In my opinion, the less said about the Seventy-first Congress the better. Taking everything into consideration, the country might have been better off if the House and Senate within the first week of each session had passed resolutions continuing the appropriations and gone home.

My record will disclose that I supported all legislation that might be termed legislation seeking to benefit the masses of the people and opposed legislation which I felt conferred special privileges on special interests.

The Seventy-second Congress which convenes in December will see a Republican majority of two in the House and a Republican majority of one in the Senate. The question of organization has not as yet been definitely determined.

The Democrats will have a responsibility equally as great as the Republicans, and the Seventy-second Congress will afford an opportunity for statesmanship. Unless politics are set aside and statesmanship prevails chaos will result, and the country will suffer.

There is an opportunity to liberalize the rules and this will be done. I am also in favor of the Democratic organization adopting a policy that will enable all the members to have a voice in the program. I favor the creation in the Democratic organization of a committee on committees, a steering committee, and a conference of all members at least once a month, where the Democratic membership will tell the leaders what they desire, rather than the leader decide the Democratic policy.

The Democrats in the Seventy-second Congress will be in a position to force a roll call on all important legislation.

I contend that when a public official goes before his constituents seeking reelection he should base his claims upon past performances rather than future promises. For this reason I am in favor of forcing a roll call on all legislation relating to questions that will be an issue in the election of 1932. Only in this way will the people be able to judge the service of their representatives.

I hope to see a record vote on the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment, modification of the Volstead law, on Muscle Shoals, the "lame-duck" resolution, the Wagner unemployment bill, the anti-injunction bill, the tariff, revenue laws, inheritance taxes, the debenture farm-relief proposal, as well as all other controversial questions. Some of these measures I will support, others I will oppose; but I am willing to place my views on record on any question of vital interest to the people of the country.

I am pleased to say that after six years of hard labor the appropriations are in the Treasury Department for the construction of a new Federal office building in St. Louis, as well as for the construction of a new post office in St. Louis. The two projects involve an expenditure of nearly $10,000,000. No one has worked harder to secure the legislation necessary for these projects than I have.

I have cooperated with the civic organizations of my city and assisted in securing a direct air-mail route from St. Louis to New York, as well as other recognition from the Government to which the leading city of the Mississippi Valley was entitled.

I have continued to serve all who have called upon me for help, where the request was a legitimate one.

As soon as conditions will permit, I will return to St. Louis, where I will be available to my constituents during the summer months in the event they need my assistance.

COMMUNISM AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under the general leave extended to Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD I submit the following radio address on Communism and the Recommendations of the House Committee delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. system, WRC, Washington, at 7.45 p. m., Monday, March 16, 1931:

This is the first opportunity I have had to speak on a coast-to-coast network on communism since the House Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, of which I had the honor to be chairman, made its report and recommendations. I am grateful to the National Broadcasting Co. and in the limited time allotted me will endeavor to present the facts to the listening and invisible public so that they may make up their own minds and form their own conclusions on this most vital of world problems.

Time will not permit me to present all the recommendations, so I venture to suggest that individuals who are interested in securing a more complete statement of facts should write to their Representative or Senators, or even to me, for a copy of House Report 2290, which is available free of charge, and you can help by expressing your approval of these recommendations direct to your Senators and Representative in Congress.

I can assure any right-thinking American of interesting and worth-while reading. That is an easy promise to fulfill, for communism is to-day the most important and far-reaching issue affecting the civilization of the world and the happiness and safety of our people. The much-discussed question of prohibition sinks into insignificance when compared to communism, which enters into practically every human activity and threatens our standards of living, civil rights, and all the ideals, traditions, and even our form of government, which we cherish and are a part of.

Communism may be divided into three parts: (1) The revolutionary or political, which is the least dangerous in the United States; (2) the religious or moral; and (3) trade competition with Soviet Russia, which is the most menacing, as it constitutes an immediate threat to our economic well-being.

I am not an alarmist and do not anticipate any serious danger to our republican form of government from the revolutionary communists in the United States until communism has made greater progress in China, India, and Germany. The communists in Germany number 15,000,000 and have an armed and drilled organization larger than the German Army and can create a serious disturbance in that country any time it suits the purpose and policy of Moscow.

Our committee reached the conclusion, after extensive study, that there were between five and six hundred thousand communists in the United States, of which two-thirds were aliens. The communists admit openly that they take their orders from Moscow, and are apparently proud of it. In other words, the Communist Party is not in reality an American political party but a section of the Communist International at Moscow, aimed at the heart of our Government and at the life, liberty, and happiness of our people. It openly advocates replacing the American flag by the red flag and the overthrow of our republican form of government by force and violence.

The Communist Party or movement in the United States is largely an alien conspiracy in our midst, having certain definite aims and purposes, which can be defined as destruction of all

religious beliefs, of private property and inheritance, promoting class hatred, and spreading revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International to incite strikes, riots, sabotage, and industrial unrest, and, lastly, to bring about a class or civil war, aimed to overthrow our republican form of government by force and violence and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat or soviet form of government with the world capital at Moscow.

If the alien communists in the United States, who have come here of their own free will and accord to enjoy the equal opportunities and protection of our laws, do not like our country and its free institutions, let them go back to their native lands, where they can enjoy the low standard of wages and oppressive laws which they are accustomed to, and where there is no freedom of speech, of the press and assembly, or trial by jury. If they will not depart or cease their revolutionary propaganda, then it is the duty of Congress to enact laws to deport all alien communists. They do not fear our police, our courts, or our jails, but they do fear deportation, and that is the most effective weapon against the kind of warfare the communists are waging against the Government of the United States and against its firmest foundations—the home, the family, and religion.

The Federal Government, through the Department of Justice, should be given power to investigate and keep in contact with the revolutionary activities of the communists as a precautionary measure to guard against this alien conspiracy of hate and destruction that permeates all section of our country and is well organized and supported by iron discipline.

The most serious and immediate issue is the protection of free American labor against competition from the convict and forced labor in Soviet Russia, which has seized and confiscated all lands and natural resources. The 5-year plan in Russia is making marked progress, and in oil, lumber, wheat, and cotton has been highly successful, due to the credit extended by American bankers, capitalists, and industrialists, and the use of American engineering brains and technical skill, the shipment of tractors, combines, sawmill machinery, and oil equipment. Lenin, who was a great man, was right when he said that capitalists will commit suicide for temporary profit. That is just what American capitalists have been doing by aiding a communist government, dedicated to the destruction of capitalism and all noncommunist governments.

We in this country have done more to build up communism in Russia in the last three years than any other country. The net result is that we will lose a billion dollars' worth of American exports in four commodities—oil, lumber, wheat, and cotton—within the next four years. We have already this year lost the world market in wheat, and we will lose it in oil, lumber, and cotton in exactly the same way.

Free American labor can not compete with the products of soviet labor harnessed and shackled to their jobs and paid 20 cents gold a day. The greed of American capitalists is helping to build up Soviet Russia, with greater natural resources than ourselves and which have cost the Soviet Government nothing. The products of forced and convict labor in Soviet Russia will undersell us in the world markets and bring economic loss and ruin to many of our most important industries.

Mr. Molotov, the president of the Council of Peoples Commissars, in a recent speech in Russia paid his compliments to me and referred bitterly to the embargo placed on soviet lumber and pulpwood by the Treasury Deparement, holding me responsible for it. If there were no other reason, and there are many, to justify the investigation of communist activities conducted by the House committee, I would say, "Thank God that we have been able to help in establishing an embargo on the murderous harvest of lumber and pulpwood, soaked and reeking with human blood, imported into the United States, in competition with free American labor and in the midst of a serious depression in our lumber and pulpwood industry."

No words can adequately depict the sufferings, outrages, inhumanities, and horrors endured by a million or more political prisoners in the timber camps around Solovetski and Archangel and northern Siberia. With nothing to eat but a small amount of black bread and cabbage or fish soup, no clothes but what they carried on their backs when arrested, the political prisoners work until they are exhausted or go insane and die off like flies, which is the process of liquidating the political enemies of communism, as there are still many available to replace them.

The prisoners in our American jails or the cannibals in the South Sea Islands would turn away in dread at the living horror of the lives of soviet political prisoners in process of liquidation. The ancient slave master at least fed and tried to maintain the physical health of his slaves to enable them to do more work, but in Soviet Russia lives have no value, as there are plenty of replacements to fill the places of the enemies of communism who have been liquidated in the forests and mines of Soviet Russia.

Human sympathy is not limited by convention or by international law, and knows no boundaries set by nations or limitations of race, color, or creed. Mr. Molotov may rave and denounce capitalists governments and the activities of our investigating committee for bringing about an embargo on convict-made lumber and pulpwood, but public opinion the world over will approve such an embargo and denounce the horrors of the soviet prison camps under the merciless administration of the O. G. P. U., supported by a government of terror by terror through force and violence.

Just so long as our capitalists bought lumber and pulpwood produced by convict labor to be used by the American people, we had a moral complicity in the basest and blackest human outrage in our day and generation. Mere remonstrance is mockery and indignation nothing, except as it leads to action. The only proper and constructive answer was the laying of embargoes, and Canada and the United States have shown the way to those nations of the world that trade with Soviet Russia.

For the past few years the American capitalists have been the biggest standing joke in Russia. The soviet leaders, while outwardly extending the utmost courtesies, have been laughing up their sleeves at the frantic efforts of the greedy and money-mad bankers and industrialists to build up revolutionary communism for the sake of temporary profit. These short-sighted and dollar-chasing American capitalists do not count the cost of promoting world revolution; their motto is apparently "After me, the deluge." Let me remind them of the words of Calvin Coolidge: "We do not intend to barter fundamental American principles for commercial advantage."

I want to take this opportunity to refer to the activities of the American Civil Liberties Union, an organization that upholds all revolutionary elements in the country that are trying to destroy civil liberties and overthrow our republican form of government by force and violence. It uses the names of some well-known citizens, including bishops and professors, as a smoke screen for its activities, most of its executive committee being socialists, or near socialists, and in some instances out-and-out communists. Its motto should be: "My country, right or wrong, I am against it."

The use of the word "American" in its title is mere camouflage. Mr. Roger N. Baldwin, the director of the American Civil Liberties Union, was formerly an Industrial Worker of the World, and is to-day one of the most consistent and violent denouncers of our republican form of government. The following is an extract from our committee report: "The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 per cent of its efforts are on behalf of communists who have come into conflict with the law. It claims to stand for free speech, free press, and free assembly, but it is quite apparent that the main function of the American Civil Liberties Union is to attempt to protect the communists in their advocacy of force and violence to overthrow the Government, replacing the American flag by a red flag and erecting a soviet government in the place of a republican form of government, guaranteed to each State by the Federal Constitution. Roger N. Baldwin, its guiding spirit, makes no attempt to hide his friendship for the communists and their principles. He was formerly a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, and served a term in prison as a draft dodger during the war. This is the same Roger N. Baldwin that has recently issued a statement: 'In the next session of Congress our job is to organize the opposition to the recommendations of the committee investigating communism.'"

This is the same organization that gave bail and protected the six communists who shot down the chief of police at Gastonia, and who, after being sentenced, jumped bail, and are now living in Soviet Russia. Our committee is perhaps fortunate in having such opposition. Lined up solidly behind most of our recommendations to Congress are such powerful groups as the American Legion and all veterans' organizations, the Catholic Church and practically all Protestant denominations, the American Federation of Labor and most of the fraternal and patriotic associations, particularly the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other organizations of women.

The opposition is composed of the communists, socialists, radicals, atheists, and all those with alleged grievances against the Government, and have the backing of the communist and socialist press and such radical papers as the Scripps-Howard chain, which, on any issue affecting Soviet Russia, might just as well have been written in Moscow by Stalin or the polit bureau. There is not much left of the Socialist Party, as the rank and file have deserted and have gone over to the communists, leaving only a few Protestant ministers and a number of pink intellectuals and a lot of vociferous, sobbing sister socialists, many of them wearing pearl necklaces and owning liberty bonds safely tucked away in well-protected safe-deposit boxes.

If you are in favor of the two main recommendations of our committee: (1) Enlarging the authority of the Department of Justice for the purpose of investigating and keeping in constant touch with revolutionary propaganda and activities of the communists in the United States, and (2) strengthening immigration laws to prevent the admission of communists into the United States, and providing for immediate deportation of all alien communists, then do not fail to get a copy of House Report 2290 and express your views direct to your Representative in Congress.

SOLDIERS' BONUS LEGISLATION

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted to all Members of the House to extend remarks on the soldiers' bonus legislation, I wish to include excerpts from my statement made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House when the committee was holding hearings upon this legislation, as follows:

I want to call your attention to this fact, that my bill, H. R. 6620, was first introduced by me in March, 1926. I have introduced it at every succeeding Congress. In other words, I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill granting the veterans the right to receive the cash value of their adjusted-service certificates. The thought came to me that a bill like this would be very helpful, particularly to the veterans, and at the same time of substantial assistance to the people generally because of the disastrous effect of the extreme drought that prevailed in Georgia in 1925, when creeks disappeared, rivers became lower than they had

been for 60 years, trees died, and the corn and cotton crops were burned up.

I contend that this bill, if it should become a law, will cost the Government less than any bill that has been introduced.

According to General Hines, it would cost $1,693,750,000. If you take from this sum the $700,000,000 or $800,000,000 now in the Treasury, evidenced by Treasury certificates and equivalent to cash, plus the amount of the loans which have been made to the veterans, it will be seen that the outlay on the part of the Government will be decreased to an amount less, by far, than under the provisions of other bills.

I introduced the first bill of this character and Mr. GARNER introduced the last. If this committee can not report favorably Mr. GARNER'S bill, which I prefer to all the bills that have been introduced, then I think it would be the duty of the committee and Congress to pass my bill.

According to my information, this bill can be made effective without seriously disturbing the economic condition of the Treasury or the financial condition of the country generally.

Mr. CRISP. Judge, when you say pay the face of the policy, you mean pay the adjusted-service credit of a dollar a day or $1.25 a day, plus the interest. That is what you mean?

Mr. BRAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRISP. You do not mean the face of the policy, the cost of paying which would total something like $3,400,000,000?

Mr. BRAND. No. I mean the cash value of the certificate plus 4 per cent interest, compounded annually, from the date it was issued down to the date of cashing the same.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Under your bill, from what date do you compute the interest?

Mr. BRAND. From the date of the issuance of the certificate.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The certificate that the soldier is now holding?

Mr. BRAND. Yes; with interest at 4 per cent compounded annually.

As I understand, actuaries in the Treasury Department assert that every dollar that is put in circulation has a purchasing power of $5, and likewise a debt-paying power of $5. If the veterans are given the permission to surrender their certificates and receive the cash value, I think it will help the present depressed situation more than anything else this Congress can do.

Mr. COLLIER. Do you believe that the apprehensions of these great financiers that increasing our bonded indebtedness in the amount of $1,000,000,000 would cause such a serious rupture of the country's economic status are justified?

Mr. BRAND. I do not. It would have a temporary depressing effect among the immensely wealthy people and the big banks all over the country who are large owners of bonds and securities, but it would soon pass by. It would likewise have an unfavorable effect upon the general economic situation of the country but, in my judgment, it would be only temporary in its nature. The war had a hundred times more serious effect on us than the evil effects predicted by many of the witnesses opposing this legislation who testified before the Ways and Means Committee, and yet we got over it.

Mr. COLLIER. I am asking you as one of the leading students of finances in the House and one who is on the Banking Committee. I wanted to get an expression of opinion from you.

Mr. BRAND. That is my mature opinion about it. But I think we would soon recover from any evil effects of it because it will put millions of money in circulation which is greatly needed by practically all classes of people throughout this Nation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Judge, did I understand you to say that in your opinion, if this legislation were passed, and the men were given cash, and the money put into circulation, it would cause more bank failures?

Mr. BRAND. No; not if the certificates are cashed; but if bonds are issued I think it will have that effect. A bond issue will take money out of the banks. With the present nervous condition of depositors who have money in the savings and checking departments of banks, they will take their money out of the bank and buy bonds and to that extent it would cause some of the weak banks to fail.

Mr. CANFIELD. If you have listened to the testimony that has been given to us, you have no doubt come to the same conclusion that I have, that most of those who are appearing here opposed to this legislation are more interested in the bondholders than in the soldiers. In your opinion, what effect would it have if we issued bonds of smaller denominations to the soldiers themselves? The bond is then their property. They can take it and sell it to whom they please.

Mr. BRAND. If the soldiers can easily convert the bond into cash, the bond is as good as cash. But to the ordinary soldier cash is more attractive than a bond. He would rather have the cash than anything else. He needs the cash. Besides, the cash would put the veteran beyond the power of the bond sharks.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Judge BRAND, you have expressed the fear that if this legislation should be enacted into law, owing to the nervous condition that now prevails throughout the country, some people who now have their money in banks will withdraw the money and purchase these bonds, which will in turn adversely affect the banks.

Mr. BRAND. I think so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If that is done, will not that money in turn, after the soldiers get it, be put into circulation, to buy goods and pay debts, and thereby find its way right back into the banks?

Mr. BRAND. It will go right back into the banks; that is true. But in the meantime some small banks might fail. I am not talking about the great banks of the country, like those in Chicago and New York. You can not break them as long as the Federal reserve system is operating. But I am talking of the little country banks.

Since my appearance before the Ways and Means Committee, while this legislation was under consideration by the committee, Congress has passed a bill in behalf of veterans authorizing the United States Veterans' Bureau, under the World War adjusted compensation act, to make loans to the veterans instead of providing for payment in cash the amount due the veterans on their certificates at the time of the payment. The amount that can be loaned on an adjusted-service certificate is half the face value, thus a certificate for $1,500 would have a loan value of not less than $750. The rate of interest charged upon these loans is 4½ per cent per annum, compounded annually.

The vice in this loan proposition is in charging the veterans any interest at all. As I see it, the money proposed to be loaned to the veterans is their money and they should not be required to pay interest on their own money. While it is true that the adjusted-service certificates do not call for payment until 1945, nevertheless it is a debt which the Government owes the veterans. Under this scheme the veterans are required to pay interest on a contract or debt which the Government owes the veterans, though it does not mature until 1945.

Whether my conviction is sound or not, I do not think it fair to the veterans to charge any interest at all. If, however—and this is now the law—they are to pay interest it should not be at a rate greater than what it costs the Government to borrow the money to make the loans, even if the Government has to do this. It is fairly well settled and a historic fact, at present at least, that the Government can borrow money at a rate from 2½ to 3 per cent. This being true, according to my conception of justice, the veterans ought not to pay any greater rate of interest than the Government has to pay on the money which it borrows to loan to the veterans. This opinion of mine may appear to be radical and, therefore, subject to criticism, but I do not think so.

SPEECH BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under the general leave extended to Members of Congress to extend their remarks in the RECORD I include the following speech delivered by me before the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware, at Dover, Del.:

Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware, it is a great honor to be invited here this afternoon to address you on communism and communist activities in the United States. By direction of the House of Representatives at Washington a special committee of five Members of the House was appointed by the Speaker last May to investigate communism and report back with recommendations. This special committee, of which I was chairman, made a most extensive and exhaustive investigation. Hearings were held in all sections of the country—Washington, New York, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Seattle, Portland (Oreg.), San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chattanooga, Birmingham, Atlanta, New Orleans, and Memphis. Approximately 275 witnesses testified under oath or affirmation before the committee, including representatives of labor, business, church, veterans, municipal, police, and executive departments of the Federal Government. All groups, regardless of race, color, or creed, were permitted an opportunity to appear before the committee.

A number of the leading communists testified, including William Z. Foster, twice communist candidate for President; J. Louis Engdahl, well-known communist agitator and head of the international labor defense; Israel Amter, district organizer of the Communist Party in the New York City district; Williams Simons, district organizer for the Communist Party in California; Joseph Fields, head of the communist youth movement at Seattle; Louis Bebritz, editor of the Hungarian communist daily newspaper, Uj Elore; Moissaye J. Olgin, editor of the Jewish communist Freiheit, published in New York; Harry Gannes, acting editor of the Daily Worker, official daily organ of the Communist Party of America. I have enumerated the names of the leading communists so that no one may claim later that they were overlooked by the committee in securing the facts in regard to communist activities in the United States.

The issue of communism is the most important, most vital, and far-reaching as affecting the civilization of the world and even the happiness and safety of our people. The merits or demerits of prohibition fade into insignificance compared to communism and all its ramifications, which enter into every form of human activity throughout the world.

It was the purpose of the committee to present a carefully prepared report, based upon the facts developed at the various hearings, to give a comprehensive picture of the history and aims of communism, and how the activities of the communists affect the interest and welfare of the American people and the security and stability of our republican form of government.

Time will not permit a detailed account in my present remarks of all communist activities in the United States, including the propaganda carried on in the public schools and among the youth of America, or in our industrial plants, or among the negroes, and even in the National Guard and civilian military training camps. Suffice it is to say that the committee is convinced that the surest and most effective way of combating communism in the United States is to give the fullest possible publicity to the fundamental principles and aims of the communists, which are the same throughout the world, as they are not likely to prove acceptable to any considerable number of American citizens, unless camouflaged by other extraneous issues such as unemployment insurance or disarmament.

The principles and aims of communists in Moscow and communists in Berlin, Paris, London, New York, Los Angeles, Tokyo, and Pekin are the same. They stand on the same platform and advocate the same principles, and all take their orders from the Communist International, with headquarters in Moscow, and obey them implicitly.

It is not difficult to find out exactly what these principles are and to define communism so that he who runs may read, as communists do not attempt to hide their fundamental purposes and admit and are apparently proud of taking their orders from Moscow and giving allegiance to the red flag and the Soviet Union.

The following is a definition of communism, a world-wide political organization advocating: (1) Hatred of God and all forms of religion; (2) destruction of private property and inheritance; (3) absolute social and racial equality, promotion of class hatred; (4) revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed, and civil war; (5) destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly and trial by jury; (6) the ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with the capital at Moscow.

The following are the recommendations made by the committee:

"(1) Enlarging the authority of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice for the purpose of investigating and keeping in constant touch with the revolutionary propaganda and activities of the communists in the United States, and to provide for additional appropriations for skilled agents to devote their entire time to investigating and preparing reports on the personnel of all entities, groups, individuals, who teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

"(2) Strengthening immigration laws to prevent the admission of communists into the United States and providing for immediate deportation of all alien communists.

"(3) Provide for additional appropriations to the Bureau of Immigration for vigorous handling of deportation cases.

"(4) Amend the naturalization laws so as to forbid the naturalization of a communist.

"(5) Amend the naturalization laws so as to cancel the naturalization certificate of a communist.

"(6) Deny reentry to the United States to an alien who has visited Russia to secure training in communistic doctrines.

"(7) Amend post office laws to declare nonmailable all newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, circulars, etc., published, written, or produced advocating revolutionary communism.

"(8) Amend interstate commerce laws to prohibit transportation of newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, circulars, etc., advocating revolutionary communism.

"(9) Enactment of Federal law to prosecute communists or other persons, organizations, newspapers, etc., in the spreading of false rumors for the purpose of causing runs on banks.

"(10) Restriction of, or elimination of, the use of secret codes or ciphers with any Government with which the United States has no diplomatic relations, and its trade agencies.

"(11) In view of the fact that the Soviet Government is under the control and direction of the communists, that the Treasury Department request, through the State Department, permission to send inspectors or agents to investigate the prison camps and the pulpwood and timber-cutting districts of Soviet Russia, and report back regarding the alleged production of lumber and pulpwood by convict labor, in order to intelligently and properly enforce the provision of the tariff act of 1930, section 307, which reads as follows:

"'All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision.'

"The difficulty in administering the law has been to prove that certain shiploads of pulpwood or lumber are specifically produced by convict labor. Up to now the Treasury Department has been unable to prove the use of convict labor in connection with any specific cargoes, and the recent regulations requiring a certificate of origin and good character on each shipment to the effect that convict labor is not used is not sufficient for the protection of free American labor and industry.

"If the Soviet Government should refuse such a reasonable request as sending American inspectors to investigate the use of convict labor in the production of lumber and pulpwood when approximately a thousand Russian engineers and Soviet subjects are roaming about at will in the United States gathering all kinds of information in our factories, mills, and mines, then the committee recommends that the Treasury Department prohibit the entry of soviet pulpwood and lumber until such time as the agents of the Treasury Department are permitted by the Soviet Government to make a thorough investigation and report.

"(12) That the Treasury Department should request through the State Department permission to send inspectors or agents to investigate the use of forced or indentured labor in Soviet Russia in order to intelligently and properly enforce the provision of the tariff act of 1930, section 307, which reads as follows:

"'The provisions of this section relating to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced labor or/and indentured labor, shall take effect on January 1, 1932; but in no case shall such provisions be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, or manufactured which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands of the United States.

"'"Forced labor," as herein used, shall mean all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its nonperformance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily. (See Trade and Commerce Section.)'

"(13) That immediate consideration be given by the Congress to the placing of an embargo on the importation of manganese from Soviet Russia.

"(14) That the Communist Party of the United States of America, section of the Communist International, be declared illegal, or any other counterpart of the Communist Party advocating the overthrow of our republican form of government by force and violence, or affiliated with the Communist International at Moscow, be declared illegal; and that the executive authority of each State and the legislature thereof be informed of the revolutionary principles and objectives of the Communist Party of the United States of America, section of the Communist International, and be requested to take appropriate action to have said party excluded from, or denied recognition as, a political entity.

"Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 500-page memorandum submitted to the Senate January 21, 1924, in his capacity as Secretary of State, devoted many pages to the Workers (Communist) Party programs regarding 'force and violence,' and is quoted in part as follows:

"'* * * It will be seen that the question of whether communist programs contemplate the use of force and violence has been passed upon by every class of tribunal which could pass upon it, namely, Federal and State courts, administrative tribunals and legislative committees of both Federal and State Governments, and in every class the result has been in support of the position that force and violence are inseparable from communist programs.'

"Mr. Hughes stated further, in the same report, that—

"'It is believed that the evidence presented by the Department of State establishes the unity of the Bolshevik organization known as the Communist Party, so-called Soviet Government, and the Communist International, all of which are controlled by a small group of individuals, technically known as the political bureau of the Russian Communist Party. Second, the spiritual and organic connection between this Moscow group and its agents in this country—the American Communist Party and its legal counterpart, the Workers' Party. Not only are these organizations the creation of Moscow but the latter has also elaborated their program and controlled and supervised their activities. While there may have existed in the United States individuals, and even groups, imbued with the Marxist doctrines prior to the advent of the Communist International, the existence of a disciplined party equipped with a program aiming at the overthrow of the institutions of this country by force and violence is due to the intervention of the Bolshevik organizations into the domestic political life of the United States. The essential fact is the existence of an organization in the United States created by and completely subservient to a foreign organization striving to overthrow the existing social and political order of this country. Third, the subversive and pernicious activities of the American Communist Party and the Workers' Party and their subordinate and allied organs in the United States are activities resulting from and flowing out of the program elaborated for them by the Moscow group.'

"To further carry out the statement of Mr. Hughes given above, the Workers' Party referred to in his report has now changed its name to the 'Communist Party of the United States of America, section of the Communist International.'

"There is a sharp distinction between the right to advocate in an academic way any doctrine we like, and the right, which is not a right under any reasonable interpretation of our Constitution, to preach and plan the overthrow of our republican form of government by force and violence.

"One of these programs is to appeal to public opinion; the other, in the case of communists in the United States, is a military plan of revolution, directed from abroad by a foreign government.

"While the communists call themselves a party, they are not in the American sense a party at all, and this word is a misnomer, for the reason that communists openly disavow the purpose of accomplishing their ends by parliamentary or constitutional methods. Nor are they seeking or expecting to win the approval of a majority of the people, any more than in Russia, where 150,000,000 people are governed by 1,500,000. The socialist government of Kerensky in Russia was overthrown by a mere handful of communists, insignificant in number as compared with those to-day affiliated with the Communist Party in the United States. All the communists in the United States expect to do is to collect into their organizations enough fanatical, desperate men and women to strike at

strategic points—such points as they mention in their pronunciamentos as key industries, and to inaugurate a reign of terrorism and bring about an armed uprising.

"It is self-evident that the communists and their sympathizers have only one real object in view, not to obtain control of the Government of the United States through peaceful and legal political methods as a political party but to establish by force and violence in the United States and in all other nations of a 'soviet socialist republic,' to which they often refer in their literature as a 'dictatorship of the proletariat.'"

This is abundantly made clear by the fact that no communist could take the oath of office to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States. The ballot is only used as a means to carry on revolutionary propaganda to overthrow our republican form of government. The Communist Party is not and never has been an American party, but is a section of the Communist International, taking its orders from Moscow, and obeying them implicitly and immediately. Such an alien and anti-American party has no place on the ballot in the United States.

It constitutes an alien conspiracy in our midst, aimed at the heart of our Government and the happiness and safety of our people. Of the five or six hundred thousand communists in the United States, two-thirds are aliens. They came here of their own free will and accord to enjoy the equal opportunities and protection of our laws, and if they do not like our ways or free institutions and form of government, let them go back to their native lands, where there is no freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly or trial by jury, where they can enjoy the pitiful wage scale and oppressive laws that they have been accustomed to in the past.

If these alien communists will not cease their seditious and revolutionary propaganda, hatred of our institutions, and stop urging the overthrow of our republican form of government by force and violence, then the Congress of the United States should enact effective laws to deport all alien communists and keep them from entering the United States.

Our republican form of government represents and continues to be the hope and aspiration of the struggling masses the world over, where all people have equal rights and equal opportunities under the law. Ours is a government by the consent of the governed, wherein every citizen is a sovereign and enabled to take part in the shaping of the destinies of the Nation and whose civil rights are protected by the guarantees of the Federal Constitution. There is no need or room for fascism or communism or any other form of dictatorship in the United States.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the proposition that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth. Let us reaffirm our belief in our republican form of government, as it is the fairest, soundest, most honorable form of government ever devised by the mind of man.

JAMES J. PHELAN, OF BOSTON, MASS., AWARDED THE LAETARE MEDAL BY THE NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Notre Dame University annually, upon Laetare Sunday, which comes during the season of Lent, confers upon an outstanding citizen of the Catholic laity of the United States the Laetare medal.

The announcement has just been made that this year Mr. James J. Phelan, of Boston, Mass., one of our leading citizens, has been recognized.

Reverend Father Sorin inaugurated the policy at Notre Dame in 1883, and since then some of the leading citizens of the United States have been recognized. The medal takes its name from the Sunday on which it is awarded. On one side it bears the name of the person recognized and on the other side the motto in Latin, "Truth is mighty and shall prevail."

The first recipient was the historian, John Gilmary Shea, of Philadelphia. Among the other recipients were: 1886, Gen. John Newton, military engineer; 1894, Augustin Daly, theatrical manager; 1896, Gen. William S. Rosecrans, leader of the Army of the Cumberland in the Civil War; 1901, William Bourke Cochran, lawyer; 1902, Dr. John B. Murphy, famous surgeon; 1903, Charles J. Bonaparte, Attorney General under President Roosevelt; 1910, Maurice Francis Egan, teacher, author, former minister to Denmark; 1916, Dr. James J. Walsh, physician and author; 1917, William Shepherd Benson, Chief of Naval Operations during the World War; 1925, Albert F. Zahm, director Aerodynamic Laboratory, United States Navy; 1927, Margaret Anglin, actress; 1929, Gov. Al Smith, of New York; 1930, Frederick P. Kenkel, journalist, of St. Louis.

Mr. Speaker, the recognition of Mr. James J. Phelan is well deserved. He started his career as a page boy on the Boston Stock Exchange and is now one of the leading bankers of my city. Within nine years he rose from a page boy on the stock exchange to become one of the members, and three years later joined the firm of Hornblower & Weeks. No civic undertaking in Boston is complete without the name of James J. Phelan on the committee. He has been most active in connection with the raising of money for various worthy charities, not only in our city but when the people of the country were called upon to assist those who had suffered disaster in other parts of the Nation, as well as the world. He was one of the leading members of the committee that handled the Liberty loan drive during the World War.

This is not the first time Mr. Phelan has been honored. His Holiness the Pope honored him by making him the first Knight of Malta in the United States, also Knight Commander of the Order of Pope Pius the Ninth, and in the spring of 1928 he was again honored with a grand cross of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta.

Mr. Phelan was born in Toronto, Canada, in 1871, and has been a resident of Boston, Mass., since 1880. He has never ceased his activities in behalf of those who need assistance, and at the present time he is chairman of the Massachusetts emergency committee on unemployment.

I join with the people of my city in congratulating Mr. Phelan upon the recognition he so well deserved.

HON. THOMAS M. BELL

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, long before I came to Congress 12 years ago I had learned how much Hon. THOMAS M. BELL was admired, respected, and truly loved by all who knew him. Upon entering here and becoming fully acquainted with Mr. BELL, I soon became one of his true friends, and understood why he has always been loved so devotedly. His people and friends were only returning his devotion for them.

No man ever served here who understood more fully the wishes of the common people or labored more for their best interest. Mr. BELL understands and sympathizes with every noble impulse of his people. I have never seen a Member of this House who could more quickly or more correctly determine whether or not a proposal was for the best interest of those he represented. His knowledge of his people and their needs and his innate honesty of purpose enable him to know at all times just what is best for his people and what they want as fully as though they were all gathered about him and discussing the proposition with him.

He is honest, able, fearless, truly loyal, and has been truly the Representative of his people. His district and the entire Nation will suffer a great loss by his retirement at the end of the present session.

CONGRESS AND APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress is the object of adverse criticism by reason of the appropriations made by it. This criticism is unjust and unwarranted.

Appropriations are made only after careful and exhaustive study on the part of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, composed of members of both parties who have become experts in the problems of Government expenditures. The Republican and the Democratic members work in harmony and rarely disagree.

The President transmits to Congress his recommendations in the Budget, which itemizes to the last cent the expenditures he believes necessary to run the Government during the fiscal year. This Budget is worked out by experts after exhaustive and prolonged study. The committees take the Budget estimates, subject them to further careful study, hear the testimony of those intimately familiar with the needs of each department and bureau, arrive at conclusions, and put them into bills for each department and independent establishment. These recommendations are in turn carefully considered by the House and the Senate. The bills are passed and sent to the President for his approval.

The appropriations for this session were $27,785,701.07 less than the amount recommended by the Executive in the Budget and the supplemental estimates. It is true that the total appropriations were $518,032,225 greater than the appropriations for the last session. But an extraordinary situation confronted the country and Congress. The economic

depression, the drought, and the necessity of granting relief to hundreds of thousands of suffering citizens made these appropriations absolutely necessary. In granting relief the Congress gave expression to what was in the hearts and minds of the American people. Every one of these increased appropriations had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

It is an outstanding fact that commencing with the Sixty-seventh Congress down to and including the Seventy-first Congress, covering a period of 10 years, Congress has cut below the estimates of the Executive Budget in its grants the enormous sum of $413,132,181. This total may be itemized for the sessions during this period as follows:

Fiscal year 1923 and prior years (67th Cong., 1st and 2d sess.)	$312,361,792.27
Fiscal year 1924 and prior years (67th Cong., 3d and 4th sess.)	10,741,504.15
Fiscal year 1925 and prior years (68th Cong., 1st sess.)	9,024,637.08
Fiscal year 1926 and prior years (68th Cong., 2d sess.)	12,596,495.90
Fiscal year 1927 and prior years (69th Cong., 1st sess.)	6,716,064.34
Fiscal year 1928 and prior years (69th Cong., 2d sess.)	7,752,939.03
Fiscal year 1929 and prior years (70th Cong., 1st sess.)	9,139,989.51
Fiscal year 1930 and prior years (70th Cong., 2d sess.), increase	8,142,294.71
Fiscal year 1931 and prior years (71st Cong., 1st sess.)	25,155,353.30
Fiscal year 1932 and prior years (71st Cong., 3d sess.)	27,785,701.07
Total reduction effected by Congress in estimates of appropriations since the establishment of the budget system	413,132,181.94

It is worthy of note that the Congress during the 1919–1921—before the establishment of the budget system—cut the appropriations $3,890,000,000 under the proposals of the administration.

The newspapers, magazines, broadcasters, and public speakers have created a widespread misapprehension that Congress is extravagant in dealing with the money of the people and unmindful of the taxpayers. Statements to that effect do not square with the facts. The statements as to the work of Congress in dealing with appropriations herein set forth can not be successfully disputed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the House, under its previous agreement, adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 3, 1931, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

871. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Mud River, Ky., with a view to the control of its floods (H. Doc. No. 793); to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

872. A letter from the Executive Secretary of the Near East Relief, transmitting report for the year ending December 31, 1930; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive of the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting copy of the twenty-first annual report of the Boy Scouts of America (H. Doc. No. 794); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. J. Res. 119. A joint resolution authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider, adjust, and settle the claim of the Indiana State Militia for military service on the Mexican border; without amendment (Rept. No. 2923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Education. H. R. 10821. A bill to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 229. A bill granting equipment allowance to third-class postmasters; with amendment (Rept. No. 2927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania. Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 14908. A bill to amend the act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 6203. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of participation by the United States in the international hygiene exhibition at Dresden, Germany; without amendment (Rept. No. 2930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SEGER: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 11512. A bill amending the river and harbor act, approved March 3, 1899, for the protection and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2931). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 17337) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 17338) to amend the Criminal Code of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 17339) to amend paragraph (3) of section 1 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 17340) to provide for the construction of a post-office building at Kutztown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17341) to provide for the construction of a post-office building at Catasauqua, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17342) to provide for the construction and site of a post-office building at Boyertown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17343) to provide for the construction of an addition to the present post-office building, or a new modern building, and the acquisition of land adjacent to the present post-office building at Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17344) to provide for a survey of the Delaware River, Pa.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17345) to provide for a survey of the Schuylkill River in Berks County, Pa.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 17346) to amend the act entitled "An act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest eco-

nomics, and related subjects, and for other purposes," by adding thereto a new section, to be numbered section 11; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOSS: A bill (H. R. 17347) to provide benefits for women who served with the American expeditionary forces during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 17348) appropriating $50,000 for the control of the beet-leaf hopper; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17349) to authorize the free transmission, outside of the mail, of reports of the sale and delivery of milk and other farm products to a creamery or other local market; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 17360) proposing an amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 524) to provide an appropriation for payment to the widow of Henry Allen Cooper, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 525) to provide for the investigation of economic conditions in the oil, coal, lumber, manganese, asbestos, and agricultural industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 526) providing for the appointment of a special subcommittee of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee to investigate and report upon a revision of the postal rates; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 527) to provide for an investigation with respect to certain matters related to banking; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIBSON: Resolution (H. Res. 389) directing an investigation by the Tariff Commission of rates on maple sirup and sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

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

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing Congress to create an amendment to the existing tariff law that will enable sugar in liquid form to be subject to the same tariff as other sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORELL: Memorial of the Oregon Legislature, petitioning Congress to extend air-mail service to several points between Portland, Oreg., and San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 17350) granting a pension to Louis Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17351) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Solmire; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17352) granting a pension to Peter B. Frey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 17353) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Bowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17354) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Emily; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 17355) authorizing the conveyance by quitclaim deed of the portion of the abandoned Erie Canal within the Watervliet Arsenal Reservation to the city of Watervliet, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 17356) granting a pension to Mrs. M. F. Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 17357) granting a pension to Joseph John Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 17358) granting a pension to Ann Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 17359) granting an increase of pension to Emma Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: Resolution (H. Res. 383) to pay Mrs. Daniel Shea, widow of Daniel Shea, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to six months' salary and an additional sum of $250 for funeral expenses; 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:

10306. Petition of citizens of New Orleans, La., urging the passage of the Sparks-Capper bill, stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution, excluding unnaturalized aliens from the count of population for apportionment of congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10307. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of J. E. Bonner, 2548 Fargo Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 37 other residents of Chicago, Ill., for cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10308. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., favoring passage of so-called Sparks-Capper stop-alien representation amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10309. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of George Mikel and 37 other residents of Waukegan, Ill., for cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10310. Also, petition of Nicholas M. Keller and 156 other residents of Waukegan, Ill., for cash payments of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10311. By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Petition of Rev. Arthur P. White and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., in support of the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10312. Also, petition of Josephine Webb Beardslee and other residents of Jordan, N. Y., in favor of the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10313. Also, petition of Flora A. Morton and other residents of Onondago County, N. Y., favoring the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10314. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of citizens of Augusta, Mich., urging Congress to support proposed Sparks-Capper amendment to the United States Constitution excluding unnaturalized aliens from the count of population for apportionment of congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10315. By Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Petition for support of Sparks-Capper amendment to the United States Constitution by citizens of Oxford, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10316. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Petition of 16 citizens of Columbia Falls, Me., urging support of the Sparks-Capper alien amendment, being House Joint Resolution 356, to exclude aliens from the count of the population for apportionment of congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10317. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of Osborne Women's Literary Club, of Osborne, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill (H. R. 9986); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10318. Also, petition of Women's Missionary Society, of Lincoln, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill (H. R. 9986); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10319. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Rochester Mills, Pa., in favor of amending the Constitution to exclude unnaturalized aliens from the count of population for congressional apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10320. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of residents of Bucks County, Pa., favoring the Sparks-Capper stop alien representation resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10321. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Thomas R. Doherty, secretary Ringwood Local, Ringwood, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 15934 as in his opinion it will benefit the farmer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10322. Also, petition of Paul W. Treed, treasurer Arnold Bros. Packers, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of bills relative to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10323. Also, petition of Anna M. Ramsey, 2909 Pine Avenue, Mattoon, Ill., urging the passage of the proposed Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution relative to the 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10324. Also, petition of Helen W. Bayne, 905 North Lowlea Avenue, Chicago, Ill., requesting Congress to pass the Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution relative to the 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10325. Also, petition of Evelyn Hyde, Meredosia, Morgan County, Ill., urging the immediate passage of the Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1931

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 17, 1931)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

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

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard
Barkley	Frazier	McGill	Shipstead
Bingham	George	McKellar	Smith
Black	Gillett	McMaster	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	McNary	Steiwer
Blease	Goff	Metcalf	Stephens
Borah	Goldsborough	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Hale	Norbeck	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Bulkley	Harrison	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Hastings	Oddie	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Partridge	Wagner
Carey	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Hebert	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Howell	Pine	Waterman
Couzens	Johnson	Pittman	Watson
Cutting	Jones	Ransdell	Wheeler
Dale	Kean	Reed	Williamson
Davis	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	
Dill	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
Fess	King	Schall	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CAPT. CHRISTIAN DAMSON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Capt. Christian Damson, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, as amended, the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized, notwithstanding the lapse of time, to examine and consider the claim of Capt. Christian Damson, who is alleged to have suffered injury while employed on or about August 17, 1918, in line of duty: *Provided*, That no benefits thereunder shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. COPELAND. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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 following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 35. An act for the relief of James W. Nugent; and

S. 4334. An act for the relief of G. Elias & Bro. (Inc.).

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 43. An act for the relief of W. W. Payne;

S. 182. An act for the relief of Daisy O. Davis;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of John E. Ross; and

S. 6072. An act for the relief of C. H. Price.

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 6161) granting the consent of Congress to Missouri Valley Pipe Line Co. of Iowa to construct, maintain, and operate a pipe-line bridge across the Missouri River, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF IDAHO.

I, Fred E. Lukens, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, and legal custodian of the original enrolled copies of all acts passed at the various sessions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed constitutes a full, true, and complete transcript of the original enrolled copy of Senate Joint Memorial No. 10, enacted by the twenty-first session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, and filed in this office the 24th day of February, 1931.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 27th day of February, A. D. 1931.

[SEAL.]

FRED E. LUKENS,
Secretary of State.

LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO,
TWENTY-FIRST SESSION,
IN THE SENATE.

Senate Joint Memorial 10. (By agricultural committee)

To the honorable Senators, the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas Idaho and other Western States have only the markets of California and Texas as profitable outlets for the millions of bushels of wheat produced by them, due to high freight rates to eastern markets and also due to the fact that eastern markets are supplied by the Central States; and

Whereas the California and Texas markets are, at the present time, ruined by large cargoes of wheat being unloaded daily from Canada and Argentina, this condition being due to the present tariff provisions on wheat, whereby for a period of two years wheat may be imported into the United States from other countries without duty if the equivalent is exported in the form of finished products, feed, or the equivalent in wheat, even though it is of the most inferior grade of wheat produced in the United States, thus resulting in the cheaper grades of wheat fixing the price on the best grade of wheat produced in the United States; and

Whereas the present Farm Board having pegged the price of wheat a few cents above the price of Canadian and Argentine wheat, the western coast millers find it profitable to ship wheat from Canada and Argentina by water; and

Whereas the farmers of Idaho and other intermountain States have, at this time, approximately two-thirds of last year's crop in storage and are unable to sell it for more than 35 cents per bushel for the best grade of wheat produced in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to place an embargo upon all grains and grain products imported into the United States until such time as Congress shall enact legislation beneficial to the farmers; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 21st day of February, 1931.

G. P. MIX,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 21st day of February, 1931.

C. A. BOTTOLFSEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.